

2 Culture

*“Die Grenzen meiner Sprache sind die grenzen meiner Welt”
“The limits of my language are the limits of my world”
(Ludwig Wittgenstein, Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus, 5.6)*

2.1 The Concept of ‘Culture’ in Different Disciplines

Many disciplines reflect on the concept of ‘culture’. The term itself, in Latin initially referring to agriculture (from ‘colere’) and indicating the cultivating of crops, was used in a figurative meaning for the first documented time by Cicero, in his *Tusculanae Disputationes*: he makes a comparison between agriculture and philosophy and especially refers to philosophical education:¹⁰. To give a satisfying overview of the term ‘culture’ in different disciplines as it is used today, though, would be an overwhelming task: already back in 1952, for example, anthropologists Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952: 11-73) reviewed and classified 156 possible definitions of ‘culture’. Interestingly, many scholars tackling ‘culture’ are *they* themselves the result of more than one academic career (Geert Hofstede, for instance, is an engineer who wrote his doctoral thesis in social psychology) – fact that could speak for the inherent interdisciplinarity of the idea of culture itself. Below, some relevant references on ‘culture’ from different disciplines useful for the present study are listed in alphabetical order.

2.1.1 Communication Science

Over the last decades, communication scientists have devolved an increasing amount of attention to cultural issues. Especially the concepts of media, cultures and communication cultures are being increasingly used (see Chapter 4). All approaches, here and in other disciplines, have in common the awareness about the polysemy of the term ‘culture’. On the one hand, ‘culture’ can refer to social groupings that constitute e.g. a national community (we will call this for the moment the ‘large’ acceptation of the term). On the other hand, ‘culture’ may be intended as

10 “(...) a field, although it may be naturally fruitful, cannot yield a harvest without cultivation, so neither can the mind without education; such is the weakness of either without the other. Whereas philosophy is the culture of the mind: this it is which plucks up vices by the roots; prepares the mind for the receiving of seeds; commits them to it, or, as I may say, sows them, in the hope that, when come to maturity, they may bear abundant fruit” M.T. Cicero, *Tusculanae Disputationes*, Liber Secundus, XIII (Cicero 45bC).

‘practice’, and can therefore group smaller social entities according to some kind of practices or identities they share (‘small’ acceptance). Hepp (2008: 185ff, and 2006) prefers the second acceptance and places the stress on the concept of transcultural communication, since in his view focussing on national borders, and examining the communication between different cultures intended in the ‘large’ sense, is a limitation.

Transcultural communication is a concept that often refers to the second mentioned meaning of ‘culture’, the one current German-speaking communication science scholars often tend to privilege: Berkowitz (2010: XVff), for instance, gives an overview of the way news can be examined by looking at their cultural meaning, and again ‘culture’ is intended in the ‘small’ acceptance. Weßler also adopts a related perspective especially in relation to Europe and to the role the media may have with respect to European ‘Öffentlichkeit’ or to the trans-nationalisation of cultures and identities (Weßler 2004; Schultz and Weßler 2005, especially 354ff). Interestingly, when defining the chosen approach to the term ‘culture’, most communication science investigations, before opting for the ‘small’ meaning of ‘culture’, still deal beforehand with the ‘large’ meaning and define it, often by explaining how “cultures all differ from each other because of how they have been impacted by historical, political, economic, religious, and other factors” (Berkowitz 2010: XV). Hanitzsch (2007: 165ff), for instance, reviews different approaches to comparing journalistic cultures and gives a good overview of the possibility to use both the ‘small’, the ‘large’ and other acceptations of the ‘culture’ term. Löffelholz (2002: 190-191, as quoted in Hahn 2008: 32) leaves out non-societal factors and articulates ‘culture’ as – among others – deriving from communication and being therefore the result of a social process.

On the other hand, Kleinsteuber seems to prefer the ‘large’ acceptance of the term and points out how the comparative perspective within communication science consists in “looking at different cultures and thereby discover different ways of dealing with similar themes (...), a task which can only be mastered with a high multi-cultural sensibility” (2003: 100).

