



The Place of Culture in International Relations Theories

¹ Mohammad Ekram Yawar

<https://doi.org/10.69760/egille.2500191>

Abstract

At the beginning of the third century, culture has been one of the central topics of many humanities disciplines, including sociology, anthropology, economics, political science, and international relations. As a result of globalization, political, economic, social, and cultural relations have intensified around the world, and distant societies have become closer to each other. Therefore, culture is in many ways the most direct, obvious, and tangible element experienced in the daily lives of human societies.

This importance has led to the relationship between culture and various domains, including economic and political power, becoming evident at the international level and becoming the focus of attention for researchers in international politics and international relations.

Most sources in the field of international relations, influenced by the main approaches of the field of international relations, realism, idealism, neorealism and neoliberalism, have studied international developments more from a security, political and economic perspective; and have evaluated issues less from a cultural perspective.

While in order to better understand international affairs, attention should also be paid to its cultural aspects. Because in many cases, evaluating international issues from a cultural perspective facilitates the understanding and comprehension of world affairs. On this basis, the present study is trying to study and evaluate the main theories of international relations from a cultural perspective.

Keywords: Culture, Norms, Cultural Relations, International Relations, International Politics, International Community.

Introduction

Culture is one of the subtle and qualitative categories of various fields of human sciences. The discussion of culture initially took its place in the social sciences and quickly became the center of sociological discussions, especially anthropology.

¹ Asst. Prof. Dr. Mohammad Ekram Yawar, Dean of the Faculty of Law, International Science and Technology University, Warsaw, Poland, ekram.yawar@istu.edu.pl, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3198-5212>



In this regard, anthropologists and sociologists such as Tylor, Boas, and Durkheim have paid special attention to the category of culture. But the peak of cultural debates dates back to the works of Malinowski and, finally, Parsons. However, the presence of culture in international relations theories came with considerable delay.

The so-called realism school, which had been the dominant paradigm in international relations theories for the past three decades and had cast a shadow on the theoretical arena, was one of the reasons for the neglect of culture and its impact on international relations. For example, Hans J. Morgenthau, a realist, explicitly denied the influence of cultural data on foreign policy decision-makers.

In the 1960s, researchers such as Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba examined the role of cultural factors in the development of public institutions, guiding the intentions and behavior of actors. This group of researchers, by proposing the discussion of “political culture”, studied the influence of culture on politics and vice versa.

Such studies, in later stages, analyzed and analyzed the relationship between culture and foreign policy. In these studies, most of the attention is focused on the reflection of customs, traditions, ethics, values, and cultural beliefs in foreign policy. In the 1980s, applied studies also focused on the role of specific cultures in how they responded to environmental challenges in different ways.

However, prior to the end of the Cold War, culture was not considered as an independent variable with a formative role in mainstream theory of international relations or foreign policy. Since the early 1990s, culture has gradually become one of the most important and influential variables in understanding and explaining international developments, especially the foreign policy choices and actions of various states.

The attack on the World Trade Organization on September 11, 2001, and the subsequent war on terrorism, the resurgence of ethnic violence, and the rise of fundamentalism have given further impetus to the study of culture in the literature of international relations.

The present study attempts to extract the perspectives of various theorists in the field of international relations on culture and its impact on international relations and politics through a textual analysis method.

In the textual analysis, the authors' opinions and views on culture and its impact on the most important issue of international politics, namely war and peace, are examined. Because with this axis, the dispersion of the studies is avoided, and appropriate comparisons can be made at the end between the existing views.

1 Culture and Realism

Hans Morgenthau is known as the father of the school of realism. To become familiar with Morgenthau's thought, one should study and examine the book “Politics Among Nations”. This book is considered a classic text of realism.

And for the sake of argument that international politics is best understood through the “concept of interests defined in terms of power,” and also the explanation of the “six principles of political realism,” has received much attention.

On the other hand, however, this book should be seen as a guide text within the framework of the historical evolution of the concept of “culture” in the field of international relations. For Morgenthau, there are stable and permanent features in international politics; The most obvious of these are war and the balance of power.

In the first pages of Politics Among Nations, Morgenthau tells us: “The interests that determine political behavior in a particular period of history depend on the political and cultural contexts in which foreign



policy is shaped” (Morgenthau, 1995:9). More importantly, he says: “A similar observation applies to the concept of power. The content of the manner in which power is used is determined by the cultural and political environment” (Morgenthau, 1995:10-19)

From the very beginning of the book, Morgenthau gives culture an important and contingent role in his theory; both interests and power are culturally determined in various ways. This aspect of his theory has been overlooked by the text's focus on "power and interests" rather than on the contexts in which he imagines power and interests to operate and take shape.

However, given the large number of references In his book *The Politics of Nations*, Morgenthau makes it clear that the power and pursuit of interests of nations are characterized by customs and characteristics that are themselves products of culture. Morgenthau considered culture to be one of the general elements of human life.

But placing the collective value of culture within a “universal” theoretical framework has its own problems. One of Morgenthau’s main assumptions is that cultural differences separate us from one another. Everyone has a culture, and it is culture that makes them who they are.

Morgenthau clearly recognized that there are fundamental differences between societies and that these differences can create serious problems in international relations; the difficult question is to what extent Morgenthau believes culture to be influential in international politics, especially given his view that political realism provides a correct perspective on international relations and its perennial problems.

Unfortunately, Morgenthau's mind is more focused on the political impact of culture at the international level and the arguments against it than on the relationships between the ideas he uses. Nevertheless, culture is an important concept in the textbook of international politics.

In this book, he defines culture as a national characteristic and identifies the areas in which power and foreign policy manifest themselves, and this is a universal issue—all societies have culture. This culture is “us,” while the differences between societies represent “them.”

Not only does Morgenthau see culture as the source of difference among people, but it is clear that he sees culture as a particular manifestation of a necessary and inevitable aspect of human meaning.

He says, “All men want to be free and are thus in a position to obtain the opportunities for self-expression and ‘self-development’ that are envisioned in their own particular culture.” (Morgenthau, 1995:262) Morgenthau’s use of culture was a new development in the field of international relations; Morgenthau’s book was the starting point for a new form of reference to culture in this field and provided the basis for various kinds of interpretations of international politics.

