

TRANSLATE CULTURAL HARMONIZATION AND KNOWLEDGE MODELS USED IN MILITARY TRAINING AND OPERATIONS

Rita PALAGHIA*

*Military Science and Management Department, Air Force Academy "Henri Coandă", Braşov, Romania

Abstract: *The concern of the advanced armies related to the development of the cultural and linguistic capabilities that are allowing the soldiers to operate into multicultural context, is active and adapted to the realities of the theatre of operations and of the hybrid warfare. The development of the capabilities is imposing testing, training, education and opportunities to for those to be put into practice. Thus, there have been created evaluation instruments of the cultural abilities, in order to see the progress into the learning, education and cultural harmonization process. Each model is offering a path of socio-cultural knowledge. The new model „The linear knowledge and harmonization model of the cultural interaction” developed in the theatre of operation is helping to determine the cultural differences in the specific multinational military environment and can be used into the education process during both peacetime and wartime.*

Keywords: *model; cultural knowledge; theatre of operations; capabilities; cultural interaction*

1. INTRODUCTION

The interest for the identification of the component elements that are acting in order to generate and to show cultural phenomena, has caused the attention of the researchers of different specialties - anthropologists, sociologists, linguists, psychologists, etc.. Those have studied the issue and have created cultural knowledge instruments and models, taking into consideration different variables.

For researchers such as: Talcott Parsons and Eduard Shils (1951), Clyde Kluckhohn and Fred Strodbeck (1961), Edward T. Hall (1966, 1976), Geert Hofstede (1980, 1983, 1991, 2001, 2005), S. H. Schwartz and Peter B. Smith (1992, 1994, 2002), Hampden-Turner and Fons Trompenaars (1993, 1997), the cultural theme has represented a special interest, especially from the perspective of the cultural values and dimensions.

An important conclusion, resulted after cultural research, was that situational evolution, in the same culture, could be different, even if the sensory elements of the respective members of the group are nearly the same. Starting from this and extrapolating the issue to the specificity of the current military operations, the multinational participation, there have been advanced the following hypotheses: this disparity can be a barrier in the way of interoperability when are

necessary coordinated actions in multinational groups, but can act as a leverage in creative management of different conflict situations. The reality of the conflict zones has confirmed the validity of both hypotheses.

2. CULTURAL KNOWLEDGE MODELS (VALUES, NORMS, PRACTICES)

When we are talking about values, especially in multinational military environment we are taking into consideration the following aspects: *general values hold by the group under the observation, how strong is the belief in those values, what is the priority that the group or individual is paying to those values in comparison to other groups.*

2.1. In 1961, Clyde Kluckhohn and Fred Strodbeck has published an important anthropologic study in which they were presenting the variation of the cultural values for six dimensions: human nature, the relationship human nature, the relationships in between people, the relation with the space, the orientation on the axis of time, the reasons of the actions (Kluckhohn & Strodbeck, 1961) The big benefit of this study consists in the fact that is presenting the vast areas and different zones that are influencing cultural interaction from the cultural values perspective.

2.2. In 1992, S. H. Schwartz took as a premise the fact that *individual values*, irrespective of culture is resulting from the combination of the features of the two dimensions: „own interest vs. the care for the others” and „opening towards change vs. conservatism”. He stated that from this interaction of the two dimensions is resulting ten motivational values: universalism, good will, conformity, tradition, security, power, hedonism, achievements, stimulation and independence. It is interesting S. H. Schwartz’s and Peter B. Smith’s theory that stated that socio-economic development can increase the consensus of the values, while the democratization of the societies can reduce the consensus of those (Smith *et al.*, 2002).

2.3. Dimensions „Time” and „Space” have been analyzed by Fons Trompenaars (Present – Past – Future), Edward T. Hall (Polychromic – Monochromic), Geert Hofstede (Confucian Dynamism), Hall (Personal Space, Public - Private) and Fons Trompenaars (Specific - Diffuse).

