

CULTURAL RELATIVISM AND THE CONVERGENCE OF ETHNOGRAPHY AND 3C

by Robert Greene Sands, PhD

The opinions and beliefs expressed in this essay are solely those of the author and do not reflect those of the DoD.

I would like to thank Dr. Louise Rasmussen and Dr. Alison Greene-Sands for their review and comments.

Introduction

One of the primary components of culture learning in the Department of Defense (DoD) has been identified as cross-cultural competence (3C). 3C is the ability "...to adapt effectively in cross-cultural environments," which includes the ability to express or interpret ideas/concepts across cultures, and make sense of foreign culture behavior.¹ The concept and application of 3C was embraced by DoD expeditionary organizations and became part of the Services' training programs. Professional military education programs are initiating a sequenced approach to developing 3C over the educational lifecycles of military personnel.² 3C has also been promoted as critical to DoD civilians who deploy in support of military operations, but who as yet do not have an institutionalized educational/training program integrating 3C.

3C is an anchor for initiating and sustaining cross-cultural relationships and promoting enduring partnerships from the individual to organizations benefiting a wide array of DoD populations such as General Purpose Forces, Special Operations Forces, Provincial Reconstruction Teams, and more. Through research, education and training programs and development of policy, defining the foundational competencies of 3C has become an important part of a larger solution for developing cultural capabilities in our deploying forces whose destinations today, and in the future, are unpredictable. A set of baseline competencies forms the foundation of 3C to be engaged through cognitive understanding of their utility and application of these competencies through continual modeling and ex-

perience.³ Competencies making up this baseline are acquiring and applying cultural knowledge, cultural self-awareness, alternative perspective taking, and learning to observe.

Ethnography and Cultural Relativism

Here, I argue that *ethnography*, the anthropological (and other social sciences) research method, as a process, offers a model for the establishment of a 3C baseline as an important component for successful cross-cultural interactions inherent in Irregular Warfare (IW) Counterinsurgency (COIN), Building Partnership (BP) and those missions that support each, such as the Security Force Assistance (SFA). Ethnography, literally a description of a people, involves long term in-depth fieldwork among a population and features a variety of sociocultural research methods.⁴ Recently, many in anthropology and the social sciences have engaged ethnography as giving "voice" to those marginalized by global economic and political forces and in lands caught up in insurgency and terrorism. Ethnography has also been engaged as a tool to help rapidly assess environmental and human-made crises through data collection utilizing observation of cultural behavior, interviews, identification and use of appropriate data gathering technologies.

It is these elements of ethnography: experientially-based data collection, the ability to decipher "voice" in a culturally-complex environment, and the contemporary use of rapid assessment capability that have similar utility to military and civilian populations engaged in the array of missions consistent with stability operations. Social science research methods, many of which are part of ethnography, have been incorporated in the DoD Human Terrain System program, as social scientists utilize qualitative field methods to elicit relevant sociocultural information to aid on-the-ground leaders in their tactical and operational decision making.

Here, ethnography will be viewed through its historical and contemporary expression of *cultural relativism*, to objectively understand others' behavior in terms of their own cultural framework. Comparisons will be drawn between baseline competencies in what is proposed as 3C and those sociocultural behaviors employed in ethnography. The interpersonal competencies that are critical for the development of 3C are equally important in establishing and sustaining those interpersonal relationships that form the social network that provides data to ethnographers. I propose that an operationally focused *methodological cultural relativism* (MCR) provides necessary skills that lay the framework for successful cross-cultural interactions in stability operations and promotes the ability to discern meaning from socially distinct behavior.⁵

It may be that in developing baseline competencies in a coordinated fashion, MCR will develop as a consequence. However, as will be discussed later, stability operations, to include pressures and risk inherent in conflict and peace-keeping missions depart from ethnography conducted outside the scope of military activity. I suggest that introducing a 3C baseline (as it is both a foundation for 3C and ethnography) will be useful to military and civilian personnel who deploy downrange in stability operations. I take a brief look at how MCR can be developed in education and training programs and how the development of MCR and 3C can continue in an uncertain future of budgetary restrictions and a loss of a sustained need of "immediate" support to recent (Iraq) and current military operations (Afghanistan).

