To fulfill the potential of what Maxine Green (1988) describes as "a world lived in common with others," our campuses must offer the opportunity for each of us to be touched by the lives of those different from us. We will never understand racism, class, social justice, international development, or the person sitting next to us without quietly listening to the stories of those who experience the world in different ways.

But as psychologist George Kelly (1963) suggests, learning from experience requires more than being in the vicinity of events when they occur. Learning emerges from our capacity to construe those events and then to reconstrue them in transformative ways. On today's culturally complicated campuses, individuals are indeed in the presence of intercultural events, but more often than not, they are having an ethnocentric experience that they may be ill prepared to construe.

We have long known that simply bringing different racial and cultural groups into contact may generate more heat than light (Pettigrew, 2000). Depending on the readiness of the learners, our well-structured curriculum may fail to produce constructive interaction, much less the commitment to social justice that we have designed it to produce. Difficult dialogues about race, ethnicity, and other cultural differences are hindered when learners are developmentally unprepared to handle them (Bennett & Bennett, 2004).

Educators also face new challenges both in teaching about culture, and in teaching across cultures. While culture is often addressed in the content of the curriculum, it is less frequently incorporated into the process of teaching and learning. Thus, while we study the sociological consequences of racism, we may be ineffective in communicating with the African-American colleague across the hall. While we may master Japanese literature, we may not be able to read between the lines when a Japanese student attempts to share a problem with us.

In short, cultural knowledge does not equal intercultural competence. And being global citizens—seeing ourselves as members of a world community, as well as participants in our local contexts, knowing that we share the future with others—requires powerful forms of intercultural competence.

Darla Deardorff conducted a study of intercultural scholars to develop an extended definition of intercultural competence and to examine appropriate strategies to assess such competence. Her resulting article in the Journal of Studies in International Education (2006) identifies specific components of intercultural competence and provides recommendations for fostering it.

It is vital to note the significance of the "inter" in "intercultural competence." Such competence bridges domestic and global diversity by focusing on patterns of interaction in a cultural context, whether within a country or across national borders. Intercultural communication is about negotiating shared meanings. Thus the study-abroad student needs to be interculturally competent, as does the student in a course on race, class, and gender.

The growing global focus on developing interculturally competent students, professionals, and citizens suggests five key trends for which there are associated resources. While there are outstanding materials grounded in other disciplines that address this issue, the primary focus of this review is to highlight the contribution of the intercultural perspective.

**The Intercultural Perspective**

The materials included in Resource Box 1 provide frameworks that comprise the "culture-general" or meta-cultural perspective that can be used to examine patterns in any culture, domestic or international. They cover core topics such as nonverbal communication, communication styles, conflict styles, language
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and culture, value patterns, prejudice and power, identity development, and cultural adaptation.

While there is no panacea for eliminating cultural misunderstanding, we can cultivate competence in order to communicate despite our differences. The field of intercultural communication provides a particularly useful perspective for developing intercultural competence: It aims to develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for effective and appropriate interactions across cultures.

Milton Bennett’s Basic Concepts of Intercultural Communication: Selected Readings (1998), a collection of classic articles on the topics I’ve outlined, serves as an introduction to the basic concepts of the field, while Alberto Gonzalez, Marsha Houston, and Victoria Chen’s Our Voices: Essays in Culture, Ethnicity and Communication: An Intercultural Anthology (2004) applies those concepts to the domestic diversity arena. The following authors each approach the central topics in the field from a different perspective: Myron Lustig and Jolene Koester examine intercultural competence in Intercultural Competence: Interpersonal Communication Across Cultures (2006); Judith Martin and Thomas Nakayama place the issue of intercultural communication in a variety of theoretical contexts in Intercultural Communication in Contexts (2007); and Stella Ting-Toomey, in Communicating Across Cultures (1999), presents an advanced overview of intercultural concepts that takes into account both Western and Asian frames of reference. Finally, now in its 11th edition, Intercultural Communication: A Reader (2006), by Larry Samovar, Richard Porter, and Edwin McDaniel features articles from both a culture-general perspective and a culture-specific point of view.

For those interested in professional development in teaching, training, curriculum design, ethnic-identity development, or creating an intercultural campus, the Intercultural Communication Institute (ICI) offers a summer program of workshops and seminars. In addition, ICI offers intercultural assessment, a master’s degree in cooperation with the University of the Pacific, and a resource library of more than 23,000 intercultural materials (www.intercultural.org). Another such resource is the Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research—USA (SUSA), which has an annual conference where professionals share their applications of the intercultural perspective (www.sietarusa.org).