In the book *Politics Among Nations*, the issue of culture is explicitly addressed in several chapters, and this book confirms the existence of an anthropological concept in the field of international relations. Morgenthau initially discusses the issue of “cultural imperialism” as part of a chapter on imperialism in general (Morgenthau, 1995:160). The issue of imperialism was a sensitive and ongoing issue during the Cold War, especially for countries in it was a time of decolonization, but the methods that Morgenthau discusses provide a clear indication of the influence of existing conditions on the shape of the anthropological imagination. In a section of his book on cultural acquisition, Morgenthau says: “There are nomadic peoples” who “are on the verge of extinction and pride under the influence of foreign cultures” (Morgenthau, 1995: 521). This is not a question of cultural sharing, but of the imposition of absorption and extinction. It is cultural, and Morgenthau was clearly aware of the possibility of this kind of cultural interference when discussing the issue of imperialism. For Morgenthau, cultural imperialism is the conscious replacement of one culture by another” (Morgenthau, 1995: 518-520).



Morgenthau's views on culture can be gleaned from the above materials and other sections of the Bibliography of International Politics. It can be said that his view on culture and its impact on international politics is influenced by ontology and state-centeredness, and his emphasis on national power and interests, and he has a national and repressive view on culture. By emphasizing cultural differences, Morgenthau believes that culture not only does not bring peace, but also leads to different definitions of interests and ultimately more conflicts.

For Morgenthau, cultural values are related only to the "national" sphere and their connection to international politics is in shaping national morals and influencing the conditions in which interests, national policies, and the way in which power is used are determined.

Also, in light of his pessimistic view of human nature, he fundamentally discredits the effectiveness of cultural exchange in creating peace between countries. Morgenthau believed that "nations go to war because they do not know each other well enough" and that greater contact "strengthens mutual understanding" and leads to a peaceful world order (Morgenthau, 1995:520). Although Morgenthau denies the influence of culture on the creation of peaceful relations, this does not mean that he believes that culture has no influence on international politics. It has not.

From the very beginning of the book, Morgenthau has given an important role to culture; interests (which are formulated in the form of foreign policy) and power are determined in various ways in terms of culture. This aspect of his theory has been ignored in his text due to the focus on "power and interests".

For Morgenthau, the power and pursuit of the interests of nations are determined by the characteristics, customs and characteristics that culture produces. Characteristic Ethnicity influences the manifestations of power and indeed the foreign policy that a state pursues. Political rationality therefore changes with cultural conditions.

For Morgenthau, local culture was more evident in the form of the nation-state, which was the most widespread unit of that day, than in the cultural identity of the sub-national group, and he not only saw culture as a source of difference between peoples, but it is clear that he conceived of culture as a specific representation of a necessary and inevitable aspect of what it meant to be human. That is why he wrote, "All men desire to be free, and in this respect they are seeking opportunities for self-expression as they are conceived in their own particular culture." (Morgenthau, 1995:262) All these issues therefore show that for Morgenthau, culture is a purely collective experience of existence, which in its purest form is exclusive to the individual; culture belongs to a particular society. It is opposite to the other and it induces meaning and to some extent it is dependent on environmental determinism; the appropriate level of application of culture is the local and national level and where there is no cultural sharing (the system of modern states) culture cannot prevail. Finally, it must be said that for Morgenthau and other traditional realists, different cultures intensify the conflicts in international politics by influencing national interests and power.

2 Culture and Neorealism

The most important theorist of neorealism is Kenneth Waltz. In his work, entitled "Theory of International Politics," Waltz attempts to answer the question of why states, despite their differences, pursue similar policies in the field of international relations. Within the framework of neo-realism, the most important feature of the international system is anarchy (lack of central authority), which leads to the problem of security and the formation of an environment based on self-reliance and the fragility of cooperation and the susceptibility of states' foreign policies to system-level factors. Therefore, ensuring survival and security, gaining power (military and economic capabilities), strengthening independence, expanding influence over others, and making profits. Relatively speaking, the most important factors affecting the choices and actions



of foreign policies of states (Vahidi, 2008:146). Waltz does not present an explicit view and position on culture and its role in international politics, but this position can be understood from his writings.

3 Culture and Liberalism

Liberal theorists have a positive view of human nature and believe that change in international relations, reduction of conflicts, and achievement of peace are possible. Liberal emphasis on such issues has led Marcus Fischer, in his article “Culture and Foreign Policy,” published in Brenda Schafer’s book, to argue that liberal theorists, with their emphasis on rationality and respect for human rights in a general sense, have not only ignored culture, but have also seen it as an obstacle to rational choice and the attainment of human rights and individual freedom. However, it should be noted that liberal theorists have also paid attention to culture, although this issue has been subsumed under the umbrella of issues such as peace, individual freedom, international regimes, and cooperation.

Alfred Zimmern, as the first professor of international politics who is considered one of the most important liberal writers, has paid attention to the category of culture, and especially to cultural exchange. Therefore, by examining the views of this writer, one can understand the place of culture in liberalism and its impact on international relations (Bayat, 2009:34). Zimmern emphasized the strengthening and development of mutual understanding between people and hoped that this would affect other aspects of international relations, including the foreign policy of states. He considered international cultural relations to strengthen and develop mutual understanding and believed that Individual participation in this type of relationship is a political act and is essentially international.

In his view, cultural relations are not limited to government officials or influential individuals and are something in which all people can participate. These individual international partnerships may be more important than what is achieved through formal participation, in terms of the effects they create.

In fact, Zimmern seeks has distinguished this kind of cultural internationalism from “cultural diplomacy,” which is limited to the state level. In fact, for him the most important goal in international cultural relations is to increase intellectual awareness and “mutual understanding.” Unlike many liberal theorists, Zimmern believed that an international union of states or governments, such as the League of Nations, could not achieve the mutual understanding and recognition he envisioned because he considered perception and cognition to be “psychological” issues. Also, Zimmern did not advocate the elimination of differences, national and racial characteristics among nations, and he did not imagine that the world would become homogeneous. Rather, he believed that there was a long way to go before it would get there; on the contrary, he thought that these sources of distinction, namely race and nationality, would remain. He was simply opposed to policies based on distinction. Although Zimmern does not state this explicitly, he argues against the worship of distinction as a basis for policies.

In fact, Zimmern is discussing a form of relationship that both clarifies distinction and removes the obstacles that prevent the creation of a valuable internationalism. He defended the real difference between others and spoke of the elimination of distance and coldness in relations between people, not their real way of life. For Zimmern, the most effective way of recognizing differences internationally was through the ways of thinking, the achievements, and the products that formed the content of cultural exchange.

