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Abstract: Forming the relational dimension of Romanian military personnel and not only of participants in international missions, represents a requirement for developing l’esprit de corps (fundamental characteristic of their professional profile), lay at the foundation of forming and strengthening convictions, contributes to shaping/reshaping military staff personality, its adaptation to various acting situations (including intercultural environments) and to the accomplishment of complex missions. Starting from these considerations, we found it useful to review the models of forming/developing the intercultural communication competence, for a future formative design where the directions of developing the communication competence become evident. Byram’s model inspired an adequate model of forming, the military system of education being easy to expand to the prefigured dimensions (knowledge, skills, attitude, education). This step must be continued with life-long training courses, respectively adequate selection and training of military personnel for international missions, together with position requirements and the development of cultural frame.
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1 INTRODUCTION

The concept of intercultural communication competence continues and develops according to the interpersonal communication competence. The intercultural perspective does not presuppose a communication limitation to the intercultural context of its production. In other words, intercultural communication may be regarded as a particular case of intercultural communication, but the terms of defining the application particularities depend on the context of communicative performance.

Once the intercultural field of communication competence has been delimited from that of interpersonal communication, within the dynamics of communicative relations, some researchers have proposed interpretative models. A first synthesis of these models was accomplished in 2002 by Manuela Guilherme [1], Brian Spitzberg and Gabrielle Changnon [2], in a dynamic approach of the “intercultural communication” field and of the adequate conceptual apparatus have proposed the analysis of a set of compositional theoretical models, for co-orientation, development and adaption and of causal processes. Such processes lay the basis for shaping models of outlining/developing the intercultural communication competence. Further on, Spitzberg and Changnon join the models of forming/developing the intercultural communication competence and name them development models that “retain a dominant role for the time dimension of intercultural interaction, specifying stages of progression or maturity through which competence is hypothesized to evolve” [3]. Within this category they distinguish: the King – Baxter model or the Bennett model. Apart from these, Howard Hamilton et al.[4] or Ting-Toomey [5] models are worth mentioning, as they contain features common with the models of outlining/developing the intercultural communication competence: attitudes, knowledge, skills, and also models that describe methods of achieving the Arasaratnam [6] and Deardorff [7] communication competence. The former aims at reaching the competence in a double manner, starting from the cultural empathy (both directly and indirectly, at the same time with the interaction development and a change in the global attitude, which influences the motivation of interacting proficiently). The latter refers to a pyramidal projection of the interaction, starting from attitudes, knowledge, understanding and skills and proceeding with fixing the internal and external objectives. In Romania, a similar synthesis was mentioned by Aura Codreanu [8] in 2009.

2 THE SEELEYE MODEL

Author of various studies dedicated to teaching strategies of outlining/developing the intercultural communication competence, H. Ned Seelye structures, beginning with 1984, a model based on Goal-Oriented End-of-Course Performance Objectives that is initially structured on seven [9], and later on, ten objectives that related to the ways of generating the student’s interest, proving the relevance of social variables, the exploration of the connotations/reactions to the target culture, the understanding of the situational variables and of the conventions which model the human behavior, the understanding of the use of behaviorist
options permitted by society, the development of skills for structuring the information about the target culture and the evaluation of the culture generalization in terms of evidence, which sustains this generalization. Seelye’s model, presented in the paper *Teaching Culture. Strategies for Intercultural Communication* [10], may be applied by a set of tests (initial and final ones) reflecting the degree in which the change of attitudes has been achieved. The model proposes a middle way in outlining the intercultural communication competence: (...) Seelye’s model stands half-way between foreign language/culture education that frequently relies on the acquisition of cultural content or on functional language activities and on professional training on intercultural communication that often rests on intercultural generalizations and stereotypes”.

