

Bennett, M. (2010). A short conceptual history of intercultural learning in study abroad. In W. Hoffa & S. Depaul (Eds) *A history of U.S. study abroad: 1965-present*. Special publication of *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, pp. 419-449.

A SHORT CONCEPTUAL HISTORY OF INTERCULTURAL LEARNING IN STUDY ABROAD

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

In 1967 I was a bus chaperone for a group of international AFSⁱ students, which involved three weeks of stops each evening at homes across the country and non-stop stories each day about their experiences in the US the previous year. It was clear then, as it is when I talk with exchange students today, that the experience of studying abroad has some common elements and a lot of individual variation.

In common was the powerful impact of immersing one's self in another culture, and the increase in tolerance that typically accompanies that experience. With a few exceptions, the students were more appreciative of the complexity of US American life, and thus less likely to engage in stereotyping. I do not believe a single student would have judged the experience a waste of time.

But there was a lot of variation in what might be more objectively stated as experiential education goals: the attainment of cultural self awareness, increased knowledge of the cultural perspective of the hosts, and general intercultural competence. The students did not seem to have any technical jargon with which to refer to these aspects of their experience, as they did, for instance, in referring to political, economic, or even culinary differences between their own and US society.

In my subsequent work with US college-age students in study abroad programs, I have found a similar pattern. The cross-cultural contact, at least if it involves some cultural immersion, is profoundly moving. With reasonably good "site utilization," the acquisition of knowledge about traditional liberal arts topics is enriched. But the cross-cultural contact does not automatically translate into intercultural learning. In other words, the mere experience of being in another culture, even of being immersed in another culture, does not necessarily translate into either specific knowledge about that culture or transferable principles about intercultural relations.

To talk about this discrepancy, I have found it useful to define the terms commonly used in international exchange in the following way:

- The term "international" refers to multiple nations and their institutions, as it is used in "international relations." When "international" is used to modify "education," it refers to curriculums that incorporate attention to the institutions of other societies, and it refers to the movement of students, faculty, researchers, and other academics across national borders. For instance, "Our international education program incorporates foreign students and returned study-abroad students into an effort to internationalize the curriculum of the university.

- The term “multicultural” refers to a particular kind of situation, one in which there are two or more cultures represented. For example, “The international university had a multicultural campus, with more than 15 different national and ethnic cultures represented.”
- The term “cross-cultural” refers to a particular kind of contact among people, one in which the people are from two or more different cultures. For example, “On a multicultural campus, cross-cultural contact is inevitable.”
- The term “intercultural” refers to a particular kind of interaction or communication among people, one in which differences in cultures play a role in the creation of meaning. For example, “The cross-cultural contact that occurs on multicultural campuses may generate intercultural misunderstanding.” The term “intercultural” may also refer to the kind of skills or competence necessary to deal with cross-cultural contact. For example, “Administrators of cross-cultural programs need intercultural skills to be effective.”
- The term “intercultural learning” refers to the acquisition of general (transferable) intercultural competence; that is, competence that can be applied to dealing with cross-cultural contact in general, not just skills useful only for dealing with a particular other culture. For example, “In her study abroad in Germany, not only did Susan learn how to argue in a more German than American style, she also learned how to recognize and potentially adapt to a wide range of cultural variation in dealing with differences of opinion.

Sometimes the terms “intercultural” and “cross-cultural” are used interchangeably, particularly by psychologists who are familiar with the specialty of cross-cultural psychology. Perhaps because of the prevalence of psychology in training, the term “cross-cultural training” is still common, even when the goal of the training is stated as intercultural competence. Cross-cultural psychologists are more likely to use the term “cross-cultural” to refer to a comparison among cultural contexts; for example, “In a cross-cultural study, ratios of extraversion and introversion were found to be roughly equal in the five cultures examined.” The field of intercultural communication is more likely to focus on the interaction between members of different cultural groups; for example, “Despite personality differences, Japanese patterns of polite restraint were significantly misinterpreted by US Americans as diffidence.” Another way of referring to this distinction is that the levels of analysis are usually different for cross-cultural psychology, which emphasizes individual traits in different cultural contexts, and intercultural communication, which emphasizes the influence of group normative patterns on human interaction. Despite the fact that there are crossovers from each discipline, this distinction captures an essential difference in focus between the two fields.

This chapter continues an exploration of the “great debate” that is the focus of Chapter 6 of Volume One in this series. In that debate, the more traditional academics, while now

embracing study abroad for various reasons, are still leery of claims of experiential learning, particularly when academic credit is requested. Experiential educators, on the other hand, claim that the cross-cultural experience is at the heart of study abroad, and that its credibility be acknowledged and, well, credited. While not always overtly stated, the field of study abroad has been searching for a key to reconciling these positions for the last forty years. One commentator who has made this goal explicit is Josef Mestenhauser, a former director of the Office of International Education at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, and professor of educational policy and administration:

In any event, the field needs to bridge the conceptual and theoretical gap between the professional and the academic. Unfortunately, academics are presently largely isolated from exchanges, while educational exchange professionals have shown little interest in theory and cognitive complexity. Unless this gap is bridged, neither group will benefit from the other, and educational exchanges will continue to be marginal to academic pursuits. (17)ⁱⁱ

What is needed is a treatment of cross-cultural experience that is sufficiently rigorous to attain credibility in the context of traditional learning while being sufficiently true to experiential learning principles to maintain its credibility with their proponents.

This chapter will trace the development of intercultural communication and consider its application to study abroad as an attempt to provide this bridge. To understand the depth of the continuing debate between traditionalists and experientialists and the often-halting progress towards its reconciliation, the chapter will first frame the debate as an epistemological clash between the assumptions of modernity and “comparative development” and the assumptions of post-modern relativity and “contextualism.” It will then show how intercultural communication over the last forty years has generated models and technical jargon for referring to cross-cultural experience, how training based on these models has entered various aspects of study abroad programming, and how as a result the cross-cultural experience can now be more predictably and credibly translated into substantial intercultural learning.

A CLASH OF ASSUMPTIONS

At the turn of the 18th century, Franz Boas delivered a devastating critique of his fellow anthropologists for their adherence to the comparative method.ⁱⁱⁱ By comparing cultures to an assumed absolute standard of civilization (as defined by the Western anthropologists), a hierarchy of cultures had been created, from “savage” to “civilized.” Colonialists and other cultural imperialists were using this idea and the mistaken notion of “social Darwinism” to fuel their assumption of cultural superiority. Boas pointed out the ethnocentrism of this stance and argued that cultures could only be understood in their own terms – a position that became known as *cultural relativism*. Ethnographies according to this principle were famously developed by his students Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict, among many others. The idea of cultural relativism was originally accompanied by *historical particularism*, which assumed that the development of societies could not be explained in terms of any universal principle, and thus could not be adequately compared one to another in terms of such principles.