3C and the Baseline

In 2007, the concept of 3C was introduced into DoD research, education and training as a capability that facilitated successful cross-cultural interactions in a variety of unfamiliar and often times complicated social situations and settings.⁶ Over the last three years several researchers have investigated the concept and application of 3C to the military and DoD mission. These efforts included further conceptualization of 3C, identification of competencies and knowledge, skills, abilities, and attitudes (KSAAs) important to the development of 3C and promotion of 3C through learning programs.

Symposia were organized that addressed culture in the military. One of the primary goals of these

events was identifying 3C's importance in facilitating cross-cultural interactions.⁷ The then Defense Language Office (DLO) (now the Defense Language and National Security Education Office (DLNSEO)) convened working groups to examine 3C in definition, properties and components, and application to the readiness of the Total Force and the development of 3C learning goals. Education programs that promoted 3C were developed through U.S. Air Force (USAF) Air University, USAF Special Operations School, Joint Special Operations University, U.S. Army John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School while the DLNSEO has and continues to sponsor 3C training through Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI) and a cross-cultural trainer 3CTrainer hosted on Joint Knowledge Online (JKO).

Research certainly has identified sets of competencies that seem to be critical and necessary for 3C development, yet a definitive set of competencies that can be utilized to construct goals and objectives for learning programs are still nascent or lack consensus of the research, education and training DoD culture community.⁸ An initial set of baseline competencies is both critical to the development of 3C and important to insert into ongoing learning programs while research defines a more robust model of 3C development for education.

Recent research has identified a number of competencies that promote 3C (Army Research Institute (ARI), DLNSEO). Ongoing research continues in the conceptualization and identification of 3C (DEOMI) as does research into the application of 3C in leadership development (ARI, DEOMI), promoting influence (ARI), potential function/MOS selection (suggested application), mission performance modeling (DLNSEO), and application to diversity (DEOMI). Commonalities across the research and from efforts of working groups convened by DLNSEO have produced a smaller number of competencies and enablers that seem to lay a foundation of 3C. There are four "baseline" competencies that resonate across research to form the foundation for the successful development of 3C:

- ◆ The acquisition and application of general cultural knowledge that promotes enhancement of existing cultural schemas (generalized representations of our existing knowledge) that direct our information processing and includes general principles and concepts of culture.⁹

- ◆ The ability to be culturally self aware of one's own worldview, including beliefs/values and possible biases and behaviors, as well as how these will impact understanding of intercultural situations.
- ◆ The ability to take alternative perspectives based on information about other cultures to aid in understanding others' motivation and feelings, as a part of their environment and culture. This competency, coupled with an enabling attribute, suspension of judgment, is critical to developing an operational cultural relativism.
- ◆ The use of elementary observation skills that will allow understanding and validation of cultural knowledge. These skills can be very beneficial in providing means to update cultural schemas, promoting a more nuanced comprehension necessary for alternative perspective taking, and augmenting the development of interpersonal skills, such as intercultural communication, that will further promote 3C.

Development of baseline competencies provides capability to engage cultural difference and minimize dissonance and bias while building an understanding of that difference through discovery. Creating channels for accessing cultural knowledge, through observation and other ethnographic methods and then being able to apply that knowledge to discern understanding to better help interactions and motivations for behavior is paramount to mission success. The ability to understand one's own cultural beliefs/values and possible biases, as well as how these will impact understanding of intercultural situations is a critical competence. Adopting a willingness and ability to utilize alternative perspectives or frames by using information about other cultures to understand others' motivation for certain behaviors, and others' feelings as a part of their environment and culture can reveal a more nuanced and intimate understanding of those in other cultures. Finally, engaging suspension of judgment that can minimize cognitive biases facilitates alternative perspective taking.

3C, Ethnography, and Cultural Relativism

3C is not a novel or unique set of competencies to past or contemporary military operations. Looking to international business, diplomacy, even academic research reveals the importance of interpersonal skills in promoting success in cross-cultural

interactions and relationship building. Pertinent examples include international business, specifically marketing, and working collaborations of non-profits and nongovernmental agencies in the international arena. For academic purposes, 3C was and still is necessary for ethnography. For over 150 years, anthropologists have put themselves in position to learn about different cultures mostly from considering the perspectives of those in that culture. Understanding the cultural calculus of a group of people, their behavior, and how elements of the culture worked in an integrated fashion were and still are the primary goals of the anthropologist.