3 THE DAMEN MODEL

Louise L. Damen contributed to the acknowledgment of culture in foreign languages learning, by publishing the paper “Culture Learning: The Fifth Dimension in the Language Classroom” in 1987. Damen focuses on the necessity of projecting the behaviour of cultural self-consciousness, empathy, awareness and acceptance of diversity, tolerance, lack of ethnocentrism as requirements of a critical pedagogy. Cultural self-consciousness or the understanding of own cultural behavior and thinking lays the foundation for cultural consciousness and perception of other cultures’ models. The transcultural consciousness represents the next step and it implies “a continuum process of acculturation into bi- or multicultur alism, which is problematic if we take into consideration theories that emphasize group differentiation or other possibilities of intercultural cohabitation”[11].

The model mentions a reorganization of the linguistic skills structure in listening, speaking, reading, writing and intercultural communication. Thus, a special attention should be granted to intercultural communication when learning a foreign language since “instances of intercultural communication are more likely to result in miscommunication than in meaningful communication” [12]. The model is perceived at the synthetic level and appeals to the dynamic approach to developing the communication competence, according to Rohrlich analysis:

4 THE ROBINSON MODEL

The model, mentioned in 1988, is inherently used within the process of foreign culture acquisition seen as an extension into the own culture.

---

The process does not involve a functional mechanism of a cumulative type, but it is more likely based on a homogenous synthesis between elements of the own culture and those of the other’s, filtered through the value systems of the native culture. Trans-cultural understanding, useful when promoting positive intercultural interactions, may be reached by the “versatile culture”: “We will need to replace traditional views of culture as knowledge with views of culture acquisition as the development of cultural versatility” [13], which also includes the perceptual versatility. Consequently, the achievement of the perceptive consistency becomes a necessity, and its difficulty is given by the cultural interference between the native culture and the other one. In order to overcome this drawback, Robinson suggests three strategies, as follows:

- actively looking for similarities as an initial point of departure;
- searching for empathy/similarity through analogy (a search for the similarity beneath the difference);
- using ethnography [14].

Their result is the deletion of cognitive errors concerning the extraction of differences and their exploitation in order to identify cultural similarities, that is, an immersion into the new culture by means of the own culture.

5 THE BENNET MODEL

In 1993, Milton Bennet proposed a model for improving the intercultural communication competence, necessary in the development of cultural sensitivity: Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS). The DMIS model, later on developed, implies going through several phases in experimenting the difference and the development of this sensitivity, within two relevant stages: ethnocentrism and ethno relativism.
Changing the set of standards, from personal (the native culture) to contextual standards of intercultural communication presupposes going through the negation, defense and minimization phases (into the ethnocentric phase), respectively, the acceptance, adaptation and integration phases (into the ethnocentric phase). Negation represents a conscious phase of rejection, it presupposes hostility towards diversity. Defense aims at an over-evaluation of the native culture as compared to the other cultures. The minimization phase (or passing over the ethnocentric phase) is characterized by the reduction of differences between cultures and by the identification of similarities (the affiliation to humankind, religion etc.). Acceptance presupposes respecting the cultural differences. Adaptation is related to the development of the ability of transcending into another referential cultural medium and the use of alternative cultural interpretations. Integration aims at including some other culture values into the native axiological system, and implicitly, acquiring an intercultural or multicultural identity, in addition to the national/ethnic background. The integration phase takes the form of “constructive marginality” variant, contacts with other cultural marginals and the refusal of assimilation by the core being often accomplished, thus allowing the engagement into the “contextual evaluation”.

6 THE KRAMSCH MODEL

The Kramsch Model, proposed for the first time in 1993, brings into discussion three intercultural traditions: Critical Approach, Pragmatics and Hermeneutics, namely the orientation towards transcending into another referential cultural medium and the use of alternative cultural interpretations. Integration aims at including some other culture values into the native axiological system, and implicitly, acquiring an intercultural or multicultural identity, in addition to the national/ethnic background. The integration phase takes the form of “constructive marginality” variant, contacts with other cultural marginals and the refusal of assimilation by the core being often accomplished, thus allowing the engagement into the “contextual evaluation”.

