

DOI 10.31651/2524-2660-2021-4-82-88

ORCID 0000-0001-7411-4623

BILOUS Tamara

PhD in Pedagogy, Associate Professor of the Department of English Language Practice
and Teaching Methodology,

Rivne State University of the Humanities

e-mail: tamara.bilous@ukr.net

ORCID 0000-0002-5232-5945

PERISHKO Iryna

PhD in Pedagogy, Associate Professor of the Department of English Language Practice
and Teaching Methodology,

Rivne State University of the Humanities

e-mail: perishko_irina@ukr.net

ORCID 0000-0003-2383-3569

VOLKOVSKA Iryna

fifth-year student of the Philology Faculty,

Rivne State University of the Humanities

e-mail: iryha.rysyha@gmail.com

UDK 373.016:811.111'27(07)(045)

APPROACHES AND MODELS OF INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE

The article deals with a modern study into intercultural competence in teaching English as a foreign language. Culture competence has become an important issue of modern language education, a focus which reflects a greater competence of the

connection of a language and culture and the need to prepare students for intercultural communication. In the paper the recommended approaches and models are critically analyzed. They are characterized by treatment of culture issues directly and

openly in the comparative cross-cultural way. The study expands disputes on culturally responsive pedagogy by emphasizing specifically on the approaches and models of intercultural competence.

The authors examine the main approaches and models to conceptualize intercultural competence such as Ruben's behavioral approach, European multidimensional models by M. Byram and K. Risager, J. Bennet's developmental model of intercultural sensitivity, a culture-generic approach and other theoretical approaches to intercultural competence.

Keywords: *education; intercultural competence; English language teaching; approaches; models.*

Statement of the problem. It is worth emphasizing that English language teachers have to be also English culture teachers. English language teaching (ELT) is not complete without studying the related culture. The problem of learning and teaching culture is a matter of the considerable interest to foreign language teachers and educators. The clear and unique relation between the culture and the language is based on research of teachers and educators of different disciplines.

Culture competence development is a process of acquiring general knowledge, attitudes and skills which are required for effective communication and interaction with people of the other cultures. It is the dynamic and developmental process that involves the students cognitively, behaviourally and effectively. Incorporating intercultural communication in ELT is the attempt to develop students' cultural competence and help them transcend traditional ethnocentrism and explore new relations across the cultural boundaries.

Thus, the teachers of the English language should shift from traditional to the intercultural stance for development of both learners' linguistic and intercultural competencies. Approaches that teachers engage in depend on their attitudes to target cultures and the perspectives on culture teaching in the English classroom. Moreover, the teachers of English have to avoid teaching culture as the facts but rather as culture understanding, intercultural competence, and awareness of importance of the dialogue trying to understand other cultures.

Analysis of research and publications. The issue of intercultural competence is the theme in different works by numerous researchers who claim that a language is a way of communication and it carries the culture. D. Brown [1] supports this idea by indicating that language is a part of culture and a culture is a part of language; the two are inside each other and they cannot be separated from each other without losing the signifi-

cance of either language or culture. Since the accent and aim of intercultural competence studies have expanded, approaches and models to its description have evolved also. The need for a systematic approach is self-evident but when teachers have little training in the cultural dimension as has been shown in the studies by M. Byram (2009), L. Sercu et al. (2005). Different models exist that provide a starting point to plan teaching. In a wide research Chen (2009) provides a useful categorization and summary and makes a distinction between models which are "designed for the purpose of acculturation, which are mostly useful for immigrants or business purposes, and models that are useful for teachers" [2, p. 49].

The aim of the article is to analyze the main approaches and models to conceptualize intercultural competence.

Presentation of the main material. Additional theoretical approaches to intercultural competence are shortly described but in our work the main accent is on the approaches that serve as a base to assess developed to gain intercultural competence.

Ruben's Behavioral Approach to Intercultural Communicative Competence.

One of the earliest comprehensive frameworks is Ruben's behavioral approach to conceptualize and measure intercultural communicative competence. In contrast to the attitudinal accents of previous approaches and the personality, Ruben reported on the behavioral approach to link the gap between knowing and doing, i.e. between what an individual knows being intercultural competent and what a person actually does in an intercultural situation.

It is common for people to be exceptionally well-versed on the cross-cultural effectiveness theories, possesses the best motives and be faithfully concerned about enacting their role accordingly, yet be unable to show this understanding in their own behavior.