Putting the anthropologist in a position to succeed in retrieving the necessary knowledge and applying it from the perspective of cultural members as part of the research experience was, in part, the goal of anthropological inquiry first advanced by Franz Boas and Bronislaw Malinowski. Ethnography included several qualitative methods still advanced today, such as participation and observation, informal and formal interviews, surveys, kinship charts, and photographs. Each of those methods required an interactive competence that facilitated a partnership between the anthropologist/ethnographer not only with individuals, but with entire cultural groups, to elicit and interpret gleaned cultural data. This approach to studying human cultures included cultural relativism; the underlying goal was to faithfully and objectively recreate the cultural reality of group members. Early ethnographers saw their approach as a path to understanding behavior; the cultures they studied existed in a natural laboratory of human interactions. Field methods replicated the scientific method and field work, data collection and analysis were seemingly bereft of the influence of the researchers' own cultural lens and subsequent reactions to behavior contrary to their own belief and values system.

Anthropology, like many of the social sciences, has undergone a revolution in the research enterprise over the last half century as cultures have been influenced by a more interconnected global economy and increased need for natural resources. Much contemporary ethnography done in foreign cultural settings seems to focus on the marginalization of indigenous populations as a result of external forces, such as globalization, conflict, or environmental/climate change. Ethnography works to document the interface between global change

and those cultures mostly in marginal or developing regions or countries that are in danger of losing their traditions, customs and livelihood due to instability. Ethnography has also become a tool for rapid response to more urgent humanitarian needs, such as health care and subsistence crises in indigenous or minority groups, usually in conflict-torn or developing countries.¹⁰

Part of this revolution is also the consideration of the role and impact of the ethnographer in fieldwork, collection and interpretation of the data, and the overall goal of the study. As much as classical ethnographers attempted to portray a cultural reality devoid of interpretation, emotional and personal bias, in the end, it was analysis that was contextualized to fit the colonial-era endeavor of “explore, explain and demystify cultures” foreign to the western world. Contemporary ethnography exists in a social science world bent toward explaining the inequities fostered by globalization, where cultural realities are many and shifting and interpretation of data is based on layers of cultural filters. Social context belies the impact of the global condition on groups marginalized by radical change and prone to reactions of extreme radicalism and insurgency.

Into the interconnected global cultural landscape, the application of 21st century cultural relativism extends to both method and perspective of the *cultural other* ranging from the extremes of adhering to universal human rights to existing behavior as a product of fit and tradition in that cultural system. In this sense, many engage cultural relativism beyond the original utility of straining away the tendencies of humans to apply their own worldviews to dissimilar behavior in order to understand meaning to those that practice that behavior. However, relativism when viewed as a process can reveal much about motivation for behavior and cultural coherency of behavioral patterns.

The tension that exists in ethnography over the use of the ethnographic process and product is of value to understanding and utilizing the competencies essential to promoting effective and meaningful cross-cultural interactions in stability operations. The context of stability operations, from operations to intelligence gathering, demands a competence that can facilitate successful cross-cultural interactions as well as begin to offer insights into understanding patterns of behavior of those involved in interactions. The value of both cross-cultural facili-

tation and discovery is critical to exploring meaning of behavior which can help to explain motivation.

Making sense of multi-layered and complex social environments in order to understand the swirling patterns of behavior that represent worldviews and belief systems face both ethnographers and deployed military and civilian personnel, especially those populations that interact with other cultures frequently and in meaningful situations with hidden or overt consequences. In other words, the intent of Boas, Malinowski, Margaret Mead, E.E. Evans-Pritchard, and other classical anthropologists who were describing a culture to produce meaning through the frame of that culture is still critical to this competence. What has been advanced through the last century of social science fieldwork as cultural relativism can be a foundation for developing 3C critical for promoting successful navigation of socially complex environments.

Methodological Cultural Relativism

The historical trajectory of ethnography highlights a process that certainly relied on the development of a set of interactional skills that acted to facilitate successful relationships necessary for collecting data while also aiding in understanding behavior through observation and interviewing. The very complex social environment seen in many of the developing regions and countries today includes conflict, post-conflict and stability operations and is very different from the lands and cultures studied by the colonial-era anthropologists. The goal of reconstructing cultural reality has not really changed in ethnography.

