Tampere University

Miia Pylvänäinen

CIVILIAN CRISIS MANAGEMENT AND THE AMBIVALENCE OF CULTURE

Examining the Social World of International Operations

Faculty of Education and Culture
Master's Thesis
November 2020

ABSTRACT

Miia Pylvänäinen: Civilian Crisis Management and the Ambivalence of Culture: Examining the Social World of International Operations
Master's Thesis
Tampere University
Lifelong Learning and Education
November 2020

The study examined the relevance and meanings given to culture in civilian crisis management. The topic was addressed by conducting semi-structured interviews of six Finnish civilian crisis management experts and analyzing the data by means of qualitative content analysis and discourse analysis. Instead of the research participants' personal views, the focus was set on social practices and the social world of civilian crisis management.

Generally, culture appeared as significant to civilian crisis management through its influence especially on ways of behavior and mental aspects. However, the identified discourses and meanings given to culture in them painted different kinds of pictures of the reasons behind this relevance as well as its extent, manifestations and implications for learning, training, interaction and building mutual understanding. Also, the subject positions of crisis management experts and others involved differed depending on the discourse. The findings shed light onto multivocality, even contradictory discourses as well as tensions sometimes associated with culture.

Based on the analysis, the way culture is approached is significant from the perspective of equality and building mutual understanding. The question as to how culture is approached is ultimately an ethical one and also related to goals such as local ownership, fruitful collaboration, legitimacy and people-centered operations. Critical examination of implicit and explicit assumptions about what is seen as culture, as cultural differences and as thinking and behavior stemming from cultural reasons was suggested to be practiced in crisis management training and peacebuilding more broadly. Also, considering the wider context of interaction was encouraged.

Keywords: crisis management, civilian crisis management, peacebuilding, culture, intercultural communication, interculturality

The originality of this thesis has been checked using the Turnitin OriginalityCheck service.

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION **4**
1.1 Civilian Crisis Management *10*
1.2 Previous Research *12*
1.3 Methodology *24*
2 CULTURE AND INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION – THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK **29**
2.1 Approaches to Culture and Developments in Research on Intercultural Communication *31*
2.2 Challenges Related to Pursuing Non-essentialism *39*
2.3 The Approach in This Study *41*
3 DATA AND METHODS **47**
3.1 Collecting the Data *47*
3.2 Ethical Considerations *50*
3.3 Discourse Analysis *52*
3.4 Qualitative Content Analysis *55*
3.5 The Analysis Process *55*
3.6 Reliability and Validity *57*
4 RESULTS **61**
4.1 Culture's Relevance for Ways of Behavior *62*
4.2 Culture as a Set of Definable Manners and a Code of Conduct *70*
4.3 Culture as an Attribute of a Group of People *75*
4.3.1 The Relevance of "Culture as an Attribute" 81
4.4 The Intertwining Aspects of Culture, History, Politics, Religion and Nationality *83*
4.5 The Fluid Discourse and Multiple Potential Meanings of Culture *87*
5 DISCUSSION **99**
REFERENCES **112**
APPENDIXES **125**
Appendix I: Invitation to the Research Interview (in Finnish) *125*
Appendix II: Preliminary Interview Questions in Finnish *127*
Appendix III: Preliminary Interview Questions in English *130*
Appendix IV: Interview Quotations in Finnish *133*

1 INTRODUCTION

Intercultural communication, communicating with people from different backgrounds, is an integral part of crisis management at many levels. Interaction between military and civilian agents in peacekeeping missions started to intensify already in the 1990s, and currently, the complex and integrated crisis management calls for a variety of actors into interaction both with each other and with local people.[1] Therefore, the abilities and skills needed in cooperation and communication are essential to the smooth functioning of the operation. (Anttila, 2012, p. 89, p. 158; Rubinstein, Keller & Scherger, 2008, p. 540, p. 544; Vanonen, 2009, p. 5; see also Anttila, 2014.)

Changes in the nature and scope of conflicts today present challenges for crisis management. As for instance the joint study of the UN and the World Bank describes, proliferation in the number, scope and diversity of non-state armed groups involved in conflicts, different and evolving configurations of those groups, the involvement of external countries as well as the border-crossing flows of communication, finance, ideas and crime complicate both the conflicts and the efforts to resolve them. Many contemporary conflicts have links at international, national, regional and communal levels. Violence appears to be becoming increasingly protracted. After a declining trend, violent conflict has increased: violent interstate conflicts are still low in number, but the number of those within states has grown since 2010, leading to a sharp rise in the numbers of battle-related deaths. Attacks on civilians have increased in quantity and forced displacement has reached historically high levels. (United Nations & World Bank, 2018, pp. xvii-xx, p. 1, pp. 11-19, p. 275.)

In the face of the changing context, for example the 2015 report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (HIPPO) recommends, among other things, a shift towards *field-orientedness and people-centeredness* in the setting of UN peace operations (United Nations, General Assembly & Security Council, 2015, pp. 29-30; Stamnes & Osland, 2016, pp. 8-11; see also Heinonen, 2017, p. 52). As Heinonen (2017, p. 53, p. 65) interprets, pursuing the people-centered approach requires paying attention to the quality of communication skills needed in

[1] In civilian crisis management, the operation personnel may consist of internationals and locals from various backgrounds. In addition to interaction within the mission, the personnel may engage with local inhabitants beyond the operation personnel, such as with civil society and public administration partners, as well as with international actors such as NGOs, IGOs and diplomats. In certain duties, interaction with the associated administrative bodies, such as headquarters, of the organization carrying out the mission is needed. Also, contact between the deployed personnel and the national agencies in their home countries may take place.

peacekeeping missions. He sees the ability to "bridge the gap in understanding that is seen in relation to various challenging circumstances and actions" (p. 65) even as a part of peacekeepers' action competence. The same can be argued when it comes to civilian crisis management as well: as Anttila (2012, p. 158) points out, in civilian crisis management, interaction with local populations on a regular basis is necessary, although the frequency may vary depending on the duties of the personnel and the number of the local interlocutors may be limited. In order to reach the goals of the HIPPO recommendations and, also beyond the framework of the UN, to make peace operations effective and relevant in the face of the changing context and nature of conflict, it is essential to pursue establishing constructive interaction in the intercultural settings of crisis management. Gaining a deeper understanding of intercultural communication in peace operations is a challenge both for practitioners and researchers.

Despite the centrality of intercultural communication in crisis management, and despite the existence of a whole discipline dedicated to examining intercultural interaction in particular, it would appear that there is not an extensive body of academic research building bridges between these two fields when it comes to large-scale conflicts (see Chapter 1.2): intercultural communication and peacebuilding can, indeed, be seen as intersecting in many, maybe even in fundamental ways, but peacebuilding has not been subject to a lot of research in the field of communication (see Broome & Collier, 2012, p. 246). In addition, apart from the most recent studies such as the work of Broome and Collier (2012) as well as Collier (2016), most of the studies related to peacebuilding and peacekeeping that are utilizing intercultural communication approaches, as far as we know on the basis of the literature review in this thesis, can be interpreted as functionalist and essentialist (see Chapter 1.2). Even if contributions in various disciplines are considered, the body of academic research related to intercultural communication in the context of crisis management – not to mention civilian crisis management specifically – seems not to be very broad. Within anthropology and psychology, gradually increasing attention to culture and crisis management has started to emerge rather recently, often emphasizing the need to understand the so-called local cultures (see Autesserre, 2011, p. 6; Ådahl, 2009a, p. 104). In the fields of international relations and peace and conflict research, studies focusing on crisis management are conducted, as it would appear, quite often from perspectives other than communication and interaction in intercultural settings as such. Tarja Väyrynen (2005, p. 347) interestingly points out that "negotiation and conflict resolution theories do little to shed light on the role of understanding in resolving violent political conflicts."

Yet, as already implied, pursuing peace requires paying regard not only to macro-level dynamics but also to the orientations of individuals, interpersonal and intergroup relations and the

significance of social systems, as well as their role in influencing interaction (see Broome & Collier, 2012, p. 251). For instance, crisis management personnel's views, although only rarely studied (see Anttila, 2014, p. 82; see also Anttila, 2012, p. 11), have an influence on the implementation of crisis management operations (see e.g. Anttila, 2012, p. 11). As Autesserre (2014) points out, field-based peacebuilders not only implement but also interpret and translate instructions into action, often "with substantial leeway" (pp. 25-26) – and sometimes even circumvent or reject them (p. 28). Furthermore, it is the on-the-ground personnel's actions that shape local people's views on international peacebuilding more than written mandates or media reports (Autesserre, 2014, pp. 28-29; Lipsky 1980, as cited in Autesserre, 2014, p. 28). As can be seen in these examples, paying attention to micro-level dynamics (see Autesserre, 2014, p. 57) and particularly to the social reality is of great importance. As crisis management involves interaction between people from different kinds of backgrounds, both between locals and crisis management personnel and between the members of the personnel, meanings and relevance given to culture in the utterances of crisis management personnel are brought to the center of this thesis; the approaches to culture inevitably frame the ideas of intercultural communication (see Martin & Nakayama, 2010, pp. 84-86) and may also affect orientations towards operating in the local context more generally.

Gaining a better understanding of crisis management personnel's ways of constructing social reality may also be useful with respect to developing future training and abilities of the personnel (see also Anttila, 2012, p. 75). The changing and challenging contexts and nature of contemporary conflicts require constant learning and critical reflection on organizational and individual levels as well as readiness for continuous development of the training of crisis management personnel. As Anttila (2014, p. 85) argues, pursuing peace of lasting nature sets challenges both for organizational and individual learning in crisis management operations, although only rarely have these processes been subject to research. Anttila (2014) also points out that "a crisis management mission is a learning environment for the personnel" even if missions usually have not been seen as such (p. 97). For these reasons, conducting studies related to crisis management and peacebuilding also in the field of educational sciences is highly relevant.

However, apart from the dissertation by Anttila (2012) employing the perspectives of both organizational and individual learning, and her following article (2014), the perspectives of learning at the individual level seem not to be often included in academic literature on civilian crisis management – let alone individual learning related to intercultural communication in the context of civilian crisis management. Yet, learning can be seen as playing a central role in intercultural communication if building a common ground of meanings and reaching mutual understanding is

pursued (see also Keisala, 2012, p. 13, p. 182) – without learning from other participants in and through the interaction, there are no other options but to lean on assumptions of the other's ways of thinking and behavior or to ignore their views. Neither of these approaches provides a fruitful starting point for interaction (see Keisala, 2012, p. 12, p. 182). If norms, principles and practices are dictated by one party only, interaction is based on the adaptation of those who are in a more disadvantaged or vulnerable position. From an ethical perspective, this can be questioned. (Keisala, 2012, p. 182.) Accordingly, in intercultural training and education, the perspectives of learning are often emphasized and new ways of understanding and acting called for (Lasonen, Halonen, Kemppainen & Teräs, 2009, p. 11). The more the backgrounds of the interlocutors vary, the greater the need becomes to learn from each other (Keisala, 2012, p. 13).

In the western social science, seeing culture as contingent and fluid instead of homogenous and stable has become a popular view (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse & Miall, 2016, p. 405; see also Virkama, 2010, pp. 39-41). The same shift has characterized also the development of intercultural communication research. However, approaching cultures as solid entities is widespread among intercultural workers and trainers of intercultural communication (Virkama, 2010, p. 39, p. 44). According to Ramsbotham et al. (2016), "a naturalized view of culture can be seen as more universal than the fashionable western social scientific one" (p. 405; see also Baumann, 1999, p. 24). As far as we know on the basis of the literature review, no previous research focusing on meanings given to culture by crisis management personnel can be found (see Chapter 1.2).

In this study, attention is paid to various understandings of culture and its relevance to civilian crisis management as they are expressed in discourses by members of civilian crisis management personnel, henceforth called also as civilian crisis management experts. Focusing on discourses instead of practitioner's views is preferred mainly for three reasons. First of all, when it comes to views, or to the self and the mental life as Coulter argues, it is the *language of them* that is public and available for analysis (Coulter, 1979, as cited in Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 178). One cannot reach the views of others as such but only through language, through the process of communication and interpretation, in social interaction (cf. Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 178). Therefore, accurate analysis purely of the views of the interviewees is not considered possible.[2] Secondly, as it will be elaborated later (see Chapter 2.3), cultures are not treated as essences but as social constructs in this study. Discourses, for their part, are active in constructing cultures, and without this process of

[2] Even debate concerning the questions as to whether people's spoken or written utterances provide access to a person's inner world at all or whether they can be considered as valid descriptions of it exists: for instance, Burr (2015) argues from a Foucauldian perspective that things people say and write "have their origin not in the person's private experience, but in the discursive culture that those people inhabit" (p. 76). She also contests the status of concepts such as "opinions" and "attitudes" within a social constructionist approach to a person (Burr, 2015, p. 76).

construction we would not have “culture” as a concept to have view of. Therefore, the role of discourses in constructing and giving meanings to culture is considered significant. Not only do discourses construct meanings but also contribute to constructing social identities, social relationships as well as systems of knowledge and belief (Fairclough, 1992, p. 64; Campbell, 2007, p. 216). In this way, they relate to social systems, orientations of individuals, interpersonal and intergroup relations as well as micro-level dynamics, considering of which Broome and Collier (2012, p. 251) and Autesserre (2014, p. 57) call for so as to promote a more complete understanding of peacebuilding and to pursue peace. This leads us to the third point. As this study seeks to gain a deeper understanding of the social world in the context of civilian crisis management in order to potentially contribute to constructive interaction, attention is diverted from individual research participants and their personal views and actions to the level of social practices and the construction of social reality. Looking at discourses allows this perspective, as language is understood as “a form of social practice” instead of “a purely individual action” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 63). Accordingly, discourse analysis focuses on social practices instead of individuals (Jokinen, Juhila & Suoninen, 2016, pp. 43-44).

In addition, examining discourses may also shed light onto the kinds of meanings given to culture that one is not necessarily conscious about but that still are active in constructing reality. As Potter and Wetherell (1987, pp. 33-34) point out, individuals employ pre-existing linguistic capital when giving accounts, and choosing a certain form of language in a particular situation is not always an intentional and conscious decision (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 34; Burr, 2015, p. 70). Therefore, focusing on discourses may also allow the potentially contradictory meanings given to culture in social interaction to become visible: discourse analysis allows paying attention to multivocality, variance and even incoherence related to using language (see Suoninen, 2016a, p. 51).

Drawing on current critical approaches in research on intercultural communication (e.g. Piller, 2011; Holliday, 2011; Holliday, 2013), the aim of this study is to examine the questions as to with what kind of meanings and when culture appears in discourses in the context of civilian crisis management. In order to pursue this aim, two research questions were set: 1) *When and to which aspects is culture made relevant by civilian crisis management experts?* and 2) *What kinds of meanings are given to culture in discourses employed by civilian crisis management experts?* As for the former question, the aim is not to identify the intentions of the interviewees, but, rather, to look at the ways in which culture is seen to have influence on human life – for instance, what kinds of things culture is seen to explain or have influence on when the interviewees address their experiences in civilian crisis management. The first question, therefore, further contributes to

paying particular attention to the specific field of civilian crisis management by providing concrete examples of the expressed relevance of culture. Because of the intertextual nature (see Fairclough, 1992, p. 55, pp. 84-85, pp. 101-136) of discourses, not only the discourses employed as such by the interviewees themselves are considered but also those – employed for instance by the colleagues of the interviewees and the locals they have met – that the interviewees refer to. These discourses, too, are part of the social world of civilian crisis management.

The two research questions are addressed by conducting semi-structured interviews of six civilian crisis management experts and analyzing the data by means of qualitative content analysis and discourse analysis. Qualitative content analysis is utilized with respect to the first research question, whereas discourse analysis is preferred when analyzing the second one. However, because of the interrelated character of the two research questions, the analysis was performed in an intertwined way through a multi-step process: in order to deepen the analysis, the aim was to see which meaning given to culture is in question whenever culture is called into play. Each time culture is made relevant, it is referred to in some meaning given to the concept.

As for the aforementioned lack of knowledge on crisis management personnel's views, identified by Ulla Anttila (2014, p. 82; see also Anttila, 2012, p. 11), it is to be remarked that discourses do not necessarily reflect views directly. The relationship between "utterances and mental states" (see Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 178) is ambiguous and problematic. Therefore, the discourses identified in this study cannot be considered as representing the interviewees' opinions and inner world – in this study discourses are taken as a research topic and a social resource rather than a medium through which to recover views (see e.g. Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 184). However, discourses are not irrelevant to mind and views either: according to Potter and Wetherell (1987, p. 178), "[i]n practice, much of the phenomenon of the mind is intersubjectively constituted as the person speaks, writes, reminisces, talks to others and so on." In addition, as Burr (2003, p. 8) argues, "the way a person thinks, the very categories and concepts that provide a framework of meaning for them, are provided by the language that they use." Therefore, language is "involved with the processes of thinking and reasoning" (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 9). Through meanings, language guides our perceptions, which makes meanings a relevant subject for study (Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2011, p. 23). Although further elaboration of and reflection on the relationship between individual views and discourses, or even thought and language (see e.g. Burr, 2003, p. 8), is out of the scope and approach of this study, I hope the findings of this thesis will be able to contribute also to meeting some of the needs for research on crisis management personnel's views by providing useful perspectives.

The study is especially topical not only because of the HIPPO recommendations in the context of the UN peace operations but also for another reason. As mentioned in the publication *Varying Cultures in Modern Crisis Management* (Ådahl, 2009c) of the Finnish Defence Forces International Centre (FINCENT), in rather recent years in this millennium the role of culture has been identified as an important dimension in implementing peace operations (Vanonen, 2009, p. 5). In response to this, there have been efforts "to bring cultural awareness into the focus of crisis management" (Vanonen, 2009, p. 5, p. 7; see also Ådahl, 2009b, p. 8; Ådahl, 2009a, p. 104). Indeed, "multicultural awareness" is mentioned as "part of the civilian crisis management experts' professional skills" in Finland's National Strategy for Civilian Crisis Management which also states that attention be given to competence related to "culture sensitivity" (Prime Minister's Office, 2014, pp. 17-18). As the concept of culture is central to those of cultural awareness, multicultural awareness and culture sensitivity, meanings given to the former inevitably have an influence on how the latter ones are understood.

In the following subchapter, to illustrate the context of this study, the concepts of crisis management, civilian crisis management and comprehensive crisis management are defined. Also, Finland's aims and focus in civilian crisis management are briefly introduced. In the second subchapter, relevant previous research from a multidisciplinary set of fields is looked at, which also serves to illustrate the place of this study at the intersection of various disciplines. The third subchapter is dedicated for delineating the methodological foundations and influences this study is building on. In the second chapter, the theoretical framework of this thesis is introduced. Various theoretical approaches to culture are first illustrated by describing the development and major changes related to the understandings of culture especially with respect to interdisciplinary research on intercultural communication. This exploration then leads to explicating the approach of this study and describing how culture and intercultural communication are understood here. The third chapter, in turn, serves to provide the reader with a detailed account of how the study was conducted: the process of collecting and analyzing the data, illustrations of the methods chosen, discussions on reliability and validity as well as ethical considerations are presented. The findings of the study are introduced in the fourth chapter. Finally, in the fifth chapter, the findings are outlined and reflected on, and topics for potential further discussion are raised.

1.1 Civilian Crisis Management

Crisis management appertains to the process of peacebuilding that aims at attaining sustainable peace: peacebuilding seeks to attend to structural issues and long-term relationships between

conflicting parties. Crisis management consists of civilian and military activities, the latter of which is often called peacekeeping. (Anttila, 2012, pp. 56-57; Ramsbotham et al., 2016, p. 35.)

Civilian crisis management, in turn and in its simplest definition, can be seen as "crisis management carried out by civilian experts in a peaceful manner" (Anttila, 2012, p. 60). Non-military experts are deployed from outside the target society to contribute to restoring the prerequisites for the society's functioning in the crisis area. Civilian crisis management strives for preventing conflicts, maintaining stability and strengthening local governance in crisis areas and is organized from outside the society in the crisis area. (Anttila, 2012, p. 60; Prime Minister's Office, 2014, p. 10.) Anttila (2012) raises governance building as the main function of civilian crisis management: setting up and supporting local state structures that facilitate trust-building are involved in civilian crisis management (p. 56, p. 59). Finland's National Strategy for Civilian Crisis Management (Prime Minister's Office, 2014, p. 10) considers strengthening the principles of constitutional state, human rights and democracy as the aims of the activity.

Comprehensive crisis management refers to the collaborative engagement of various actors and has been advanced inter alia by the EU and the NATO (e.g. Anttila, 2012, p. 56; Petersen, Binnendijk, Barry & Nielsen, 2010, pp. 75-78). In its narrowest sense, it is understood as the integration of civilian and military aspects of crisis management. The concept may refer to a joint mission or to cooperation of civilian and military actors. (Anttila, 2012, pp. 56-57, p. 60; see also Pirozzi, 2013, pp. 5-8.) The comprehensive approach recognizes the need to develop military and civilian crisis management "in a coherent and flexible manner" (Anttila, 2012, p. 56). If interpreted more broadly, the comprehensive approach may involve political, security and development activities in a wider sense (see e.g. Pirozzi, 2013, p. 8) and comprise the contributions of national, international and non-governmental actors of many kinds (see Petersen et al., 2010, p. 76). In the framework of the EU, the European Commission and the High Representative of the EU for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (2013) state that comprehensiveness refers both to "the joined-up deployment of EU instruments and resources" and "to the shared responsibility of EU-level actors and Member States" (p. 3). While acknowledging the lack a commonly accepted definition for the concept, it has also been argued that a wide consensus exists on the comprehensive approach referring to "the pursuit of an approach aimed at integrating the political, security, development, rule of law, human rights and humanitarian dimensions of international missions" (Rintakoski & Autti, 2008, p. 9).

In Finland, participation in international crisis management is considered as part of the country's foreign and security policy as well as international cooperation. "[S]upporting local capacity, rule of law and good governance" are mentioned as the areas of focus in crisis

management participation. (Prime Minister's Office, 2016, pp. 27-28; Prime Minister's Office, 2014, p. 10.) The focus of Finnish civilian crisis management is on the civilian crisis management operations led by the European Union (EU). Furthermore, Finland participates in the operations of the United Nation (UN), North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the Council of Europe (CE) as well as cooperates with the Nordic countries and some other groups of countries. The aim is to deploy on average 150 Finnish experts annually. (Prime Minister's Office, 2014, p. 10.)

In the Finnish Civilian Crisis Management Vision, Finland formulates its aim in a following manner: "It is Finland's aim that international civilian crisis management be coordinated expert action, based on strengthening human rights, democracy, social and gender equality, which, pursuant to rule of law principles, promotes peace, stability and sustainable development" (Prime Minister's Office, 2014, p. 9). Finland also designates "advancing human rights and equality, strengthening the rule of law as well as the comprehensive approach" (p. 11) as cross-cutting themes in its foreign policy, having influence on Finnish civilian crisis management. The concrete activities of civilian crisis management may vary from surveillance, training and advisory tasks to deputizing government officials such as the police or the judiciary in executive operations. (Prime Minister's Office, 2014, pp. 10-12.) The duration of a single deployment is usually 1-3 years. In 2007-2018, the areas of operation with the greatest number of secondments comprised Kosovo, Afghanistan, Ukraine and Georgia. (CMC Finland, 2019.)

1.2 Previous Research

The research topic in this study is situated at the intersection of a variety of disciplines, including educational sciences, intercultural communication studies, peace and conflict research, anthropology and international relations, all of which may have multidisciplinary characteristics in themselves. For this reason, the academic literature this study is drawing on is of multidisciplinary nature. In this chapter, relevant previous research from various fields is introduced. As research on crisis management personnel has mainly been conducted on peacekeepers (see Anttila, 2012, p. 89), studies on peacekeeping are considered as well.

As illustrated earlier, interaction and communication in intercultural settings are an essential part of civilian crisis management. However, when it comes to large-scale conflicts, research building bridges between the fields of intercultural communication and peace and conflict research appears to be rather rarely conducted. Despite the fact that some of the very first impetuses for interest in intercultural communication studies as well as much of the initial developments in the

field can originally be traced back to the US military and diplomatic institutions in the mid-twentieth century, alongside with the strands of corporate business and religious studies (see Piller, 2011, pp. 29-31; Martin & Nakayama, 2010, pp. 45-47), peacebuilding has not been paid a lot of regard in the field of communication (Broome & Collier, 2012, p. 246). It appears that, instead of peace and conflict in large-scale contexts, conflict resolution and crisis management have been addressed more often from perspectives such as organizational communication at interpersonal or intergroup levels, interaction in study and corporate environments and crisis communication. As for wider-reaching violent conflicts, communication studies concerning media and the role it plays in peace and conflict exist, some of them also considering an intercultural perspective. As an example of the recent studies of this kind, Sudeshna Roy in the article "*Culturally unconscious: Intercultural implications of The New York Times representation of the Israel–Palestine conflict in 2009 and 2011"* (2012) utilizes critical discourse analysis to examine media representations and their implications on intercultural communication and group relations. The topics related to peace and conflict have sometimes been addressed from the point of view of culture and arts well (see e.g. Noorzai & Hale, 2016).

Some of the pioneering articles looking at intercultural communication in large-scale conflicts from a perspective other than media, arts and culture focused on the dimensions of negotiating and diplomacy. Examples of studies of this kind can be found in the book *Communicating for Peace: Diplomacy and Negotiation* (1990) edited by Felipe Korzenny and Stella Ting-Toomey. In his article "*Deadlock: Israel and Egypt Negotiate"* (1990), Raymond Cohen, PhD in International Relations and a specialist in intercultural communication, applies an intercultural approach of that time to an international relations matter (Cohen, 1990; Cohen, 2002 [1991]) – Cohen sees international relations as "the too-long-estranged sister field" (p. 152) of intercultural communication. Cohen analyzes the effects of differing cultural and traditional negotiation styles of the conflict parties (Cohen, 1990, pp. 136-153) and depicts the case as "a paradigm of a confrontation between two cultural architypes: high-context versus low-context, traditional versus modern, collectivist versus individualist, shame versus guilt, third world versus first world" (p. 152). In the face of "intercultural incompatibility" (p. 152), as Cohen calls his findings, he underscores the importance of a mediator or a cultural interpreter (pp. 136-153).

As it can be seen, Cohen uses what is called the functionalist approach and binary categories. The functionalist approach, typically, sees culture as a measurable element and seeks to distinguish culturally varying patterns in communication as well as predict the influence of culture on human behavior (Martin and Nakayama, 2010, pp. 54-59). Many other articles in the same book (Korzenny & Ting-Toomey, 1990), too, draw on this approach (see Martin & Nakayama, 2010, p. 55). For

instance, the theoretical contribution "*Diplomacy: A Special Case for Intergroup Communication"* (1990) by the immensely cited intercultural communication researcher William B. Gudykunst outlines a theory of anxiety and uncertainty reduction and introduces its application to diplomatic communication. In "*Intergroup Diplomatic Communication: A Face-Negotiation Perspective"* (1990) Stella Ting-Toomey and Mark Cole draw on Ting-Toomey's face-negotiation theory and apply it to the analysis of the Cuban missile crisis. A shift from functionalist approach has been made in the more recent research of intercultural communication, the approach of this thesis included (see Chapter 2 in this study).

Research on negotiation and mediation has subsequently continued its development as a field, in which some of the literature also aims at utilizing cross-cultural perspectives in negotiation theory. For example, *The Handbook of Negotiation and Culture* (Gelfand & Brett, 2004b) provides 20 articles related to psychological and social processes as well as negotiation in context. However, as Gelfand and Brett aptly illustrate in the epilogue *"Integration Negotiation and Culture Research"* (2004a), also applying to the large majority of the articles in the volume in question, " – – individualism and collectivism is currently the most favored dimension among scholars studying culture and negotiation" (p. 422). While considering individualism and collectivism as "important to the study of conflict and negotiation" (p. 423), they also acknowledge the risk of oversimplifying culture and holding to limited views when centering on one dimension exclusively (p. 422). According to Autesserre (2011), two top-down approaches of research on culture's influence on international negotiations can be identified: one of them focuses on the differences in national or regional negotiation styles, the other on the international diplomatic professional culture shared by negotiators from various national and regional backgrounds. Both of the approaches mostly pay attention to high-ranking diplomats and state representatives. (Autesserre, 2011, pp. 3-4.)

As for research on peacekeeping, culture was usually not addressed in the early analyses at all. Once interaction between peacekeepers and various civilian agencies intensified in the 1990s, the interaction was first scrutinized in terms of strategic and technical factors. (Rubinstein et al., 2008, pp. 540-541.) Discussions on culture and the intercultural dimensions of the relationships between various actors in the peacekeeping context started to be addressed more towards the end of the 1990s and the beginning of the new millennium (Elron, Halevy, Ben Ari & Shamir, 2003, p. 263; Rubinstein et al., 2008, pp. 540-541). Among the early ones, for instance, studies related to differing linguistic abilities in the transmission of orders and to issues with trust between peacekeepers and foreign nationals were conducted (e.g. Downes, 1993, Palin, 1995, Segal & Tiggle, 1997, as cited in Elron et al., 2003, p. 263). In 1997, linguistic and cultural differences were raised as one of the main problem areas also in a seminar addressing cooperation, command and

control in UN peacekeeping operations (International Association of Peacekeeping Training Centers, 1998, as cited in Elron et al., 2003, p. 263).

Subsequently, Soeters and Bos-Bakx (2003) as well as Elron, Halevy, Ben Ari and Shamir (2003) have paid attention to intercultural dimensions of multinational military peacekeeping. In their article *"Cooperation and Coordination across Cultures in the Peacekeeping Forces: Individual and Organizational Integrating Mechanisms"* (2003) Elron et al. draw on intercultural communication theories and concepts dominant in the 1980s and 1990s: they use theories such as the intercultural competence theory by Ting-Toomey (1999, as cited by Elron et al., 2003) and Bennett's (2003, as cited by Elron et al., 2003) model of developing intercultural sensitivity. The study by Elron et al. rests on an assumption that interaction in the multicultural context of peacekeeping has to be founded on individual intercultural competence so as to increase the unity of multinational peacekeeping forces. Although focusing on individual level orientations and behaviors, the authors also aim to shed light on the embeddedness of these aspects in organizational level mechanisms and norms. As a result of analyzing 62 semi-structured interviews of military officers and UN officials in a variety of locations and missions, Elron et al. recommend implementing selection criteria for peacekeepers regarding their individual intercultural effectiveness, assessing the behaviors and attitudes of candidates, implementing intercultural training as well as discussing cultural differences in relation to specific tasks. (Elron et al., 2003.)

The concept of intercultural competence or effectiveness as well as assessing the competence, however, entails certain problematic. Questions can be raised on how to define and operationalize effectiveness, competence or competences, and whether full competence is even possible to be reached. It has been argued that skills required in interaction vary according to the context and specific situation, affected and shaped by multiple factors (see e.g. Saastamoinen, 2009, p. 55; Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, p. 122). This, accordingly, makes the definition of competence contextually specific (see e.g. Kemppainen, 2009, p. 122; Saastamoinen, 2009, p. 55). What is "competent" in one situation may also differ for those whose positioning in terms of, for instance, gender, religious affiliations, ethnic positioning or socioeconomic class is not similar (Collier, 2015, p. 11). Furthermore, the issues related to intercultural competence or competences are inevitably connected to approaches to culture – a different kind of definition for the competence is probable to be settled upon if cultures are seen as unchanging, bounded and collective national units than if they are approached as more blurred, dynamic, contested and multidimensional. Moreover, defining what is needed particularly in *intercultural* communication is related to the questions as to how great a role culture is seen to have in human interaction or how "intercultural" is understood. More discussion on the definitions and components of intercultural competence in general as well as the challenges

related to defining them can be found in intercultural communication literature (see e.g. Breidenbach & Nyíri, 2009, pp. 262-318; Collier, 2015; Dervin & Keihäs, 2013; Jokikokko, 2002, pp. 87–89; Kemppainen, 2009; Saastamoinen, 2009; Virkama, 2010, pp. 49-51; Yershova, DeJaeghere & Mestenhauser, 2000).

Soeters and Bos-Bakx, in turn, focus on international cooperation in military missions in their article *"Cross-Cultural Issues in Peacekeeping Operations"* (2003). Like the aforementioned authors Cohen (1990), Gudykunst (1990) and Ting-Toomey and Cole (1990) looking at diplomacy and negotiating more than ten years earlier, Soeters and Bos-Bakx draw on the functionalist approach in intercultural communication: following Hofstede, they focus on national cultures and use Hofstede's dimensions (see p. 33 in this thesis) to analyze the role of cultural values in two peacekeeping missions. Their approach can be interpreted as having essentialist characteristics as well.

Anthropologist Robert Rubinstein has conducted extensive research work on peacekeeping. When discussing cultural models and their influence on interaction in his article *"Cross-Cultural Considerations in Complex Peace Operations"* (2003), he, too, draws on the work of scholars such as Hall and Hofstede, among others, as well as on concepts and classifications (e.g. "power distance" and "high context" vs. "low context") first created by them. In the article, Rubinstein pays attention to cultural differences between military and humanitarian actors in operations as well as to issues related to the interaction with locals. He, in acknowledgement of intracultural variation (see p. 31), approaches culture as "an aspect of groups" (p. 32) and "a model for understanding and action" (p. 30) that "guides – but does not determine – individual and collective action" (p. 46). Rubinstein describes culture as a "dynamic, symbolically-based – – learned system of meanings" (p. 30). In the article, Rubinstein discusses national, organizational and professional cultures in peace operations (see p. 32).

Later in his work, Rubinstein addresses deep cultural and symbolic levels: In *"Culture and Interoperability in Integrated Mission"* (2008), Rubinstein, Keller and Scherger extend the discussion of culture's influence on interoperability to vertical interoperability, that is, to interaction with local populations. The focus in the article is on deep cultural differences and their role in the perception of partnership and respect. In his article "*Intervention and Culture: An Anthropological Approach to Peace Operations"* (2005), Rubinstein looks at a deep symbolic level and its relation to the legitimacy, position and authority of peacekeeping. According to Ben-Ari (2010, pp. 382-384), also in the book *Peacekeeping under Fire: Culture and Intervention* (2008) Rubinstein argues for considering the role of the symbolic dimensions of peacekeeping in order to improve missions' effectiveness. As instanced by Ben-Ari (2010), "Rubinstein strongly argues that culture should be

seen as involving more than cross-cultural misunderstandings – –" (pp. 382-383). When it comes to other contributions in the field of anthropology, e.g. Donna Winslow (1997; see also Rubinstein et al., 2008, p. 541), for her part, looks at the role of military culture in the breakdown of the behavior of Canadian soldiers in Somalia.

Altogether, as for anthropological research on culture and peace interventions generally speaking, Autesserre provides an excellent summary of the bottom-up studies in her article *"Constructing peace: Collective understandings of peace, peacemaking, peacekeeping, and peacebuilding"* (2011). She identifies two bodies of research (pp. 6-7), the smaller of which pays attention to the following four themes, usually with respect to UN military peacekeeping:

> *"The first is the process through which national, organizational, and professional cultures orient the choice of specific peacekeeping strategies. The second is how differences in national cultures create tensions or misunderstandings between various contingents of a peacekeeping mission, and thus decrease the mission's effectiveness. Here again, we see a divergence between researchers who emphasize the significance of national military cultures, and those who argue that national cultures dissolve into a common, military peacekeeping culture, which mitigates misunderstandings between different national contingents. The third main theme is how gender impacts peacekeeping practices, notably by creating a dominant masculine and militaristic culture within the missions. Finally, the last theme is concerned with "how culture works to maintain peacekeeping as a social institution" and to provide peacekeeping and peacekeepers with legitimacy."* (p. 7.)

A larger body of anthropological research, combined with psychological contributions, focuses on what are seen as local cultures and their differences from those of international peace interveners as well as on varying conceptions of peace and peacebuilding (see Autesserre, 2011, p. 6). According to Autesserre, the central finding of these studies is that the interveners' lack of understanding of the cultures of local populations is connected to failures "as it orients intervention strategies toward unproductive approaches, severely affects the popularity of the interveners, and even generates conflict between international actors and local populations or armed groups" (p. 6). Within this body of work, improving interveners' understanding of local cultures is called for. The findings have been followed by advisory literature targeted to practitioners. (Autesserre, 2011, p. 6.)

When it comes to intercultural communication studies and the aforementioned shift from functionalism, the article "*Culture, Communication, and Peacebuilding: A Reflexive Multi-Dimensional Contextual Framework"* (2012) by Benjamin J. Broome and Mary Jane Collier represents this turn: the article stands in clear contrast with essentialist and functionalist views. The framework introduced by Broome and Collier consists of personal, relational and structural dimensions existing and coming about in a dynamic context. The dimensions are interrelated, and it

is through communication and culture that they are connected – instead of a national unit, culture is described as “multi-level, dynamic, and often contested communication structures and processes that evidence subject positions and past, present and future itineraries“ (p. 253). The presence and interplay of various cultural identifications, representations, structures and contextual elements in any encounter or spatiotemporal context is acknowledged (see p. 253). Collier further demonstrates how the three dimensions are intersecting, related to their context and constructed in social interaction in her more recent article “*An Intercultural Peacebuilding Framework: Extending the Conversation Through a Focus on Connections”* (2016), in which she applies the framework to a case study in Kenya.

In their article, Broome and Collier (2012, pp. 260-266) introduce seven strategies of utilizing the framework with regard to challenging conflicts; Collier discusses these dimensions also in her later work (2016, pp. 25-27). The strategies further illustrate Broome and Collier taking distance from essentialist views. First of all, the authors suggest avoiding “the tendency to essentialize culture in peacebuilding" (p. 260, *capitals removed*) and caution about the pragmatic consequences of a-contextual, essentialist orientations in peacebuilding. For example, referring to Holliday (2011), Broome and Collier (2012, p. 260) argue that oversimplified representations have the potential to contribute to maintaining inequality and hierarchies between groups of people. Instead, and as the second strategy, they emphasize the importance of recognizing “cultural multivocality and intersectionality” (p. 261, *capitals removed*). Next, they recommend looking into historical legacies and ideologies both in research and praxis of peacebuilding, revealing foundational assumptions influencing the work and examining what these assumptions produce and for the benefit of whom (p. 262). In her later work, Collier (2016, p. 26) also adds that competing histories occur around most intractable conflicts, and that rival ideologies and histories pertaining to peace and conflict are at play when it comes to intercultural communication. Moreover, Broome and Collier (2012) argue for paying attention to power relations and privilege which they approach as social constructions reproduced through structures and as processes that take a shape of taken-for-granted norms (pp. 262-263). “Examine agency and voice in peacebuilding” (p. 263, *capitals removed*) as well as “advocate for long-term engagement in peacebuilding projects” (p. 264, *capitals removed*) are also strategies proposed by Broome and Collier. Last, they call for engaging in reflexive dialogue. (Broome & Collier, 2012, pp. 260-266; see also Collier, 2016, pp. 25-27.) Furthermore, in her article in 2016 (p. 15, p. 18, pp. 25-26), Collier emphasizes the significance of praxis of reflexivity in attending to cultural difference, interculturality and intersectionality; she

finds reflective praxis important also in identifying and considering "levels of privilege, status positioning, equity, inclusion, and justice" (p. 15).[3]

Broome and Collier (2012) consider the aim of their article to be the encouragement of intercultural communication scholars to contribute to the practice and study of peacebuilding. They believe intercultural scholars can have a significant impact in this field. (Broome & Collier, 2012, pp. 245-247, p. 266.) Also, Cindy Gallois, PhD and Professor of Psychology, recognizes the potential of intercultural communication research to improve intergroup relations in the contemporary world in her article "*Reconciliation Through Communication in Intercultural Encounters: Potential or Peril*?" (2003), written in the aftermath of September 11th, 2001. However, she brings to the fore another important aspect: the potential of intercultural communication training to worsen these relations significantly. Gallois points out that each intercultural encounter is actually of intergroup and interpersonal nature at the same time, a fact that is often ignored by researchers looking at these two dimensions separately. Without a trained understanding of intergroup relations and the larger socio-political circumstances, intercultural communication skills training may even aggravate the conflict. Therefore, only when the context is carefully examined should choices about training be made. Gallois also notes that in many occasions, people involved may even lack motivation for good communication. (Gallois, 2003.) Emphasizing the importance of comprehending the influences that cultural domination, inequality and the history of conflict – dimensions that Broome and Collier (2012) as well as Collier (2016) pay attention to in their articles related to peacebuilding – have on interaction between individuals, Gallois (2003) also denotes the inadequacy of ethnorelativism. The article by Gallois (2003) intersects with the one by Collier (2016) in the sense that both attend to the importance of the contextual frames of interaction.