For these reasons, B.D. Ruben (1989) discussed that to understand and assess people's behavior it would be necessary to apply "measures of competency that reflect an individual's ability to display concepts in his behavior rather than intentions, understanding, knowledge, attitudes, or desires" [3, p. 229]. B. D. Ruben investigated that observing people in the situations to that they were being trained for or selected would provide the information to predict their performance in the similar situations in future.

Based on the works in literature and his own study, B.D. Ruben outlined seven dimensions of intercultural competence:

1) *display of respect* shows a person's ability to "express respect and positive regard" for other people;

2) interaction posture describes a person's ability to "respond to others in a descriptive, non-evaluative and non-judgmental way";

3) *orientation to knowledge* highlights a person's ability to "recognize the extent to which knowledge is individual in nature"; in other words, orientation to knowledge shows a person's ability to acknowledge and recognize that individuals explain the world around them in the different ways with various opinions of what is "right" and "true";

4) *empathy* is a person's ability to "put [himself] in another's shoes";

5) *self-oriented role behaviour* describes a person's ability to "be flexible and to function in [initiating and harmonizing] roles". In the context, initiating means to request information, clarify and evaluate ideas for problem solving. On the other hand, harmonizing means to regulate the group status quo via mediation;

6) *interaction management* is a person's ability to take a turn during a discussion, initiate and terminate an interaction on the ground of reasonably accurate assessment of others' desires and needs;

7) *tolerance for ambiguity* highlights a person's ability to "react to new and ambiguous situations with little visible discomfort" [3].

B.D. Ruben defined these seven dimensions with observation and rating scales to assess. They were subsequently used and further developed by other authors. Ruben's research on a behavioural model and assessment of behavioural purposes, i.e. describing a person's competence based on the observation may be regarded as a precursor to performance intercultural communicative competence as well.

To sum up, according to B. D. Ruben, intercultural communicative competence includes the "ability to function in a manner that is perceived to be relatively consistent with the needs, capacities, goals, and expectations of the individuals in one's environment while satisfying one's own needs, capacities, goals and expectations" [3, p. 236]; the ability which is best assessed by observing a person's actions rather than reading a person's self-report.

European Multidimensional Models of Intercultural Competence by Byram and Risager.

On the bases of their experience in the European context, Byram (1997) and Risager (2007) explained multidimensional models of intercultural competence.

In his work 'Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Competence' Byram analyzed a five-

factor model of intercultural competence including the next:

1) the *attitude* factor means the ability to relativise oneself and value other individuals and consists of "curiosity and openness, readiness to suspend disbelief about other cultures and belief about one's own" [4, p. 91];

2) *knowledge* of oneself and other individuals refers to the rules for personal and social interaction and includes knowledge about social groups and their practices both in own culture and the other one;

3) the first skill set – the *skills of interpreting and relating* – highlights a person's ability to explain, interpret and relate documents and events from other culture to own one;

4) the second skill set – the *skills of discovery and interaction* – allows a person to acquire "new knowledge of culture and cultural practices" including the ability to apply existing attitudes, knowledge and skills in cross-cultural interactions [4, p. 98];

5) the last factor – *critical cultural awareness* – represents the ability to apply perspectives, practice and products in own culture and on other one to evaluate.

Further Byram explained that the interaction factor – the skills of discovery and interacting – consists of a number of communication forms including verbal and non-verbal modes and development of discourse, linguistic and sociolinguistic competencies.

Based on Byram's theory, Risager (2007) presented the expanded concept of intercultural competence. She discussed that the model of intercultural competence should consist of a number of resources that a person possesses and also narrow competences which can be assessed. Risager stated that the model is broader in range. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that ten elements which she described are largely outlined in the linguistic development and proficiencies [5, p. 227]:

- linguistic (linguastructural) competence;
- linguacultural competences and resources – semantics and pragmatics;
- linguacultural competences and resources – poetics;
- linguacultural competences and resources – linguistic identity;
- translation and interpretation;
- interpreting texts (discourses);
- using of ethnographic methods;
- transnational cooperation;
- language knowledge as critical language awareness as well as a world citizen;
- knowledge of culture and society, and critical cultural awareness as well as a world citizen.

