

## POWER DISCOURSE IN MULTINATIONAL DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENTS. A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS (CDA) PERSPECTIVE

Aura CODREANU

The Regional Department of Defense Resources Management Studies, Brasov, Romania

**Abstract:** *Individual discourse is power focused and that is all the more true in situations in which status and rules of the game are to be maintained or imposed in front of outsiders. However, the question that arises is the extent to which this discourse is actually shaped and inculcated into the individual frame of mind by institutional discourse and ideology. Hence, this article starts from a cross disciplinary understanding of the concept of “power”, and by building on the CDA approach to discourse and its relationship with power, it analyses the extent to which NATO discourse is assumed by affiliated/allied national establishments and hence gains, maintains or loses the multinational footprint to national approaches. In this respect, based on a textual and semiotic analysis of the official websites of entities that allegedly epitomize the multinational environments fostered by the very mission of this alliance of nations, the article is to describe how power discourse is shaped both at overt and covert level in multinational defense establishments.*

**Keywords:** *power, discourse, defense, organizational ideology, critical discourse analysis, organization studies*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

“You are here to learn and network.”

“This culture is wrong.”

“They are smart. Too bad their English isn’t better.”

All of the above are remarks made within the precincts of multinational institutions or in multinational environments that the author of the article was part of at a given point in time. Regardless of what emotions or thoughts they first trigger (even in the absence of the overall context in which they were uttered), they actually point out to the following reality: individual discourse is power focused and that is all the more true in situations in which status and rules of the game are to be maintained or imposed in front of outsiders. However, the question that arises is the extent to which this discourse is actually shaped and inculcated into the individual frame of mind by institutional discourse and ideology. In this respect, the remarks above actually remind of the following truth and of the inherent question it triggers:

Very often, multilingual societies which apparently tolerate or promote heterogeneity in fact undervalue or appear to ignore the linguistic diversity of the people. An apparently liberal orientation to equality may mask an ideological drive towards homogeneity, a drive which potentially

marginalizes or excludes those who either refuse, or are unwilling, to conform. However, having established that language ideologies are powerful means by which discrimination occurs in multilingual societies, it is less clear where such ideologies originate. Nor is it immediately evident how such ideologies are reproduced, or how they gain power and authority. (Blackledge, 2005:vii)

Hence, the first research assumptions that initially emerged based on all of the above were as follows: A1: “Discourse at individual level is influenced by institution/culture affiliation”, and A2: “Discourse at individual level must be supported by institutional infrastructure (i.e. organization mission, vision, supporting architecture, processes, information flows, etc.) to actually be a promoter of power status”. However, for these to be validated, access to a multinational environment where to actually conduct the research to this end was not possible. Consequently, the research endeavor took an outsider’s perspective. As such, it focused on the North Atlantic Organization as an entity that fosters multinational encounters and projects, and more specifically the latter’s Partnership and Training Centers that, by their very mission and role within the alliance, epitomize a multicultural approach both at institutional and individual level. The theoretical underpinnings for the research are

cross disciplinary and are built on the theoretical delineations of “power” and “discourse” anchored in organization studies and Critical Discourse Analysis. The source for data collection was open access media, namely the websites of the aforementioned PTECs. Consequently, the research questions developed were as follows:

Q1: Is multinational organization (i.e. NATO) ideology assumed by the overt/covert online power discourse (both textual and semiotic) of affiliated/allied national establishments?

Q2: Under what circumstances is NATO PTEC discourse enabled/disabled/omitted as a power discourse?

## 2. NATO AND ITS INHERENT FEATURES

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is defined as a political and military alliance of nations whose main goal is to “safeguard the freedom and security of its members through political and military means” (NATO, 2015). This very way of defining it entails two important aspects. First, as an alliance, is characterized by the following (Bamford *et al.*, 2003:12-13): a. Agreement on behalf of partners to contribute resources on an ongoing basis in order to achieve “joint value”; b. The terms of the agreement cannot and are not specified distinctly from the very beginning (“incomplete contract”); c. Joint decision making is needed in order to meet the first two conditions. Second, as the phrasing itself, but also as history has proved it, this alliance is first and foremost a political one and hence, its military related features become overt as a last resort. Moreover, the first feature of any alliance: resource contribution raises, a question in terms of organization theory: is NATO an international, multinational or transnational organization? If it is an international establishment, then as a lead entity it transfers and adapts its knowledge and expertise to foreign environments. In this respect, the subsidiaries do not retain much authority or independence, but they can adapt products and ideas from the center. If it is a multinational entity, it consists of a “portfolio of multiple national identities” and as such “is very sensitive and responsive to differences in national environments around the world” while preserving a “dominant strategic mentality”. As a transnational organization, certain decisions need to be made as to centralizing or decentralizing resources in order to “realize scale economies, protect certain competencies, and to provide the necessary supervision of... management” (Furrer *et al.*, 2001:343-346).

