

**Defining, Measuring, and Facilitating Intercultural Learning:  
A Conceptual Introduction to the IJIE Special Issue**

***State of the Art Research on Intercultural Learning in Study Abroad  
and  
Best Practice for Intercultural Learning in International Educational Exchange***

**Milton J. Bennett, Ph.D.  
Intercultural Development Research Institute**

If you do not already think so, the articles in this volume will convince you that study abroad has changed. At the university level, it has transcended its history as a “grand tour” for the leisure class and the more plebian “junior year abroad.” Now university study abroad encompasses massive mobility of students among European Union universities and to and from the United States and other countries through a myriad of school-based and consortia-based programs. At the secondary (high school) level, the traditional AFS year in the US or Europe has been expanded by AFS and other organizations to include shorter programs to and from a broader range of countries. Added to the change in format and destination are educational foci that go well beyond traditional study to include internships, service-learning, and other learning opportunities.

However, a basic tenant of international educational exchange and study abroad has remained unchanged. Every program, no matter at what level, format, or focus, continues to claim that educational cross-cultural contact contributes to intercultural competence and thus to global citizenship. Whether that citizenship takes the form of transnational European, or international American, or citizen of the world, it is based on the idea that exposure to cultural differences is “broadening” and therefore a legitimate aspect of education in the modern world.

Although the concern is not new (Bennett 2009, Vanden Berg 2009 this volume), the rapidly expanding horizons of study abroad have given new urgency to the question of exactly what is meant by “global citizenship” or “intercultural competence,” how they should be addressed pedagogically in programs, and how they should be assessed. A related question is how governments and school systems can differentiate bone fide study abroad from student tourist programs and provide appropriate support to the educational programs.

It is to that end that the conference Moving Beyond Mobility was organized by a consortium of secondary international educational exchange organizations – the *European Federation of Intercultural Learning* (EFIL). Co-sponsoring the conference were *AFS Interkulturelle Begegnungen/Germany* in cooperation with *AFS Intercultural Programs/New York*, the *Intercultural Development Research Institute Europa* (IDRIInstitute) based in Milano, Italy, *AJA (Arbeitsgemeinschaft gemeinnütziger Jugendaustauschorganisationen)*, and the *Friedrich-Schiller-University of Jena*. The conference received funding from the *Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union*. The overall objective of the conference was to provide an international platform for the various players in the field of study abroad and international educational exchange to share research results and best practices at both secondary and tertiary levels. In addition, policy-makers, researchers, and potential sponsors engaged in a discussion on how to overcome obstacles and create a supportive environment for the programs.

In the call for papers for Moving Beyond Mobility, the conference sponsors agreed on a definition of “intercultural learning” and “intercultural education” as a point of reference for Research and Best Practice proposals. Presentations in each category were then selected competitively by a committee of researchers and practitioners in the field of study abroad, and a few of those presentations were in turn selected by the committee for publication in two special issues of the *Journal of Intercultural Education* (to be published as a double-issue): *State of the Art Research in Study Abroad* and *Best Practices in Study Abroad and International Educational Exchange*. In this introduction to the special issues, I will explicate the rationale for the definitions used in the selection process and consider some contemporary issues in measuring and implementing such learning.

## **Intercultural Learning**

The definition of intercultural learning used for the conference was:

*Acquiring increased awareness of subjective cultural context (world view), including one’s own, and developing greater ability to interact sensitively and competently across cultural contexts as both an immediate and long-term effect of exchange.*

The primary aspect of this definition is the idea of *context*. The term is often used casually to refer to some objective circumstance, such as “in the context of an Italian family, food represents love,” or “in the context of this sentence, the verb implies direct action.” In this sense, the term is true to its Latin root: to weave together (circumstances) and its Middle English application, to create a text. But a more rigorous use of the term implies a kind of relativism of perspective. For instance, a therapist might explore the context of a patient’s delusions, a politician the context of his opponent’s argument, or an interculturalist the cultural context of a decision-making strategy. It is in this latter sense that the term is used in this definition of intercultural learning.