I believe these assumptions of cultural relativity and particularism were at the heart of the surge in experiential dimensions of study abroad, particularly after WWII as American isolationism went into decline^{iv}. The world outside the US was somehow more different than we had thought, and it was vitally important (and interesting) to find out exactly how different other cultures were. Since the prevalent view of cultural relativity held that cultures could only be understood from within their own context, learning about them meant going there, preferably

with some kind of immersion experience. By the end of the 1950's, exchange programs such as Experiment in International Living (EIL) and AFS had established sophisticated strategies for managing cultural immersion experiences, predominantly homestays and local school enrollment. The popularity of these programs was mainly located in upper middle class groups, where parents had been exposed to the precepts of cultural relativity in their own college educations and thus were more likely to hold "liberal" ideas about the benefits of deep cross-cultural experience. In other words, an influential portion of the US population had been primed to support cross-cultural programs that went beyond the Grand Tour and were aimed at experience, not necessarily scholarship.

The tacit popular acceptance of relativist assumptions was paralleled by a more explicit lay embrace of experiential pedagogy. Beginning at the turn of the century, in fact within a year of Boas' opening salvo against comparative anthropology, John Dewey began his campaign against traditional didactic education.^v "Give the pupils something to do, not something to learn; and the doing is of such a nature as to demand thinking; learning naturally results." Famous experiments in education based on experiential methods were launched by Maria Montessori and Rudolf Steiner, among others. With the exception of Antioch College, The Evergreen College, and some other non-traditional schools, experiential methods never took hold in traditional American universities; however, they formed the basis of American training methodology, fueled the Rogerian encounter group movement, and maintained a popular existence in extracurricular programs of all kinds, particularly international exchange programs.

By the early 1960s, the idea of cultural immersion took a governmental form in the Peace Corps and eventually VISTA. Both the international form of Peace Corps and the domestic form of VISTA had a strong service component, which was the mechanism whereby cultural immersion was accomplished. The first goal of the Peace Corps stated by JFK in 1961 was "Helping the people of interested countries in meeting their need for trained men and women." In my own Peace Corps service (Truk (Chuuk), Micronesia, 1968-70), "community development" was the euphemism for looking around the village where we were living to find some project that might justify the time and effort it took local people to have us around. Sometimes the projects were moderately successful, more often they were dismal or laughable failures, but always they were the stated reason for our presence. The local people indulged us in this pretense, even though they were clear in their preference for development workers with big bulldozers and big budgets. Of course the real reason for embedding inexperienced young college graduates into villages was to accomplish Kennedy's second and third goals: "Helping promote a better understanding of Americans on the part of the people served," and "Helping promote a better understanding of other peoples on the part of Americans." These goals were often achieved by what was and is, for the most part, a service-learning program.

Parenthetically, I would like to note that the Peace Corps has gone through many cycles of rediscovering how relatively unimportant its first goal is. Usually this occurs when host country nationals complain that the B.A. generalists, as we were called, don't know enough to be very helpful in development work. The Peace Corps responds by recruiting older, more experienced volunteers who, while they are indeed more useful, are usually less adaptable and thus less able to engage in cultural immersion. The second and third goals begin to suffer until the B.A. generalists are again recruited in greater numbers. The reification of the first goal – the assumption that development work is more than the mechanism to create immersion – is like assuming that the real reason for homestays in AFS or EIL programs is so families can have the pleasure of an additional child in the house.

Noting the popularity among students of immersion programs like EIL and AFS, colleges and universities began incorporating similar elements of cultural immersion into their more

traditional, junior-year-abroad type programs.^{vi} However, the traditional university programs were not built on the post-modern assumption of cultural relativism nor on the parallel pedagogical assumption of experiential education; they were rooted in the comparative assumptions of modernity. Courses in comparative economics, politics, comparative cross-cultural psychology, and even some approaches to modern languages were based on a more positivist view of reality, wherein there were 1) universal criteria against which to assess economic and political development; 2) universal models of personality against which to measure “national character”; and 3) a universal grammar out of which particular languages were transformed. Because the faculty and administrators of traditional study abroad programs did not share a relativist epistemology, they had difficulty understanding why cultural immersion was important beyond customer satisfaction. Thus, cultural immersion was included but marginalized as a non-credit activity rather than incorporated as a core learning strategy.

So, as we pick up our story in the early 60s, the traditionalists and the experientialists were arguing over appropriate learning goals and teaching methods in university study abroad programs, and argument mostly uninformed by awareness of the underlying discrepancy in modern positivist and post-modern relativist epistemologies. By 1965, a little-known field called “intercultural communication” was beginning to offer a bridge between the two positions. But to understand how it happened, we need to back up a bit.

THE BIRTH OF INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

The initial applications of cultural relativism were unyielding in their purity. To really understand another culture, one needed to drop all preconceived notions and describe with absolute neutrality the worldview of the culture under consideration with no reference to concepts outside that worldview. The difficulty, if not impossibility, of this requirement led anthropologists to fudge the principle a little, and sometimes a lot. For instance, Ruth Benedict combined the idea of cultural relativism with the idea of cultural patterns – an imposition of an outside concept (since people indigenous to a worldview usually do not perceive their behavior as part of a pattern.)

But the main problem with pure cultural relativism was that it precluded intercultural communication. For communication across cultural contexts to occur, people would need to be able to shift rather casually from their own cultural perspective to that of another culture. The idea of cultures as discrete and incomparable contexts made such a shift impossible. Even with the fudging that allowed some comparison of cultural patterns, the idea of using those comparisons for communication purposes was originally unthinkable.

Enter Edward T. Hall, who took the radical stance that cultures could be compared in terms of “etic” categories that observers created for the purpose of making the comparison.^{vii} He was particularly interested in creating categories about communication, so that people could generate a comparison between say, a “high-context” indirect style and a “low-context” direct style of message delivery, and then adjust their own style to be more effective in the other context. Hall’s work was solidly based in cultural relativism, but he had found a road back to comparison without recourse to universal principles. Actually, he was pushed onto the road by his students at the Foreign Service Institute (FSI), where he taught from 1951-1955.^{viii} The foreign service workers were impatient with theoretical and ethnographic anthropology – they wanted practical advice on how to communicate in the societies to which they would be assigned. Hall and the linguist George Trager created what was, in essence, intercultural communication training as a response.^{ix}

With the publication in 1959 of *The Silent Language*, which summarized the FSI training program, Hall found himself at odds with his anthropology colleagues. Not only did the

remaining positivists spurn his work as more relativism, but the relativists also attacked his position as a return to the comparative method and all its colonialist baggage. The resulting rejection of Hall's work was so strong that that anthropologists have only recently been reconsidering intercultural communication as possibly more substantial than fieldwork support.^x

An early proponent of Hall's ideas of intercultural communication was Dean Barnlund, a professor of general semantics and interpersonal communication at San Francisco State University (then College). He inaugurated some the first intercultural communication research, studying the implications for communication of cultural differences in self-disclosure between Japanese and US Americans.^{xi} One of Barnlund's students, John Condon, published one of the first intercultural communication textbooks in 1975.^{xii} That text used the etic categories of "value orientations" created by Florence Kluckhohn and Clyde Strodbeck, two other anthropologists whose work has become central in intercultural communication.