In Finland, Crisis Management Centre Finland (CMC Finland) conducts research particularly in the field of civilian crisis management. However, intercultural interaction and communication are not specifically addressed in the research publications that could be found on the CMC Finland website at the time of writing this thesis. Cultural sensitivity is mentioned in the article *"Recruitment and Training in Civilian Crisis Management: Learning from the ECMM/EUMM Experiences"* (2008) by Setkic: mainly based on the interviews of monitors, cultural sensitivity,

[3] In *Community Engagement and Intercultural Praxis: Dancing with Difference in Diverse Contexts* (2014) Collier expands the conversation began by her and Broome (2012) by applying a metaphor "dances with difference" to addressing seven case studies of community engagement as well as peacebuilding (Collier 2014, as cited in Collier, 2016, p. 16 and Alhinai, 2016, pp. 69-70). The metaphor is later employed also in Collier and Muneri's work *"A Call for Critical Reflexivity: Reflections on Research with Nongovernmental and Nonprofit Organizations in Zimbabwe and Kenya"* (2016).

alongside interpersonal skills, is considered essential within a successful team as well as when communicating with locals (pp. 14-15).[4]

Yet, as mentioned in the Introduction, cultural awareness has emerged as an area of increased interest of various stakeholders in crisis management (see Vanonen, 2009, pp. 5-7; Ådahl, 2009a, p. 105). Even if not representing research work as such, in the CMC Finland article collection *Siviilikriisinhallintaa erilaisten kulttuurien keskellä* [Civilian crisis management among different kinds of cultures] (2017a), experienced civilian crisis management experts employ the perspective of culture when addressing their experiences. The concepts of cultural competence and sensitivity are looked at by the editor Maritta Itäpuisto (2017b, p. 5). Some Finnish contributions relevant to the topic can be found also in the publications of the Finnish Defence Forces International Centre (FINCENT) responsible for organizing military crisis management training in Finland in the framework of the UN, NATO, the EU and the AU crisis management operations (see FINCENT, n.d.). Although not all the articles in FINCENT material, perhaps, fulfill the standards of academic publications, their focus illustrates the increasing attention given to the thematic. The FINCENT publication *Varying Cultures in Modern Crisis Management* (2009c), edited by anthropologist Susanne Ådahl, contains 11 articles by various authors. In the collection, the importance of including "a cultural dimension within crisis management operations" (see Vanonen, 2009, p. 7) is discussed and lessons learnt introduced, and, indeed, it is the perspective of cultural awareness that is given great attention (see also Ådahl, 2009a, p. 105). The point of view is supplemented inter alia with the use of the concepts of cultural sensitivity and cultural competence in some of the articles (see e.g. Liesinen, 2009; Kokkarinen, 2009; Toivonen, 2009; see also Ådahl, 2009a, p. 105). Although some brief overviews of the concept of culture are provided (see e.g. Vanonen, 2009, p. 6; Melasuo, 2009; Ådahl, 2009a, p. 104) and even the relevance of defining the concept is discussed (see Melasuo, 2009, pp. 13-14), approaching culture as a primarily practical issue is stressed (see e.g. Melasuo, 2009, p. 19).

Highly related to the area of interest in this thesis is a contribution by Emeritus Professor Heinonen, with PhD in Theology and MA in Pedagogy, in a more recent FINCENT publication. As already cited in the Introduction chapter in this thesis, Heinonen argues for the essentialness of communication skills in the changing context of peace operations in his article "*Bridging the Gap of Understanding: Dialogue Competence in the Renewal of UN Peacekeeping and Civil Crisis Management"* (2017). His theoretical framework for dialogue competence consists of three key

---

[4] Although not conducting academic research, also Wider Security Network (WISE), a civil society network bringing together Finnish NGOs and parliamentary groups (see Wider Security Network), publishes material related to crisis management. Yet, culture as a topic is not broadly addressed, even though its role as a relevant factor is acknowledged (see e.g. Siirtola, 2018, p. 17).

dimensions: 1) "dialogue rules based on knowledge of religions and cultures" (p. 65) , 2) "a system of symbol theory based on the abstraction level of the concepts" (p. 65), drawing on the studies of James Fowler and Peter Biehl (Fowler, 1982, Biehl, 1989, as cited in Heinonen 2017, pp. 61-63) and 3) "awareness of the combining universal ethical principles and norms" (p. 65), which Heinonen conceptualizes as global ethic. He sees the latter one as a factor that creates mutual understanding and that is required for enabling possible changes in one's attitudes, worldview and values (p. 65). The theoretical framework is applied to examining two case studies, Renoir's *The Grand Illusion* and the peace negotiations between Israel and Egypt in Camp David in 1978.

It appears that Heinonen does not draw a strict line between intercultural and inter-religious interaction in his text. Especially when it comes to the analysis of the negotiations in Camp David, he seems to focus more on the inter-religious aspects. Yet, even then, many of his considerations may be applied to intercultural communication as well. For instance, the fifth level in the symbol theory, *"post-critical" symbolizing* (see Heinonen, 2017, p. 63), can be interpreted as having some confluences with perspectives often mentioned in intercultural communication literature[5]. According to Heinonen (2017, p. 63), a process at the level of "post-critical" symbolizing is characterized by self-reflection, by mutual questions and answers in a dialogue as well as by understanding common values and principles. This could perhaps be interpreted as negotiating a shared, "common ground of meanings and practices" (Koole & ten Thije, 2011, p. 571) or a cultural framework, on which interaction, action and mutual understanding can be built (Saastamoinen, 2009, p. 59; Keisala, 2012, p. 13, pp. 33-34) – in intercultural communication literature, this framework is often conceptualized as *third culture* (see e.g. Keisala, 2012, p. 13, pp. 33–34; Saastamoinen, 2009, p. 59) or as *intercultural discourse* (see Koole & ten Thije, 2001, p. 571). Furthermore, Kemppainen (2009, p. 123) approaches the process from the perspective of building a *strategy* suitable for the situation in question or *negotiating reality*, which is a concept central especially to the work of Friedman and Berthoin Antal (2005; Berthoin Antal & Friedman 2008).

Nevertheless, some of the assumptions underlying Heinonen's arguments should, from the perspective of the methodological foundations of this study (see Chapter 1.3), be brought under critical scrutiny. In light of social constructionism, one of these is the existence of universal ethical principles and norms. Likewise, the existence of "cultural and religious *facts*" (Heinonen, 2017, p. 61, *italics added*), the knowledge of which Heinonen mentions when talking about dialogue rules and dialogue competence, can be contested from social constructionist and critical perspectives. The

[5] Also, the article "A Shared Understanding: Gadamer and International Conflict Resolution*" (2005) by peace researcher Tarja Väyrynen has confluences with intercultural communication literature, as she discusses dialogue, fore-concepts and the fusion of horizons in negotiations.

expression can also be interpreted as referring to essentialist or neoessentialist discourses on culture or as potentially drawing on an essentialist or neoessentialist approach to it (see Chapter 3) – even if Heinonen (2017, p. 61) also cautions against making generalizations and ignoring the uniqueness of each person.

As for the perspective of learning in the context of crisis management, Ulla Anttila makes a valuable contribution in her the doctoral dissertation *Enhancing Human Security Through Crisis Management: Opportunities and Challenges for Learning* (2012) as well as in her more recent article *"Human Security and Learning in Crisis Management"* (2014) based on the dissertation. Anttila primarily looks at the question as to "what kind of learning should be promoted in crisis management" (2012, p. 11; 2014, p. 82). In addition, she aims at identifying learning challenges presented by what she calls "new conflicts" (see e.g. p. 11, p. 27). Anttila employs both the perspectives of organizational[6] and individual learning, the latter of which she sees as necessary for the former. The original research comprises two empirical parts: a Delphi panel process on crisis management, with 15 experts attending, and qualitative interviews of 27 members of civilian and military crisis management personnel whose experience was from Kosovo. As for her findings relevant to this study, Anttila regards that developing the interaction skills of crisis management personnel is vital for reaching a sustainable peace process with local involvement. Similarly to Heinonen (2017), Anttila describes communicative capacity as an essential part of crisis management competence – she emphasizes the role of communication skills especially in ensuring local ownership, information sharing and civil-military cooperation. Anttila also considers local awareness as a valuable competence in advancing one's ability to collaborate and interact. Many of the interviewees had co-operated with locals and other members of crisis management personnel to solve problems, and the experts in the panel underlined the interaction abilities of the civilian personnel in particular. (Anttila, 2012; Anttila 2014; see also Setkic, 2008, pp. 14-15.) In the theoretical considerations of her dissertation (pp. 91-103), Anttila also discusses the role of reflexive skills as well as cultural dimensions in crisis management with respect to learning.

In the field of educational sciences, with a view on the improvement of recruitment and training, Kivistö looks at peacekeepers' views of peacekeeping and its significance, reasons for enlisting as well as the challenges experienced on the field in her rather recent dissertation *"'En mä oikein tiennyt, mihin olin hakeutumassa. Kaikesta on kuitenkin selvitty ja vaikeudet voitettu. Paljon*

[6] Organizational learning is also addressed in Howard (2007): *"UN peacekeeping in civil wars"* and Bossong (2013): "*EU civilian crisis management and organizational learning*". By means of systematic comparative analysis of ten cases, Howard (2007) examines the reasons for success and failure in UN peacekeeping. Bossong (2013), in turn, analyzes the applicability of the notion of organizational learning to EU civilian peace operations and focuses on surveying organizational and conceptual development in 2000-2009.

olis kerrottavaa siitä, mitä oon oppinut' Rauhanturvaajien kuvauksia rauhanturvatehtävään hakeutumisesta, rauhanturvatyön merkityksestä sekä kohdatuista haasteista rekrytoinnissa ja koulutuksessa huomioitavaksi." (2016). Some of the challenges experienced by peacekeepers, according to Kivistö, were connected to inadequate competence related to cultural habits: inappropriate ways of behavior, challenges related to language skills, lack of routine in applying politeness norms and "differences in national characteristics" (see e.g. p. 121, *transl.*). Inadequate competence was associated with differences on societal level as well as with "unawareness of local people's ways of behavior and factors influencing their behavior" (p. 126, *transl.*). Kivistö further illustrates wishes and considerations related to training expressed by peacekeepers: she lists "knowing cultural habits and norms", "studying local language(s)", "prerequisites for cooperation with conflict parties" and "knowing nationalities, culture and ways of behavior of participants of peacekeeping operation", referring to peacekeepers from other countries, as key areas. (p. 126, pp. 148-153, *transl.*)

As it can be seen, practically-oriented dimensions are underscored in the views and experiences of peacekeepers interviewed by Kivistö (2016). As aspects related to interaction with locals and other peacekeepers were raised as an important content area of training (see p. 153), there seems to be need and willingness to improve intercultural communication in the context of peacekeeping. According to Kivistö, the abilities to listen to the locals, to communicate and interact as well as to behave in a correct way were also seen as part of the competences of a peacekeeper (p. 124); these stances are in line with the abovementioned views of Heinonen (2017, p. 65) and Anttila (2012; 2014) concerning the essential role of communication and interaction skills. However, the assumptions of the existence of national characteristics and differences in them seem to underlie the views of at least some of the interviewees in Kivistö's study (see 2016, p. 121, p. 125, p. 136, p. 140).

All in all, even if contributions in various disciplines are considered, the body of academic research related to intercultural communication in crisis management – not to mention civilian crisis management specifically – appears not to be very extensive. In the field of anthropology and psychology, gradually increasing attention has been paid to culture and crisis management, often emphasizing the need to understand the so-called local cultures (see Autesserre, 2011, p. 6; Ådahl, 2009a, p. 104). In international relations and peace and conflict research, studies focusing on crisis management are conducted but, as far as we know, usually from perspectives other than communication and interaction in intercultural settings. In intercultural communication or studies overlapping with it, apart from the most recent research such as the work of Broome and Collier (2012) as well as Collier (2016), most of the studies generally related to peacebuilding and

peacekeeping can be interpreted as functionalist and essentialist. Generally, it appears peacekeepers have been subject to research more often than civilian crisis management personnel (see also Anttila, 2012, p. 89; Autesserre, 2011, p. 7). Studies focusing on the opinions and views of crisis management personnel seem rare, as Anttila (2014, p. 82) argues. Neither are the perspectives of learning on individual level often included in the academic literature on civilian crisis management, let alone individual learning related to intercultural communication.

On the basis of this literature review, no research focusing specifically on crisis management personnel's views of culture or intercultural communication or examining the underlying assumptions related to these concepts from the perspective of the critical approach could be found. Neither was any research found that would look at the meanings given to these concepts at the level of discourses utilized by crisis management experts. This is so even if cultural awareness and sensitivity appear to be gaining prominence in the discourses employed by various stakeholders (see e.g. Vanonen, 2009). The gaps in previous research identified above add to the relevance and justification of this study. In addition, the importance of communication and interaction skills in the context of crisis management, identified and brought to the fore in the studies of Anttila (2012; 2014) and Kivistö (2016) as well as in the article by Heinonen (2017), further illustrates the relevance of studying intercultural communication related to crisis management. It also speaks to the need of examining the meanings given to culture: as already mentioned in the introduction, the ideas of culture inevitably frame those of intercultural communication (see Martin & Nakayama, 2010, pp. 84-86).

1.3 Methodology

The study is influenced mainly by the research paradigms of *social constructivism, social constructionism* and *critical theory* that can be considered as partly overlapping. Especially the differences between constructivism and social constructionism appear subject to various interpretations, and the terms are sometimes used interchangeably (see Young & Collin, 2004, p. 378). By some authors (e.g. Tynjälä, 1999, p. 162), social constructionism is seen as one of the approaches under the umbrella of constructivism. According to Burr (2015, p. 22) and Young & Collin (2004, p. 378), however, the most important difference between constructivism and social constructionism lies in the extent to which emphasis is placed on individual vs. social construction process: constructivism, especially when it comes to the most radical approaches, inclines towards the former, whereas social constructionism stresses the latter. Social constructivism, in turn, has several features in common with social constructionism and recognizes the role of social

relationships in influencing individual construction. (Young & Collin, 2004, pp. 375-378.) In this study, contributions of both social constructionism (e.g. Burr, 2003; Burr, 2015) and social constructivism (e.g. Keisala, 2012) are considered, together with certain aspects of critical theory, as it is elaborated in this chapter.

Following social constructivism that has its roots in constructivism, in the approach of this study social reality is understood as being constructed in social interaction (Onuf, 2012, pp. 3-4; see also Birks, 2014, p. 20). This fundamental assumption is shared by social constructionism as well: as pointed out by Young and Collin (2004), these two approaches "share a common heritage" (p. 384). The world is seen as being made what it is "from the raw materials that nature provides, by doing what we do with each other and saying what we say to each other" (Onuf, 2012, p. 4). As Lincoln (2016) further illustrates, only rarely does the raw physical environment shape our behavior, but "it is, rather, the meanings we associate with any given tangible reality or social interaction which determines how we respond" (p. 12). Also, human beings, understood as social beings, are influenced by their social relations (Onuf, 2012, pp. 3-4). For these reasons, "constructivism holds that people make society, and society makes people" (Onuf, 2012, p. 4).

In social constructionism, as it is in this study as well, especially the role of language is considered central in constructing social reality. Therefore, language is found an element of great interest. (Burr, 2003, p. 4; Burr, 2015, p. 52.) Accordingly, this approach, for its part, serves to provide methodological foundations for both of the methods of analysis in my study: As for discourse analysis, the role of language is inevitably significant, and the method is based on the very same assumption that language constructs social reality (Jokinen, Juhila & Suoninen, 2016, pp. 25-32). When it comes to content analysis, in turn, language is still the means by which the interviewees and the researcher communicate and, in that process, construct versions of the reality.

As the ways of understanding the reality are constructed through interactions with other people (see e.g. Burr 2003, pp. 2-10; Onuf, 2012, pp. 3-4), for instance in different historical periods of time and in different places the views and versions of the reality may vary. The ways of understanding the world are, therefore, specific to particular context but also products of it (see Burr, 2003, pp. 3-4); social constructivism and social constructionism are usually seen as being based on a *relativist* view of the reality (see e.g. Lincoln, Lynham & Guba, 2018, pp. 114-115; Burr, 2003, pp. 22-23). Our ways of understanding the world can be considered as coming "from other people, both past and present" in the sense that we learn "conceptual frameworks and categories" from other people in our social surroundings (Burr, 2003, p. 7). Nevertheless, our understandings of the world are not only constructed through interaction but also through our lived experiences (Lincoln et al., 2018, p. 115): not even two persons can be found on this planet who

would have lived in exactly similar kind of surroundings and interpreted their experiences in a similar way (Keisala, 2012, pp. 12-13, p. 30). This view is influenced especially by social constructivism: according to Young and Collin (2004), from a social constructivist perspective, individual construction exists, although influences on it are "derived from and preceded by social relationships" (p. 376). As also Lincoln et al. (2018) argue, constructivism acknowledges the existence of individual, personal realities that sometimes merge with collective reconstructions around consensus (Lincoln et al., 2018, p. 112, pp. 114-116). Accordingly, the understandings of the reality are not only contextually specific but may also have variation on individual level.

What follows from the discussion above is "a critical stance toward taken-for-granted knowledge", also with respect to one's own views (Burr 2003, p. 2). The assumptions underlying positivism and empiricism – the claims that the nature of the world, *facts*, can be objectively observed and that knowledge directly reflects the reality – are called into question and problematized in social constructionism (Burr, 2003, pp. 2-3, p. 6) and in social constructivism. I do not argue, however, that an absolute truth would not exist, but that as human beings, our understandings of the reality are always limited, partial and biased, shaped by our personal experiences, interpretations and interactions with other people. In a similar way, in light of the discussion above, also the perspective and results of my study are affected by the context in which the study is conducted as well as my interpretations as a researcher – which, thus, makes the study unable to provide objective facts. Rather, it serves as one version and interpretation of the reality.

As different versions of knowledge can be seen as products of the social processes people are engaged in, from this perspective, human knowledge could be described as "something that people do together" instead of them possessing or not possessing it (Burr, 2003, pp. 3-6, p. 9). From this it, then, follows that people also have agency when it comes to producing knowledge and interpretations of the reality. Moreover, as Burr (2003) puts it, "all knowledge is derived from looking at the world from some perspective or other, and is in the service of some interests rather than others" (p. 6). Therefore, knowledge is also related to power.

Furthermore, "knowledge and social action go together" (Burr, 2003, p. 5): that is to say, our constructions of the world influence our behavior. They have implications, for instance, on how to interact with other people and what is permitted to be done by whom – one kind of construction of the world encourages certain kind of social action while excluding others, whereas other constructions may invite different kinds of behavior. (Burr, 2003, p. 5.) This point makes studying the meanings and relevance given to culture in the context of civilian crisis management highly relevant: in light of Burr's remarks on social constructionism, the ways of seeing culture and its role

in the social reality are very likely to have influence, in one way or another, on behavior and interaction in the intercultural settings of crisis management operations.

Accordingly, as it is language that is seen as significant in constructing meanings (see e.g. Burr, 2003, p. 4; Onuf, 2012, pp. 3-4), language can be seen as highly consequential too. Therefore, interviews can be considered as a relevant method to approach the topic of this study – it is the meanings constructed through language that can be examined through the data from the interviews. In addition, in any case language is the means that the interviewees and the researcher use in the process of communication and interpretation. Therefore, language will be inevitably present and playing an important role in the collection of the data in this study.

Seeing the social world and people engaged in it as products of social processes has significant implications also on views of human beings: any given essence or determined nature associated with people becomes problematized (see Burr, 2003, p. 5). Similarly, social constructionism calls us to examine whether the categories we divide the world and people into are based on real, naturally occurring divisions or constructed imaginaries (see Burr, 2003, p. 3) – a notion highly relevant to my study as well, as it applies to categories based on culture or ethnicity too. In addition, as social constructionism also invites us to critically examine taken-for-granted knowledge (Burr, 2003, pp. 2-3), our views of culture as a concept and of the ways it influences the social reality are encouraged to be scrutinized.

The ability of social constructions to influence human behavior, including what is permitted to be done by whom and how to interact with other people, also denotes that descriptions of the world are related to power relations (Burr, 2003, p. 5). This notion can be seen as making links between social constructionism and the perspectives of critical theory. In my interpretation, the critical approach is utilized in a significant part of the academic literature that the theoretical framework in my study is drawing on, particularly when it comes to intercultural communication. In critical theory, social actors are seen to operate in a world where power relations and struggle for power are present, therefore leading to interactions of privilege and oppression. These patterns of privilege and oppression may be based on categorizations such as race, ethnicity social class or gender. (Lincoln et al., 2018, p. 114; Bernal, 2002, Giroux 1982, Kilgore 2001, as cited in Lincoln et al. 2018, p. 114.) Foundations of the critical approach are then rooted in striving for equality and social justice (Lincoln et al., 2018, pp. 128-129); critical theory aims to shed light on social conditions, with emphasis especially on sources of oppression (see Peters, 2005, p. 38).

Transformation, therefore, is an aspect highly relevant to the aims of critical theory. Similarly to social constructivism and social constructionism, in the critical approach knowledge is seen as being socially constructed (Kilgore, 2001, as cited in Lincoln et al., 2018, p. 120) but also as

“subjective, emancipatory, and productive of fundamental social change” (Merriam, 1991, p. 53) – it then is in the interests of critical theory to seek to offer improved self-understandings of social agents pursuing transformation (Peters, 2005, p. 38). Indeed, “emancipation”, “enlightenment” and “empowerment” are terms often associated with critical theory and its aims (see e.g. Merriam, 1991, pp. 51-58; Peters, 2005, p. 38; Lincoln et al., 2018, pp. 112-131).

The roots of the paradigm lie in German philosophy, especially in the work of Hegel, Marx and the Frankfurt school and later, Jürgen Habermas (Merriam, 1991, p. 51). Originally the word “critical” when related to critical paradigm was employed to refer to self-reflexive social theory addressing its own conditions of possibility and effects that might be transformative (Peters, 2005, p. 38). However, as Peters (2005, p. 38) explains, “since its adoption by Horkheimer as a revision of Marx” critical theory has been more widely accepted to describe theoretical approaches critical in the sense illustrated above. According to Peters, these approaches include “feminism, psychoanalytic thought, much cultural theory, the various forms of structuralism and poststructuralism, “French theory” and postcolonial studies” (p. 38). Kincheloe, McLaren, Steinberg and Monzó (2018) outline “critical research can be understood best as research that attempts to create conditions for empowerment and social justice” (p. 237). As for my study, the critical approach is, as already mentioned, related to the foundations of some theoretical contributions of others, but also to the attempts in this study towards reflexivity and self-reflexivity, seeking to provide better self-understandings of social actors as well as to provide insights into and accounts of social conditions (see Peters, 2005, p. 38) – which is, ultimately, yet in acknowledgment of the modest and humble role of a study of this kind, related to aspirations of potentially being able to contribute to advancing fruitful interaction in the intercultural settings of crisis management, in pursuit of peace.

2 CULTURE AND INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION – THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

> *"Culture is one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language*." (Williams, 1976, p. 76.)

Culture as a concept, although being very commonly used, is often left without a definition. This can be problematic not only in our daily communication in which the word "culture" may have multiple meanings, but also in part of academic literature ignoring any scrutiny of the concept. Yet, our ideas of culture influence our understanding of what is actually at hand in the discussion, and definitions are needed in order to ensure all those involved are discussing the same thing. For instance, as argued in the Introduction of this thesis, the way we approach culture influences our understandings of intercultural communication (see Martin & Nakayama, 2010, pp. 84-86) and cultural awareness in the context of civilian crisis management, as in any other context.

As for academic literature, only careful examination of understandings and conceptualizations of culture makes dialogue and debate related to intercultural communication reasonable and sound – otherwise, there is no actual chance of reliably understanding the foundations on which the discussion is built in the first place. The importance of scrutinizing the view of culture in any academic text related to culture or intercultural communication is emphasized by the observation that two dominant theoretical approaches to culture – identified as *essentialist* and *non-essentialist* views of culture (see e.g. Virkama, 2010, p. 40; Holliday, 2011, pp. 4-6) or as *entity understanding* and *process view* of culture (see e.g. Piller, 2011, p. 15) – within the fields of social science and intercultural communication can be seen as lacking coherence in relation to each other. In everyday life practices, however, the boundaries of these two differing kinds of views are not always clear. Instead, essentialist and non-essentialist approaches do intermingle sometimes. (Virkama, 2010, p. 44.)

Encapsulated by Virkama (2010), according to the essentialist view culture is seen as "a set of characteristics that can be studied and used in order to communicate with the people 'belonging' to this culture" (p. 42). In addition to seeing culture as something people belong to, it may be

considered as something people have, making culture a collective attribute determining individuals' behavior. Culture is therefore seen not only as deterministic but also homogenous. Culture as an entity may be a national or a smaller unit – bounded and separate from other cultures, though. Often, the essentialist view of culture is also coupled with seeing culture as static. (Breidenbach & Nyíri, 2009, p. 321; Nathan, 2015, p. 103; Piller, 2011; Virkama, 2010.)

Obviously, the non-essentialist approach challenges the essentialist notions of culture. The non-essentialist view emphasizes the constructed and contextualized nature of culture, and resists approaching cultures as entities. Rather, culture is considered as heterogenous and the boundaries of different cultures as blurred. Cultural elements can manifest with varying meanings and in varying forms in different contexts. From a constructionist perspective culture is viewed as something people do or perform, which brings to the fore not only the role of social interaction in constructing culture but also the view of it as being constantly in a process of change. Following the non-essentialist understanding, culture can be described as dynamic and complex. (Nathan, 2015, p. 103; Piller, 2011, p. 15; Virkama, 2010, pp. 42-43.) According to Nathan (2015, p. 103), the non-essentialist paradigm is "rooted in human conditions", in contrast to the rootedness of essentialist approach in human nature.

In this chapter, I first introduce various theoretical approaches to culture by describing the development and major changes related to the understandings of culture especially with respect to interdisciplinary research on intercultural communication. This exploration is of great importance, as different approaches to culture lead to different understandings of the relevance of culture in explaining human behavior and the social world. In addition, as no single definition of culture can be found, attention is also paid into how the concept of culture is used and for which purposes (see Piller, 2017, p. 5; see also Barker & Galasiński, 2001, p. 11). Alongside the emergence of more non-essentialist stances in the academia, a turn from functionalism towards critical approaches has been characterizing the developments in research on intercultural communication. Instead of adhering to a binary understanding of essentialism/non-essentialism, I also introduce Holliday's (2011) concept of *neo-essentialism* and Dervin's (see Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, pp. 36-37) concept of *interculturel janusien* as well as reflect on understanding non-essentialism as a certain kind of goal rather than a once-obtained condition. Finally, I end this chapter by explicating the approach of this study and describing how the concepts of culture and intercultural communication are understood here.

2.1 Approaches to Culture and Developments in Research on Intercultural Communication

The English word "culture" has its roots in Latin "cultura": the word "culture" in the 15th century English language originally carried an agricultural meaning of "husbandry" and "the tending of natural growth" (Williams, 1976, p. 77; Kramsch, 1998, as cited in Piller, 2017, pp. 14-15). Other meanings, such as those related to artistic activity, started to emerge gradually. As for meanings relevant to the topic of this study, influences from the German language in the 19th century as well as the Romantic movement in Germany, France and England formed the context for their emergence. It was the German word "Kultur" already in the 18th century that first carried the meaning "historical self-development of humanity", a lineal process leading to the culmination of the European culture of that time. (Williams, 1976, pp. 77-80; see also Piller, 2017, pp. 14-15.) Likewise in the 18th century, Herder criticized the idea and was the first one arguing for speaking of cultures in the plural, meaning "the specific and variable cultures of different nations and periods, but also the specific and variable cultures of social and economic groups with a nation", as Williams (1976, pp. 78-79) explains.

When it comes to the spreading of those new meanings given to "culture", the emergence and development of anthropology as a discipline has been central. In the context of colonialism in the 19th century, the development of the modern nation state as well as increasing traveling leading to the proliferation of awareness of other peoples and their ways of living, the early anthropology was characterized by the assumption of cultures being separate units. In addition to the separateness of cultural entities, each of them was seen as being situated on a specific point on a path of human development leading from savagery through barbarism to civilization. European culture was seen as superior, and the evolutionary view of cultures served to justify and underscore colonialism as a civilizing effort of a morally obligatory nature. Comparative study of cultures located in different points of evolution was conducted for example by anthropologist Edward Tylor, who decisively introduced the new meaning given to culture into English language. (Piller, 2011, pp. 20-23; Avruch, 1998, pp. 6-8; Williams, 1976, p. 80; see also Martin & Nakayama, 2010, pp. 47-48.) However, as Piller (2017, p. 16) points out, this view of "different peoples having different cultures" that could be "hierarchically ordered" could not only be found in the academia but also in a multitude of popular discourses.

Although the evaluation of cultures as more developed and as less developed ones has continued, other discourses have emerged as well. Similarly having its roots in anthropology, first in the work of Franz Boas, *multiculturalism* is also built on the idea of different cultures and

cultural differences. However, multiculturalism refuses the evolutionary understanding of cultures, and instead, celebrates cultural diversity referring mostly to intranational variety. (Piller, 2011, pp. 24-28; see also Jokikokko, 2002, p. 86; Breidenbach & Nyíri, 2009, p. 159; Avruch, 2016, p. 67.) Following the political decolonization as well as the reform and protest movements in the 1960s, multiculturalist positive orientation to cultural difference spread (Piller, 2011, p. 25); also the origin of multicultural education is traced back to the Civil Right struggles in the United States (May & Sleeter, 2010, p. 4). Although the work of many anthropologists, starting with Boas, included a moral and political component of inter alia aiming to decouple culture from race, biology and heredity (Avruch, 2016, pp. 67-68), culture has often been equated with ethnicity and race (May & Sleeter, 2010, p. 4; Piller, 2011, p. 25). Culture has also been mobilized as part of identity politics by groups subordinated on the basis of ethnicity, race, sexuality or gender (Piller, 2011, pp. 25; Breidenbach & Nyíri, 2009, p. 157, p. 323): according to Avruch (2016, p. 68), "the relationship of culture and race was born in the 19th century". As for multiculturalism, though, Stuart Hall (2003b, pp. 234-235) points out that instead of being a bounded doctrine, multiculturalism can refer to a variety of political strategies and processes ranging from conservative to liberal and from pluralist to corporative multiculturalism.

At approximately the same time with the emergence of multiculturalism, *intercultural communication* first appeared in academic discourses, and later became common in wider use (Piller, 2011, pp. 28-30). In the context of the Cold War, the economic successes of for instance Japan and other Asian societies as well as the military and civilian developments in the former colonies leading to decolonization, interest to intercultural communication was increasing exponentially especially in the strands of corporate business, religious studies and military (Piller, 2011, pp. 29-33); in particular, the significance of international business training is often emphasized when considering the development of the field (see e.g. Virkama, 2010, p. 42). As for the key figures of intercultural communication studies, for example William B. Gudykunst, the developer of the *anxiety uncertainty management* (AUM) theory, earlier served as an intercultural relations specialist in the US Navy in Japan. Anthropologist Edward T. Hall, also having contributed to the business context, can be associated with the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) training diplomats from the United States for their missions abroad and is sometimes considered even as the creator of the concept *intercultural*. Influenced by the practical concerns of his students and structural linguistics, Hall focused on micro-cultural investigation of proxemics (the use of space), time, paralanguage (i.e. intonation and pitch) and kinesics, which continues to influence many texts in the field. Considering the original context, in this paradigm the unit of analysis is usually national culture. Scholars at the FSI came from various backgrounds, which contributed to

the development of an interdisciplinary, integrated approach in intercultural communication field. (Piller, 2011, pp. 28-33; Martin & Nakayama, 2010, pp. 45-48, pp. 54-55; Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, p. 30.) While the concept of intercultural can be associated inter alia with the practical needs of training diplomats in the United States, the French synonym *l'interculturel* accompanied the desire to integrate migrates in the French society after the World War II (Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, p. 30). With the growth in human mobility and tourism in the 1980s, the interest in interculturality as a research topic increased in many disciplines, including educational sciences, linguistics, anthropology, psychology, history and, obviously, intercultural communication studies (Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, p. 30).

In the business strand, especially the work of Geert Hofstede has been immensely influential since the publication of the first version of his model in 1980. It has also inspired a multitude of subsequent research, a hint of which could already be seen in the chapter "Previous Research", as well as a great amount of intercultural communication advice outside the academia. Hofstede, having his background in psychology, conducted comparisons of cultural dimensions by means of statistical analysis. At the outset, his primary data consisted of pre-existing employee attitude surveys conducted in 1967 and 1973 in the subsidiaries of IBM in various countries, of which he chose 40 countries. Later, subsequent studies were conducted. Hofstede first focused on the dimensions of power distance, collectivism versus individualism, femininity versus masculinity and uncertainty avoidance, and later added the fifth one, long-term orientation. In 2010, the sixth dimension, indulgence versus restraint was added to the model in a book coauthored by Geert Hofstede, Michael Minkov and Gert Jan Hofstede. Underlying in Hofstede's work are the assumptions that these value orientations can be quantified and measured, and culture can be reduced to these dimensions. (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010, p. xi, pp. 4-5, pp. 29-39, pp. 277-300; McSweeney, 2002, pp. 90-91, p. 94; Piller, 2011, pp. 76-79.) Nation states are seen as the units of analysis, the loci of culture (see Piller, 2011, p. 79), and culture as "software of the mind" (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 5).

However, Hofstedian views are also largely criticized (see e.g. Breidenbach & Nyíri, 2009, p. 319; Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, p. 35; Holliday, 2011, pp. 5-6; McSweeney, 2002; Nathan, 2015, p. 105; Piller, 2011, p. 15, pp. 79-83; Virkama, 2010, p. 42). Part of the criticism focuses on data collection and analysis, and another part on the underlying assumptions related to his work. For example, McSweeney (2002) evaluates Hofstede's research methodology and points out methodological flaws and assumptions on which Hofstede's study is based: McSweeney notes, for instance, that the respondents in the first study were from one company only, which makes the sample narrow. Also, the average number of respondents per country was small, sometimes minute.

Only in six of the countries the number of respondents was more than 1000 in both surveys. Hofstede's work then relies on an assumption of the homogeneity of the population. (McSweeney, 2002, pp. 93-95.) Hofstede's work is often seen as overgeneralizing and essentializing (e.g. Piller, 2011, p. 80; Virkama, 2010, p. 41), and, therefore, also ethically dubious (Dervin & Keihäs, 2010, p. 35). Hofstede's dimensions are also argued to be Western-centric and thus lacking meaning and validity in some other cultural contexts. Furthermore, quantification of the dimensions is subject to criticism. (Piller, 2011, pp. 80-83.) In addition, it is argued that teaching people to categorize cultures with the help of cultural dimensions may promote stereotyping[7]. Hofstede, however, is not the only one having identified cultural dimensions: for instance, Bird and Osland could outline 23 different but commonly used dimensions on the basis of the work of various scholars, including Hofstede (1980), Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars (1993), Trompenaars (1994) and Hall and Hall (1990). (Bird & Osland, 2004, pp. 89-90.)

The aforementioned theories of Hofstede, Gudykunst, E. T. Hall and Trompenaars can be associated with the *functionalist approach* (also called as the *social scientific approach*), having its basis on psychology and sociology. The approach is based on the assumption of the existence of an external reality that can be described, and of culture as a measurable element – a variable. It is also assumed that human behavior can be predicted. Accordingly, the approach often invokes quantitative methods. Functionalist studies seek to identify culturally varying patterns in communication and predict future interaction and human behavior – from this point of view, once cultural differences are analyzed, it then becomes possible to provide a method or a toolkit to overcome difficulties in intercultural communication. Cultures are often seen as national units and separate entities, and, consequently, intercultural communication as interaction between people from different national backgrounds. The functionalist approach used to be the dominant approach in intercultural communication and was especially popular in the 1980s. In addition to the aforementioned scholars, for instance Stella Ting-Toomey, with her face negotiating theory related to the variety in conflict styles and face-saving strategies of cultural groups, is among the often-cited figures representing the functionalist approach. (Martin & Nakayama, 2010, pp. 54-55; Inuzuka, 2013, p. 86; Virkama, 2010, pp. 42-43.)

It is notable that based on this historical insight, according to Piller (2011, p. 19), "discourses of culture, cultural difference and intercultural communication arose in the historical context of the nineteenth and twentieth century as part of the processes of colonialism". Similarly, May and Sleeter (2010) trace the view of culture as "a set of concrete practices" (p. 5) back to colonial views

[7] Stereotypes refer to "stored beliefs about characteristics of a group of people" (Bar-Tal, 1997, p. 491).

and the work of anthropologists. In the late 1980s, however, approaches emphasizing *the subjectivity of human experiences* started to emerge. From this perspective, accompanied with the understanding of reality as subjective, human behavior is not considered as easily predictable. Culture, in turn, is considered as something that is produced and maintained through communication and should be studied in context. In this approach, the role of qualitative research is significant. Martin and Nakayama call these perspectives as *the interpretive approach.* (Martin & Nakayama, 2010, p. 51, p. 59.) As it can be seen, these changes in viewing culture demonstrate moving further from the essentialist approach.

Currently, non-essentialism appears to have become more prominent among social science researchers (Virkama, 2010, pp. 40-41; Ramsbotham et al., 2016, p. 405). In the present field of intercultural communication, for instance articles such as Collier's (2015, pp. 9-11) text "*Intercultural Communication Competence: Continuing Challenges and Critical Directions*" and Martin's "*Revisiting Intercultural Communication Competence: Where to Go from Here*" (2015) serve as examples of views shifting away from essentialism: They criticize approaching culture as nationally shared, relatively static and stable, singular, bounded and homogenous, or as a mental program built up through socialization. Collier (2015) also challenges the view of culture as something that individuals have and carry as well as problematizes the unitary group identifications associated with culture. Instead of the essentialist views, Martin (2015) encourages shifting from the focus on presumably homogenous, nationally bounded culture groups to "conceptualizations that acknowledge the fluid, dynamic, contested nature of culture, multiple cultural identities, and intercultural interactions" (p. 6). Collier (2015), in turn, argues:

> *"Cultures become sites of struggle since contact occurs in spaces in which identifications and representations as insiders/outsiders, international visitor/local, immigrant/Diaspora/community member, as well as those based on nationalities, races, genders, sexual orientation, class and religion/spiritual affiliation, are all being negotiated, contested, and positioned in relation to others."* (p. 10.)

As the articles by Martin (2015) and Collier (2015) demonstrate, the change in the research on intercultural communication can also be described as a move from functionalism to the *critical approach*. The ideas underlying functionalism, such as considering nations synonymous to cultures, have been problematized; similarly, viewing culture and communication as something that could be quantified has been replaced with a more fluid understanding of culture. At the same time, many concepts popular in the functionalist approach, such as high-context/low-context and individualism/collectivism, have become subjects to criticism. (Inuzuka, 2013, p. 86.) Critical

scholars emphasize the importance of power as well as of historical context with respect to intercultural communication, and often focus on macro levels such as political and social structures. (Martin & Nakayama, 2010, pp. 65-70.)

As for social structures, critical scholars have paid attention to the role of culture in producing social categories, in creating groups and building boundaries between them. Seeing culture as something that "other people" have and that "we" can study may lead to constructing imagined cultures, as May and Sleeter (2010, p. 5) point out referring to an article by Ortiz (2008). According to Holliday (2011, p. 1), well-known and established theories of culture in the academy may contribute to producing imaginations of ingroup and outgroup, of "us" and "them". Holliday (2011, p. 1) considers such theories as being of ideological kind, and also Breidenbach & Nyíri (2009, pp. 323-324) argue they lay on ideologically constructed bases. Similarly, Piller (2011) sees culture as an ideological construct that, then, appears as a means employed by social actors "to produce and reproduce social categories and boundaries" (p. 16). Therefore, not only are the assumptions underlying functionalism problematized in the critical approach but also those of multiculturalism: at the same time with calling for tolerance and affirmation of different cultures, multiculturalism encourages distinguishing people on the basis of ethnicity, language or other aspects[8] (see Breidenbach & Nyíri, 2009, p. 170).

Ideological imaginations can be considered problematic for many reasons. For instance, they are argued to commonly lead to a negative view of "the other" or to the objectifying of "the other", often followed by overly generalized picture (Holliday, 2011, p. 1; Pierre Ouellet, 2003, p. 185, as cited in Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, pp. 97-98): social representations may be prejudicial, stereotyping and othering[9] (Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, p. 98). Even if the views were not negative, having fixed assumptions of "the other" does not provide a fruitful starting point to interaction[10]: as also Keisala (2012, p. 12) points out, the assumption of knowing how the other interlocutors think and behave does not contribute to creating mutual understanding. In conflict resolution literature, Väyrynen (2005) argues based on Gadamer: "The claim that one knows the other person and can predict her behavior keeps the claims of the other person at distance and cannot, according to Gadamer, serve as a basis for understanding, and therewith for joint decisions" (pp. 351-352). Leaning on stereotypes may also make it possible for an individual's own ways of thinking and behaving to

---

[8] These criteria may not even be of their own volition, which stands in contrast with liberal principles too (Breidenbach & Nyíri, 2009, p. 170).

[9] *Othering* as a concept refers to seeing a person or a group of people as an object instead of an individual actor or actors. (Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, p. 101).