With a view to all of the above, the nominal definition that this article is to rely on in its research investigation is as follows: NATO is an international organization in terms of knowledge transfer and adaptation to its member or partner countries needs and commitments, a transnational organization as far as the centralization/decentralization focus is concerned, but also an organization that given the two features above, as well its guiding principle of “collective defense” fosters multinational encounters and, hence, multinational projects. In this context of describing NATO as a triple hatted entity in terms of its resource building and use, the research question that arises is as follows: *To what extent, does the multinational environment characteristic of NATO, the work processes and decision making system actually trigger a specific type of strategic discourse and ideology?* Moreover, how is this ideology assumed and hence reflected at individual level? In this respect, it is worth also looking at whether there are any power levers that actually contribute to the shaping of the discourse of individual representatives who are part of multinational environments. Hence, the proposal is to understand the micro political games (discourse) played/displayed by understanding the macro political and structural differences among multinational defense institutions/environments: i.e. the country where they are (and inherently the country’s level of contribution to NATO), their service orientation: tactical, operational, strategic, and the employee categories (adapted from Furrer *et al.*, 2001).

## 3. BRIEF CONCEPTUAL DELINEATIONS

The approach undertaken by the article is highly indebted to the CDA method since it enables an approach based on the “linguistic character of social and cultural processes and structures”, while also allowing for an interdisciplinary perspective (Blackledge, 2005:3). Moreover, as Fairclough (2013) emphasizes

CDA explores the tension between understandings of language as socially shaped, and language as socially shaping. Language use is simultaneously constitutive of social identities, social relations, and systems of knowledge and belief, although with different degrees of salience in different instances.

Consequently, given the advantages offered by the method, the hypothesis inbuilt in it is that as a result of the power asymmetry resulting among participants to discourse events, the latter have

## POWER DISCOURSE IN MULTINATIONAL DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENTS. A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS (CDA) PERSPECTIVE

uneven and imbalanced capacity to control text production, distribution and consumption.

Moreover, concerning the fine relationship between language and power, the same method establishes that even though language does not yield power, it does though grant the means by which power status is expressed in hierarchical structures. Thus, the main propositions of CDA concerning discourse as a form of both linguistic and isual communication are:

- Discourse is structured by dominance;
- Every discourse is historically produced and interpreted and, hence, situated in time and space;
- Dominance structures are legitimated by ideologies of powerful groups.

As such, discourse is both “socially shaped” and “socially shaping and constitutive” (Fairclough, 2013:92). Last but not the least, from an organizational perspective offered by organizational studies, organizational discourse

is a structured collections of texts embodied in the practices of talking and writing (as well as a wide variety of visual representations and cultural artifacts) that bring organizationally related objects into being as those texts are produced, disseminated and consumed (Grant *et al.*, 2004).

### 4. METHODOLOGY

The research methodology employed by this paper takes both a qualitative and quantitative stance. Quantitatively, the investigation starts from the total number of 29 Partnership Training and Education Centers and indentifies the relevant sample by narrowing down the numbers in terms of access to information in the online environment, namely to the sites of the aforementioned multinational NATO establishments. Qualitatively, the research is based on comparison and contrast between the key textual markers identified in NATO PTECs vision as it is to be found in the promotional brochure and established as guiding lines for the CDA analysis of the open source media employed by these centers to inform on their mission, vision and activity.

Thus, the means to establish the key words relevant for the investigation undertaken by this paper consist in focusing on: (1) the status expressed by the name chosen for each of the centers as derived from the aforementioned vision and overall definition of their mission; (2) their underlying implicit and explicit goals as formulated against the overarching ones expressed

in the same brochure that is self telling of the status in the community; (3) the means employed to achieve the goals and that are either directly expressed or merely hinted at.

All of the above are underlined in bold in the quote below that details the aforementioned of NATO PTECs:

The PTECs are a Community of Education, Training, and Research Partnerships promoting transparency and mutual understanding for sustainable global peace, security, and stability achieved through: Cooperation; Coordination; Inclusivity; Communication; Networking; Standardization.