Culture can be thought of as *context* in both the objective and subjective sense of the term. Objective culture (Berger & Luckmann, 1967) is the set of institutional, political, and historical circumstances that have emerged from and are maintained by a group of interacting people. So, for instance, Germans interact with one another (facilitated by a common language) more than they interact with Italians. The institutions generated by Germans to enable and regulate their interaction among themselves with their unique historical circumstances become the objective context of Germans, or German Culture. Elsewhere (Bennett, 1998) I have called this distinction “Big-C” culture, as opposed to “little-c” subjective culture. Learning about the Culture of foreign countries has traditionally been one of the main educational goals of study abroad, reflected in curricula filled with courses on art, architecture, literature, government, and history.

Subjective culture (Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Triandis 1994) is the *worldview* of people who interact in a particular context. It is their unique perspective on how to discriminate phenomena in the world, how to organize and coordinate communication, and how to assign goodness and badness to ways of being. So, for instance, North Americans tend to organize their perception less abstractly than do Northern Europeans, which leads North Americans to more easily coordinate themselves tactically around processes (how to get it done) rather than strategically around ideas (why to do it). It also inclines members of each group to value their own perceptual organization as superior, so that North Americans are generally pleased with themselves for being practical problem-solvers and relatively impatient with extended theoretical consideration. Northern Europeans, on the other hand, tend to evaluate American decision-making negatively as “shooting from the hip” (Stewart & Bennett, 1991).

A cultural worldview does not prescribe or determine the behavior of individuals who share the culture; rather, it constitutes the context in which perception and behavior occur. So, continuing the example from above, both Americans and Europeans can and do coordinate their perception in both tactical and strategic ways, but the context of their respective cultures facilitate doing it one way or the other. For various reasons, a given North American might be more strategic in some situations, and a given Northern European might be more tactical. Cultural patterns ought not be treated as a stereotypical categories into which every member of a group fits, but rather as generalizations about group tendencies and as clues for interpreting the behavior of individual group members.

Study abroad programs have not usually addressed learning about subjective culture as part of their explicit curriculums. At best, some material about the subjective cultural patterns of a target country might be included in pre-departure orientation, or, in the case of study abroad in non-Western countries, a cultural anthropology course might be offered. The curricular imbalance in favor of Culture over culture is ironic, in that the explicit goal of study abroad is more likely to be stated in terms of subjective rather than objective culture. If the educational goal for study abroad were, say, “to learn about the history, politics, and literature of Turkey,” then these days students and their funders would appropriately wonder why travel was necessary at all; information on these topics is easily assessable through study alone, not necessarily study abroad. Instead, the benefit of study abroad outside of language-learning is more often stated in terms of being on-site in a foreign country, making friends with locals, and in general deriving the assumed benefits of contact with an alternative worldview. In other words, the benefit of study abroad is that it occurs in the context of a different subjective culture.

The aspect of subjective culture that has received the most attention in international exchange is *cultural self-awareness*. It has long been known that one of the most common effects of study abroad mentioned by students, particularly at the secondary level, is “learning about myself.” In some but not all cases, such learning may include awareness of one’s own cultural predilections. However, it is likely that the claim of self-awareness conflates several *levels of analysis*. In some cases, students are using an *individual level of analysis* to recognize personality characteristics, self-esteem, or personal likes and dislikes. In other cases, they are drawing from an *institutional level of analysis* to recognize the Cultural context of their political beliefs or to become aware of institutional oppression or privilege. Only sometimes are they are using a *group level of analysis*

to recognize ways that their own worldview is reflective to some extent of the group of people with whom they interact – their national group, their regional or ethnic group, and perhaps their gender, generational, sexual orientation, or other reference group. It is in only this last sense that students have acquired (subjective) cultural self-awareness.

Cultural self-awareness is a necessary precursor of intercultural learning, which involves recognizing cultural differences. If students do not have a mental baseline for their own culture(s), they will find it difficult to recognize and manage cultural differences. They may learn something about the target culture, but that kind of culture-learning is different than intercultural learning. Culture-learning usually refers to the acquisition of knowledge about, and perhaps even skills in enacting, a particular foreign culture. Such “emic” knowledge is not necessarily related to general intercultural competence, just as the knowledge of a particular foreign language is not necessarily related to a general competence in language-learning. To acquire general intercultural competence, one needs to have learned some “etic,” or culture-general categories for recognizing and dealing with a wide range of cultural differences (M.J. Bennett, 1998).