[10] Generalizing can be seen as problematic also from the perspective of dialogue competence. Referring to the dialogue rules derived from the work of Gustav Mensching and Udo Tworuschka, Heinonen (2017, p. 61) points out that making generalizations on the basis of culture or religion creates prejudices about the encounter at hand. A genuine kind of an encounter then becomes difficult to reach.

remain unquestioned, as the other interlocutor can be blamed for misunderstandings and conflicts for culturally-related reasons (Keisala, 2012, p. 12). Consequently, this mindset also impedes learning of and in the specific situation of interaction at hand.

Referring to the works of Baumann, Abdallah-Pretceille as well as Breidenbach and Nyíri (2009), Dervin and Keihäs also remind culture can be used for manipulating. Dervin calls manipulating a strategy used for instance when someone wants to reach her/his goals, is not willing to do something, aims to seem polite or to stand out, or wishes to provide some explanation for a mistake that has been made. Culture and cultural differences can be employed as a safe place in which to hide especially when experiencing insecurity. (Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, pp. 105-106.) In addition, 'culture' can be called into play when linguistic proficiency and communicative skills, the lack of them as well as inequality and injustice should be addressed instead (Piller, 2011, p. 173) – in the critical literature, the mobilization of culture is argued to obscure structural inequalities related to racism, discrimination or institutionalized poverty, which relates to the criticism of multiculturalism as well (May & Sleeter, 2010, p. 3; Piller, 2011, p. 28). When it comes to communicating, in practice, there is a risk of conflict being explained by misunderstandings rather than inequitable power relations. Violent conflicts, too, may be depicted as culturally coded. (May & Sleeter, 2010, pp. 4-5; Breidenbach & Nyíri, 2009, p. 324; see also Keisala, 2012, pp. 11-12.)

As it is pointed out in conflict resolution literature, discourses on culture and identity may also be harnessed to serve political interests (Ramsbotham et al., 2016, p. 405; see also Avruch, 2016, p. 67). Yet, considering the history of the concept of culture and views related to it (see e.g. Piller, 2011, pp. 20-34; Avruch, 1998, pp. 6-9) briefly introduced above, the concept of culture has actually always carried political "baggage", as Avruch calls it. He further argues that different ideological and political agendas potentially attached to different understandings of culture in the past have not ceased to resonate in the present, in one way or another. (Avruch, 1998, pp. 6-9, p. 21; Avruch, 2016, p. 67.) Yet, according to Ramsbotham et al. (2016, p. 405), in times of conflict very reified and homogenous views of culture seem to be fostered by conflict parties in relatively many occasions. Notions of culture may be appropriated for instance to make sense of both the ingroup's and outgroup's behavior. Culture may also be used as an ideological resource especially in identity conflicts "around ethnic, religious, racial, or nationalist matters", as the view of it may be associated with moral overtones of, for instance, authenticity or traditions. (Avruch, 2016, p. 67.) Many conflict resolutionists consider that analyzing and understanding culture is not enough but *re-engineering* it is needed as well (Avruch, 1998, pp. 20-21); however, Ramsbotham et al. (2016) find the conflict between western social science view of culture and non-wester fundamentalist,

naturalized view of culture as "the most testing challenge to conflicts resolution in the culture debate today" (p. 405).

While seeing cultures as homogenous, unchanging and bounded units, incompatible with others, and mixing of them as undesirable or even dangerous, may lead to "pathologizing" of cultural differences on the one hand, it also tends to lead to uncritical celebration of them on the other hand (Breidenbach & Nyíri, 2009, pp. 319-322; see also Hannerz, 1999, pp. 393-407). The celebration of cultural difference, in turn, can set the individual complexity to the margins (Holliday, 2013, p. 124) – as Breidenbach and Nyíri (2009) put it, "the misrepresentation of the cultural dynamics of groups and societies ultimately risks destroying cultural diversity per se" (p. 324). Hannerz (1999, p. 393, p. 404), in turn, criticizes "cultural celebrationism" that views cultural differences from an enjoyable, esthetic and performative angle for ignoring difficulties related to cultural differences in encounters.

Indeed, there is diversity in many ways. Individuals, and even groups, may identify to different cultures at the same time when it comes to subcultures and even to so-called national cultures; a person is always influenced by many cultures, all of which are not "national" or "ethnic" but may be derived, for instance, from experiences in the practices in professional or class social spheres. (See e.g. Friedman & Berthoin Antal, 2005, p. 73; Avruch, 1998, pp. 12-16; Avruch, 2016, p. 11.) Cultural influences are also transmitted through television (see Breidenbach & Nyíri, 2009, p. 322) and the Internet, which, together with the increased human mobility, expands the reach of these influences further from the locality. In addition, as Avruch argues in his books *"Culture and Conflict Resolution"* (1998) and *"Context and Pretext in Conflict Resolution: Culture, Identity, Power, and Practice"* (2016), cultural representations[11] are not internalized by individuals equally or all at the same level: some of them are internalized superficially, others deeply and invested with emotions and affect. Some may be connected to goals as well. Paying attention both to emotion and to affect, Avruch sees culture, among other things, as "*psychologically* distributed within individuals across a population" (2012, p. 11, *italics added*). (Avruch, 2016, p. 11; Avruch, 1998, p. 19.) Keisala (2012), in her part, points out that not even two persons can be found on this planet who would have lived in exactly similar kind of surroundings and interpreted their experiences in a similar way. Thereby, each person has "*a personal web of meanings"* (pp. 21-22, *transl.*) that is only partly shared with other people. The personal web of meanings is incoherent in itself. (Keisala, 2012, pp. 12-13, pp. 21-22, p. 30.) The personal web of meanings could also be described as a set of

[11] Avruch (1998) defines cultural representations as "images, encodements, schemas and models" (p. 19).

“interpretive frameworks”, an expression used by Avruch (2016, p. 13): he also considers these frameworks being only partially shared with other people having similar kinds of backgrounds.

Also, the membership of one group may be contested and, among the members of the group, there may be disagreement about characteristics of the culture, such as traditions and meanings of symbols (Breidenbach & Nyíri, 2009, p. 322). Therefore, instead of being homogenous and stable entities, cultures are subject to internal paradoxes, differences and contradictions and can be described as fragmented and contested (Avruch, 2016, p. 20; Avruch, 1998, pp. 12-14). In addition, culture is not exclusive of other cultures, but the boundaries between them are blurred. Cultures also mingle as well as cut through and across one another. (Holliday, 2011, p. 5.)

From these arguments it inevitably follows that culture is incapable of providing unambiguous instructions for behavior (see e.g. Avruch, 1998, pp. 12-14) and cannot predict human behavior. Agency is possessed by individuals, not by culture (Avruch, 2016, p. 20.) Neither is communication possible to be reduced to predictable patterns of behavior that exist outside the context of interaction. Breidenbach and Nyíri (2009) argue: “[P]eople act with the knowledge of cultural norms and scripts that come from a variety of sources – – Which of these norms and scripts they follow depends on sets of circumstances— including the individual’s own intentions and inclinations, the historical and political circumstances— that are unique in each case” (p. 322).

In consideration of the discussion above, from a critical perspective it then becomes the central aim of critical research in intercultural communication to understand reasons, forms and consequences of employing cultural differences in a particular situation (Piller, 2011, p. 16). For example, Piller (2011) in her critical approach considers the question as to “who makes culture relevant to whom in which context for which purposes” (p. 13) being the fundamental one in the intercultural communication research. She argues “the main challenges of intercultural communication are the linguistic challenges of language learning, the discursive challenges of stereotyping, and the social challenges of inclusion and justice” (p. 1). Similarly, also Dervin and Keihäs (2013, p. 105) suggest asking questions as to how cultural differences are addressed, constructed in social interaction and used as symbols for building boundaries between groups of people.

2.2 Challenges Related to Pursuing Non-essentialism

Even though non-essentialism is argued to have become more prominent among researchers (see Virkama, 2010, pp. 40-41), Holliday identifies the rejection of essentialism and cultural overgeneralization in intercultural communication studies having been incomplete. According to

Holliday, significant essentialist components yet remain: the very same work may, on the one hand, acknowledge and consider cultural complexity beyond national boundaries but still, on the other hand, draw on categories of Hofstedian legacy or others of similar kind, thereby leaning on using national cultures as the basic research units in an essentialist way. (Holliday, 2011, p. 7.) "—[T]hey fall back on prescribed national cultural descriptions", Holliday (2011, p. 15) argues. Consequently, behavior differing from national stereotypes is then seen "as an exception to the essentialist rule rather than as a reality in its own right". Holliday conceptualizes this as *neo-essentialism*. (Holliday, 2011, p. 7.)

Similarly, Dervin notes approaches to interculturality are often a mixture of perspectives having both essentialist and non-essentialist characteristics. In Dervin's analysis, essentialist approaches that objectify culture are called *solid* ones, whereas non-essentialist approaches that acknowledge the constant change of culture, its construction in social interaction as well as the diversity of individuals are conceptualized as *liquid.* When the diversity on individual level is first recognized but individual behavior is later defined as characteristic for a certain culture, Dervin calls the approach *interculturel janusien*; the name of the Janusian approach derives from that of a god with two faces in the ancient Roman mythology. (Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, pp. 35-37.) Baumann (1999), in turn, calls culture "a dual discursive construction" as it vacillates between "the conservative "re"-construction of a reified essence at one moment, and the pathfinding new construction of a processual agency at the next moment" (p. 95).

While the non-essentialist or neo-essentialist approaches appear to have become more prominent among researchers (see Virkama, 2010; Holliday, 2011), a naturalized view of culture is still argued to be more universal (Ramsbotham et al., 2016, p. 405). Often the essentialist view constitutes also the ground on which much of the teaching and training of intercultural communication is still based (see e.g. Virkama, 2010, pp. 40-41). Moreover, it is argued that in the face of globalization, sometimes experienced as a threat to cultural identities, one of the strategies and reactions is characterized by returning to viewing culture as a homogenous, internally coherent unit with clear boundaries (see Hall, 2003a, pp. 111-117).

Breidenbach and Nyíri (2009) list many reasons for the wide distribution of essentialist views of culture and the misunderstandings related to the effect of culture and cultural differences. First, a genuine desire, whether on an individual or a broader level, for open-mindedness and for taking the needs of other people into consideration has been employed as a strategic tool by political and business elites. So has the desire to *present oneself* as open-minded and sensitive towards others, too. According to Breidenbach and Nyíri, whereas mobilizing culture once contributed to governing colonies, struggling for resources and sustaining the power of warlords, it has more recently been

employed for instance with respect to promoting the agendas of cultural conservatives, dealing with challenges in foreign policy as well as fueling the so-called war on terror, too. Culture has also been mobilized as part of identity politics by politicians pursuing more visibility in the media, and, as already mentioned, by subordinated groups: essentialist representations may have contributed to harvesting benefits on material and symbolic levels. (Breidenbach & Nyíri, 2009, pp. 323-324; see also Piller, 2011.) Similarly, Baumann (1999, p. 87) points out that essentialist views of culture may be utilized as a strategy "in arguing for rights and exemptions, collective demands, and even group privileges." Finally, Breidenbach and Nyíri raise the role of academics and professionals in the distribution of ideological constructs – as the audience in the West often does not have substantial personal experience with or knowledge of "other cultures" in question, the foundations underlying the claims made by experts have remained unquestioned. At the same time, the livelihood of many of these experts is connected to the views of cultures as collective and measurable. (Breidenbach & Nyíri, 2009, pp. 323-324.) Also, Hannerz (1999) suspects that the efforts of commercial trainers and consultants, 'interculturalists' as he calls them, may be "somewhat inclined toward stereotyping, occasionally given to exaggerating cultural differences perhaps as a way of positioning the interculturalists themselves as an indispensable profession" (pp. 396-397).

As for the reasons for the prominence of essentialist views in teaching and training, the current theoretical, non-essentialist approaches are considered hard to apply to training in practice. There are few illustrations of bringing conceptually dense critical work into practice. After all, many practitioners are looking for practical advice for concrete situations. (Virkama, 2010, pp. 39-42, p. 45; May & Sleeter, 2010, p. 12.) Moreover, essentialist views may not be seen as questionable by practitioners (cf. May & Sleeter, 2010, p. 12). In addition, critical views may be resisted as too destabilizing (May & Sleeter, 2010, p. 12).

2.3 The Approach in This Study

In order to make my approach in this study as explicit as possible, it is to be stated that this study follows the non-essentialist approach. However, I believe achieving complete non-essentialism is, at least, a great challenge for all of us, if even possible in the first place. Even if functionalist categories are omitted, essentialism appears to be built-in, common and customary in many other expressions even in everyday language and various social practices surrounding us. As Burr (2003) argues, "conceptual frameworks and categories" (p. 7) used by other people already exist at the moment of our birth. These categories and concepts are learned – and also reproduced – by us as we develop the use of language. (pp. 7-8.) "Our ways of understanding the world do not come from

objective reality but from other people, both past and present" (p. 7), Burr notes, and further continues: "the way a person thinks, the very categories and concepts that provide a framework of meaning for them, are provided by the language that they use. Language therefore is a necessary precondition for thought as we know it." (p. 8). Language is an inseparable part of the world surrounding us and we cannot break away from it totally (Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2011, p. 17). This applies to the researcher and the participants alike.

For this reason, I wonder if, despite genuine intentions, it is possible to be so aware and attentive that one does not, even occasionally, slip into invoking some essentialist elements when it comes to ways of thinking or oral or written language. In an attempt to be critical and self-reflexive also with respect to my own work, I would prefer introducing the approach of this study as an *effort to pursue* a non-essentialist stance; as Juhila and Suoninen (2016, p. 462) put it in their text related to conducting discourse analysis, reflexivity means critical consideration of one's own ways of using language and their potential consequences.

In this thesis, culture is looked at from a perspective that is influenced by social constructivism, social constructionism and the critical approach as well as the intertwining angles of them. Meanings given to culture are seen as continually reconstructed and negotiated through social interaction – 'culture' is what we make of it.

Therefore, from the perspective employed in this study, cultures do not exist as such but are continually constructed. The role of language and discourses is considered significant (see Burr, 2003, p. 4; Onuf, 2012, pp. 3-4): as "language itself is one of the principal means for constructing meaning" (Hall, 1995, p. 183), cultures are constructed through various and partly overlapping discourses (see Keisala, 2012, pp. 28-29). As Holliday (2011, p. 1) puts it, "[i]t is at the level of discourse that individuals are able to negotiate, make sense of and practice culture".[12] Also, culture involves practices organized by shared meanings. At the same time, social practices construct meanings. (Hall, 2003a, p. 85; Hall, 1995, p. 176.) Accordingly, the meanings emerge not only at the level of ideas but are also "embodied in the material and the social world" (Hall, 1995, p. 176).

Cultures are also negotiated and contested. Discourses constructing cultures may be contradictory and consensus on what exactly constitutes a certain culture is challenging to find (see also e.g. Breidenbach & Nyíri, 2009, p. 24). The boundaries of cultures are blurred, and, as Breidenbach and Nyíri (2009) point out, "who belongs to the group is itself often open to contestation" (p. 322). Individuals may also identify with various cultural groups at the same time –

[12] From this perspective, as Baumann (1999) points out, those professing the *essentialist* view of culture actually practice the *processual* theory: using essentialist rhetoric is processual activity. For Baumann, the essentialist and processual theories are therefore not opposites, but the latter is implicit in the rhetoric of the former. (Baumann, 1999, pp. 91-92.)

each individual has many kinds of cultural backgrounds (see e.g. Keisala, 2012, pp. 21) and cultural identification is "situational, dynamic, and multivalent" (Breidenbach & Nyíri, 2009, p. 322). Consequently, both because of the complex processes of identifications and as individuals also interpret their experiences in different ways, the existence of personal webs of meanings (see Keisala, 2012, pp. 12-13, pp. 21-22, p. 30) on individual level is acknowledged in this study. Furthermore, human behavior is not seen as being dictated by culture but is understood as a result of a complex process – various aspects, such as circumstances, historical and political contexts as well as an individual's own intentions, are seen as playing a role (see Breidenbach & Nyíri, 2009, p. 322).

Accordingly, and as already mentioned, in this study cultures are not treated as essences. However, such a view does not refuse the significance of cultures in the social world. Even if cultures do not exist as such, they emerge and exist as social constructs and therefore have influence, in one way or another, on the social world including its power relations. Indeed, it is the social world, especially related to the meanings given to culture, of civilian crisis management of which this study seeks to gain better understanding, in order to potentially contribute to advancing constructive communication and interaction.

Acknowledging the existence of a personal web of meanings of each individual leads us, in a sense, to understanding all communication as intercultural communication (see Keisala, 2012, p. 30). Also, Koole and ten Thije (2001, p. 571) approach intercultural communication as any type of communication in the sense that "intercultural communication, as any type of communication, is only possible when interactants construct a common ground of meanings and practices that are oriented to as shared." Koole and ten Thije (2001) call this process *intercultural discourse* (p. 571).

Building a common ground can also be conceptualized as *negotiating reality* or *building a third culture*: a common ground of meanings and practices can be described as a shared cultural framework that the interaction and mutual understanding can be based on and that, therefore, guides the behaviour and interaction of the participants. (Friedman & Berthoin Antal, 2005; Berthoin Antal & Friedman, 2008; Keisala, 2012, p. 13, pp. 33–34; Kemppainen, 2009, p. 123; Saastamoinen, 2009, p. 59.) From the perspective of critical constructivism, the interlocutors negotiate meanings, roles, values, norms and assumptions that guide their behavior, and it is through the process of negotiation that the interlocutors can have influence on how the situation proceeds. (Keisala, 2012, p. 34.) As "individuals are culturally complex beings" (Berthoin Antal & Friedman, 2008, p. 365) and each encounter is potentially unique when it comes to the combination of behavioral repertoires, expectations and values, interlocutors need to actively create a strategy appropriate for the situation in question. Through negotiating reality, it is possible to acquire cultural information

required in the specific situation. (Berthoin Antal & Friedman, 2008, p. 365; Kemppainen, 2009, pp. 122-123.) The approach may be considered challenging as it calls for the ability to examine both one's own and the others' assumptions, to become conscious of the cultural influences behind one's own ways of thinking and acting as well as to create new potential ways instead of holding to the unconscious and automatic ones. (Berthoin Antal & Friedman, 2008, pp. 365-366; Keisala, 2012, p. 34; Kemppainen, 2009, p. 123.)

Accordingly, critical reflection and self-reflection are central with respect to building a common ground of meanings. Reflection is more than mere understanding (Gray, 2007, p. 496): In the process of reflection a concept that has been understood is absorbed into one's personal knowledge structure. Through reflection, the new concept is approached in light of, and becomes connected to, one's other knowledge and experience, and it becomes invested with personal meaning. (Leung & Kember, 2003, p. 69.) The process is active and purposeful and involves both cognition and feeling in an interrelated way (Boud, Keogh & Walker, 1985, p. 11; Gray, 2007, p. 496). In critical reflection the validity of one's assumptions from conscious and unconscious prior learning is examined and critically reviewed, considering both their sources and consequences (Gray, 2007, pp. 496-497; Leung & Kember, 2003, p. 69), whereas critical self-reflection involves "reassessing the way one has posed problems and one's orientation to perceiving, believing and acting" (Gray, 2007, pp. 496-497; see also Mezirow, 1991, p. xvi). On the other hand, deeply internalized assumptions may be challenging to recognize as assumptions – if one is aware of their existence in the first place – and therefore, challenging to change. Interestingly, the most abundant number of these deeply ingrained beliefs appears to be related to topics that are central to one's main interests and activities. (Leung & Kember, 2003, p. 69.)

Yet another challenge lies in this approach as well. As building a common ground of meanings is a joint process of the participants, it makes all the interlocutors responsible for interaction and its success, at least to a certain extent (see also Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, p. 122). Therefore, for instance motivation – or the lack of it – may play a role (Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, p. 122). As Cindy Gallois (2003, p. 12) points out, sometimes "[m]iscommunication may be motivated and deliberate, rather than the result of lack of appropriate skills or knowledge, or may result from a competing motivation like anxiety or the protection of personal identity (cf. Coupland et al., 1991, p. 12)". Indeed, also the emotional state of the interlocutors may have an influence on the interaction (see e.g. Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, p. 122), and emotions may be present all the more if the encounter provokes critical reflection: reflecting on one's own assumptions may lead for instance to experiencing feelings of quilt, shame, fear, a sense of loss or anxiety (Boud et al., 1985, p. 11; Dirkx, 2006, p. 19; see also Gray, 2007, p. 498). Challenges to established perspectives

"often call into question deeply held personal values and threaten our very sense of self" (Mezirow, 1991, p. 168). On the other hand, emotions may also enable and enhance learning (see e.g. Boud et al., 1985, p. 11; Jokikokko, 2016, p. 219).

As culture is seen as continually reconstructed and negotiated through social interaction, acknowledging the existence of a personal web of meanings is obviously not to encourage omitting the wider social, political and spatiotemporal context. For instance, Avruch (2012, p. 11; see also Avruch, 1998, p. 20) argues that culture, "the derivative of experience", is connected to ongoing or past social practice in a deep way making it flexible and responsive to "the exigencies of the worlds that individuals confront". No less is the significance of the context for intercultural communication to be ignored either – intercultural encounters do not exist in a vacuum but always take place in a wider context. For this reason, in this study intercultural communication is understood as contextually situated social interaction. Therefore, even if each situation is treated as potentially unique, broad knowledge of the world is needed; accordingly, also previous experience can be a positive advantage as it contributes to gaining this valuable knowledge (Kemppainen, 2009, pp. 122-123). The skills required in interaction vary according to the context and the specific situation in which multiply factors are involved (see e.g. Kemppainen, 2009, p. 122; Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, p. 122).

To illustrate an example of the variety of dimensions present in intercultural encounters, let us look at a part of Broome and Collier's definition of intercultural communication. They define it as inter alia "the set of processes through which personal views, also group identifications, inter-group relationships, group representations, relationships within and across groups, institutional policies, public and organizational discourse, social practices and norms are formed". (Broome & Collier, 2012, p. 253.) They are not only formed but also negotiated, contested and maintained as part of social interaction and the process of constructing a common ground of shared meanings and practices.

As for the process of building a common ground of meanings in effect, "intercultural in practice" can also be seen as "a matter of degree", as Avruch (2012, p. 15) puts it. Firstly, in some contexts potential cultural divides are more likely to be ignored more easily than in others. For instance, in competitive contexts, in their part, the divide can be experienced as more significant. (Avruch, 2016, p. 15.) There is variation at the level of discourses with respect to which differences are considered meaningful: even if each individual is unique, some differences are considered more significant than others either from a cultural, social, political or economic perspective (Keisala, 2012, pp. 29-30). Secondly, an individual's personal web of meanings can have more commonalities with some people than with others. As for building the common ground for

interaction, the more the backgrounds of the interlocutors vary, the greater the need to learn from each other becomes (Keisala, 2012, p. 13). Acknowledging the prerequisite of building the common ground of meanings to making the communication possible in the first place, intercultural communication can also be understood as a process, or a "set of processes" as Broome and Collier (2012, p. 253) do from their perspective.

Along with *intercultural* as a concept, also *cross-cultural, transcultural and multicultural* are terms sometimes appearing in academic literature (see also Jokikokko, 2002, p. 86; Virkama 2010, p. 46; Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, p. 31); yet, according to Dervin & Keihäs (2013), *intercultural* as a term is "most often related to intercultural education, communication and psychology" (p. 31, *transl*.). In addition to the variation related to the approaches and theoretical foundations within the studies under the same term (see e.g. Piller, 2011, p. 8), an example of which has been described earlier in this paper, the differences between these concepts are often ambiguous and dependent on interpretation and perspective (Jokikokko, 2002, p. 86; see also Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, p. 31). In addition to their unclear meanings, the terms are sometimes used interchangeably, which may further increase the confusion (Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, p. 31). Following Yershova, DeJaeghere and Mestenhauser (2000, p. 42) I prefer *intercultural* in this study: referring to Asante and Gudykunst [1989], they note *intercultural* refers to the interaction of people from different backgrounds, whereas *cross-cultural* is often related to the perspective of a comparative study of multiple cultures. According to Scollon and Scollon (as cited in Piller, 2011, p. 8) cross-cultural studies build on the assumption of distinct cultural groups. *Multicultural*, in turn, has often been associated with addressing a community consisting of different, often ethnic groups (see e.g. Jokikokko, 2002, p. 86; Piller, 2011, pp. 24-28; see also Breidenbach & Nyíri, 2009, p. 159). Even though international personnel in a specific crisis management operation may be interpreted as comprising a community, at least temporarily, the term "intercultural" allows wider perspectives, including the consideration of the interaction between the crisis management personnel and locals. In addition, "multicultural" as a term sometimes appears to be associated with politically charged meanings, because of which "intercultural" is preferred in this study. As for the literature referred to in this paper, texts may have been utilized regardless of the terms used by the author(s) if the content and its foundations have been found relevant to this study. Concepts originally chosen by the author have been used if quoting them directly or if otherwise required by my understanding of the original content.

3 DATA AND METHODS

3.1 Collecting the Data

The data of this study consists of six semi-structured interviews of Finnish civilian crisis management experts. As Hirsjärvi and Hurme argue, conducting interviews is, as a flexible method, suitable for various kinds of research purposes. Interviewing provides certain advantages especially when, as in the case of this study, the topic has not been studied extensively earlier and/or when the topic may bring forth a complex body of information. Interviewing also allows asking for clarifications, specifications and other further questions in order to gain deeper insight into the topic. (Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2011, pp. 34-35.)

The first steps towards the process of collecting the data were taken in the autumn 2019 when I contacted CMC Finland, a governmental institution responsible for research in the field of civilian crisis management as well as for the training and recruitment of civilian crisis management experts for international missions (CMC Finland, 2020). After introducing my initial research plan, CMC Finland kindly promised to support me in finding suitable candidates for the interviews for the study. In December 2019 and January 2020 CMC Finland forwarded my request, including information about the study as well as my contact information, to 31 civilian crisis management experts. The ones interested in participating in the study and making a voluntary contribution (see Christians, 2011, p. 65) contacted me directly, without CMC Finland playing any further intermediating role. In this way, the anonymity of the participants was ensured. All of the experts contacting me were included in the group of interviewees.

After formulating the interview questions on my own, I introduced them to one of my previous university lecturers, Katja Keisala, PhD in Political Science (International Relations) who has a wide knowledge of critical multicultural and intercultural education, multiculturality in education and working life and intercultural communication. With the help of her valuable remarks, the questions were further elaborated. The questions prepared in advance constituted the general framework for the interviews, during which the order of the questions was, however, quite freely conformed to the flow of the interviewees' speech. Further and additional questions were also presented, for instance in order to ask for specifications or clarifications (see Hirsjärvi & Hurme,

2011, pp. 34-35). As the interviews consisted of direct verbal interaction with the research participants, it was possible to tune and target the process of collecting the data in each situation (see Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2011, pp. 34-35), with the aim of maximizing the amount of relevant information. In this way, the conversations could also flow more naturally, and attention could be given to topics raised and emphases placed by the interviewees themselves.

In addition, each one of the interviewees was given possibilities to raise topics, found important or relevant by them, beyond my questions; the role of the interviewees was considered active (see Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2011, p. 35). Some of the participants took the chance, whereas others felt they had no supplementary aspects to bring into the discussion. As an example of the active role of the interviewees, one of them also took the initiative of showing pictures and a video during the interview in order to deepen my understanding and further elucidate what he had told.

The interviews were conducted in January 2020, each one of them individually. The locations of the interviews were chosen together with the participants. Primarily, face-to-face conversations were aimed at; however, two of the interviews were conducted in Skype because of practical reasons. Before conducting the interviews in Skype, the decision, especially with respect to privacy, was discussed first with my supervisor, Professor Veli-Matti Värri and then with each of the two interviewees. The durations of the interviews varied between 56 and almost 140 minutes, the average being about 95 minutes.

The group receiving my request was chosen with the help and expertise of CMC Finland. The aim was to find interviewees with versatile experience from diverse operations, countries, duties and fields of expertise; according to Graneheim and Lundman (2004, pp. 109-110), engaging interviewees with diverse experiences and backgrounds may support richer variation and enhance the opportunities of elucidating the research question from a wide range of perspectives. Because of the topic of the study, the emphasis was placed on experts with experience on duties requiring communicating both with locals and with the international staff of the operations. For this reason, for instance experts experienced only in administrative duties were excluded. The choice of operations was guided by the principle that the experience was still to be considered topical. The group of addressees was further narrowed down on the basis of the organization leading the operation: most of the addressees had served either in EU operations, in UN operations or in both. EU-led operations were chosen, as the focus of Finnish civilian crisis management is on them (see Prime Minister's Office, 2014, p. 10). The choice of including EU-led operations also served to secure the adequate number of interviewees. Other organizations were added so as to ensure the potential presence of diverse aspects possibly influencing communicating – e. g. the potentially different kinds of structures of the operations – on which the organization may have influence.

Including UN-led operations was considered especially topical because of the HIPPO recommendations in 2015 calling for more people-centered operations (see United Nations, General Assembly & Security Council, 2015, p. 10, p. 24, pp. 29-30), as referred to in the introduction of this study. The aim was also to find interviewees of both genders.

My request was sent in three cycles, which enabled addressing crisis management experts in a way that took notice of the aim of finding a diverse group of interviewees. For instance, as no female addressees replied after the first set of requests was sent, on the following rounds the number of female addressees was increased. As a result, two female experts finally participated in the study. The final number of female participants perfectly corresponds the gender distribution of deployed experts in 2007-2018 (CMC Finland, 2019).

Considering also the other aspects related to the aim of finding experts with diverse experience and background, the aim was achieved well. The participants had served in various duties related to their respective fields of expertise, such as law, law enforcement, border security, monitoring and logistics. Some of the duties of the interviewees had included advisory and training tasks, and many of them had also had managerial or supervisory roles as part of their duties. The duties of the interviewees required communicating with the operation personnel consisting of local and international employees, and some of the duties also included communicating with local colleagues recruited by the local authority and/or interaction with other local inhabitants. The ages of the participants fit the average variance of 35-65 of the deployed Finnish experts (Ville Savoranta, Research and Development Specialist, personal communication, spring 2020). The interviewees had served in one or more operations altogether in eight countries, half of which are situated in Africa, two in Europe and the rest in Caucasia and Asia. Some of the participants had served in the same operation with each other; should these experiences be counted separately, the number of attended operations reaches 14 operations consisting of eight EU-led ones, four UN-led ones and two others. The distribution of these operation experiences varied among the interviewees: half of the participants had served in three or more operations. The combined number of the participants' years of service in civilian crisis management reaches significant numbers, as two thirds of the interviewees had served for four years or more. One third of the interviewees had experience of less than three years. Four of the interviewees had peacekeeping experience prior to serving in civilian crisis management operations, and some of the interviewees had experience of working in international settings of other kind.

However, it is to be taken into account that even if the aim of gathering as diverse group of experts as possible was achieved well, the group of interviewees is not representative of Finnish civilian crisis management experts as a whole. As a qualitative study of this kind, this study does

not aim at making generalizations (see e.g. Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2011, pp. 58-59). However, despite the small number of the interviewees, the results should not be seen as negligible either – discourses related to culture or any other concept are not to be rendered to discourses employed by the interviewed individuals only. As discourses and ways of understanding the world are constructed in social interaction, they are also influenced by those employed by other people, both past and present (see Burr, 2003, pp. 7-8). Therefore, individuals employ "pre-existing linguistic resources" (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, pp. 33-34), and language is seen as "a form of social practice" instead of "a purely individual action" (Fairclough, 1002, p. 63). Discourses, then, are a social resource (see Burr, 2015, p. 70). In addition, as Hirsjärvi and Hurme (2011) argue, even a small number of interviewees may provide significant information in qualitative studies: a qualitative approach aims at gaining information or deeper understanding of certain phenomena or looking for new theoretical approaches (pp. 58-59). Especially when conducting discourse analysis, rather small amounts of data, such as the data from a few interviews only, are considered reasonable: increasing the number of interviews does not necessarily add any value to the study, and its quality is not measured by the amount of data. (Eskola & Suoranta, 2003, p. 197.)

Furthermore, it is to be noticed that this study does not reflect – nor does it aim to reflect – the contents and the quality of the training provided by CMC Finland or any other organization. Each of the interviewees had attended education and training organized by other actors as well, and, in any case, social interaction in which discourses and ways of understanding the world are constructed is by no means restricted to training contexts only.

3.2 Ethical Considerations

The participants contributed to the study on a voluntary basis (see Christians, 2011, p. 65). The voluntary nature of participating in the study was informed to candidates both in an oral and a written manner: it was mentioned already in the official form enquiring their willingness to participate as well as discussed in the beginning of each interview. Following the guidelines of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity (TENK, see Kohonen, Kuula-Luumi & Spoof, 2019, p. 52), before giving their consent for participating in the study the candidates were informed about the aims and content of the research as well as about the envisaged acquisition, use, possible subsequent use and storage of the data (see also Christians, 2011, p. 65; Hirsjärvi, Remes & Sajavaara, 2009, p. 25). The participants were also informed about the fact that they were allowed to discontinue or withdraw their participation at any point of the research process (see Kohonen et al., 2019, p. 51). In case of possible discontinuation, the research data that had already been

collected could still have been used (Kohonen et al., 2019, p. 51). However, no withdrawals or discontinuations occurred. My contact information was provided in the form so as to enable the possible discontinuations and withdrawals of the participants as well as to allow further questions related to the study. Before the interviews the participants were also informed that, should they find it more favorable, any of the questions can be left without an answer. Yet, no one refused to answer the questions.

I find that the atmosphere during the interviews was relaxed, and I also got some spontaneous positive feedback from most of the participants after the interviews. Many of them expressed they had enjoyed the conversation, and more than one of the interviewees mentioned it was especially the reflection raised by the questions that they found very positive. Indeed, some of the questions gave rise to a lot of reflection, into which the interviewees mainly immersed themselves openly instead of responding with quick answers or bypassing. I was strongly impressed by the way the interviewees both invested their time and involved themselves into conversation and reflection. It is a great pity that all the aspects of these rich conversations and the valuable experience the interviewees shared in them cannot be addressed in the scope of one thesis only.

General ethical principles (see Kohonen et al., 2019) related to conducting research are considered in this study. As Christians (2011) summarizes, "under the principle of beneficence, researchers are enjoined to secure the well-being of their subjects" (p. 66); avoiding significant harm to research participants is called for (Christians, 2011, p. 66; Kohonen et al., 2019, p. 50). For the reasons related to the specific field of crisis management and to safety, particular attention was paid, both in advance and during the process, to not revealing potentially confidential information as well as to ensuring that the participants will not be recognizable on the basis of anything mentioned in the study report. As for the former task, the awareness and professionalism of the interviewed civilian crisis management experts did not leave need for these concerns. The latter task was not as easy because of the relatively small number of civilian crisis management experts as well as the unique combinations of attended operations and specific fields of work of each expert. For these reasons, the group of interviewees as well as their crisis management experience is described in a very undetailed manner in this report. In order to be able to make these decisions in a proper and trustworthy manner, I needed to be familiar enough with civilian crisis management as a field. If in doubt, I did not hesitate to discuss the interviewees and CMC Finland so as to ask for further information and advice. Direct identifiers, such as names, were obviously removed when transcribing the data; also, indirect ones such as details related to the duties of the interviewees were removed each time a risk of these details making the participant recognizable was detected. Moreover, even weak identifiers related to other persons potentially mentioned in the study, such as

family members and colleagues of the interviewees as well as locals in the crisis areas, were removed; also, the interviewees avoided mentioning detailed information of this kind. The transcribed data was stored and handled confidentially. The final report of my study will be forwarded to CMC Finland. Participants willing to read the report will receive it as well.

As for the methods used, however, discourse analysis may involve certain ethical challenges. According to Hammersley (2014), when using discourse analysis, a gap between the expectations of the interviewees and the actual use of data may exist: the informants may assume that the researcher's purpose is to gather aspects such as their experiences and perspectives, instead of focusing on discourses or discursive practices. When it comes to this study, the potential gap is only partial as qualitative content analysis was used as well. Furthermore, I did my best to elucidate how the data would be used, striving to give an adequate amount of information without digging unreasonably deep into methodology. How well I managed, though, may be partly influenced by the background of each participant and the potential familiarity of the methodological foundations of an approach of this kind. For instance, Hammersley (2014) claims that the contrast between a naturalist perspective, that is, "*a requirement* in carrying out the normal business of life" (p. 534), and a constructivist analytical orientation may disrupt full comprehension of the method (Hammersley, 2014, pp. 529-538). On the other hand, Taylor and Smith (2014, p. 543) argue that "to insist on an entirely transparent analytic process which can be made wholly intelligible in a brief description is simply not practicable and denies the specialist nature of academic research." In any case, analyzing interview data by means of discourse analysis does not normally involve severe ethical problems (see Hammersley, 2014, p. 537).

3.3 Discourse Analysis

In discourse analysis, attention is given to the question as to how agents give account of things and make sense of them: as we noticed when looking at the various understandings of culture earlier, even the same phenomenon or concept can be given various meanings and explanations (see Suoninen, 2016b, pp. 231-232; Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 35). Accordingly, in discourse analysis the social reality is seen as consisting of various systems of meaning, some of which may be competing with each other (Jokinen, Juhila & Suoninen, 2016, p. 32). They are also defined by their relations with others, making them *intertextual* or *interdiscursive*. Fragments of other texts may be, for instance, merged in, objected, or ironically referred to. (Fairclough, 1992, pp. 84-85, pp. 101-136; see also Fairclough, 1992, p. 55.) The systems of meaning are conceptualized as *discourses* or *interpretive repertoires* – both of the concepts can be understood as sharing the same meaning

(Jokinen et al., 2016, p. 34), yet various understandings of their exact definitions exist[13]. For the sake of clarity, I henceforth prefer the concept of discourse to the one of interpretive repertoire – according to Jokinen et al. (2016), the former concept is the more appropriate choice when examining institutional social practices, analyzing power relations or scrutinizing the construction of certain phenomena; the latter one is preferred in detailed analysis of the variety of everyday language (pp. 34-35).

Drawing on Jokinen et al. (2016, p. 34) and Parker (1992, pp. 10-12, see also p. 5), in this study I define discourses as rather coherent systems of meaning that construct social reality in which they are, at the same time, constructed. Discourses can be seen as the ways, both written and spoken, in which people use their language to construct versions of the social reality (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 7, p. 33; Keisala, 2012, p. 27). Yet, the relationship between discourse and social structure is dialectical: discourse is shaped by the very same social structure, including norms, conventions, relations, identities and institutions, to the constitution of which it contributes. By acknowledging the dialectical nature of this relationship between discourse and social structure, I aim to avoid overemphasizing neither of these aspects. (Fairclough, 1992, pp. 64-65.)

Discourses involve both representations and practices, and have constructive effects on many levels: they construct meanings, social relationships as well as systems of knowledge and belief, thereby contribute to fostering or hindering some political and ethical consequences (Fairclough, 1992, p. 64; Campbell, 2007, p. 216). They also invite "perceptions of ourselves and others" (Parker, 1992, p. 9) and construct social identities (Fairclough, 1992, p. 64; Campbell, 2007, p. 216). How one is positioned as a subject in discourse may also affect what one is expected to do: for instance, someone identified as a doctor or an expert may have a different set of rights to speak in a certain situation than another person positioned as a patient and a non-medic (Parker, 1992, pp. 9-10). Accordingly, the concept of subject position is used especially when analyzing restrictions of action (Jokinen et al., 2016, p. 45). As the example of the subject positions of "a doctor" and "a

[13] The field of discourse analysis consists of various kinds of research orientations and emphases (Jokinen & Juhila, 2016, pp. 267-268). Discourse analysis can be seen as a wide theoretical framework that allows various methodical applications and choices (Jokinen et al., 2016, p. 25; Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 175). For instance, Arja Jokinen, Kirsi Juhila and Eero Suoninen utilize ideas from multiple authors and a few partly overlapping orientations, mainly the so-called British orientation and critical research influenced by Foucault (see Jokinen et al., 2016, p. 18; Suoninen 2016b, pp. 230-231). Following the example of these Finnish experts of discourse analysis, also do I dare to draw on partly overlapping orientations instead of confining my analysis strictly to one given template. In addition to the work of Jokinen, Juhila and Suoninen, my study is influenced by the texts of Jonathan Potter and Margaret Wetherell (1987) and the thoughts of Ian Parker (1992) and Norman Fairclough (1992), although Fairclough's method is not strictly followed. Ideas from both analytical and critical discourse analysis orientations are considered in this study, as they are not seen as exclusive of each other (see Jokinen & Juhila, 2016, p. 302).

patient" also reveals, discourses are related to power: as Keisala (2012, p. 29) points out, discursive power is used each time we define or describe someone.

Yet, the process of constructing reality is not necessarily intentional but emerges when providing accounts of events and things (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 34; Burr, 2015, p. 70). When giving accounts, individuals employ "pre-existing linguistic resources" (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, pp. 33-34; see also Burr, 2003, pp. 7-8). A variety of potential accounts exist, and even the same person's account may vary according to the situation and the purpose of the talk: for instance, the focus of a description given to one's parent may differ from that given to a close friend. Yet, choosing a suitable account for a particular situation may be an unconscious process instead of an intentional decision. (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, pp. 33-34; Burr, 2015, p. 70.)