Developing the ideas of these bases, Byram and other European scientists (Kühlmann, Müller-Jacquier and Budin) have co-worked to combine existing theories on intercultural competence as the foundations to develop their own tool of assessment. Called INCA (intercultural competence assessment), the research project has adopted the multidimensional framework. Their overall model concludes two dimension sets – one for an assessor and another for an examinee – with three skill levels for each dimension: basic, intermediate and full. According to an assessor’s opinion, intercultural competence includes six various dimensions as outlined by the INCA assessor’s manual [4, pp. 5–7]:

1) *tolerance for ambiguity* is “the ability to accept of clarity and ambiguity and to be able to deal with it constructively”;

2) *behavioural flexibility* is “the ability to adapt one’s own behavior to different requirements and situations”;

3) *communicative awareness* is “the ability [...] to establish relationships between linguistic expressions and cultural contents, to identify, and consciously work with, various communicative conventions of foreign partners, and to modify correspondingly one’s own linguistics forms of expression”;

4) *knowledge discovery* is “the ability to acquire new knowledge of a culture and cultural practices and the ability to act using that knowledge, those attitudes, and those skills under the constraints of real-time communication and interaction”;

5) *respect for otherness* is “readiness to suspend disbelief about other cultures and belief about one’s own”;

6) *empathy* is “the ability to intuitively understand what other people think and how they feel in concrete situations”.

Regarding an examinee’s point of view, intercultural competence includes three dimensions in the simplified variant of the assessor’s model [4, p. 11]:

1) *openness* is the ability to “be open to the other and to situations in which

2) something is done differently” (respect for other people + tolerance of ambiguity);

3) *knowledge* is the characteristic of “not only want[ing] to know the ‘hard

4) facts’ about a situation or about a certain culture, but also [...] want[ing] to know something about the feelings of the other person” (knowledge discovery + empathy);

5) *adaptability* outlines the ability to “adapt [one’s] behaviour and [one’s style of communication” (behavioural flexibility + communicative awareness).

The presented assessment orientation of the given intercultural communicative competence framework, the various dimensions have not only been defined theoretically as above mentioned but have been described concrete descriptions for each level of skills as well. For instance, Table 1 presents the descriptions for each level of the first dimension – *tolerance for ambiguity*.

Table 1

Skill Levels for Tolerance for Ambiguity Dimension

Basic	Intermediate	Full
deals with ambiguity on a one-off basis, responding to items as they arise. May be overwhelmed by ambiguous situations which imply high involvement.	has begun to acquire a repertoire of approaches to cope with ambiguities in low-involvement situations. Begins to accept ambiguity as a challenge.	is constantly aware of the possibility of ambiguity. When it occurs, he/she tolerates and manages it.

Besides the INCA project, the multidimensional approach and the dimensions by Byram and Risager described the intercultural competence can be seen in both commercial assessment tools (Cross-Cultural Adaptability Index) and non-commercial assessment practice (Intercultural Index in Longo (2008) and Assessment of Intercultural Competence in Fantini, 2006). The key to these European-oriented frameworks and distinct from early research by Ruben is the accent on proficiency acquisition in a host culture, moving proper beyond the ability to interact effectively, non-judgmentally and respectfully with a host culture.

Bennet’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS). Recently in the con-

text of North America, the other model of intercultural competence has been widely researched, analyzed and discussed – Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) [6; 7; 8]. Based on the studies in the 1970–1980’s, Bennett developed a dynamic model for explanation how people respond to cultural differences and how their responses evolve for time.

The Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) includes six stages which are grouped into three *ethnocentric* stages (the individual’s culture is the central worldview) and three *ethnorelative* stages (the individual’s culture is one of many equally valid worldviews), as follows:

1) in the first ethnocentric stage – *denial* – a person denies the difference or existence of another culture by rising psychological or physical barriers in the form of isolation and separation from other cultures;

2) in the second ethnocentric stage – *defense* – a person reacts against the threat of another culture by denigrating another culture (negative stereotype) and promoting superiority of own culture; in some cases a person undergoes the reversal phase during which the worldview shifts from own culture to another and the own culture is the subject to disparagement;

3) in the third ethnocentric stage, *minimization*, a person accepts cultural differences on the surface, though considers all cultures as mainly similar.

Three ethnorelative development stages lead to acquisition of the more complex worldview in which cultures are understood relative to each other and the actions are understood as culturally situated.

1) (4) In the *acceptance* phase a person accepts and respects cultural differences in regard to the behavior and values.

2) (5) In the second, ethnorelative stage – *adaptation* – individuals develop the ability to shift their frames of reference to the other culturally diverse worldviews via empathy and pluralism.

3) (6) In the last stage – *integration* – individuals incorporate and expand other worldviews into their own worldviews.

All together, the six stages form the continuum from the least culturally competent to the most culturally competent and they display a dynamic way of modeling the intercultural competence development.