Besides the communicating cultures. The new perspective, achievable within the frame of a “critical pedagogy” is vaster than the native culture’s (C1) or than the target culture’s (C2), fact that leads to four main directions in the projection of new language/culture learning:
- establishing a “sphere of interculturality;
- teaching culture as an interpersonal process;
- teaching culture as difference;
- crossing disciplinary boundaries [17].

In such a vast process, namely, the development of intercultural communication competence from the Kramsch model’s perspective, the events and facts are perceived within a kaleidoscope of reflections that lead to the configuration of a hermeneutical scale for interpersonal interactions, as follows:

![Fig. 3 The Cultural Reality and the Cultural Perceptions according to the Kramsch Model [18]](image-url)

According to this approach it is necessary to follow specific steps for achieving trans-cultural understanding:
1. Reconstruct the context of production and reception of the text within the foreign culture (C2, C2’).
2. Construct with the foreign learners their own context of reception, i.e. find an equivalent phenomenon in C1 and construct that C1 phenomenon with its own network of meanings (C1, C1’).
3. Examine the way in which C1’ and C2 contexts in part determine C1” and C2”, i.e. the way each culture views the other.
4. Lay the ground for a dialogue that could lead to change. [19].

7 THE BRISLIN-YOSHIDA MODEL

Richard Brislin and Tomoko Yoshida forward a four-steps pattern in 1994 [20]. They started from Knight’s interpretative models (1991), based on
continuous knowledge, attitude, skills, and those of Sue’s, Bernier’s, Durrant’s, Feinberg’s et.al. (1982). Their model was built on continuous awareness, knowledge and skills and consists of: (1) awareness; (2) knowledge; (3) emotions (including attitudes); (4) skills (regarding visible behavior). The awareness phase aims at identifying the native culture/other cultures values. Knowledge refers to gathering the necessary notions related to the culture/cultures contacted in order to eliminate possible misunderstandings and also to manage communication in case misunderstandings appear. Emotions refer to one’s ability of mastering them. Intercultural skills aim at the behavior adaptation to the interactional context. The Brislin-Yoshida pattern is strictly focused on the psychological aspects of forming the intercultural communication competence (completely neglecting the linguistic aspects) and suggests a deeper awareness of the proper cultural values and of the cultural values of the other cultures. It also stresses the necessity of psychic comfort within the frame of pluri-, trans- or intercultural, the importance of mastering emotions and personal control in case of intercultural experience.

8 THE PENNYCOOK MODEL

In 1994, Alastair Pennycook proposed a model for outlining/developing the intercultural communication competence starting from the cultural and political implications of spreading the English language worldwide, a model that contributed to a post-colonial world with regard to the intercultural competence. Once the language holds the meaning of locus for “the political struggle” to impose the system of values, and cultural politics are viewed as “struggle over different meanings”[21], the acquisition of a new language (English, in this respect) gets new valences. In such a context, school should be perceived as a cultural and political arena and not a location in which an information corpus is transferred from teacher to pupil/student. The teacher must engage politically in order to contribute to the forming of intercultural communication competence whereas curricula have to be designed on interest topics, socially relevant for students. Teachers, seen as “transformative intellectuals”, represent the engine for the Pennycook model that promotes a set of approaches within the generous area of “critical pedagogy”. Although the model does not render a prescriptive list of phases in acquiring the intercultural communication competence, “Pennycook develops the potential for a critical pedagogy to the full since he links the concept of ‘voice’ to ‘agency’ by empowering students/speakers of English as a global language into subjects who perform their own representations and by understanding a critical pedagogy of English as cultural politics” [22].

9 THE BYRAM MODEL

Starting from the idea that the intercultural communication process needs the development of interpretation skills, establishing relations between cultures, that is, discovery and interaction, Michael Byram proposes in 1997 a model of acquisition, together with the necessary attitudes and knowledge, outside the institutionalized educational frame. The implication of the formative frame and of the teaching staff needs the insertion of the teaching process into a curricular/educational philosophy. Given the situation in which the teaching staff tend to promote autonomy and create teaching-learning methods in this respect, Byram imposes a new direction in outlining/developing the intercultural communication competence: “I shall argue for the integration of teaching for intercultural communication within a philosophy of political education (Doye, 1993; Medle, 1987), and the development of learners’ critical cultural awareness, with respect to their own country and others (Byram, 1997)”[23]. Furthermore, Byram develops a model of outlining/developing the intercultural communication competence initially focused on four factors (outside the institutionalized educational frame), later on based on five factors (see Figure no.4).

