

LOVE MAKES THE WORLD GO ROUND... BUT SO DO SECOND LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY AND INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

Roxana-Maria NISTOR-GĂZ*

* Department of Foreign Languages for Specific Purposes, Faculty of Letters, Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

Abstract: *The world we are living in—a world in which migration and technological advancements have become commonplace—is so interdependent and complex from the cultural point of view that all these changes have somehow marked our attitudes towards diversity and, consequently, the way in which we interact with one another and with people from other cultures. That is why, intercultural communicative competence has become a necessity for today's global citizens. Building on the three models of intercultural competence (Bennett's 1993; Byram's 1997; Deardorff's 2006), and by taking into consideration the opinions expressed by the students enrolled at Faculty of European Studies within Babeş -Bolyai University (Cluj-Napoca, Romania), on the one hand, and the opinions of the foreign language teachers working in the aforementioned institution, on the other hand, this article analyses the undeniable connection between second language proficiency and intercultural communicative competence, as well as the necessity of 'an intercultural mindset' (Bennett et al. 2003) for today's students, as well as the importance of the two elements for the global workforce.*

Keywords: *second language proficiency; intercultural communicative competence; university studies, foreign language teaching and learning*

1. INTRODUCTION

The world we are living in has been changing continuously and at a highly rapid pace for at least a decade now. Since the introduction of smartphones and the general advancement of technology, our lives have changed (for the better or for the worse, some might say), but, most importantly, the learning and teaching process have also undergone great transformations. In a time where everything is one click away, the methods of transferring knowledge to students and of building relationships (whether we refer to personal relationships or professional ones) have metamorphosized. Furthermore, globalization has affected not only the way in which we live and learn, but also the way in which we work, as the global workforce has greatly changed, in that it has become more international and mobile. Also, another factor that has affected our personal and professional lives is internationalization (the objective set, for instance, by many higher education institutions in order to attract more foreign students and to occupy a better position in

international rankings). Consequently, learning and speaking at least one foreign language besides one's mother tongue (second language proficiency) (European Council Conclusions, 2017:3), being able to understand cultural differences and to work and communicate across cultures (intercultural communicative competence) have become prerequisites of becoming truly global individuals.

In 1997, Michael Byram observed the fact that the specialists in intercultural competence did not include the language component in this ability, although it is common knowledge that language is the medium of transmission of a culture. That is why he made a distinction between intercultural competence and intercultural communicative competence, the latter meaning more than the simple transmission of messages from a sender to a receiver. Intercultural communicative competence also includes "establishing and maintaining relationships" (Byram, 1997:3).

Building on the three models of intercultural competence (Bennett's 1993; Byram's 1997; Deardorff's 2006), and by taking into consideration the opinions expressed by the

students enrolled at Faculty of European Studies within Babeş-Bolyai University (Cluj-Napoca, Romania), on the one hand, and the opinions of the foreign language professors working in the aforementioned institution, on the other hand, this article analyses the connection between second language proficiency and intercultural communicative competence, the necessity of ‘an intercultural mindset’ (Bennett *et al.*, 2003) for today’s students, as well as the importance of the two elements for the global workforce.

2. SECOND LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY AND INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE – THEORETICAL ASPECTS

Language and culture are inseparable; consequently, “foreign language education is, by definition, intercultural. Bringing a foreign language to the classroom means connecting learners to a world that is culturally different from their own.” (Sercu, 2006:16) Several books have been published to explain and to advocate for the importance of intercultural foreign language education at all levels of studies (Byram, 1997, 2008; Byram and Risager, 1999; Corbett, 2003; Dearsorff, 2006; Feng *et al.*, 2009; Jackson, 2012, 2014; Liddicoat and Scarino, 2013; Risager, 2007; Sercu *et al.*, 2005; Soler and Safront Jordà, 2007, just to mention some of the most notable ones).