The latter half of the definition of intercultural learning involves the development of cultural awareness into intercultural sensitivity and competence. The term “intercultural sensitivity” refers to the complexity of perception of cultural difference, so that higher sensitivity refers to more complex perceptual discriminations of such differences (M.J. Bennett, 1993, 2004). The term “competence” refers to the potential for enactment of culturally sensitive feeling into appropriate and effective behavior in another cultural context (Bennett & Castiglioni, 2004). According to the developmental theory underlying these definitions, intercultural learning is transferable to other cultural contexts; for example, a student who develops intercultural sensitivity on an exchange program in France can apply that sensitivity in Korea, or Nigeria, or with different domestic ethnic groups. Of course, the student may know more about French culture than about Korean culture, so he or she will have more ways of expressing competence in France than in Korea. But since intercultural learning includes how to learn about culture, someone going to a new culture can relatively quickly acquire the knowledge that will allow them to turn sensitivity into competence there, as well.

Intercultural learning can be both an immediate and a long-term effect of exchange. In the short term, intercultural learning involves the acquisition of intercultural sensitivity and the ability to

exercise intercultural competence in the exchange culture. A middle-term effect is the transfer of intercultural sensitivity and potential competence from the exchange culture to other cultural contexts. The longer term effects involve the development of global citizenship and/or other manifestations of a permanently heightened awareness and appreciation of cultural difference. These effects can be measured.

### **Measuring Intercultural Learning**

Following the well-worn path of looking where the light is best, assessment has tended to focus on relatively easily-measured variables. For instance, it was (and is) possible to assess Culture-learning with traditional measures of academic achievement, and so that has received more assessment focus than might be warranted by the stated goals of study abroad. Likewise, language acquisition is relatively easily measured, and so it has often become a criterion of accomplishment extending well beyond the goal of language-learning itself. Even subjective measures fall into this syndrome, where answers to the simple question “How satisfied were you with the program” are given much more weight than their ambiguous roots and tentative connection to learning justify.

Qualitative, phenomenological studies that inquire into the subjective feelings of participants have been the most prevalent type of inquiry into intercultural learning. While it is indeed possible to infer learning from statements generated by questionnaire or interview respondents, the question remains “what kind of learning”? Questions need to be couched in terms of a rigorous definition of intercultural learning for the answers to be given a strong interpretation. For instance, a clear definition of subjective culture is necessary to support questions like, “to what extent did cultural difference influence relations with your homestay family?” Without a clear definition, positive responses could indicate differences at any level of analysis: institutional differences (eg, religious rituals); personal differences that are attributed to culture (eg introspectiveness), or actual group-level differences in cultural worldview (eg more direct or indirect problem-solving strategies). If the question elicits more content, such as “What cultural differences did you observe?”, it is still necessary to have a clear definition that allows the answers to be categorized by level of analysis, and further to be identified as examples of intercultural learning or more simply as culture-learning, as that distinction was discussed above.

The frontier of descriptive empirical study is in the extensiveness of the inquiry, both conceptually and longitudinally. An example in this volume of more extensive descriptive inquiry is Paige et al (2009 this volume). They report on findings from the study *Beyond Immediate Impact: Study Abroad for Global Engagement* (SAGE), where a huge number of respondents were asked to reflect on the connection between study abroad in the college years and their subsequent commitment to active citizenship. Examples of such citizenship were participation in local civic activities, establishment of socially-oriented businesses or organizations, knowledge production, philanthropy, and voluntary simplicity. Quantitative results from questionnaires and qualitative data from open-ended questions and interviews showed that study abroad was perceived by participants as being a strong influence in a majority of these global engagement activities.

A more program-oriented longitudinal study asks YFU secondary-level exchange participants between 1951 and 1987 to reflect on their experience and its influence in their lives. Based on their research, *Students of Four Decades* (Bachner & Zeutschel, 2009a), these authors can claim increased credibility for some of the common wisdom in study abroad: a) homestays are reported to be an important part of the program; b) duration of the program is important – the longer the exchange, the greater its perceived impact; c) exchange is associated with “international perspective,” supporting the idea that former participants are more likely to become involved in international peace and cooperation efforts (Bachner & Zeutschel, 2009b)

Because of the self-report methodology of these and similar descriptive studies, it is not possible to claim that study-abroad programs “caused” participants to change. Insofar as they claim to show intercultural learning, long-term impact studies must invoke a kind of reverse inference, arguing that more self-reported engagement in volunteer and civic activities can be taken as indicative of intercultural learning having occurred. This is probably a justified assumption – it is difficult to imagine that people who are able to reflect on their experience over such a long period and in the contexts of several aspects of their lives did not experience something like intercultural learning. Still, the claim that study abroad contributes to intercultural learning, and particularly the claim that certain conditions are more or less influential, begs more experimental methodology.