In the past decade, Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity has served as the foundation for some assessment tools that are addressing both commercially available cross-cultural competence and intercultural sensitivity (Bennett, 1993) and locally developed (Olson & Kroeger, 2001). Nevertheless, Bennett has not explicitly outlined the communication role in the intercultural sensitivity development he has referenced communication as the developmental strategy, especially in ethnorelative stages:

“Participants moving out of acceptance are eager to apply their knowledge of cultural differences to actual face-to-face communication. Thus, now is the time to provide opportunities for interaction. These activities might include dyads with other-culture partners, facilitated multicultural group discussions, or outside assignments involving interviewing of people from other cultures... communication practice could refer to homestays or developing friendships in the other culture” [6, pp. 58–59].

A Culture-Generic Approach to Intercultural Competence. The most recent developments in the intercultural competence theory emerged in the study by Arasaratnam and Doerfel (2005). In their research, Arasaratnam and Doerfel call for a new culture-wide model of intercultural communication competence. The authors discuss that the previous models are often subjective and limited by the cultures of the people involved in their conceptualization and assessment. Instead of imposing factors and dimensions in a top-down way, Arasaratnam and Doerfel have approved a bottom-up approach in which themes and dimensions come to light in the interviews. The researchers conducted the semantic network analysis of the interview transcripts with thirty-seven participants who are intercultural competent for identification of the themes. The participants were affiliated with a large university and included U.S. students ($N=12$) and the international students from fourteen various countries ($N=25$). U.S. students were sorted on the bases of their involving in the international student organizations, foreign study programmes and international host/friendship programmes. In the interview the participants replied to the following questions:

Question 1: How would you define intercultural communication?

Question 2: Can you identify any aspects or qualities of individuals who are competent in intercultural communication?

Question 3: Can you identify any specific people who you believe are particularly competent in intercultural communication and say why you perceive them as such ones?

Question 4: What are the aspects of good communication in your culture/opinion?

Question 5: What are the aspects of bad communication in your culture/opinion?

The semantic analysis of the participants' answers revealed 4-5 dominant word clusters for each question. For instance, the terms of intercultural communication (Question 1) include:

a) *able, cross, cultural, language, religious, talking and verbal;*

b) *across, backgrounds, coming, countries, ideas, message and understand;*

c) *beliefs, communicating, exchange, group, individuals, information, outside and town;*

d) *communicate, cultures, differences, different, ethnic, people, trying and two.*

Based on the semantic analysis for the five questions, Arasaratnam and Doerfel (2005) outlined ten unique dimensions of intercultural communicative competence:

- heterogeneity;
- transmission;
- other-centered;

- observant;
- motivation;
- sensitivity;
- respect;
- relational;
- investment;
- appropriateness.

Nevertheless, this approach has not led to development of widely applied methods of assessment, it promises a bottom-up and culture-genetic approach to elicit the definitions and dimensions of intercultural competence which may be applied in future tools of assessment.

Other Theoretical Approaches to Intercultural Competence.

In addition to the above mentioned theoretical approaches, at least three more other models have been described and analyzed:

- anxiety/ uncertainty management by Gudykunst (1993, 1998);
- an integrative system's theory by Kim (1993);
- identity negotiation by Ting-Toomey (1993).

In the model of anxiety/uncertainty management (AUM), Gudykunst (1993,

1998) discusses that a person feels both anxiety and uncertainty while interacting with a foreign culture. In order to adapt, people have to develop the ability to manage their anxiety by means of mindfulness. According to Gudykunst, mindfulness consists of identifying and accenting on anxiety sources that can consist of the concept of self, the reaction to the host culture, situations and relations with the host cultures.

In Y.K. Kim's integrative model (1993) cross-cultural adaptation is considered as the interactive and integrative process in which a person is dynamic, "never a finished product but instead... in the business of growing and maturing" [9, p. 173]. Her model consists of six various dimensions comprising communication competence, social communication, environment, intercultural transformation and predisposition. The person that experiences cross-cultural adaptation undergoes the phases of acculturation (acquiring elements of host cultures), and deculturation (unlearning elements of the old culture) in the cyclic pattern of stress-adaptation.

Finally, Ting-Toomey's negotiation model (1993) consists of three elements which contribute to the adaptation when a person is faced with the foreign or unfamiliar setting: 1) cognitive; 2) affective; 3) behavioural factors. The factors contribute to effective identity negotiation and outcome attainment pro-

cesses" [10, p. 106] and enable a person to interact with a stranger.