Before becoming proficient in a language, one must first acquire the basics. Among the theories that explain the way in which individuals learn foreign languages is the behaviourist theory. In psychology, it is known as the theory that explains the connection between human and animal behaviour (Pavlov’s dog experiment). In second language acquisition, this theory is used to explain how language learners remember, through the operant or behavioural conditioning (i.e. reward and punishment), specific linguistic constructs by repetition or imitation (e.g. the plural of nouns). Then, by analogy, they can acquire new grammar knowledge¹ or even new vocabulary².

For language learners to become proficient, however, they cannot rely on grammar structures only, but it is of utmost importance for them to acquire new vocabulary and all the skills they need

in order to become fluent speakers (listening, reading, writing, and speaking skills). To become proficient in a foreign language, learners have to be able to play with the words, to master the idiomatic expressions in their target language, as

figurative competence is an important component of L2 fluency and (...), in order to be proficient in a foreign/second language, an L2 learner needs to build a large repertoire of conventionalized expressions such as idioms, collocations, compounds, phrasal verbs, and other so-called multiword lexical items (Cieślicka, 2015:209)³.

To do all this, they also have to know some cultural elements of the language they want to learn, because language learners often rely on their own cultural background to predict, assume, or guess the meaning of words or phrases in another language. They sometimes even translate words and phrases in the foreign language they learn assuming that the English equivalent, for example, is identical or very similar⁴. This happens because of the

interlanguage of second language learners, i.e. the language produced by second language learners when they use their second language, which contains features that may be markedly different from the language of native speakers of the target language” (Jacobs and Renandya, 2016:16).

Another theory that plays an important role in explaining second language acquisition is Jean Piaget’s theory of cognitive development, which comprises four stages (sensorimotor, pre-operational, operational and concrete operational) (Piaget, 1950). According to this theory, language learners build their knowledge actively by taking information not only from their language instructors, but also from their surrounding environment, by “explaining, debating, role playing, creating visuals, comparing and connecting” (Jacobs and Renandya, 2016:15). Therefore, a very important role is played by the language instructors who have to make sure they prepare the appropriate materials for the language learners.

³ For more on idiomatic language and the reasons why it is important for language learners to acquire figurative competence, see the author’s research: Nistor & Cotoc (2018:219-229).

⁴ In the case of Romanian students, many of them translate the Romanian term “proces” as “process” irrespective of the context they use it in. In Romanian, we use this term to refer to both the “series of actions or operations conducting to an end” (Merriam Webster online) and the “formal examination before a competent tribunal of the matter in issue in a civil or criminal cause in order to determine such issue.”

¹ For instance, in English, in the case of nouns of foreign origin and their plural forms, language learners can make analogies: e.g., thesis-theses → crisis-crises; memorandum-memoranda → curriculum-curricula, etc.

² Romanian language speakers can easily learn vocabulary in English if that vocabulary is derived from Latin, e.g. villa, antique, longitude, province, figure, popular, dense, etc.

Perhaps one of the most important theories of learning that can be applied to language learning as well is Lev Vygotsky's socio-cultural theory, according to which the zone of proximal development⁵ plays a very important role. Learners first work under guidance, and then, if they are consistent, they can become proficient. This consistency goes hand in hand with the learners' instrumental and/or integrative motivation⁶.

Proficiency can, therefore, be acquired through practice, and both learners and language instructors play equally balanced roles. Instructors have to put learners at the centre of the learning process (Gibbs, 1995; Hall and Saunders, 1997; Harden and Crosby, 2000; Lea *et al.*, 2003; O'Neill and McMahon, 2005), while also promoting "multilingualism, an awareness of the different varieties of English and exposing students to these varieties" (which mirror perfectly the speakers' various cultural backgrounds), "embracing multiculturalism and promoting cross-cultural awareness" (Renandya and Widodo, 2016:6). However, as previously mentioned, learners also have to be motivated and consistent in their work, and they also need an understanding of the culture whose language they are speaking/learning.