Other early innovators were Edward Stewart, a psychologist whose work at the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) of George Washington University and at the Business Council for International Understanding led to the publication of one of the first theoretical treatments of intercultural theory, *American Cultural Patterns: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*, in 1971^{xiii}; Robert Hanvey, a professor of Education at Indiana State University, who contributed early work on the idea of cultural awareness and intercultural sensitivity^{xiv}; Marshall R. Singer, a professor of the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs at the University of Pittsburgh, whose work on intercultural perception and empathy was influential; and LaRay Barna, a professor of speech communication and TESL at Portland State University, who introduced concepts of intercultural communication into a department of applied linguistics.^{xv} Much of the original literature in the field was published by The Intercultural Press, co-founded by David Hoopes and former NAFSA president Peggy Pusch in 1980, although now intercultural communication texts and topical treatments are handled by a wide range of publishers.

The purpose of mentioning this brief history of intercultural communication is to establish its academic context in addition to its training application, which will be stressed in the following section. Insofar as intercultural communication has been able to act as a bridge between the poles of traditional academics and experiential educators in study abroad, it has done so because it has credibility in both camps.

THE INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION WORKSHOP

The mid-seventies was a time of consolidation of the intercultural training approach, with initial targeted applications to study abroad such as the *SECUSSA Sourcebook* described in the next section. Prior to this time, intercultural training had been conducted with relatively small numbers of international visitors to the US and business people going abroad, and in much larger numbers of Peace Corps Volunteers, and AFS or EIL exchange students. According to a survey conducted by George Renwick in 1994^{xvi}, the total number of intercultural training programs from the years 1950 to 1974 was 24,300 with participants numbering 701,000. Of this number, 21% were conducted by Peace Corps, and 66% were conducted by a combination of AFS, EIL, and the Washington International Center International Visitors program. By the year 1983, 1,978 programs occurred in that single year, conducted by a wide variety of organizations. This is about twice the number of programs conducted in 1974, and represents a steadily growing trend. Based on other observations, much of this growth appears to have been in study abroad.

A major contributor to the growth in intercultural programs during this period was the *intercultural communication workshop*. The ICW is an educational training package that combines a developmental curriculum based on intercultural communication principles with a carefully structured experiential teaching strategy. The format of the workshop is either an intensive weekend or a semester/quarter-long course with weekly 3-hour meetings, although other variations have been attempted. Approximately 10 participants are selected for a balanced mix of cultures, typically with no more than 50% US Americans and the other 50% either from a variety of other cultures or from a single other culture. The main learning style employed is concrete, with large group discussion and dyad interaction predominating. A trained facilitator is always present for the large group discussion.

I will describe briefly the history of the ICW in the context of international education, because it shows an early flurry of interest in intercultural learning in academic settings. Although the ICW movement has cooled off considerably since its heyday in the seventies, the lessons learned from its format and treatment of intercultural topics remain relevant. I will consider first the format, and then the content.

The first weekend ICWs were organized in 1966 by David Hoopes and Stephen Rhinesmith through the Regional Council for International Education (RCIE), associated with the University of Pittsburgh.^{xvii} Concurrently, Cliff Clark at Cornell University developed a similar program. The original purpose of the ICI was to provide an intercultural learning platform for foreign students in the US. However, since the workshop necessarily involved host country nationals (in this case, US Americans), the course provided a similar learning experience for them. The original workshops were non-credited extracurricular activities and usually met off-campus at a retreat center over a weekend.

These original workshops proved so popular and apparently successful in meeting their goals that RCIE began publishing a newsletter with NAFSA funding, *Communique*, focusing on new developments in the ICW movement. RCIE also published an initial series, *Readings in Intercultural Communication (1970, 1972, 1973)* with articles about research, theory and programs in the field. This series continued under the editorship of David Hoopes and the auspices of The Intercultural Communications Network and the Society for Intercultural Education, Training, and Research (SIETAR) through 1977. In addition to NAFSA, other organizations expressing an interest in the ICW included the American Psychological Association, the Speech Communication Association (now the National Communication Association), and the International Communication Association.

In 1973, NAFSA convened the Task Force on Intercultural Communication Workshops with a grant from the Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.^{xviii} The task force, which included many of the people then conducting ICWs^{xix}, was to evaluate the effectiveness of the activity. At the time of the evaluation, 73 international education professionals, of whom about half were foreign student advisors, were identified as conducting ICWs, involving 11,698 international students and 7,524 US American students. Due to a relatively low questionnaire response rate, it is likely that the number of conveners and participants was much higher. All of the identified professionals had received training in group leadership and most had also received t-group or encounter-group training from the National Training Laboratory (NTL) or the (Rogerian) Center for the Study of the Person.

The NAFSA task force made the following observations that are relevant to our discussion here:

- Participants agreed with the conveners that the primary goal of the workshop was “to encourage and understanding of cultural

factors as they influence interpersonal communication” and “to share common human experience in an accepting environment.”

- Facilitators used a non-directive approach and encouraged a highly supportive climate and moderate self-disclosure.
- ICWs were conducted successfully in foreign student orientations, weekend sessions for international and US American students on topics such as friendship; mid-semester continuing orientation programs, dormitory programs for residents, training for staff members who work with and US and foreign students; host family training, foreign student re-entry programs, and faculty orientation programs
- Reported evaluations of ICW participants was extremely favorable

Based on their analysis of the data collected and consultation with other experts^{xx}, the task force found

that the intercultural communication workshop experience, when designed and conducted responsibly, is conducive (1) to effective intercultural communication, (2) to realization of the participant’s goals, and (3) to the effective functioning of persons working with foreign students.

The task force’s further comments called for more NAFSA-sponsored research on the ICW, NAFSA-sponsored training of ICW facilitators, and the establishment of clear guidelines for the content and process of ICWs in the international education context. None of these recommendations were implemented, although NAFSA professional development workshops now include one on intercultural communication in general.

A major development in the format of the ICW occurred at the University of Minnesota in 1972, when Robert Moran, then director of the Minnesota International Center, cooperated with the department of speech communication to set up a credited ICW-format course. The course was offered at the upper-division/graduate level, and facilitators were selected from speech communication graduate students who were pursuing a specialty in intercultural communication. With my own ICW experience as one of those graduate students, in 1977 I carried the format with me to Portland State University, where LaRay Barna had for many years already been conducting ICW-like activities in credited TESL classes. The transplanted Minnesota format became a lower-division course (in fact, it supplanted the previous lecture-based Introduction to Intercultural Communication) with a separately-credited graduate-level facilitator training course attached. As in Minnesota, the course was extremely popular, and we never had any trouble recruiting at least 50-60 students for five or six groups (depending on availability of qualified facilitators) for each of three quarters a year. Also as in Minnesota, the course was logistically and organizationally challenging, necessitating dedicated directors. The program at Portland State stopped after I departed (Barna had retired a few years earlier). The Minnesota program also has ceased, and I am not aware of any other ICW program now active on a college campus.