**Integrating Domestic and Global Diversity**

The seemingly intractable stress between those committed to social transformation in America and those focused on global development presents itself as a core issue for interculturalists. Mutual accusations include being self-serving, development an inevitable necessity or inevitably fatal? If we think globally, do we oppress locally? By carefully constructing a complex, multilayered, contextualized framework, they make a persuasive case that globalizing education requires both/and, not either/or. The Web site of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (www.diversityweb.org) supports educators with further resources for this integration. Resource Box 2 contains references to these materials.

Janet M. Bennett and Milton J. Bennett (2004) outline a developmental model appropriate for teaching and training in a sequence based on learner readiness, in “Developing Intercultural Sensitivity: An Integrative Approach to Global and Domestic Diversity” (2004). They suggest that early diversity efforts often placed the Western perspective at the center, where not only the content but also the process belied the core value of inclusivity. They note that sensitivity initiatives may often themselves be culturally insensitive.

According to this model, individuals respond to cultural differences in identifiable stages. In the first stage, those who see culture as a barrier tend to deny, resist, or minimize differences. In the second, those who see culture as a resource tend to accept and appreciate differences. In order to create a culturally competent campus, leaders need to create appropriate interventions to move people from the first to the second stage.

**Learning Experientially**

After a long effort to achieve credibility, experiential learning has earned its rightful place in academic programs as a viable, even desirable, approach to putting theory into practice. Service learning has linked different cultural groups within the United States, as well as overseas. Study abroad has moved far from the grand tour to a smorgasbord of programs, short and long, in familiar and less-familiar destinations. The campus is increasingly used as a laboratory for intercultural and intercultural dialogues. Each of these contexts presents opportunities for the development and practice of intercultural competence, guided by educators prepared to infuse the curriculum with intercultural learning.

In a recent text, Learning Through Serving: A Student Guidebook for Serv-
vice Learning Across the Disciplines (2005), by Christine M. Cress, Peter J. Collier, Vicki L. Reitenauer, and associates, the authors presume that community-based learning places students in contact with diverse others and, therefore, that learners must attend to that aspect of their own development. They provide the instructor with useful guidelines for designing and implementing effective service-learning programs. (See Resource Box 2.)

In the area of international education, the state of the art suggests three essential requirements for effective experiential learning: that it prepare learners to understand their own culture, that it facilitate their cultural learning abroad, and that it integrate that learning upon their return. Standard practice suggests a unified curriculum that attends to all three of these stages.

The What's Up With Culture? Web site (www.pacific.edu/sis/culture/) is an online cultural training resource for study abroad that contains modules for predeparture preparation, reentry, and resources for going abroad that are useful for instructors and students. R. Michael Paige, Andrew D. Cohen, Barbara Kappler, Julie C. Chi, and James P. Lassegard (2002) recently revised their Maximizing Study Abroad: A Students' Guide to Strategies for Language and Culture Learning and Use (2002). Organized into units focusing on predeparture, in-country, and post-study abroad, the text contains rich resources for the sojourner, as well as for the faculty or staff member guiding the program.

For those facilitating intercultural/interracial dialogues, Paul Pedersen’s Handbook for Developing Multicultural Awareness (2000) supplies conceptual background understanding, as well as a series of approaches and methods to enhance learning while constructively handling conflict.

**THE CULTURALLY COMPLICATED CAMPUS**

For the educator, daily interactions consistently involve adaptation to different cultural styles. Most of us can no longer enter our classrooms confident that our learners will share our worldview, our cultural norms, or even our language. Campuses have traditionally privileged certain styles for teaching and learning, a process that is being transformed in today’s intercultural context. Diversifying our cognitive styles, learning styles, and communication styles has become an essential response to our diversified populations.

“Thinking Not As Usual: Adding the Intercultural Perspective” (2002)—by Yelena Vershova, Joan DeJaeghere, and Josef Mestenhauser—addresses the issue of culturally influenced cognitive styles. Assessing the Western-based approaches to intercultural competence, critical thinking, and comparative thinking, they dispute the universality of Western analytical constructs.