Instead of being presented as complete wholes, systems of meanings emerge as small pieces in the data (Suoninen, 2016a, p. 53). In discourse analysis different ways of talking are deliberately systematized so as to allow better understanding of them (Parker, 1992, p. 5). Therefore, discourses can also be seen as products of the interpretation made by the researcher. The interpretation is based on the dialogue between the data and the researcher and must, obviously, be well-reasoned. (Jokinen et al., 2016, p. 35.)

As it has been illustrated, from the perspective of discourse analysis, language is seen as a form of social practice that constructs meanings to the world and reproduces and transforms the social reality – language is not seen to reflect and represent the external reality as such but rather, to be in an active relation to it (Jokinen et al., 2016, p. 26; Fairclough, 1992, pp. 41-42, p. 63). As for the extent to which language reflects the internal, mental reality, the relationship between utterances and mental states is problematic (see Potter and Wetherell, 1987, pp. 177-179). Employed discourses do not necessarily represent one's views or mental states per se. Yet, as Potter and Wetherell (1987, pp. 178-179) elucidate, the issue is irrelevant as the focus of discourse analysis is on discourse itself. Accordingly, also in this study discourses are taken as a research topic rather than a medium through which to recover attitudes and views (see Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 184): this study does not aim at uncovering the personal views of the interviewed crisis management experts as such. Indeed, discourse analysis as a method allows focusing on social practices instead of individuals (Jokinen et al., 2016, pp. 43-44). This is in accordance with the general interest of this study: it is the social world in the context of civilian crisis management that this study seeks to gain better understanding of.

3.4 Qualitative Content Analysis

Qualitative content analysis is a method aiming at describing a phenomenon under study by reorganizing the research data into a clear and compact shape, yet without omitting any relevant information. Its outcome is presented in the form of concepts or categories that may formulate a conceptual map or system, a model or mere categories so as to allow drawing solid conclusions about the studied phenomenon. (Elo & Kyngäs, 2007, p. 108; Tuomi & Sarajärvi, 2002, p. 110; Tuomi & Sarajärvi, 2018, p. 122.)

Qualitative content analysis is conducted by means of logical reasoning and interpretation and may be suitable both for inductive, deductive and abductive approaches. Inductive content analysis proceeds through the phases of coding and categorizing to a condensed description of the data, thereby deriving the categories from the data. In deductive analysis, previous knowledge guides the operationalization of the analysis structure and the analysis is often related to testing that knowledge in a new context. In abductive approach, in turn, the analysis does not directly draw on theory but theoretical connections serve in aid of the analysis process, without restraining new information emerging from the data. (Elo & Kyngäs, 2007, pp. 107-111; Eskola, 2018; Tuomi & Sarajärvi, 2018; Tuomi & Sarajärvi, 2002, pp. 95-99, p. 110.)

3.5 The Analysis Process

The analysis of the two research questions was conducted in an intertwined fashion through a multi-step process utilizing both qualitative content analysis and discourse analysis. Initially, the data was read multiple times first to “obtain a sense of the whole” (see Graneheim & Lundman, 2004, p. 108) and to distinguish information relevant to the research questions. With respect to the first research question, qualitative content analysis was used: relevant, small extracts of the text were first coded in the initial file, then listed into another file as *reduced expressions* (see Tuomi & Sarajärvi, 2002, p. 110, *transl.*) or *condensed meaning units* (see Graneheim and Lundman, 2004, p. 108), and finally clustered based on similarities and differences in their content. If further similarities at the level of the categories were found, upper categories were formed. The categories were then named according to their content. (Tuomi & Sarajärvi, 2002, pp. 111-113; see also Elo & Kyngäs, 2007, p. 111.) No specific theory led the analysis process and forming of the categories, but deriving them from the data in an inductive fashion was aimed at (see Eskola, 2018; Elo & Kyngäs, 2007, p. 109). The reason why I claim *aimed at*, is that I am aware of the analysis process being interaction between the data, the researcher and her/his mindset and previous knowledge, even if an inductive

approach is pursued. As Eskola and Suoranta (2000, p. 19) point out, our perceptions are influenced by our previous experiences. In addition, as Tuomi and Sarajärvi (2018, p. 109) argue, inter alia the concepts and methods chosen by the researcher have an influence on what will be found.

Conducting discourse analysis was initiated at the same time with performing qualitative content analysis. When reading the data in order to code the extracts relevant to the first research question, those relevant to the second one were coded simultaneously. When it comes to discourse analysis, however, the goal of coding differs from the one set within qualitative content analysis: as Potter and Wetherell (1987, p. 167) point out, "coding has the pragmatic rather than analytic goal of collecting together instances for examination." Therefore, special attention was paid to performing the coding phase very inclusively, initially taking notice of each instance that appeared to be even vaguely related (see Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 167). Obviously, careful reading of the data was required. What happened next can be put simply in a few words: re-reading the data, reflecting on it and repeating. Despite the plain description, my experience relates to what Potter and Wetherell (1987) claim: "[o]ften it is only after long hours struggling with the data and many false starts that a systematic patterning emerges" (p. 168). Principally, no actual method or mechanic technique to discourse analysis can be defined (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 175; Suoninen, 2016a, p. 61; see also Eskola & Suoranta, 2003, p. 195, p. 197; Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2011, p. 155) but the analysis has to do with "identifying significant patterns of consistency and variation", that is, identifying "differences in either the content or form of accounts" and "features shared by accounts" (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, pp. 168-169, *italics removed*; see also Suoninen, 2016a, p. 53).

Indeed, identifying differences in the systems of meanings strongly drew on the data (see e.g. Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2011, p. 155): the interpretations were made based on the differences in the accounts, in ways of using language and constructing reality in them (see Suoninen, 2016a, p. 54). As a system of meanings is not presented as a complete whole in the data, but, rather, emerges in smaller pieces, making fixed initial hypotheses does not serve discourse analysis very well. Instead, potential systems of meanings were identified during the process of analysis, and these interpretations were then scrutinized in detail during the process. (Suoninen, 2016a, p. 53.) Should they be found false starts instead of systematic patterns, for instance in case they left "too much unaccounted", they were rejected (see Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 168). The Results chapter serves to further elucidate how the interpretations were made: differences in ways of using language and constructing reality in the accounts are illustrated and plenty of direct extracts of the data are provided (see e.g. Eskola & Suoranta, 2003, p. 198). This is typical for studies utilizing discourse analysis, as the report aims at allowing the reader to "follow the process of interpretation and make one's own interpretations" (Eskola & Suoranta, 2003, p. 198, *transl.*).

However, as a researcher is a central tool in the qualitative research process (Eskola & Suoranta, 2003, p. 210), s/he cannot fully distance herself/himself from her/his previous theoretical understanding of the topic. Both in order to make this visible and in order to allow dialogue between the findings and previous academic literature, after identifying the discourses, they were also looked at in light of academic literature so as to find possible similarities and differences. Indeed, in discourse analysis theories and previous research are looked at when initial concepts, categories and descriptions are first interpreted from the data (Jokinen & Juhila, 1991, p. 35, as cited in Eskola & Suoranta, 2003, p. 196; Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2011, p. 155). For instance, concepts such as "socialization" and "the personal web of meanings" (see Keisala, 2012, pp. 21-22, *transl.*) were eventually utilized after the initial analysis was conducted. Therefore, while the analysis pursued drawing on the data, especially the discourse analysis was conducted in a way ultimately allowing connections to theory and previous research (see Eskola, 2018). This dialogue is also presented in the Results chapter.

During the analysis process, the interrelated character of the two research questions became more and more apparent. Therefore, the reduced expressions found during the process of qualitative content analysis were returned to when conducting discourse analysis. The aim was to deepen the analysis and to see which meaning given to culture was in question when culture was made relevant. To reach this aim, the reduced expressions concerning culture's relevance had to be, again, looked at in their context. In this way, analyzing one research question contributed to gaining deeper understanding of the other, and vice versa.

3.6 Reliability and Validity

Reliability and validity as concepts have their roots in quantitative research and are many times associated with measuring (Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2011, pp. 185-186; see also Hirsjärvi, Remes & Sajavaara, 2009, p. 232). In qualitative research orientation, these concepts and their interpretations are often subject to debate: as Hirsjärvi and Hurme (2011, p. 185) illustrate, reliability and validity are based on the idea of an objective reality and objective truth that a researcher can reach. From the perspective of other kinds of methodological assumptions, the concepts and their definitions become more problematic. (Eskola & Suoranta, 2003, p. 211; Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2011, pp. 185-186; Hirsjärvi et al., 2009, p. 232.)

Regardless of whether the exact concepts of reliability and validity should be used with respect to qualitative research or not, it is clear that research should aim at as high levels of trustworthiness, quality, soundness and credibility as possible and that research should be subject to

critical evaluation (see also Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2011, pp. 188-189; Hirsjärvi et al., 2009, p. 232). According to Eskola and Suoranta (2003, p. 212), evaluation is ultimately related to the questions as to whether the arguments presented in the study can be justified and considered truthful. Hirsjärvi and Hurme (2011, pp. 188-189), among others, call for the ability of a researcher to convincingly argue for her/his choices as well as to document her/his steps on the path leading to the interpretations s/he has made. Each phase of conducting the research should be described accurately (Hirsjärvi et al., 2009, p. 232; see also Elo & Kyngäs, 2007, p. 112).

With these aims in mind, I have explicated and argued for the choices I have made concerning the topic, methodology, data collection and analysis as well as cherished a high level of transparency in describing the processes of collecting and analyzing the data. I have depicted the process of finding the interviewees, described the group of interviewees, yet protecting their anonymity, and described conditions in which the interviews were conducted (see e.g. Hirsjärvi & al., 2009, pp. 232-233).[14] Instead of basing my arguments on random extracts of the data or excluding any relevant part of data, I have taken the data into consideration as a whole (see Graneheim & Lundman, 2004, p. 110; Eskola & Suoranta, 2003, p. 215). I have also provided the reader with direct extracts of the data in order to improve the transparency and trustworthiness of my study as well as to enable the reader either to approve or to object my interpretations (see Eskola & Suoranta, 2003, pp. 216-217; Graneheim & Lundman, 2004, p. 110). Furthermore, the findings have been scrutinized in light of previous literature. Yet, there is a possibility of another researcher having come to different kinds of outcomes (see Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2011, p. 189): the researcher herself/himself, as well as her/his process of interpretation, are central tools in the research process (Eskola & Suoranta, 2003, p. 210; Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2011, p. 8).

In aim of high quality, credibility and soundness, I have also carefully defined the subject and purpose of this study, defined the concepts central to the topic, and reflected on the suitability of the research methods with respect to the research topic and aim in this report (see e.g. Graneheim & Lundman, 2004, pp. 109-110). Special attention has been paid to ensuring that the ontological and epistemological assumptions, definitions and theoretical understandings of concepts as well as methods of collecting and analyzing the data utilized in this study be in accordance with each other (see e.g. Eskola & Suoranta, 2003, p. 213). In addition to conducting the analysis, this appeared to be perhaps one of the most demanding parts of the whole thesis process and at times led to deep philosophical reflections. Various researchers, teachers and items of literature seemed to have different kinds of approaches – some of them providing opinions of a very strong kind, some

[14] This information has been provided also in order to facilitate the reader's potential reflection on the transferability of the findings – the decision concerning transferability is the reader's (Graneheim & Lundman, 2004, p. 110).

tentative reflections and some no answers at all – to questions of this kind, which first increased the confusion but ultimately brought some relief. As unambiguous answers and clear consensus appeared to be difficult to be found when it comes to methodological choices, I gained confidence in making decisions of my own and in applying what I had learned – not in an arrogant way but in consideration of various aspects and sources. The more difficult it appeared to find just one correct way of conducting research of this kind, the more it highlighted the need to provide the reader with information of the choices and interpretations made as well as the reasons behind them. These aspects have been made visible throughout the text, which further contributes to the aim of critical reflexivity and self-reflexivity as well. In awareness of myself being a central tool in the research process (see Eskola & Suoranta, 2003, p. 210), I have not only made my approach, assumptions and choices visible but also constantly aimed at critically evaluating my ways of thinking and acting (see e.g. Hirsjärvi & al., 2009, p. 22). I have also taken up chances to discuss and reflect together with my supervisor as well as with other experts in order to minimize the risk of blind spots.

Yet, there are certain aspects that can be considered as the weaknesses of my study. The most severe ones of them can perhaps be associated with myself as a tool (see Eskola & Suoranta, 2003, p. 210) in the research process. Despite having conducted two Bachelor's Theses prior to this study, I consider myself as a beginner in conducting research. For instance, I had no previous experience in conducting discourse analysis. I did my best to address this deficiency by studying a remarkable number of academic literature on discourse analysis and previous research utilizing the method, all of which are not referred to in this study. Moreover, I did not hesitate to ask for advice when needed. As for collecting the data, I had some previous experience in interviewing, which I see as an advantage, although I do not consider myself as a particularly experienced interviewer. In any case, my rather strong theoretical understanding related to culture and intercultural communication as well as my ability to utilize multidisciplinary perspectives can be considered as an advantage when conducting interviews, such as in other phases of the research process as well. Yet, I have no personal experience in civilian crisis management, which may be a factor creating limitations to my abilities in targeting the interview questions as well as in making interpretations of the data. This was one of the reasons why I found it important to allow the interviewees to raise topics that they found important also beyond my questions.

Interviewing as a method also brings with certain challenges. As interviews consist of interaction between at least two human beings, for instance miscommunication and different understandings of the questions may occur. In addition, as Hirsjärvi and Hurme (2011, p. 49) point out, the replies of the interviewees are also influenced by the presence of the researcher, his/her ways of communicating as well as the previous questions and answers at least to some extent.

Interviews may also be vulnerable to other human factors such as the mental state of the interviewer (see Hirsjärvi & Hurme, 2011, p. 124). On the other hand, also many other methods, such as observation and inquiries, share some of these challenges – all of the challenges cannot be totally avoided when conducting research on human beings and the social world.

According to Hammersley (2014, p. 532), interviewees may also edit the language they use if being told about the analytical focus of discourse analysis. Despite the potential existence of this risk, the ethical goals related to informing the interviewees were valued in this study. Furthermore, even if the risk of the interviewees editing the language they used exists, I consider its significance in this study relatively minor. The somewhat long duration of the interviews made the potential efforts of constant self-consciousness about one's ways of talking rather difficult. The atmosphere appeared relaxed and the interviewees seemed genuinely motivated to contribute to a study concerning the field of civilian crisis management. Furthermore, the way one uses language is, anyway, affected by multiple factors such those mentioned in the previous paragraph. Therefore, the ways language is used are subject to variation instead of being absolute.

In any case, yet another vulnerability related to communication exists in this study. As the interviews were conducted in Finnish but the results are presented in English, the citations had to be translated. The process of translation obviously entails interpretation (see also van Nes, Abma, Jonsson & Deeg, 2010), and making choices related to translation may be subjective and difficult (Dervin, 2013, p. 94). Some expressions are language-specific (see e.g. van Nes et al., 2010; Birbili, 2000), which further creates additional challenges. For these reasons, I discussed my choices with Iida-Liisa Repo, a native speaker of Finnish having a Degree in English Philology (Master of Arts, Humanities). In order to increase transparency, the citations in the original language are also included in this report. (See Gonzaléz y Gonzaléz & Lincoln, 2006, as cited in Dervin, 2013, p. 95; Birbili, 2000.)

4 RESULTS

> *“ [Culture] influences everything. – – The culture has to be, I mean in everything, (it) has to be taken into account. – – ”*[i]

As this quotation by a research participant serves to illustrate, culture was attached great significance during the interviews. Multiple examples of culture’s relevance for civilian crisis management as well as for human life in general were given by the interviewees. By means of qualitative content analysis, the reduced expressions were organized into three clusters: ways of behavior, mental aspects and manifestations of human life.

Out of all the times when culture was referred to by the interviewees, a remarkable share was related to different kinds of *ways of behavior,* both when it comes to the behavior of civilian crisis management personnel as well as to that of local populations. From the perspective of executing a crisis management operation, the significance of culture’s role in influencing human behavior appeared as great and multifaceted. On the basis of the accounts given by the interviewees, two major, yet interrelated categories were formed by means of qualitative content analysis: (1) structural and societal factors and (2) social norms. The category of social norms was further divided into the following, interrelated subcategories: (1) communication styles, (2) politeness norms, (3) social roles and (4) work culture. It should be noted, though, that culture was not necessarily described as the only factor relevant to these categories. For instance, especially the role of history and religion was relatively often intertwined with that of culture in the accounts focusing on human actions.

Another significant share of the accounts made culture relevant to *mental aspects*, including attitudes, values, moral, beliefs, ways of thinking and sense of humor. However, while part of the accounts addressed ways of thinking or acting separately, in some of them they were interrelated in complex ways. Especially when the mental aspects were referred to, they were often depicted as interrelating with ways of acting: in particular, when it comes to the categories of social norms, ways of acting and ways of thinking were often intertwined in the accounts. Separating them in the analysis process appeared sometimes artificial and, therefore, dubious. For this reason, the accounts in which culture was made relevant to ways of thinking and acting in an intertwined and simultaneous fashion are included in the categories considering culture’s relevance for ways of

behaving: if the distinction was not made in the accounts, a line is not drawn between the spheres of the mental and physical actions by the researcher. The category of mental aspects was composed accordingly.

In addition to the ways of behaving and the aforementioned mental aspects, in two of the interviews, culture was also made relevant more broadly to all kinds of *manifestations of human life*, including architecture, music, films, interior decoration, clothes, food and drinks. Although related to human behavior, these aspects are distinguished from the category of ways of behavior: instead of representing ways of acting as such, they are, rather, seen as the objects and outcomes of human actions. However, the relevance of this category in the context of civilian crisis management appeared significantly lesser compared to the ways of behaving and the mental aspects: the particulars of this category were mentioned only when addressing the UN's culturally or religiously sensitive headwear options and entertainment, for instance theme nights organized around different national groups in turns.

In this chapter, the findings of this study are introduced. As the two research questions are strongly interrelated, findings to them are addressed in an intertwined fashion in order to deepen the analysis. To begin with, in the first subchapter the categories of culture's relevance for human behavior are introduced. In the subsequent subchapter, attention is paid to a discourse in which culture's relevance specifically for ways of acting is addressed. Meanings given to culture in the discourse are scrutinized. Next, further discourses derived from the data and meanings given to culture in them are introduced. Relevance given to what is seen as culture is looked at step by step as the various meanings of the concept are introduced.

Because of the intertextual nature of discourses, the utterances of the interviewees also uncovered meanings given to culture that the participants did not agree with but that they referred to. For instance, the view of *culture as art* was contested by an interviewee as carrying too limited a meaning: "It is like, now that we think about, think about culture, one may say that 'oh, it is this art, that somebody paints', but it is an absolutely huge concept"[ii]. As these meanings are part of the social world, they are included in the analysis, too.

4.1 Culture's Relevance for Ways of Behavior

As mentioned, based on the accounts in which culture was made relevant to ways of behavior, two main categories were formed: the reduced expressions were clustered under the categories of (1) structural and societal factors and (2) social norms. Starting from the category of *structural and societal factors*, culture was, depending on the target society, made relevant to judicial and legal

traditions and the balance of authority between them, clanship, echoes of the Soviet system and corruption. For example, corruption was mentioned by a few of the interviewees, one of them even referring to it as a ”feature in that culture”[iii] when talking about the local context. It should be noticed, though, that culture was usually not seen as the only factor having influence on these aspects. As an illustration, many of the structural and societal factors were seen as interrelating with the local history. Also, the relationship between culture and structures was reflected on especially by one of the interviewees: ”does culture shape structures or do structures shape culture?”[iv]

Based on the interviews, culturally-related structural and societal factors are significant from the perspective of civilian crisis management at two levels. First, they should be taken into account already when setting out the mandate, as they form the framework conditions for the functioning of an operation. As an interviewee put it,

> *” – – one should know exactly like…before a mission is set out, that wha-wha-what are like the, in a way, the framework conditions according to which the execution of the mission mandate can then be started, and the mission mandate should be contemplated taking that into account.”*[v]

According to the interviewee, the framework conditions should be considered when assessing whether it is a top-down approach, a bottom-up one or a combination of both that should be preferred.

Secondly, based on the interviews, the societal and structural factors need to be considered in the field in order to deliver positive outcomes. Knowing how the local society or community functions in practice is of great importance. As one of the interviewees explained, concerning the context of his experiences,

> *”the official system is very fragile, and weak, so, so, what is on paper does not necessarily correspond to the truth. So, so we need to always remember that if we really want to move things forward, it is not enough that they are on paper but – and agreed by a public official, so it is not necessarily enough, but we need to involve [the local traditional leaders]. And what is the power balance between them, remains a mystery for me.”*[vi]

As it was raised by some of the interviewees, the official system does not necessarily have the absolute authority, and the significance of religious and traditional systems has to be considered. The traditional and religious leaders’ and groups’ support for the official system may be indispensable, and therefore, engaging them may be crucial. (See also Autesserre, 2014, pp. 154-155; Smock, 2010, p. 45.)[15] Moreover, connecting with the traditional leaders was considered an

[15] A lack of inclusion of local actors, such as faith groups and companies, to interventions has been recognized e.g. in the EU-funded Horizon 2020 project Whole of Society Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding (WOSCAP) in the context of the EU interventions. A policy recommendation of establishing a strategy of engaging stakeholders

important factor in order to gain acceptance for the operation's presence. Also, according to two of the interviewees, the processes and ways of negotiating and solving crises or disputes in the local contexts may be culturally-related and connected with the ways the society is structured.

Not only was culture made relevant to societal factors in the local contexts but also to those related to the international personnel's backgrounds. When talking about ”the turmoil of cultures”[vii], as he called it, and ”differences in dealing with things”[viii], an interviewee described that, despite the good quality of their work, the words of the personnel members from certain countries had to be received with some caution. The interviewee made sense of this by referring to the former Iron curtain: according to him, the authorities in certain societies had had to make some extra money when performing their official duties and then learn not to get caught. In this way, in his account the societal aspects, ”the legacy of the days of communism”[ix], had an influence on the personnel members' behavior at work in the present.

Based on these accounts, culture was made relevant to societal and structural factors in order to make sense of the local conditions and functioning of the target society as well as of the behavior of the local populations and the international personnel. Usually, the ultimate orientation of this sense-making appeared to be related to the aim of delivering the best possible outcomes in civilian crisis management.

As for *social norms* and its subcategories, culture was made relevant with respect to *communication styles* in almost each of the interviews. Especially differences related to the level of directness in communication were mentioned. Coming straight to the point was often seen as a Finnish way of communication and not so common in some of the local contexts or in other personnel members' countries of origin. Moreover, inter alia different orientations towards small-talk, talkativeness and quietness as well as physical distance while discussing were mentioned as cultural aspects of communication styles.

Partly overlapping with the subcategory of communication styles, culture was depicted as relevant to *politeness norms* and meanings given to social actions. Culture was, for instance, called into play when describing differences in how to address interlocutors in a polite way or how to start meetings. Culturally related politeness norms were seen as the reason why, after a lecture, each listener raised their hands in order to show interest even if, as it turned out, they did not actually have any questions. Furthermore, local people's generosity and hospitality were described as being related to culture as well as to the local history; hence, according to the interviewees, also responses

---

comprehensively, customized to each context individually, was given. (WOSCAP, 2017.) The significance of involving local actors in international efforts has been recognized by multiple other studies as well (see e.g. Autesserre, 2014, pp. 102-107).

to expressions of generosity should be culturally appropriate. The importance of drinking coffee and tea together was mentioned with respect to part of the local contexts. In addition, meanings given to social actions, such as giving and receiving gifts, were raised as culturally-related aspects involving expectations: in some contexts, obligations would follow a gift received. These were described as something that crisis management personnel should be aware of, in order to avoid causing hurt feelings, misunderstandings and risks.

When it comes to the third subcategory, *social roles*, culture was made relevant to gender roles during each of the interviews. According to Friedman and Berthoin Antal (2005), "many if not all cultures contain beliefs that differentiate between the roles of men and women in the system" (p. 73). Especially the position of women in the local context was often brought to the fore. In these accounts, the influence of culture was many times intertwined with that of religion. Diverse understandings of gender roles may also be present within the international work community of expatriates: some potential challenges were mentioned by one female and one male interviewee. Besides gender roles, two interviewees made culture relevant also to the social roles of the elderly in certain local contexts. Furthermore, the social role of a white foreigner in some African and Asian contexts was sometimes mentioned, often intersecting with gender roles, assumed economic statuses and historical baggage. Culture was also called into play when making sense of the roles of superiors and subordinates, which relates to the category of work culture as well.

In the accounts given by the interviewees, social roles were, obviously, often related to politeness norms, expectations, hierarchy and communication in the local contexts. They were also linked with potential social inclusion and exclusion as well as economic positions in complex ways. For instance, a woman acting against her gender role when seeking relief in a difficult situation might, according to an interviewee, be rejected by her kin. In addition to the social consequences, the rejection would lead her to economic difficulties in a society without a social security system. As this example illustrates, the category of social norms was also linked with societal and structural factors.

The aforementioned aspects considered, culture, through its influence on social roles in the local contexts, was generally seen as relevant to operational activities and planning – and, according to one of the interviewees, even to the recruitment of civilian crisis management experts. The local understandings of social roles were depicted as significant inter alia from the perspective of crisis management personnel's access to information, gaining legitimacy among locals, trust-building, active inclusion of various groups in the local contexts and distribution of tasks between male and female experts, as mentioned by the interviewees. By way of example, despite certain challenges and restrictions associated with the gender of female crisis management personnel by one of the

male interviewees, especially the female interviewees themselves described their gender as an advantage in civilian crisis management (cf. Anttila, 2012, p. 152): it, for instance, allowed them more possibilities to interact with local women and girls (see also Bratosin D'Almeida, Haffner & Hörst, 2017, p. 315) and in a certain context the attitude of local soldiers towards female experts was depicted as less negative than towards males. According to Bratosin D'Almeida et al. (2017, pp. 315-316), as female personnel may be able to liaise with both men and women in the local society, their presence not only contributes to gaining information but also advances the implementation of a mission mandate through contributing to the local acceptance of the mission.

However, both when it comes to interaction with local populations and within the international work community, the experts' gender-related social roles are intersecting with the category of an international worker and a professional, as pointed out by the female interviewees. As illustrated by Tzemach Lemmon (2015, as cited by Bratosin D'Almeida et al., 2017, p. 315) with respect to US female soldiers in Afghanistan, foreign women may be considered to represent a 'third gender' positioned outside the validity of the local moral codes in some contexts. Indeed, as the concept of *intersectionality* elucidates, the complex conditions of social and political world are rarely shaped by one factor only but, rather, by many of them and in mutually influencing ways (Hill Collins & Bilge, 2016, p. 11). In addition to gender, this relates to other social divisions as well.

The name of the fourth subcategory, *work culture*, is directly based on the expression used by two of the interviewees. One of them explained: "work culture, it is, well – well yes, that's how I would call the aspect that we have got used to using somewhat different kinds of processes and working in different, different ways in different countries."[x] Later, when returning to the concept of work culture, he referred to it as different kinds of ways and procedures of working and sees it as "related to, like, this kind of normal concept of culture too."[xi] Indeed, according to the interviewee, work culture is not related to the professional fields of employees but, instead:

> *" – – in my opinion, it stems from the general cultural infl… concept of culture. How people are used to behaving. If, if people in general are for instance punctual, if they keep to deadlines, how they behave in a situation in which, like, they have not fulfilled what they were asked to do… if they tell honestly what it is about or… if they cover it by telling white lies. All things like these, in my opinion, are related to it."*[xii]

The majority of the other interviewees, too, made culture relevant to ways of working. Yet, many of them called culture into play also when addressing attitudes related to working. Indeed, in some of the accounts, merely ways of acting were scrutinized, whereas in others ways of acting, thinking

and feeling were intertwined. Here, the interrelated and partly overlapping character of the categories of ways of behaving and mental aspects introduced in the beginning of this chapter becomes visible.

Distinctively for the category of work culture, variety in the orientations towards deadlines and timetables was made sense of in almost each of the interviews by associating them with culture in certain regions – yet, some of the interviewees considered also the military backgrounds of some personnel members influential for punctuality. In addition to the aforementioned dimensions, differences in multiple other aspects related to work culture were brought to the fore. Culture was made relevant to the roles of and relationships between the superiors and subordinates, including chain of command, orientations towards authority and manifestations of hierarchy; management; work ethic, motivation, vision and self-discipline; the quality of work, paying attention to details and thoroughness; conduct of meetings; efficiency; and proactivity vs. reactivity. Preferring reactivity to proactivity in a certain cultural context was thought of being related to religion and beliefs, such as fatalism, too. As for efficiency at work, culture was made relevant to it by some of the interviewees; however, the relationship between culture and structures in inter alia influencing efficiency as well as liability at work was also reflected on by one of them. Moreover, in one of the interviews, culturally-related differences in ways of "doing things"[xiii] and interpreting regulations were also considered as one of the reasons contributing to the forming of "a little, like, two camps"[xiv] of the personnel members in the interviewee's unit. Thus, in this account, work culture was seen as playing a role in dividing personnel members into two groups.

Altogether, multiple examples of the presence of the diversity of work cultures in the everyday life in civilian crisis management were raised. Generally, the differences in work culture were described to increase the need for conversation on establishing common rules and for arguing for one's stances. Discussing was also raised as a means to make differences visible and to increase mutual understanding. Especially when in superior positions, the interviewees could invite subordinates to discuss with them: in superior positions, they could require certain procedures to be followed, explain the grounds for them and ask for reasons if the objectives were not achieved. One of the interviewees argued that, in case of contradictions, "it depends on oneself, especially if one is in superior positions"[xv] if procedures are followed the next time and mutual understanding is reached. Accounts of subordinates starting conversations with their bosses were given, too. As one of the interviewees pointed out, in this sense, the role of the personnel members' cultural backgrounds in influencing their behavior was restricted by the operation itself: factors such as structural issues, rules and regulations concern each person regardless of their cultural backgrounds.

Sometimes, instead of discussing, the interviewees had changed their ways of acting in order to increase mission performance. For instance, even the following of procedures was sometimes avoided: one of the interviewees mentioned bypassing the ordinary chain of command sometimes in urgent matters and contacting a subordinate instead of the subordinate's boss. According to the interviewee, the subordinate shared more similar kinds of cultural backgrounds with him than the boss. In these cases, the interviewee would not have had time to explain the reasons for his request, which, according to him, was not necessary with the employee sharing similar kinds of backgrounds, education and vision. Therefore, culture was made relevant to the smooth cooperation with the subordinate as well as to the challenges related to requesting something from the boss – accordingly, culture was called into play when making sense of differences in both ways of thinking and ways of acting. However, the superior was not kept uninformed even though his/her subordinate was the one completing the task.

Moreover, more than one of the interviewees mentioned getting prepared to differences in orientation towards schedules, as in the following excerpt: "it took a little time to get used to this kind of difference, and then (I) had to, at some point, I did, if there was a meeting scheduled, I told the counterpart or colleague a time that was 30 minutes earlier, so then we were approximately at the same time there"[xvi]. Another interviewee, in turn, reserved some extra time in his calendar so that his schedule would not fail if someone was late. Not only were the differing orientations towards time and varying understandings of efficiency seen as culturally-related but also the reactions to these differences, such as irritation or frustration: "[i]t probably is a culturally-related issue that a Finn does not really accept that things do not proceed forward."[xvii]

As differences in work cultures lead to differences in expectations as well, the expectations were sometimes subject to reshaping:

> *"Well, one of the challenges is, in a way, like coordinating different ways of working, that what-what is expected, who is expecting from oneself and from the others, and like, as these standards of us Finns and people from the Nordic countries are very high, so how, like, (they) should be decreased."*[xviii]

As another interviewee pointed out, one cannot insist for what one has got used to. Rather, acceptance of difference and adjusting is needed.

When it comes to advisory tasks, the local work culture was described to influence how pieces of advices could be received. According to an interviewee, if words of advice were given to someone in a subordinate position in the local work community, in case of a very hierarchical and strict work environment, s/he cannot necessarily bring ideas upwards in the chain of command. This

highlights the need of knowing the local context already when establishing a mandate: according to the interviewee, in an ideal situation, advisory work could be done at each level of the chain.

All in all, differences in social norms were described to be a potential reason behind culturally-related misunderstandings, possibly leading to resentment or someone getting offended. They were also seen as potentially causing challenges for achieving dialogue as well as getting good results when it comes to the very substance of the experts' duties. In addition, differences in communication styles were made relevant to work efficiency, especially from the perspective of how time is used. Yet, most of the challenges related to differing social norms, particularly with respect to communication styles, were usually seen as surmountable; with this respect, openness and open conversation, willingness to understand each other, flexibility (see Anttila, 2012, p. 175), patience, genuinely being oneself, knowledge on other cultures, and good communication and social skills (see also Anttila, 2012, pp. 180-181), including abilities to argue for one's stances, had become valuable assets. Relatedly, Anttila (2012, p. 87, p. 116) considers collaboration skills, communicative capacity and local awareness even as part of the most essential competencies in crisis management. Also, the local employees' knowledge on the local ways of behavior and history were described as a precious resource and help for the international personnel by some of the interviewees (see also Eckhard, 2020, p. 12, p. 14).

However, unawareness of or breaking the social norms were seen as a potential risk for the functioning of the operation by most of the interviewees, although they themselves did not have experiences of that kind. In the following excerpt, an interviewee describes how unawareness of "the local culture" would affect the daily working. Right before the extract, he had talked about the importance of familiarizing oneself with the local manners and ways of acting already prior to deployment.

> *The researcher: "What happens if one does not know about those?"*
>
> *The interviewee: "Then collisions probably emerge and the, the cooperation, both with those within the operation and those beyond it, like, does not work as it should so, well, certainly challenges will follow. Some… there will be these kinds of things that (gives an example of what could happen in duties related to his field of expertise) will become more difficult. It certainly is related, related to the very daily working if you are strongly on a direct collision course with the, the local culture and way of acting.*"[xix]

According to the participants, misunderstandings and unawareness might, at worst, lead to dangerous situations, and inappropriate behavior to a position of "persona non grata"[xx] in the host society – even one mistake was seen as potentially ruining the possibilities for further discussions

with the local population. A bad reputation or loss of face was described as difficult or impossible to fix also in the eyes of other personnel members serving at the same time "there in an international setting, as there are people from various backgrounds"[xxi]. Losing face was described to happen, for instance, when one needs to back off in a discussion in which one has first pronounced a stance in an intransigent way. In addition, according to one interviewee, a civilian crisis management expert's unawareness of the local culture could also stigmatize her/his country of origin. This may apply to sending institutions and organization as well (see Setkic, 2008, p. 15).

Accordingly, knowledge of the local culture was seen as crucial, and training related to the target society's social norms already prior to deployment was considered essential to the smooth functioning of the operation and safety. Taking social norms into consideration would also contribute to successful trust-building in the local context. "Dos and don'ts"[xxii], the list of "what you are absolutely not allowed to do, and what is desirable to be done"[xxiii], was described as a helpful tool in avoiding pitfalls. In addition, knowledge of the local culture was described to help crisis management experts to orientate themselves mentally to encounters with the host population.

4.2 Culture as a Set of Definable Manners and a Code of Conduct

When looking at the accounts in which culture was made relevant to ways of behavior, a few different kinds of discourses can be distinguished. Within the first one, the focus is very clearly on acting. A definition of culture given by one of the participants provides a distinctive summary of the most significant aspects related to this discourse:

> *"Culture, mm… Culture, I have said- appro- well, let's put it this way that I approach (it) in this way that culture, in my opinion, means how people behave, how they work… what, what kinds of habits they have... and culture is very much influenced by that region's or… people's or… country's history. Also, religion is relevant with respect to the question as to what kind of culture (there is). I have experienced that myself. But then on the other hand, religion does not necessarily have significance to what kind of - what culture is."*[xxiv]

As can be seen, in this excerpt culture refers specifically to ways of behaving. Mental aspects, such as beliefs and attitudes, are not addressed – culture's potential influence on them, or vice versa, is not denied either, but no specific attention is paid to them. This is so even though religion's potential significance for culture is brought to the fore: in the accounts employing this discourse, religion is looked at from the perspective of the rules it sets for behaving, instead of its possible influence on the mental or spiritual life. In addition to the relevance of religion for culture, that of history is raised.

Distinctively for this discourse, as evident in the expressions such as ”the habits of the local culture” [xxv], ”how people behave”[xxvi], ”the ways they act”[xxvii], ”how one has to behave there”[xxviii], “a cultural rule”[xxix] and ”they know the culture, know people's manners there”[xxx], culture not only refers to ways of behavior in general but to a set of manners that can be defined. As one of the interviewees illustrated, “[c]ulture… whatever it is, it influences the cultural practices according to which, like, one behaves, what is the code of (literally: what are the rules for) behavior, what is considered desirable and what is not, it influences cert- gives the certain framework conditions”[xxxi]. Based on these expressions, culture appears to provide the rules for behavior, compliance to which is desirable.

Yet, the discourse does not assume these rules always to be followed, and, hence, culture does not appear as a determinant of human behavior. The influence of other driving forces, too, is acknowledged, as it is apparent in the following example: “no, no, we are not similar each, we are not similar as individuals, we have a different culture, backgrounds and everything else that influences also the individual's behavior.”[xxxii] Although not determinative, culture's role is, however, typically depicted as significant within this discourse, as illustrated in the following extract: “one must also learn to accept that, well, people live, like, strongly affected by the culture, like, and you have to, like, to know it (the culture) before you really go to the country.”[xxxiii]

This discourse also assumes that cultures exist as such. Expressions such as ”has come home from the operation, the country, the culture”[xxxiv] and ”works in that operation, country, culture”[xxxv] presuppose a view of cultures as ”independently existing patterns”, as Virkama (2010, p. 41) puts it. Also, the expression: “the norms of the community are very much set by the culture”[xxxvi] contributes to this idea. Relatedly, and contrary to the process view (see Piller, 2017, p. 9), seeing culture as a set of definable manners represents *an entity view* of culture. By way of example, one of the interviewees articulated:

> *”the better an operation's, a civilian crisis management operation's personnel have familiarized themselves with the (local) culture in advance, from all the countries from which the personnel comes, (and) the more they have like, this kind of homogenous view of what the culture in the (target) country is, the easier it, like, is for the whole action of the mission to start also because everyone understands why a certain thing does not happen exactly the same way as it does in one's own home country, but because, because there is this kind of culture in this country, one has to behave on the culture's terms.”*[xxxvii]

Without any intention to underestimate neither the importance of gaining understanding of the local context (see e.g. Autesserre, 2014; Howard, 2007) nor the significance of coordination in crisis management operations, it can be interpreted that this account is, at the level of discourses, based on

and contributes to the idea of the existence of culture as an entity so that a homogenous view of the local culture can be formed in the first place. Also, some other expressions employed by some of the participants, if interpreted like Piller (2017, p. 9) does, hold a presupposition of the existence of an entity: the expressions such as ”the Finnish culture” serve as an example. According to Piller (2017), the entity view of culture is essentialist, as ”it treats culture as something people have or to which they belong” (p. 9). According to Virkama (2010, p. 41) an entity may be a national or smaller unit – yet, based on some of the interviewees' accounts, should the neighboring countries have been united in the past, they could today share a similar kind of culture. Hence, it is not the national borders but a shared past that appears substantial for defining a certain culture's sphere of influence. In any case, within this discourse culture is typically associated with a certain region.

As culture is seen as a set of definable manners associated with a certain region, it means culture can also be studied. Accordingly, and what is also characteristic for accounts employing this discourse, civilian crisis management experts are asked to adjust to the specific manners associated with the local context, inter alia with the help of a list of dos and don'ts. As one of the interviewees illustrated, during one of his trainings he was given "a very effective information package of what you are absolutely not allowed to do, and what is desirable to be done"[xxxviii], referring to the local cultural context. Another interviewee argued: "in my opinion, it is indispensable that there has to be (a training related to the target society's culture). So that… a so-called error won't happen that… you break right away so-some, like, cultural rule."[xxxix] Therefore, the local culture also carries the meaning of *a code of conduct* for crisis management personnel. Drawing on Virkama, this picture ultimately relates to an essentialist approach to culture: culture is seen as "a set of characteristics that can be studied and used in order to communicate with the people 'belonging' to this culture" (Virkama, 2010, p. 41). Yet, the information package of the local ways of behavior was also referred to as "probably the most workable in the region in question"[xl] by another interviewee – as culture is not seen as a determinant of human behavior within this discourse, some uncertainty remains.

Defining and studying a set of manners also holds that culture be presented as rather solid. However, instead of complete stability, according to the accounts employing this discourse, changes in culture do emerge in the course of time. One of the interviewees described this process of change in the following manner: ”Over time, culture changes. It is affected very much by the history. The country's history, the region's history, people's history. (That) what kind of culture there is."[xli] Accordingly, it is the temporal and historical context that is emphasized when considering changes, rather than the context of interaction: within this discourse, changes were not described as situational and nuanced modifications but as a more macro level process taking place over time.