According to Byram model, knowledge (savoirs) represents the result of socializing affecting identity and refers to the acknowledgement of social groups and their cultures (of proper groups and also of the Other – usually a “relational” knowledge), of interaction processes at individual and society levels. The drawback of this type of knowledge is related to the dominance of a certain type of culture and national identity acquired within an educational process whereas the national identity is acquired differently by individuals within the socializing process.

Interpretative skills (savoir comprendre), as well as discovery and/or interaction (savoir apprendre/FAIRE) skills are useful for the conscious application of knowledge accessible by formal education, respectively by overtaking specific malfunctions of the interpretative activity regarding the other. Attitudes (savoir etre), conditioned by knowledge, skills and education, can not be regarded as simple cause-effect relations, but as part of a dynamic whole, necessary for acting in intercultural communication. More than that, attitudes condition the success of intercultural relations and, lest they should be characterized as simple stereotypes or
SKILLS of interpreting and establishing connections savoir comprendre

KNOWLEDGE of self-knowledge and of others; of social and individual interaction savoir

EDUCATION of political education; critical cultural education savoir s’engager

ATTITUDES of self-relativity; appreciation of others savoir être

SKILLS of discovering and/or of interaction savoir apprendre/être

Fig. 4 Factors that determine the outlining / developing of intercultural communication competence [24]

prejudices, they should not be just positive or presuppose willingness, but “attitudes of curiosity and openness, of readiness to suspend disbeliefs and judgement with respect to others’ meanings, beliefs and behaviors”. Education (savoir s’engager), acquired in the sense of political education (politische Bildung), for the purpose of forming the subjects’ critical cultural consciousness, presupposes the existence of some cognitive, evaluative and actionable directions/orientations, necessary for the obtaining the intercultural communication competence.

10 THE HAJEK-GILES MODEL

Christopher Hajek and Howard Giles proposed in 2003 the PMICC model (The Process Model of Intercultural Communication Competence), applicable in distinct contexts. The intercultural communication depends, from the two researchers’ point of view, on the type of interacting entities, on the state of cognitive preparedness and on the cultural orientation. If the intercultural interaction may be long or short-termed, hence resulting the interacting entities type, the cognitive state of preparedness influences the ability/inclination towards the communion with the group characteristics and presupposes self-supervision in terms of openness to change, activation of the sense of presence, appeal to awareness and situational consciousness. The cultural orientation refers to the community ideology in terms of cultural dimensions submitted to study by Hofstede. The three characteristics influence the learning and the conscious and unconscious development of the new culture. “In other words, the model predicts that a person entering an intercultural encounter with an openness to change, a sense of presence, or enhanced mindfulness will be better prepared to learn, comprehend, or understand the influence of ingroup or outgroup history, politics, laws, customs, and language because these influence subsequent communicative processes and outcomes. Similarly, individuals will be better prepared to tolerate and appreciate characteristics of the outgroup” [25].

Apparently a model of the acculturation process, Hajek and Giles’ PMICC model brings into discussion the outlining/developing of intercultural communication process within an intercultural frame, not by appealing to the institutionalized educational system, but by activating the latent potentialities of the individual that is found in the situation of managing his own communicational resources. Practically, the variable combination taken into consideration leads to a consideration of the communication management, seen as “the maintenance of optimal levels of individuation versus stereotypic expectations in one’s perceptions of particular outgroup members, and maintaining this balance may regulate risk for miscommunication and intergroup prejudice” [26]. So, the PMICC model does not imply the integration in construct of specific abilities, of layout, and nor does it exist an evaluation of the model validity, but it facilitates new research in the field, and, especially, its implementation within a institutionalized formative frame [27].