2.4. Talcott Parsons has developed a set of dimensions for cultural differentiation, some of them being common with those of Hofstede (Triandis, 2012:34-45). Adding to cultural values and dimensions, numerous studies have treated specific *cultural attitudes and practices* that are making the distinction from a group to another, from a nation to another one. For example, the perspective over some life aspects is almost completely different in Muslim countries versus Western ones. The most important norms and/or cultural attitudes of the participating nations to military missions, that have to be analyzed when we are doing the „cultural portrait” of the group we are interacting with are as follows: female’s role / man’s in society, age, time, orientation towards future, the notion right / wrong, logic and emotions, styles of communication and body language.

3. MODELS

3.1. Normative cultural organizational model. In the harmonization process of functionality of the multinational military structures, they have been taken selectively cultural organizational models, on which it was built certain features generated by military subcultures. Organizational culture is a dynamic process, as have been stated by Richard Hagberg and Julie Heifetz (1998:277-281):

an organizational *culture is operating at conscious and unconscious level...is a complex phenomenon that comprises symbols and symbolism, relations, behavior and values.*

A very well known cultural model is that which belongs Fons Trompenaars and Turner (1993), called *cultural organizational QinetiQ model*. The value of this model is offering a perspective inside the mechanisms that are generating a change inside an organization.

The normative organizational culture is a feature specific also for the military structures. Norms and procedures inside such a kind of organization are predefined, and the rules and regulations are established.

Military organizations are not like the public or private organizations. As L. Joseph Soeters (2004:465) highlighted

...organizations in uniform are distinct ones. They are representing specific occupational cultures, in fact isolated by the society,

but is reflecting the culture of the society in which it exists. At the organizational level, as long as the contacts in between the military of a longer duration and more tight, the level of cultural understanding and of efficient application of the procedures is better. Without reciprocal understanding, procedures established before are more difficult to be implemented.

Practices and relationships that functioned during a complete rotation of the personnel inside theatre of operations is not mandatory to function in the next rotation, all of them being renegotiated continuously.

For the stimulation and the amelioration of this dialogue are necessary more than six months of participation into a theatre of operations of those respective individuals, the practice of a continuous repeated contacts with the local population, and also a more thorough specific pre-cultural training, without any soldierly procedural dogmas and political dogmas (Hentea, 2008:320)

3.2. Functional perspective - Edgar Schein’s cultural model „Iceberg model”- is approaching the cultural knowledge from the functional perspective (the creation of a community of those that are working in an organization and finding the means in order that such a kind of organization to function and to develop, in the context of functioning).

3.3. Complex models that are focused on cultural differences

3.3.1. Marelle DuPraw and Marya Axner used in the cultural knowledge process cultural classification groups of the cultural differences, generated by: style of communication, attitude vs. conflict, the approaching and the way to accomplish the tasks, the decision style, the availability to share information gained and the disposal for learning.

3.3.2. The cultural knowledge model through the comparison of the differences in the way leadership is delivered in Nord-European countries and South-Europeans ones – presented using two studies. In the first one conducted by P. B. Smith, & M. H Bond, Social psychology across cultures, Prentice Hall Europe, 1998, are investigated the cultural differences related to „style of management”, based on 17 North and South European countries. They analyzed the following dimensions: „Hierarchy and Loyal Implication in the activity of the organization” and „Equality and the Utilitarian participation”.

In the second study, Zandler in Culture and Leadership Across the World, the Globe Book of In-Depth Studies of 25 societies, 1997, it has been evaluated the preference of the personnel vs. the leadership style. The results of those studies are providing useful information related to the leadership style in the European countries (with the exception of the Eastern ones).

3.3.3. Fons Trompenaars (1993) comprising the group of Eastern European countries vs. Western Europeans ones. This study comprises fifty nations, a variety of personal values and intentional behavior. The conclusion of this study is as follows: the major lines of cultural separation are re-confirmed. On another hand, the Western European countries from the Nordic, English, Germanic and Latin groups that are tending to have bigger scores at the following items „Equality” and „Equal engagement”. In the same way, the Eastern European ones are tending to have bigger scores to the following items „Hierarchy” and „Conservatism”.