PTECs are a global network of educational and training establishments promoting collaborative initiatives and quality instruction to enhance capacity building, interoperability, and a comprehensive understanding of wider security issues. (NATO, 2015)

Based on all of the above, the levels of analysis are two fold. Overtly, the research focuses on the textual and semiotic references to the research questions as they are to be found on the main website page of these centers or yielded upon key words search in the website. Thus, the indicators searched for are PTEC or NATO related signs, and their presence is to be read as the establishment’s willingness and/or pride to be part of this “community”.

Covertly, the analysis focuses on textual references by investigating the correlation between the vision of the center and the vision of NATO on PTECs. Mention should be made that in the cases when the center is part of a larger vision that describes a national entity’s direction (a center, department, Ministry of Defense, etc.), the analysis does take into account the latter’s vision, as well. Thus, the indicators in this respect point out to a status that is covertly expressed not necessarily hinting at the PTEC community as such. Hence, the reading of such indicators is to be done as a self-explanatory role that is already fully assumed and no longer needs recognition on behalf of fellow members

Thus, the research initially took into account all the 29 PTECs listed by the NATO official site in 2015, as well as the active links provided by the latter (NATO, 2015). Then, the criterion employed by the research endeavor in order to identify relevant categories for analysis and decide what elements of the categories could not be used was the type of country affiliation to NATO: full NATO members (group 1); PfP NATO countries

and MAP countries (group 2), European non-NATO countries (group 3), and non NATO countries outside Europe (group 4).

Concerning Group 1, this consists of 13 centers located in Germany, Bulgaria, Greece, Italy, Romania (2), Slovakia, Slovenia, Turkey, United Kingdom and United States, namely: Partner Language Training Center, Europe (PLTCE), Garmisch, Germany; Foreign Languages Department (FLD) National Military University, Bulgaria; Hellenic Multinational Peace Support Operations Training Center (MPSOTC), Greece; International Institute of Humanitarian Law (IIHL), Italy; The Regional Department of Defence Resources Management Studies (DRESMARA), Romania; Crisis Management and Multinational Operations Department (CMMOD), Romania; The Slovak Armed Forces Academy of General Milan Rastislav Stefanik, Slovakia; The Slovenian PfP Language Training Centre, Slovenia; Turkish PfP Training Centre, Turkey; Defence Academy, United Kingdom; Joint Special Operations University, Tampa, Florida, United States; Naval Postgraduate School (NPS), United States.

As for group 2, this is made of two sub categories: PfP NATO countries (a), and MAP countries (b). In terms of subcategory a, out of the five centers: Sachkhere Mountain-Training School, Georgia; Continuous Training Centre of the Armed Forces Military Academy, Moldova; Austrian Armed Forces International Centre (AUTINT), Austria; Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP), Switzerland; PSO Training Centre Swiss Armed Forces International Command (PSO TC SWISSINT), Switzerland, only three could be analyzed in terms of the research questions of this paper. As for the MAP countries, out of four: Peace Support Operations Training Centre (PSOTC), Bosnia and Herzegovina; Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) Training Centre, Serbia; Public Affairs Regional Centre (PARC), The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; International Peacekeeping and Security Centre (IPSC), Ukraine, only one website was available, namely that of the center from Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The European non-NATO countries (group 3) hosting PTECs are Finland and Sweden with the following establishments: Swedish Armed Forces International Centre (SWEDINT), Sweden; Finnish Defence Forces International Centre (FINCENT), Finland.

Concerning the non NATO countries outside Europe (group 4) gaining military and financial

benefits from their strategic partnership with NATO, out of five PTECs: Cairo Regional Center for Training on Conflict Resolution and Peacekeeping in Africa (CCCPA), Egypt; Jordan Armed Forces Language Institute, Jordan; Peace Operation Training Center (POTC), Jordan; Partnership for Peace Training Center, Army Academy (KAZCENT), Kazakhstan; Five Hills Peace Support Operations Training Centre, Mongolia, only the websites of those from Jordan could be analyzed.

Thus, out of 29 NATO PTECs, the research could only focus on 24 multinational establishments. Hence, the next criterion employed in the interpretation of the findings was the eagerness/willingness of the state to be part of NATO and to be acknowledged as such in terms of its politics and/ or chronological approach/resource contribution level (who are the founders, who are newcomers, etc. in the community) as all this becomes obvious at overt and covert level of analysis, as well as in terms of the three fold indicators related to status, goal and means to achieve the stated goal.