Recently, a technique was developed to translate some qualitative indicators of intercultural learning into valid and reliable quantitative data. The Intercultural Development Inventory™ assesses the ability to perceive and organize cultural differences in increasingly complex ways, as construed by the DMIS (M.J. Bennett, 1993; Hammer, Bennett & Wiseman, 2003).

Intercultural sensitivity has been shown to correlate well with other indicators of intercultural learning, such as “world-mindedness,” and it has shown predicative validity when correlated with homestay evaluations (Hansel, 2005). The advantage of using such an instrument is that the effectiveness of a program or of particular elements of a program can be assessed using a pre/post/control research design. Because the instrument is geared to looking at how individuals compare to a group (the “Developmental Score” of the IDI), it is quite sensitive to group changes such as those measured in studies of program effectiveness. And because the instrument meets the criteria for inferential statistical methodology, it is possible to directly assess the amount of causality attributable to measured variables.

The disadvantage of the IDI is that it sacrifices ideographic data in favor of the nomothetic data necessary for group comparisons. What this means is that the instrument is not very sensitive to individual differences; it tends to overestimate the “normative” condition – Minimization – and underestimate the extent of more ethnocentric or more ethnorelative positions. For individuals, this tendency can be counteracted through individual interpretations taking into account the distribution of responses on the instrument. But for a group profile, individual variations are summarized as group data, and it is therefore not possible to counteract the over-attribution of Minimization with the IDI data. Consequently, the IDI should be used cautiously and only with other measures, such as the qualitative data reported in descriptive studies, to discover the overall intercultural sensitivity of groups.

An example of using the IDI in an experimental design to test change is Pedersen (2009 this volume). She reports that in a short-term study abroad (2 weeks), there is no statistically significant difference in the pre/post developmental scores (DS) of the group compared to a control group. This is consistent with my observation that there is a minimum level of duration and intervention (in various combinations) necessary to cause significant change in the group DS. Nevertheless, Pederson notes significant reductions in the ethnocentrism scales of Denial and Defense in the short-term group compared to the control. This change may reflect the “Allport Effect,” referring to Gordon Allport’s initial observation that any cross-cultural contact



is likely to cause a reduction of prejudice, assuming that certain conditions such as “equal power” are met (Allport, 1954; Amir, 1969; Pettigrew and Tropp, 2000). Most international exchange programs have structures such as homestays or host-culture school attendance that tend to equalize power, and so they can legitimately claim that mere participation in their programs is likely to increase tolerance for other cultures (Paige et al, 2009 this volume). A longer-term program with intervention is likely to show more intercultural learning, and Pederson’s findings about such a program fulfill that prediction.

An example of a mixed qualitative and quantitative descriptive design using IDI data is offered by Jackson’s study of a short-term exchange to England with Chinese-speaking students from Hong Kong (2009, this volume). She describes changes up and down in IDI scores and their relationship to textual analysis of journal entries. Consistent with Paige et al (2003) who helped validate the IDI instrument with similar studies, Jackson found that students with a DS in Denial/Defense or in Acceptance indicated clear rhetorical differences from those with a DS in Minimization. She also finds students overestimate their intercultural sensitivity. Part of this observation is another artifact of the instrument design, which generates a difference between a raw score (PS) and the DS that is interpreted as “overestimation.” By design, the gap is always there until it collapses as DS reaches its upper limit. That said, it certainly is true based on other observations that people tend to overestimate their intercultural sensitivity. In this sense, intercultural sensitivity may be similar to driving a car – nearly everyone thinks they’re great at it, no matter what the outside observation might be! I have seen in my own research with the IDI that some people and/or groups overestimate themselves more than others, which means that they rate themselves relatively high in ethnorelativism while still having a high profile in ethnocentrism. While this overestimation may naturally disappear as ethnocentrism is reduced, it is nevertheless useful to call attention to it in intercultural training.