3.3.4. Cultural group model related to the attitudes associated with work – A study conducted by Simcha Ronen and Oded Shenkar (1985). Major European cultural zones, identified in this study are represented by the group of the countries influenced by English language (Ireland and Great Britain), the Nordic Group (Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden), the Germanic Group (Austria, Germany and Switzerland), the Latin Group (Belgium, Italy, Spain, Portugal and France) and the neighbors of the Eastern-European

Group (Greece and Turkey). Simcha Ronen and Oded Shenkar are taking into consideration eight previous studies, including Geert Hofstede’s study from 1980, studies that are measuring a series of attitudes and values associated with work, such as: the importance paid to the accomplishment of the established objective, the satisfaction offered by work, the managerial style, the organizational climate, the role in the working process and interpersonal orientation.

3.3.5. Yaw Mensah’s and Hsiao-Yin’s model – An extension of the GLOBE Study. The authors (2012) used various types of analysis in order to examine the observable attributes inside the GLOBE Study: ethnic distribution/racial, religious distribution, geographic proximity, language majority distribution and colonial distribution.

3.4. Sub-military cultural knowledge complex models

3.4.1. René Moelker, Joseph Soeters and Ulrich von Hagen (2013) wanted to determine if cultural interoperability is feasible, what conditions are favoring cultural interoperability and in what direction is developed. There is a research conducted in Peacetime with the participation of two NATO countries, in between 1995-2005. The authors of the study have been focused on two hypothesis of the intercultural theory, affirming that the *frequency of contacts* and *reciprocal trust* are likely to favor the sympathy feelings in between different cultures. The conclusions of the study are double. First is that the xeno-cultural images are very resistant to change and seems to be cultural constants. Values and images that are part of the cultural nucleus of a nation remain stable, with changes coming gradually. The second conclusion is that attitudes towards other cultures are prone to changing. The attitudes can be influenced by organizational policies. A basic condition for a successful military collaboration in between two nations is *reciprocal communication and understanding*, which is better resumed by the *sympathy concept*. David Hume is seeing this concept as being

a disposition of human mind, through which our ideas of pleasure, pain or passion can generate in the others diverse living impressions, in an equal proportion with our degree of identification with them and to produce the same feeling inside us (SEP, 2004).

Despite the fact that it does not existed more space for emotional identity in between the

members of different military cultures involved into the bi-national collaboration process, there is a common ground when we are talking about profession, objectives and standards. In order that those standards to fusion it is necessary, the increase of the share of the time spent together and that of the time allocated for collective exercises and for the permanent formation abilities

3.4.2. Checking the feasibility of the interoperability model, in Wartime. In the theatre of operations, the German-Dutch relationship got cooler and became public, in the newspapers, the attitude of the Dutch soldiers saying, „the Afghans are not the problem, the Germans are (...)” (Soeters *et al.*, 2006). It was a case of bi-national cooperation, in a multinational mission, but the contribution of the two countries was clearly unbalanced (Hagen *et al.*, 2003). The camp was crowded, and the Dutch soldiers’ tents have been isolated from the Germans. The Dutch have criticized the way the Germans led the mission and the tasks they ordered to accomplish. After the military personnel returned to Münster (2006>97-129), the Dutch and German commanders from the first Army Corp felt the need to pay a considerable attention to the improvement of the relationship in between the participating personnel to the mission in Kabul (van der Dunk, 2005).

The conclusion of this research is as follows: a long and common pre-mission training is proving to be an important element, but not always sufficient. The observed evolution in this case study does not represent a rule, but the tracked variables during the research can represent a cultural knowledge model.

3.4.3. Faur Marius Gabriel is proposing an „Informational-behavioral-action model of the cultural competencies”, a very useful model in the soldiers’ cultural formation process that are participating in a multinational mission. In the elaboration of such a kind of model, the author considered three psych pedagogic dimensions: cognitive, affective-motivational and actional. The importance of this model consists in the possibility for a guided formation of the leaders’ cultural competencies.