## 5. FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

When analyzing both overtly and covertly the available websites of the PTECs listed on NATO page, the following approach was taken. At overt level the focus was on the textual and semiotic references to the research question as displayed on the main website page or yielded upon key words search in the website. At covert level, the textual clues were the point of reference and the method employed relied on investigating the correlation between the vision of the center and the vision of NATO on PTECs. In terms of the indicators, the clues concerning the acknowledgment of goals, means and status were taken into account.

The findings of the research undertaken were as follows. In terms of the thirteen centers belonging to NATO member countries, the ones from the USA, namely the Joint Special Operations University, Tampa, Florida, and the Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) do not provide any overt or covert textual or semiotic clues as to their status of PTECs. What is more, the vision, mission and goals are fully aligned to the US DOD goals. A somewhat similar situation is represented by the Defence Academy of the United Kingdom since no overt or covert reference is made to its PTEC status. However, concerning the means employed by the center to achieve its goals there is a slight

## POWER DISCOURSE IN MULTINATIONAL DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENTS. A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS (CDA) PERSPECTIVE

difference and an implicitness of the roles derived from the aforementioned status at the level of the discourse employed: “establishing and maintaining itself as the MOD’s primary link with UK universities and with international military educational institutions”.

By comparison, the power discourse of the centers from Slovakia, Bulgaria and Slovenia is nationally anchored while also acknowledging to a certain extent their belonging to the community of PTECS. In this respect, information about the Bulgarian Foreign Languages Department (FLD) is to be found on the website of the National Military University. As such, the status of the center is supported by the national identity as unveiled by the mission of this university. Consequently, the goals and means are anchored into national values. Unlike this overall national focus, the The Slovenian PfP Language Training Centre and The Slovak Armed Forces Academy of General Milan Rastislav Stefanik manage to merge the national discourse with the NATO related one. Thus, the overt textual clues included in the name of the center from Slovenia are already an indicator of a shift from a nationally anchored perspective to a potentially multinational one. Even though the website of the center is hosted by the Slovenian Ministry of Defense webpage and the National objective is first expressed, that is immediately completed by the following goal

PfP LTC is also responsible for the language training that enhances NATO’s interoperability objectives and international peace initiatives.

As for The Slovak Armed Forces Academy of General Milan Rastislav Stefanik, Slovakia, the covert clues hint at a nationally anchored power discourse given the goals and means expressed on the website. However, even though the PTEC status is not overtly mentioned on the site except for the news area, the discourse employed acknowledges the center as being part of a community by pointing out the other participants to PTEC events as “colleagues”. Thus, in one of the news feeds, this type of belonging reads as follows:

The main aim of the annual marketplace was to strengthen the relations and to promote the activities of the institutions, taking part in the event. Our representants approached the colleagues from other PTEC centres about future cooperation. From the total amount of twenty six, the sixteen PTEC took part this year.

Additionally, in terms of the overt textual clues, it is worth mentioning that this center positions the coat of arms of NATO PTEC community in the left margin in the lower part of the page, the NATO symbol top page next to the name of the university, and the active participation of the center to the PTEC community in the news area. Concerning the other centers from the NATO member countries, the only one that makes no overt or covert reference to its affiliation and that also takes a rather neutral approach is the International Institute of Humanitarian Law (IIHL), Italy. The latter, does have a specific indication that is really worth recording in terms of the neutral perspective it adopts: “The Institute pursues its objectives and carries out its activities in full independence from any government or organization.” The Partner Language Training Center, Europe (PLTCE), Garmisch, Germany, acknowledges first and foremost its belonging to the George C. Marshall Center for Security Studies and hence it adopts the latter’s vision. Even if its very name is an overt reference, there are no other overt or covert clues to NATO or to the PTEC community. Even though the Hellenic Multinational Peace Support Operations Training Center (MPSOTC), Greece does not provide any direct reference to its PTEC status, at covert level, its mission outlines compliance with NATO and other organizations’ standards, whereas the news area refers to the PTEC specific events or to the center’s acknowledgement as such by NATO publications. The Crisis Management and Multinational Operations Department (CMMOD), Romania is referred to as a former PfP in the presentation on the front page of the website. Moreover, the goals express its full alignment to NATO principles:

“to promote the wider dissemination of NATO doctrine and procedures”, “support of the current and developing NATO and EU doctrine and procedures used in multinational operations”.