Despite its failure to become institutionalized, the ICW phenomenon carries several lessons for our consideration of intercultural learning in study abroad today. First, it shows that if you build a program where students can interact with people from other cultures under safe and supportive circumstances, they will come. Second, it shows that, while difficult to initiate and maintain, it is not impossible to get credit for a largely experiential course in the international

education area. Third, it demonstrated that Edward T. Hall's approach to teaching intercultural communication is transferable to a university setting, and that the general goals of such training – cultural self-awareness, greater appreciation of alternative cultural behavior and values, and increased empathy for people of different cultures – are readily attainable.

Based on my experience in conducting and supervising a couple hundred ICW groups in the middle and latter days of the movement, here is how I would summarize the movement's bequeathal to the intercultural field:

- **Cultural generalizations need to be sanctioned and differentiated from cultural stereotypes.** We learned to explain that cultural generalizations were based on probability distributions of behavior and values within a cultural context, and that a “cultural pattern” was not the same as a “cultural label.” Schooled in cultural (and personal) relativity, students were quick to reject as a “stereotype” any label that appeared to deny individual variation or that was imposed by observers. Differentiating generalizations from stereotypes is not a difficult distinction to make, but it needs to be made before the accusation of stereotyping occurs. Trainers call this an “inoculation,” and it has become standard practice in any kind of intercultural presentation.^{xxi}

In the case of study abroad, faculty need to agree to at least this one concept. Some faculty, trying to avoid stereotyping, avoid the normative level of analysis altogether, sticking either to institutional comparative analysis and/or individual personality dynamics. However, the idea of normative distributions is so central to intercultural learning that the rejection of appropriate generalizing is tantamount to a rejection of intercultural learning, as defined here.

- **Culture-general should precede culture-specific.** Consideration and practice with general strategies of perception, definition of cultural identity, and observational categories for cultural differences should precede any substantial discussion of specific cultural differences. Again and again we observed that if ICW participants started talking about their own specific cultural experience too soon, the knowledge thus gained could not be transferred into different contexts (ie it was non-generalizable). For instance, if participants from North America and Latin America immediately started comparing their different ideas of “friendship”, they could not then generalize their discoveries to understanding the yet different way that friends are defined in many Asian contexts. But if we did the reverse – first explained how relationships in general are defined and valued differently in a variety of cultures and then discussed differences in defining friendship between cultures represented in the group, the learning became transferable to other cultural contexts.

The lesson for study abroad is that orientation programs should resist the temptation to present only information on the host culture, or differences between the host culture and the sending culture. Such information needs to be preceded by general strategies for perceiving and analyzing cultural differences. Realistically, both things cannot be done well in the time typically available in pre-departure programs. It is better to use the pre-departure time to establish the culture-general framework (and do safety/logistics), and introduce culture-specific information at a post-arrival session.

- **Culture-general frameworks are necessary, and they should be presented from concrete to abstract.** We learned that people weren't able to see cultural differences very well without some framework, or set of observational categories, to guide their perception. The more they saw some cultural differences, the more they could see additional differences. It was easier for them to see concrete differences first, just like the prospective diplomats that E.T. Hall was teaching at the Foreign Service Institute. In fact, the following sequence appeared to be the most effective:
 1. **Language use.** Whorf-Sapir hypothesis of linguistic relativity and its implications for perception; ritual uses of language for greeting, apology, compliments, etc.
 2. **Nonverbal behavior.** Modifications or substitutions of language with gesturing, eye contact, proxemics, etc.
 3. **Communication style.** Organizations of messages, such as linear/circular, direct/indirect.
 4. **Cognitive style.** Organizations of perception, such as concrete/abstract, inductive/deductive.
 5. **Cultural values.** Assignment of goodness or badness to ways of being in the world.

The lesson for study abroad is that discussion of cultural values systems such as Kluckhohn, Steward, Hofstede, Trompenaars, or others should not come at the beginning of a program. This is the mistake that Hall originally made at the FSI, and it continues to be made by faculty whose learning style is more deductive than their students'.

- **The goal of intercultural learning is empathy, not just tolerance.** In the ICW, a safe, equal-power cross-cultural situation was created, which had the effect in itself of reducing prejudice and increasing tolerance.^{xxii} However, the goal was intercultural learning, not just reducing prejudice. So the ICW built on the initial reduction of prejudice with exercises and discussion geared to create acute awareness of cultural differences among members of the group. This demanded that members exercise greater amounts of empathy with one another as the course went on, until at the end of the ICW there was often a high level of mutual understanding in the group.

The lesson for study abroad programs is that insofar as they incorporate relatively equal-power immersion experiences, the payoff will be an increase of tolerance without much additional effort. However, this is not intercultural learning. Turning a cross-cultural immersion experience into an intercultural learning experience does take an additional effort.

EXEMPLARS OF INTERCULTURAL LEARNING IN STUDY ABROAD

By 1960, Irwin Abrams had defined “the furthering of international understanding” as a possible third goal of study abroad.^{xxiii} He stated the first goal as “the intellectual and professional development of the student in his specialized field of study” – the traditional *wanderjahr* goal, and the second goal as “the general education of the student” – the traditional goal of the Grand Tour. Acknowledging that there were many interpretations of what “international understanding” might mean, he suggested that one would be

“...the improvement of relations between peoples as a consequence of increased contact between them, assuming that

familiarity breeds good will, or at least that the knowledge gained is a necessary, even if not a sufficient, condition of friendliness.”

(5)

This carefully hedged statement seems to be acknowledging the already-established popularity of cultural immersion experiences, but it betrays the relative vagueness of the concept of international (intercultural) understanding at that time. Still, Abrams recognized that the cross-cultural experience could not continue to exist at the margins of study abroad:

By and large, institutions seem to be doing very little to integrate the foreign experience within the campus educational program. There seems to be more concern about the “readjustment” of the returned students than with methods of furthering the educational process which might have begun abroad... (This) problem is less likely to be solved by psychological counseling than through providing challenging experiences which will aid the student in rediscovering America, in reconsidering his values after the testing time abroad, and in reflecting upon his experiences. (19)

With some notable exceptions such as the Callison College and now the International Studies program at the University of the Pacific, Stockton, California, many study abroad administrators are still neglecting the crucial contribution that re-entry programming could make to the overall educational value of the experience. Abrams also had some prescient comments on orientation that may resonate in many programs today:

... Integration with the campus program should begin with a sound orientation program... In many colleges, orientation is not considered an academic experience at all... At most a certain amount of information is purveyed, which ranges all the way from travel tips to introductory remarks about foreign politics and institutions. It is questionable how much effect this has, and one hears frequent complaints from students overseas about the inadequacies of their orientation programs....(19)

Finally, Abrams has defined the issues of accreditation for the “learning to learn” activities in study abroad:

The ideal orientation would be a course for academic credit. It would seek to draw together the implications of the student’s previous general education for his foreign experience, and it would aid him in developing techniques with which to explore the foreign community... Field trips for the exploration of an American community could help the student develop the concepts of social analysis which will aid identifying difference in other cultures overseas. (20)

One of the first study abroad programs in the 1960’s to incorporate intercultural learning as it was implied by Abrams was actually a service-learning program: Volunteers in Asia (VIA), a kind of mini-Peace Corps program associated with Stanford University. In 1963, Dwight Clark, then the Dean of Men at Stanford University, took a group of students to Hong Kong on a service/immersion experience. The popularity of this trip led to establishing VIA as a nonprofit organization in 1966. VIA continues to offer service learning/cultural immersion experiences for Stanford students, graduates, and others. In the words of its current executive director, Scott Sugiura, “VIA has been providing opportunities for American and Asians to walk in each others’ shoes, share each others’ cultures and come to understand each other through a common

commitment to service and education.” Notably, VIA does not receive academic credit for its programs, despite its association with the university.