2.1.2 Cultural Studies and Cultural Anthropology

The work by Marvin Harris represents the perspective of cultural materialism, and addresses a definition of cultures by examining the natural, geographical and contingent circumstances under which cultures have developed. Harris indirectly gives a definition of culture, resumed from a 1750 work of French statesman Anne Robert Jacques Turgot, where the following statement describes “the man” (as quoted in Jenks 1993: 15): “Possessor of a treasure of signs, which he has the faculty of multiplying into infinity, he (man) is able to assure the retention of his acquired ideas, to communicate them to other men, and to transmit them to his successors

as a constantly expanding heritage” (Harris 2001a). In Harris’ view, “human social life is a response to the practical problems of earthly existence” (Harris 2001b: XV), and ‘culture’ “refers to the learned repertory of thoughts and actions exhibited by members of social groups” (47). He defines as ‘infrastructure’ for the development of cultures the “principal interface between culture and nature, the boundary across which ecological, chemical, and physical restraints to which human action is subject interact with the principal sociocultural practices aiming at overcoming or modifying those restraints” (57). The restraints are “ultimately based on laws of nature that can never be altered” (quoted in Nyerges 1997: 3).

Disciplines like cultural studies and cultural anthropology often underline the origin of cultures in the natural factors that have played a role in their development. Still, it is not rare for cultural studies scholars to enclose that perspective into a bigger idea of culture. Stuart Hall, for example, acknowledges that cultural studies may be a biased discipline from the very start (in his case, through the British perspective): “what we have to say comes out of particular histories and cultures and (...) everyone speaks from positions within the global distribution of power” (as quoted in Stratton and Ang 1996: 388). The position of contextualist cultural studies is also worth mentioning: this specific approach reflects on the overlapping between culture and nation, and “does not take for granted a world geography divided into discrete, contiguous national spaces”, therefore “the space of the national is a porous, perhaps precarious organization of economic, demographic and cultural flows that must constantly be redefined and reinforced in the midst of a fluid geography” (Crofts Wiley 2004: 90).

2.1.3 *Linguistics*

In linguistics, the emphasis is rather placed on the first acceptance of the term culture. ‘Intercultural’, more often than ‘transcultural’ communication, is referred to. Relevant in this respect is the research by Adrian Holliday (2011): it is him differentiating between a ‘large’ and a ‘small’ acceptance of the term ‘culture’, referring the first one to the broad understanding of a ‘culture’ in ‘hard’ terms indicating e.g. a nation, the second one to the border-blurred term indicating ‘softer’ cultures that can be found “in all types of social groupings, which may or may not have significant (...) national qualities” (Holliday 2004: 64). The adjective ‘intercultural’ more often than not deals with the ‘large’ meaning of the term. From a linguistic point of view, it is a logical way of dealing with the term, especially regarding Europe: the borders between European languages have a lot to do with the borders between European countries, so the perspective is justified. The same assumptions are shared by Fred Jandt, who deals with intercultural communication by referring to culture in the ‘large’ acceptance of the term and regarding all remaining meanings as examples of ‘sub-cultures’ (2004: 20ff). The view that often

couples culture and linguistic relativity is situated in the tradition that goes back to Johann Gottfried Herder (1764 and 1772), Wilhelm von Humboldt (1820, 1806, 1836-39) and Ludwig Wittgenstein (op.cit.), and also to the research carried out by Sapir and Whorf, who hypothesised that people are at the “mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression of their society” (Sapir 1985: 162), so language is a filter between individuals and their environment and there is a systematic relationship between the categories and words available in a language and how the people live experience and conceive the world.

2.1.4 Political Science

Political science scholars tend to rather deal with the concepts of identity, community, or nation and sometimes delineate the differences between those terms and the term ‘culture’ in the ‘large’ acceptation, or embed the concept of culture into those terms. “Cultural identities are only one of several possibilities to ‘identify’ oneself; other possibilities of identification are e.g. gender or class. (...) Cultural identity building was part of the process of national political identity building and devolved from the necessity to build up loyalty in a fragmented society”, states Mokre (2006)¹¹. ‘Culture’ can also be tackled e.g. as ‘political culture’; in this respect, the meaning of ‘culture’ as ‘practice’ is privileged. Sometimes, both acceptations overlap: the talk can be about ‘political culture’ as in the works of Jürgen Gebhardt, who investigated, among others, US political culture in several works at the end of the 1980s (Gebhardt 1986, 1987 and 1990) and of John Clark (2004), who examines the immigrant revolutionary political culture in mid 20th century New York. The talk about ‘culture’ in the ‘small’ meaning can also be about ‘public sphere culture’, or ‘gender culture’, to name but a few examples. Otherwise, the cultural variable can be examined as it influences politics and policies, as for instance Fischer and Hajer (1999) have done by looking at environmental politics.