Concerning the Turkish PfP Training Centre, its name is explanatory. Moreover, the NATO symbol is placed in the right margin, upper half, links area of the webpage, and the goals and means it assumes are, by comparison with the centers previously analyzed, the most compatible and aligned to the vision and mission of the NATO PTECs community:

To be one of the leading institutions; on partnership training within NATO Education & Training

community and on multinational operational training in Turkey ...to provide training and education to NATO, Partner Nations and National Personnel in order to contribute for the attainment of interoperability objectives and enhance military cooperation in accordance with NATO and TGS policy and principles.

Last but not the least, The Regional Department of Defence Resources Management Studies (DRESMARA), Romania, is very much similar in terms of acknowledging its status to the Turkish center. However, if in the case of the latter, this is to be found at textual level, the former emphasizes the visual clues that contribute to the covert acknowledgment of its status: the PTEC Coat of arms is top left, the 5<sup>th</sup> button out of 7 provides more information on NATO PTEC's, and below the buttons the following mention is found: "NATO Training and Education Center". Additionally, unlike all the other centers, this one fully assumes its belonging to PTEC community:

DRESMARA is officially acknowledged by NATO as one of its 26 international Partnership Training and Education Centers – PTEC.

Concerning the PfP NATO COUNTRIES and the PTECs of these, the ones of Switzerland and Austria should form a distinct group since, even though the two countries do not wish to enter NATO, they are heavily involved in NATO activities. However, that is also overtly and covertly expressed by the website of only one of these. For instance, the Austrian Armed Forces International Centre (AUTINT) makes an explicit textual acknowledgement of being a PfP center "The Austrian Armed Forces International Centre are the Austrian Partnership for Peace Training Centre." Moreover, it cannot go unnoticed the heavy emphasis placed on troop use in operations abroad among which NATO ones, as well as the national focus in terms of the number of troops contributed to various operations. Moreover, the center is keen on reinforcing NATO vision and mission for its PTECs:

the Austrian Armed Forces' main focus within enhanced Partnership for Peace is the achievement of interoperability, primarily for crisis response operations. The Austrian Armed Forces have long-term experience within multinational forces on battalion-level. They participate in international NATO-, UN-, EU-, and OSCE- led operations.

By contrast, the PSO Training Centre Swiss Armed Forces International Command (PSO TC

SWISSINT), Switzerland has no individual site and upon searching its name the action is redirected towards the Swiss Armed Forces site. As for the Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP), Switzerland, Its goal expressed in the "Mandate and Vision" area and it can be implicitly identified in the goal expressed in the vision of NATO PTEC.

Concerning the Continuous Training Centre of the Armed Forces Military Academy, Moldova, its site is available as part of the Military Academy "Alexandru cel Bun". There are no distinctive signs concerning the PTEC affiliation, except for an announcement on the bottom of the page that reads: "On 22 March 2012, Continuous Training Centre was recognized as a Partnership and Education Centre." In terms of its goals, they are aligned to that of PTECs: "to reach Interoperability Objectives and Partnership Goals".

As for the MAP countries, the Peace Support Operations Training Centre (PSOTC) of Bosnia and Herzegovina displays a highly visible coat of arms (larger than that of the Center) placed in the left margin, mid page, the acknowledgement of its status is to be found in the mission and vision areas of the text. Moreover, its goal is in line with national and NATO goals and emphasize its orientation towards the larger area of security:

operate as a Partnership and Regional Training and Education Centre in order to support BiH's contribution to international peace and security (mission);

delivers PSO related functional/specialized courses as well as products related to wider security and its comprehensive approach concept without losing its global and regional reach.

Similar to one of the centers from Romania, this center also emphasizes its status as PTEC unequivocally: "accredited Partnership for Peace (PfP) Training and Education Centre".

Concerning the European non-NATO countries, that are service providers to NATO among other partners equally important, the situation is somewhat distinct and more coherent compared to the findings concerning the previous groups. Thus, the when accessing the website of the Swedish Armed Forces International Centre (SWEDINT), the front picture displays the a number of flag poles with NATO flag right in the middle next to the one of the European Union. Additionally, the center acknowledges its contribution to NATO and other organization led operations, whereas in the news area the center

celebrates the award “NATO Quality Assurance Unconditional Accreditation” received in recognition for its efforts to produce the highest quality NATO education and training. The news headline reads as „SWEDINT first PTEC to receive NATO full systems accreditation”. As for the Finnish Defence Forces International Centre (FINCENT), even though on the front page there is no acknowledgment of its status as PTEC, an indirect and inter alia reference to this is made in the tasks page: „arrange and host national and international seminars, courses and exercises for the UN, NORDEFECO, the EU, NATO and NATO/Partnership”. Besides its textual reference, there are also coat of arms of the other organizations the center established relations with.