11 THE KING-BAXTER MAGOLDA MODEL

Patricia King and Marcia B. Baxter Magolda proposed in 2005 a model aiming at the development of intercultural maturity, seen as the final point in the process of outlining/developing the intercultural communication competence. Starting from Robert Kegan’s model (1994) of human development, that presupposed the engagement into building the meanings in order to render sense to the proper life course. King and Baxter-Magolda introduce a multidimensional frame which allows the description of intercultural maturity by explaining the frame dimensions, the connections with theories/models and that illustrates the levels of development. Intercultural maturity is multidimensional and consists of “a range of attributes, including understanding (the cognitive dimension), sensitivity to others (the interpersonal dimension), and a sense of oneself that enables one to listen to and learn from others (the intrapersonal dimension)” [28]. A structure based on levels of development overlaps the three-dimension structure, as follows:
Tab. 1  The Cultural Maturity Model, adapted by Spitzberg and Changnon [29]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Initial Level of Development</th>
<th>The Intermediary Level of Development</th>
<th>The Mature Level of Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Dimension:</td>
<td>Cognitive Dimension:</td>
<td>Cognitive Dimension:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Definite knowledge;</td>
<td>- The development of the</td>
<td>- The ability to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Naivety regarding cultural</td>
<td>awareness capacity and perspectives</td>
<td>perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practices;</td>
<td>acceptance;</td>
<td>- The use of multiple cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Resistance to cognitive</td>
<td>- Transition from authoritative</td>
<td>frames.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenges.</td>
<td>knowledge to autonomous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal Dimension:</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Dimension:</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Dimension:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unconsciousness of the</td>
<td>- The development of identities</td>
<td>- The ability of creating an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intersection of social roles (</td>
<td>distinct from external perceptions;</td>
<td>inner self;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race, category, etc.)</td>
<td>- Pressure between internal and</td>
<td>- The challenge of own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of cultural</td>
<td>external stimulus;</td>
<td>perspectives upon social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consciousness;</td>
<td>- The reconnaissance of the</td>
<td>identities (category, race);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Outward defined beliefs;</td>
<td>legitimacy of other cultures;</td>
<td>- self- identity integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Differences viewed as threats.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Dimension:</td>
<td>Interpersonal Dimension:</td>
<td>Interpersonal Dimension:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identity, dependant on those</td>
<td>- The consent of the interaction</td>
<td>- The ability of engaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alike;</td>
<td>with divergent ones;</td>
<td>distinct interdependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Distinct experiences</td>
<td>- The exploration of the way in which</td>
<td>relationships;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considered mistaken ones;</td>
<td>social systems affect norms and</td>
<td>- Solid relations in appreciating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unawareness of cultural</td>
<td>group relations.</td>
<td>differences;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>systems and norms;</td>
<td></td>
<td>- The understanding of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Egocentric perspective on</td>
<td></td>
<td>intersection of social systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>and practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The agreement to work for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>others’ rights.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 THE ADAPTATION OF MODELS OF FORMING/DEVELOPING THE INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION TO THE ROMANIAN MILITARY SYSTEM

Regarding the Romanian military education, the reshaping of competences and spreading the relational construct prefigured at the intercultural dimension are brought into discussion. Normally, this reconfiguration does not aim at the relocation of funds or massive restructuring of a system already subjected to adaptations, rehabilitations and lining to standards (regarding not only its educational side, but also the military one), but at a reshaping of competences according to comprehension investment and to the reconfiguration of the requests, submitted to a present and/or future prefigured reality. But, as long as the entire Romanian higher education is configured according to Hainaut’s matrix [30]: to know for the sake of knowing, of doing and of being, it is obvious that the simplest way is that of following the step and of development in the same respect. Therefore, a valid way of forming the intercultural communication competence within the military higher education is the one proposed by Byram. Byram model, previously discussed, together with the other models of intercultural communication system starts from the idea of projecting this competence on three dimensions: cognitive, affective and psychomotor, alongside with the implementation of a new educational philosophy. Hence, the projecting frame remains unchanged whereas the approach changes. Therefore, Byram model is focused on knowledge, attitudes and skills – in d’Hainaut’s perspective – but this perspective is modified, that is, skills aim at the interpretation and discovery/interaction, meaning that, in a cumulative manner, a fifth factor – the proper system of education – contributes to a configuration of the competition.