3.4.4. Cultural model in mainly standardized multinational operations. The study that was the foundation of this model was conducted in 2001, on the Kabul military airport KAIA (Afghanistan). The command of the airport has been on a rotational basis every six months, the styles of leadership were different, and the rules were clear, unique, standardized. The decision-making rhythm was

sometimes criticized; all the deficiencies have been linked to the complex multinational chain of command and control. Every operational unit accomplished its own tasks relatively independently and thus, the coordination costs have been kept to minimum. In total 25 nations are contributing with troops but none was dominating them as number. The activities at the airport are executed with success, the personnel is encouraged to report „provocations instead of problems” (a slogan made visible on banners and posters), a similar practice like in NATO bases. Uniformity of the Air Forces in relation to technology (for example, Blackhawks, F-16) is reducing variation represented by the human behavior and thus, the impact of the cultural factor is decreasing. Part of the Air Force operations, the tasks are based mainly on standard objectives in order to evaluate the rightness and the superiority of a certain solution. The execution of those tasks is, in general, expected to be influenced by the cultural diversity (Hamrick *et al.*, 1998:194-196). Despite of some problems, the soldiers from KAIA are, in general, satisfied with the mission and consider their activity as being „just a place to work”.

In the theatre of operations, being a stressed environment generated by uncertain situation, all the cultural differences in between the participants to the Coalition are worsens. A large number of elements that belong both to national cultures and to military sub-cultures are interacting: the impact of national composition, cultural distances, „the complex of the cultural treatment from above”, professional isomorphism, etc.

3.4.5. The linear knowledge and harmonization model of cultural interaction in the theatre of operations (Palaghia, 2018). This model results from the direct research conducted in the theatre of operations from Afghanistan, over and extended period, more than four years, by the author of this article. The aim of this article is to identify the cultural variables that are interacting and generate frictions in multinational military missions, their classification and the generation of an extended data base. This data base is used for the cultural training of the personnel participating in multinational military missions and of the students through post graduate and master courses.

After we studied the documents we identified the following variables that are influencing in certain degree the efficiency of the interaction inside the coalition: the knowledge level of communication language, the work ethics, religion, the level of expertise, the expected living standard, the context (high/low) from which they belong, gender, age, time management, orientation towards

the time axis, notion good/wrong, logic and emotions, communication and body language, survival/values of self-expressions, the different interpretation of the aim of the mission, the rotational system, hierarchy, specific professional training and pre-mission training, military factors that are determining the decisions, factors related to the management process, the formal/informal dimension of the code of conduct, the sympathy concept, professional isomorphism, the difference in terms of personnel policies, professional structure, the composition of the contingents, (religious, gender), physical and moral status, the way leadership is exercised and what is the fighting motivation. All those variables are component parts of the 14 groups that I identified as being important in the knowledge cultural process and, whose differences are determining the functioning level inside the Coalition.

The groups of the linear model are as follows: the level of linguistic knowledge, (English language, local language); „*common*” history of the participants to the mission, and the way this is known and perceived by the partners, the knowledge of your own culture; knowledge of the simplified cultural model of the nation from which the coalition partners are coming; the knowledge of sub-military cultures, common elements and differences; the values of the five cultural dimensions (Hofstede) for each country; the working relation; the time management relation; communication and body language; the way the mission is approached; the endowment level, the equipment, accommodation level, the eating level, doctrine, common procedures and their level of usage, the expertise inside the theatre of operation and the notion right/wrong in different cultures.

The conclusions of those gender knowledge cultural studies have been landmarks on which I guided myself in my research of the components of the cultural knowledge. Some nations are restricting the presence of women in the Army or they are just exclude (like in some Arab countries), while others are allowing them in all departments and branches, including their participation in fighting. In the theatre of operations, female soldiers proved they have a special role, the gender representing a cultural advantage increasing to efficiency of the capabilities. Women utility in the relation with the local population made that the definition of „women responsibilities related to work in theatre of operations” to modify.