Vande Berg’s (2009 this volume) report on the ambitious Georgetown Study (Vande Berg et al, 2004; Vande Berg et al, in press) tackles the difficult issue of how much duration, how much intervention, and what kind of intervention is more likely to generate change. Using a constellation of instruments including the IDI, the Georgetown findings provide some objective – though still not statistically significant – support for the importance of duration. Data from that study show that the shortest program (13-18 weeks) has a slight loss in intercultural sensitivity, while the longer programs of 19-25 weeks and 25 weeks to a year have progressively larger

gains. The Georgetown Study also shows that some common conditions of study-abroad such as homestays and immersion in host culture educational processes do not have a simple relationship to intercultural learning. Contrary to some commonly-held beliefs in study abroad, the most intercultural learning does not occur when students are immersed in host-culture education. Rather, they learn best when they are in mixed situations with compatriots, other international students, and host culture students. This finding rather easily supports the idea that more processing of cross-cultural experience is associated with greater intercultural learning.

A point of correspondence among both the descriptive and the inferential studies is that homestays are an important element of intercultural learning. The Georgetown Study brings some additional statistical detail to that observation, showing that it is not just having a homestay, but spending time with the homestay family that is most correlated with intercultural learning (as implied by an increase in intercultural sensitivity). This finding is consistent with the constructivist roots of intercultural sensitivity (Bennett, 2004b), particularly the observation of George Kelly (1963), here paraphrased: “experience is not a function of being in the vicinity of events when they occur, but rather it is how one construes those events that makes a person more or less experienced.” Study abroad students in the vicinity of homestays do not necessarily have a “homestay experience.” It is their interpreting that experience, typically through relating and communicating with the family, that generates the experience.

The importance of the homestay is the focus of Weidemann and Bluml (2009 this volume) discussion of individual and family psychodynamics. They rightly note that not all events in the exchange experience are related to cultural differences. There are some verities of individual development and family dynamics that probably cut across cultures and which may be extremely important in understanding the homestay experience. By recognizing when this individual/family level of analysis is likely to yield the best insight into a situation, the authors remind us that not everything is best understood at the cultural level of analysis, and that confusing the levels may actually obscure the particular issues at play. I agree with the authors when they say that recognizing and resolving threat and self-esteem issues in personal and family dynamics “opens the host parents’ eyes to real cultural differences.”

The major contribution of the Georgetown Study, supported by all the other studies included in this volume, is that intervention in the learning process is more effective than no intervention.

This is shown clearly in the finding that students with significant improvement in intercultural sensitivity were those who had substantial coaching while on-site. Vande Berg makes the case that it is intervention, not just program design, that is the key to intercultural learning. Pointing to experiential activities such as homestays and internships that were not in themselves correlated with measurable intercultural learning, he suggests that intervention would facilitate students' construal of the events as intercultural learning experiences.

## **Intercultural Education**

In soliciting examples of good intervention, The Moving Beyond Mobility conference called for papers on best Practices in intercultural education, defined as:

*The intentional and systematic effort to foster intercultural learning through curriculum design, including pre-departure, on-site, and re-entry activities, and/or course content emphasizing subjective culture and intercultural interaction, and/or the guided facilitation of intercultural experience.*

Given the preceding discussion, the specification that intercultural education be *intentional* is no surprise. It is clear that intercultural learning does not usually happen accidentally, ie merely as a function of being in the vicinity of cross-cultural events. State of the art research included in this volume and elsewhere (eg Engle & Engle, 2003, 2004) supports the idea that intervention is necessary, and that the intervention be of two types: curriculum and facilitation.

One way to focus on intercultural learning is to have programmatic elements that present frameworks for construing subjective cultural differences and that provide opportunities for exploring those differences. The traditional form of this intervention has been the pre-departure cultural orientation, wherein exercises in cultural self-awareness, information about cultural differences, and some intercultural communication strategies are included. When done well, these orientations can be quite effective. Note, for instance, the increase in intercultural sensitivity reported by Jackson (2009, this volume) following her orientation but before the actual travel. I would hypothesize that the closer the pre-departure orientation resembles a substantial training in intercultural communication, the greater the immediate gain in intercultural sensitivity and the greater the intercultural learning derived from the subsequent program compared to groups who receive inferior orientations.

If intercultural orientations are indeed effective, why doesn't every program do it? Good question, and one that inspired Vande Berg to comment on the "master narrative" of study abroad professionals in his article (2009, this volume). Success does not always speak for itself; at least here must be a commitment to intercultural learning in the first place. If one remains convinced that whatever emerges automatically from cross-cultural contact is intercultural learning, it is difficult to make the case for intentional preparation beyond the logistics of contact. Another pressure is faced by shorter-term programs that draw participants from multiple locations. A short-term program may seem to (and perhaps does) require less commitment from participants, and it is therefore difficult to have them add the substantial time and cost of a significant intercultural orientation, particularly if it involves travel from a remote location. Ironically, it is likely that intercultural learning from shorter programs is even more dependent than longer programs on adequate preparation.