Another category of centers held under scrutiny belongs to non-NATO countries gaining military and financial benefits from their strategic partnership with NATO. Out of the three centers, only the Jordanian ones have their own websites. Thus, the PTEC status of the Jordan Armed Forces Language Institute is acknowledged textually and briefly in the right bottom corner. When trying to access the mission/vision, we find in the Institute’s message in the last paragraph the same acknowledgment and two values of NATO vision: cooperation and coordination. Moreover, in the history of the Institute “chronological milestone” one can find an image of the certificate testifying to the status of PTEC. Concerning the Peace Operation Training Center (POTC), Jordan its status and goal alignment to NATO PTEC vision is openly acknowledged right on front page. While the coat of arms of the center lies to the left right under the main heading presenting the name, the buttons of access to the page, the one of NATO PTEC lies in the same position to the right. Exactly under this coat of arms, the status is also announced in textual form and underlines the community and network idea from the vision.

POTC is now a full and official member in NATO PTEC Community and Network; the Center has been declared as Partnership Training Center since 11 July 2011.

Moreover, its goal is a takeover and adaptation of NATO PTEC goal to the Jordanian Armed Forces’ outreach

building high capacity for the most important sector of society, that is peace and security... enables JAF members in those fields and launching toward international and regional prospects to serve the Jordanian objectives.

## **6. CONCLUSIONS**

In conclusion, the answer to the research question concerning the existence and manifestation of an overt/covert power discourse that in builds NATO ideology becomes more than obvious. Thus, reference to NATO and its discourse becomes a means of status upheaval inside or outside the country of the PTEC that either through textual and/or visual clues acknowledges its contribution to NATO or its commitment to the same alliance. In this respect, this two-fold differentiation is of utmost importance to be made since it structures and directs the “semiosis” of the text. What is more, the same semiosis is to be understood from a more comprehensive perspective: the centers of major contributors in terms of resources to NATO either do not feel the need to show their belonging to this multinational organizations and hence NATO ideology goes unnoticed in their case (see the websites of the two US PTEC) or are aware of their role as regional players and as such incorporate NATO discourse as part of a more comprehensive regional approach. Nonetheless, there are centers that choose to adopt NATO ideology through their very assignment as PTECs, but that still rely on a national ideology, rather than a multinational one. Such a situation can only be understood as a self serving case since the power discourse simply unveils a national calculation on behalf of the bodies accepting only or hardly in an (c)overt manner their status and underlying goals.

Furthermore, the research question about the circumstances in which NATO PTEC discourse is enabled/disabled/omitted as a power discourse, finds its answer in the political orientation of the countries where the centers are located, as well as in the nature of contribution granted or received as part of NATO power discourse. All of the above considered, the research endeavor could be further continued by focusing on the individual power discourse that manifests within these centers. However, this is a long term commitment that, if it to be undertaken, may unveil new findings in the area of organizational ideology transfer into employees’ discourses. Additionally, it may also contribute to the research in the field of organizational studies and more particularly to the area of organizational culture as that was initially defined by Hofstede: a mix of national and organizational culture that molds and shapes

organizational reality and people's discursive behavior.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bamford, J.D., Gomes-Casseres, B., Robinson, M.S. (2003). *Mastering Alliance Strategy: A Comprehensive Guide to Design, Management and Organization*. Oxford, OX: Jossey Bass.
2. Blackledge, A. (2005) *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
3. Furrer, O., Sudharshan, D., Thomas, H. (2001). Organizational Structure in a Global Context: The Structure- Intangible Asset Portfolio Link. In F.J. Contractor (2001) *Valuation of Intangible Assets in Global Operations*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books. 343-346.
4. Grant, D., Hardy, C., Oswick, C., Putnam, L.L. (eds.). (2004). *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Discourse*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
5. Fairclough, N. (2013) *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Routledge.
6. NATO. (2015). Organization. [online]. *North Atlantic Treaty Organization*. Available: <http://www.nato.int/> [last retrieved 15.01.2015].