

**AN INTERDISCIPLINARY EXPLORATION OF LINGUACULTURE IN
MODERN LINGUISTICS****Lisa-Marie Kotze**

1st-year master's degree student of English Linguistics

University of exact and social science

lisatjie.kotze@gmail.com<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-8307-111X>

Abstract: Linguaculture, a term that aims to reveal aspects about, and facilitate ways of thinking about and understanding, the interconnectedness of language and culture, is the focus of this article. It examines the development of linguaculture in modern linguistics, considering both its theoretical foundations and methodological frameworks, as well as its practical applications. The significance of linguaculture lies in understanding language and culture as one, and in what this implies for intercultural communication and language teaching. As it is a relatively new concept in modern linguistics, primarily due to rapid globalisation, this understanding is fundamental.

Keywords: linguaculture, culture, language, cultural identities, modern linguistics, interconnected

**МЕЖДИСЦИПЛИНАРНОЕ ИЗУЧЕНИЕ ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРЫ В
СОВРЕМЕННОЙ ЛИНГВИСТИКЕ**

Аннотация: Лингвокультура направлена на выявление аспектов и формирование способов мышления и понимания взаимосвязи между языком и культурой, акцентируя внимание на том, как языковые выражения отражают и формируют различные культурные идентичности. В данной статье рассматривается развитие концепции лингвокультуры в рамках современной лингвистики, включая её теоретические основы, методологические подходы и практическое применение. Значимость лингвокультуры заключается в целостном восприятии языка и культуры как единого феномена, что имеет важное значение для межкультурной коммуникации и преподавания языков. Поскольку это относительно новая концепция, возникшая в условиях стремительной глобализации, её понимание становится особенно актуальным.

Ключевые слова: лингвокультура, культура, язык, культурная идентичность, современная лингвистика, взаимосвязь

ZAMONAVIY LINGVISTIKADA LINGVOKULTURA MASALASIGA FANLARARO YONDASHUV

Annotatsiya: Lingvokultura tili va madaniyat o'rtasidagi o'zaro bog'liqlikni ochib berish, shuningdek, bu bog'liqlik haqida fikrlash va tushunish yo'llarini shakllantirishga xizmat qiladi. U til vositalarining madaniy identifikatsiyani qanday aks ettirishi va shakllantirishini o'rganadi. Ushbu maqola zamonaviy lingvistikada lingvokultura konsepsiyasining rivojlanishini uning nazariy asoslari, metodologik yondashuvlari hamda amaliy qo'llanilishi jihatidan tahlil qiladi. Lingvokulturaning ahamiyati til va madaniyatni yagona butunlik sifatida tushunishda, shuningdek, bu tushunchaning madaniyatlararo muloqot va til o'qitishdagi o'rnida namoyon bo'ladi. Bu tushuncha zamonaviy lingvistikada nisbatan yangi bo'lib, asosan globallashtirish jarayonlarining jadallashuvi bilan bog'liq holda yuzaga kelgan. Shu bois, bu yondashuvni to'liq anglash muhim ahamiyat kasb etadi.

Kalit so'zlar: lingvokultura, madaniyat, til, madaniy identiklik, zamonaviy lingvistika, o'zaro bog'liqlik

Introduction:

Language and culture are interlinked. One cannot function without the other within the modern linguistics sphere. Language is not only used as a form of communication, but it also forms part of culture, which encompasses cultural values, social norms, and historical experiences. Thus, due to this phenomenon, an interdisciplinary study of linguaculture has emerged. The concept of linguaculture examines the way people speak, the symbolic meaning of metaphors used within a language, and how these elements are all interconnected with culture. Listening to how different cultures communicate can provide insight into the culture in question. Linguaculture is not limited to modern linguistics but also interacts with other disciplines, such as anthropology, sociolinguistics, and cognitive linguistics, among others. This enables scholars to create a more holistic approach to understanding communication across different cultures. Due to rapid globalisation over the past few years, cross-cultural communication has become more common between people, and therefore, linguaculture has become a key focus in modern linguistics.

Integrating cross-cultural communication is important, but one must also preserve one's cultural identity.

Literature Review:

Linguaculture has garnered considerable attention over the past few years. The term linguaculture was formulated by Agar (1994), who described it as an interdisciplinary field that bridges the gap between culture and language. Instead of treating these two terms as separate entities, they could be joined, emphasising the mutual view of language and culture as interconnected. While Agar's initial conceptualisation (1994) was based on the cultural patterns, values, and worldviews of its speaker, Risager (2006) improved this concept by stating that linguaculture is continuously reshaped through discourse and interaction, thus challenging the static views of culture. Kramsch (2011) supported and reinforced this view by stating that language is not just a tool for communication, but also consists of a symbolic system embedded within each culture.