He makes it clear elsewhere that he is not interested in “baseless rhetoric about the world of patriotism,” but rather in seeking common ground of experience that “will unite and reconcile humanity” and on that basis create “trust and even friendship” (Bayat, 2009:35). From the perspective of institutional neoliberalism, the state is an institution that represents the interests of multiple state and non-state actors, some of whom These interests shape the foreign policy of states.



This approach emphasizes the importance of international processes, institutions, and regimes in the international arena, which influence the process of shaping the priorities of players in relation to foreign policy issues, help to establish order and cooperation, reduce security dilemmas, and promote self-help politics. Therefore, states, as rational beings, seek Maximizing their absolute profit and pursuing a foreign policy that is based on profit (Vahidi, 2008:146).

Neoliberals, more than neorealists, paid more attention to culture and normative factors and their impact on shaping leaders' perceptions of foreign policy issues. For example, neoliberal Joseph Nye, in his theory of soft power, emphasized the place of cultural factors, beliefs, and norms as the main sources of soft power. Countries have emphasized this in their foreign policy. In his view, the expansion of technology and information networks has led to the importance of soft power (Nay, 2008: 54). However, despite the liberals' attention to the impact of cultural and normative factors on foreign policy, for them, national interests take precedence over morals and cultural factors. And cultural factors are the mediating variables between interests and behavioral consequences (Lamy, 2004: 411-450). Therefore, it can be said that Culture in liberalism serves its ultimate goal, which is to achieve peace.

Cultural exchanges in liberalist theories lead to greater mutual understanding and recognition among people of different nations, ultimately avoiding war and achieving peace. In general, it should be said that liberalism, like traditional realism, recognizes cultural differences, but on the contrary, it believes that cultural exchanges can not only It will not eliminate its major effects, but it can lead to mutual understanding and ultimately peace between different nations.

First of all, it should be said that culture in Waltz's writings is under the influence of structuralist and materialist ontology and the characteristic He argued that the structure of the international system, with its three components of anarchy as an organizing principle, the determination of the functions of units, and the distribution of powers, imposes restrictive conditions on states that make their behavior in the international arena similar (Waltz, 1979:82-83). In neorealist theory, although it is focused on the internal states and on ideological, ideological, and normative issues, It is not often acknowledged, but the systemic and structural pressures of the international system effectively engage states in a kind of socialization process in terms of the homogenization of behavior, such that despite the cultural, political, and ideological differences of the systems, they act similarly.

In other words, the structure of the international system has initiated a kind of culturization, prescribing a specific norm to all players. In this process, collectivism, fear, hostility, and chaos remain the main features of the international politics of the time (Qavam, 2005: 127).

What is important here is the way in which the structure of the international system influences states. For Waltz's implicit view of culture can be extracted from this section of his writings. Waltz believes that the structure of the international system limits the creation of states in two ways. It shapes and shapes their behavior; one through "competition" and the other through "collectivism." The collectivism of states in Waltz's writings means that states, by paying attention to the rewards and punishments that the international structure applies to them, learn what is appropriate behavior in this structure and try to adapt their behavior to it.

Of course, the collectivism of states and the learning of appropriate behavior in The international system is made possible by the transmission of norms, values, and rules to states and their institutionalization in the behavior of states; and It is from this that Waltz's implicit view of culture can be extracted.

Indeed, according to Waltz, the structural pressures of the international system practically place states in a kind of socialization process in terms of the homogenization of behavior, in such a way that despite the differences between the systems in terms of culture, politics, and Ideologically, they act similarly.



In other words, it considers a kind of culturalization in the structure of the international system. Considering this part of Waltz's writings, it can be concluded that, unlike Morgenthau, he did not emphasize cultural differences, but rather focused on the cultural similarities that he found in the similar behavior of the units. Of course, these cultural similarities, from Waltz's point of view, are the result of systemic pressures on states, not of cultural exchange that exists at the international level.

Therefore, Waltz implicitly believed that if socialization takes place in the desired form, states would have fewer conflicts and contradictions in international politics. Because they would observe the principles, rules, and norms existing in the international system in their behavior. Although Waltz raises the issue of sociability, he does not elaborate on this aspect of his theory, which can be considered a result of his positivist epistemology and, consequently, his materialist ontology (Mashirzadeh, 2005:120).

Regarding the definition of the concept of culture, neorealism has an explanatory definition of culture that, like ideology, has a more instrumental and explanatory role in foreign policy. Edward's definition Tylor's view of culture is close to the neorealist view.

From this perspective, culture is: "The totality of complex things that include knowledge, beliefs, symbols, art, law, customs, traditions, and capabilities and habits acquired by individuals in the process of socialization and which distinguish them from other societies" (Salimi, 2006:18).

From the perspective of this theory, governments use culture as a tool to understand and develop knowledge. In turn, they use culture to attract public support, justify goals and policies, and facilitate trade and economic relations with other states in foreign policy, and after security, economics, and diplomacy, they view culture as the fourth pillar of foreign policy (Micheal, 1986:1-21). However, despite their individualistic instrumental view of culture, their understanding of its role is not the same. Some neo-realist researchers, under the influence of changes in the international environment, have placed greater emphasis on the role of culture, unlike in the past (Vahidi, 2008: 147-148).

4 Culture and Marxism

Marxism or historical materialism is a philosophy that attempts to attribute the production and re-production of culture to the organization of the material conditions of life. Here, culture is a material force that is dependent on the socially organized production of the material conditions of life.

This concept refers to the forms that social life assumes under specific historical conditions. Marxism elaborates on the idea that culture is determined by the production and organization of material life with the metaphor of the substructure and the superstructure (Barker, 2008:131-132).

Marx and Engels paid very little attention to cultural phenomena specifically and made only passing references. In their view, the economic foundation of society consists of the forces and relations of production in which culture and ideology are used to help The dominant social groups have been constructed. The influencer and superstructure-infrastructure models consider the economy as the foundation and foundation of society and conceive of cultural, legal, and political forms as superstructures that arise from the economic foundation and serve to reproduce it.

In general, from the perspective of Marx, cultural forms always appear in specific historical situations. And they serve specific economic and social interests and perform important social functions. According to Marx and Engels, the cultural ideas of each era serve the interests of the ruling class, providing ideologies that legitimize class power (Kellner, 2004: 141-143). In other words, from the perspective of Marxism, culture is class power and is a political matter, because:

- Statement The agent of social relations is class power.