The cultural models generated by religious diversity have supported the conclusions of my research. The knowledge of the religion is

increasing the operational capacity, the international level of engagement and the social balance (Azari *et al.*, 2010:585-603). When inside the mission we have soldiers familiar with the religious practices, is a proper framework for communication, the cultural barriers are eliminated and they are offering an opening to know other religions and to develop cultural sensibilities. Inter-ethnic and inter-religious differences exist, but they are not representing a problem in operations. Cultural knowledge from the religious perspective is a notion of a modern education that seems to be useful, thus the religious and ethnic membership tend to be accepted and not to generate major frictions.

The enumeration of the categories of the “Linear and harmonization knowledge model” does not mean that those groups have to be taught/accumulated/treated in this order inside the training/cultural knowledge process, but it should be considered based on their importance and their relation with the other. In the same time, each group comprises a plenty of variables that are influencing the actions of that specific group and/or generate reactions in the interaction with the elements of the other groups. This cultural knowledge model can be applied in the interaction of two or more cultures, both in soldiers training for the missions inside theatre of operations and for missions, operations and exercises executed outside of the theatre of operations.

4. CHECKED CULTURAL KNOWLEDGE INSTRUMENTS

4.1. From psychology. The most significant instruments used in the process of *testing intercultural performance and abilities* in the *pre-mission psychological testing phase*, but also in different stages of the professional training, are: Multicultural Personality Questionnaire, Intercultural Development Inventory and the Cultural Intelligence Scale. Those are highlighting the availability degree for multicultural interaction with the possible influence over the professional performances generated by the deficit of those abilities.

4.2. Belonging to complex domains.

4.2.1. The researcher who has a great influence in the *cultural values* domain, in the last 57 years is *Milton Rokeach*. The instrument created by him to measure the values, *RVS (Rokeach Value Survey)* is made of 36 items, grouped in 16, in terminal and instrumental values, prioritized items on each subject, based on their own scale of

values. This instrument was used also by other researchers to study different features of the values, such as: their relations, the behaviors, the attitudes. An important argument of RVS in supporting the importance of values is the fact that individuals are trying to maintain a constant opinion about them, an opinion that seems to reflect morality and competence. When his actions and belief are getting in contradiction with this constant, the individual is feeling dissatisfaction and the change is produced through his self image, group image, beliefs and actions in the same line. The values are guiding individual behavior, and sometimes are even stronger than his own interest.

4.4.2. Cross cultural adaptability model
Schmidtchen (2002) has developed the quantification instrument (1997) for the identification of the cross-cultural adaptability (CCAS) that comprises 53 items integrated in six domains: the openness to experience, attention to interpersonal relations, the identity sense, lining of personal objectives with the organization's ones, the way to resolve the problems and the cross-cultural expertise. The utility of this model lays in the fact that is offering categories of items that can be observed and tested during the multicultural interaction process with the aim to determine the degree of cultural adaptability.

4.2.3. Geert Hofstede – Cultural dimensions and knowledge of National Cultures. The instrument has been created with the aim to categorize different cultures belonging to different nations, cultures that at that time were found at IBM Company. Initially has identified 6 common dimensions, each with two complementary variables. He has created a valid instrument for the evaluation of the dimensions that, even was criticized sometimes, completed later, is still remaining a basic instrument besides that created by the GLOBE Study to know the National Cultures. „Interhuman relations” dimension was long time treated by Geert Hofstede (Individualism – Collectivism), (Distance towards Power) and Fons Trompenaars (Particularism – Universalism, Previous Traced Status – Acquired Status, Neutral – Affective). According to the conclusions of Geert Hofstede's cultural theory (1983:285-305), there are six dimensions that are explaining how different cultures are motivating their people and organizations.

It is essential to remark that Hofstede's cultural theory is used as a starting point in the recognition process of the fact that there are differences, to see the way those differences are manifesting inside military organizations and to try to apply this

knowledge in the optimization process of the intercultural performances.

Elron Shamir and Eyal Ben-Ari (1999) stated that Hofstede's dimensions are relevant for multinational operations

...in hierarchic organizations such as armies, the item „distance towards power” can influence many aspects of interrelationship (Stewart *et al.*, 2008:16-20).