However, external and internal forces have created contested spaces both in the physical and cultural landscape and feature contrasting cultural realities of ethnic, tribal and cultural groups with different traditions, customs and heritage. Needing to deconstruct a diverse social landscape featuring marginalized cultural groups; dominant governments who may be incapable or not wanting to meet human security of all its populations; and external forces of change through terrorism, insurgency or economic repression while interacting with all of these groups confronts both ethnographers and military organizations alike. Facilitating successful relationships to extract data that can provide keys to understanding meaningful behavior is the means to get at the many differing cultural realities where stability operations occur.

MCR as a process reflects the articulation and integration of the four baseline competencies and the enabler suspension of judgment. There has been some research done on the sequencing of overall 3C competencies or the development of curricular stages that lead to competency within DoD military and civilian populations, however, recent work has started to explore what 3C should look like in an individual.¹¹

Currently, the DLNSEO is sponsoring a study on determining competencies beyond the baseline and sequence of development of 3C competencies that would be useful for 3C learning development.¹² However, it is suggested here that a culture-general approach holds the key to development of MCR including its *baseline* competencies and that introducing cultural knowledge and promoting a cultural self-awareness are critical as an introductory framework.

Alternative perspective taking and learning to observe are then later used to expand the focus of the individual from self to the cultural and social environment that is engaged in during cross-cultural interactions. Bundling up the baseline into a meta competency, or MCR, provides the individual with a learning “gestalt” that can focus on a singular event or interaction, or guide the individual through a series of interactions or over an extended stay in a socially diverse environment or culture. It must be understood that like 3C, MCR represents a capability that can promote successful cross-cultural interactions, and more complex cross-cultural competencies and behavior; it is not the actual performance within these events.

Ethnographers and military personnel engage similar competencies in their respective endeavors, although the intent, roles, and ultimate goals of ethnography often diverge. Ethnography serves to reconstruct the cultural reality of those caught in the middle of change, often through forces beyond their control, and then to help assess and catalog assistance and changes. The adoption of the same baseline competencies aids the military working in similar environments. The ultimate goal of protecting our national security can certainly contrast with intent of anthropology and other social sciences. However, stability operations, and those missions that support success, such as COIN, SFA, BPs, and humanitarian relief are often in support

of those same or similar cultural groups studied by anthropologists.

Interacting across cultures is made more difficult due to behavior of that cultural group that contrasts or counters one’s set of beliefs and values. Judgments of observed behavior create cognitive and affective barriers to successful cross-cultural interactions, from understanding and engaging in acceptable behavior to the process of deriving meaning from others’ behavior within that interaction. For practicing anthropologists in foreign cultures and engaged military members, the importance of detailing an ethnic or social group’s cultural reality that is faithful to their collective perspective is critical to deriving meaning from their behavior as well as forecasting future behavior. Engaging the baseline steers clear of making value judgments of cultural behavior based on adherence to a universal set of human rights or from the other extreme, an acceptance of cultural behavior based on its efficacy of contemporary cultural expression.

Rosado (2000) writes of engaging the disparity and extreme differences through inquiry while working toward a common or necessary goal. Kottack (2008) alludes to an MCR that does not preclude making moral judgments while searching for understanding and reason for behavior. Relativism can help discern the origins of behaviors which seem contrary and mediate value conflict through understanding. It can operate to promote further interactions with the culture and its members while seeking understanding that is instrumental in allowing discovery of origins and sustainment of cultural behaviors. Borrowing from both Rosado and Kottak, I suggest that the baseline competencies when engaged as a foundation of 3C represent an MCR. To this end, the baseline represents an approach to cross-cultural interactions that is more process and operational and less a means of passing judgment on cultural behaviors.