- It presents the social order as natural, appearing as an unavoidable reality.
- It conceals the underlying relations of exploitation.

From the perspective of Marxism, the relationship between the economic base and the cultural superstructure is a mechanical relationship in which the economy is the determinant. Economic determinism is the idea that profit motives and class relations directly determine the form and meaning of cultural productions (Barker, 2008:133). This theory seeks to educate people by identifying the relationship between the capitalist system and the mentality of society; and it believes that those who have the means of producing culture have the ability to produce the same culture and reproduce the ideology they desire. They also have.

The important thing is the field of production of culture through which the capitalist system forms the mentality of society. Marxism's understanding of modern culture takes place within the framework of the concept of ideology. Because culture is a product of ideology and the dominant ideology in any era is the idea of the ruling class. Cultural, educational-legal and political institutions as the superstructure of specific forms of social consciousness such as religious consciousness, They create moral, philosophical and cultural. The relationship between the substructure and the superstructure is dialectical and two-way. The superstructure is both a reflection of the substructure and a justification and continuation of it. The substructure determines the content and form of the superstructure (Suri, 2007:186).

Neo-Marxists, led by Immanuel Wallerstein, believe that the modern world order has shaped a specific culture. Throughout the historical evolution of this system, in view of the growth of new beliefs such as the legitimacy of political change and its acceptance as normal, as well as the legitimacy of popular sovereignty and the perception of these beliefs as dangerous, it has transformed into democratization, which appears in the system's response in three areas: 1. The invention of ideologies; 2. The triumph of scientism; and 3. The suppression of social movements that form in the face of the world order. That is, anti-world order movements are centered around a kind of contradiction between universalism on the one hand and the particularistic aspects of cultural racism within which the world order operates (Mashirzadeh, 2005:201).

Wallerstein has presented two definitions and applications of culture in his book "Politics and Culture in the Changing World Order; Geopolitics and Geoculture":

1. Culture is a set of values, customs, and It is a formality that distinguishes one society from another. .
- 2 Culture is a set of phenomena within which some concepts and values (the social system and Western culture) are superior to other phenomena (the system and values of surrounding countries). In this application, culture becomes an ideological cover to justify the capitalist system and the ruling class and to help reproduce and resolve its internal contradictions.

In fact, Wallerstein considers culture to be a battleground of conflicting interests within the framework of the capitalist system (Wallerstein, 2005: 31-95).

Antoniocracy, also from a Marxist perspective, considers culture and ideology to be the main factor in the continuation of hegemony or domination, which leads to the self-knowledge of the hegemonic power. He considers any change in the field of international relations to be the result of changes in the basic social and cultural relations and emphasizes the role of intellectuals in educating the masses and weakening hegemonic norms and concepts (Cox, 2006: 205-233).

In general, in Marxism, culture is a material force that is influenced by the socially organized production of material conditions of existence. Marxism He tries to explain this relationship with the metaphor of superstructure and infrastructure. Here, the material mode of production is considered as the "real



expression" of cultural superstructures, and the intention is that economic matters determine the cultural sector.

5 Culture and Postmodernism

Postmodernism, which is also known by other terms, such as transmodernism, transmodernism, and, is also known by it. In terms of definition, it faces numerous differences among theorists and it is therefore impossible to provide a comprehensive and coherent definition of these terms.

That is why some consider postmodernism neither a school nor a leader, nor an artistic organization, nor one that has a specific vision, theoretician, and a single speaker. This characteristic is the reason why postmodernist ideas have been drawn from various sources, from philosophy to history and linguistics, social studies, psychology, and political science. Therefore, it can be observed that sometimes its meaning in one field and context does not coincide with its meanings in other fields (Qarabaghi, 2001:101).

However, despite the floating and anarchic nature of this type of thinking, it should be said that this term increasingly refers to the general meaning of the word in recent decades, with the end of the heyday of modernism and its decline after its peak in the twentieth century.

In this way, in a general view, postmodernism is It is a complex, ambiguous, diverse and multifaceted entity and an influential and powerful cultural, political and intellectual current; whose main characteristic is the challenge to the science and reason of modernity and the doctrines of the modern world and its grand narratives, and the criticism and objection to its consequences and critical achievements (Qarabaghi, 2001:103). Postmodernism is a broad set of perspectives that Rather than reforming many traditional ways of looking at the world, they seek to subvert them. This theory was developed in the second half of the twentieth century by philosophers such as Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Jean-François Lyotard, and Jacques Lacan.

Postmodernism is the belief that there is no final arbiter of truth. From the perspective of postmodernism, human values, beliefs, and behaviors vary according to broader cultural and social conditions; Because there is no characteristic or value that has a general and universal application, under these conditions, the behavior and actions of individuals and specific values can only be understood and judged according to specific meanings (Qavam, 2005: 199).

These theorists deny the idea that human knowledge and awareness of the social world can produce certainties about the world, can reach objective realities, can end up with universal claims. Because There is no external validity for knowledge claims, and one can construct a set of true beliefs based on more fundamental statements that are not subject to doubt.

Furthermore, they emphasize the role of language, while criticizing the neo-religious individual's ideas about knowledge. Language, they say, is not a neutral and impartial tool that we use to convey realities outside ourselves—objects—but an activity It is a society that to some extent constitutes the social world (Chernov, 2009: 319).

From the point of view of many postmodern theorists, human nature is shaped by social conditions. In principle, there is no new reality about the world, but rather values and cultures that influence human interpretations and explanations of the world; in this regard, postmodernism does not consider human nature to be unchanging.

According to these approaches, human values, beliefs, and behaviors differ across broader cultural and social spaces and cannot be generalized. In this way, the behavior and actions of individuals, as well as specific values, can only be understood and judged according to specific cultural meanings and contexts



(Qavam, 2005: 127-128). Therefore, the central point of the postmodernist cultural approach is to question the concept of world culture as a meta-narrative consisting of a set of values, beliefs, and patterns of behavior in the form of a homogeneous worldview. In other words, following the occurrence of information and communication in the early 1980s, as a result of the expansion of various global processes such as international relations, we have to face the phenomenon of fragmentation and multi-ethnicity of national culture, diversity and multiplicity and cultural mixing (Chopani, 2009: 168-169).