An early program that carried credit for pre-departure learning to learn activities was SPAN – the Student Project for Amity Among Nations. Established in 1947 at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, SPAN institutionalized the independent faculty-led summer trip. With strict criteria for pre-departure meetings over the course of a semester and a required post-trip research paper, the program allowed (but did not require) a focus on credited intercultural learning. Program topics and faculty were competitively selected, and resources were offered to faculty members on everything from logistics to group process. However, in the end, it was entirely a faculty-developed and faculty-led trip. This meant that trips ranged from the epitome of traditional education abroad to ones that were purely experiential without much structure.

An example of an intercultural learning design was the SPAN program to Micronesia I developed with Janet Bennett in 1974. Weekly meetings using an ICW format were officially conducted for the Spring Semester. Unofficially, we conducted some meetings the previous semester as well, since the students were already selected and they all agreed to the extra time. In addition to developing the intercultural frameworks mentioned earlier in the ICW section, we conducted Trukese language sessions, discussions of logistics and etiquette, and preparation for individual research topics. By the time we arrived in Truk (Chuuk), the students were primed to “hit the ground learning.” This did not preclude them from having the normal culture-shock and adjustment challenges that face every sojourner. But their learning from those challenges was faster and deeper, their adaptation quicker, and their overall sensitivity vastly superior to other groups of students that were visiting Truk that summer. In fact, the group grew a little haughty, watching other international visitors in Truk behave in ways that were just normally ethnocentric.

Most of the participants in the Micronesia SPAN program showed up for a 25th year reunion. They all reported that the experience had made a difference in their lives; but more importantly for our topic, they reported that after the trip they approached all cross-cultural situations, foreign and domestic, with more thoughtfulness and (they hoped) more sensitivity. Assuming this is true, and I have no reason to doubt it, it is a good example of the long-term transferability of a relatively short-term structured intercultural learning experience.

Some early research on intercultural learning was conducted on participants in a study abroad program sponsored by the Regional Council for International Exchange (associated with the University of Pittsburgh).^{xxiv} Edward Morgan Jr. collected questionnaire data and/or interviewed 124 students who had spent a year in Basel, Switzerland between 1968 and 1970. The program had an unusually clear set of intercultural learning goals, including: 1) To understand that being a stranger will make it necessary to restructure routine responses in order to adapt to the new culture; 2) To resolve or reduce successfully value conflicts between the old and the new and to begin organizing an internally consistent value system; and 3) To integrate what is being learned into the formulation of new patterns of adaptation. His conclusion, that the “Cultural Relativist” type learner had a deeper and more empathic intercultural experience than the “Cultural Opposite” type learner, led him to call for greater integration of the “affective and psychomotor” with traditional cognitive learning in study abroad programs. In his recommendations to increase the educational impact of programs, he writes:

The question of how to achieve the learning objectives of cross-cultural study could be simply answered by developing specific programs for these objectives. Administrators could place priority on providing pre-, during, and post-encounter opportunities to maximize the valued outcomes... These experiences should be available before the student leaves his own culture and continued

as the more in-depth cultural encounter occurs in the host country. Basically, it is helping the person to acquire cross-cultural and inter-personal sensitivity. (212)

Another program with a long and distinguished history of intentional intercultural learning is the study abroad program of the University of the Pacific in Stockton, California. Since its inception in 1962, the Callison College of UOP annually sent its entire sophomore class to India. To deal with issues that arose during that sojourn, Bruce LaBrack, an anthropologist with an unusually high regard for intercultural communication, developed an informal reentry program that not only dealt with the emotional turmoil of “cultural readjustment” but that also focused on the incorporation of intercultural learning into the students’ subsequent education. In 1977 LaBrack created a reader for the reentry course, “Analysis of Overseas Experience,” and soon an 8-week predeparture orientation was added that integrated material and participants with the re-entry module. In 1978, despite resistance from the foreign language department, the course was accredited and soon thereafter was mandated as a required course for all students participating in study abroad at University of the Pacific. The course continues to be taught to this day by Ph.D. faculty with specialties in cultural anthropology and/or intercultural relations, within The School of International Studies.

The UOP integrated predeparture and reentry course has become a prototype for how to organize intercultural learning for study abroad. Accompanying a shift from India to Japan in the LATE 70s, the program incorporated an intentional balance of traditional academic and experiential dimensions that models a success in bridging the “great debate” between those two emphases. More recently, LaBrack has developed an internet-based program that supports the kind of on-site structured activities that are now considered a crucial component of an overall intercultural learning program.^{xxv}

It may be interesting to note parenthetically how the UOP intercultural learning program came to co-exist with the foreign language department. Ironically, foreign languages departments have resisted intercultural programs at many American universities, adding to other impediments that have often kept those programs from attaining enough autonomy to mount a coherent intercultural learning effort. Some of this resistance is undoubtedly due to normal academic protectionism, wherein foreign languages “own” the territory of culture-learning as a subdivision of foreign language-learning. However, there is also a paradigm clash between intercultural communication and foreign languages as they are taught in the university. Intercultural communication is located in the social sciences, with its roots in anthropology and communication theory. Foreign language is usually taught as a humanity, with its roots in literature. This may surprise non-specialists who think of language-teaching in linguistic terms, but in most American universities the acquisition of linguistic competence is simply a prerequisite for the foreign literature courses. Language acquisition courses are often relegated to junior faculty, while the tenured faculty teach the “real” literature courses, and in some cases the acquisition courses are not even creditable to one’s major. In this context, the acquisition of intercultural competence may appear to language departments as undeserving of its own separate programming. So the more subtle prototype offered by the UOP is how to position a credited intercultural learning program alongside foreign language and other traditional university departments. Along with the need for credible direction and support from the president and academic dean, the program demonstrates the importance of maintaining a dedicated course on the topic of culture-general intercultural learning taught by faculty with an academic specialty in intercultural communication and who receive pay, promotion, and tenure recognition for the activity.

Judith Martin describes an effort based on these principles that was conducted at the University of Minnesota^{xxvi}, where a “Foreign Studies Minor” was established with a required curriculum that included pre-departure, on-site, and re-entry work directed towards the development of intercultural competence along with culture-specific language and area studies work. By not only giving the program academic credit, but also by allowing it to be claimed by students as a minor, the University’s effort is another good example of bridging the experiential/traditional education gap.