Resource Box 2 contains references to resources for cultural-learning activities suitable for the university context. For classroom and experiential learning, see Crossing Cultures: Insights from Master Teachers, a 2003 collection by Nakiye A. Boyacigiller, Richard A. Goodman, and Margaret E. Phillips, who gathered the educational modules used by senior educators. The Web site for the Thiagi Group: The Source for Training Games and Interactive Experimental Strategies (www.thiagi.com) features a wide variety of free teaching and training resources, including “frame-games”—content-free, creatively constructed methods (frames) for achieving the full engagement of learners. In their collection 52 Activities for Exploring Value Differences (2003), Donna M. Stringer and Patricia A. Cassidy have gathered strategies for teaching about deep values in both domestic and global contexts.

Theodore M. Singelis has produced a thoughtful collection of well-designed, theoretically grounded methods in his compendium Teaching About Culture, Ethnicity, and Diversity (1998). The Web site for Nipporica Associates, www.nipporica.com, features a variety of learning tools, including a series of case studies entitled The Cultural Detective that focus on learning about values and interaction in specific cultures. Finally, faculty members teaching about conflict will find Mitchell Hammer’s Intercultural Conflict Style Inventory (2002, 2003) useful in exploring their students’ own styles as they participate in difficult dialogues.

**ASSESSING INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE**

While excellent instruments exist for assessing campus climate and learning outcomes for diversity, not many instruments exist that assess the intercultural sensitivity or competence of students, faculty, and staff. R. Michael Paige, in his 2004 “Instrumentation in Intercultural Training,” provides a detailed review of the instruments commonly used to measure organizational climate, personal development, cultural identity, prejudice and racism, and intercultural competence. The instruments noted here are particularly appropriate for campus assessments (Resource Box 3):

- The Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) is a widely used self-assessment tool that addresses a person’s ability to adapt to both domestic and international contexts.
- The Global Competencies Inventory (GCI) assesses personal qualities associated with environments where there are cultural norms and behaviors different from one’s own. Based on personality factors, this instrument can be used as part of an assessment process for a variety of functions.
- The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) is a psychometric instru-
ment based on the developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. Useful for program evaluation, the IDI can also be used for audience analysis and needs assessment.

**INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE AND GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP**

With global citizenship and civic engagement as core missions in higher education, intercultural competence becomes central across the disciplines. Grant H. Cornwall and Eve W. Stoddard (1999) link the two agendas by suggesting that educational goals include "understanding diverse cultures and understanding cultures as diverse ... [and] preparing for citizenship, both local and global" (Resource Box 2). They elaborate on this idea in their 2006 article "Freedom, Diversity and Global Leadership" (Resource Box 4).

Researchers in business and management have produced multiple texts with a focus on the impact of culture in the organizational context, as noted in Resource Box 4. Nancy J. Adler’s application of core intercultural notions to the structure and functions of organizations in *International Dimensions of Organizational Behavior* (2002) offers not only a conceptual overview but also engaging case studies. Mark E. Mendenhall, Torsten Kühnmann, and Günter Stahl offer chapters on global teams, leadership transformation, assessment, and women leaders in their collection *Developing Global Business Leaders: Policies, Process, and Innovations* (2000).

Research in global leadership and managing cultural complexity offers insights to both those within and outside the corporate world. The comprehensive *Culture, Leadership and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies* (2004) by Robert J. House, Paul Hanges, Mansour Javidan, Peter Dorfman, and Vipin Gupta offers substantive information about worldwide value patterns that is useful to professionals in any field.

For pragmatic applications of intercultural concepts, P. Christopher Earley and Soon Ang, in their 2003 book *Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions Across Cultures*, have developed a model of cultural intelligence that specifically addresses multicultural contexts. They review the cognitive, attitudinal, and behavioral bases of cultural intelligence and describe strategies for developing, assessing, and promoting it in organizations.

On the domestic front, Norma Carr-Ruffino has thoughtfully examined specific cultural groups in organizations in her 2003 text *Managing Diversity: People Skills for a Multicultural Workplace*. By reviewing the history of each group, its experiences of prejudice, its cultural patterns, and recommended approaches to management, she has bridged issues of social justice, intercultural sensitivity, and organizational productivity.

For those interested in locating resources for teaching in the area of domestic diversity, authors Lee Gardenswartz and Anita Rowe (1998) have developed conceptually grounded strategies for developing intercultural competence that are useful for practitioners as well as educators. (See also their 2003 collaboration with Patricia Digh and Martin Bennett in *The Global Diversity Desk Reference*.)

Recent educational research suggests that for those desiring robust intercultural transformation on campuses, we must do more than simply be "in the vicinity of cultural events." Intercultural competence is fostered through developmental opportunities, grounded in theory and facilitated experiences. Only then will learners be able to construe—and reconstrue—them to achieve shared meaning. ❑