11 She also quotes Gellner, according to whom “(...) the role of culture in human life was totally transformed by that cluster of economic and scientific changes which have transformed the world since the seventeenth century. The prime role of culture in agrarian society was to underwrite people’s status and people’s identity. Its role was really to embed their position in a complex, usually hierarchical and relatively stable structure. The world as it is now is one where people have no stable position or structure. They are members of ephemeral professional bureaucracies which are not deeply internalised and which are temporary. They are members of increasingly loose family associations. What really matters is their incorporation and their mastery of high culture; I mean a literate codified culture which permits context-free communication. Their membership of such a community and their acceptability in it, that is a nation”. Gellner 2005, consultable at <http://www.members.tripod.com/GellnerPage/Warwick2.html> as on 02.03.2011.

2.1.5 *Semiotics*

From a semiotic point of view, culture can be investigated by looking at it through four main paradigms; semiologist Peter Stockinger (2003) deals with intercultural communication, describes these different paradigms and highlights the scholarly approaches they respectively are derived from. 1) Culture as a frame to the world view of a community (an approach of Foucaultian origin, in his view); 2) Culture as a collective cognitive resource of a community, which is an idea influenced by Claude Lévi-Strauss; 3) Culture as a symbolic capital, as defined by Pierre Bordieu; 4) And, finally, culture as a historical entity changing through time, as regarded by Norbert Elias. Still, the idea that culture is ultimately based on common language, for example, is underlying his reflections: most examples of intercultural communication he provides not only regard different countries, but also countries where different languages are mainly spoken. In a way, it seems that there is some implicit assumption that distinct 'cultures' are first apparent only when differences between cultures in the 'large' sense emerge. Only then, other possible ways of defining 'culture' are elaborated.

2.1.6 *Sociology and Social Sciences*

British professor Chris Jenks, before turning to the social and anthropological implication of the subject, addresses 'culture' as a concept intertwined with the natural environment. He differentiates between 'civilization', etymologically deriving from 'civis' and referring to the urban self-awareness of ancient collectivities, and 'culture', term of agricultural origins. While 'civilisation' rather underlines the membership and status of those who belong to a specific group, "culture" bears "ideas of emergence and change, perhaps even transformation", so he concludes that sociologists and anthropologists use the term for "all that is symbolic: the learned, ideational aspects of human society" (Jenks 1993: 8). Jenks also looks at the current use in Europe of the two terms, which have been interchangeable until the advent of the German romantic idea of culture, seen as the highest human achievements and representing excellence in literature, music or arts. He categorises 'culture' in four acceptations, respectively referring to the cognitive, the collective, the descriptive and the social dimensions of the term.

Lacey and Longman (1997), on the other hand, adopt an education-focussed approach and study what they called "cultures of understanding and cultures of ignorance"¹². These two terms collocate information about environmental issues within the framework of the UN Earth Summit in 1992 and compare the UK and the US by looking at questionnaires and differences that emerged within readership

12 The title of their work is incidentally similar to that of this study, but the author only discovered it by chance in the year 2010.

groups of several media. Here, again, ‘large’ and ‘small’ meanings of ‘culture’ seem to overlap.

2.2 The Language Perspective in Defining ‘Culture’

In “The linguistic turn”, a work edited by Richard Rorty (1967), the American neopragmatist explains in an introduction titled “Metaphilosophical difficulties of linguistic philosophy” the philosophical consequences of the role played by the linguistic perspective on occidental thinking. The linguistic turn idea originated from the analytic philosophy in England at the beginning of the 20th century and was developed on the Continent by Ludwig Wittgenstein, who in his later works (Schulte 2001) stressed how language meaning just *is* the ordinary use of it, to put it with the easiest possible wording (Wittgenstein 1953: §138). Over the 20th century, increased travelling and globalisation made it possible for cultures and languages to get in touch with each other as it never had been even conceivable before.