Based on this concept, the military higher education can be extended to prefigured dimensions:
- self knowledge and knowledge of the other, knowledge of the interaction, individual and social knowledge (savoirs), by sets of transmitted content within the educational act;
- skills of interpretation and establishing connections (savoir comprendre) by comparative analysis of transmitted knowledge;
- skills of discovering and/or interaction (savoir apprendre/faire), by applying the content correctly and by going beyond the classical interpretative frame;
- attitudes resulted from the relativization of the self and the re-evaluation of the other (savoir etre), by effective performance within an intercultural environment and by evaluating the prefigured skills and knowledge;
Within the military environment, the openness to alterity by projecting and forming the intercultural communication competence must not be seen as an alternative to patriotism and nationalism, or as an openness to poor cosmopolitanism or as a rejection of national culture in the detriment of civilization values that exclude the first ones. Patriotism and nationalism, if they imply love and the identification with a state/homeland, that is, a nation, that appeals to political consciousness, respectively to cultural consciousness of a nation-state existence, should not presuppose restrictive, exclusive or even aggressive forms. In its essence, patriotism offers the strong motivation for acting morally (Alasdair MacIntyre) [31], which presupposes the transcendence of any barriers towards the other one, the promotion of human rights irrespective of ethnicity, religion, race or type and the tolerance manifestation as a fundamental value of intercultural relations.

The openness to intercultural forming and development of intercultural communication competence answer very important and critical issues regarding present actionable steps of the Romanian military staff. Participation in peace keeping missions raises problems related to the Romanian military relations with the country, the accomplishment of the mission for the country and to the use of its action for the country they represent.

Intercultural education represents a way of forming in the sense of providing answers, at the other perceptive level, regarding the way in which the Romanian soldiers can cope, constrained by the oath of faith to the country, by the globalist challenges they are subjected to. The intercultural education also provides answers to unhealthy and non-attractive forms of cosmopolitanism, such as the aggressive universe, a cosmopolite strategy of destroying local cultures and institutions. Furthermore it creates a global political and cultural system, such as the hegemonic globalization, or a version in which a single country creates a united world, by subordinating other countries to the proper jurisdiction [32].

In the military environment, the intercultural education and, implicitly, forming the intercultural communication competence (which has attitudes and intercultural components at its basis) is shaped in the spirit of moderate patriotism characterized by interdiction of harming any one, no matter the person, special duties to the own country (but positive one - assistance, support for everybody), increased interest towards the own country and authentic interest, but, most important for the other, moral constraints in accomplishing the national goals and obligations, not only towards the own country but also towards the other ones through their citizens [33]. Thus, exaggerations of the obligations only for the own country are abandoned, with no constraints in reaching the targets, specific to extreme patriotism, or those regarding interests with no constraints in reaching the cosmopolite targets specific to extreme cosmopolitanism.

4 CONCLUSIONS

The application of a forming model of intercultural communication should not be made by ignoring other models. Thus, even if the Byram’s model is the most adequate to the Romanian environment, due to the projection of the finalities, at least of the military system of education, according to d’Hainaut, we may consider as viable in applying an adaptive model to the military theater of operations (during the training period for the peace-keeping mission) the objectives from Seelye’s model, the knowledge of the host culture and the application of the steps from Brislin-Yoshida, or the prefiguration of the maximum level of cultural maturity from the King-Baxter Magolda model. Also, to adequate the cognitive content regarding the host culture, Robinson’s model or Bennett’s model is useful and applicable within the theater of operations.
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