Discussion

Operational challenges within conflict and post-conflict environments make application of the baseline (and individual competencies), and by virtue MCR, much more difficult in the warfighting context than in the research context. With regard to the development of alternative perspective taking, research has implicated the benefits of alternative

perspective taking (and its related cognitive processes) to foster and sustain social bonds between “self” and “other” by breaking down stereotypes and minimizing prejudice. In this respect perspective taking as part of MCR can facilitate the development and expression of 3C. However, there is an “ironic darkside” to engaging perspective taking; it must be deep, reflective and focused to provide benefit beyond the construction of social bonds.¹³

When interactions occur, perspective taking can provide a means to “get at” the meaning of others’ behavior, but the act of perspective taking may inhibit introspection and create artificial stereotypes of self. In other words, perspective taking can work to create enduring cross-cultural relationships with cultural other, but it may impact self’s behavior by leaning too much on facilitating other. Other problems may arise when both self and other take each other’s perspective, thereby promoting contrary behavior as a result of exchanged perspectives.

Initiating and sustaining relationships with data providers in the cross-cultural environment found in stability operations are often based on perspectives that include political agendas, cross-cutting social identities and alliances that may not be overt to the military individual and thus, incomplete perspectives may be problematic. Add to this suspected ties to insurgents of those involved in relationships may also create/add a layer of risk and operational complexity to managing the data collection process not experienced in ethnography. Bluntly, sometimes those you interact with or elicit data from may in the near future try to kill you, or more commonly are trying to use your relationship to their advantage.

How does one know when to trust the outcome of an analysis of another person’s or group’s cultural reality versus one’s own perspective strained through worldview, and perhaps cynical interpretation? How does one manage those two perspectives, while really trying to objectively understand the individual or group’s reality—and know which one to act on? If one adheres to the scientific context that a perspective and interactions derived through MCR should always be based on an objective understanding as the end state, perhaps in the warfighting context, with shifting and dynamic identities, teasing out that objective perspective is not always as clear, and this ambiguity or uncertainty can put in jeop-

ardly the development of necessary interpersonal relationships that easily could be critical for achieving mission success.¹⁴

The baseline competencies provide capability to enhance cross-cultural interactions and help discern meaningful behavior. Developing the baseline as a collection of skills and abilities can promote MCR as a method that can be developed through learning and experience. This development does not rest on the fact that American or any other military service men and women are anthropologists by any stretch of the imagination. The intent of comparing behavior and goals of ethnography and MCR is that each, the anthropologist and military personnel and civilians who support stability operations in foreign cultures, encounter similar socially complex situations that require building and sustaining relationships and discern meaning of behavior. However, for military and civilians deployed into situations where traditional belief systems and behaviors that may present situations which test military and civilian personnel along with conflict and attendant violence and suffering, MCR is a necessary approach.

To deployed service members going into harm’s way, holding onto a set of core beliefs and values is necessary to navigate through the complexity and risk inherent in conflict and potential conflict situations. The far greater danger for the DoD military and civilian members that do not engage a methodological relativism is to cast those in other cultures in distinctly unfavorable light and this perception can unduly influence interactions with those foreign cultural members and ultimately could lead to mission failure. MCR becomes a critical “tool” to ground perception and action in comprehension.

Research into identifying competencies that extend beyond the baseline are ongoing. Rasmussen et al (2009) explores the competency of “cultural sensemaking, “...making sense of cultural behaviors” as critical to successful 3C. They suggest that competencies such as observation are important to “sensemaking,” a more complex behavior that allows rapid and effective adaptation to and learning about a new cultural environment, and it seems a critical behavioral dimension that promotes cross-cultural expertise. Necessary for sensemaking are some of the baseline competencies, such as perspective taking. Rasmussen and Sieck (2012) offer a model for 3C derived from a collection of critical

incidents that applies to enhancing leadership in cross-cultural environments. It is suggested here that the baseline, advanced as MCR, provides the foundation for developing and exercising more complex competencies such as cultural sensemaking.

Developing MCR and a Note on the Future of 3C

With the more immediate need of pre-deployment training waning as Operations Enduring and Iraqi Freedom wind down, there remains the development of 3C and the need to institutionalize and synchronize it across military learning programs. The application of 3C to the Total Force will require "customization" of learning to fit a variety of factors: service/agency/organization utility; service and organizational-specific learning opportunities; level of 3C necessary for enlisted/officer and civilians; immediate versus career long learning; maturity of 3C learning instruction; and the fit of traditional and non-traditional instruction methods, among others. The value of 3C for future learning is in complementing specific DoD programs, departments, and centers that specifically instruct on culture with the integration of 3C into existing military education and training curriculum and those traditional areas of study, such as leadership, strategy, regional studies, etc. Developing the baseline competencies as a foundation for 3C and fitting that development to the continuum of missions across those variables identified above is a bridge to that long term goal.