Many philosophical currents arose from the linguistic turn or were implicitly influenced by the shift in perspective, ranging from structuralism and post-structuralism to pragmatism and neo-pragmatism. The present study was carried out in awareness of these currents, among others of the ordinary language philosophy school, a later development of Wittgenstein’s ideas. Possible applications of ordinary language philosophy ideas have been expressed in the last works of the philosopher Oswald Hanfling (2003), despite their being considered unfashionable among many academics (The Times Online 2005)¹³. For example, Hanfling’s approach facilitates and justifies this very study’s investigation on what ‘environment’ means in different cultures simply by looking at the use or the usage of the term in different cultures and what it is associated with, because he exemplifies the same concept by discussing the meaning of the word “cause” as opposed to “Ursache” in English and German (Hanfling 2003: 64-66). The theory also helps avoiding a position of essentialism, i.e. deterministically defining cultures as essential or immutable, precisely because of the role language has in looking at them.

Since the ‘linguistic turn’, many academics have been wearing the language spectacles: in differentiating cultures from each other and perceiving differences and similarities among them, language has always been playing a very relevant role. In this respect, the language analytical perspective, deals with an idea of communication pragmatically depending on language (for a recent example of language analysis applied to foreign policy, see Hellmann et al 2008). “(...) Cultural differences like cultural standards and stereotypes are articulated through the language, that is to say through communication, and lead to misunderstandings during pro-

13 The obituary of Oswald Hanfling on The Guardian also states the obsolescence of his theories: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/nov/29/guardianobituaries.obituaries> on 20.06.2008.

cesses of intercultural personal communication" (Hepp 2006: 58). Hepp, however, as mentioned above, does not seem to privilege an integration of the language and perspective into his idea of "translokale Vergemeinschaftungen" (something like 'trans-local communities'), and in a scheme for delineating them, omits language as a relevant factor, even in distinguishing territorially bound versus non territorially bound communities (283). He rather confines language to "intercultural personal communication", instead, and interestingly admits that "contrarily to English-speaking countries, (...) the linguistic-analytical approach has not established itself within the German communication and media science discourse" (60-61). In Germany, he points out, the language perspective would be rather dealt with from an anthropological point of view (61-62)¹⁴. Apropos anthropology, it is interesting how Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952: 95) also stated how culture, among others, can be made up of "speech-material traits". A statement that reminds of the linguistic approach mentioned above: "Culture is in language, and language is loaded with culture" (Agar 1994: 28).

2.3 Choosing a Definition of 'Culture': Some Philosophical Background

Two principal philosophical speculations have had an influence on the theoretical perspective of this analysis, together with the language perspective mentioned above. Below, some observations about them are made.

2.3.1 *Cultural Materialism*

The definition chosen for 'culture' not only is a result of the 'linguistic perspective', but also regards the territorial, physical aspect of cultures, the approach to defining culture as a result of naturally determined variables. This approach, the cultural materialistic one, has a long history in cultural anthropology and structuralism, for example. Marvin Harris and Karl August Wittfogel both tried to establish a link between natural conditions and political situation of a culture or civilization. Harris, with his much criticized Principle of Infrastructural Determinism, developed Marxist theories adding to the picture of how cultures developed also on the basis of environmental factors (Kuznar 2007: 7 or 199). Wittfogel, on the other hand, thought that the natural hindrances are the indirect first cause of the development of specific political and cultural patterns in some countries (he mainly looked at China and Russia and especially concentrated on the results of water distribution and so-called hydraulic empires, cf. Watté 1992).

14 There are of course several exceptions, among others the work by Josef Klein, who investigates political communication from a primarily linguistic perspective (in Jarren et al. 1998: 190ff in particular) and lists the possible ways of carrying out investigations from that perspective (for instance: analytically, classifyingly, etc.).

Cultural materialism approaches are more popular in natural science disciplines than in social sciences. Over the last years, however, due to the climate change debate, the increased role of climate issues in media and societies have been examined from several perspectives: paleo-ecologists, for instance, tackle the possible influence of climate on the development of human societies (as in the authors examined by Haberle and Chepstow, see Haberle 2000) or at least the correlation between the two; communication scientists, on the other hand, deal with how societies or media construct the climate discourse (as investigated, for instance, by the research cluster CLISAP in Hamburg)¹⁵. Shortly: on the one side, the focus is how nature determines culture, whereas on the other side, how culture determines nature. Sometimes it is referred to a pre-Kantian and post-Kantian way of looking at culture in this respect: culture used to be a completion of nature, a product of the rational qualities of humans. After Kant, it is rather the opposite: not culture is a completion to nature, but nature is a product of culture itself: “nature is only a phenomenon created by an *a priori* synthesis of impressions with the categories of the intellect. In this concept of nature, culture becomes an autonomous sphere in which we create values.” (Jaroszynski 2007: 219). Nature is useful for producing things, but its people who are “god” (220).