Since language and culture are two inseparable entities, learning about the culture of the target language becomes an essential part of language learning. Language instructors play an additional role of cultural mediators by exposing language learners to the culture whose language they are studying or speaking, and "they are now required to teach intercultural communicative competence (ICC)." (Sercu, 2006:16)

Initially coined by Hymes, the concept of "communicative competence" was introduced to refer to the ability of using grammatical competence, as well as to the ability of adapting language to specific cultural contexts, i.e. the sociolinguistic competence of language learners (Hymes, 1972). Later on, Stern (1983) argued that "language teaching is fast acquiring a sociolinguistic component, but still lacks a well-defined socio-cultural emphasis" (Stern, 1983:346), while in 1986 van Ek developed a "model of communicative ability", which included

six competences (...): linguistic, sociolinguistic, discourse, strategic, socio-cultural, and social" (van Ek *apud* Byram, 1997:10). Compared to "communicative competence" "intercultural communicative competence places more emphasis on contextual factors (Chen and Starosta, 2008:219). If "intercultural competence" emphasizes culture, "intercultural communicative competence" is the point where culture and language intertwine. Providing an exact definition for the "intercultural communicative competence" has proved to be a quite strenuous task, as various researchers state that language learners need to acquire several competences in order to become intercultural competent (Spitzberg and Cupach, 1984; Dinges, 1983; Collier, 1989).

Perhaps three of the most important models in intercultural communicative competence are those proposed by Bennett (1993), Byram (1997), and Deardorff (2006).

Milton J. Bennett introduced the *Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity* (DMIS), which differentiates between "ethnocentrism" and "ethnorelativism", where "ethnocentrism" places an individual's own culture in the centre of their reality, whereas "ethnorelativism" places one's own culture among many viable possibilities. Stage 1 (ethnocentrism) includes denial, defence, and minimisation, while stage 2 (ethnorelativism) includes acceptance, adaptation, integration.

The second model proposed for our research is that of Michael Byram (1997), according to whom intercultural communication in foreign language teaching always depends on a context; this context can be "between people of different languages and countries where one is a native speaker of the languages used; between people of different languages and countries where the language used is a lingua franca; and between people of the same country but different languages, one of whom is a native speaker of the language used." (Byram, 1997:20). Byram's Model of Intercultural Communicative Competence focuses on four major factor groups that are involved in the knowledge (*les savoirs*) necessary for intercultural communicative competence: attitudes (*savoir être*), education (*savoir s'engager*), skills to interpret and relate (*savoir comprendre*), and skills of discovery and interaction (*savoir apprendre / faire*) (Byram, 1997:34).

Last but not least, the third model of intercultural communicative competence is that proposed by Deardorff (2006), organised like a pyramid with four layers. The basic layer is represented by requisite attitudes (respect,

⁵ The zone of proximal development represents "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1978:86).

⁶ For more on this topic, see Gardner (1985); Dörnyei (2001, 2012); Brown (2000); Nistor-Gâz (2017).

openness, curiosity and discovery); the second layer comprises knowledge, comprehension and skills (listening, observation, interpretation, analysis, evaluation and the ability to relate); the third layer is that of the desired internal outcome (and it refers to the learners' adaptability, flexibility, ethnorelative view, and empathy); while the fourth and top layer of the pyramid is represented by the desired external outcome (i.e. behaving and communicating effectively and appropriately in various cultural settings/contexts).

3. SECOND LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY AND INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE IN PRACTICE

To see how these three models apply in practice, we developed two online questionnaires, which were sent to the students enrolled at the Faculty of European Studies within Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca (Romania), as well as to the language instructors from the two language departments of the university (namely, the Department of Foreign Languages for Specific Purposes, and the Department for Modern Languages and Business Communication).

The questionnaire was applied as a method of obtaining a large quantity of information from various groups of people whose answers are relevant to our research topic. There were 60 bachelor's and master's degree students who filled in our questionnaire, as well as 11 language instructors from the two language departments. The questionnaire is structured into three large sections and includes factual, behavioural, and attitudinal questions, both open-ended and close-ended ones. The questionnaire was built on the three models of intercultural communicative competence of Bennett (1993), Byram (1997), and Deardorff (2006), with the purpose of gathering information about the respondents' background, about their attitudes towards and acceptance of various cultures, about their skills to discover new cultures and to integrate in them (if necessary), about their skills to interpret and to adapt to new cultures, all of them being related to education.