According to this first depiction of culture, based on the accounts, crisis management experts' lack of adjusting would lead to an increased risk of misunderstandings and potentially negative feelings. Moreover, the crisis management operation or an expert's share in it might be jeopardized. Following the cultural rules, therefore, appears essential for human safety and the functioning of the operation. Adjusting also carries connotations of respecting the local culture – "it has been emphasized that, that you need to respect"[xlii], as one of the interviewees told me when discussing cultural sensitivity. However, this discourse constructs representations of crisis management experts' agency and subject position in a different light compared to those of locals. Regardless of their cultural backgrounds, the crisis management personnel are depicted as able – perhaps even obliged – to adjust their behavior, whereas culture's influence on human behavior in the local context appears as potentially more determinative. Intercultural communication then becomes "a one-way phenomenon, governed by culture, not negotiated and co-constructed by individuals" (Dervin & Layne, 2013, p. 8).

It is notable, though, that while studying the ways of behavior as well as dos and don'ts associated with the target society's culture was depicted as extremely important, generalizing was often referred to as undesirable. This, obviously, leads to a challenging setting: the somewhat contradictory aims of defining and studying a set of manners applicable to the local context, as well as refraining from making generalizations and from overemphasizing culture's role in influencing human behavior exist at the same time. Inconsistency, in this sense, was present in part of the accounts, and the efforts to tackle the challenge varied. Taking an example, behavior differing from what is expected on the basis of the so-called cultural rules was sometimes defined as an exception to the rule (qv. neoessentialism) or bypassed by giving it little noteworthiness: the behavior could be depicted as related to "some individual case"[xliii] only. The challenge becomes visible also in the following example, in which one of the participants takes some time to find words or even hesitates when talking about the local people and their behavior. The account is also self-reflexive in the sense that it pays attention to its own content (see Parker, 1992, pp. 14-15; Suoninen, 2016a, p. 64). I had asked what kinds of things supported or restricted the interaction both with locals and with other international personnel. The interviewee started with addressing first communication with the locals by describing their ways of behavior:

> *The [local] culture is… uhm, the [locals]… and of course, one should not generalize, right? (gives a short laugh) Each person is an individual. But we have to (make generalizations). And, and, if we generalize, so, so... uhm, we can speak of [the locals] in a generalizing manner, so, uhm, [the locals] are, are, are devout Muslims.* [xliv] *(Then continues describing the effects of the religion on the behavior*

of and interaction with the local people; the interviewee considers religion's role "dominant"[xlv] *in the local culture.)*

When employed, generalizing discourses not only addressed others but also the groups the interviewees themselves identified with. Sometimes the interviewees positioned themselves as typical members of a group – that is, as individuals who comply with the so-called cultural rules of behavior associated with a group that comes from a certain region and that they identify with. Sometimes, however, they were positioned as exceptions, the ones breaking the rules, such as in the following excerpt: "I am very talkative for a Finn, even extrovert, (as) usually Finns are quiet. And… and reticent, do not talk much, and do not engage in small-talk."[xlvi] Notably, though, when describing himself in relation to other Finns and thereby, raising the possibility of breaking the norm on one hand, the interviewee strongly constructs a representation of the behavior of "Finns" on the other hand. Therefore, the excerpt is, first, based on the assumption of the existence of "Finns" as a group; secondly, especially by using the word "usually", it also produces a generalizing view of their ways of behaving. Indeed, even if culture is not seen as the only factor influencing human behavior, both the existence of a group and generalizations of their behavior are needed in order to define "the local culture" as a set of manners associated with a population living in a certain area.

Presented out of its context, the abovementioned citation could also be interpreted as a representative of a discourse associating personality traits with cultural backgrounds. However, the phrase appeared when the interviewee described differences in politeness norms in different cultural environments and illustrated how divergent views of what constitutes good manners can cause misunderstandings. For this reason, according to my interpretation, the account itself is related to social norms and practices instead of personality traits. However, the excerpt and especially the expression "*Finns are quiet – –* " show the somewhat ambiguous and problematic relationship between two discourses. If taken to its extreme, the discourse of "culture as a set of definable manners" may lead to a view according to which culture is the *only* driving force of human behavior: one may be seen to behave in a certain way because of his/her cultural background. Culture then becomes a determinant of human behavior, thereby an attribute of an individual or a group of people – a discourse that is introduced next.

4.3 Culture as an Attribute of a Group of People

The interviewee: ”So, so, in a mission, erm, there may, may be, like on a general level, people may, like a large number of people, uhm, may have a clear opinion of certain nationalities, and, and I did not necessarily share these views with them, because, like, each one of us is different so it depends on the person herself/himself, like, and not on her/his nationality, uhm, after all. But it can be said that like people coming from [certain geographical areas] did not necessarily have the best of reputation. Or like [gives another example, refers both to nationality and work history]. So, so, their motivation to work was not (gives a laugh) at its greatest. So, so, these kinds of factors, erm, then explain the reputation associated with a certain nationality. But in my unit, erm, there were [a list of nationalities] and they were, in my opinion, great workers though, each one of them.”

The researcher: ”Well, in practical terms, if thinking about what kinds of, how it is visible if it is visible, so motivation is one of these like, aspects that comes into your mind?”

The interviewee: ”Yes, yes.”

The researcher: ”Is there anything else that you can think of, like…?

The interviewee: ”Well, what is it then that explains that… that, that, somehow… Uhm, easily one just, in a way if you talked about it with someone, so then, uhm, one just referred to culture, and did not define it any better than that their – like their, uhm, demeanor or behavior stems from them being from a certain culture. (Pause) So, so, well. Yeah, so, so, is it then like… that if you come from a former, uhm, Soviet state, so, so, has it possibly influenced the way you work. Like these kinds of assumptions exist behind people's comments.”[xlvii]

Later, the same interviewee further illustrated her perception of some people's views:

“ – – it is, in a way, a kind of, that, that even if people would not say it aloud, it is in a way the starting assumption that because of them coming from [a country], ergo they represent, like, a certain kind of culture, so, so it explains that, uhm, what kind o- why they are, as persons, the kind that, that they are.”[xlviii]

By contesting it, the accounts above refer to a specific discourse in an illustrative way and reveal one of the meanings given to culture. According to the objected meaning, culture appears as a determinant of human behavior which, then, makes culture an attribute of a group of people – as the interviewee describes, according to the views that she did not agree with, the demeanor or behavior of certain people was depicted as *”stemming from them being from a certain culture”*. As mentioned earlier, this is the logical result of taking ”culture as a set of definable manners” discourse to its extreme so that ”the cultural rules” become binding and, hence, determinative. It is also a very essentialist view, perfectly corresponding for instance to Holliday's (2011) definition of essentialism: ”Essentialism presents people's individual behaviour as entirely defined and

constrained by the cultures in which they live so that the stereotype becomes the essence of who they are" (p. 5). In addition to being essentialist, using solely culture to explain someone's behavior can be seen as a form of othering (see Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, pp. 101-102).

The risk of stereotypes becoming the essence of people exists also when culture is made relevant to aspects beyond ways of acting – inter alia to attitudes, moral views, ways of thinking or opinions (see also Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, pp. 101-102). Indeed, culture as an attribute was made relevant to ways of thinking, acting and being within this discourse. In one of the accounts of this kind, certain virtues such as "integrity"[xlix] and "honesty"[l] were associated with Finnish culture and people, although not exclusively. Taking another example, as illustrated in the excerpt xlviii above, culture may be considered as an explanatory factor to why people coming from a certain country "are, as persons, the kind that, that they are."

Altogether, discourses that depict culture as an attribute of a group of people involve highly generalizing and stereotyping characteristics. As can be seen in the excerpt xlvii above addressing certain groups' unfavorable reputation, stereotypes may often carry negative associations that contribute to creating boundaries between groups of people (Moore, 2003, p. 16, as cited in Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, p. 99): characteristics such as certain traits, intentions and capacities ascribed to a social group may affect other people's behaviors towards the group members (Bar-Tal, 1997, p. 492). Indeed, later the interviewee (excerpt xlvii) added that sometimes the aforementioned, stereotyping views underlay the expressed wishes – that, however, remained unfulfilled – of some personnel members not to carry out some tasks with certain people.

The risk of inclining to generalizing, fixed representations or stereotyping was recognized by some of the interviewees when employing some versions of "culture as a set of definable manners" -discourses or "culture as an attribute" -discourse. In these cases, stereotyping was referred to as undesirable or even harmful as the existence of individual differences, among other things, was acknowledged. Yet, sometimes this statement was immediately followed by the use of stereotypes, accompanied by arguments giving reasons to employing stereotypes in the particular situation. These kinds of accounts may be seen as intertextual in the sense that they first refer to or comment other well-known discourses according to which stereotyping is depicted as undesirable, and then call stereotypes into play with some caution, or sometimes with a justification or rationale:

> *"Well, well, this just so easily leads to, like, fostering stereotypes, but, but… stereotypes too do exist for some reason, like, maybe it can be said in an exaggerating manner that people from certain countries are people from certain countries and, and, it is easier to work with for example people from the Nordic countries because their background is so close to (one's) own culture. That yes, of*

course these kinds of… these kinds of things, like, occurred in (my) own work as well."[li]

Expressing that one is aware of the risk of stereotyping as well as providing the justification or rationale, such as "stereotypes too do exist for some reason" can be interpreted as a defense against potential criticism. Yet, this process is not necessarily conscious (see Potter and Wetherell, 1987, pp. 33-34). These kinds of accounts are also contradictory in the sense that they express one's awareness of employing a stereotype and yet call it into play (see Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, p. 138). This is visible also in the following account, in which, one of the interviewees, although aware of employing a stereotype, made culture, through the influence of work culture, relevant to results at work:

> *The researcher: "Are there some other pros or challenges… that different kinds of cultural backgrounds bring to crisis management?"*
>
> *The interviewee: "(Pause). Uhm, well, through those… like through work culture, m-maybe just like some people… perform better than others, are more thorough, pay more attention to details, so, so let's put it this way that you… may get a better result, if, if your patrol consists of... erm, certain... thi-this is kind of a stereo…ty-type again but that if it like consists of certain nationalities so then the work may be done better, simply, so… so, like, yeah."*[lii]

Although stereotypes are often related to negative notions, attributes associated with a certain cultural group may also be positive:

> *The researcher: "Do you recall some advantages or disadvantages that your cultural backgrounds have provided you with, at work?"*
>
> *The interviewee: "Uhm, absolutely more, more advantages. Just, like, when, when you interact with locals, so... exactly the point that I mentioned (earlier) that we (Finns)are not given any labels. Uhm, erm… we, we are generally considered, like, as hon-honest and, like, down-to-earth persons, and, and, as for working, Finns have… erm, a very good reputation so, so we are considered good workers, uhm, competent workers so, so it is, in turn, a kind of label in a way in work environment that often… uhm, I have experienced that it (the label) helps, that people are like 'oh, s/he is from Finland, well, okay great' that, that 'this will certainly work', so, so, like this."*[liii]

The good reputation of Finnish civilian crisis management experts, sometimes accompanied with similar descriptions of the reputation of Finnish peacekeepers or Finnish employees in general, was brought to the fore in three interviews. In one of the accounts, Finns were depicted as "wanted" crisis management personnel because of "the Finnish virtues"[liv] such as "honesty"[lv], "integrity"[lvi] and "punctuality"[lvii], although these were not considered as Finnish characteristics only.

What is noteworthy is that the idea of Finns as good and competent workers and crisis management experts not only constructs the idea of Finnish cultural and national backgrounds but also creates a certain kind of subject position of a competent worker. The expectations and attitudes that the personnel are faced with as well as the possibilities of acting may therefore differ from those positioned otherwise: indeed, if culture is regarded as the determinant of people's behavior and "the essence of who they are" (Holliday, 2011, p. 5), it is the ideas of their cultural backgrounds that also shape the expectations and potential restrictions set for their actions. The favorable position of Finnish crisis management personnel was clearly visible in especially one of the accounts referring to the good reputation of Finns in the context of crisis management. Yet, unlike within the attribute discourse, in his account the good reputation of Finns was related to the training of Finnish personnel and their successful performance in previous operations, rather than to any characteristics of the so-called cultural group:

> *The researcher: "Is there something that I have not realized to ask, or something that you would like to say related to cultures… uhm, to interaction with people from different, different cultural backgrounds in civilian crisis management operations?"*
>
> *The interviewee: "Well, I don't know, I would like to emp-emphasize that, that like… even if I myself am Finnish, that Finnish peacekeepers and civilian crisis management personnel have… maybe… the highest class of reputation, in a positive sense, so some-something has been done right by us, there is something that is right in our training and… right actions have been taken in the situations, especially in, like, a little more challenging situations[16] so... so in that sense, it is nice to belong to this group, uhm… and it is easy for Finns to go, go to any group… like, to any cultural group because Finnishness is seen as a positive thing."[lviii]*

Even if the interviewee does not associate the good reputation of Finnish peacekeepers and civilian crisis management experts with any attribute of the group but, instead, to their previous actions and performance, the positive view of "Finnishness" influences other people's attitudes towards those identified as belonging to the group (see Bar-Tal, 1997, p. 492). In addition, using the pronoun "we" contributes to the idea of the existence of "us" in relation to others, and the expression "Finnishness" holds the presupposition of the existence of an entity (see Piller, 2017, p. 9).

Despite being sometimes utilized by the interviewees, the generalizing discourses were often contested by them. Looking at the strategies of opposition contributes to shedding light onto some characteristics of the attribute discourse. Stereotypes were questioned for instance by drawing on

[16] As for the performance of Finnish personnel, the interviewee had earlier referred, for instance, to Finnish peacekeepers' strong preference for non-violent actions and impartiality.

shared humanity[17], as in the following example, even if culture was described as something that people ”have”:

> *”[E]ach problem can be got over if there is the slightest will. Yes. Or what about problems, the starting point is that it is there, that you have a different culture than I have, so, so I get along with peop- I engage with people, and am not, not like ’all [an ethnic group] are uhm, like… uhm, suicide bombers, so, I don’t talk with you’. That is not how it goes. Instead, you are… here and you are a human being, and I get along with you because you are here. And it goes just fine like that, doesn’t it.”*[lix]

In addition to, and also, *by* invoking shared humanity – that is, by what is common to all of the interlocutors – the account rejects giving excessive emphasis on differing cultural backgrounds. This way, it challenges both the boundary-building character of the stereotyping attribute discourse and its tendency to overemphasize culture’s role in interaction.

Another way of contesting stereotypes was emphasizing individual agency as well as diversity on individual level, as the interviewee does in the excerpt xlvii quoted before: ” – – I did not necessarily share these views (referring to strong opinions of certain nationalities) with them, because, like, each one of us is different so it depends on the person herself/himself, like, and not on her/his nationality, uhm, after all.” As referring to uniqueness of each individual is used as a means to challenge the attribute discourse, it reveals that stereotypes, in effect, are based *on the idea of homogeneity of the members of a certain group* (see also e.g. Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, p. 102; Bar-Tal, 1997, p. 492), making the attribute collective.

Thirdly, the interviewees often paid attention to factors other than culture – or other than culture and religion, if these two were seen as intertwined – that may potentially influence the ways people act or think. For instance, the role of structural factors, media and propaganda and the influence of events in the recent history of the local context were sometimes addressed when reflecting on people’s ways of behavior or thinking. Moreover, when making sense of why it was easier or more difficult to get along with some people than with others, culture was sometimes made relevant, but so were factors such as personalities of both the interviewee and his/her interlocutor, professional backgrounds or ranks, work ethic and vision, religion as well as educational backgrounds too.

The reason why bringing up aspects other than culture challenges the view of culture as an attribute is related to the very essence of the attribute discourse. While making culture a determinant of human behavior, the attribute discourse ignores any other potential factor, such as social

[17] In a CMC Finland Yearbook, the experience of common humanity has been discussed with respect to overcoming the civilian-military binary opposition in crisis management (see Penttinen, 2010, p. 52).

motivations, or ”sets of circumstances— including the individual’s own intentions and inclinations, the historical and political circumstances— that are unique in each case” that Breidenbach and Nyíri (2009, p. 322) consider meaningful for human behavior. Thereby, the attribute discourse also *decontextualizes* intercultural communication.

However, ”culturalist”[18] approach may also emerge when the accounts, on the surface, seem to contest cultural stereotyping. Yet, when taking a closer look, the overemphasizing view of culture’s role becomes prominent:

> *“If you base your view or thought, idea of someone on his/her, like nationality, like national or work- or work culture mostly, so, so, then you may get surprised as, like, as you don’t know where the person has been working (earlier). So, so, like… for instance, for instance... let’s put it this way that I myself got surprised that [mentions a few colleagues] that I just had, in a way, maybe a little, like categorized stereotypically that okay, they come from those countries so they are like this, and then they were extremely international, perfectly different than what I had imagined they would be. So, so, yes, things like that happen, in a way, rather regularly.”*[lx]

As the behavior differing from stereotypes is seen as a result of work experience in other cultural contexts than one’s own[19], rather than being related to factors other than culture, the discourse ends up strengthening the view of the culture’s significant role with respect to human behavior. Yet, a moment earlier, the same interviewee had emphasized the uniqueness of each individual and opposed stereotyping views. The example, once again, reminds us of how the boundaries between essentialist and non-essentialist approaches get blurred in real life (see Virkama 2010, p. 44) and contradictory discourses may be used in an inconsistent way.

Indeed, generalizing phrases such as ”Finns work diligently, and that’s not a cliché either”[lxi] could be found in the very same discussions in which the uniqueness of each person as well as the changing and dynamic character of culture – an approach strongly opposing the attribute discourse – were also brought to the fore. In addition to the intermingling of essentialism and non-essentialism in everyday life practices (see Virkama 2010, p. 44), these contradictory ways of talking strongly relate to Dervin’s definition of *interculturel janusien*, a combination of liquid and solid approaches to interculturality (Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, pp. 35-37; see also p. 39 in this thesis).

---

[18] Culturalist thinking refers to making culture the only explanatory factor for any phenomenon (Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, p. 97). According to Dervin and Keihäs (2013), the French scholar Martine Abdallah-Pretceille calls it *culturalisme* when someone is “seen exclusively as the product of her/his culture” (p. 97).

[19] This relates to the concept of secondary socialization (see p. 92 in this thesis).

4.3.1 The Relevance of "Culture as an Attribute"

As already mentioned, although often resisted, culture in the attribute sense may be made relevant to ways of acting, thinking and being in various kinds of situations. The accounts revealing the attribute discourse could be divided into two groups: some accounts employed the attribute discourse as such, thereby making ”culture as an attribute” relevant to something, whereas others made someone's *view* of culture as an attribute relevant when making sense of something. As for the first one of these groups, a few examples have already been presented: cultural backgrounds in a determinant sense were called into play for instance when making sense of why Finns are ”wanted” crisis management experts, why it was easier to work with some people than with others and why results at work may differ. What is notable is that within this group of accounts, even if not intended, culture actually appears as a means of categorizing people as culture represents a determinant of their behavior and thinking (see Holliday, 2011, p. 5). The label can be either a positive or a negative one. These accounts were mostly related to working in intercultural settings, and culture often refers to a national unit. However, accounts of this kind were rather rare – for instance, the last two examples draw on one interview only.

As for the other group of accounts, the aspect that someone is viewing culture as a determinant of someone else was made relevant for instance when making sense of why some people were unwilling to work with others. Indeed, this group of accounts illustrates cases in which culture appears to be *used* as a means to categorize people by someone else, whether intended or not. Interestingly, in a significant share of these accounts, in addition to potentially associating culture with nationality, the illustrated views of culture were intertwined with politics, religion or history, or some combinations of these elements. As for politics, religion and history, it should be emphasized, though, that in these cases the interviewees always referred to other people's views instead of their own.

By way of example, viewing ”culture as an attribute” was made relevant by an interviewee when describing some locals' attitudes towards certain groups in the context of a particular conflict. As a reply to my question if peoples' different *cultural* backgrounds have an influence on civilian crisis management, an interviewee explained that ”a label”[lxii] is attached to some nationalities by some people. The participant then illustrated that Americans did not have the best of reputation among locals in a certain region. According to the interviewee, Americans were seen to represent certain political views that differed from the hopes and wishes the locals had for their country's future already before the conflict. Moreover, once the conflict started, part of the locals may have blamed Americans for the reasons leading to it. Sometimes some locals' view of Americans

expanded to concern Germans and French people, too: ” – – some people there have very strong opinions on Americans, and, and… maybe on, like, French, Germans… uhm, be-because of them representing like, in their minds, the West.”[lxiii]

Building on this account, not only were some locals' views of American, French and German people highly generalizing, but culture also carried meanings intertwined with politics and nationality. Based on the account, the attribute view of culture then contributed to creating boundaries, at least to some extent, between the locals and part of the civilian crisis management personnel (see Moore, 2003, p. 16, as cited in Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, p. 99): what was attributed to certain groups affected other people's attitudes and behavior towards the group (see Bar-Tal, 1997, p. 492). Moreover, fixed and generalizing assumptions of "the others'" ways of thinking did not serve as the most fruitful starting point for interaction (see Keisala, 2012, p. 12). Indeed, according to Anttila (2012, pp. 77-78), social categorization may affect group relations among locals, between locals and crisis management personnel as well as between various groups of personnel members. However, the account does not provide an adequate basis for making conclusions if the locals in question also considered the issue actually being related to *culture* – it only illustrates one version of the reality as interpreted by the interviewee. The existence of labels, though, whether they were associated with culture, nationality or the political agendas of nation-states, emphasizes the advantages of multinational and multicultural crisis management operations: as another interviewee pointed out, the multinational character of for instance UN operations may contribute to impartiality on one hand and affect locals' attitudes towards the operation on the other hand, as their views of it are not influenced by their perceptions of one or few countries only.

Taking yet another example of the relevance of the attribute view of culture that other people had, the events of the Second World War, according to an interviewee, still appeared to affect some people's attitudes towards Germans. In this example, politics, nationality and history are intertwined with culture. In concrete terms, the memory of the war was described inter alia to restrict off-duty interaction as topics addressed depended, to some extent, on the national backgrounds of the persons present. ”The historical baggage”[lxiv], as the interviewee called it, was, in some contexts, also described as the reason behind potential misunderstandings between personnel from countries of opposing sides in the World War II. Attentiveness as well as awareness of the history then became valuable. Yet, the interviewee emphasized that he had got along with everyone very well. What is of special interest with respect to the topic of this thesis is that the misunderstandings were brought to the fore by the interviewee when I had asked if he had experienced misunderstandings or contradictions that, in his opinion, stemmed from *cultural* reasons. Hence, the attribute view of culture that some other people, according to the account, had

was made relevant by the interviewee when making sense of the social practices among the crisis management personnel. Once again, though, conclusions cannot be made if the people in question also considered the issue being related to *culture.*

In any case, culture's intertwining with history, politics and religion may involve complex tensions. Part of the attribute discourses that some other people, according to the interviewees, employed, were even related to depicting cultures as incompatible with others. Furthermore, mixing them up could be depicted not only as undesirable but also dangerous in the opinions of some people the interviewees referred to. (See Breidenbach and Nyíri, 2009, pp. 320-321.) Accordingly, seeing threats could be involved in the attribute discourse. According to Breidenbach and Nyíri (2009), the argument of the dangerousness of mixing up cultures ”still enjoys rather wide currency” (p. 321). They also claim that it ”is most often heard from opponents of immigration” (p. 321), which was visible at least in one of the accounts in which other people's ways of talking were referred to.

In the following subchapter, the intertwining aspects of culture, history, politics, religion and nationality are further looked at. Interestingly, as also the subsequent examples will show, this kind of intertwining appeared to be present especially when culture was referred to in the attribute sense. Yet, it does not concern the attribute discourse exclusively, for which reason a subchapter of its own is included.

4.4 The Intertwining Aspects of Culture, History, Politics, Religion and Nationality

As apparent above, within the attribute discourse culture was quite often referred to as a national unit. However, culture was spoken of with national terms many times in accounts employing other discourses as well. Even the expression ”national culture”[lxv] was sometimes used.

Associating culture with nationality in discourses may be looked at from a few different angles. One interpretation that might be made here is that culture is seen as a nationally bounded unit. With respect to some of the discourses referred to or expressions employed by the interviewees, this interpretation might even appear well reasoned – especially the expression ”national culture” encourages this perspective. Seeing culture as a national unit would also be one way of seeing culture as an entity and is not rare for essentialist discourses (see e.g. Piller, 2011, p. 81). Yet, as for part of the accounts, and especially when it comes to the discourses presented as agreed by the interviewees, this interpretation may be hasty: when being asked about the relationship between culture and nationality, none of the interviewees described culture as

nationally bounded. Instead, more fluid discourses according to which the boundaries of culture do not follow national frontiers were employed. Although this inconsistency could be made sense of by invoking the complexity of the social reality in which even contradictory discourses may be used, there are other sides to this point that should be considered, too.

At least one of them is rather obvious. Civilian crisis management functions in the framework of nation-states, which has an influence on the language used. Moreover, organizing the world into nation-states is a very dominant approach in many discourses in other contexts as well, which, for its part, provides with the ”pre-existing linguistic resources” (see Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 34) employed in discourses related to crisis management too. As even contradictory discourses on the relationship between culture and nationality may be used during the same interviews, not only the variety of accounts but also the existence of pre-existing linguistic capital at the level of social practices become visible. Yet, the aforementioned aspects do not necessarily erase the point that when employed, discourses associating culture with nationality still contribute to and reinforce the idea of national cultures as well as, for their part, construct these cultures.

Based on the interviews, the idea of national cultures was sometimes present not only at the level of discourses, topics that could be addressed and subject positions the discourses shape but also when it comes to other social practices. In one account, theme nights organized around the so-called national cultures were discussed. These events refer to leisure time social activity: in turns, what was seen as national cultures and aspects considered characteristic for them, such as habits, drinks, food, films and music, were introduced. Culture is then looked at as *a way of life*, focusing on its relevance from the perspective of the objects and outcomes of human activity. Indeed, according to Hall (1995, p. 176), shared meanings are not “free-floating ideas” but, rather, “embodied in the material and the social world”. Furthermore, the account of the theme nights also relates to presenting cultural differences from an enjoyable, esthetic and performative angle, which Hannerz calls ”cultural celebrationism” (Hannerz, 1999, p. 393, p. 404).

In any case, it is noteworthy that when culture is presented as a national entity, it may also appear as tied to the history of what is seen as the nation. This becomes visible, for instance, in the aforementioned account according to which the events of the Second World War still appeared to affect some people’s attitudes towards certain national groups and influence the off-duty interaction among crisis management personnel. Cultural backgrounds of groups of people were depicted as carrying “historical baggage”, which was described as relevant both to attitudes, that is, to mental aspects, and behavior of other people towards them. What is worth noticing, from the perspective of discourse analysis, according to the interviewee’s account some people addressed the so-called cultural and national group of others by using the pronoun “you”[lxvi] (in plural) when actually

discussing the events of the Second World War. A discourse of this kind clearly constructs and contributes to an idea of the existence of nationally-bounded cultural groups and identifies interlocutors in the present with those groups' past – in other words, these groups are presented as existing throughout the times. Based on the account, the understandings of the past also appear to place individuals into different kinds of subject positions according to their nationalities, in terms of what, how and when something can be said and by whom. In this way, the cultural backgrounds, or the idea of them, is connected to power as well; power appears as socially constructed relations (see Broome & Collier, 2012, p. 263). This account is also related to Gallois' (2002) view of intercultural communication involving both intergroup and interpersonal dimensions at the same time.[20]

However, historical baggage may be involved even if culture is not seen as a national entity. For instance, colonial history is related to regions also beyond the contemporary national borders. Still, it may affect the historically charged meanings given to culture and the subject positions of those representing certain cultural groups in the eyes of others. Taking an example, in one of the accounts, the colonial history of the host country was considered to still contribute to the present local culture, which, in turn, was depicted to influence a local's view of and behavior towards a white man: the white man was approached with expectations of him giving the local man some money.

Colonial history is present also in the following account: ”the local authority, they did not want, not all of them wanted the advice, that we provided, from us as they considered it as such European fussing and, and, uhm, like, a wrong kind of culture caused by the former colonial ruler.”[lxvii] In the picture this particular excerpt paints, the advisors are positioned disadvantageously with respect to the functioning of the operation, and their possibilities to serve are restricted, because of some of the local authorities' ideas of culture, affected by the colonial past. Part of the local authorities, in turn, are described as unwilling to receive advise because of the historically charged meanings given to culture. Accordingly, as can be seen, the ideas of cultures may become or be made relevant to the functioning of civilian crisis management operations. Yet, it should be noted that this account does not illustrate how the civilian crisis management experts as human beings were seen (cf. the attribute discourse) – it only pays attention to the attitudes towards their advice. In any case, as apparent in the account, history not only potentially affects ideas of cultures

---

[20] Moreover, according to Gallois (2003), intercultural communication “should always be considered in full knowledge of the specific intergroup history” (p. 12). However, the challenge in gaining this knowledge lies in the concurrent existence of various interpretations and narratives of the past. Awareness of this is needed. Gathering information of the present situation alike from various sources and parties is important so as to minimize the risk of biases and manipulation as well as to contribute to the effective implementation of the mandate (Eckhard, 2020, p. 13).

but is also incorporated in the context in which crisis management takes place; this context is more than just a "scene" of the operation (see Broome & Collier, 2012, p. 253).

In any case, according to the account, the views of the local authorities in question represent an entity view in the sense that culture refers to a certain unit called ”European” associated with the former colonial ruler. Indeed, in order to enable categorizing cultures into right and wrong kinds of cultures or to better and worse ones, a presupposition of the existence of culture as an entity is included. What is noteworthy, too, is that the account reveals yet another meaning given to cultures: the excerpt refers to a view according to which cultures can be *hierarchically ordered.*

Another account in which categorizations of cultures in an evaluating fashion becomes visible was also given. In it, the view of cultures as hierarchically ordered as well as the idea of the superiority of the so-called Western culture are revealed as the interviewee opposes them. The interviewee contests Western superiority by associating it with arrogance. In the extract, the relevance given to culture may refer both to ways of thinking and acting.

> (the interviewee illustrates that he cannot accept certain aspects he associates with the local culture, and then continues:) ”– – *but I need to understand that, in order to be able to work there. And I need to accept that I cannot change them and I also need to accept that… who am I to tell them. It is their culture, and I cannot come, like, to tell them or to show arrogance, like by saying that this is wrong. I can just tell my own story, and the story complying with the standards of the UN of course, that, that, that sexual abuse is wrong, corruption is wrong and – – and so on. And that alternative ways of acting exist. But I cannot, like, like… Yeah. Quite easily, some, some Western person is rather arrogant. S/he comes like, is superior in her/his own opinion. Even though the locals have lived there for centuries, in such circumstances, survived there. So the culture has its power and you cannot change it just like that.”*[lxviii]

What is notable, too, is that the superiority associated with the so-called Western culture is also, again, connected to the attribute discourse: the cultural background of a Western person is, based on the account, easily seen as a quality that makes *her/him* superior.

Furthermore, as inter alia the references to colonialism and to the Second World War reveal, culture may also carry political baggage. Although the interviewees themselves avoided making political comments – and nor was it the intention of the researcher to scrutinize political views or stances – based on their accounts of some other people's views and ways of talking, for instance the relations, agendas and political history of nation states may have influence on the ways culture as a national or regional unit is seen. Sometimes religion is also involved in this complex web. Altogether, this perspective once again reveals the complex interconnectedness of power and culture, too.

4.5 The Fluid Discourse and Multiple Potential Meanings of Culture

On the contrary to the attribute discourse, accounts concerning individuals negotiating their ways of behavior beyond the so-called "rules set by the local culture" were also given during the interviews. For instance, as illustrated by one of the interviewees, a local woman had exceeded the cultural norm common in her community and shook hands with a male civilian crisis management expert to thank him for help when no one else could see it. According to the interviewee, should someone else have been present, she could not have done it. Despite this restriction, or perhaps precisely because of it, the account brings human actors and agency in at two levels: first, at the individual level, as the woman made a decision to act against the so-called cultural rules; secondly, at the collective level, as it is "the local community" that "also monitors compliance with Islam and the traditions"[lxix], as the same interviewee said later during the same interview. Importantly, as these two points indicate, in these depictions culture does not emerge as an "independently existing pattern" (see Virkama, 2010, p. 41) and does not possess agency as such (see Avruch, 2016, p. 20). Instead of an essence or an agent, culture emerges as a social practice, thereby as *a social construct*. As the example of the local woman's behavior reveals, this picture of culture still takes culture's influence on ways of behaving and being into account, yet holding on to human agency: in this picture, human diversity, contextual factors and interaction play a significant role in encounters. Each situation therefore carries possibilities beyond predestined cultural codes, and intercultural communication becomes *contextually situated interaction.*

Indeed, the second and a significant part of the accounts that made culture relevant to ways of behaving were constructed differently compared to those in which culture emerges as an attribute of a group of people or as a set of definable manners. Henceforth, the discourses depicting culture as a social construct are called as fluid discourses or as discourses representing the process view: the process view is constructionist as it "treats culture as something people do" (Piller, 2017, p. 9). Taking an example, one of the interviewees reflected on the way he defines culture: "country does not make culture but it is the population and, the, the, let's say traditions, that how things have traditionally been done, that constitutes then even – even like that culture"[lxx][21]. As can be seen, again, in this excerpt the role of people and social practices in constructing culture becomes visible.

In addition to the view of culture as something that is constructed, culture as something that is learned in social interaction was also emphasized within the fluid discourse. Instead of rules set by culture, expressions such as "to learn"[lxxi], "has got used to"[lxxii], "has learned to"[lxxiii] and "has been

[21] Similarly, Hall (1995, p. 180) considers custom and tradition as one of the many systems of meaning that construct culture.

learned”[lxxiv] emerged repeatedly. Even if partly similar kinds of events were made sense of within both the solid and fluid discourses, the perspectives differed significantly. For instance, when discussing gender roles, an interviewee construed the local men’s ways of seeing a particular event by saying “ – – they have grown into that, as men, they have grown to the idea that men have this kind of right – – ”.[lxxv] For the sake of comparison, the attribute discourse would say “they think and behave like this because they are from this culture”, and the discourse emphasizing culture as a set of manners might simply express “they act according to the cultural rules”. Within the fluid discourse, gender roles are not presented as dictated by culture as an independently existing pattern (see Virkama, 2010, p. 41) but as something that has been learned in social interaction – a perspective that pays attention to human agency when it comes to the very concept of culture.

As the excerpt above also reveals, within the fluid discourse, culture was typically seen as having influence on aspects more various than just ways of behavior. Instead, it was made relevant also to values, moral, beliefs, attitudes, sense of humor, and ways of thinking, including expectations, in part of the accounts during most of the interviews. Therefore, it was sometimes given inter alia a meaning of *a potential contributor to views and moral stances* – yet, not in a determinative sense.

Various examples of calling culture into play when making sense of the aforementioned aspects exist. Culture was made relevant to the variety in understandings of what is right and wrong, causing sometimes potential contradictions between the international law and some local’s or international personnel’s views. Likewise, according to an interviewee, disagreement on the extent to which culture, together with religion, can provide a justification for acting against the international law had occurred. By another interviewee, culture was presented as one of the factors affecting an interpreter’s behavior that differed from what had been expected from him by the crisis management expert. Culture, influenced by the colonial history, was interpreted as the reason why a local man approached a civilian crisis management expert with expectations of receiving money. When it comes to building trust between crisis management personnel and locals, culture, together with history and the security situation, was seen as playing a role through its influence on ways of thinking and values. Culture was also made relevant to challenges in understanding or accepting other people’s ways of thinking and acting, although not exclusively, and it was seen to increase the need to discuss. On the other hand, sometimes it was depicted as a contributing factor to resolving disputes. In the following extract, an interviewee took “a conflict-scale negotiation”[lxxvi] as an example:

The interviewee: "– – a colleague may, through her/his background, see that issue differently, and that, like, provides the negotiation with fruitful things."

The researcher: "Mm."

The interviewee: "Just, like, simple things, it does not need to be, like, those broad kinds of things, but just, just normal, this kind of, let's say a negotiation of five minutes, so during that time you can, like, think that a man that has never actually given anything, and then in five minutes, he can save the situation, uhm, with his background as he understands, wha-what, like, uhm, the ongoing so-called dispute in negotiation is about and where the other then can come from, so you learn yourself too."[lxxvii]

Indeed, as this example also illustrates, in the interviewees' accounts culture was often depicted as *a positive resource for learning and enrichment*, which shall be returned to. Culture was also made relevant as *a social resource*: according to some of the interviewees, cultural differences provide topics for socializing, too, which may contribute to breaking silence and encouraging team spirit.

Within the fluid discourse, culture itself was described as consisting of "various elements"[lxxviii] or "different kinds of building blocks"[lxxix] or "different kinds of fragments that change all the time"[lxxx]. What is common to these expressions is their indefinite character. Indeed, and as already mentioned, as culture is seen as a social construct in these discourses, it is also depicted as subject to change, to a greater or lesser extent. Two thirds of the interviewees used expressions[lxxxi] such as "dynamic", "not static", "not bounded" and "changes over time" when describing culture, some of them also giving examples of possible changes. Although not depicted as the only one, the impact of the influences of other cultures was also seen as a meaningful factor contributing to the constant process of change. Also, the complex influence of a variety of other factors, such as historical events, geopolitical context, life conditions, social classes and language, on culture was brought to the fore. Therefore, culture as a social construct is understood as contextually situated.

The existence of diversity and various cultures or "subcultures"[lxxxii] inside one country was also acknowledged. So was the actuality of "multiculturality"[lxxxiii] too, for instance among neighbors originating from different parts of Finland. One of the interviewees illustrated:

"It is this kind of, well culture all the same, it cannot be said that in Finland culture is like this but, rather, it depends on the group, from which part of the country (they are) and what they are used to doing, even like the extended families' own, each extended family may have their very own kinds of ways and it may even constitute culture, this is how I (see) it."[lxxxiv]

Accordingly, in contrast to the discourse viewing culture as an entity, culture was not described as a nationally or in some other way bounded unit – on the contrary, cultures were depicted as

potentially partly overlapping and cultural boundaries as “changing”, “blurred”[lxxxv] as well as subject to the influence of factors such as historical events, the amount of social interaction and languages. The diversity inside national borders sets a challenge with respect to gaining cultural awareness of the target country, as it was pointed out by one of the interviewees. The challenge is further increased by the dynamic and not bounded character given to culture within the fluid discourse. Indeed, the same participant emphasized that although the information given in advance about the target society’s culture “helps a little, of cour- or – well, of course it helps, but in no way does it replace what you are faced with there (in the field) then”[lxxxvi]. According to him, questions would remain even after a long deployment.

Also, the role of conscious efforts of change was brought to the fore by one of the interviewees. The participant, having first portrayed a very fluid approach to culture and cultural boundaries, pointed out: “And especially like in the context of a conflict, so, so, they (cultural boundaries), they somehow appear to alter and, and change and they, like, are subject to conscious change efforts… and, and, there are efforts of, like, supporting certain elements of culture.”[lxxxvii] The same interviewee also described how “the language issue”[lxxxviii], as one of the elements she considered being related to culture, can be politicized in a complex context affected by historical events and inequal social divisions. As can be seen based on this account, culture may be used as a *political tool* (see e.g. Ramsbotham et al., 2016, p. 405). It also becomes apparent that the question of culture is related to power, too. Efforts of changing culture and cultural boundaries in pursuit of certain aims can, for example, be seen as exercising soft power: Nye’s famous analytical concept “soft power” refers to “the ability to affect others by attraction and persuasion rather than just coercion and payment” (Nye, 2014).

Also, utilizing culture as a tool of another kind was articulated in one of the interviews. According to the interviewee, culture and its religiously intertwined aspects were used as *an excuse* sometimes by other people when they just did not want to do something. Likewise, according to Dervin (2011, as cited by Dervin & Keihäs, 2011, pp. 105-106) and Dervin and Layne (2013, p. 9), culture and cultural differences may be used as a strategy that serves, inter alia, a purpose of avoiding doing something. Using culture as an excuse, however, may refer to exploiting an essentialist idea of culture as a set of definable rules, rather than to invoking the fluid understanding of it. On the other hand, when culture is used in such a manner, the approach is eclectic: it is certain elements of “culture” that are chosen, highlighted, exaggerated, or perhaps even invented, so as to serve one’s purposes. Thereby, when looking at the level of the interviewee’s account, the protagonist is presented as constructing such a version of culture that is suitable for pursuing certain interests. This way, both an essentialist and non-essentialist pictures of culture are present in the

same account – as Baumann (1999, pp. 91-92) points out, professing essentialist rhetoric is actually practicing the processual theory of culture.

All in all, seeing cultures as complex and changing and boundaries of them as blurred and overlapping is characteristic for non-essentialist approach (see e.g. Holliday, 2011, p. 5). Yet, one of the interviewees added that even though the boundaries of every culture are blurred, some more than others, and cultures are partly overlapping, cultures are distinguishable. This may be interpreted as not contradictory to non-essentialism either: according to Holliday (2011, p. 5), non-essentialism views culture as a "social force which is evident when it is significant."