The idea that natural environments influence the development of social features of cultures was relevant for this study, because the reporting examined is about the environment itself. Also the different ways of communicating it, and ultimately the very languages describing it, could possibly be traced back to some ultimate material circumstances having an influence on that communication, e.g. when reflecting the importance of some media like the Internet or habits like the culture of reading newspapers in the North of Europe, the climate difference between the North and the South of Europe can possibly be taken into account as an additional feature of different readership or reporting patterns and of different media usage and production cultures in general. But the other side of the coin, where cultures construct how nature is perceived, had to be considered too. For this reason, the differentiation between nature and culture is now dealt with.

2.3.2 *The Nature-Culture Dichotomy*

Above, some acceptations of the term “culture” have been defined and the approach of cultural materialism has been mentioned. What are the consequences of choosing a definition of culture both depending on language and the natural environment? The first consequence is that, if culture is defined as determined by nature, culture and nature are something different from each other. The second con-

15 <http://www.klimacampus.de/media.html?&L=1> on 01.02.11.

sequence is that, if culture depends on language, the very terms 'nature' and 'culture' are culturally biased.

A short philosophical 'journey' helped the author realise the meta-reference of the study to the subject actually discussed, environment in the media. This journey started reflecting on the long-lasting discussion about the dichotomy between nature and culture, somehow intertwined with the study itself: comparing different cultures (people) and, within them, possibly different cultures (practices) of reporting the environment, required a clear mindset about not only what the borders between cultures are, but also about what the border between culture and nature for this study is (and whether there is one), since a 'socio-cultural practice'¹⁶ (the daily press) in different cultures dealing with natural phenomena' is the matter examined. The definition of 'environmental communication' and 'environmental themes' provided in the next chapters is artificial and had to reflect the nature-culture dichotomy: are news concerning demographic developments or human settlements environment-related news or not? If yes, is everything concerning humans environment-related? If not, where is the threshold between nature and culture for the analysis pursued? A satisfying, even if polyvalent, definition of 'culture' had to make it possible to define the 'environment' as 'natural environment' or 'nature' with respect to 'culture'. An additional difficulty was the variation of the terms among the languages playing a role in the study. 'Culture' (cultura, Kultur, kultur) is etymologically the same term and shares almost the same meanings in English, Italian, Swedish and German and many other European languages of Indo-European origin thanks to the common Latin root. 'Nature' enjoys a similar situation, being the Latin term indicating 'what is about to be born' and referring in all the four languages of this study approximately to what the pre-Socratic Greeks philosophers used to call 'physis' (Brancacci and Morel 2007: 106). 'Environment', on the other hand, as intended here, refers to 'natural environment' in its being observed or experienced by people and is a concept hard to define sharply, for it is situated in the intersection between 'nature' and 'culture' and carries both within.

The ways of understanding the terms 'culture' and 'nature' are more or less complementary since the dawn of materialistic philosophical debate like in Democritus (see for instance Vamvacas 2009: 220ff and Brancacci and Morel 2007: 105ff) and represent an essential dichotomy for mankind's self-reflection. From a theological perspective, over the centuries, the meaning of "nature" has shifted to then not only indicate the material "physis", but also to refer to the human "ratio entis" or "notio comunissima" (Callari Galli 1995: 50). That is to say, "nature" became increasingly human and mankind saw more and more itself as interwoven with it. Again looking at theological reflections, Jean-François Malherbe, explains

16 Raymond Williams also talked about media as a 'social practice' (1977: 165). He was also one of the first to suggest the 'large' meaning of culture that he notoriously defined as 'way of life' (see among others Williams 1961 or 2001: 57ff).

how people “constantly discover themselves as being between the two poles of nature and culture” and that “there [is] nothing more cultural than the very concept of nature” (1994: 115). Deborah Lupton, talking about risk and risk perception, also states how in that case nature is “constructed through the lens of culture” (1999: 29). Selin reminds how the view on nature particularly differs across European and non-European cultures: “Ideas about land and nature are central to every culture. There are no universals regarding what it means to live in your environment. Environmental knowledge and accompanying practices in all societies are closely associated with other widely held values about how people understand the world and their place in it. Even though these values change with new knowledge and new technologies, we can still speak with confidence about culturally specific systems. A society’s view on nature and the environment arise from and reflect its cultural beliefs and customs” (Selin 2003: XIX). Even among anthropologies, there is not a consensus about whether and what parts of nature determine what parts of culture: for example, Stoffer criticizes the position of culture ecologist Julian Steward, who believed that, in “environmental deterministic theories”, “which aspects of nature were influencing which aspects of culture” should be specified. “More abstract activities” are “generally unrelated to human adaptation” (in Selin 2003: 98ff); “In Western philosophical thought humans are sometimes viewed as being a part of and sometimes separate from nature. In fact most believe that humans are keystone species” (97) in a ‘post-Kantian’ fashion, as seen above.