The first part of the questionnaire was built so as to cover the first part from each of the three models of intercultural communicative competence. All three models first look at the individuals' general perception of the other cultures, at their attitudes of curiosity, openness, at their readiness to dismiss stereotypes, to accept other culturally different points of view and other cultures, therefore, to move from ethnocentrism to

ethnorelativism. If one applies Bennett's model to language learning, one may interpret that the language learners are ethnocentric if they put their own culture at the centre of their intercultural experiences, if they ignore other cultures or if they refer to people from other cultures as "foreigners" or "immigrants" (Bennett, 1993), and if they are more prone to lending an ear to stereotypes. This idea is also supported by Byram's model, according to which people

are only concerned (...) with attitudes towards people who are perceived as different in respect of the cultural meanings, beliefs and behaviours they exhibit (...). Such attitudes are frequently characterised as prejudice or stereotype (Byram, 1997:34).

As such, respondents were first asked to define culture and cultural diversity. The answers varied greatly proving, therefore, that defining culture and cultural diversity is indeed a difficult task, and that "the word *culture* is used by many people in many ways" (Shaules, 2007:24), but the most widely used words in the answers given were "language", "values", "customs", and "traditions." Furthermore, the fact that 94.9% of the students and all the language instructors declared they had travelled abroad shows the fact that their answers were based on their experience with other cultures.

Another question that strengthened this result and whose purpose was to see the respondents' openness towards, their curiosity and discovery of the various cultures they know about was related to their contact with and openness to people from other cultures. 96.6% of the students and all the language instructors declared they have or had friends or colleagues from other cultures; 47.5% of the students declared they are always curious to find information about their colleagues' or friends' cultures, 42.4% declared they are only sometimes curious, while 10.2% declared they are never curious to find information about their colleagues' or friends' cultures. In the case of the language teachers, 63.6% of them declared they always look up information about their colleagues' or friends' culture, while 36.4% declared they are only sometimes curious about this aspect.

The respondents' openness to learn about other cultures, to become more openminded and non-judgemental about other cultures has also been analysed through another question in this first section, by which respondents were asked whether they had ever had prejudices related to other cultures. 36.4% of the language instructors and 33.9% of the students declared they had never been

prejudiced by the various existing stereotypes, 36.4% of the language instructors and declared they rarely had had prejudices, while 27.3% of the language instructors and 64.4% of the students admitted to having sometimes had prejudices related to other cultures. What was interesting to find out in our research was the fact that only 18.2% of the language instructors declared they were always able to dismiss their stereotypes after they had travelled to the respective country whereas 45.5% of them declared they had only sometimes been able to overcome those prejudices. This contrasts the students' answers, who, in 64.4% of the cases, stated that they were able to dismiss their initial prejudices.

Further on, they were asked whether they try to connect with people from other cultures with the purpose of learning as much as possible about their culture. No language instructor fully agreed with this statement, but 54.5% partially agreed with it, 36.4% neither agreed nor disagreed, while 9.1% expressed their full disagreement. The contrast with the students' answers is quite evident, as 35.6% of the students fully agreed with the statement and 33.9% partially agreed, which shows a higher degree of openness of students towards the establishment of a contact with people from other cultures. Through these answers we were able to see the respondents' requisite attitudes to becoming interculturally competent (Deardorff 2006), and we were able to see that they show openness to other cultures, as well as curiosity to understand and to discover different cultures. As such, we can say that students are more curious and open to learning about new cultures and they are more likely to tolerate cultural ambiguity.