4.2.4. GLOBE Study, finalized in 2007, is highlighting cultural dimensions that are determining the style of leadership and behavioral models inside multinational organizations. It is a very useful study because is helping us in making behavioral predictions inside this big military multinational organization that is the Coalition Force. GLOBE Study has nine dimensions: orientation towards performance, avoiding uncertainty, collectivism as a group, distance towards power, equality in between genders, human orientation, institutional collectivism, orientation towards the future and servitude.

GLOBE is the most comprehensive empiric data study that is showing the relation in between culture and the leaders' behavior in different societies and organizations, using different qualitative and quantitative methods (GLOBE, 2012)

Even Hofstede's study was criticized by well-known sociologists (McSweeney B., Shenkar O., Schwartz S. H., Bilsky W. and Mansour Javidan, that were saying that in the analysis of a phenomenon, it should be used various qualitative techniques and that were taken into consideration insufficient aspects of the culture), the study is still remaining the dominant model of the cross-cultural research.

Besides the difference in the number of dimensions from the two studies, a major difference is represented by the fact that GLOBE Study is measuring two distinct aspects of the national cultures, *practices and values*, for each dimension resulting 18 cultural scores for each country that was part to the study, in comparison to Hofstede's five.

The two studies are not in a major contradiction, GLOBE Study supporting Hofstede's one. The only inadvertency seen is the dimension „Uncertainty Avoidance”. Since 2008, Sunil Venaik and Paul Brewer (2008:17), were publishing the following results of their common research

There is a major difference in between the following dimension „Uncertainty Avoidance” in between two studies and they are representing two

different totally opposed concepts because they are in a significant way negatively correlated

4.2.5. E.K. Bowman has published in 2002 a study that is presenting the relation in between cultural dimensions and the elements that are supporting team performance/groups (Bowman, 2002). It has been a research for 12 months in the military multinational mission from Bosnia. The author is pleading for the major importance of the variables such as cultural competence and adaptability inside the teams. Bowman has studied the relation in between the value of the cultural dimensions, leadership style and the cohesion of the teams. Besides Hofstede's research of cultural dimensions, the new aspect of the research conducted by E. K. Bowman is given by the fact that those were checked inside military organizations and in the operational environment.

4.2.6. In the number of September-October 2010 of the *Military Review* (2010), US colonel, Casey Haskins, proposed a simple model for cultural understanding (Bowman. This model is thought more than a list „to be checked” than an instrument of detailed knowledge of the local culture. This list is offering just a way a guided focus on objectives and/or actions. It is a positive attempt after various attempts to incorporate the cultural factor in the US Army Doctrine. IT was tried to create a cultural knowledge model, during which they concluded that a certain model cannot be applied in another area just for the fact that inside of the same country, tribal cultural differences are significant. Colonel Haskins is proposing an knowledge instrument comprising two parts: first a simplified model of the society and in the second part a list of questions that have the role to direct the observation process.

The first part is a copy of the societal model that belongs to Chirot that is also using Talcot Parsons's model. This part has also four parts interrelated: the political system, economy, social institutions and culture.

The second part on the list of questions is arranged on categories: groups and their identity, the way the decisions are taken, the belonging to a culture of honor and of a winners (or not), social norms and interaction. For each of them there have been identified constitutive elements based on which the questions were built.

4.2.7. The researches on the World cultural values are focused on the way the values of different nations and societies are changing in time and are offering an instrument for comparison and knowledge in between different cultures. The

project is conducted at the global level, by the Social Science Association, *Word Values Survey*, a global network comprising many universities and is led by professor Ronald F. Inglehart from the University of Michigan. They reduced the culture analysis to two basic dimensions: traditional values vs. rational-secular values and to survival vs. self-expression values.

Initially the researchers started from the idea that traditional values dimension vs rational-secular values are measuring the degree in which a society is valorizing religion or not. The researchers were capable to correlate a series of other values with religion, resulting that traditional values are reflecting other cultural features, not only religion. Those societies that are more traditional, have clear standards related to the family obligations and they are rejecting those things, such as the divorce. They are also very traditional. All these attributes are opposed to the rational-secular societies.