Within the fluid discourse, in some accounts, the community's role in constructing, reproducing and modifying culture was emphasized, whereas in others, the focus was on the individual level. In this analysis, these two perspectives are divided into two, partly overlapping subdiscourses under the main category of the fluid discourse: the community discourse emphasizes culture's meaning as *a product of socialization* and the individual perspective highlights culture's role as "*a personal web of meanings"* (see Keisala, 2012, pp. 21-22, *transl*.). The words socialization, personal web of meanings and a social construct were not used by the interviewees as such, but choosing these concepts is based on my interpretation on their utterances.

Socialization as a concept refers to the process in which an individual learns a community's dominant and accepted ways of behavior and thinking through social interaction as well as to the behavioral changes taking place as a result of this process (Lahikainen & Pirttilä-Backmann, 2007, p. 77; Siljander, 2014). Through the socialization process, a person becomes a member of the community but also an individual subject: each person is influenced by the surrounding community, and interaction with others is needed also in order to learn who one is and what is distinctive for oneself. (Lahikainen & Pirttilä-Backmann, 2007, p. 82; Siljander, 2014.) Returning to one of the excerpts partly quoted before provides a telling example of an account employing the socialization discourse. In the extract, culture, appearing as constructed by community members and their social practices, is depicted to influence the next generation's process of growing up:

> *"[A] country does not make culture but it is the population and, the, the, let's say traditions, that how things have traditionally been done, that constitutes then even – even like that culture. I don't know if I am (does not finish the sentence), but this is my opinion how, how I see, how I see that from where that thing, from where culture comes, and it strongly guides like, the young people, on their path to growing up – –.* "[lxxxix]

Another participant, when being asked about the potential influences of one's own cultural backgrounds in working in the field of civilian crisis management, raised Finnish education as an

advantage. In this example, education is associated with cultural backgrounds – indeed, education can be seen as a part or a means of socialization (Tomperi, 2011, p. 4; Siljander, 2014).

Taking a further example, one of the interviewees and I discussed his experiences on somewhat problematic situations in which the approach of some persons, whether expatriates or local people, was inconsistent with the standard operating procedure. When being asked where the differences stemmed from, in his account he associated them, in addition to misunderstandings and overgeneralizing taking place on both sides, with upbringing and attitude:

> *The interviewee: "Probably it stems all the way from upbringing slash attitude, like, what, what it is about, so... They are far-reaching – –. (Describes the local context.) They stem from – they are not invented by an individual person but… approximately almost everyone living there, not only those who are employed by the operation, have a similar kind of an attitude. And maybe, those who are employed by the operation and have worked there for a while, their attitude changes after, immediately after the start because a certain kind of an attitude (describes the one he associates with the local context) does not pay off in these operations, so… It probably is the background, a longer-term background, attitude, approach. – – " (Talks about misunderstandings and overgeneralizing both in Finland and elsewhere.)*
>
> *The researcher: "Have you felt that some misunderstandings or contradictions are related precisely to cultural reasons?"*
>
> *The interviewee: "Yes, absolutely. As I said, underlying there at the background (there are) the general attitude and orientation and conditions and so on, so…and the way people have acted (there) for centuries so… it certainly is one part."*
>
> *The researcher: "So, culture, like, is related to these attitudes and ways of acting? Did I understand correctly?"*
>
> *The interviewee: "Yes, yeah. Yes."*[xc]

In this account, the role of socialization becomes clearly visible. The role of social surroundings and upbringing is emphasized. According to this account, individuals absorb influences from their social context, which sheds light onto the conforming effects of socialization (see Lahikainen & Pirttilä-Backman, 2007, p. 77). Referring to the way "people have acted (there) for centuries" points to a community's capacity for social reproduction through socialization as certain ways of acting are passed to the next generations (see e.g. Lahikainen & Pirttilä-Backman, 2007). Learning in social interaction is, however, not only depicted as being related to the environment in which one grew up, often referred to as primary socialization, but also to secondary socialization, such as learning that takes place at one's workplace. Learning through socialization is, therefore, presented as a potentially constantly ongoing process. Hence, the account also raises possibilities of change and diversity.

The same interviewee also reflected on a situation in which an interpreter took liberties of interacting beyond mere translating. In crisis management operations, a situation like this might, at worst, have serious and even dangerous consequences. When being asked, the interviewee made sense of the interpreter's behavior by referring to culture but also to the interpreter's previous experiences of interpreting in which he may have been allowed to act this way. This also refers to socialization in a broader sense – according to the depiction, the interpreter had potentially learned, through social interaction, to consider certain ways of behavior as accepted. In addition, the interpreter's potential aims of seeking personal gain and an important position were reflected on as contextually situated aspects that, ultimately, were related to upbringing and common attitudes – that is, culture as a product of socialization – in the local context. As can be seen, too, the sense-making constructs a complex reality in which culture is not the only explanatory factor (cf. the attribute discourse) or "seen everywhere" (see Breidenbach & Nyíri, 2009).

As for the subdiscourse giving culture the meaning of a personal web of meanings, typically the uniqueness of each person was strongly emphasized. As one of the interviewees put it, "each person has his/her own interpretation of the culture"[xci], although, according to him, part of it is shared with other people (see Avruch 2016, p. 13; Keisala, 2012, pp. 21-22). While culture was depicted as *part of people's identities* in both of the subdiscourses, identifying with various cultures or subcultures at the same time was addressed especially in the one emphasizing the individual perspective. Accounts within "culture as a personal web of meanings" discourse also allowed the possibility of an individual struggling with his/her cultural backgrounds and feeling the need of distancing herself/himself from it:

> *"It (culture) is an important part of a human being's identity and… if a person, uhm, struggles (the root of the verb in Finnish language is related to the word 'pain') with her/his culture and wants to distance herself/himself from it, it still is part of… her/his process of growth, so then s/he will find another cultural… framework of her/his liking in which to live thereafter. But still (it) will always accompany (her/him), at least to some extent."*[xcii]

All in all, the majority of the interviewees depicted cultural backgrounds at the individual level as constantly changing and "molding"[xciii]. Some variety, however, existed in the extent to which, according to the accounts, changes could take place or in the depth of these changes. Part of the interviewees described the web of meanings as significantly fluid, whereas especially one of the participants, emphasizing the role of primary socialization, considered changes possible at rather superficial level only. According to him, for instance values learned in childhood would be

impossible to change, although one can learn to cooperate and accept that others may have different kinds of values.

Within the fluid discourse, learning often appeared as an impetus for the changes in what was seen as one's cultural backgrounds. Learning was brought to the fore, in one way or another, by each of the interviewees. When discussing their experiences related to crisis management, living in various cultural contexts, and interacting with people from different cultural backgrounds, the interviewees described many kinds of transformations: for instance widening of one's perspectives, stances and worldview, increased understanding of different ways of living, acting and thinking as well as acceptance of difference, improved language skills, changes related to one's work culture, such as more relaxed orientation towards work and adaptability, changes related to verbal and non-verbal communication styles, adaptability in general, and even changes in personality were reflected on. Cultural differences, therefore, appeared as *a resource for learning* (see also Berthoin Antal & Friedman, 2008, p. 365). Learning of these kinds, in turn, was often described as a benefit with respect to further interaction and cooperation with people from different kinds of backgrounds (see also Kemppainen, 2009, pp. 123) – according to Kemppainen (2009, pp. 123), too, wide knowledge of the world valuable for future interaction may be gained through previous experiences and practice. Some of the learning outcomes were considered potentially useful back in the home country as well. Despite previous experiences, constant learning is needed, though, as one of the participants pointed out: "one, like, must always learn to know the environment in which and the group of people with whom one operates, and according to that one must like… modify her/his ways of acting. And develop them, and to be, to be more open."[xciv]

Furthermore, living outside one's own country "for a bit longer time"[xcv] and getting to see that "other ways of doing things exist as well"[xcvi] were described to contribute to gaining deeper understanding of one's own cultural background. Becoming conscious of the influence of one's own cultural background in one's behavior and thinking would, then, allow increased agency and transformation:

> *"So, so, the, like, awareness of what, how your own culture, uhm, however you define it, influences you… uhm, so, so like… it, it, it allows that your own culture actually defines you, uhm… a bit less, if you want. So this, like, depends on the person herself/himself that, how, how Finnish, for instance, s/he wants or does not want to be there on duty."*[xcvii]

"Finnish" in this account refers to "your own Finnishness that what, what in you is so-to-say Finnish"[xcviii] – as can be seen, "Finnish" is not presented as definite and given. Indeed, the interviewee approached culture in fluid terms: "culture, absolutely it, it is not bounded and it is, is,

uhm, it is dynamic, it changes all the time, it cannot be anything static, in my opinion"[xcix]. Somewhat similarly, another interviewee employing the fluid discourse reflected on the role of agency and choice when discussing culture's influence on human behavior: "each person… is the product of her/his culture to the extent s/he lets herself/himself to be. (Pause.) …I guess, I don't know."[c] Hence, in contrast with the attribute discourse, culture is not given a determining role in these accounts. Instead, the relationship between culture and behavior now appears as subject to human agency. It becomes "a matter of selection" (see Friedman & Berthoin Antal, 2005, p. 74).

Notably, when looking at especially the former of the last two accounts through the lens of critical theory, improved self-understanding is described to lead to the possibilities of transformation and emancipation (see e.g. Peters, 2005, p. 38). Becoming conscious of the influences of one's own cultural background also relates to critical self-reflection that involves, inter alia, reassessing "one's orientation to perceiving, believing and acting" (Gray, 2007, pp. 496-497).

From the perspective of adult education, many of the interviewees' accounts related to learning also have connections to transformative learning theory, first introduced by Jack Mezirow in 1978 (see Merriam & Kim, 2012, p. 56; Mezirow, 2011, p. 18). The role of transformative learning in civilian crisis management has been brought up by Anttila (2012), too, as she raises transformative learning styles as "crucial for adopting core competences in crisis management, namely collaboration skills and local awareness" (p. 100). Transformative learning refers to a learning process through critical self-reflection that involves perspective transformation (Mezirow, 1991, p. 167; Mezirow, 1990, xvi): fixed assumptions and expectations, such as meaning perspectives and mindsets, are transformed "to make them more inclusive, discriminating [sic], open, reflective, and emotionally able to change" (Mezirow, 2003, p. 58). Mezirow (1991) defines perspective transformation as

> *"the process of becoming critically aware of how and why our assumptions have come to constrain the way we perceive, understand, and feel about our world; changing these structures of habitual expectation to make possible a more inclusive, discriminating [sic], and integrative perspective; and, finally, making choices or otherwise acting upon these new understandings"* (p. 167).

The process of transformative learning starts when encountering an alternative perspective that challenges assumptions based on previous experiences (Cranton, 2016, p. 7, p. 19). This is conceptualized as a disorienting dilemma within the transformative learning theory (see e.g. Mezirow, 1991, p. 168). Indeed, according to the interviewees' accounts, intercultural encounters may provide a disorienting dilemma of this kind that begins a process of self-reflection leading inter

alia to increased awareness of how one's own cultural backgrounds influence one's ways of thinking and acting. This process finally allows a potential "reformulation of a meaning perspective" and "acting on these insights" (Mezirow, 1990, p. xvi).

As for intercultural communication, awareness of "the effect of one's own culture on thinking and action" is needed in the process of negotiating reality, as one's own and the other's tacit assumptions are explored together and new ways of thinking and acting can be tested (Berthoin Antal & Friedman, 2005, p. 70). Keisala (2012, pp. 34-35) sees reflection and awareness of one's own ways of thinking and acting as well as cultural influences behind them as a prerequisite for improving as an intercultural actor. Moreover, intercultural competence is sometimes even defined as "the ability to consciously explore one's ways of thinking and acting so as to actively construct an appropriate strategy" (Berthoin Antal & Friedman, 2008, p. 365).

Indeed, the fluid perspective of the accounts introduced in this subchapter relates to building a third culture, as it allows negotiating goals, rules and norms for interaction in the specific situation (see Keisala, 2012, p. 34; Saastamoinen, 2009, p. 59). For instance, an interviewee described a process in which the meanings given to the custom of shaking hands had been examined and negotiated between a male and a female crisis management expert from different cultural backgrounds: for one of them, handshake was just a way of greeting, whereas for the other, it represented an uncomfortable situation of getting too close to the opposite sex. A new way of greeting, suitable for both of the interlocutors, had been created in a respectful dialogue. Both of the experts became conscious of each other's ways of thinking as well as cultural influences behind them, and new ways of acting were created in a joint process (see Keisala, 2012, p. 34; Berthoin Antal & Friedman, 2008, p. 365). According to the interviewee, the discussion contributed positively also to the following interaction and cooperation of the two personnel members.

As for another example, one of the interviewees described situations in which he had questioned the ways hierarchy had been manifested in the relationship between the superior and the subordinates in their multicultural work community. The interviewee made sense of the initial situations by calling culture into play. Following their joint discussion, new ways of being and behaving had been constructed. Active participation of each party was needed in the interaction process (see e.g. Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, p. 122): the subordinates could not have made a change without the involvement of the superior. Also, examples of interacting with the local counterpart and dealing with the substance in advisory tasks exist. In these cases, it was not the professional practices the advisor was accustomed to in his home country that would be brought and directly imposed to the local context. First, crisis management experts in the interviewee's team came from various countries, each having somewhat different kinds of practices or ways of implementing

them. This variety provided resources for finding a combination most suitable to the local context, out of a variety of potential formulas. Then, before anything else, building trust, a good relationship and open dialogue between the advisor and his local counterpart were considered of prime importance in the process so as to achieve positive outcomes. Similarly, another interviewee depicted people's diverse backgrounds as a strength in civilian crisis management in case open dialogue is reached: new ways of acting as well as improved practices suitable for the context in question, potentially useful even in some other contexts as well, can be created together. Although not mentioning dialogue specifically, a third interviewee, too, discussed the possibility of finding new ideas that emerges in the multicultural settings of civilian crisis management.

In these examples, possibilities for genuine encounters and learning from each other exist, as interaction is not dictated by one interlocutor's cultural background – or the idea of it. Yet, the cultural backgrounds of the interlocutors and the local contexts are not ignored or disrespected, nor is the significance of knowing the local politeness norms underestimated. Learning is, however, not described as a one-way process but, rather, as something that is needed from all the parties. An interviewee who also described many aspects, both related to ways of thinking and acting, that he had learned, illustrates his counterparts' need for learning:

> *The researcher: "How did your, in your opinion, your own cultural backgrounds influence your ways of working?"*
>
> *The interviewee: "(Pause) Probably, from the perspective of the, the counterparts and, and others, sometimes probably in a little unpleasant way (gives a laugh). By this I mean, I mean that, that when… uhm, it probably took some time for them to get used to my ways of working – – (describes himself as a person). At the beginning, it made working a little more difficult, but then as they learned to know what kind of a person I am, and, and even if I say something strongly, it does not mean, – – (searching for words), it does not influence the interaction after work, like at the personal, nothing was, like, at the personal level but it was a work-related thing that was addressed, and, it took a good while, even a good while to get like, well it is normal that we get to know each other, but my, like, a kind of perseverance, uhm, uhm, strong desire for justness, and those kinds of things, it was not easy for them at first."*
>
> *The researcher: "Okay, and do you consider these as stemming from your cultural background?"*
>
> *The interviewee: "Yes, they stem from there for sure."*[ci]

What is also notable in this excerpt is that the process of getting to know one another is described as *normal*. Intercultural communication is therefore not given the exoticness it is sometimes associated with. Rather, it is approached as any kind of communication, enabling of which requires constructing a common ground of meanings (see Koole & ten Thije, 2001, p. 571; see also Keisala,

2012, p. 30). Aspects stemming from the interviewee's cultural backgrounds are, however, depicted as increasing some counterparts' need for learning to know the interviewee: relatedly, Keisala (2012, p. 13) points out that the more the backgrounds of the interlocutors vary, the greater the need to learn from each other becomes.

Yet, mutual understanding is not always reached:

> *"So, so, or it may even be so that it (understanding) never occurs, people just behave, like, so that things proceed, but the kind of understanding, mutual understanding does not necessarily ever occur. Then one just needs to go on with what one has and just try to make it. Because, if I understood, for instance if I understood how things should be proceeded with, but if the other counterpart is by no means willing to, (but) only wants to operate, okay let's operate then, but (the counterpart) does not want to understand and build the shared vision for getting on the same page, so it did not always work, by no, no means, but one just has to live with that and know that okay, this is the situation now and one must go on with what one now has and to manage according to that and once you were aware that it would not always work, or that by no means it will not, like, always work, so, so, it was not necessarily a terrible thing after all, one would make it."*[cii]

Another participant, too, talked about some people's lack of willingness to understand others. In this account, the lack was explained by the profit gained from the presence of an international organization in the target country: some people, both among locals and international personnel, may be more motivated to gain economic benefit than to cooperate and to genuinely improve the crisis situation. Indeed, according to Gallois (2003), in some contexts people may even lack motivation to communicate well. As it was pointed out by one of the interviewees, however, local counterparts' or other local people's lack of willingness to cooperate with an international organization publicly is not always unwillingness as such: in certain contexts, it may, rather, be related to the security situation and efforts to protect one's safety.

5 DISCUSSION

”The truth about culture is extremely difficult to get at.” (Holliday, 2011, xi)

In this study, meanings and relevance given to culture in the context of civilian crisis management were looked at. Attention was paid to the questions as to (1) when and to which aspects culture is made relevant by civilian crisis management experts and (2) what kinds of meanings are given to culture in discourses employed by them. Not only meanings agreed by the interviewees were included but also those referred to by them. The discourses were distinguished and meanings given to culture analyzed by means of discourse analysis, whereas qualitative content analysis was utilized when addressing the first research question. In addition, as the research questions are strongly interrelated, the study also looked at which meanings given to culture are in question when culture was called into play by the interviewees. Thereby, with respect to each discourse one by one, it was considered to which aspects culture is made relevant in the accounts representing the particular discourse.

As a result, this study has introduced a variety of discourses about culture and meanings given to it. Instead of finding one truth, it has shed light onto multivocality and even contradictory discourses, each one being part of the social world of civilian crisis management. Differing discourses may be referred to and employed during a single encounter, which makes both the variety of accounts and the existence of “pre-existing linguistic resources” (see Potter & Wetherell, 1987, pp. 33-34) at the level of social practices visible. Despite the many ways of talking about culture, there appears to be consensus on one thing: culture, whatever it is, has relevance for civilian crisis management. When it comes to the extent of this relevance as well as to aspects such as how the relevance manifests, what it implies from the perspective of learning, training, interaction and building mutual understanding, and why culture is relevant in the first place, the discourses and meanings given to culture in them paint different kinds of pictures. Also, the subject positions of crisis management experts and others involved appear in different light depending on the discourse.

In this chapter, the findings of the study are first summarized. In view of them, the role of educational sciences in advancing peacebuilding is then reflected on. Attention is paid also to the position of this study, and the explorations made in it, at the intersection of intercultural

communication studies and peace and conflict research. The rest of the chapter discusses the findings in relation to the current themes, practice and training of civilian crisis management, to intercultural communication as well as to academic literature related to peacebuilding. Some suggestions are made and topics for further discussion raised in view of both practitioners and scholars.

Altogether, culture was seen as having relevance for civilian crisis management in multiple ways through its influence especially on two interrelating dimensions. First, culture was made relevant to human *ways of behavior*, including structural and societal factors as well as social norms. Structural and societal factors, that is, judicial and legal traditions and the balance of authority between them, corruption, clanship and echoes of the Soviet system were seen to require attention both when setting out the mandate and later in the field. Social norms, in turn, included the interrelated subcategories of communication styles, politeness norms, social roles and work culture. These were given great significance from the perspective of civilian crisis management. For instance, the local understanding of social roles was depicted as significant inter alia from the perspective of crisis management personnel's access to information, gaining legitimacy among locals, trust-building, active inclusion of various groups in the local context and distribution of tasks between male and female experts. Accordingly, culture, through its influence on social roles in the local context, was seen as relevant to operational activities and planning, and, according to one of the interviewees, even to the recruitment of civilian crisis management experts. Yet, as indicated by some of the interviewees' accounts, the social world of civilian crisis management is shaped by intersectionality (see e.g. Hill Collins & Bilge, 2016, p. 11) rather than one-dimensional social roles. This adds to the complexity of the social world of civilian crisis management.

Differences in social norms were often described as a potential challenge: they might, according to the interviewees, cause culturally-related misunderstandings, possibly leading to resentment or someone getting offended, increase the need for conversation, make it more difficult to achieve dialogue, reduce efficiency at work and cause challenges for getting good results when it comes to the substance of civilian crisis management experts' duties. Yet, most of the challenges related to differing social norms, particularly with respect to communication styles, were usually seen as surmountable with the help of the experts' certain social and communication skills (see also Anttila, 2012, pp. 180-181), attitudes and knowledge on other cultures, the local employees' knowledge on the ways of behavior in and history of the target society as well as open conversation. Similarly, Anttila (2012, p. 87, p. 116) considers collaboration skills, communicative capacity and local awareness even as part of the most essential competencies in crisis management.

Correspondingly to the aforementioned aspects, unawareness of or breaking the social norms were seen as a potential risk for the functioning of the operation and, at worst, for safety. Moreover, the possibility of stigmatizing one's country of origin as a result of unawareness of the local culture was raised by one of the interviewees. Some mistakes were seen as difficult or even impossible to fix. Accordingly, knowledge of the local culture was considered crucial and training related to the target society's social norms prior to deployment essential to the smooth functioning of the operation and safety. Knowledge of the local culture was also described to help crisis management experts to orientate themselves mentally to encounters with the host populations. Furthermore, taking social norms into consideration was considered meaningful for successful trust-building in the local context.

In addition to and partly interrelatedly with the category of ways of behavior, secondly, culture was made relevant to *mental aspects*, such as attitudes, values, moral, beliefs, ways of thinking and sense of humor. Plenty of examples exist and are presented in the Results chapter. In these instances, culture was made relevant inter alia to challenges in understanding or accepting someone's ways of behaving or thinking; disagreements and increased needs to discuss; a variety of understandings of what is right or wrong, and relatedly, contradictions between international law and local or international employees' views; expectations; resolving disputes; and trust-building. Thirdly, culture was also made relevant to *manifestations of human life*, including architecture, music, films, interior decoration, clothes, food and drinks; in these cases, culture often referred to *a way of life.* Yet, the significance of the third category in the context of civilian crisis management appeared greatly lesser compared to the two previous ones.

As for the discourses and meanings given to culture, the category of ways of behavior was addressed in an exclusive fashion in one discourse only. According to this discourse, culture refers to *a set of definable manners* of a group of people living in a certain area. The region is determined by a shared past rather than national borders. Culture's significance for mental aspects is not denied, nor is it considered in any other way. Within this discourse, culture is depicted to provide the rules for behavior, compliance to which is desirable. Yet, the discourse does not assume the so-called cultural rules always to be followed, and therefore, culture does not appear as a determinant of human behavior. The influence of other driving forces is acknowledged as well, although culture's role is considered significant. Culture itself appears as an independently existing pattern (see Virkama, 2010, p. 41), and, ultimately, the discourse relates to an entity view of culture (see Piller, 2017, p. 9).

For civilian crisis management experts, within this discourse, culture stands for *a code of conduct* in the host society. Culture as a set of definable manners can be studied and defines what is

desirable to be done as well as what should not be done. Following these rules may carry the connotations of respecting the local culture. Moreover, according to the discourse, a crisis management expert's lack of adjusting to the local culture would lead to an increased risk of misunderstandings, potentially negative feelings and perhaps even to jeopardizing the crisis management operation or the expert's share in it. Therefore, following the cultural rules is depicted as essential to the functioning of the operation and safety within this discourse. However, the discourse constructs representations of crisis management experts' agency and subject position in a different light compared to those of locals. The experts are depicted as able – perhaps even obliged – to adjust their behavior, whereas culture's influence on human behavior in the local context appears as potentially more determinative. Intercultural communication turns into "a one-way phenomenon, governed by culture, not negotiated and co-constructed by individuals" (Dervin & Layne, 2013, p. 8). Drawing on Virkama (2010), this picture ultimately relates to an essentialist approach to culture: culture is seen as "a set of characteristics that can be studied and used in order to communicate with the people 'belonging' to this culture" (p. 41).

Studying the behavior of people living in a certain area as well as defining the "dos and don'ts" associated with the target society's culture presupposes both the existence of a group as well as generalizations of their behavior. Yet, as culture is, despite its significant role, not seen as the only factor influencing human behavior within this discourse, the information package of the local ways of behavior may serve as not more than "probably the most workable in the region in question" (quotation xl). Moreover, while making generalizations appears as a necessity for gaining information crucial to the smooth and safe functioning of the operation on one hand, it was also referred to as undesirable on the other hand. The setting is challenging: the somewhat contradictory aims of defining and studying a set of manners applicable to the local context as well as refraining from generalizing and from overemphasizing culture's role in influencing human behavior coexist. Inconsistency, in this sense, as well as discursive strategies to overcome the challenge were present in part of the accounts.

From the perspective of another discourse, the challenge turns negligible. If cultural rules are depicted as binding and hence, determinative, culture becomes a determinant of human behavior and *a collective attribute of a group of people*. Therefore, the attribute discourse itself is highly generalizing. It also perfectly corresponds to Holliday's (2011) very definition of essentialism: "[e]ssentialism presents people's individual behaviour as entirely defined and constrained by the cultures in which they live so that the stereotype becomes the essence of who they are" (p. 5). If generalizations are given great validity, taken to its extreme, also the discourse of "culture as a set

of definable manners" may lead to the same end. The boundary between these two discourses is, therefore, somewhat ambiguous.

Within the attribute discourse, however, culture is depicted as the determinant of not only the group's ways of behavior but also of their ways of thinking and being. The discourse, therefore, assumes the homogeneity of the members of a so-called cultural group. At the same time, it overemphasizes culture's role in influencing interaction and decontextualizes intercultural communication as the significance of any other potential factor is ignored. Depending on the view of the culture in question, the stereotype may be positive or negative. In any case, because of the attribute meaning given to it, culture serves as a means of categorizing people according to their cultural backgrounds and building boundaries between different so-called cultural groups (see also Moore, 2003, p. 16, as cited in Dervin & Keihäs, 2013, p. 99; Piller, 2011, p. 16); as presented in the Results chapter, this stereotyping categorization may have implications at the level of attitudes and behavior towards a so-called cultural group (see also Bar-Tal, 1997, p. 492). It also constructs subject positions according to what is seen as a cultural background, as the ideas of people's cultural backgrounds shape the expectations they are faced with and the potential restrictions set for their actions. This concerns both crisis management experts and local populations alike.

Especially within the attribute discourse, although not exclusively, meanings given to culture appear to be capable of intertwining with ideas of history, politics, religion and nationality in multifaceted ways. Culture could, for instance, be depicted as carrying political or historical baggage related e.g. to Colonialism or the Second World War when the interviewees addressed the utterances and behaviors of some people they had met. Also, the ideas of cultures as *hierarchically ordered* or as dangerous to be mixed up (see also Breidenbach & Nyíri, 2009, p. 321) were revealed in some accounts as the interviewees opposed such views or referred to them without making any comments of their own. When the intertwining of culture with history, religion, politics and/or nationality is present, complex tensions can be involved and have an influence on the interaction among crisis management personnel or between the personnel and locals. For instance, if culture, history and nationality are intertwined, the so-called national cultural groups may be presented as existing throughout the times in such a way that the interlocutors in the present become associated with the groups' past. The understandings of the history may then place individuals into different kinds of subject positions according to their nationalities, in terms of what, how and when something can be said and by whom. The influences of the intertwined meanings given to culture on the subject positions of the crisis management experts may emerge both on leisure time and on duty. When on duty, if positioned disadvantageously, the possibilities of crisis management experts to serve become restricted. The ideas of cultures may become or be made relevant to the

functioning of civilian crisis management operations also from the perspective of how the activity, such as advising, is seen.

Within the third discourse, called as the fluid discourse in this study, both the meanings given to culture and the subject positions of individuals differ significantly from the attribute discourse. This time, culture is seen as *a social construct*, something that is both constructed and learned in human interaction. As it is the role of people and social practices in constructing culture that is emphasized, agency becomes depicted as possessed by people rather than culture (see also Avruch, 2012, p. 20). Instead of the entity view, the fluid discourse represents the process view of culture (see e.g. Piller, 2011, p. 15).

In the accounts employing the fluid discourse, culture was typically seen as having an influence on aspects more various than just ways of behavior. It was made relevant also to values, moral, beliefs, attitudes, sense of humor and ways of thinking, including expectations. Yet, culture's influence was not seen as determinative (cf. the attribute discourse), but, rather, it was given a meaning of *a potential contributor to views and moral stances.* Culture was also seen as *a social resource*, as cultural differences could provide topics for socializing, thereby potentially contributing to breaking silence and encouraging team spirit.

Two subdiscourses were distinguished within the fluid discourse. The one focusing on the community's role in constructing, reproducing and modifying culture emphasizes culture's meaning as *a product of socialization*. Within the other subdiscourse, culture is approached especially as "*a personal web of meanings"* (see Keisala, 2012, pp. 21-22, *transl.*): typically the ideas of uniqueness of each person and their individual interpretations of culture were present in the accounts employing this subdiscourse. Although culture could be depicted as *part of people's identities* within both of the subdiscourses, identifying with various cultures or subcultures at the same time was addressed especially in the accounts employing the personal perspective. Furthermore, while the majority of the interviewees depicted cultural backgrounds at the individual level as constantly changing and ”molding”, some variety existed in the illustrations of the extent to which changes could take place or of the depth of these changes within the socialization subdiscourse.

As culture is seen as constantly constructed, it is also depicted as having an indefinite, changing and dynamic character. The complex influence of a variety of factors, such as historical events, geopolitical context, life conditions, social classes, other cultures and language, on culture was brought to the fore in the accounts representing this discourse. In this way, culture as a social construct is understood as contextually situated. Within the fluid discourse, cultural boundaries alike were seen as blurred, changing and subject to the influence of various factors, such as historical events, languages, the amount of social interaction as well as conscious efforts of change.

As indicated by the last of these factors, culture can also be given the meaning of *a political tool* (see also e.g. Ramsbotham et al., 2016, p. 405), connected to power. Moreover, utilizing culture as a tool to pursue personal goals, such as avoiding doing something, was articulated in one of the interviews: according to an interviewee, culture and its religiously intertwined aspects were used as *an excuse* sometimes by other people when they just did not want to do something (see also Dervin, 2011, as cited in Dervin & Keihäs, 2011, pp. 105-106; Dervin & Layne, 2013, p. 9). As it may be noticed in this case, if looked at from the perspective of Baumann (1999, pp. 91-92), utilizing essentialist rhetoric is actually practicing the processual theory of culture.

When it comes to gaining cultural awareness of the target society, the setting is challenging also within the fluid discourse. This time, it is the dynamic, not bounded character given to culture as well as the diversity and multiculturality even inside national borders that set the challenge. From this perspective, the need for learning in each situation of interaction becomes significant.

The need for constant learning is highlighted within the fluid discourse also for another, yet interrelated, reason. This rationale has to do with the remark, made already in the Introduction chapter, that the approaches to culture inevitably frame the ideas of intercultural communication (see Martin & Nakayama, 2010, pp. 84-86). As culture is seen as a contextually situated social construct that is in a continuous process of change and as the role of human agency is emphasized, human diversity, contextual factors and interaction each play a significant role in encounters. Intercultural communication now becomes *contextually situated interaction* rather than merely an act of fulfilling predestined cultural codes. New perspectives for learning then open up: instead of defining and studying a set of ways of behavior considered as local, much more nuanced learning is needed in each situation. Moreover, as the interaction is not depicted as dictated by one interlocutor's cultural background or the idea of it, the perspective allows mutual learning from one another – learning is not described as a one-way process within the fluid discourse. Yet, the cultural backgrounds of the interlocutors and the local contexts are not ignored or disrespected, nor is the significance of knowing the politeness norms common in the particular context underestimated. Rather, the perspective allows negotiating reality or building a third culture: one's own and the other's tacit assumptions can be explored together and a shared cultural framework created so as to build a ground on which interaction can be based (Friedman & Berthoin Antal, 2005; Berthoin Antal & Friedman, 2008; Keisala, 2012, p. 13, pp. 33–34; Kemppainen, 2009, p. 123; Saastamoinen, 2009, p. 59). Indeed, part of the interviewees' accounts can be interpreted as negotiating goals, rules and norms for interaction in the specific situation, thereby as building a third culture (see Keisala, 2012, p. 34; Saastamoinen, 2009, p. 59).

Yet, it must be noted that even if the fluid discourse allows mutual learning, a shared understanding is not always reached. This may be due to multiple potential reasons. Taking a few examples, as brought to the fore by the interviewees, there may be lack of willingness to understand and communicate. The lack may be related, for instance, to efforts of pursuing personal economic benefit or to security threats possibly following cooperation with an international organization. The tense security situations in the field may also set challenges for interaction by restricting the possibilities for interaction in very concrete terms or, to name another example, by affecting the composition of the interlocutors present. Understanding intercultural communication as contextually situated not only reminds us of the need for learning but also of the variety of factors that influence interaction.

However, and despite the complex context, not only was the *need* for learning visible in the interviewees' accounts – culture and cultural differences were also depicted as *a positive resource for learning and enrichment* (see also Berthoin Antal & Friedman, 2008, p. 365). Learning was brought to the fore, in one way or another, by each of the interviewees and often appeared also as an impetus for the changes in what were seen as one's cultural backgrounds. When addressing their experiences related to crisis management, living in various cultural contexts and interacting with people from different cultural backgrounds, the interviewees described many kinds of transformations. For instance, widening of one's perspectives, stances and worldview, increased understanding of different ways of living, acting and thinking as well as acceptance of difference, improved language skills, changes related to one's work culture, such as more relaxed orientation towards work, changes related to verbal and non-verbal communication styles, adaptability in general and even changes in personality were reflected on. Learning of these kinds was often described as a benefit with respect to further interaction and cooperation with people from different kinds of backgrounds (see also Kemppainen, 2009, p. 123), although constant learning would still be needed. Some of the learning outcomes were considered potentially useful back in the home country as well.

Moreover, within the fluid discourse, experiences in countries other than one's home country were described to contribute to learning about one's own cultural background and becoming conscious of its influence on one's behavior and thinking by one of the interviewees. This would, then, allow increased agency and transformation so that the extent to which one's "own culture" defines one's behavior becomes subject to choice. Likewise, Friedman and Berthoin Antal (2005) reflect on the relationship between culture and behavior as "a matter of selection" (p. 74). The participant's account is in line with the perspective of critical theory, as improved self-

understanding was described to lead to the possibilities of transformation and emancipation (see e.g. Peters, 2005, p. 38).

Altogether, many of the interviewees' accounts also have connections to transformative learning, a learning process through critical self-reflection that involves perspective transformation (Mezirow, 1991, p. 167; Mezirow, 1990, xvi). Based on these accounts, intercultural encounters may provide a disorienting dilemma (see e.g. Mezirow, 1991, p. 168), an alternative perspective that challenges assumptions based on previous experiences (Cranton, 2016, p. 7, p. 19). The dilemma begins a process of self-reflection leading inter alia to increased awareness of how one's own cultural backgrounds influence one's ways of thinking and acting. This process finally allows a potential "reformulation of a meaning perspective" and "acting on these insights" (Mezirow, 1990, p. xvi). The role of transformative learning in civilian crisis management has been brought up by Anttila (2012), too, as she raises transformative learning styles as "crucial for adopting core competences in crisis management, namely collaboration skills and local awareness" (p. 100). Moreover, reflection and awareness of one's own ways of thinking and acting as well as of cultural influences behind them can be seen as a prerequisite for improving as an intercultural actor in general (Keisala, 2012, pp. 34-35). Relatedly, intercultural competence is sometimes even defined as "the ability to consciously explore one's ways of thinking and acting so as to actively construct an appropriate strategy" (Berthoin Antal & Friedman, 2008, p. 365).

What is notable from the perspective of educational sciences is that learning was inevitably present in each of the discourses, either as identifying, studying and adjusting to what were seen as the local cultural codes or, from the perspective of the fluid discourse, in much more multifaceted and nuanced ways. These findings related to the significance of learning in civilian crisis management contribute to speaking to my claim, put forward already in the Introduction, that research utilizing educational sciences perspectives has its role in studying and advancing the field of crisis management. This potential exists also beyond topics directly related to culture and intercultural communication.

However, as for this study, my choice of research topic initially raised some confusion as many appeared to be surprised, some positively and others negatively, that someone majoring in educational sciences would or could engage a topic such as this. The surprised reactions perhaps illustrate that the potential contributions of educational sciences in the field of peacebuilding have often remained unexplored and unused for many parts. Accordingly, I hope to encourage further considerations of the potential contributions of educational sciences in advancing peacebuilding. I would also like to thank CMC Finland once more for their open-minded and positive attitude

towards my research idea and for making this study possible by forwarding my request to potential interviewees.

In addition to bringing together educational sciences and peacebuilding, this study has aimed at building bridges between intercultural communication research and peace and conflict research. In this, especially when it comes to studies utilizing other than functionalist approaches, the thesis has navigated towards waters that appear to be previously unsailed for many parts. It is not only that studies focusing on the particular topic of this thesis could not be found but that, more generally speaking, as far as we know, these two fields have apparently not often been brought together. Yet, and in light of this study, peacebuilding and intercultural communication intersect in many ways (see also Broome & Collier, 2012, p. 246). For these reasons, there may be potential in further research examining the intersections of these fields, also at theoretical, meta levels. In any case, at the face of the changing and challenging contexts of crisis management today, as well as of complex operations, it is worth considering if peacebuilding could benefit from bringing together multidiscipline perspectives even more broadly.

As the interviewees' accounts addressed in the Results chapter have revealed, meanings given to culture emerge not only at the level of ideas (see Hall, 1995, p. 176). They are also "embodied in the material and the social world" (Hall, 1995, p. 176) and may have practical real-life implications in civilian crisis management as in other contexts alike. For this reason, meanings given to culture cannot be considered negligible and as belonging to the sphere of rhetoric only. Indeed, as the approaches to culture may, in light of the findings of this study, be connected to how people are seen and interacted with, the implications they have on crisis management in the field may be serious and significant.

Also, as pointed out in the Introduction, depending on what kind of meaning culture is given, expressions such as cultural awareness and cultural sensitivity that are gaining prominence in crisis management discourses get different kinds of tones and meanings. Regarding this, in light of the findings of this study, the challenge that crisis management training as well as individual experts are faced with is at least two- if not even three- or four-fold. The first issue is related to the variety of meanings given to culture as a concept. Which meaning of the concept is referred to when addressing culture in the first place? Do all the interlocutors share the same idea of it, and if not, what are the actual results that their conversation promotes?

The rest of the challenge then depends on the perspective chosen. From that of the fluid discourse, cultural diversity even inside national borders and the dynamic, constantly changing character of culture set a challenge for gaining cultural knowledge of the target society. As for training, this challenge has to do also with the problematic of defining "the local culture", as well as

with the issues related to power when doing so. What is included, what is excluded? Who is the one making these decisions, on which grounds and for which purposes? What do these decisions potentially imply? What kinds of subject positions do they create and for whom, and how do these ideas of culture and cultural differences affect interaction? Thirdly, if culture is regarded especially as a set of definable manners associated with a certain population in a certain area, it is the contradictory and coexisting aims of studying what is seen as the local culture, as well as of refraining from generalizing and from overemphasizing culture's role in influencing human behavior that the challenge lies in. As already mentioned, this dilemma was distinct in part of the accounts. If inclining to the extreme, essentialist end in which stereotypes become the essence of people (see Holliday, 2011, p. 5), it can be questioned whether the approach serves building mutual understanding, trust, fruitful communication and cooperation (see e.g. Keisala, 2012, pp. 12-13) as well as the aims of civilian crisis management in the first place – for instance, Finland names *advancing equality* as one of the cross-cutting themes in its foreign policy, an element of which civilian crisis management is (Prime Minister's Office, 2014, pp. 10-11). Indeed, as the discourse analysis in this study has made visible, the way culture is approached is also related to the subject positions given to individuals and groups of people as well as potentially to defining "I" and "the Other". Therefore, power is involved, too. The implications that approaches to culture may have for equality, for the positions of individuals and groups of people both within and beyond the mission personnel as well as for gaining positive outcomes in crisis management operations in general should be considered.

Furthermore, because of their potential implications for interaction, gaining mutual understanding and equality, assumptions about and approaches to culture ultimately relate to reaching goals such as local ownership, legitimacy as well as people-oriented operations[22]. Constructing a common ground of meanings (see e.g. Koole & ten Thije, 2011), building a third culture (see e.g. Saastamoinen, 2009, p. 59; Keisala, 2012), negotiating reality (see Berthoin Antal & Friedman, 2008; Friedman & Berthoin Antal, 2005) or reaching the fusion of horizons (see Gadamer, as cited by Väyrynen, 2005) – whichever fashion of conceptualizing the process is preferred – is essential to such goals. Likewise, within a mission, reaching a common ground of meanings and practices and an understanding shared by actors at different levels, in different positions and from various backgrounds, is significant to the internal dynamics and a smooth functioning of any operation.