The second part of the questionnaire was constructed so as to test the respondents' skills of discovery and interaction, their ability to become aware of the cultural dynamics, to develop intercultural sensitivity and to *savoir apprendre* new information about a culture by listening, observing, interpreting, analysing, and evaluating their experience with other cultures. We wanted to see if, when communicating with people from other cultures, our respondents are "ethnographers" (Sercu, 2006:19), i.e. if they study the behaviour of people from other cultural groups. As such, this second part contains mostly close-ended questions, where the respondents had to read some statements and to select the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with the given statements. Based on Deardorff's Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence, we wanted to see the degree to which respondents have in-depth knowledge of the

different culture (obtained through listening, observation, and interpretation) so we asked them if they analyse the behaviour of people from other countries when they are in a group with people from various cultures. In this case, 27.1% of the students fully agreed with the statement, compared to only 9.1% of the language instructors; 54.5% of the language instructors partially agreed with the statement, compared to 42.4% of the students who gave the same answer.

Next, we wanted to see if the respondents are able to analyse, evaluate and relate to different cultural context and if they are affected to some degree by failures in intercultural communication, so they had to tick the degree to which they agreed with the following statement: "When a conversation with people from other cultures fails, I try to analyse the reasons why the conversation was not a successful one". 67.8% of the students and 72.7% of the language instructors strongly or partially agreed with this statement, while 22% of the students and 18.2% of the language instructors neither agreed nor disagreed probably thinking that it is not of utmost importance to analyse the reasons behind a failed intercultural discussion. This shows that the great majority of both students and language instructors have an interest in understanding other cultures and what they can do in order to improve their communications skills. This aspect is very important because it shows that both students and language instructors are committed to improving their knowledge and understanding of other cultures, because, as Sercu (2006) mentioned "the intercultural speaker is not a cosmopolitan being who floats over culture, much like tourists tend to do. Rather, s/he is committed to turning intercultural encounters into intercultural relationships" (Sercu, 2006:18).

Further on, we wanted to see whether the respondents are aware that body language plays an important role in communication by asking them if they try to analyse the way in which their interlocutors from other cultures use body language, and not surprisingly 70% of the students responded affirmatively, by strongly agreeing with the statement, while 63% of the language instructors agreed with it, partially or fully. The more visible difference between the two groups of respondents came with the following statement related to body language, where they had to tell us whether they believe that body language is different from one culture to another, and here, surprisingly (because up to this point students seemed more open to other cultures), the language instructors' experience came into play, and 81% of them agreed with the

statement, while only 66% of the students fully or partially agreed with it; however, they still confirmed that it is easy for them to learn about other cultures by direct contact with them, and language teachers supported this idea too, and this backs the idea that “being intercultural” means having “contact with people from different cultural backgrounds” (Renandya and Widodo, 2016:162). Cultural knowledge is, therefore, essential to correctly reading, interpreting and making use of verbal and non-verbal language and to using it in intercultural contexts.

Last but not least, in the third part of our questionnaire we wanted to see how language education impacts the acquisition of intercultural communicative competence, which “involves the fusing of language, culture and learning into a single educative approach” and which can be taught by language instructors by “developing with learners an understanding of their own language(s) and culture(s) in relation to an additional language and culture” (Renandya and Widodo, 2016:162). As previously mentioned, language and culture are two inseparable elements which, if not correctly handled, can lead to breakdowns in communication.

According to Newton *et al.* (2010), there are six principles for intercultural communicative language teaching. The first one is that language and culture are integrated from the beginning, being at the centre of foreign language education. 81.8% of the language teachers who responded to our questionnaire agreed with the fact that in the language courses they teach the information they give students about different cultures plays an important role in the teaching and learning process. The same percentage of language instructors mentioned that they strongly believe that it is essential for students to acquire intercultural competence irrespective of their field of studies.

The second principle presented by Newton *et al.* “engages learners in genuine social interaction”. This includes Byram’s skills of discovery and interaction, while “for language teaching to adequately respond to these views of language and culture it must provide learning opportunities that are themselves dynamic, experiential, and interactive” (Newton *et al.*, 2010:65-66). This statement is also supported by the answers to our questionnaire where more than 80% of the language instructors declared they carry out activities with their students where the latter are put in different cultural situations in which they have to identify solutions to various intercultural communication problems.