Another approach to bridging the gap is that of service learning. In 1982, The International Partnership for Service-Learning and Leadership was formed with the explicit goal of “creating a powerful dynamic between direct cultural exposure and academic learning.”^{xxvii} By creating a focus for engagement, service-learning (like the early Stanford VIA program) provides a cross-cultural experience in context. When appropriate facilitation of that experience through coursework, journaling, or other means occurs, these program have the potential to generate significant, transferable intercultural learning.

While there were other study-abroad and service-learning programs in the 80s and 90s that claimed intercultural learning as an outcome, they were still a minority. And even among the minority, most of the programs with explicit intercultural learning goals did not have equivalently explicit and comprehensive intercultural programming. Until recently, the UOP program stood as an exceptional case of providing real pre-departure preparation for intercultural learning, and it was virtually alone in combining that preparation with significant on-site and re-entry programming.

A CASE STUDY OF MODERATE SUCCESS

Part of the reason for the dearth of intercultural programming may be that the logistics of providing substantial pre-departure orientation can be overwhelming. On a single campus, it is difficult enough to schedule substantial pre-departure meetings, and with consortia that involve students from several regional campuses it may become impossible. Following is a case study of one such consortium, the Northwest Interinstitutional Council on Study Abroad (NICSA)^{xxviii} and its attempts to introduce more preparation for intercultural learning from 1978-1981.

NICSA brought students from the various campuses together for a weekend at a conference center about 3 months prior to departure for semester or year-long study abroad programs at three sites: London, England; Avignon, France; and Cologne, Germany. The timing of the weekend was always contentious, since it inevitably conflicted with some big event on one of the campuses. Attendance was variable, and always low for students who had to travel the furthest. Traditionally, the program had had two goals: 1) Present and discuss logistics and safety issues; 2) Provide introduction to NICSA and AHA to the disparate participants. The consultants to AHA^{xxix}, who were doing successful intercultural work with teachers and students in AHA’s high school program, suggested that the pre-departure program aspire to more intercultural learning. AHA convinced a reluctant NICSA faculty board that such a change was useful in solving some problems, and a third goal was added to the program: Introduce concepts and practice of intercultural communication that would show up in improved behavior on-site. Intercultural learning activities included running the cross-cultural simulation Bafa Bafa, presentations and exercises around a few of the intercultural frameworks, and direct discussion of problematic behavior (eg bringing casual sexual partners for unannounced overnight visits to homestays). Immediate post-program evaluations were quite positive, but it was unclear from subsequent on-site reports whether there were significant changes in intercultural behavior.

The consultants’ analysis was that the spotty attendance and long lead-time made the overall effect of the program unpredictable, and that the unending logistic concerns (“how late

does the metro run at night”) made the time available for intercultural learning preparation inadequate, anyway. The initial strategy to deal with these problems was to have international education professionals at each campus run separate orientations, using common materials and strategies acquired in a “train the trainer” session with the consultants. While this improved the attendance somewhat, it reduced the effectiveness of the intercultural learning component, judging from both immediate post-program evaluations and again, on-site performance. Subsequent interviews with the newly minted trainers confirmed that many of them were either too busy or too disinterested in the topic to devote much time or effort to the intercultural training.

The next strategy was to maintain short pre-departure logistic programs on separate campuses and to have the consultants conduct the intercultural program on-site soon after arrival. This was very successful in improving attendance (100%), and in reducing time on logistics (near 0%). With the additional focus available, the goal of “becoming more cultural self-aware” was added to the objectives, with the rationale that it was a key element in intercultural learning, and it was readily measurable. Despite resistance from local faculty, some of whom resented the time lost from “real” courses, the on-site programs were resounding successful. Immediate post-program evaluations continued to be excellent, measurements of the self-awareness goal showed significant gain^{xxx}, and local coordinators reported decreases in problematic behavior (although a few alumni of the orientation program still invited their paramours back to the homestay bedroom).

A serendipitous finding was that of the ideal time for the post-arrival training. The order in which the programs were presented at the three sites was rotated, allowing the consultants to observe how, for instance, the Avignon groups responded to the training after three days, one week, or one and one half weeks. For one set of sessions did not occur until a month after arrival. Groups at all three sites seemed to respond best to the post one week programs. An explanation for the effectiveness of this timing might be that 1) most of the logistic concerns are now old news; 2) the homestay situation is established; 3) the student has confronted cultural difference but not so much as to elicit a lot of disorientation or defensive reaction (culture shock); and 4) therefore the student is most able at this time to focus on the deeper and longer-term issues of intercultural communication.

Eventually the consultants tried to, as the Peace Corps puts it, “work themselves out of a job” by again conducting training of trainer sessions, this time with the on-site coordinators. Again, the results were mixed, with some of the coordinators became quite accomplished in this kind of training and others dropping it as soon as possible. It appeared that those coordinators who saw their job as more educational than logistic were more likely to become accomplished intercultural trainers. This parallels the behavior of the international education office employees who earlier had attempted to learn the training; although there seemed to be fewer of the international educators who defined themselves in the educational role. Perhaps they were not as motivated as the site coordinators to have students exhibit more interculturally sensitive behavior.

SEMINAL INTERCULTURAL LEARNING PUBLICATIONS AND NAFSA BENCHMARKS

Because it acknowledged intercultural education as its primary goal, Volunteer in Asia produced some of the earliest intercultural learning materials to be used in this type of program. The *Transcultural Study Guide*^{xxxii} was first published in 1972. In the second edition (1975), Ken Darrow writes:

Is it really true that all people are brothers and sisters? We think so.
We all laugh and we all cry; we all have our dreams and our

disappointments... But can we really expect to embrace the unfamiliar on faith alone, without real understanding? Our friends and those we love and hold dear, by and large are not rice farmers. So long as we cannot begin to imagine life as a rice farmer, we cannot fully understand and live out the idea (with all its implications) that all humans comprise one humanity. (4)

The book is divided into the topics that normally comprise a comparative international relations book: Economics, Politics, Social Structure, Religion & Belief, Music & Art, etc. However, each section is filled with questions meant to guide the student into a deeper understanding of the cultural experience underlying the institution. For example, in the economics section, one sub-set of questions is this: 1) In what ways do family ties serve as a form of social security?; 2) Does this cut down on the accumulation of capital from which needed investment might take place?; 3) What are the strengths and weaknesses of this form of social security?; 4) What are the most important threats to the continuation of the family as a social and economic unit? And later, 1) What kind of person is considered to be a *good worker*? *Bad worker*? 2) How does the community react toward those who don't work, can't work, or won't work? I have used these questions in preparing students for an immersion experience in Micronesia, described earlier, and they really do draw attention to an underlying communal experience that contrasts with typical US American individualism.