The second dimension, survival vs self-expression values is an indirect measure of the wealth of a society. Poor countries are presenting a greater survival mentality, while in the richest countries, exonerated by excessive worries related to the survival, have self-expressed values, being focused on the quality of life and wealth.

Ronald F. Inglehart and Christian Welzel, two of the main researchers involved in the study, used the two dimensions to graphically represent the way different nations and World civilizations were grouped.

5. MATHEMATICS OF INTEROPERABILITY

Cultural knowledge + Intercultural communication = Cultural harmonization = The increase of the level of interoperability in multinational coalition.

Cultural competence and intercultural communication are representing a key element in building the ratio with other cultures, representing the important abilities of the personnel from NATO and partners' military cultures.

Exemplifying, T.E. Lawrence has engaged himself in a long cultural search for the enemy, after Arab mutiny against Ottoman Empire in 1916, analyzing in depth local culture: geography, tribal structure, religion, social traditions, language, food habits.

Even „knowing the enemy” is one of the first principles of war, military and National Security operations are lacking constantly the thorough knowledge of the foreign culture and societies.

Livia Markóczy's theory is supporting the idea that we have already the capacity to work with persons from other cultures, but if

our overview is distorted by our expectations related to the necessary existence of the cultural differences. When we are expecting that individuals we are meeting to be radically different, with a behavior that sometimes is difficult to fully understand and we have the tendency to say that we are very different from the cultural point of view.

Majority of human behavior are universal, and if we are looking for cultural differences, we will find only obstacles, but if we are looking for commonalities, we will create bridges in between the cultures and will lay down the foundation for an efficient cooperation.

Christopher J. Lamb, in his speech related to motivation tactics in US psychological operations is highlighting the fact that basic principles of the cultural communication are transcending cultures. A relevant example is „my own interest principle” existent in all cultures (Lamb, 2005).

6. CONCLUSIONS

Those studies and models are offering the results of the miscellaneous research on the topic or/and lessons learnt but, the most important instruments for checking and/ or understanding of the cultural diversity in multicultural environments, instruments that will not be antiquated, but are completed or re-evaluated in the same time when the area of responsibility of the coalition forces and of the changes of the configuration of the Alliance. These are creating the vast foundation of data necessary for the creation of different learning models through simulation and virtual games, modern instruments with a complex usage of the variables from the existent studies.

We are considering the importance of the distinction in between cultural knowledge studies, models, and instruments. If the first two are representing very often systematic unchecked research and conclusions, points of view over some perspectives in approaching of the cultural issue, instruments are the extended results of the existing research, checked on representative samples. When we have to conduct cultural training of the personnel, we need to ensure that additional to the common knowledge and the highlights through certain actions resulted from the direct participation

into the theatre of operations; we are using instruments and data that are checked successively.

I appreciate that only through cultural knowledge and harmonization it can be created the misalignment foundation that is facilitating the situational perception not only through the lens of its own socio-cultural formation, but also through the “cultural lens” of the allies, which has a major impact over the multinational interoperability.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Azari, J.; Dandeker, C. & Greenberg, N. (2010). Cultural Stress: How Interactions With and Among Foreign Populations Affect Military Personnel. *Armed Forces & Society*. 36(4). 585-603.
2. Bowman, E.K. (2002). *Cultural factors affecting MNT communications in the SFOR environment*. Unpublished Manuscript.
3. Gullenstrup, Hans. (2002). The complexity of intercultural communication in cross-cultural management. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*. No.6.
4. Hagberg R., Heifetz J. (1998). Corporate culture/organizational culture: understanding and assessment. *The 1988 Leadership Conference: The Art & Practice of Coaching Leaders*. 277-281.
5. Hambrick, D.C.; Davidson, C.; Snell, S. A., & Snow, C.C.. (1988). When Groups Consists of Multiple Nationalities: Towards a New Understanding of the implications. *Management and Organization*. Vol.19. no.2. 194-196.
6. Hentea, C. (2008). *Noile haine ale propagandei*. Pitești: Paralela 45 Publishing House.
7. Hofstede, G. (1983) National cultures revisited. *Behavior Science Research*. 18(4), 285-305.
8. Hofstede, G. (1998). A case study for comparing apples and oranges: International differences in values. In M. Sasaki (ed.), *Values and Attitudes Across Nations and Time*, Brill, Leiden. 16-31.
9. Kluckhohn C., Strodtbeck F. (1961). Variations in value orientations. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson
10. Lamb C.J. (2005). *Review of Psychological Operations Lessons Learned from Recent Operational Experience*. Washington DC: National Defense University Press.
11. Markóczy, L. (1996). Are cultural differences overrated? *Financial Times*, 26 July.
12. Mensah, Y. M. & Chen, H.Y. (2013). *Global grouping of the countries based on cultural*