The third principle encourages and develops the exploratory and reflective approach to culture and culture-in-language; however, this principle can only be implemented if language learners already have at least an intermediate level in the language of a specific culture, because that level influences the degree to which they can explore the target language and how much they can reflect upon it. The language instructors who answered our questionnaire also agree with this additional remark, as 63.6% of them confirmed they always explain to their students about the strong relation existing between the students’ level of language competence and their capacity to understand the culture whose language they are speaking, while 36.4% confirmed they often explain this aspect to their students.

The fourth principle is that intercultural communicative language teaching fosters explicit comparisons and connections between languages and cultures, while the fifth refers to the fact that intercultural communicative language teaching “acknowledges and responds appropriately to diverse learners and learning contexts.” These two principles can be easily applied to multicultural classrooms, where learners have to interact with one another, share experiences, give examples, observe and analyse, developing therefore a cultural awareness. 81.8% of the language instructors who filled in our questionnaire have students from various cultures in their classrooms, and 90% of them stated that their students have the ability to see and understand cultural differences.

Last but not least, the sixth principle “emphasizes intercultural communicative competence rather than native-speaker competence”, which is one of the key elements of language learning and teaching. The best example is that of English, which is the current *lingua franca*⁷. In this case “the introduction to the national culture of a country where the language is spoken natively can serve as an example, but must be combined with developing in learners the methods to cope with other situations, based on this example” (Byram, 1997:20).

Furthermore, in today’s global world, where the movement of workers has become commonplace, “neither language nor education

⁷ In our research, 45.5% of the language instructors declared they always use English to communicate with people from other cultures, while 45.5% of them declared they use English most of the times in intercultural settings. In the case of students, 89.9% of them stated they always use English when they communicate with people from other cultures, while 8.5% of the declared they use English most of the times.

abroad alone makes someone interculturally or global competent” (Deardorff and Hunter, 2006:81). The more diverse this global workforce is, the more likely it is for communication among interlocutors to suffer from breakdowns. That is why second language proficiency and intercultural communicative competence are inseparable and have become necessary for a truly global worker to be able to collaborate across cultures. Studies have also shown that, for instance, the fact that someone resides abroad does not necessarily mean that they become proficient in the language of that country or that they acquire intercultural competence (Shaules, 2007; Jackson, 2012).

According to Jackson (2014) a truly global citizen and worker needs knowledge (*les savoirs*) related to a country’s geography, language(s), events, etc. This idea is backed by our research as well since the respondents to our questionnaire marked several items as being relevant in terms of becoming culturally competent: customs and traditions (76.3% of students, 90.9% of language instructors), cuisine (72.9% of students, 63.6% of language instructors), the language spoken by a specific culture (81.8% of language instructors), or people’s behaviour and attitudes (62.7% of students). Therefore, truly global workers and citizens have to be able to understand a variety of cultural elements, not only what comes at the top of the iceberg of culture, but mostly what goes below the surface of the water⁸.

Moreover, a truly global worker needs skills that can help them not only perform their jobs well, but also understand the culture in which they are working (research skills, critical thinking skills, communication skills, teamworking and problem-solving skills, coping and resiliency skills) (Jackson, 2014:318)

Last but not least, a truly global worker and citizen has an open attitude to learning about new cultures, to new opportunities, languages, and ways of thinking, is tolerant, culturally sensitive and empathetic, knows their own culture but is also able to appreciate other ways of being (Jackson, 2014:318), elements which therefore contribute to the creation of an “international mindset” and to avoid becoming “a fluent fool” (Bennett, 1997:16).

⁸ The Model of Culture, introduced by Edward T. Hall in 1976, presents cultural aspects under the form of an iceberg, where, at the top of the glacier, are the elements that are easily visible related to a culture (behaviours and some beliefs), while under the water are the less-visible elements (values and thoughts of pattern) that are of great importance to understanding a culture.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Second language proficiency and intercultural communicative competence go hand in hand, and they are the attributes of truly global citizens, who, in order to become so, need an “intercultural mindset”. Building on the three models of intercultural competence of Bennett (1993), Byram (1997), and Deardorff (2006), we designed two questionnaires: one was applied to the language instructors teaching at our university; the second was applied to the students studying international relations and European studies, who, due to the nature of their studies, will obviously need to rely on their second language proficiency, as well as on their intercultural competence in their future jobs. Moreover, the results of a study conducted in 2017 on students from the same field of study within Babeş-Bolyai University showed that a large percentage of the respondents also expressed an interest in working abroad after graduation (Flanja, Nistor-Gâz, 2017:70).