The development of sound and meaningful 3C assessment programs is integral to the future of 3C learning. There are assessment instruments developed to support cross-cultural training in varied civilian foreign enterprises to generally facilitate the increased cross-cultural interactions that characterize the increased relations brought about by globalization. However, as suggested here, the conditions of stability operations and the DoD mission and the structure, organization, and function of DoD education and training programs require a unique and applied assessment program to gauge the effectiveness of 3C learning in the DoD, and to do the same for MCR is equally important. ARI is currently sponsoring a study to develop such a robust tool.¹⁵

Currently, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness is in the process of develop-

ing a policy that will establish the requirement that all military personnel and select DoD civilian personnel will be provided foundational instruction on 3C (to ensure personnel have the ability to interact effectively with those from other cultures). Including the development of the baseline set of competencies (and MCR) in this foundational instruction would work to provide a set of KSAs that span the variety of missions engaged through stability operations.¹⁶ Many of the service culture learning programs include instruction and curriculum on some or many of the baseline competencies. Yet MCR and its utility is not conceptually presented as a process that can facilitate successful cross-cultural interactions and promote a means to derive meaning of cultural behavior for general awareness as well as elucidating meaning to understand future motivation.

There are recently developed 3C products that begin to promote the baseline and the process of MCR, such as the 3C Trainer, while service specific products such as VCAT, the Army 360, and the USAF VEST video series provide instruction on various baseline competencies. ARI is now developing instruction on perspective taking and non-verbal communication as important in promoting cultural influence. Organizations such as DIA are in the process of developing 3C learning programs that build on the baseline and identify the utility of MCR.

Conclusion

In the last five years, the development of culture programs across the DoD, driven by urgency of conflict and with some discontinuity and redundancy of effort, managed to provide a critical component for successful non-traditional military operations. Looking to the future will require a change in focus, effort and delivery of culture programs; institutionalization of culture into existing education and training channels that will provide sustainable and career long learning and development is perhaps the most critical. 3C has already been identified as one of the critical components in this institutionalization. I suggest that starting with instruction on baseline competencies and developing MCR to the Total Force will provide an important first step toward the success of future culture learning. Promoting application and utility of baseline/MCR to 3C and mission success will in part guarantee this future. ❁