It is also now accepted (but not necessarily practiced) that effective facilitation of intercultural learning includes on-site and re-entry programming. The purpose of on-site programming is to encourage reflection and guide analysis. Guided reflection is necessary to generate the kind of cultural self-awareness that supports intercultural learning – that is, reflection at a cultural, not just personal level. Labeling communication issues appropriately as personal, cultural, or institutional is another intercultural learning activity that usually requires guidance. And supporting strategies for improving transferable intercultural competence is an activity that demands the most sophisticated coaching interventions. Similarly, re-entry programming demands highly skilled intervention to achieve the specific applications of intercultural competence envisioned by programs, such as the cross-over of competence from international to domestic multicultural situations or of civic involvement beyond the Minimization goal of peaceable "tolerance."

Addressing the need for skillful intervention, current best practice focuses on the issue of increasing the sophistication of volunteers, staff, and others involved in facilitating the international exchange experience. For instance, Kurtz (2009, this volume) describes a program (FAIJU) dedicated to developing skills for volunteers working in international youth exchange. Since volunteers are often on the frontline of educational activities in exchange, their skills are crucial to the educational outcomes of the programs. In the FAIJU training, volunteers are

presented with prototypical exchange situations (eg conducting a counseling interview, making a strategic programming decision) and assessed by trained observers for their exhibition of competencies such as creativity and perspective-taking.

Volunteers are usually not experienced professional educators, which means that they probably do not have a large toolbox of models and methods that they can apply to an educational task. The ability of volunteers to facilitate intercultural learning successfully is particularly dependent on their access to defined strategies. A strategy for assessing and improving students' emotional resilience in youth exchange is offered by Abarbanel (2009, this volume). This strategy, which she calls an "emotional passport," allows volunteers and others working with participants to recognize signals of emotional stress and to help the participants disengage from the overload in ways that facilitate intercultural learning. In a kind of parallel to Weideman and Bluml's work with families (2009, this volume), Abarbanel provides a framework to separate individual-level psychological observations from group-level intercultural issues.

A particularly creative approach to training for youth exchange volunteers is described by Gisevius and Weber (2009, this volume). In this case, volunteers from the US and Germany were given the task of analyzing their own cultural differences in areas that had previously been identified by homestay families in each country. The volunteers then were to use what they learned about the interactions between their two cultural worldviews to create cultural orientation handbooks for the homestay families. The handbooks were to be culture-specific, both in the sense of their content (about US students' culture for Germans, and vice versa) and also in their form. So, for instance, the handbook for German families used a more deductive style, beginning with complex context and moving to more straight-forward applications, while the one for US Americans began with more motivational self-discovery material and moved later into greater abstraction and complexity. So the project not only generated useful intercultural materials for families, but it enlisted the process of creating the materials as a cultural self-awareness and intercultural analysis exercise for the volunteers.

Another issue of current best practice is bringing the benefits of intercultural learning from exchange and study abroad back to sponsoring educational institutions. For instance, the *Colored Glasses* program (Siefert, 2009 this volume) enlists volunteers from an international exchange program to conduct training in primary and secondary school classrooms. Since teachers have

not necessarily had a study abroad experience, the volunteers are able to add the result of that experience to discussions of cultural diversity and multicultural relations. In some cases, this provides a perspective to students who will never have the opportunity to study abroad. In other cases, it may motivate students to avail themselves of an exchange opportunity. And, of course, the volunteers themselves continue learning in the process of teaching.

Walters, Garii, and Walters (2009, this volume) describe how an international experience can contribute to teacher development. They note that there seems to be a cross-over from the appreciation of international cultural differences to a respect for domestic cultural diversity. I would add to that observation that the domestic benefit is likely to occur when the international experience is oriented towards intercultural learning. In other words, the “Allport Effect” that occurs in nearly all international exchange programs is not easily transferable to a different cross-cultural context, including from national culture interaction to ethnic or gender culture interaction. The key to generating such transferability is having a definition of subjective culture and a model of intercultural communication that includes both contexts in the first place, before the international experience is engaged (J. Bennett & M. Bennett, 2002). Teachers with international study or teaching experience are then equipped to apply both the reduction of prejudice that they have acquired and also the more sophisticated results of intercultural learning: a general respect for cultural difference and increased ability to adapt to cultural difference. These competencies can then be transferred into improved management and better educational strategies in multicultural classrooms.