- factor – and extinction of the GLOBE Study. Taiwan: Kainan University.
13. Moelker R., Soeters J. (eds.). (2006). *Cultural Interoperability. Ten Years of Research into Cooperation In the First German-Netherlands Corps*. Breda & Strausberg: Sozialwissenschaftliches Institut der Bundeswehr. Forum International. Volume 27. 97–129.
 14. Palaghia, R. (2018). *Cultural differences in the Theatre of Operations from Afghanistan*. ‘Henri Conadă’ Air Force Academy Publishing House.
 15. Ronen, S. & Shenkar, O. (1985). Clustering countries on Attitudinal Dimensions a Review and Synthesis. *The Academy of Management Review*. July.
 16. Smith, Peter B.; Schwatz, Shalom H.; Peterson, Mark F. & Abd Halim Ahmad. (2002). Cultural values, sources of guidance, and their relevance to material behavior: A 47-nation study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. 33(2). 188-208.
 17. Soeters J.; Poponete, C.R. & Page, Joseph T. (2006). Culture’s consequences in the military. In Thomas W. Britt, Amy B. Adler, *Military life: The psychology of serving in peace and combat*. Vol. 4, *Military Culture*. Westport, CT: Praeger Security International; Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc. Chapter 2. 13–34.
 18. Soeters, L.J.; Tanerçan, Erhan & Sıgri, Ünsal. (2004). Turkish-Dutch Encounters in Peace Operations. *Sociology. International Peacekeeping*. 2004. DOI: 10.1080/ 13533310 42000237319.
 19. Stewart, K.; Bonner, M. & Verrall, N. (2008). Cultural factors in future multinational military operations. *Symposium on Human Factors in the 21st Century*, Paris, France. 16-20.
 20. Sunil, V., & Brewer, P. (2008). *Contradictions in national culture: Hofstede vs GLOBE*. St Lucia: UQ Business School/ University of Queensland.
 21. Triandis, H.C. (2012). Culture and conflict. In Larry A. Samovar, Richard E. Porter, & Edwin R. McDaniel (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (13th ed.). Boston: Wadsworth. 34-45.
 22. von Hagen, U.; Klein, P.; Moelker, R.; Soeters, J. (2003). True Love. A Study in Integrated Multinationality within 1 (GE/NL) Corps. *SOWIFORUM International*. N° 25.
 23. von der Dunk, T. (2005). *Buren? Een alternatieve geschiedenis van Nederland*. Amsterdam: Veen Magazines.
 24. von Hagen, U.; Moelker, R. & Soeters, J., *Cultural Interoperability.Ten Years of Research into Co-operation in the First German-Netherlands Corps*. Breda & Strausberg: Sozialwissenschaftliches Institut der Bundeswehr. Forum International, Volume 27. 15–51, 131-161.
 25. ***. (2004). Hume’s Moral Philosophy. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (SEP)* [online]. URL: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hume-moral/>. [Accessed on March, 2020]
 26. ***. (2012). Culture and Leader Effectiveness. The GLOBE Study. *gdb129’s Blog* [online]. URL: http://www.google.ro/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0ahUKEwi3qb7n1_HLAhVEVBQKHVmAADZsQFgkMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.inspireimagineinnovate.com%2Fpdf%2Fglobesummary-by-michael-h-hoppe.pdf&usg=__AFQjCN GivV2krTImuSQDD4WWbZ0LzRKRXg. [Accessed on 11th June 2016, 12:17 hrs].