The findings of our current research showed us that both language instructors and students understand not only the terms of “culture” and “cultural diversity”, but also their importance for the development of the aforementioned intercultural mindset.

Furthermore, language teachers play a very important role in helping students acquire intercultural communicative competence, by teaching students to become more tolerant, to understand and treasure cultural diversity, by promoting human rights. Through education (*le savoir de s’engager*), students acquire the ability to analyse points of view, different ways of doing things or different ways of reacting to similar situation. That is why, in their turn, language learners have to continue being openminded and curious about other cultures, learning from each intercultural experience and interaction with people from other cultures, in order to fight stereotyping and prejudice by becoming tolerant, empathetic, and aware of the fact that love isn’t the only thing that makes the world go round, and that by being proficient in one or more foreign languages and by having an intercultural communicative competence they can also contribute to the future of the world..

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bennett, J. M., Bennett, M. J., & Allen, W. (2003). Developing intercultural competence in the language classroom. In D. L. Lange &

- R. M. Paige (Eds.), *Culture as the core: Perspectives on culture in second language learning*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing. 13-45.
2. Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (2nd ed.). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press. 21-71.
 3. Brown, D.H. (2000). *Principles of Language Teaching and Learning*. 4th Edition. New York: Longman.
 4. Byram, M. & Risager, K. (1999). *Language Teachers, Politics, and Cultures*. Clevedon, Philadelphia, Toronto, Sydney: Multilingual Matters.
 5. Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clevedon, Philadelphia, Toronto, Sydney, Johannesburg: Multilingual Matters.
 6. Byram, M. (2008). *From Foreign Language Education to Intercultural Citizenship. Essays and Reflections*. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
 7. Chen, G.M. & Starosta, W.J. (2008). Intercultural Communication Competence: A Synthesis. In M.K. Asante, Y. Miike & J. Yin (Eds.). *The Global Intercultural Communication Reader*. New York and London: Routledge. 215-238.
 8. Cieřlicka, A.B. (2015). Idiom acquisition and processing by second/foreign language learners. In R. Heredia & A. Cieřlicka (Eds.), *Bilingual Figurative Language Processing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 208-244.
 9. Collier, M. J. (1989). Cultural and intercultural communication competence: Current approaches and directions for future research. In *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 13, 287-302.
 10. Corbett, J. (2003). *An Intercultural Approach to English Language Teaching*. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto, Sydney: Multilingual Matters.
 11. Deardorff, D. K. and Hunter, W. D. (2006, May-June). Educating global-ready graduates. In *International Educator*, 15(3), 72-83.
 12. Deardorff, D.K. (2006). Identification and Assessment of Intercultural Competence as a Student Outcome of Internationalization. In *Journal of Studies in International Education*. Vol. 10, No. 3, Fall 2006. 241-266 (DOI: 10.1177/1028315306287022).
 13. Dinges, N. (1983). Intercultural competence. In D. Landis & R.W. Brislin (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training volume 1: Issues in theory and design*. New York: Pergamon. 176-202.
 14. Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 15. Dörnyei, Z. (2012). *Motivation in language learning*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
 16. European Council Conclusions. (14 December 2017). [online]. Available: <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/32204/14-final-conclusions-rev1-en.pdf> [20/03/2020]
 17. Feng, A.; Byram, M. & Fleming, M. (2009). *Becoming Interculturally Competent through Education and Training*. Bristol, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
 18. Flanja, D. & Nistor-Gâz, R. (2017). Brain drain Are we losing our minds? A study on the Romanian human capital flight. In *Online Journal Modelling the New Europe*, 24/2017. 58-75.
 19. Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning. The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*, Edward Arnold Press.
 20. Gibbs, G. (1995). *Assessing Student Centred Courses*. Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff Learning and Development.
 21. Hall, J. & Saunders, P. (1997). Adopting a student-centred approach to management of learning. In C. Bell, M. Bowden, and A. Trott (Eds.), *Implementing Flexible Learning*. London: Kogan Page.
 22. Harden, R. M. & Crosby, J. (2000). AMEE Guide No 20: The good teacher is more than a lecturer – the twelve roles of the teacher. In *Medical Teacher* 22(4), 334-347.
 23. Hymes, D.H. (1972). On Communicative Competence. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (Eds.). *Sociolinguistics. Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 269-293.
 24. Jackson, J. (2014). *Introducing Language and Intercultural Communication*. London and New York: Routledge.
 25. Jackson, J. (Ed.). (2012). *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication*. London and New York: Routledge.
 26. Jacobs, G.M. & Renandya, W.A. (2016). Student-Centred Learning in ELT. In W.A. Renandya & H.P. Widodo (Ed.). *English Language Teaching Today. Linking Theory and Practice*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing. 13-24.