According to this view, the liberal culture of the West is considered only one narrative among other narratives. Therefore, it can no longer claim an inclusive and trans-narrative world. Because the nature of the world Today, due to the astonishing turn of various cultural phenomena, it has undergone fundamental changes.

It has now been almost three decades since the order defined by modernists and supporters of the school of reconstruction has been transformed into a disorderly, orderly system due to some global developments.

Jim George says in his global discourses in this field: Ethnic, religious, racial, cultural, moral, sexual, environmental, economic, Class, development, human rights, etc., in the 1990s have shown the inadequacy of general science plans and theories for implementing control and creating order (Bozregi, 1998: 244).

On the one hand, the failure of the one-dimensional and exclusive approach of the Reformation to achieving development in Third World societies fully prepared the ground for the rise of religious movements and religious revivalism in the form of the process of de-secularization of the world during the two decades of the 1980s and 1990s, and on the other hand, with the end of the Cold War, we witnessed a world that suddenly became home to new nationalisms in regions such as the Balkans, Africa, and the Caucasus.

It is clear that postmodernists such as James Derrian and Jim George see all these developments as a sign of the failure of general and positivist theories of a world order. According to Derrian, the world is a text that is itself composed of intertextual relations. Each text has its own meaning and implies a significant set of language, experiences, history, memories, beliefs, and values (Der Derian, 1989:1-3). As a result of such a perception of the text, it can be said that each text will be the home of a culture.

Identity is formed in the shadow of intertextuality on the principle of “exchange” and not in isolation, confrontation, or transcendence of the expansion of various transnational flows such as interethnic and transnational migration from one country to another. On the other hand, the development of the global communications network has not only given old and worn-out identities the opportunity to be re-presented and refined, but also led to the emergence of new identities in the form of migration of various ethnic groups.

The result of such a transformation is that today, national cultures have become fragmented, diverse, and mixed. In this context, one can no longer witness the superiority of One narrative was over another; for none of them has absolute principles. The circulation of cultural phenomena and their reproduction in an intertextual framework is the most fundamental characteristic of a postmodern culture.

Moreover, the globalization of culture, from the postmodernist point of view, does not mean the domination of one culture over other cultures - as Western liberal culture claims - but rather the interaction Cultural discourse is a process of mixing and interaction.

Global culture can also be understood and understood in such a way (Chopani, 2009:170). In general, it should be said that, especially with regard to the postmodernist approach to culture, it is difficult to draw any conclusions due to the existence of different and ambiguous views in it; in such a way that it is practically impossible to lump the views of the different faces of this approach into one.



However, despite the existence of ambiguities and dispersion in different views Postmodern thought seems to have a special talent for explaining cultural phenomena due to its permissive and pluralistic nature.

6 Culture and Critical Theory

Critical theory in its general sense encompasses a wide range of theories opposing the mainstream, including world theory, postmodernism, poststructuralism, feminism, and neo-Marxism, and in its specific sense includes views influenced by the Frankfurt School Antonio Gramsci, Jürgen Habermas, Max Horkheimer, and Theodor Adorno (Mashirzadeh, 2005:213)

Roots of the emergence of critical theory should be sought in the efforts of German neo-Marxist thinkers. Adorno was one of the theorists who founded his school in 1923 in Frankfurt, Germany, at the Institute for Social Studies and Research of the University of Frankfurt. The Frankfurt School, for the purpose of researching Marxist ideas and the conditions of weakness and decline of labor movements and the absence of Socialist revolutions were created in the post-World War I era.

The researchers of the Frankfurt School did not remain loyal to the economic tradition of Marxism and its emphasis on the economy, and their emphasis was more on the superstructure or culture itself. Gradually, the Frankfurt School turned to the critique of bourgeois culture and thought and the process of rationalization of the new society.

As a result, he distanced himself from political economic and historical analyses in Marx's own style. The main theme of the works of the school's writers was the philosophical critique of capitalism, positivism, and bourgeois culture (Beshiriyeh, 1999:169-170).

The important theories of the Frankfurt School regarding culture were first presented in the writings of Adorno and Horkheimer. In their article entitled "Cultural Industries and Mass Culture," they argue that cultural industries are a new part of the industry of information institutions. Media, such as radio, the press, and cinema, are used to serve the interests of industrialists.

In their view, culture serves the interests of industrialists by creating wider commercial markets and political coherence. They believe that the emergence of mass culture is the result of the mass production of cultural industries by monopoly capitalism. Adorno and Horkheimer see the cultural industry as one of The most important features of the era of instrumental rationality have been described.

In their view, the main function of the cultural industry in the era of advanced capitalism is to eliminate any possibility of fundamental opposition to the established power. A society that is caught in this cultural industry has lost any power to liberate itself (Bashiriya, 2009: 185).

They emphasize propaganda in the cultural industry and believe that, That is the peak of advertising in the cultural industry, that consumers feel compelled to buy and consume the products of this industry. In their view, in such a fabricated space, the working class will not be a revolutionary class, and the happiness, well-being, and joy that exist are false and illusory, and because they are the product of the capitalist economy and state, they do not bring true freedom (Beshiriyeh, 2009:201).

Antonio Gramsci is one of the important theorists in critical theory. Gramsci emphasizes the independent role of politics and culture in the power of the state and also in organizing public opposition to it. He Emphasizing the importance of cultural superstructures and the separation of "civil society" from "political society" or the state, he emphasized the special role of the state in cultural hegemony. By emphasizing cultural hegemony or hegemony in the analysis of culture, Gramsci believes that the state, by using cultural hegemony, also acquires the possibilities of coercion and consolidates its power (Chernov, 2009: 352-354)



The theories of the writers of the Critical School, regarding international hegemony, are mostly inspired by the writings of Gramsci. For these writers, international hegemony is a type of political, economic and cultural structure that establishes itself through the transmission of ideas, symbols, values, patterns and to their people. Considering these issues, it can be said that in critical theory the concept of culture is linked to the concepts of power and hegemony.

In the opinion of critical writers, the transfer of cultural symbols and values from the ruling classes to other classes leads to the continuation of power and hegemony in the domestic and international arenas, because the oppressed and dominated classes accept and internalize these symbols and values, and in this situation, the possibility of revolution (liberation) against the ruling capitalist classes and industrial owners becomes difficult (Bayat, :2009:44)

Return to normative ethics in international relations is considered one of the main features of critical theory. Reducing global inequalities, establishing international justice, respecting diversity, pluralism, and differences are among the points considered by critical theorists in the possibilities of international change.