In 1963, a group was formed within NAFSA (then, the National Association of Foreign Student Advisors), USSA, which became in 1971 SECUSSA – Section on Education for US Students Abroad. NAFSA had been (and still is) mainly focused on foreign student issues. But SECUSSA has maintained a steady influence and sometimes has achieved an unusually high profile in that huge organization. In 1975 it generated the *SECUSSA Sourcebook*,^{xxxii} a guide for introducing intercultural learning into orientation and re-entry programs for study abroad. It defines six variables which should be considered in designing an orientation program: 1) self-awareness; 2) communication skills; 3) problem-solving skills; 4) learning skills; 5) social awareness; and 6) factual background. At this time, many orientation programs were focusing exclusively on “factual background,” so the suggestion of five other variables represented a major change in the direction of intercultural learning. In addition, the *Sourcebook* defined several different formats for training, from a short “basic survival” program, through a 2-3-day program that incorporates many ICW elements, to a semester-long course.

It is notable that the resources listed in the *Sourcebook* are mostly the original ICW people, who from the start thought that intercultural learning worked both ways: US Americans were learning as much as the foreign students in the ICW. The major difference in study abroad vs foreign student applications is that intercultural learning in study abroad is more likely to stress cultural self-awareness and transferable intercultural skills, while the foreign-student application is typically has been more oriented to culture shock, American culture-learning, and problem-solving in a US context. The SECUSSA Sourcebook represented a large step by NAFSA to embrace both study abroad and intercultural learning. The following year, Gary Althen, a well-known proponent of foreign student education, declared at NAFSA that intercultural communication was “central” to international exchange.^{xxxiii}

In 1979, an influential set of readings was published by Elise C. Smith and Louise Fiber Luce.^{xxxiv} With the title “*Toward Internationalism: Readings in Cross-Cultural Communication*,” this book represented the next step in collected literature on intercultural learning beyond the Hoopes series, *Readings in Intercultural Communication*, that ended under the auspices of SIETAR in 1977. It received wider distribution through Newbury Press, and it went through

several editions before its final publication in 1987. In the Introduction to the first edition, the editors state a perspective that is purely E.T. Hall intercultural communication:

...the articles illustrate the influence which a society's value orientations, role expectations, perception, nonverbal patterns, and language behavior bring to bear on the international cross-cultural encounter. In other words, the material selected for this volume deals with the substance, rather than the theory, of cross-cultural interaction between Americans and nationals from Europe, Asia, the Middle East, Latin America, and Africa. (ix)

The authors and articles in the book represent state-of-the-art for the time – Ed Stewart on values, Kalvero Oberg on culture shock, Robert Hanvey on cross-cultural empathy, E.T. Hall, Jack Condon, and Melvin Schnapper on nonverbal behavior – and it combined these culture-general intercultural perspectives with culture-specific applications: Dean Barnlund on US/Japanese communication patterns; Lorand Szalay and Glen Fischer on American/Korean meaning-making; John Fieg on American/Thai values; Raymond Gordon on guest/host relations in the US and Columbia.

Besides its fine editorial selection, the interesting thing about this book is that the editors were not in the mainstream of the ICW movement, intercultural communication, or, for that matter, study abroad. Smith was with the Overseas Education Fund of the League of Women Voters, and Luce was a linguist at Miami University. However, they seemed to be aware of the growing interest in cross-cultural/intercultural topics across a wide range of disciplines and, almost intuitively, were able to collect material that was keenly focused on intercultural learning. This was a benchmark event – the topic of intercultural learning in study abroad had grown beyond its disciplinary roots.

In this same year, 1979, Margaret (Peggy) Pusch published *Multicultural Education: A Cross Cultural Training Approach*.^{xxxv} Although she says that the book is primarily aimed at domestic teacher education, she adds that “living in a culturally pluralistic world became less and less distinguishable from living in a culturally pluralistic society.”(vii). In fact, the training approaches and exercises in the book were, and continue to be, used by study abroad professionals in cultural orientations. *Multicultural Education* acted as a complement to *Towards Internationalism*, with the latter providing practical, but conceptual explanation and the former translating the concepts into training strategies and techniques. Many of the techniques alluded to in the *SECUSSA Sourcebook* were presented in a more usable form in the Pusch book.

The explication of experiential learning techniques in international exchange was really pioneered by the Experiment in International Living a couple of years earlier in the seminal book, *Beyond Experience: The Experiential Approach to Cross Cultural Education*.^{xxxvi} This book translated the well-established EIL commitment to experiential education into specific learning techniques, with an emphasis on simulations. This material was specifically meant for study abroad, a field in which EIL had been active since 1932. Compared to *Multicultural Education: A Cross Cultural Training Approach*, the EIL book was weighted toward experiential activities without as much cognitive contexting. A better balance between these aspects was achieved in the revised edition of the *Beyond Experience*, published in 1993. Interestingly, the authors of both these books chose to use the term “cross cultural” rather than “intercultural.” This probably is a marketing nod to the greater recognition enjoyed by the former term in the late 70s. The current trend in the training area is to use both terms, eg Ken Cushner and Richard Brislin's 1995 book, *Improving Intercultural Interactions: modules for Cross-Cultural Training Programs, Volume 2*, or Sandra Mumford Fowler's *Intercultural Sourcebook: Cross-cultural*

Training Methodologies (and previously David Hoopes' and Paul Ventura's Intercultural Network book with the same title).

The next benchmark in NAFSA was the 1982 awarding of the Marita Houlihan Award for Distinguished Contributions to the Field of International Education to Joe Mestenhauser and Michael Paige for "transforming administrative responsibility into educational opportunity." They were instrumental in the movement toward defining the "international education professional" – a person whose job was intrinsically educational, since he or she was facilitating in some way the process of international exchange, and exchange was an educational opportunity. The implication was that foreign student advisors, study abroad administrators, and other personnel were responsible for taking the opportunity to facilitate intercultural learning whenever possible.

Later as president-elect of the Association, Mestenhauser built this theme into the Thirty-Ninth Annual Conference of NAFSA at Long Beach, California in May, 1986. The Houlihan award was again given for work in intercultural learning^{xxxvii}, and presentations on a variety of intercultural topics were invited. After peer review some of those presentations were selected for the volume *Building the Professional Dimension of Educational Exchange*, edited by Joy Reid and published by Intercultural Press in 1988.^{xxxviii} Three of the 16 articles are devoted to topics of intercultural learning^{xxxix} – a healthy but not unrealistic balance of this topic with the many other demands on international education professionals. In 1990 the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs became NAFSA: Association of International Educators, the administrative culmination of the effort to redefine the profession in more educational terms.

In 1993 R. Michael Paige published the edited volume, *Education for the Intercultural Experience*^{xl}, which in many ways summarized the state of the art of intercultural learning to that point and established concepts that have been used to the present. The intensity factors in cross-cultural encounters and intercultural trainer competencies defined by Paige are still in use, and my *Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS)* continues to be the primary way that intercultural development is defined. Global nomads and others continue to explain some identity issues in terms of "encapsulated marginality," as introduced by Janet Bennett in this volume, and the two pieces by Bruce LaBrack and Judith Martin, respectively, on re-entry issues continue to be topical.