[22] Concerning people-centered operations, see United Nations, General Assembly & Security Council, 2015, p. 10, p. 24, pp. 29-30; Stamnes & Osland, 2016, p. 11.

Moreover, advancing fruitful interaction and building a shared understanding through mutual learning are needed also if the binary between local and international is to be exceeded and the problematic with privileging external over local knowledge (see Autesserre, 2014, pp. 97-114; Eckhard, 2020, p. 15) overcome. According to Autesserre (2014), interventions suffer from "imposition of foreign ways of thinking and working" (p. 98), the intervener's belief in the superiority of the external knowledge (pp. 97-98) and the "attendant disregard of local ideas" (p. 97). The manner of implementing these foreign ideas, rather than their content as such, was often criticized and felt as "disrespectful and humiliating" (p. 99) by Autesserre's local interviewees. According to her, the "lack of local ownership, conflictual relationships between interveners and local stakeholders, and widespread phenomena of contestation and resistance" (p. 98) as well as decrease in the effectiveness of international interventions (p. 112) follow. Altogether, it is exactly the lack of evolving "in collaboration and open dialogue with local actors" as well as "not giving enough consideration to local realities and the needs of local populations" that peacebuilding efforts of today often have been criticized for (Fjelde & Höglund, 2011, p. 20).

A common ground of meanings is significant not only during the operation but also when assessing its impact. Gelot and Söderbaum (2011) argue that "determination of the success or failure of an intervention is at best partial and inadequate unless it takes seriously", among other things, "the role of local dynamics and cultural meaning systems that inform social action – –" (pp. 73-74). Finally, as Fjelde and Höglund (2011) point out, "precisely because all peace-building operations necessarily have an end-point where sovereign responsibility must be handed over to local authorities, the need to anchor the peace process locally is unavoidable" (p. 21). All in all, constructing a shared web of meanings may be significant to conflict prevention and resolution more widely, in each phase of conflict.

The aforementioned aspects considered, developing abilities to critically examine implicit and explicit assumptions about what is seen as culture, as cultural differences and as thinking and behavior stemming from cultural reasons should be included in crisis management training, as in peacebuilding more widely. I also suggest considering the practice of critical reflection and critical self-reflection as part of crisis management personnel's competences and, thus, encouraging the practice also after the training. Furthermore, abilities to reflect on and consider the wider context in which communication takes place are essential, both when it comes to interaction among the personnel members and between the personnel and locals. As it can be seen in the accounts, intercultural interaction related to civilian crisis management is situated in a complex context shaped by multiple factors. For instance, the partly intertwining aspects related to safety and complex tensions, mission structures, ranks, the life spans of missions and temporal frames of

deployments, politics, religion, history, economic factors and power were reflected on by the interviewees as factors having influence on human behavior and interaction in the field. At times, some of these aspects were depicted as intertwined with culture, too, as it was illustrated in the Results chapter. However, without adequate consideration of the contextual factors, including both macro and meso elements as well as small-scale situational dimensions, there is a risk of overemphasizing culture's role. If culture's role is overemphasized and naturalized, the question as to what remains misunderstood or disregarded then follows. Similarly, Broome and Collier (2012, p. 261) argue,

> *"[a]n important challenge for peacebuilding scholar/practitioners – – is to move beyond offering overly simple predictions for national or ethnic group conduct without reflecting situational variations and relational complexities, in addition to contextually driven influences such as histories of colonization or continuing privilege."*

As stated in this quotation by Broome and Collier (2012, p. 261), too, the challenge is not only that of practitioners but also of scholars. Therefore, research that calls into question essentialist ideas of culture and challenges culturalist approaches is needed in all the aforementioned fields. According to Broome and Collier (2012, p. 260), "– – approaching cultures and voices as plural and contradictory, and contextual factors and discourses as profoundly consequential, increases the likelihood that peacebuilding research and praxis will be relevant, and contribute to structural as well as personal change." In addition to the potentially increased relevance of peacebuilding studies and its possible practical implications, research of this kind serves to contribute to the development of these academic fields as such.

However, as the question is related to peace and the social world, including power relations, the issue is, ultimately, an ethical one (see also Broome & Collier, 2012, p. 260). This ethical dimension concerns us all: what kinds of meanings do we give to culture and what kind of role and relevance are we constructing for it in our social world? What are the implications? How does this shape our perceptions and affect our thinking, behavior and interaction? What kinds of subject positions are we constructing and for whom? Finally, is it peace, justice, equality and constructive interaction that this contributes to?

REFERENCES

Alhinai, M. (2016). Community engagement and intercultural praxis: Dancing with difference in diverse contexts, Mary Jane Collier. Peter Lang, New York (2014). 250 pp. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 51*, 69–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2015.12.003

Anttila, U. (2012). *Enhancing human security through crisis management: Opportunities and challenges for learning*. (Publication Series 1 No. 9). [Doctoral dissertation, National Defence University]. Retrieved from http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-25-2357-3

Anttila, U. (2014). Human security and learning in crisis management. *Journal of Humanitarian Logistics and Supply Chain Management, 4*(1), 82–94. https://doi.org/10.1108/JHLSCM-04-2013-0014

Autesserre, S. (2011). Constructing peace: Collective understandings of peace, peacemaking, peacekeeping, and peacebuilding. English version of "Construire la paix: Conceptions collectives de son établissement, de son maintien et de sa consolidation," *Critique Internationale*, *51*(2), 153–167. Retrieved from http://www.sciencespo.fr/ceri/sites/sciencespo.fr.ceri/files/critique_add/art_sa.pdf

Autesserre, S. (2014). *Peaceland: Conflict resolution and the everyday politics of international intervention.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Avruch, K. (1998). *Culture and conflict resolution.* Washington D. C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Avruch, K. (2016, [2013]). *Context and pretext in conflict resolution: Culture, identity, power, and practice*. London: Routledge. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Barker, C. & Galasiński, D. (2001). Cultural studies and discourse analysis: A dialogue on language and identity. London: Sage Publications. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Bar-Tal, D. (1997). Formation and change of ethnic and national stereotypes: An integrative model. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 21*(4), 491–523.

Baumann, G. (1999). *The multicultural riddle: Rethinking national, ethnic and religious identities.* New York: Routledge. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Ben-Ari, E. (2010). Book Review: Rubinstein, R. A. (2008). Peacekeeping under Fire: Culture and Intervention. Boulder, CO: Paradigm. *Armed Forces & Society, 36*(2), 382–384. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095327X09340753

Berthoin Antal, A. & Friedman, V. (2008). Learning to negotiate reality: A strategy for teaching intercultural competencies. *Journal of Management Education, 32*(3), 363–386.

Birbili, M. (2000). Translating from one language to another. *Social Research Update*, 31. University of Surrey, Guildford, UK. Retrieved from https://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU31.html

Bird, A. & Osland, J. S. (2004, [2003]). Teaching cultural sense-making. In N. A. Boyacigiller, R. A. Goodman & M. E. Phillips (eds.), *Crossing cultures: Insights from master teachers* (pp. 89-100). New York: Routledge. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Birks, M. (2014). Practical philosophy. In J. Mills, & M. Birks (eds.), *Qualitative methodology* (pp. 17-30). London: Sage Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473920163

Bossong, R. (2013). EU civilian crisis management and organizational learning. *European Security*, *(22)*1, 94–112. https://doi.org/10.1080/09662839.2012.704364

Boud, D., Keogh, R. & Walker, D. (1985). What is reflection in learning? In D. Boud, R. Keogh & D. Walker (eds.), *Reflection: Turning experience into learning* (pp. 7–17). London: Kogan Page.

Bratosin D'Almeida, I., Haffner, R., & Hörst, C. (2017). Women in the CSDP: Strengthening the EU's effectiveness as an international player. *European View, 16*(2), 313–324. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12290-017-0467-1

Breidenbach, J. & Nyíri, P. (2009). *Seeing culture everywhere: From genocide to consumer habits.* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Brookfield, S. D. (2012). Critical theory and transformative learning. In E. W. Taylor & P. Cranton (eds.), *The handbook of transformative learning: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 131-146). United States: Jossey-Bass. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Broome, B. J. & Collier, M. J. (2012). Culture, communication, and peacebuilding: A reflexive multi-dimensional contextual framework. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, *5*(4), 245–269. https://doi.org/10.1080/17513057.2012.716858

Burr, V. (2003). *Social constructionism* (2nd ed). London: Routledge.

Burr, V. (2015). *Social constructionism* (3rd ed). London: Routledge. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Campbell, D. (2007). Poststructuralism. In T. Dunne, M. Kurki & S. Smith (eds.), *International relations theories: Discipline and diversity* (pp. 203-228). New York: Oxford University Press.

Challenges Forum. (2015). *Institution- and capacity-building for peace: Implications of the UN's review panels' recommendations for future missions*. Challenges annual forum report. Stockholm: International Forum for the Challenges of Peace Operations.

CMC Finland. (2019). *Crisis Management Centre CMC Finland*. Retrieved from https://www.cmcfinland.fi/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/CMC_fact_sheet_2907.pdf

CMC Finland. (2020). *Crisis Management Centre Finland*. Retrieved from https://www.cmcfinland.fi/en/cmc-finland

Cohen, R. (1990). Deadlock: Israel and Egypt negotiate. In F. Korzenny & S. Ting-Toomey (eds.), *Communicating for peace. Diplomacy and negotiation* (pp. 136-153). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Cohen, R. (2002, [1991]). *Negotiating across cultures: International communication in an interdependent world* (Rev. ed.). Washington D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Collier, M. J. (2014). *Community engagement and intercultural praxis: Dancing with difference in diverse contexts.* New York City: Peter Lang.

Collier, M. J. (2015). Intercultural communication competence: Continuing challenges and critical directions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 48*, 9–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2015.03.003

Collier, M. J. (2016). An intercultural peacebuilding framework: Extending the conversation through a focus on connections. In S. Roy & I. S. Shaw (eds.), *Communicating differences: Towards breaking the boundaries for Peace and Conflict Research in Communication* (pp. 15-28). Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillian.

Collier, M. J. & Muneri, C. (2016). A call for critical reflexivity: Reflections on research with nongovernmental and nonprofit organizations in Zimbabwe and Kenya. *Western Journal of Communication, 80*(59), 638–658. https://doi.org/10.1080/10570314.2016.1187762

Christians, C. G. (2011). Ethics and politics in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln, *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 61-80). Los Angeles: Sage.

Cranton, P. (2016). *Understanding and promoting transformative learning: A guide to theory and practice* (3rd ed). Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing.

Dervin, F. (2013). Making sense of education for diversities: Criticality, reflexivity and language. In H. Arslan & G. Rață (eds.), *Multicultural education: from theory to practice* (pp. 85-100). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publisher. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Dervin, F. & Keihäs, L. (2013). *Johdanto uuteen kulttuurienväliseen viestintään ja kasvatukseen [Introduction to new intercultural communication and education]*. Kasvatusalan tutkimuksia [Research in educational sciences], 63. Helsinki: Suomen kasvatustieteellinen seura FERA.

Dervin, F. & Layne, H. (2013). A guide to interculturality for international and exchange students: An example of Hostipitality? *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 8*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2012.753896

Dirkx, J. M. (2006). Engaging emotions in adult learning: A Jungian perspective on emotion and transformative learning. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education,* 109, 15–26. https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.204

Eckhard, S. (2020). Bridging the citizen gap: Bureaucratic representation and knowledge linkage in (international) public administration. *Governance*, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12494

Elo, S. & Kyngäs, H. (2007). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 62*(1), 107–115. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x

Elron, E., Halevy, N., Ben Ari, E. & Shamir, B. (2003). Cooperation and coordination across cultures in the peacekeeping forces: Individual and organizational integrating mechanisms. In T. W. Britt & A. B. Adler, *The psychology of the peacekeeper: Lessons from the field* (pp. 261-282). Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publications.

Eskola, J. (2018). Laadullisen tutkimuksen juhannustaiat: Laadullinen analyysi vaihe vaiheelta [The midsummer spells of qualitative research: Qualitative analysis step by step]. In R. Valli (ed.), *Ikkunoita tutkimusmetodeihin 2 – Näkökulmia aloittelevalle tutkijalle tutkimuksen teoreettisiin lähtökohtiin ja analyysimenetelmiin* [Windows on research methods 2 – Perspectives on the theoretical research starting points and methods of analysis for a beginner researcher]. Jyväskylä: PS-kustannus. Retrieved from http://www.ellibslibrary.com

Eskola, J. & Suoranta, J. (2003 [1998]). *Johdatus laadulliseen tutkimukseen* [Introduction to qualitative research] (6th ed.). Tampere: Vastapaino.

European Commission and High Representative of the EU for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (2013). *Joint Communication to the European Parliament and the Council – The EU's comprehensive approach to external conflicts and crises*. Brussels. Retrieved from http://www.eeas.europa.eu/archives/docs/csdp/structures-instruments-agencies/eu-military-staff/save_the_date/docs/joint_communication_on_comprehensive_approach.pdf

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

FINCENT. n.d. *About FINCENT.* Retrieved from https://puolustusvoimat.fi/en/web/fincent/about

Fjelde, H. & Höglund, K. (2011). Building peace, creating conflict? In H. Fjelde & K. Höglund (eds.), *Building peace, creating conflict? Conflictual dimensions of local and international peacebuilding,* pp. 11-24. Lund: Nordic Academic Press. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Friedman, V. & Berthoin Antal, A. (2005). Negotiating reality: A theory of action approach to intercultural competence. *Management Learning, 36*(1), 69–86. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507605049904

Gallois, C. (2003). Reconciliation through communication in intercultural encounters: Potential or peril? *Journal of Communication, 53*(1), 5–15. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2003.tb03001.x

Gelfand, M. J. & Brett, J. M. (2004a). Integrating negotiation and culture research. In M. J. Gelfand & J. M. Brett, *The handbook of negotiation and culture* (pp. 415-428). Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Gelfand, M. J. & Brett, J. M. (2004b). *The handbook of negotiation and culture*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Gelot, L. & Söderbaum, F. (2011). Interveners and intervened upon. The missing link in building peace and avoiding conflict. In H. Fjelde & K. Höglund (eds.), *Building peace, creating conflict? Conflictual dimensions of local and international peacebuilding,* pp. 73-88. Lund: Nordic Academic Press. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Graneheim, U. H. & Lundman, B. (2004). Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: Concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Education Today, 24*, 105–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2003.10.001

Gray, D. E. (2007). Facilitating management learning: Developing critical reflection through reflective tools. *Management Learning, 38*(5), 495–517. Sage Publications. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507607083204

Gudykunst, W. B. (1990). Diplomacy: A special case for intergroup communication. In F. Korzenny & S. Ting-Toomey (eds.), *Communicating for peace. Diplomacy and negotiation* (pp. 19-39). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Hall, S. (1995). New cultures for old. In D. Massey & P. Jess, *A place in the world? Places, cultures and Globalization* (pp. 175-213). Oxford: Oxford University Press in association with The Open University.

Hall, S. (2003a). Kulttuuri, paikka, identiteetti [Culture, place, identity]. (J. Koivisto, trans.). In M. Lehtonen & O. Löytty (eds.), *Erilaisuus* [Difference] (pp. 85-131). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Hall, S. (2003b). Monikulttuurisuus [Multiculturalism] (M. Lehtonen, trans.). In M. Lehtonen & O. Löytty (eds.), *Erilaisuus* [Difference] (pp. 233-281). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Hammersley, M. (2014). On the ethics of interviewing for discourse analysis. *Qualitative Research, 14*(5), 529–541. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794113495039

Hannerz, U. (1999). Reflections on varieties of culturespeak. *European Journal of Cultural Studies, 2*(3), 393–407. Sage Publications. https://doi.org/10.1177/136754949900200306

Heinonen, R. E. (2017). Bridging the gap of understanding: Dialogue competence in the renewal of UN peacekeeping and civil crisis management. In A. Mutanen (ed.), *Ethical basis of human security: Towards renewal of peace operations training* (pp. 50-67). FINCENT Publication Series, 1. Helsinki: Finnish Defence Forces International Centre.

Hill Collins, P. & Bilge, S. (2016). *Intersectionality*. Cambridge: Polity Press. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Hirsjärvi, S. & Hurme, H. (2011). *Tutkimushaastattelu: Teemahaastattelun teoria ja käytäntö.* [Research interview: Theory and practice of thematic interview]. Helsinki: Gaudeamus Helsinki University Press.

Hirsjärvi, S., Remes, P. & Sajavaara, P. (2009). *Tutki ja kirjoita* [Research and write] (15th ed.). Helsinki: Tammi.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J. & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Holliday, A. (2011). *Intercultural communication and ideology*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications. Retrieved from https://www.dawsonera.com

Holliday, A. (2013). *Understanding intercultural communication: Negotiating a grammar of culture*. London: Routledge. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Howard, L. M. (2007). *UN peacekeeping in civil wars.* New York: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Inuzuka, A. (2013). When the periphery becomes the center: a critical turn in intercultural communication studies. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 8*(1), 86–92. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2013.767819

Itäpuisto, M. (ed.) (2017a). *Siviilikriisinhallintaa erilaisten kulttuurien keskellä* [Civilian crisis management among different kinds of cultures]. CMC Finland. Retrieved from https://www.cmcfinland.fi/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/Siviilikriisinhallintaa-erilaisten-kulttuurien-keskellae.pdf

Itäpuisto, M. (2017b). Siviilikriisinhallinnan työ erilaisten kulttuurien parissa [Civilian crisis management work among different kinds of cultures]. In M. Itäpuisto (ed.), *Siviilikriisinhallintaa erilaisten kulttuurien keskellä* [Civilian crisis management among different kinds of cultures] (pp. 4-7). CMC Finland. Retrieved from https://www.cmcfinland.fi/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/Siviilikriisinhallintaa-erilaisten-kulttuurien-keskellae.pdf

Jokikokko, K. (2002). Interkulttuurinen kompetenssi apuna kulttuurien kohdatessa [Intercultural competence as an aid when cultures encounter]. In R. Räsänen, K. Jokikokko, M.-L. Järvelä & T. Lamminmäki-Kärkkäinen (eds.), *Interkulttuurinen opettajankoulutus: Utopiasta todellisuudeksi toimintatutkimuksen avulla* [Intercultural teacher education: From utopy to reality through action research] (pp. 85-96). Department of Educational Sciences and Teacher Education, University of Oulu. Oulu: Oulu University. Retrieved from http://urn.fi/urn:isbn:9514268075

Jokikokko, K. (2016). Reframing teachers' intercultural learning as an emotional process. *Intercultural Education*, *27*(3), 217–230. https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2016.1150648

Jokinen, A. & Juhila, K. (2016). Diskurssianalyyttisen tutkimuksen kartta [The chart of discourse analytical research]. In A. Jokinen, K. Juhila & E. Suoninen (eds.), *Diskurssianalyysi: Teoriat,*

peruskäsitteet ja käyttö [Discourse analysis: Theories, basic concepts and utilization] (pp. 267-310). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Jokinen, A., Juhila, K. & Suoninen, E. (2016). Diskursiivinen maailma: Teoreettiset lähtökohdat ja analyyttiset peruskäsitteet [Discursive world: Theoretical bases and analytical concepts]. In A. Jokinen, K. Juhila & E. Suoninen (eds.), *Diskurssianalyysi: Teoriat, peruskäsitteet ja käyttö* [Discourse analysis: Theories, basic concepts and utilization] (pp. 25-50). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Juhila, K. & Suoninen, E. (2016). Kymmenen kysymystä diskurssianalyysista [Ten questions about discourse analysis]. In A. Jokinen, K. Juhila & E. Suoninen (eds.), *Diskurssianalyysi: Teoriat, peruskäsitteet ja käyttö* [Discourse analysis: Theories, basic concepts and utilization] (pp. 445-463). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Keisala, K. (2012). *Monikulttuurisen työyhteisön viestintä* [Communication in a multicultural work community]. Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Kemppainen, R. P. (2009). Liike-elämän näkökulma [Business perspective]. In J. Lasonen & M. Halonen (eds.), *Kulttuurienvälinen osaaminen koulutuksessa ja työelämässä* [Intercultural competence in education and working life] (pp. 109-127). Kasvatusalan tutkimuksia [Research in educational sciences], 43. Jyväskylä: Suomen kasvatustieteellinen seura FERA.

Kincheloe, J. L., McLaren, P., Steinberg, S. R. & Monzó, L. D. (2018). Critical pedagogy and qualitative research: Advancing the Bricolage. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln, *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed., pp. 235-260). Los Angeles: Sage.

Kivistö, K. (2016). ”En mä oikein tiennyt, mihin olin hakeutumassa. Kaikesta on kuitenkin selvitty ja vaikeudet voitettu. Paljon olis kerrottavaa siitä, mitä oon oppinut”. Rauhanturvaajien kuvauksia rauhanturvatehtävään hakeutumisesta, rauhanturvatyön merkityksestä sekä kohdatuista haasteista rekrytoinnissa ja koulutuksessa huomioitavaksi [”I did not know, where I was going to go. I have survived and won the difficulties. I would have a lot to tell about that, what I have learned.” Peacekeepers descriptions of becoming a peacekeeper, the significance of peacekeeping, and the challenges and key areas of focus in training for the advancement of recruitment and training] [Doctoral Dissertation, Behavioural Sciences, the University of Helsinki]. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:ISBN 978-951-51-2265-0

Kohonen, I., Kuula-Luumi, A. & Spoof, S.-K. (2019). The ethical principles of research with human participants and ethical review in the human sciences in Finland 2019. Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK guidelines 2019. *Publications of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK, 3*. Retrieved from https://www.tenk.fi/sites/tenk.fi/files/Ihmistieteiden_eettisen_ennakkoarvioinnin_ohje_2019.pdf

Kokkarinen, H. (2009). When cultures meet – stories from daily life. In S. Ådahl (ed.), *Varying cultures in modern crisis management* (pp. 22-31). FINCENT Publication Series, 1. Helsinki: Finnish Defence Forces International Centre.

Koole, T. & ten Thije, J. D. (2001). The reconstruction of intercultural discourse: Methodological considerations. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*(4), 571–587. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(00)00035-7

Korzenny, F. & Ting-Toomey, S. (eds.) (1990). *Communicating for peace: Diplomacy and negotiation.* Newbury Park: Sage.

Lahikainen, A. R. & Pirttilä-Backman, A.-M. (2007). *Sosiaalipsykologian perusteet* [Introduction to social psychology]. Helsinki: Otava.

Lasonen, J., Halonen, M., Kemppainen, R. P. & Teräs, M. (2009). Monikulttuurisuus, kulttuurienvälisyys ja osaamisen tunnustuksen tarve [Multiculturality, interculturality and the need for the recognition of competence]. In J. Lasonen & M. Halonen (eds.), *Kulttuurienvälinen osaaminen koulutuksessa ja työelämässä* [Intercultural competence in education and working life] (pp. 9-24). Kasvatusalan tutkimuksia [Research in educational sciences], 43. Jyväskylä: Suomen kasvatustieteellinen seura FERA.

Leung, D. Y. P. & Kember, D. (2003). The relationship between approaches to learning and reflection upon practice. *Educational Psychology 23*(1), 61–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410303221

Liesinen, K. (2009). Cultural competence – smooth behaviour or deep understanding? In S. Ådahl (ed.), *Varying cultures in modern crisis management* (pp. 22-31). FINCENT Publication Series, 1. Helsinki: Finnish Defence Forces International Centre.

Lincoln, Y. S. (2016). Introduction. In Y. S. Lincoln & E. G. Guba, *The constructivist credo* (pp. 7-14). Walnut Creek, California: Left Coast Press, Inc. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Lincoln, Y. S., Lynham, S. A. & Guba, E. G. (2018). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences, revisited. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed., pp. 108-150). Sage: United States of America.

Martin, J. N. (2015). Revisiting intercultural communication competence: Where to go from here. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 48*, 6–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2015.03.008

Martin, J. N. & Nakayama, T. K. (2010). *Intercultural communication in contexts* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

May, S. & Sleeter, C. E. (2010). Introduction. In S. May & C. E. Sleeter (eds.), *Critical multiculturalism: Theory and praxis* (pp. 1-16). New York: Routledge. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

McSweeney, B. (2002). Hofstede's model of national cultural differences and their consequences: A triumph of faith - a failure of analysis. *Human Relations, 55*(1), 89–118. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726702551004

Melasuo, T. (2009). Cultural dimensions in crises in general and in crisis management in particular. In S. Ådahl (ed.), *Varying cultures in modern crisis management* (pp. 13-21). FINCENT Publication Series, 1. Helsinki: Finnish Defence Forces International Centre.

Merriam, S. B. (1991). How research produces knowledge. In J. M. Peters, P. Jarvis & Associates (eds.), *Adult education: Evolution and achievements in a developing field of study* (pp. 42-65). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. & Kim, S. (2012). Studying transformative learning: What methodology? In E. W. Taylor & P. Cranton (eds.), *The handbook of transformative learning: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 56-72). United States: Jossey-Bass. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com.

Mezirow, J. (1990). Preface. In Mezirow, J. et al., *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning* (pp. xiii-xxi). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (2003). Transformative learning as discourse. *Journal of Transformative Education, 1*(1), 58–63. https://doi.org/10.1177/154134460325217

Mezirow, J. (2011). Transformative learning theory. In J. Mezirow & E. W. Taylor (eds.), *Transformative learning in practice: Insights from community, workplace, and higher education* (pp. 18-32). Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Nathan, G. (2015). A non-essentialist model of culture: Implications of identity, agency and structure within multinational/multicultural organizations. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 15*(1), 101–124. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595815572171

Noorzai, R. & Hale, C. L. (2016). Promoting peace through songs: Peace activism during the Afghan Conflict. In S. Roy & I. S. Shaw (eds.), *Communicating differences: Towards breaking the boundaries for Peace and Conflict Research in Communication* (pp. 251-264). Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillian.

Nye, J. S. (2014). The information revolution and soft power. *Current History, 113*(759), 19–22. Retrieved from http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:11738398

Onuf, N. G. (2012). Making sense, making worlds: Constructivism in social theory and international relations. London: Routledge. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com.

Ortiz, W. P. (2008). Fictionalized history in the Philippines: Five narratives of collective amnesia. *Children's Literature in Education*, *39*, 269–280.

Parker, I. (1992). *Discourse dynamics: Critical analysis for social and individual psychology.* London: Routledge.

Penttinen, E. (2010). Enhancement of expertise in civilian crisis management: Positivity as a key towards personal dedication for a comprehensive approach. In Henriksson, K. (ed.), *Crisis Management Centre Finland yearbook 2010 on peacebuilding and civilian crisis management studies, 3*(6), 44-59.

Peters, M. (2005). Critical pedagogy and the futures of critical theory. In I. Gur-Ze'ev (ed.), *Critical theory and critical pedagogy today: Toward a new critical language in education* (pp. 35-48). Haifa: University of Haifa, Faculty of Education.

Petersen, F. A., Binnendijk, H., Barry, C. & Lehmann Nielsen, P. (2010). Implementing NATO's Comprehensive Approach to complex operations. In G. Aybet & R. M. Moore (eds.), *NATO in search of a vision* (pp. 75-98). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Piller, I. (2011). *Intercultural communication: A critical introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Piller, I. (2017). *Intercultural communication: A critical introduction* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com

Pirozzi, N. (2013). *The EU's comprehensive approach to crisis management*. Brussels: Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF). Retrieved from https://www.dcaf.ch/sites/default/files/publications/documents/Pirozzi_EU-CM.PDF

Potter, J. & Wetherell, M. (1987). Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour. London: Sage.

Prime Minister's Office. (2014). *Finland's national strategy for civilian crisis management.* Prime Minister's Office Publications, 8. Retrieved from http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-287-127-5

Prime Minister's Office. (2016). *Government report on Finnish foreign and security policy.* Prime Minister's Office Publications, 9. Retrieved from https://um.fi/publications/-/asset_publisher/TVOLgBmLyZvu/content/government-report-on-finnish-foreign-and-security-policy

Ramsbotham, O., Woodhouse, T. & Miall, H. (2016). *Contemporary conflict resolution: The prevention, management and transformation of deadly conflicts* (4th ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Rintakoski, K. & Autti, M. (eds.) (2008). *Seminar publication on comprehensive approach: Trends, challenges and possibilities for cooperation in crisis prevention and management.* Helsinki: Ministry of Defence.

Roy, S. (2012). Culturally unconscious: Intercultural implications of The New York Times representation of the Israel–Palestine conflict in 2009 and 2011. *International Communication Gazette*, *74*(6), 556–570. https://doi.org/10.1177/1748048512454823

Rubinstein, R. A. (2003). Cross-cultural considerations in complex peace operations. *Negotiation Journal, 19*(1), 29–49. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022399824684

Rubinstein, R. A. (2005). Intervention and culture: An anthropological approach to peace operations. *Security Dialogue, 36*(4), 527–544. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010605060454

Rubinstein, R. A. (2010). Peacekeeping and the return of imperial policing. *International Peacekeeping, 17*(4), 457–470. https://doi.org/10.1080/13533312.2010.516652

Rubinstein, R. A., Keller, D. M. & Scherger, M. E. (2008). Culture and interoperability in integrated missions. *International Peacekeeping, 15*(4), 540–555. https://doi.org/10.1080/13533310802239857

Saastamoinen, R. (2009). Lähestymistapoja ja kehityskohteita kulttuurienvälisen vuorovaikutusosaamisen tutkimuksessa [Approaches and areas for improvement in intercultural competence research]. In T. Valkonen, P. Isotalus, M. Siitonen & M. Valo (eds.), *Prologi 2009. Puheviestinnän vuosikirja* [Prologue. The Annual of Speech Communication]. Retrieved from http://prologos.fi/prologi/index.php?page=vuosikirjat&year=2009

Setkic, O. (2008). Recruitment and training in civilian crisis management: Learning from the ECMM/EUMM experiences. *CMC Finland Civilian Crisis Management Studies*, *1*(2), 1–30.

Siirtola, R. (2018). Suomi kokonaisvaltaisen kriisinhallinnan toimijana [Finland as a comprehensive crisis management actor]. In R. Siirtola & A. Palm (eds.), *Yhdessä enemmän – kriisien hallintaa kokonaisvaltaisesti* [More together – managing crises comprehensively] (pp. 15-18). Helsinki: Wider Security Network WISE.

Siljander, P. (2014). *Systemaattinen johdatus kasvatustieteeseen: Peruskäsitteet ja pääsuuntaukset* [A systematic introduction to educational sciences: Basic concepts and main approaches]. Tampere: Vastapaino. Retrieved from https://www.ellibslibrary.com

Smock, D. R. (2010). Conclusion. In D. R. Smock (ed.), *Religious contributions to peacemaking* (pp. 43-48). New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Soeters, J. & Bos-Bakx, M. (2003). Cross-cultural issues in peacekeeping operations. In T. W. Britt & A. B. Adler (eds.), *The psychology of the peacekeeper: Lessons from the field* (pp. 283-298). Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publications.

Stamnes, E. & Osland, K. M. (2016). *Synthesis report: Reviewing UN peace operations, the UN peacebuilding architecture and the implementation of UNSCR 1325.* NUPI report, 2. Oslo: Norwegian Institute of International Affairs.

Suoninen, E. (2016a). Kielenkäytön vaihtelevuuden analysoiminen [Analyzing variation in how language is used]. In A. Jokinen, K. Juhila & E. Suoninen, *Diskurssianalyysi: Teoriat, peruskäsitteet ja käyttö* [Discourse analysis: Theories, basic concepts and utilization] (pp. 51-73). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Suoninen, E. (2016b). Näkökulma sosiaalisen todellisuuden rakentumiseen [A perspective on the construction of the social reality]. In A. Jokinen, K. Juhila & E. Suoninen, *Diskurssianalyysi: teoriat, peruskäsitteet ja käyttö* [Discourse analysis: Theories, basic concepts and utilization] (pp. 229-247). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Taylor, S. & Smith, R. (2014). The ethics of interviewing for discourse analysis: Responses to Martyn Hammersley. *Qualitative Research, 14*(5), 542–548. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794113503742

Ting-Toomey, S. & Cole, M. (1990). Intergroup diplomatic communication: A face-negotiation perspective. In F. Korzenny & S. Ting-Toomey (eds.), *Communicating for peace: diplomacy and negotiation* (pp. 77-95). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Toivonen, P. (2009). Cultural awareness in Finnish cadets education. In S. Ådahl (ed.), *Varying cultures in modern crisis management* (pp. 93-102). FINCENT Publication Series, 1. Helsinki: Finnish Defence Forces International Centre.

Tomperi, T. (2011). Poliittinen sosialisaatio perheissä: Tutkimuksen perinteestä nykynäkymiin [Political socialization in families: From traditional research to contemporary views]. *Nuorisotutkimus*, *29*(3), 3–28. http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:ELE-1755249

Tuomi, J. & Sarajärvi, A. (2002). *Laadullinen tutkimus ja sisällönanalyysi* [Qualitative research and content analysis]. Helsinki: Tammi.

Tuomi, J. & Sarajärvi, A. (2018). *Laadullinen tutkimus ja sisällönanalyysi* [Qualitative research and content analysis] (Renewed ed.). Helsinki: Tammi. Retrieved from https://www.ellibslibrary.com

Tynjälä, P. (1999). Asiantuntijuuden rakentaminen kognitiivisena, sosiaalisena ja kulttuurisena ilmiönä [Building of expertise as a cognitive, social and cultural phenomenon]. In A. Eteläpelto & P. Tynjälä (eds.), *Oppiminen ja asiantuntijuus: Työelämän ja koulutuksen näkökulmia [Learning and expertise: Working life and education perspectives]* (pp. 145-179). Porvoo: WSOY.

United Nations, General Assembly & Security Council. (2015). *Identical letters dated 17 June 2015 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council. Report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations on uniting our strengths for peace: politics, partnership and people,* A/70/95, S/2015/446. Retrieved from https://undocs.org/pdf?symbol=en/a/70/95

United Nations & World Bank. (2018). *Pathways for peace: Inclusive approaches to preventing violent conflict.* Washington, DC: World Bank. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10986/28337

van Nes, F., Abma, T., Jonsson, H. & Deeg, D. (2010). Language differences in qualitative research: Is meaning lost in translation? *European Journal of Ageing, 7,* 313–316. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10433-010-0168-y

Vanonen, E. (2009). Preface. In S. Ådahl (ed.), *Varying cultures in modern crisis management* (pp. 5-7). FINCENT Publication Series, 1. Helsinki: Finnish Defence Forces International Centre.

Virkama, A. (2010). From othering to understanding: Perceiving ‘culture’ in intercultural communication, education and learning. In V. Korhonen (ed.), *Cross-cultural lifelong learning* (pp. 39-60). Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Väyrynen, T. (2005). A shared understanding: Gadamer and international conflict resolution. *Journal of Peace Research, 42*(3). 347–355. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343305052017

Wider Security Network. (n. d.) *Laajan turvallisuuden verkosto* [Wider Security Network]. Retrieved from https://www.widersecurity.fi/wise.html

Williams, R. (1976). *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society*. London: Croom Helm.

Winslow, D. (1997). *The Canadian airborne regiment in Somalia: a socio-cultural inquiry.* Ottawa: The Commission.

WOSCAP. (2017). *Policy recommendations from a Whole of Society perspective for the EU's conflict prevention and peacebuilding capabilities*. Retrieved from https://woscap.eu/documents/131298403/131299900/WOSCAP%2bRecommendations_booklet_Final.pdf/WOSCAP%20Recommendations_booklet_Final/index.pdf

Yershova, Y., DeJaeghere, J. & Mestenhauser, J. (2000). Thinking not as usual: Adding the intercultural perspective. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 4*(1), 39–78. https://doi.org/10.1177/102831530000400105

Young, R. A. & Collin, A. (2004). Introduction: Constructivism and social constructionism in the career field. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64*, 373–388. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2003.12.005

Ådahl, S. (2009a). Culturally confident crisis management – some hints from an anthropologist. In S. Ådahl (ed.), *Varying cultures in modern crisis management* (pp. 103-112). FINCENT Publication Series, 1. Helsinki: Finnish Defence Forces International Centre.

Ådahl, S. (2009b). Introduction. In S. Ådahl (ed.), *Varying cultures in modern crisis management* (pp. 8-12). FINCENT Publication Series, 1. Helsinki: Finnish Defence Forces International Centre.

Ådahl, S. (ed.) (2009c). *Varying cultures in modern crisis management.* FINCENT Publication Series, 1. Helsinki: Finnish Defence Forces International Centre.

APPENDIXES

Appendix I: Invitation to the Research Interview (in Finnish)

Tutkimustiedote

KUTSU TUTKIMUKSEEN OSALLISTUMISEEN

Hyvä siviilikriisinhallinnan asiantuntija,

teen pro gradu -tutkielmaani Tampereen yliopiston Kasvatustieteiden ja kulttuurin tiedekunnassa, ohjaajanani professori Veli-Matti Värri. Tutkimusaiheeni koskee kulttuurienvälistä viestintää siviilikriisinhallintakontekstissa. Etsin tutkimustani varten haastateltavia siviilikriisinhallinnan asiantuntijoita.

Tutkimuksen aihe

Tutkimuksen kiinnostuksenkohteena ovat erityisesti kulttuuriin liitetyt merkitykset siviilikriisinhallintakontekstissa – esimerkiksi millaiseksi kulttuuri ymmärretään ja miten sen nähdään vaikuttavan. Tutkimus on luonteeltaan laadullinen, ja tutkimuskysymysten fokus ja muoto saattavat muuntua ja tarkentua haastatteluaineiston tarkastelun myötä.

Tutkimuksen toteutus

Tutkimusta varten toivotaan voitavan toteuttaa 6–9 haastattelua. Haastattelut järjestetään yksilöhaastatteluina alkuvuodesta 2020; haastattelujen tarkemmat ajankohdat ja paikat sovitaan jokaisen tutkimukseen osallistuvan kanssa erikseen. Tapaamisen arvioitu kesto on noin 60–90 minuuttia[23]. Haastattelu ei vaadi tutkimukseen osallistuvalta valmistautumista. Haastattelut toteutetaan suomen kielellä.

Haastattelut äänitetään aineiston käsittelyä varten. Haastattelutallenteet hävitetään aineiston puhtaaksikirjoittamisen jälkeen, ja käsitelty aineisto hävitetään tutkimuksen ja sen arvioinnin valmistuttua[24]. Haastatteluaineistoa ei luovuteta tutkimuksen ulkopuoliseen käyttöön.

Aineiston käsittelyvaiheessa aineisto anonymisoidaan. Tällöin aineistosta poistetaan sellaiset tiedot, joista haastateltavat voidaan tunnistaa. Haastateltavat eivät siis ole tunnistettavissa tutkimuksen raportoinnissa. Haastatteluaineisto analysoidaan laadullisen sisällönanalyysin ja/tai diskurssianalyysin keinoin. Anonymisoituja suoria lainauksia haastattelusta voidaan käyttää tutkimuksen raportoinnissa.

[23] Koska jo ensimmäinen haastattelu osoittautui pidemmäksi, korjasin arviotani lopuista haastatteluista sopiessani.
[24] Luvat aineiston säilyttämiseen ja mahdolliseen jatkokäyttöön on pyydetty myöhemmin.

Valmis tutkimusraportti on julkinen ja kirjoitetaan englanniksi. Tulokset saatetaan mahdollisesti raportoida myös artikkelina kotimaisessa tai kansainvälisessä tieteellisessä tai ammatillisessa julkaisussa.

Vapaaehtoisuus

Tutkimukseen osallistuminen on vapaaehtoista. Ennen haastattelua tutkimukseen osallistuvilta pyydetään kirjallinen suostumus tutkimukseen osallistumisesta.

Osallistujalla on oikeus keskeyttää tai peruuttaa osallistumisensa tutkimukseen. Jos osallistuminen halutaan keskeyttää tai peruuttaa, osallistumisen keskeyttämiseen tai peruuttamiseen mennessä kerättyjä tietoja ja niistä tehtyä analyysiä voidaan kuitenkin käyttää tutkimuksessa; koska tunnistetiedot poistetaan aineiston käsittelyvaiheessa, yksittäisestä haastattelusta peräisin olevaa tietoa ei ole enää mahdollista erottaa muusta aineistosta.

Tutkimukseen osallistumisesta ei makseta palkkiota.

Muuta

Tutkimuksesta laaditaan henkilötietolain edellyttämä tietosuojailmoitus. Tutkimuksen tietosuojailmoitus on saatavissa allekirjoittaneelta.

Osallistuminen

CMC Finland on ystävällisesti lupautunut välittämään tämän haastattelukutsun. Jos olette kiinnostunut osallistumaan tutkimukseen, pyytäisin teitä ottamaan yhteyttä suoraan minuun maanantaihin 20.1.2020 mennessä. Tavoitatte minut sähköpostiosoitteesta (poistettu) tai puhelimitse numerosta (poistettu). Vastaan mielelläni myös tutkimusta koskeviin kysymyksiin.