Endnotes

1. Joan R. Rentsch, Allison Gunderson, Gerald F. Goodwin, and Allison Abbe, *Conceptualizing Multicultural Perspective Taking Skills*, ARI Technical Report No. 1216 (Arlington, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 2007), 2.
2. Allison Abbe and Stanley M. Halpin, "The Cultural Imperative for Professional Military Education and Leader Development," *Parameters*, Winter 2009-10, 20-31.
3. Robert Greene Sands and Allison Greene-Sands, (n.d.) *Teaching Methodological Cultural Relativism to the DoD Total Force: Identifying and Developing Intervention Strategies for a Baseline of Cross-Cultural Competence*, paper submitted for publication.
4. Robert R. Sands, "Ethnography in Support of Capturing the User-Experience in Sport Practice" In A. Cereijo-Roibais, E. Stamatakis, and K. Black (Eds.), *Design for Sport* (London: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2011).
5. Conrad P. Kottak, *Anthropology: The Exploration of Human Diversity* (New York: McGraw Hill, 2008) and Greene Sands.
6. Allison Abbe, Lisa Gulick, Jeffrey Herman, *Cross-cultural Competence in Army Leaders: A Conceptual and Empirical Foundation*, ARI Study Report No. 2008-01 (Arlington, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 2008). See the DLO/DEOMI sponsored 3C portal for a comprehensive repository of 3C-related research and publications at <http://www.defenseculture.org/>.
7. The Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (USD P&R) sponsored a symposium on 3C in 2009 entitled, "The Role of Cross-Cultural Competence (3C) in Organizational and Mission Success." The event explored the concept of 3C and its application in a military context. In January 2011, USD P&R hosted a summit entitled, "Language, and Culture: A National Imperative," discussing the need for a more globally deployable, culturally adaptable Total Force.
8. Research efforts now ongoing through ARI concentrate on 3C assessment, competency analysis, assessment, and application of 3C to identified areas of development such as promoting cultural influence, see Zbylut et al 2010 and Zbylut 2011.
9. Allison Abbe, Joan Rentsch, and Iona Mott, *Cultural Schema: Mental Models Guiding Behavior in a Foreign Culture*, presentation given at the DEOMI Biennial Research Symposium, 20 February 2009.
10. Sands, 2011.
11. Daniel McDonald, Gary McGuire, Joan Johnston, Brian Selmeski, and Allison Abbe, *Developing and Managing Cross-cultural Competence within the DoD: Recommendations for Learning and Assessment*, RACCA Subgroup 2 Final Report, 2008.
- Michael J. McCloskey, Aniko Grandjean, Kyle J. Behymer, and Karol Ross, (2010a). *Assessing the Development of Cross-Cultural Competence in Soldiers*, ARI Technical Report No.1277 (Arlington, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 2010).
- Michael J. McCloskey, Kyle J. Behymer, Elizabeth L. Papautsky, Karol Ross and Allison Abbe, *A Developmental Model of Cross-Cultural Competence at the Tactical Level*, ARI Technical Report No.1278 (Arlington, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 2010).
- K.G. Ross, *Toward an Operational Definition of Cross-Cultural Competence from Interview Data*, DEOMI Technical Report 08-01, 2008.
- Rentsch, et al.
- Michelle Zbylut, Michelle Wisecarver, Hannah Foldes, and Rob Schneider, *Advisor Influence Strategies: 10 Cross-Cultural Scenarios for Discussion and Self-Assessment*, Instructor's Manual, ARI Research Product 2010-05, (Fort Leavenworth Research Unit, U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 2010).
- Michelle Zbylut, Kimberly Metcalf, and Jason Brunner, *Advising Foreign Security Forces: Critical Incidents Describing the Work of Advisors*, ARI Research Report 1951 (Fort Leavenworth Research Unit, U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 2011).
12. Personal communication with Dr. Allison Greene-Sands, Associate Director of Culture, Defense Language Office, 24 January 2012.
13. Adam Galinsky, Gillian Ku, and Cynthia Wang, "Perspective Taking and Self-Other Overlap: Fostering Bonds and Facilitating Social Coordination," *Groups Processes and Intergroup Relations*, (2005) 8 (2): 109-124.
14. Personal communication, L. Rasmussen, 17 January 2012.
15. This project will work toward further conceptualization of 3C and the development of a 3C assessment system. Currently, the only validated measures of 3C that exist are based on self-reports, and there are limitations to using self-reports to assess psychological constructs that relate to skill and competency and 3C. Self-reports can be misleading to over- or underestimation of one's performance. This assessment project will look at developing an assessment that is not tied to self-reports as its only measure of assessment (personal communication, Dr. Jessica Gallus, Senior Research Psychologist, ARI, 24 January 2012)..
16. Personal communication with Dr. Allison Greene-Sands, Associate Director of Culture, Defense Language Office, 24 January 2012.

Other References

- Rasmussen, L.J., Sieck, W.R., Gnome, A.P., and Simpkins, B. (2009). *Cultural Sensemaking: Competence Assessment and Learning Objectives for New Leaders in the Marine Corps*. (Technical Report CTTSO W91CRB-09-C-0028b). Fairborn, OH: Klein Associates, Division of ARA.
- Rasmussen, L.J. and Sieck, W.R. "Strategies for Developing and Practicing Cross-Cultural Expertise in the Military." *Military Review*, March April 2012. 71-80.
- Robert R. Greene Sands is a consultant for the Department of Defense for Language, Regional Expertise and Culture programs. His graduate degrees in anthropology were from Iowa State University (MA) and University of Illinois (PhD). He formerly was Chair of the Department of Cross-Cultural Competence, Air Force Culture and Language Center, Air University. He has published six books and several book chapters and also has extensive experience in the applied anthropology fields of environmental security and cultural resource. He has spent the last three years researching and developing 3C education and training programs for the U.S. Air Force, U.S. Army and the intelligence community.