At the same time, attention should be paid to the cultural position of individuals and the fact that their interests and goals are socially defined. Attention should also be paid to the relationship between Morality and power: This issue is important for critical theorists who ask how to hope for a change in the existing situation in a world that is culturally and value-diverse, and then how to achieve general and universally accepted moral principles in order to replace it with a new order (Moshirzadeh, 2005: 239). Considering these theories, it can be said that in critical theory, culture is associated with the homogenization of societies and Accepting the existing authority will allow the current situation and conditions to continue, and conflicts and differences will not arise in the international arena due to the unification of values and symbols. Although critical theory emphasizes power and class struggle, it can be concluded that in their view, this existing cultural trend leads to a reduction in objections and, as a result, conflicts in the international arena. Therefore, in critical theory, culture, on the one hand, causes conflicts (due to the self-creation of alienation in the ruling classes) and, on the other hand, is a basis for change in the field of international relations, which, according to some critical theorists, will be accompanied by violence.

7 Culture and Structuralism

Structuralism, which has been translated and termed under other names such as structuralism or structuralism in Persian, was a new approach that was proposed in the field of political science and international relations in the last decade of the twentieth century. Thinkers of this school of thought criticized and evaluated both neoliberal and neorealist perspectives from an epistemological and ontological perspective.

The main idea of structuralism is that chaos in international relations is caused by the diversity and multiplicity of norms, values, and beliefs (Kazemi, 2001:226). Structuralism has been proposed in international relations in sociology and meta-theoretical discussions in all social sciences, and its roots in sociology can be traced to the Chicago School and phenomenology. From an epistemological perspective, structuralism is a learning theory It is rooted in psychological philosophy (Bashir, 2007:15-16).

This theory pays special attention to the role of “state identity” in foreign policy. This theory focuses on the role of the conscious and interactive dimensions of human behavior, that is, “the ability and interest of people to have a considered view of the world and to perceive it with importance” in international life.

This ability creates social realities whose existence Based on human agreements about their existence, and their survival requires the formation of human institutions. For example: money, property rights, governance, marriage and festivals. (Structuralists believe that actors have identities and interests that are based on social construction. They also share in all the mental factors that are rooted in other people - as



cultural beings - (Ruggie, 1998: 855-885). Organization, identity, norms, and culture play an important role in global politics. The identities and interests of states are created by norms, interactions, and cultures, and it is this process that determines the subject of state interaction (Bayat, 2009:46). Based on this view, the sources of change in international relations are also changes in beliefs and identities (Suri, 2007:191).

Structuralism was first known by the name of Alexander Wente. Prominent structuralist thinkers in international relations include: Warnig, Michel Barnett, Nicholas Onf, Kratochvil, and Jean Raggi pointed out. Alexander Wente states in the social theory of international politics: Culture is something more than a set of shared ideas that individuals hold in their minds and is a phenomenon that is maintained in a “shared” form and is therefore inherently a public phenomenon.

Within the limits of this view, the realization of specific beliefs is sufficient to realize a particular form of culture in a specific situation. may not be necessary. Contrary to this shared knowledge, there are collective cognitive structures and behavioral patterns that these structures shape (Wendt, 2005:239).

Kratochvil, as one of the thinkers of organization, emphasizes the role of rules and norms in constructing international political life. He emphasizes “language games” and believes that they are defined in terms of rules and norms. According to Kratochvil, games create inter-verbal meanings and players establish relationships within the framework of these meanings. According to him, different understandings of reality can be resolved and separated by continuous interactions of mutual understanding.

Cooperation under the ownership of common rules can be seen among the players, but if these different understandings remain, cooperation will not be possible (Moshirzadeh, 2005:49). Nicholas Onoff, another follower of the constructivist school, explains the relationship between individuals in society with each other in the light of the theory of social interaction as follows: Constructivism discusses humans and societies, arguing that humans build societies based on They create actions themselves and shape societies of individuals, and individuals identify each other in the form of the same actions (Bashir, 2007:182).

From the perspective of structuralists, all human activities in international relations and foreign policy are understood in terms of the meaning that individuals give to the world, and all concepts are socially constructed. Therefore, the distinction between material interests and meaning is meaningless, and material resources without discourses and structures of meaning that It gives meaning to the actions and goals of the players, it is not comprehensible. In other words, they place the players in a social structure that both constructs the players and constrains their behavior. And is itself constructed by the players' interactions (Farrell. 2002: 49-72) In summary, cultural factors from a structuralist perspective affect the field of international relations in several ways (Vahidi, 2008: 155-156).

- Culture helps to structure the international system and foreign policy objectives.
- Provides various alternatives for organizing the international system.
- Constructs the ethnic, national, political, and linguistic identities of international actors.
- Shapes the goals of actors and the methods of achieving them.
- Influences the perceptions and actions of actors.
- Helps to understand international relations and foreign policy.

Within the framework of structural analysis, international politics cannot be reduced to a series of rational interactions and behaviors and to purely material and institutional frameworks at the national and international levels. Because the interactions of states are not shaped by a series of established national



interests; rather, over time, they take shape as a kind of behavioral pattern through identities or cause the formation of identities (Bayat, 2009:46).

In general, with the emphasis that structuralists place on the role of culture in international relations, they conclude that without paying attention to the standardizing global political culture, the high stability of the state system and the reduction in the diversity of political forms cannot be explained.

Structuralists state that chaos and the chaos that dominates international relations is the result of the diversity and multiplicity of norms, values, and beliefs. In other words, as long as we live in a diverse environment with different cultures, this chaos should not be surprising.

8 English Culture and School

The English School refers to a group of works and writers who, in their understanding of international relations, consider it, beyond an international system, as a “complex community of states and believe in the importance of its common goals, rules, institutions, values, and norms” (Moshirzadeh: 2005: 137-139).

What is interesting about the theory of international society, which is sometimes called the English School, is that It is noteworthy that this approach is one of the few areas in the field of international relations in which the idea of "culture" in international relations has taken a special place.