For the present study, reporting on the natural environment is a cultural undertaking, presenting differences between cultures. Why not “Nature in the European press”, then? Because the focus is on the *interaction* between humans and the natural environment they are part of, so ‘environment’, and not ‘nature’, is the perspective adopted. ‘Environment’ represents the culturally mediated idea of nature, the intersection between ‘nature’ and ‘culture’, nature itself seen through the lens of culture(s). The very term ‘environment’ carries in itself the point of view of mankind (whether in, around, or as a part of it, see Chapter 3). The ‘interaction’ perspective was chosen, since the research design refers to the EU as a decision-making body affecting the peoples of the examined countries and their environments. Looking at press coverage concerning solely nature-related themes was not enough, news about humans interacting with nature had to be included too.

In addition, observing the media leads to reflect on how communication has to be considered within the nature-culture dichotomy. Currently, a debate on this subject is going on between so-called ‘naturalists’ and ‘culturalists’, and Rafael Capurro (2010) offers some relevant contributions to it: in particular, he reminds how the culturalist approach by Janich, where information is a human ‘Handlung’ (‘operation’, ‘activity’; in Renn et al 2005: 20), is criticized by the naturalist scholars who rather see information as an evolutionary concept; Capurro humorously

acknowledges how the evolutionary perspective represents an unitary point of view that could only be taken by a hypothetical observer who looks at mankind from an extra-terrestrial perspective (Janich calls this "God's eye view, in *ibid*: 34-35). The debate seems to point out that whatever the observations about culture and nature are, they belong to the cultural perspective anyway, since nude nature could not reflect on itself.

The already debated Latin rural etymology of the term 'culture', however, demonstrates that 'nature' and 'culture' are deeply intertwined from the very beginning. Scientific communities of different traditions, disciplines or countries seem to deal differently with language and culture and the interaction of the two. The borders between what culture is and what culture is not also need clarification. This is why it is important to now choose a definition of the term 'culture'.

2.4 What 'Culture' Means in this Study

The term 'culture' has always had an ambivalent – or, better, polyvalent – meaning. Etymologically, 'cultura' moved on from being an agricultural term to then refer to education. The sense 'intellectual side of civilization' is from 1805 and that of 'customs and achievements of a group of people' is from 1867 (Harper 2001). By comparing English monolingual dictionaries and studies on the subject (excluding natural science disciplines, where culture is rather 'the cultivation of micro organisms' or 'the cultivation of soil and the growing of plants'¹⁷), the following general acceptations are currently the most widespread (partly as listed in Jandt 2004):

- 1) Culture *in opposition to 'nature' as person-made, artificial*; the term refers subsequently to any 'intellectual and artistic activity and the works produced by it' (Jandt 2004: 7). Example: *Cultural events*.
- 2) Culture as *practice*, habit, way of doing/looking at something or way of life. Example: *the drug culture*.
- 3) Culture as *a limited, self-sustaining group of individuals*, sometimes limited in their existing in space and/or time. Example: *the Japanese culture*. This latter meaning can be intended both in the 'large' sense, often nation-based or territory-based, as already explained, or in the 'small' sense, referring to social groupings sharing practices or identities of some kind.

The borders between these definitions are blurred indeed. Culture may refer to 'cultivation through education', then to the kind of education used to achieve cultivation (e.g. reading literature), then to the practice of producing education (e.g. writing literature), then to a group of people doing this (e.g. novelists). In cultural, linguistic, social, anthropological and communication studies, the term seems to be

17 The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (2006) Fourth Edition, Houghton Mifflin Company.



<http://www.springer.com/978-3-658-00951-9>

Cultures of Environmental Communication
A Multilingual Comparison

Nofri, S.

2013, XIV, 411 p. 5 illus., Softcover

ISBN: 978-3-658-00951-9