Conclusion and prospect for further research. Despite the fact that the models of intercultural competence have been theorized, none of them has led to the development of assessment to estimate the degrees or the levels of intercultural competence. Nevertheless, these models offer the further insights into the factors which can be related to the learner's development of intercultural communicative competence.

To summarize, a difficult nature of intercultural competence has led to a number of terms, models and theories which are served as the basis for various approaches for its assessment. Some models focus on a communicative nature of intercultural competence when the other ones stress the person's adaptation and the development while confronted with new cultures and still the others emphasize the empathic and tolerant reactions to another culture. Ultimately the models seek to explain skill types and the abilities that people need to function in culturally various settings and processes they undergo to develop the skills and abilities to be intercultural competent.

References

Список бібліографічних посилань

1. Brown, Douglas (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*, New York: Longman.
2. Chen, H.S. (2009). *Intercultural team teaching: a study of foreign and local EFL teachers in Taiwan*. Unpublished PhD, University of Durham, England.
3. Ruben, B.D. (1989). The study of cross-cultural competence: Traditions and contemporary issues. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 13, pp. 229-240.
4. Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters.
5. Risager, K. (2007). *Language and culture pedagogy: From a national to a transnational paradigm*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
6. Bennett, J. M. (1993). Toward ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 21-71). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural.
7. Hammer, M. R., Bennett, M. J., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27, pp. 421-443.
8. Paige, R.M., Jacobs-Cassuto, M., Yershova, Y.A., & DeJaeghere, J. (2003). Assessing intercultural sensitivity: An empirical analysis of the Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27, 467-486.
9. Kim, Y.K. (1993). Cross-cultural adaptation: An integrative theory. In R.L. Wiseman, and J. Koester (Eds.), *Intercultural communication theory* (pp. 170-193). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
10. Ting-Toomey, S. (1993). Communicative resourcefulness: An identity negotiation perspective. In R.L. Wiseman, and J. Koester (Eds.), *Intercultural communication theory* (pp. 72-111). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

БІЛОУС Тамара Миколаївна

кандидатка педагогічних наук, доцентка кафедри практики англійської мови та методики викладання,
Рівненський державний гуманітарний університет

ПЕРІШКО Ірина Володимирівна

кандидатка педагогічних наук, доцентка кафедри практики англійської мови та методики викладання,
Рівненський державний гуманітарний університет

ВОЛКОВСЬКА Ірина Петрівна

студентка V курсу філологічного факультету,
Рівненський державний гуманітарний університет

ПІДХОДИ ТА МОДЕЛІ МІЖКУЛЬТУРНОЇ КОМПЕТЕНТНОСТІ

Анотація. У статті йдеться про сучасне дослідження міжкультурної компетентності у викладанні англійської мови як іноземної. Культурна компетентність стала важливою проблемою сучасної мовної освіти, акцент на якій відображає зв'язок мови та культури, необхідність підготовки учнів до міжкультурного спілкування. У статті проаналізовано рекомендовані підходи та моделі щодо формування міжкультурної компетентності, які характерні для відкритого розгляду проблеми міжкультурної комунікації іноземною мовою.

Автори досліджують основні підходи та моделі концептуалізації міжкультурної компетентності, такі як поведінковий підхід Б. Рубена, європейські багатовимірні моделі М. Байрама та К. Рісейджера, розвиваюча модель міжкультурної чутливості Дж. Беннета та інші теоретичні підходи до розвитку міжкультурної компетентності.

Виходячи з аналізу опрацьованих джерел щодо підходів та моделей міжкультурної комунікації, автори роблять висновок, що для досягнення ефективної міжкультурної комунікації, знання та вміння є необ-

хідними компонентами, але не вичерпними. Знання та вміння в контексті міжкультурної взаємодії повинні поєднуватися з відкритістю, гнучкістю мислення, а також бажанням здійснювати ефективну комунікацію та успішно вибудувувати взаємовідносини. Формування міжкультурної компетентності передбачає готовність людини до взаємодії з іншими культурами та базується на повазі інших культурних цінностей. Міжкультурна компетентність – здатність індивіда розпізнавати, поважати й ефективно застосовувати відмінності в сприйнятті, мисленні та поведінці у міжкультурних взаєминах. Будь-які дослідження щодо міжкультурної компетентності мають на меті підвищити рівень міжкультурної компетентності особистості.

Ключові слова: освіта; міжкультурна компетентність; викладання англійської мови; підходи; моделі.

Одержано редакцією 12.11.2021
Прийнято до публікації 23.11.2021