The need for improved intercultural competence is not just for primary and secondary school teachers; college and university faculty also face multicultural classrooms and, increasingly, the mandate that they “internationalize” their courses. Hiller and Wozniak (2009, this volume) note these pressures and suggest that faculty of residential colleges be able to facilitate the kind of multicultural campus citizenship that would model citizenship in multicultural societies at large. They describe an approach to faculty development in an international residential university that addresses these needs with sophisticated training in intercultural learning. They state the goal of their training as *behavioral flexibility* and *perspective-taking*, which are typically the ultimate goals of all intercultural education programs. In the case of college faculty, these competencies can be applied to facilitating intercultural learning in their students and, like the international exchange volunteers, they will continue learning as they teach.

## Comments on Interculturalism and Study Abroad

The intercultural field is becoming mature, but in a way that does not parallel the development of traditional academic disciplines. Intercultural studies continue to be spread among numbers of departments in universities – communication, psychology, sociology, languages, business – and within specialized educational institutes and professional societies. In addition to these various “homes,” much of the development of interculturalism occurs through practical applications – program design and assessment, training methods, coaching, and strategic organization development.

Interculturalism has grown through “theory into practice.” The field was conceived in this way, and it continues to grow by generating theory when necessary to explain intercultural phenomena and by creating new practice based on that theory to implement applications. There is very little intercultural theory that exists for its own sake; that is, theory that does not directly relate to the facilitation of intercultural learning. Unfortunately, the same cannot always be said for intercultural practice. There are techniques and methods that have been devised to address cross-cultural issues that are not rooted in coherent theory. As the field continues to mature, I am hopeful that these unfounded techniques will disappear.

Over the years since ET Hall’s founding work (1959), study abroad and international educational exchange programs have offered some exemplars of theory into practice. For instance, one of the original applications of Hall’s work was through the Intercultural Communication Workshop, a training strategy developed for foreign students at some U.S. Universities (Abinader, 1971). Some of the original work emphasizing intercultural learning in pre-departure orientations was practiced by secondary exchange programs. And the original re-entry work was done with returning study abroad students (LaBrack, 1993). I believe the Moving Beyond Mobility conference and this collection of papers continues the tradition by taking another step towards greater sophistication in intercultural learning and education.

Abinader, J. (1971). *The laboratory approach to learning in intercultural workshops*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh

Allport, G. (1954) *The nature of prejudice*. New York: Addison-Wesley

- Amir, Y., Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations, *Psychological Bulletin*, 1969, 71, 319-343.
- Abarbanel, J. (2009). Moving with emotional resilience between and within cultures. In (M. Bennett, Guest Ed) *International Journal of Intercultural Education*, Special Issue 2009
- Bachner, D. & Zeitschel, U. (2009a) Students of Four Decades: Participants' reflections on the meaning and impact of an international homestay experience. Münster: Waxmann.
- Bachner, D. & Zeitschel, U. (2009b) Long-term effects of international educational youth exchange. In (M. Bennett, Guest Ed) *International Journal of Intercultural Education*, Special Issue 2009
- Bennett, J. & Bennett, M. (2002) Developing intercultural sensitivity: An integrative approach to global and domestic diversity. In *The diversity symposium proceedings: An interim step toward a conceptual framework for the practice of diversity*. Wlatham, MA: Bentley College. Also in D. Landis, J. Bennett & M. Bennett (Eds.). (2004), *The handbook of intercultural training* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed, pp. 147-165). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bennett, M. J. (1998). Current perspectives of intercultural communication. In M.J. Bennett (Ed.), *Basic concepts in intercultural communication: Selected readings* (pp. 191–214). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Bennett, M. J. (1993). Toward ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (21–71). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press
- Bennett, M. J. (2004). Becoming interculturally competent. In J.S. Wurzel (Ed.) *Toward multiculturalism: A reader in multicultural education*. Newton, MA: Intercultural Resource Corporation.
- Bennett, M. J. & Castiglioni, I. (2004). Embodied ethnocentrism and the feeling of culture: A key to training for intercultural competence" in D. Landis, J. Bennett & M. Bennett (Eds.), *The handbook of intercultural training* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed, pp. 249-265). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NJ: Anchor.
- Engle, L. & Engle J. (2003) Study abroad levels: Toward a classification of program types. In Vande Berg, M. (Guest Ed.). *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, IX, Fall, 1-20.
- Engle, L. & Engle, J. (2004). Assessing language acquisition and intercultural sensitivity development in relation to study abroad program design. (pp. 219-36). In Vande Berg, M. (Guest Ed.). *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, X, Fall, 219-36.
- Gisevius, A. & Weber, R. (2009). The transatlantic orientation exchange project. In (M. Bennett, Guest Ed) *International Journal of Intercultural Education*, Special Issue 2009
- Hall, E.T. (1959). *The silent language*. New York: Doubleday.