Personal and social identities utilise linguaculture and Identity construction as their foundations, shaping them. According to Kramsch (2011), foreign language learners often find themselves in conflict with their cultural identities as they learn a new language that is not part of their own culture. This cultural identity negotiation is more common among bilingual and multilingual speakers, as they need to express and internalise the values of the foreign languages they speak. Duff and Anderson (2015) support this statement, claiming that learners often experience identity shifts when placed within a new linguacultural environment due to their reflections on the hybridisation of self. Cognitive linguistics has also been influenced by linguaculture. Multilingual individuals engage in different thought patterns, known as linguistic relativity, depending on the language they are using (Pavlenko, 2014). Linguistic relativity reflects the different cultural frameworks associated with each language, demonstrating how linguaculture is embedded in cognition itself. Individuals who are bilingual or multilingual often do not realise that their personality changes when speaking in different languages, as the mind associates specific personalities with the spoken language according to that specific culture.

Due to globalisation, intercultural communication is more than just linguistic competence; it also involves understanding the culture being communicated, in addition to linguistic competence. Communication breakdowns frequently stem from misinterpretations, as each culture has its meaning embedded within it, rather than grammatical errors that occur (Holmes & Dervin, 2016). Competence in linguaculture is vital for development in intercultural

communication. With a lack of awareness, speakers and listeners may inadvertently violate cultural norms or misinterpret the speaker's intention. This can lead to what is known as 'pragmatic failure', a breakdown in communication due to a lack of understanding of the cultural context, which can have significant implications in various social and professional settings.

In language education, Applied Linguistics has increasingly incorporated linguaculture, deviating from traditional structuralist models. Byram (2012) contends that effective language instruction must integrate critical cultural awareness, enabling learners to interpret and engage with diverse cultural frameworks. Empirical evidence, as shown by Gao (2020), indicates that students who received linguaculture-integrated instruction demonstrated a higher level of intercultural sensitivity and communicative fluency than those learners exposed to traditional methods.

Linguaculture also plays a role in translation studies due to the intercultural aspect. Translators act as cultural mediators, not just translating words, but also conveying cultural meanings in their translations (Katan, 2016; House, 2015). Translation cannot be based solely on literal meanings; it must be translated within the context of the culture in which it is being used. These literal translations are often out of context and fail to resonate with the target audience. Due to these shortcomings, more emphasis has been placed on dynamic equivalence and cultural adaptation within the translation sphere.

Another sphere influenced by linguaculture is the digital world. Thorne, Black and Sykes (2015) investigated how online gaming and social media adapt their language to the norms and expectations of these digital communities. This contributed to the rise of digital linguacultures, which reflect both global communication and local, platform-specific cultures, paving the way for new linguistic and cultural analyses.

Despite the overwhelming evidence of how linguaculture influences other spheres of life, there are critiques and challenges to this theory. Dervin and Gross (2016) caution against essentialising culture by reducing it to fixed traditions or national norms. Instead, they advocated for viewing culture as dynamic, contested, and relational, constructed through interaction rather than predefined. This critique helps avoid stereotypical representations of cultural differences within the linguistic and cultural sphere.

The literature reviewed above points out that linguaculture is undoubtedly one of the key dimensions for studying the intricate connection between language and culture. From education to translation, identity to digital communication, linguaculture is a lens that crosses disciplinary boundaries and sheds light on how and why people use language in context. Nevertheless, as

other authors, such as Dervin and Gross (2016), point out, caution is required when dealing with culture as a fluid and negotiated phenomenon. Further investigation may need to extend to the development of linguaculture in the digital sphere, in multilingual settings, and globalised societies, while being inspired by them and taking them into account, highlighting its contemporary pertinence in linguistic enquiry.

Research Methodology:

A Qualitative, interdisciplinary approach was followed with the following methods: discourse analysis to examine how speakers and listeners adapt to cultural norms and values when using a language, and textual analysis of selected interactions from language learning environments and thematic analysis by using existing studies in linguistics literature to identify patterns related to linguaculture. Frameworks from Agar (1994) and the “rich point” and “symbolic competence” model from Kramsch (2011) were used for interpretation.

Analysis and Results:

The study emphasises the notion that linguaculture is a dynamic, interactive, and emergent concept that affects language, identity, and interculturality. From discourse analysis, speakers constantly interpret cultural expectations to modulate their language responses. This supports Kramsch’s (2011) symbolic competence model, in which people need ways to learn to become culturally sensitive, because meaning lies not within language, but within the language (syntax and semantics). In the classrooms reviewed, learners of language were more engaged and had greater context awareness when language teaching was combined with cultural teaching. This is reinforced by Gao (2020) regarding global communication competence. Underlying thematic constructs in the literature and qualitative case investigations across time also contribute to these central themes, including negotiated identity, cultural mediation, cognitive linguaculture, and digital adaptation. Such is the case, for example, in Pavlenko's (2014) discussion of the linguistic relativity exhibited in bilinguals, where each language triggers a different way of thinking and set of emotional triggers. These trends were evident in the subjects' accounts, where a shift in language use was noted to report changes in self-perception, behaviour, and emotional expression.