Ystävällisin terveisin,
Miia Pylvänäinen

Appendix II: Preliminary Interview Questions in Finnish

0. Taustatiedot

0.1. Nimi
0.2. Sukupuoli
0.3. Syntymävuosi
0.4. Synnyinmaa / asuinmaa / maat, joissa on asunut
0.5. Koulutus
0.6. Ammatti (millaisia työtehtäviä tehnyt)
0.7. Kriisinhallintakokemus: vuodet, paikat, organisaatiot

1. Yleistä

1.1. Millainen oli tyypillinen työpäiväsi siviilikriisinhallintapalveluksen aikana?

2. Vuorovaikutus

2.1. Kenen kanssa pääasiassa työskentelit? Millaista oli työskennellä heidän kanssaan?

- (Operaation kansainvälinen / paikallinen henkilöstö, muut paikalliset / kansainväliset?)

2.2. Kuinka operaation organisaatio vaikutti vuorovaikutukseen eritaustaisten ihmisten kanssa?

- Mahdollistiko tai estikö operaation organisaatio rakentavaa vuorovaikutusta eritaustaisten ihmisten kanssa? Miten?

2.3. Onko joidenkin ihmisten kanssa ollut helpompi tulla toimeen kuin toisten kanssa? Minkä takia?

2.4. Onko joidenkin ihmisten kanssa ollut vaikeampi tulla toimeen kuin toisten kanssa? Minkä takia?

2.5. Onko sinun joskus ollut vaikea ymmärtää tai hyväksyä toisten ajattelu- tai toimintatapoja? Jos on, millaisissa tilanteissa? Miten toimit sellaisessa tilanteessa?

2.6. Mikä auttaa rakentamaan yhteisymmärrystä?

- (Millaiset rakenteet / käytännöt / asiat auttavat vuorovaikutusta sujumaan hyvin?)

2.7. Vaikuttavatko ihmisten erilaiset taustat siviilikriisinhallintaan? Jos kyllä, miten?

- Miten eritaustaisuus ilmenee? Mihin asioihin se vaikuttaa? Miten?
- Onko joitakin vahvuuksia, joita eritaustaisuus tuo siviilikriisinhallintaan? Millaisia?
- Onko joitakin haasteita, joita eritaustaisuus tuo siviilikriisinhallintaan? Millaisia? Miten mahdollisista haasteista selvitään?

2.8. Ovatko ihmiset samanlaisia?

3. Kulttuurin käsite – termejä ja niiden merkityksiä siviilikriisinhallinnan kannalta

3.1. Mitä kulttuuri mielestäsi on?

- Miten kulttuuri vaikuttaa ihmisten käyttäytymiseen?
- Vaikuttavatko kulttuurit / ihmisten erilaiset kulttuuriset taustat siviilikriisinhallintaan? Jos kyllä, miten ne ilmenevät? Mihin asioihin ja miten ne vaikuttavat? (Jos haastateltava ottaa kulttuuriset taustat esiin kohdassa 2.7., näitä kysymyksiä ei välttämättä esitetä enää tässä.)
    - Onko joitakin vahvuuksia, joita kulttuurinen eritaustaisuus tuo siviilikriisinhallintaan? Millaisia?
    - Onko joitakin haasteita, joita kulttuurinen eritaustaisuus tuo siviilikriisinhallintaan? Millaisia? Miten mahdollisista haasteista selvittiin / selvitään?
- Miten omat kulttuuriset taustasi vaikuttivat tapaasi työskennellä? Onko omista kulttuurisista taustoistasi ollut hyötyä / haittaa työssäsi?
- Oletko kokenut työssäsi väärinymmärryksiä tai ristiriitoja, jotka mielestäsi johtuvat kulttuurisista syistä?

3.2. Mitä tarkoittaa kulttuurienvälisyys / monikulttuurisuus?
Riippuen vastauksesta seuraavia kysymyksiä saatetaan esittää:

- Miten se ilmeni työyhteisössäsi / työssäsi?
- Tuoko kulttuurienvälisyys / monikulttuurisuus siviilikriisinhallintaan vahvuuksia? Millaisia?
- Onko joitakin haasteita, joita kulttuurienvälisyys / monikulttuurisuus tuo siviilikriisinhallintaan? Millaisia? Miten haasteista selvittiin / selvitään?

3.3. Onko käsite kulttuurisensitiivisyys sinulle tuttu?

- Mitä tarkoittaa kulttuurisensitiivisyys? Mikä on sen merkitys siviilikriisinhallinnan kannalta? Huomioidaanko sitä / miten se näkyy siviilikriisinhallinnassa? Pitäisikö sitä mielestäsi huomioida? Huomioitko kulttuurisensitiivisyyttä jotenkin omassa työssäsi?

3.4. Onko käsite kulttuuritietoisuus sinulle tuttu?

- Mitä tarkoittaa kulttuuritietoisuus? Mikä on sen merkitys siviilikriisinhallinnan kannalta? Huomioidaanko sitä / miten se näkyy siviilikriisinhallinnassa? Pitäisikö sitä mielestäsi huomioida? Huomioitko kulttuuritietoisuutta jotenkin omassa työssäsi?

4. Taidot

4.1. Millaisia taitoja siviilikriisinhallinnassa mielestäsi tarvitaan kulttuurisesti eritaustaisten ihmisten kanssa työskenneltäessä?

5. Koulutus

5.1. Huomioitiinko kulttuurinen eritaustaisuus / monikulttuurisuus / kulttuurienvälisyys siviilikriisinhallintaa liittyvässä koulutuksessasi? Miten ja missä koulutuksessa?

5.2. Vastasiko koulutus mielestäsi kentällä havaitsemiisi tarpeisiin eritaustaisten ihmisten kanssa vuorovaikuttamiseen liittyvien sisältöjen osalta?

5.3. Vastasivatko koulutuksen sisällöt omia käsityksiäsi kulttuurisesta eritaustaisuudesta / monikulttuurisuudesta / kulttuurienvälisyydestä?

6. Mahdollisia muita näkökulmia

6.1. Muuttiko siviilikriisinhallintakokemuksesi käsitystäsi kulttuurista / kulttuurisesta eritaustaisuudesta / kulttuurisesti erilaisista taustoista tulevien ihmisten kanssa vuorovaikuttamisesta? Miksi? Jos kyllä, miten muuttui?

6.2. Onko jotain, mitä en osannut kysyä / mitä haluaisit sanoa?

Appendix III: Preliminary Interview Questions in English

0. Background Information

0.1. Name
0.2. Gender
0.3. Year of birth
0.4. Country of birth / Country of residence / Countries where the interviewee has lived in
0.5. Education
0.6. Profession
0.7. Crisis management experience: years, countries, organizations

1. General Questions

1.1. How was your typical work day during your civilian crisis management deployment?

2. Interaction

2.1. With whom did you work mainly? How was it?

- (Internationals / locals within the operation personnel, locals / internationals beyond the operation personnel?)

2.2. How did the organization of the operation(s) affect interaction with people from different kinds of backgrounds?

- Did it enable or hinder fruitful interaction with people from different kinds of backgrounds? How?

2.3. Has it been easier to get along with some people than others? Why?

2.4. Has it been more difficult to get along with some people than others? Why?

2.5. Have you found it difficult to understand or accept other people's ways of thinking or acting? If yes, in what kinds of situations? How did you act in these situations?

2.6. What contributes to building mutual understanding?

- (What kinds of structures / practices / things positively contribute to interaction?)

2.7. Do people's different kinds of backgrounds have an influence on civilian crisis management? If yes, how?

- How do these differences manifest? On which things do they have an influence? How?
- Are there some advantages that people's different kinds of backgrounds provide in the context of civilian crisis management? What kinds of advantages?
- Are there some challenges that people's different kinds of backgrounds bring in the context of civilian crisis management? What kinds of challenges? How were they overcome / how can they be overcome?

2.8. Are people similar to each other?

3. The Concept of Culture – Terms and Their Significance from the Perspective of Civilian Crisis Management

3.1. In your opinion, what is culture?

- How does culture influence human behavior?
- Do cultures / people's different kinds of cultural backgrounds influence civilian crisis management? If yes, how do they manifest? On which things and how do they have an influence? (If the interviewee talks about cultural backgrounds when addressing the questions in 2.7., these questions will not be asked here.)
    - Are there some advantages that people's different kinds of cultural backgrounds provide in the context of civilian crisis management? What kinds of advantages?
    - Are there some challenges that people's different kinds of cultural backgrounds bring in the context of civilian crisis management? What kinds of challenges? How were they overcome / how can they be overcome?
- How did your own cultural backgrounds affect your ways of working? Have your cultural backgrounds provided some advantages / brought some challenges at work?
- Have you experienced misunderstandings or contradictions that stem from cultural reasons (at work)?

3.2. What does interculturality / multiculturality mean?
Depending on the reply, the following questions may be asked:

- How did it manifest at your work / in your work community?
- Does interculturality / multiculturality provide civilian crisis management with some advantages? What kinds of advantages?
- Does interculturality / multiculturality bring some challenges into civilian crisis management? What kinds of challenges? How were they overcome / how can they be overcome?

3.3. Are you familiar with the concept of cultural sensitivity?

- What does it mean? Does it have significance from the perspective of civilian crisis management? Is it considered / how does it manifest in the context of civilian crisis management? In your opinion, should it be considered? Did you take cultural sensitivity into consideration somehow at work?

3.4. Are you familiar with the concept of cultural awareness?

- What does it mean? Does it have significance from the perspective of civilian crisis management? Is it considered / how does it manifest in the context of civilian crisis management? In your opinion, should it be considered? Did you take cultural awareness into consideration somehow at work?

4. Competences

4.1. In your opinion, what kinds of competences are needed in civilian crisis management when working with people from different kinds of cultural backgrounds?

5. Training

5.1. Were people's different kinds of cultural backgrounds / Was multiculturality / interculturality considered in your training related to civilian crisis management? How and in which training?

5.2. In your opinion, did the training meet the needs you perceived in the field when it comes to interaction with people from different kinds of cultural backgrounds?

5.3. Did the content of the training correspond with your ideas of different kinds of cultural backgrounds / multiculturality / interculturality?

6. Other potential perspectives

6.1. Did your experiences in civilian crisis management change your views of culture / different kinds of cultural backgrounds / interaction with people from different kinds of cultural backgrounds? Why? If yes, how did they change?

6.2. Is there something I did not realize to ask / something you would like to say?

Appendix IV: Interview Quotations in Finnish

---

[i] "[Kulttuuri] vaikuttaa ihan kaikkeen – – pitää ottaa, siis kaikessa, pitää ottaa huomioon se kulttuuri. – –"

[ii] "Se on niin ku, nyt ku aatellaan, ku aatellaan kulttuurii, voidaan puhua et 'aa se on sitä taidetta, et joku maalaa", mut se on aivan valtava käsite."

[iii] "sitä piirrettä siinä kulttuurissa"

[iv] "muokkaako kulttuuri rakenteita vai rakenne kulttuuria?"

[v] " – – pitäis hyvin tarkalleen tietää niin kun… ennen ku missio perustetaan että mit-mit-mitkä on ne niin kun ne, ikään ku reunaehdot millä voidaan lähteä sitä sitten sitä mission mandaattia toteuttamaan ja miettiä sen mukaan se mission mandaatti."

[vi] "virallinen koneisto on varsin hauras, ja heikko, niin niin, se mikä on paperilla ei välttämättä oo se mikä on todellisuus. Niin, niin meidän täytyy muistaa aina että jos me halutaan asioita eteenpäin oikeasti, niin se ei riitä että ne on vaan paperilla, vaan – ja jonkun virallisen… viralliseen koneistoon kuuluvan virkamiehen tai -naisen sopimana asiana, niin se ei välttämättä riitä, vaan meidän pitää saada ne [paikalliset perinteiset johtajat] siihen mukaan. Ja mi-mikä on se niitten, välinen, voimatasapaino on jääny mulle, niin ku arvotukseksi."

[vii] "kulttuurien myllerrystä"

[viii] "eroavaisuuksia siitä, miten asioita hoidetaan"

[ix] "se perintö, mikä sieltä on sieltä kommunismin ajalta"

[x] "työ-, työkulttuuri se on, no – no joo, sillä nimellä mä sitä kutsuisin sitä että me ollaan totuttu työskentelemään vähän erilaisilla prosesseilla ja eri, eri tavalla eri maissa."

[xi] "liittyy niin kun tämmöseen normaalin kulttuurin käsitteeseen myös"

[xii] " – – mun mielestä se tulee sieltä yleisestä kultturivai… käsitteestä. Miten ihmiset on tottunut toimimaan. Ollaanko, onko ihmiset yleensäkin esimerkiksi täsmällisiä, pitääkö ne kiinni määräajoista, miten ne toimii tilanteessa jos ne ikään kun, eivät oo tehnyt sitä mitä heiltä on pyydetty… kertooko he suoraan mistä on kysymys vai… peittääkö he sen valkoisella valheella. Kaikki tämmöset asiat mun mielestä on niin ku, liittyy siihen."

[xiii] "tapa tehdä asioita"

[xiv] "oltiin vähän niin kun kahdessa leirissä"

[xv] "itsestähän se sillon on kiinni jos on esimiehenä varsinkin että onko se sit seuraavalla kerralla korjattu ja, ja sitten että molemmat ymmärtää (ja) lähtee samalla ajatuks-, ajatuksella siitä tilanteesta niin kun eteenpäin."

[xvi] "siihen kesti tottuminen hetken aikaa tämmöseen eroavaisuuteen, ja sitte täyty ruveta tekemään yhessä vaiheessa, niin mä tein, et jos oli joku tapaaminen sovittu ni mä annoin sen vastinkumppanille tai tot- kollegalle annoin 30 minuuttia aikasemman ajan, niin sitten oltiin suurin piirtein yhtä aikaa siellä."

[xvii] ”[s]e on varmaan kulttuurisidonnainen juttu et suomalainen ei oikeen hyväksy sitä et asiat ei etene.”

[xviii] ”No kyllähän yks semmonen haaste on tavallaan se erilaisten työntekotapojen niin ku yhteenlyöminen, et mitä-mitä odotetaan, kuka odottaa itseltä ja toisilta, ja tavallaan kun nää meidän suomalaisten ja pohjoismaalaisten standardit on tosi korkeella, et miten niin ku pitäs sitte laskee tietyllä tavalla.”

[xix] Tutkija: ”Mitä tapahtuu jos niistä ei tiedä?”

Haastateltava: ”Sillon tulee varmaan yhteentörmäyksiä eikä se, se yhteistyö ei mee, niin operaation sisäisten ku ulkoisten kanssa niin kun ei mee kohillaan että tota noin noin, varmasti tulee haasteita. Joitakin… tulee semmosia että sit se todellakin vaikeutuu (antaa esimerkin omalta alaltaan) ja, ja näin että tuota. Ihan päivittäiseen työntekoon varmasti kovastikin liittyy, liittyy se että jos sä oot välittömällä isolla törmäyskurssilla siihen, siihen tota paikalliseen kulttuuriin ja toimintatapaan.”

[xx] “persona non grata”

[xxi] ”siellä kansainvälisessä ympäristössä, kun on monista eri lähtökohdista olevia ihmisiä”

[xxii] ”dos and dont’s”

[xxiii] ”mitä sä et todellakaan saa tehdä, ja mitä sun kannattaa tehdä”

[xxiv] “ Kulttuuri, mm… Kulttuuri, mä oon sanon- lähe- no sanotaan että mää lähestyn näin että kulttuuri tarkoittaa mun mielestä sitä että miten ihmiset käyttäytyy, miten ne työskentelee… mitä, minkälaisia tapoja niillä on… ja kulttuuriin vaikuttaa hirveen paljon sen, sen alueen tai… ihmisten tai... maan historia. Myös uskonnolla on merkitystä että minkälainen kulttuuri. Sen minä oon kokenu ite. Mutta toisaalta taas, uskonnolla ei välttämättä ole merkitystä siihen minkälai- että mikä on kulttuuri.”

[xxv] “paikallisen kulttuurin tapoihin”

[xxvi] “miten ihmiset käyttäytyy”

[xxvii] ”miten he toimii”

[xxviii] “miten pitää siellä toimia”

[xxix] ”kulttuurisääntöä”

[xxx] ”he tuntee sen kulttuurin, tuntee ihmisten tavat siellä”

[xxxi]”[o]li se kulttuuri… mitä vaan niin sehän vaikuttaa niihin kulttuurisiin käytänteisiin miten niin ku käyttäydytään, mitkä (on) käytössäännöt, mitä pidetään toivottavana ja mitä ei, niin sehän vaikuttaa tiet- antaa ne tietyt reunaehdot.”

[xxxii] ”ei, ei, me ei olla kaikki sama-, me ei olla kaikki samanlaisia yksilöinä, meillä on erilainen kulttuuri, taustat ja kaikki muut mitkä vaikuttaa myös sen yksilön käyttäytymiseen.”

[xxxiii] “pitää oppia hyväksymään myös että tuota, ihmiset elää niin ku vahvasti sen kulttuurin vaikuttamina, että tuota, ja se pitää niin ku tuntee ennen ku sä meet todellakin sinne maahan.”

[xxxiv] “kotiutunut sieltä operaatiosta, siitä maasta, kulttuurista”

[xxxv] ”työskentelee siellä maassa, operaatiossa, kulttuurissa”

[xxxvi] ”yhteisön normit asettaa paljon se kulttuuri”

[xxxvii] ”mitä paremmin operaation, siviilikriisinhallintaoperaation henkilöstö on perehtynyt siihen kulttuuriin etukäteen, kaikista maista joista sitä tulee sitä porukkaa, mitä enemmän heillä on niin ku, tämmönen homogeeninen käsitys siitä mitä se kulttuuri siellä maassa on, sitä helpompi se niin ku se mission koko toiminnan on käynnistyä myös koska kaikki ymmärtää, että minkä takia joku tietty asia ei tapahdukaan ihan niin ku samalla tavalla ku mitä tapahtuu omassa kotimaassa, vaan koska, koska tässä maassa on tämmönen kulttuuri, niin on toimittava sen kulttuurin ehdoilla.”

[xxxviii] “hyvin tehokas infopaketti siitä mitä sä et todellakaan saa tehdä, ja mitä sun kannattaa tehdä”

[xxxix] ”mun mielestä se on ehoton, että tämmönen (viittaa kohdemaan kulttuuriin liittyvään koulutukseen) pitää olla. Ettei tuu sitten… sitä niin sanottu ylilyöntiä että… sä rikot heti jo-jotakin semmosta kulttuurisääntöä.”

[xl] ”sillä kyseisellä alueella todennäköisesti se toimivin”

[xli] ”Ajan myötä kulttuuri muuttuu. Siihen vaikuttaa hirveen paljon se historia. Maan historia, alueen historia, ihmisten historia. (Että) minkälaisia kulttuuria sitte siellä on.”

[xlii] ”kissan kokoisin kirjaimin, niin ku, sanottu että, että sun pitää kunnioittaa.”

[xliii] ”joku yksittäinen tapaus”

[xliv] “[Paikallinen] kulttuuri, niin se on.. ää, [paikalliset]… ja tietysti, ei pitäis yleistää, eiks niin. (naurahtaa) Jokainen ihminen on yksilö. Mut meidän pitää. Ja, ja, jos me yleistetään, niin niin... ee, niin me voidaan puhua [paikallisista] yleistäen, niin, öö, [paikalliset] on, on, on hartaita muslimeja – –”

[xlv] ”hallitseva”

[xlvi] ”Mähän oon suomalaiseksi todella puhelias, suorastaan ekstrovertti, (ku) yleensähän suomalaiset on hiljaisia. Ja… ja, pidättyväisiä ja puhuu vähän ja small-talkia ei harrasteta.”

[xlvii] Haastateltava: ”Eli, eli missiossa tota, saattaa… saattaa niin kun yleisellä tasolla olla… ihmisillä, niin kun suurella osalla, ää, selkeä mielipide tietyistä kansallisuuksista, ja, ja mä en kuitenkaan välttämättä, ää, jakanut näitä näkemyksiä heidän kanssaan koska, niin ku kaikkihan me ollaan erilaisia et se riippuu siitä ihmisestä itsestään niin kun eikä hänen kansallisuudestaan, ääm, loppujen lopuks. Mut et, et sen voi sanoa että niin kun [alue] tulevilla, ää [alue] tulevilla ei välttämättä ollut kaikista paras maine. Tai vaikka (antaa toisen esimerkin, viittaa sekä kansallisuuteen että työtaustaan.) Mut et, mut et se heidän työmotivaationsa ei ollu (naurahtaa) aina niin ku ihan huipussaan. Niin, niin tämmöset tekijät… öö, selittää sit sitä mainetta mikä liitetään johonkin tiettyyn kansallisuuteen. Mut et mulla oli omassa yksikössä tota… öö, siellä oli [kansallisuus], siellä oli [toinen kansallisuus] ja he oli… mun mielestä ihan loistavia työntekijöitä kuiteski kaikki.”

Tutkija: ”Tota, jos menee ihan siihen konkretiaan että millaisia, missä se tavallaan, niin ku, näkyy jos näkyy niin tää oli tää motivaatio se…. yks, yks niin ku tämmönen seikka, mikä tulee mieleen?”

Haastateltava: ”Joo, joo.”

Tutkija. ”Tuleeko muuta mieleen niin ku… tämmösiä?”

Haastateltava: ”Niin, mikä sitä nyt sitte selittää et... et, et, jotenkin silleen… öö, helposti sen vaan, tavallaan et jos siitä keskusteli jonkun kanssa niin sitten, ää, just viittas... kulttuuriin, eikä määritelly sitä yhtään sen enempää kuin että, että heidän - niin ku heidän, ää, olemuksensa tai käytöksensä

johtuu siitä että he ovat tietystä kulttuurista. (Tauko.) Et et, et tota. Niin, et et, onko se sitten niin ku… e-, et jos sä tuut entisestä, öö Neuvostoliiton maasta niin, niin onko se... mahdollisesti vaikuttanu siihen että millä… ää, millä tavalla sä teet työtä. Niin ku tämmösii oletuksia siellä, siel ihmisten kommenttien taustalla on.”

[xlviii] ” – – se on tavallaan semmonen et, et vaikkei sitä ihmiset sanois ääneen niin se tavallaan on se lähtöolettamus että sen takia että he tulee [maa] eli he edustaa niin ku tietyntyyppistä kulttuuria niin, niin se selittää että, ee, minkäl-minkä takia he ovat semmosia ihmisenä kun, kun he ovat.”

[xlix] ”lahjomattomuus”

[l] ”rehellisyys”

[li] ”No, no tää menee just helposti siihen niin ku että, et aletaan viljellä stereotypioita, mut, mut... jostain syystähän stereotypiatkin on olemassa niin kun et, et kyllä ehkä voi kärjistäen sanoa niin kuin että tietynmaalaiset on tietynmaalaisia ja, ja on helpompi tehdä töitä vaikka pohjoismaalaisten kanssa koska se on niin lähellä omaa kulttuuria se, se heidän taustansa. Et kyllä tietty tämmösiä… tämmösiä, juttuja niin ku omassa työssäkin… ää, tuli.”

[lii] Tutkija: ”Tuleeko vielä muita mieleen vahvuuksia tai haasteita... mitä tää kulttuurinen eritaustaisuus siviilikriisinhallintaan tuo?”

Haastateltava: ”(Tauko) Ää, no, noiden… niin kun työkulttuurin kautta, e-ehkä just niin ku jotkut… hoitaa asiansa paremmin kun toiset, on perinpohjaisempia, kiinnittää enemmän huomiota yksityiskohtiin niin, niin sanotaan näin et sä… saatat saada paremman tuloksen, jos, jos sun partio koostuu…öö, tietyn…tä-tää nyt on vähän stereo…ty-typia taas mutta et jos se niin kun koostuu tietyistä kansallisuuksista niin sitten se, työ saatetaan tehdä paremmin yksinkertaisesti. Et...et, niin kun, joo.

[liii] Tutkija: Tuleeko mieleen jotain hyötyä tai haittaa mitä sun kulttuurisista taustoista on ollu sulle, työssä?

Haastateltava: Öö, ehdottomasti enemmän, enemmän hyötyä. Just se, niin kun, paikallisten kanssa kun, kun on tekemisissä niin just… toi mainitsemani et meihin ei liitetä mitään… leimoja. Öö, emm… me, me- meitä pidetään yleisesti niin kun rehellis-rehellisinä ja… semmosina maanläheisinä ihmisinä (naurahtaa), ja, ja sitten tota työtehtävissä niin suomalaisilla on… öö, tosi hyvä maine eli, eli meitä pidetään hyvinä työntekijöinä, öö, osaavina työntekijöinä, niin, niin, se on taas sit niin ku se-semmonen tavallaan leima työympäristössä mikä monesti… ää, mä oon kokenu sen että se auttaa et ihmiset on silleen et ’aa se on Suomesta, no okei loistavaa’ et, et tota ’tää varmasti tulee toimiin’. Et, et, näin.”

[liv] “niin ku nää, suomalaiset hyveet, pitäis olla mukana. Sitte, sen takiahan meitä niin ku, halutaan sinne.”

[lv] ”rehellisyys”

[lvi] ”lahjomattomuus”

[lvii] ”täsmällisyys”

[lviii] Tutkija: ”Tuleeko mieleen jotain vielä mitä mä en oo osannu kysyä, tai jotain mitä haluisit sanoa liittyen just näihin kulttuureihin… öö eri, eri kulttuureista tulevien kanssa viestimiseen siviilikriisinhallintaoperaatioissa?”

Haastateltava: ”No en mä tiä, sitä mä haluisin painot-painottaa että, et niin kun… vaikka mä nyt itse olen suomalainen niin kyl suomalaisilla rauhanturvaajilla ja siviilikriisinhallinnan työntekijöillä niin... on kyllä ehkä… mainepuolelta... kovin taso, positiivisessa mielessä että tuota jo-jotain me on tehty oikein, meidän koulutuksessa on jotain oikein ja... on toimittu oikein niissä tilanteissa, varsinkin vähän niin ku kovemmissa tilanteissa että… et siinä mielessä on kiva kuulua siihen joukkoon että tuota- että tuota noin noin… ja suomalaisten on helppo mennä, mennä sitte mihin tahansa joukkoon... mut niin, kulttuuriseen joukkoon koska tuota... suomalaisuus käsitetään positiivisena asiana.”

[lix] ”Kaikista ongelmista päästään kyllä yli jos vaan vähänkään haluaa. Niin. Tai mitä ongelmista, siis lähtökohta on se mikä, mikä siin on, et sulla on eri kulttuuri ku mulla, niin niin mä tuun ihmisen- mä oon ihmisen kans tekemisissä enkä, enkä se et ’kaikki [etninen ryhmä] on öö, niin ku… öö… itsemurhapommittajia että, mä en puhu sun kans’. Eihän se nyt niin mee. Vaan sä oot… siinä ja sä oot ihminen, ja mä tuun sun kans juttuun koska sä oot siinä. Ja se menee ihan hyvin niin. Eiks niin.”

[lx]”Jos sä perustat sen sun näkemyksen tai ajatuksen, idean jostain ihmisestä siihen hänen, niin ku just kansallisuuteensa, niin ku kansalliseen tai työ-, tai työkulttuuriin lähinnä, niin, niin sitten sä saatat yllättyä kun et, ku sähän et tiedä et onko se ihminen ollu niin ku missä muualla töissä. Et, et niin kun… vaikka, vaikka just…sanotaan näin et mä itse yllätyin et… niiin ku [mainitsee pari kansallisuutta] kollegasta et mä olin vaan silleen ehkä vähän, niin ku just stereotyyppisesti luokitellu et okei et he tulee nyt noista maista et he on tämmösii, ja sit he olikin aivan älyttömän kansainvälisiä, aivan täysin erilaisia mitä mä… kuvittelin et he olis. Et, et kyllä niin ku tollasii sattuu, silleen, suht säännöllisesti.”

[lxi] ”Kyllä suomalaiset tekee tunnollisesti töitä, eikä sekään oo mikään klisee.”

[lxii] ”leima”

[lxiii] ” – – siel on hyvin vahvat mielipiteet joillakin ihmisillä amerikkalaisista, ja, ja sitte tota… saattaa niin ku olla silleen… ranskalaisista, saksalaisista…aam, sen -sen takia et he edustaa niin kun heidän mielessään… länttä.”

[lxiv] ”historian taakka”

[lxv] ”kansallinen kulttuuri”

[lxvi] ”tehän soditte (imperfekti)”

[lxvii] ”paikallisviranomainen, niin he eivät niinkään halunneet, kaikki eivät halunneet neuvoja meiltä, mitä me tuotiin, kun pitivät sitä semmosena eurooppalaisena hössöttämisenä ja, ja entisen siirtomaaherran aikaansaamana, öö, niin kun, vääränlaisena kulttuurina.”

[lxviii] (Haastateltava kertoo, että hän ei hyväksy tiettyjä piirteitä, jotka hän liittää paikalliseen kulttuuriin. Sitten hän jatkaa:) ”Mutta, mun on pakko ymmärtää sitä jotta mä pystyn toimimaan siellä. Ja mun pitää hyväksyä se et mä en pysty muuttaan niitä ja mun täytyy hyväksyä myös se että… mikä mä oon niille sanomaan. Se on niitten kulttuuri, en mä voi tulla niin ku… käskemään niitä tai osoittaan ylimielisyyttä, niin ku sanomalla et tää on väärin. Mä voin van kertoo mun omaa tarinaa, ja YK:n niin ku tietysti standardien mukaista tarinaa että… et, et, niin ku seksuaalinen hyväksikäyttö on väärin, korruptio on väärin ja – – ja niin edelleen. Ja että, niin ku, näinkin voi tehdä, mutta mä (en) voi niin ku, niin ku… niin. Että. Helposti joku, joku länsimaalainen, niin on aika ylimielinen äkkiä. Se tulee niin ku, on omasta mielestään parempi. Vaikka [paikallinen ryhmä] on eläny siellä vuosisatoja, niis-niissä olosuhteissa, selvinny siellä hengissä, niin siinä on oma voimansa siinä kulttuurissa eikä sitä muuteta noin vaan.”

[lxix] ”ja se yhteisö on… semmonen joka myös valvoo sitä… islamin ja perinteiden noudattamista”

[lxx] “maa ei tee kulttuuria vaan kyl se on se väestö ja ne, ne, sanotaan perinteet, että miten on perinteisesti asiota tehty, ni se muodostaa sitte jopa - jopa niin ku sitä kulttuuria”

[lxxi] ”oppia”

[lxxii] “on tottunut”

[lxxiii] “on oppinu” (esim. merkityksessä ’oppinut johonkin’, ’oppinut jotakin’; myös ’oppinut vanhemmilta tai isovanhemmilta’)

[lxxiv] ”on opittu” (esim. ”on opittu aikojen saatossa” sekä ”on opittu siihen”)

[lxxv] ”– – he on kasvanu siihen, miehenä he on kasvanu siihen, että miehellä on tällanen oikeus – – ”

[lxxvi] “konfliktiasteista neuvottelua”

[lxxvii] Haastateltava: ” – – joku kollega voi oman taustansa kautta nähdä sen asian eri tavalla, ja sieltä löytyy hedelmällisiä asioita niin ku siihen neuvotteluun.”

Tutkija: ”Mm.”

Haastateltava: ”Ihan niin kun simppeleitä asioita, ei tarvita mitään niin kun kovinkaan laajoja asioita, vaan ihan ihan normi tämmönen, sanotaan viiden minuutin neuvottelu, niin sinä aikana voi jo niin kun ajatella, että mies joka ei ole koskaan oikeestansa mitään antanu ja sitte se viidessä minuutissa se voi pelastaa sen tilanteen ää jo sillä omalla taustallaa, et ymmärtää, mi-mikä on niin ku se, öö neuvotteluissa niin sanottu eripura käynnissä ja miten sit sieltä voi tulla se toinen, ni sit samalla itseki oppii.”

[lxxviii] “tietenkin se (kulttuuri) koostuu eri, eri elementeistä”

[lxxix] ”siinä on erilaisia rakennuspalikoita

[lxxx] ”syntyy erilaisista paloista, jotka muuttuu koko ajan”

[lxxxi] esim. ”kulttuuri siis ehdottomasti se, se ei oo rajattua ja se on, öö, se on dynaamista, se muuttuu koko ajan, se ei… voi olla mitään staattista, mun mielestä”; ”ajan myötä kulttuuri muuttuu”; ”kulttuuri ei oo pysyvä eikä staattinen, se jatkuvasti muuttuu ja kehittyy”

[lxxxii] ”on… alakulttuureita”

[lxxxiii] ”Suomessa, mennään pohjoseen, ei tarvii mennä, no, naapuri- naapuri on (paikkakunta) kotosin, niin monikulttuurisuutta on meillä jo niin kun naapureilla”

[lxxxiv] ”Se on semmonen, no yhtä kaikki kulttuuria ei voi sanoo, et Suomessa on tällainen kulttuuri, vaan se riippuu väestönosasta, mistäpäin- mistäpäin maata, ja mitä on totuttu tekemään, jopa niin kun sukujen oma, suvuilla voi olla ihan omanlaiset tyylinsä ja siitä voi muodostua jopa kulttuuri, näin mä sen nyt.”

[lxxxv] esim. ”Ei niitten rajat oo selviä. Ne voi olla vähän päällekkäisiä – –”
”Mut nehän on osittain kuitenki… päällekkäisiä, et se rajahan on sumea. Jokaisen. Ja sit jossain se on sumeampi ku toisessa. Ne on melkein jopa päällekkäisiä.”
”Mun mielestä rajat on kyllä liukuvia. Ei niin kun pysty pistämään, et tos on-tos on rajat, toi nyt on vaikka savolaista ja tämä on pohjalaista – – se on niin ku, lomittuu-lomittuu jonkun verran – –”

[lxxxvi] “okei se auttaa vähän, totta- tai- siis totta kai se auttaa, mutta eihän se millään tavalla korvaa sitä, et mitä sitten siellä tulee eteen”

[lxxxvii] ”Ja siis varsinki niin ku konfliktikon… kontekstissa niin, niin ne, ne jotenkin tuntuu elävän ja, ja muuttuvan ja niitä, niin kun tietosesti, ää, pyritään muuttamaan…ja, ja pyritään niin ku tukemaan tiettyjä kulttuurin elementtejä.”

[lxxxviii] ”kielikysymys”

[lxxxix] “[M]aa ei tee kulttuuria vaan kyl se on se väestö ja ne, ne, sanotaan perinteet, että miten on perinteisesti asioita tehty, ni se muodostaa sitte jopa - jopa niin ku sitä kulttuuria. En tiiä oonks mä iha, mut tää on mun mielipide, miten, mite mä näen, mite mä näen, että mistä se asia, mistä se kulttuuri sitte tulee, ja se vahvasti ohjaa sitte niin ku, nuoria, kasvun tiellä – –. ”

[xc] Haastateltava: ”Kyl se lähtee varmaan sieltä ihan kasvatuksesta /asenteesta niin kun, missä, mis, mihin mennään, elikkä tuota… Ne on kauaskantoisia – – . (Kuvailee paikallista kontekstia.) Ne tulee jostain – ne ei oo niin ku yksittäisen henkilön keksimiä vaan... se on aika lähellä että melkein kaikilla siellä asuvilla, ei pelkästään niin ku operaatiossa töissä olevilla niin, on, samanlainen asenne. Ja ehkä, sitten taas nää jotka tulee operaatioon ja on vähän aikaa ollu, niin heillä se asenne muuttuu sen… heti alun jälkeen koska ei tietyllä tällasella (kuvailee asennetta, jonka liittää paikalliseen kontekstiin) niin ei sillä pitkälle pötkitä noissa operaatioissa, että, et tuota… Se on varmaan tausta, pidempiaikainen tausta, asenne, asennoituminen. – – ” (Puhuu väärinkäsityksistä ja liiallisesta yksinkertaistamisesta sekä Suomessa että muualla).”

Tutkija: ”Ootko kokenut että, et jotkut väärinkäsitykset tai ristiriidat on nimenomaan niin ku kulttuurisista syistä johtuvia?”

Haastateltava: ”Kyllä, ehdottomasti. Niin ku sanoin että siellä taustalla yleinen asenne ja asennoituminen ja olosuhteet ja näin, niin… ja miten on toimittu vuosisatoja niin... kyllä se varmasti on yksi osa.”

Tutkija: ”Eli se kulttuuri niiin ku liittyy näihin asenteisiin ja toimintamalleihin, ymmärsinkö oikein?”

Haastateltava. ”Kyllä, joo. Kyllä.”

[xci] ”jokaisella ihmisellä on oma tulkintansa siitä kulttuurista”

[xcii] ”Se (kulttuuri) on tärkeä osa ihmisen identiteettiä ja... sit jos ihminen, öö, ki-kipuilee sen, sen kulttuurinsa kanssa ja haluaa siitä irti niin silti se on osa... hänen kasvuprosessiaan niin sit hän löytää muun mieleisensä kulttuuri... viitekehyksen jossa… elää sitten sen jälkeen. Mutta silti seuraa aina, ainakin jossain määrin mukana.”

[xciii] ”se niin ku muovautuu koko ajan”

[xciv] “pitää niin ku aina oppia se että, missä ympäristössä millä porukalla toimitaan ja sen mukaan niin kun… sitä omaakin toimintaansa sitten muuttaa. Ja kehittää, ja olla, olla entistä avoimempi.”

[xcv] ”asut jossain muualla, et ihan hyvän aikaa, että sä ymmärrät – –”

[xcvi] ” – – olet nähnyt et on muitakin tapoja tehdä asioita”

[xcvii] ”Et, et se niin kun tietoisuus siitä mitä, miten se oma kulttuuri, ää miten sä sitten sen määritteletkin niin vaikuttaa sinuun… aa, niin, niin tota… se, se, se mahdollistaa sen että se, sun oma kulttuurisi oikeastaan määrittelee sua, aa… vähän vähemmän, halutessas. Et täähän on sitten

niin ku ihmisestä itsestään kiinni että kuin, kuin suomalainen se vaikka haluaa tuol, tuolla työhtetävissään olla tai ei.”

[xcviii] ” – – oman suomalaisuutesi että mikä, mikä kaikki sinussa on, niin sanotusti suomalaista.”

[xcix] ”kulttuuri siis ehdottomasti se, se ei oo rajattua ja se on, öö, se on dynaamista, se muuttuu koko ajan, se ei… voi olla mitään staattista, mun mielestä.”

[c] ”jokainen ihminen… on siinä määrin kulttuurinsa tuote ku se sen antaa olla. (Tauko.) …kai, en mä tiiä.”

[ci] Tutkija: ”Miten sun, miten sä näät, miten sun omat kulttuuriset taustat vaikutti sun tapaan työskennellä?”

Haastateltava: ”(Tauko) Varmaan niiden, varmaan niiden tota, vastinkumppaneiden ja, ja muiden osalta, ni joskus varmaan vähän ikävästi. (naurahtaen) Tarkotan - tarkotan tällä sitä, että, et kun… äm, heillä kesti varmaan aikansa tottua mun toimintatapoihin – – (kuvailee itseään ihmisenä). Aluksi se vähän vaikeutti sitä tekemistä, mutta sitte ku he oppi siihen, et minkälainen mä olen ihmisenä ja, ja vaikka mä jotain sanon voimakkaasti, ni se ei tarkota – – (etsii sanoja), se ei vaikuta mun niin kun siihen työn jälkeiseen olemiseen, niin kun henkilökohtasel, mikään ei ollu niin ku henkilökohtasella tasolla, vaan se oli niin ku työasia mistä sanottiin, ja, siihen meni hyvä aika, hyvänkin aikaa, että päästiin niin kun, no normaaliahan on se, että- että opitaan tuntemaan toisemme, mutta se mun semmonen periäänantamattomuus, äm, äm, vahva oikeudenmukaisuuden tunto, ja sellaset, niin niin niitten kanssa heillä ei ollu helppoo aluksi.”

Tutkija: ”Joo, ja sä liität nää, et ne tulee sieltä sun kulttuurisesta taustasta?”

Haastateltava: ”Kyllä ne tulee sieltä ihan varmasti.”

[cii] ”Eli, eli, tai sitten voi olla jopa niin, että sitä ei koskaan tule, siellä vaan toimitaan niin kun, sillä tavalla, että asiat menee eteenpäin, mutta sitä sellasta ymmärrystä, molemminpuolista ymmärrystä ei välttämättä tule koskaan. Sit vaan mennään niillä mitä on annettu ja yritetään vaan selvitä. Koska, se, että minä ymmärtäisin, esimerkiks minä ymmärtäisin, miten se asia pitäs viedä eteenpäin, mut jos toinen osapuoli ei missään nimessä halua, haluaa vaan toimia, joo toimitaan vaan sitten, mutta ei halua ymmärtää ja rakentaa sitä yhteistä näkyä siihen, et päästäis johonkin niin kun, päästäis samalle pallolle, niin, se ei aina toiminu kyllä, ei missään, ei missään nimessä, mut sen kans täyty vaan elää ja tietää, et okei, tää on se tilanne ja mennään näillä mitä on nyt annettu ja selvitään sen mukaan ja kun sen tiedosti, et se ei aina toimi, tai missään nimessä ei tuu aina nii kun -toimimaan, niin, niin, ei se ollu mikään hirvittävä juttu sitte kuitenkaan, kyl sitä pärjäs.”