Hammer, M. R., Bennett, M. J., and Wiseman, R (2003). Measuring intercultural competence: The *Intercultural Development Inventory*. In R. M. Paige (Guest Ed.), Special Issue on Intercultural Development. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27(4), 421-443.

Hansel, B. (2005) *The Educational Results Study: The AFS internal descriptive report of the complete findings*. New York: AFS Intercultural Programs, Inc.

Hiller, G. & Woźniak, M. (2009). Developing an intercultural competence program at an international cross-border university. In (M. Bennett, Guest Ed) *International Journal of Intercultural Education*, Special Issue 2009

Jackson, J. (2009). Intercultural learning on short-term sojourns. In (M. Bennett, Guest Ed) *International Journal of Intercultural Education*, Special Issue 2009

Paige, R. M., Fry, G., Stallman, E., Josić, J., & Jae-Eun, J. (2009). Study abroad for global engagements: The long-term impact of mobility experiences. In (M. Bennett, Guest Ed) *International Journal of Intercultural Education*, Special Issue 2009

Kurz, T. (2009). Faiju – An assessment center to develop skills for volunteers working in international youth exchange. In (M. Bennett, Guest Ed) *International Journal of Intercultural Education*, Special Issue 2009

LaBrack, B. (1993). *The missing Linkage: The process of integrating orientation and reentry*. In R.M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the Intercultural Experience*, (2nd. Ed.) (p. 245-270). Yarmouth, MA: Intercultural Press.

Paige, R.M., Jacobs-Cassuto, M., Yershova, Y.A., & DeJaeghere, J. (2003) Assessing intercultural sensitivity: An empirical analysis of the Hammer and Bennett Intercultural Development Inventory, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol. 27, No. 4, pp. 467-486.

Siefert, K. (2009). Colored glasses – Moving intercultural exchange into the classroom. In (M. Bennett, Guest Ed) *International Journal of Intercultural Education*, Special Issue 2009

Triandis, H. C. *Culture and Social Behavior*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1994.

Pedersen, P. Teaching toward an ethnorelative worldview through psychology study abroad. In (M. Bennett, Guest Ed) *International Journal of Intercultural Education*, Special Issue 2009

Pettigrew, T.F., and Tropp, L.R. (2000) “Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice: Recent meta-analytic findings.” In Oskamp, S. (Ed.) *Reducing prejudice and discrimination*. The Claremont Symposium on Applied Social Psychology (pp. 93-114). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Vande Berg, M., Balkcum, A., Scheid, M., & Whalen, B. (2004). A Report at the half-way mark: The Georgetown Consortium project. In Vande Berg, M. (Guest Ed.) Special Issue of *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, X, 101-16.

Vande Berg, M, Connor-Linton, J. & Paige, R. M. (2009a, in press). The Georgetown Consortium study: Intervening in student learning abroad. In *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, XVIII.

Vande Berg, M. (2009b) Intervening in student learning abroad: A research-based inquiry. In (M. Bennett, Guest Ed) *International Journal of Intercultural Education*, Special Issue 2009

Walters, L., Garli, B., & Walters, T. (2009). Learning globally, teaching locally: Incorporating international exchange and intercultural learning into pre-service teacher training. In (M. Bennett, Guest Ed) *International Journal of Intercultural Education*, Special Issue 2009

Weidemann, A. & Blüml (2009). Experiences and coping strategies of host families in international youth exchange. In (M. Bennett, Guest Ed) *International Journal of Intercultural Education*, Special Issue 2009