Within the translation sphere, misinterpretations from culturally inappropriate literal translations were noticeable. Irrespectively, House (2015) and Katan (2016) argue that translators should act as cultural interpreters and not just as linguistic converters. Effective translation is seen as a negotiation between linguistic structures and sociocultural

expectations.

Studies of digital discourse in various communities of Internet users highlight how certain platform features give rise to new, metacommunicative norms of behaviour. This aligns with the investigation by Thorne, Black, and Sykes (2015) into digital linguaculture, which explores the connection between global digital communication and local cultural expressions. In these spaces, linguistic creativity combines memes, code-switching, and culturally attuned references to create a rapidly evolving cultural-linguistic sphere.

Sociolinguistic wisdom (Holmes & Dervin, 2016) teaches that grammatical errors seldom cause misunderstandings in intercultural communication. Instead, often, inter-language problems are the result of a failure of practical application—communications breakdowns based on different cultural beliefs and conversational behaviours. This interdisciplinary study demonstrates the crucial role of linguaculture in both understanding and the actual practice of communication in our rapidly shifting, globalising, and multilingual world. In contrast to viewing language and culture as distinct spheres, linguaculture emphasises their mutual constitution. Language reflects a culture's worldview; culture is created and developed through language.

Conclusion and Recommendations:

Linguaculture provides a nuanced yet robust framework for understanding how people construct meaning, negotiate identity, and establish intercultural connections. Its use in disciplines as diverse as language education, translation, and digital communication demonstrates its versatility and importance. With increasing globalisation, however, it has become increasingly important to nurture the potential for creating critical cultural awareness, symbolic competence, and the concept of language as an embedded cultural instrument.

Recommendations include the following suggestions:

1. Integrate linguaculture into educational curricula by embedding cultural factors into actual language instruction. You should not only convey how to communicate in this way, but also teach students to interpret meanings within their context. This point aligns with Byram (2012) in emphasising the need for critical cultural awareness.
2. Encourage reflective language learning: Students should be led to unpack their own cultural identities and how these change through language learning. This enables them to become more consciously aware of language and culture—a point raised by Duff and Anderson (2015).

3. Train translators as cultural mediators: Professional education should focus on understanding meaning in a nonliteral sense, and on cultural interpretive skills that ensure the message being conveyed resonates with the intended audience. This is 1995; Katan, 2016; House, 2015).

4. Expand research on digital linguacultures: Scholars will want to explore how online environments shape new kinds of language and cultural subjects. These include examining how memes or emojis encode cultural values into norms that instruct people on what they should strive to be (Thorne et al., 2015).

5. Promote interdisciplinary collaboration: Understanding the complexities and applications of linguaculture requires combining ideas from various departments, including cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics, anthropology, and digital media.

In **conclusion**, linguaculture serves as a bridge between people, languages, and ways of seeing the world. Utilising it as a pedagogical and analytical tool enhances both language skills and cross-cultural empathy — two essential qualities in today's global landscape.

References:

Agar, M. (1994). *Language shock: Understanding the culture of conversation*. William Morrow.

Byram, M. (2012). Language awareness and (critical) cultural awareness—Relationships, comparisons and contrasts. *Language Awareness*, 21(1–2), 5–13.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2011.639887>

Dervin, F., & Gross, Z. (2016). *Intercultural competence in education: Alternative approaches for different times*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Duff, P. A., & Anderson, T. (2015). Language and literacy socialization for immigrant and international students across educational contexts. In P. A. Duff & S. May (Eds.), *Language socialization* (3rd ed., pp. 1–14). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02255-0_18-1

Gao, F. (2020). Developing students' intercultural communicative competence through culture-integrated English language teaching. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 20(2), 185–199. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2020.1723054>

Holmes, P., & Dervin, F. (2016). The cultural and intercultural dimensions of English as a lingua franca. *Multilingual Matters*.

House, J. (2015). *Translation as communication across languages and cultures*. Routledge.

Katan, D. (2016). *Translating cultures: An introduction for translators, interpreters and mediators* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Kramsch, C. (2011). The symbolic dimensions of the intercultural. *Language Teaching*, 44(3), 354–367. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444810000431>

Pavlenko, A. (2014). *The bilingual mind and what it tells us about language and thought*. Cambridge University Press.

Risager, K. (2006). *Language and culture: Global flows and local complexity*. Multilingual Matters.

Thorne, S. L., Black, R. W., & Sykes, J. M. (2009). Second language use, socialization, and learning in Internet interest communities and online gaming. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(Supplement 1), 802–821. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00974.x>