For scholars who have adopted the international community approach, international politics is more than relations between states. In their view, states form a society with laws and norms, and the ideas that underpin this society are "culture." (Reeves, 2008:184)

Prominent researchers of the international community believe that a community of states emerges when a group of states become aware of certain common interests and values and, as a result, form a community, through which they feel bound by a series of rules in their relations with each other and, at the same time, participate in working with common institutions.

Of course, achieving this situation is possible under conditions where governments are aware of common interests and values. Accordingly, the international community's approach to formally recognizing the separate sovereignty of states, norms, institutions, and common interests is considered to be the foundation of international relations (Qavam, 2004:8). In other words, the English school focuses on the intangible and discursive dimensions of international relations, emphasizes the role of culture, norms, and rules, a historical and interpretive perspective on international "reality," and avoids value judgments. In the study of international relations, it emphasizes the normative dimensions of international politics (Moshirzadeh, 2004:187).

The English school is known by the names of writers such as Martin White, Hadley Ball, John Vincent, Barry Buzan, and Herbert Butterfield. Below, the views of the first three writers on culture are discussed to clarify the place of culture in this school and its role in international relations.

Martin White, He believed in the existence of an international community. In his view, international community is more than just relations between states and includes international relations that are more or less stable, reciprocal, and organized. In his book *The System of States*, Wight wrote: “It must be borne in mind that a system of states cannot be formed without some degree of cultural solidarity among its members” (Wight, 1977:33).

Two Questions Regarding Society Internationalism is assumed to be self-evident: First, that international society is maintained by the culture existing at the international level, and second, that culture is prior to society. White writes: “The system of states has a common culture” (Reeves, 2008: 192-193).



White's conception of the international community sought to draw commonalities out of the existing diversity and to present them at the international level. In his thinking, culture gave meaning to unity at the international level and was something more than a simple means of fostering mutual understanding.

The issues that White raised in relation to culture in the international community He made the subject clearer to his successors, Hadley Ball and Arjie Vincent. And culture acquired for them a more clearly anthropological character. Perhaps more than any other theorist of the international community, Hadley Ball considered culture a distinct entity. He says: "It is through the culture of a society that we understand the basic system of values from which thought and action flow." We understand. (Bull, 1995:65)

Bull, unlike Martin White, had an embodied view of the subject of culture, and for Bull, culture has the characteristics of homogeneity, consensus and cohesion, unity, contrast, meaning and environmental algebra. Most importantly, "culture" has considerable significance at the national level and is a matter of ethnic identity. In this context, Boole's work reflects, more than anything else, changes in the "conditions of work," and his book confirms that these changes manifest themselves in quite specific ways in the field of international relations.

Bull's best-known work is "The Anarchic Society: A Study of Order in World Debates." The book begins with analytical discussions and then proceeds to examine current issues in international relations, including diplomacy, war, great powers, law, and the balance of power. In a section of *The Anarchic Society*, Boole states: While modern international society—especially at the present time—is culturally heterogeneous; Stateless Bedouin societies enjoy a high degree of homogeneity.

It is through the culture of a society that we understand the meaning of its underlying system of values, from which thought and action flow. Bedouin societies seem to be built on a shared culture, and even stateless societies are remarkably dependent on this shared culture (Bull, 1995: 18). It is clear that Bull, much like White, accepted the idea of an international community as identifiable by shared values, laws, institutions, and interests, as distinct from mere interstate relations.

However, In *Anarchic Society*, Boole did not simply explain the difference between system and society; he also spoke of the commonalities in this theory. Arjie Vincent is one of the few theorists in the field of international relations who has explicitly discussed issues related to the anthropological conception of culture in the theory of international society.

In contrast to the precedent of the field of international relations, which is often concerned with power relations and interests, National security was concerned. Vincent has examined some of the issues that have gained importance in the post-Cold War era. In his most famous work, *Human Rights and International Relations*, Vincent analyzes various theories of human rights and discusses at least some of the vital rights before other forms of rights.

Furthermore, Vincent explicitly discusses issues related to local perceptions of culture in comparison to what he calls "global culture." In this work, he explicitly defined culture within an anthropological and materialist framework. (Vincent, 1985-1995: 50)

The salient point in Vincent's work is that he re-examines the idea of an international "common culture" that was first expressed in White's work as a sign of international community. Vincent referred to this common culture as "world culture or homeland world." While Boole attempted to understand the essential content of this conception of international culture, repeatedly questioning its content and changing the language of culture to that of pluralism and integration, Vincent investigated the theoretical details of the nature of international culture.



Although Vincent did not simply follow the cultural anthropologists, he accepted their framework of thought regarding culture, and it was clear that this would create specific problems for this theory of international relations (Reeves, 2008:213). Considering the theories of White, Bull, and Vincent, it can be said that, from the point of view of the scholars of the English School, international politics is something more than relations between states.

In their view, states form a society with laws and norms, and the ideas that support this society are “culture.” In this school, the concept of culture has a social and normative content. Also, in this theory, culture is considered as the basis for the international community. Culture in this theory is not “our” culture in the national sense; rather, it is something that all countries or a number of countries, as parts of system, are involved in it. In general, the characteristics of this school can be summarized as follows:

1. The research orientation and the resulting theoretical implications for the formation of a middle ground.
 2. The primary interest in explaining culture as a space in which power and resistance play a role, and a strong emphasis on the authority of culture.
 3. Providing a clear understanding of the connections between meaning and power in the international structure.
 4. Having the ability to establish joint interactions between objective and subjective factors (Suri, 2007:190)
- Regarding the role that the English school gives to culture in international politics, it should be said that the theorists of this school pay attention to both the negative and positive effects of culture; that is, in their opinion, if cultural differences and distinctions are emphasized and common values in the international community become more limited, culture It can challenge peace, but by further promoting shared values and norms in the international community, it can consolidate peace and prevent war.

Conclusion

In this paper, an attempt has been made to study and examine the place and role of culture in international relations theories such as realism, neorealism, liberalism, neoliberalism, Marxism, postmodernism, critical school, structuralism, and the English school. A reflection on the presented material reveals that different theories in international relations each have a different view of the category of culture, and the type of view of each of these approaches leads to different perceptions and results. Sub-theorists have also theorized as social individuals under the influence of culture and their own cultural perspective.

Basically, mainstream theories of international relations (realism and liberalism) consider the cultural factor to be more related to the internal affairs of countries, which has no impact on foreign policy, and usually the leaders of countries do not sacrifice their material interests for cultural factors. Since human needs are hierarchical, interests and security have been fixed priorities of the system, but culture has changed and there is no uniform perception of it at different times.