27. Lantolf, J. (2006). Sociocultural Theory and L2: State of the Art. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(1), 67-109. doi:10.1017/S0272263106060037.
28. Lea, S. J., Stephenson, D. & Troy, J. (2003). Higher Education Students' Attitudes to Student Centred Learning: Beyond 'educational bulimia'. In *Studies in Higher Education*, 28(3), 321-334.
29. Liddicoat, A.J. & Scarino, A. (2013). *Intercultural Language Teaching and Learning*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
30. Newton, J.; Yates, E., Shearn, S. & Nowitzki, W. (2015). *Report to the Ministry of Education: Intercultural Communicative Language Teaching: Implications for Effective Teaching and Learning*. [online]. Available: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282694720_Intercultural_communicative_language_teaching_implications_for_effective_teaching_and_learning. [22/03/2020]
31. Nistor-Gâz, R.M. (2017). Motivation and Attitude in English Language Learning for First-Year Students Enrolled at the Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences. In *Lingua. Language and Culture*, issue year XVI/2017, issue No. 1, Editura Fundației pentru Studii Europene. 33-40.
32. Nistor (Gâz), R.M. & Cotoc, A. (2018). A Project-Based Approach of ESP Students to Learn Specialized Idioms. A Piece of Cake. In *Journal of Romanian Literary Studies*. No. 15. 219-229.
33. O'Neill, G. & McMahon, T. (2005). Student-Centred Learning: What does it mean for students and lecturers?. In G. O'Neill, S. Moore, B. McMullin (Eds). *Emerging issues in the practice of University Learning and Teaching*. AISHE. 30-39.
34. Piaget, J. (1950). *The Psychology of Intelligence*. London and New York: Routledge.
35. Renandya, W.A. & Widodo, H.P. (2016). English Language Teaching Today: An Introduction. In W.A. Renandya & H.P. Widodo (Ed.). *English Language Teaching Today. Linking Theory and Practice*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing. 3-12.
36. Risager, K. (2007). *Language and Culture Pedagogy*. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
37. Sercu, L. (2006). Foreign Language Teachers and Intercultural Competence Teaching. Are they in Favour or Against It? Results from an International Investigation. In *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. Vol 151. 15-31.
38. Sercu, L.; Bandura, E.; Castro, P.; Davcheva, L.; Laskaridou, C.; Lundgren, U.; del Carmen Méndes, M. & Ryan, P. (2005). *Foreign Language Teachers and Intercultural Competence. An International Investigation*. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
39. Shaules, J. (2007). *Deep Culture. The Hidden Challenges of Global Living*. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
40. Soler, E.A. & Safront Jordà, M.P.S. (Eds.). (2007). *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning*. Dordrecht: Springer.
41. Spitzberg, B.II. & Cupach, W.R. (1984). *Interpersonal Communication Competence*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
42. Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
43. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.