In their view, when there is a conflict between cultural and material interests, states prefer material interests, and this is a kind of rational choice. The second group of theories of international relations, namely the non-mainstream currents, especially Marxist, postmodern and critical theories, believe that culture functions as a tool in the service of the world capitalist system.

Marxists believe that the world capitalist system is a means of production It has culture at its disposal, and culture, as one of the basic forms, is in the service of the ideology that dominates the international system, which creates a cultural framework for the mentality of the international community. Regarding the postmodernist approach to culture, it is also difficult to draw any conclusions due to the existence of fragmented and ambiguous theories in it. In general, from the perspective of this approach, world culture is



not based on a single meta-narrative but rather a fragmented and fragmented culture. The critical school also believes that a culture of the capitalist international community mentality is dominated by other cultures by the dominant forces and that the way out is to return to a normative morality through intercultural dialogue in international relations.

The third group of theories of international relations, namely the interdisciplinary perspective of international relations, namely the English school and the structuralist theory, use normative elements in addition to material factors in the theory of processing, analysis, and synthesis of international relations, and believe that without paying attention to normative-cultural factors, we will not achieve the necessary knowledge of the international value. Based on the above data, it was observed that culture has different characteristics in different approaches to international relations and it is not possible to make a general judgment about the role of culture in theorizing international relations.

Another point that can be mentioned about the relationship between culture and international relations is the increasing attention paid to the category of culture in recent theories of international relations, and the interdisciplinary studies in this field have been increasing day by day over the past few decades. Therefore, the role of cultural elements in the theorizing of international relations cannot be ignored, either explicitly or in the essence of international relations theories.

References

- Bull, Hedley (1995). *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*, Columbia University Press
- Cox, Robert. (2006) "The Book, Gramsci, Conquest and International Relations: A Discourse on Method", translated by Alireza Tayeb, in the book: *Basic Concepts of International Relations, Marxism Volume*, Publisher. Tehran: Office of Political and International Studies. For access: <https://tinyurl.com/mrxak89c>
- Der Derian, James y Shapiro, Michael J. (Eds.) (1989). *International / Intertextual Relations: Postmodern Readings of World Politics*, Lexington, MA: Lexington Books
- Farrell, Theo (2002). "Constructivist Security Studies, Portrait of a Research Program", *International Studies Review*, 4: 1.
- Kazemi, Ali Asghar. (2001) Book, *Globalization of Culture and Politics*, Publisher. Tehran: Qoms. For access: <https://lib.ut.ac.ir/site/catalogue/79193>
- Kollner, Douglas. (2005) "Cultural Marxism and Cultural Studies", translated by Vahid Valizadeh, publisher. Tehran, *Political Economy Quarterly*, No. 10, Winter. For access: <https://www.magiran.com/paper/citation?ids=293415>
- Lamy, Stephen L. (2004) "Contemporary and New Approaches: Neorealism and Neoliberalism", in: Bliss, John and Smith, Steve, *The Globalization of Politics: International Relations in the Modern Age*, translated by Abolghasem Rah Chamni and others, Tehran: Abrar Cultural Institute for Contemporary Studies and Research, Tehran.
- Mashirzadeh, Humaira. (2004) "Transtheoretical Foundations of the English School in International Relations", *Journal of Law and Politics Research*, Year 6, Issue 12, Fall and Winter. 166-192. For access: <https://tinyurl.com/4dm6ar5k>
- Mashirzadeh, Humaira. (2005) Book, *Developments in International Relations Theories*, Publisher: Tehran: Samat. For access: <https://tinyurl.com/39axs73c>



- Micheal, G.N. (1989). *International Cultural Relations*, London, Allenand Unwin Publishers.
- Morgenthau, Hans. J. (1995) *The Book of International Politics*, translated by Humaira Mashirzadeh, publisher. Tehran: Office of Political and International Studies, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. For access: <https://tinyurl.com/3w87afx8>
- Nye, Joseph. (2008) *The Book of Power*, soft copy, translated by Mehdi Zolfaghari and Seyyed Mohsen Rouhani, publisher. Tehran: Imam Sadeq University (RA). For access: <https://tinyurl.com/42t7u8bx>
- Qavam, Abd al-Ali (2005) "Culture: The Forgotten Part or the Intrinsic Element of International Relations", Tehran, *Foreign Policy Journal*, 19th Year, Summer 2005. For access: <https://tinyurl.com/8xfa9r8m>
- Qavam, Abd al-Ali (2005); *Book, International Relations: Theories and Approaches*, Publisher. Tehran: Samt. For access: <https://tinyurl.com/7239d88k>
- Qavam, Abd al-Ali. (2004) "Analysis of the International Celestial System within the Framework of the International Community Approach", Publisher. *Journal of Law and Politics Research*, Year 6, Issue 12, Fall and Winter. From 5 to 14. For access: <https://tinyurl.com/ywwthyhs>
- Ruggie, J (1998). "What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-Utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge", *International Organization*, 52. 4 Autumn 1998.
- Vahidi, Musa al-Reza. (2008) "Theoretical Analysis of the Impact of Culture on Foreign Policy", Publisher. *Specialized Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, Year 1, Issue 2, Spring. For access: http://fp.ipisjournals.ir/issue_1640_1661.html
- Vincent, R.J. (1986/1995). *Human Rights and International Relations*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press in Association With The Royal Institute of International Affairs.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. (2005) *Book, Politics and Culture in the Changing World System (Geopolitics and Geoculture)*, translated by Pirouz Ezdi, publisher. Tehran: Ney Publishing. For access: <https://tinyurl.com/35fvfv58>
- Waltz, Kenneth N. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*, NewYork, MC Graw Hill.
- Wendt, Alexander. (2005) *Book, Social Theory of International Politics*, translated by Humaira Mosheerzadeh, publisher. Tehran: Office of Political and International Studies. For access: <https://lib.ut.ac.ir/site/catalogue/1196305>
- Wight, Martine (1977). *System of States*, Leicester, Leicester University Press in Association with the London School of Economic and Political Science.

Received: 03.29.2025

Revised: 04.01.2025

Accepted: 04.08.2025

Published: 04.10.2025



This is an open access article under the
Creative Commons Attribution 4.0
International License

Euro-Global Journal of Linguistics and Language Education
Vilnius, Lithuania