Also in 1993, in Michael Paige was instrumental in setting up Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA) at the University of Minnesota, with sponsorship from the U.S. Department of Education. The initial phase of the study occurred from 1993-1996, with the goal of creating "a solid theoretical understanding of the language/culture connection in order to begin developing concrete educational models for practitioners."^{xli} One of the papers commissioned by the project, "Developing intercultural competence in the language classroom," addressed directly the issue of foreign language teachers' resistance to intercultural competence and sought a synthesis of language and intercultural competence acquisition.^{xlii}

The second phase of the CARLA project, 1996-1999, "examined ways in which culture learning and intercultural competence can be assessed in the language classroom." Project researchers evaluated the then recently-released instrument, the *Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI)*^{xliii} for its potential to validly and reliably measure the acquisition of intercultural sensitivity as defined by the *DMIS*^{xliv}. The CARLA study established the credibility and effectiveness of that instrument, which was then used in this and many other studies to explore the effectiveness of intercultural education.^{xlv}

From 1999 to 2006, a U.S. Department of Education grant administered by CARLA funded the creation of a set of user-friendly materials for students and teachers designed to

maximize language and culture-learning on study abroad. The project was based on the following premise:

The idea that the study abroad experience **in and of itself** (bold in original) will bring about better international understanding and develop appropriate intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes in students is being challenged by studies that prove otherwise and call for effective preparation and training of students...Recent research suggests that simply sending students on study abroad is not enough, but that providing students with the skills and strategies to get the most out of experiences abroad may be a more effective path towards the desired outcome of greater intercultural competence. (32)

This premise reiterates one of the basic tenants of intercultural learning: the need for facilitation. While any study abroad program puts students into an environment favorable to intercultural learning, the learning (at least of the transferable type) does not therefore occur automatically. According to the study, these same suppositions seem to apply to language acquisition; ie, it does not happen automatically (with adults), and both target-language and transferable language-learning are leveraged by facilitation. The three guides constructed as part of the project, *Maximizing Study Abroad: A Student's Guide to Strategies for Language and Culture Learning and Use* and two accompanying guides for program professionals and language instructors, are available at subsidized prices from CARLA^{xlvi}

The Maximizing program is an important model for intercultural learning, since it bypasses the argument of academic credibility and goes directly to the ability of intercultural education to generate the intercultural learning objectives claimed by study-abroad programs. Paige believes that the assessment of intercultural learning will continue to be important for reasons of credibility, as well as for demonstrating the accountability that is increasing being applied to all academic programs.^{xlvii}

Another example of the growing importance of demonstrating program effectiveness is the Georgetown Study^{xlviii}, which examines language acquisition, intercultural competence, and major content learning during the study-abroad experience of students from a variety of types of schools in a variety of types of programs. As reported by project leader Mick Vande Berg, Intercultural learning was indicated by an increase in intercultural sensitivity as measured by the *Intercultural Development Inventory* on study abroad variables^{xlix}. The students (n=91) who achieved greater intercultural learning were those who:

1. study abroad for longer period of time (more than a semester)
2. study in the target language for a significant period of time prior to study abroad
3. take language courses in the target language while abroad
4. take content courses in the target language while abroad
5. are taught by a home campus faculty member while abroad
6. who live in a home stay while abroad
7. who participate in an internship
8. complete a research experience
9. receive mentoring while abroad
10. spent 26% to 50% of their time with other American students
11. studied in a perceived "less similar culture"¹

According to Vande Berg, these findings support the relative effectiveness of an “interventionist” model of study abroad, which stresses the combination of experience and facilitation. Particularly notable (and non-intuitive) is the superiority of being taught by a home campus faculty member while abroad and of spending a significant amount of time with compatriots. Along with the more obvious receiving of mentoring and completing a research experience, these findings support the same supposition made by the Maximizing Study Abroad project: intercultural learning on study abroad occurs more predictably with facilitation.

This kind of research and other work is the focus of *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*ⁱⁱ, which was founded in 1995 at Boston University and is now a strategic partner of the Forum on Education Abroadⁱⁱⁱ, an organization formed in 2001 with the mission to foster best practice in study abroad. The book of which this article is a part is supported by The Forum and published as a special issue of *Frontiers*.

CONCLUSION

Although this is a continuing process, the interim conclusion at the end of forty years of development is that some reconciliation is occurring in the great debate. Now we are able to speak of experiential learning in cross-cultural contexts with much greater rigor than we were in 1965. When this language and its underlying structure is used to actually guide learning, we are able to assess the quality of that learning more or less objectively. In other words, the experiential proponents now have far more credible tools with which to pursue their claims on academic credit.

On the other side, even the most traditional academics now days acknowledge the importance of learning styles and multiple forms of intelligence. They are more open to the idea that good education employs variable methods. But academic credit has traditionally been given for the acquisition of content, not for participation in process.

The longer-term reconciliation will depend on traditionalists expanding their view of “content” to include the usual undergraduate liberal arts goal of education, which is that students attain an ability to use the perspective of a discipline in everyday activities. For instance, the goal of an undergrad literature course in Conrad and Faulkner is not to become a specialist in those authors, but to have a familiarity with their social and literary perspectives, and to more generally be able to bring the perspective of literary criticism to bear on life events. Note, however, that credit in US institutions is usually not given for just reading the novels; rather, a student needs to participate in a structured experience (the course) to collect the credit and, it is hoped, attain the educational goal.

Intercultural learning fits admirably into the more general liberal arts goal. Students don’t get credit for just being in a cross-cultural immersion, any more than they do for just immersing themselves in a novel. They can, however, claim credit for participating in a structured experience that yields an increased familiarity with another culture, and which more importantly allows them to use an intercultural perspective in subsequent life events.

Based on the research and experience represented in this chapter, I conclude that the major impediment to intercultural learning in study abroad is not a lack of adequate teaching methodology nor a lack of effective assessment tools. It is probably not even the continued resistance of some traditional academics. Rather, it is our own failure as international educators to be knowledgeable protagonists of intercultural learning. The increasing demands of safety, security, regulation, and logistics can easily overwhelm good educational intentions. But if we fail to promote systematic, intentional intercultural learning, we fail, in the words of the Houlihan award, to “transform administrative responsibility into educational opportunity.”

ⁱ AFS International Programs, then known by its venerable original name, American Field Service. Bus #8!

ⁱⁱ Mestenhauser, J. Time and the international educator: International educational exchange as recent history. *International Educator*, Vol VI, 4, Summer 1997, pp 13-17.

ⁱⁱⁱ Boas, F. (1896) "The limitations of the comparative method in anthropology" in Boas, F., *Race, language, and culture*, 1948. New York: McMillan

^{iv} See Chapter 5, Volume One for more discussion of the political climate in post-war America

^v Dewey, J. (1897) "My pedagogic creed," *The School Journal*, LIV, 3 (January 16, 1897), pp 77-80.

^{vi} See Chapter 4, Volume One for a lengthier description of how EIL "worked itself out of a job" by consulting with universities on setting up immersion programs.

^{vii} Hall, E.T. (1959) *The Silent Language*.

^{viii} A complete description of this period can be found in Rogers, E., Hart, W. & Miike, Y. Edward T. Hall and the History of Intercultural Communication: The United States and Japan. *Keio Communication Review*, 34, 2002

^{ix} Leeds-Hurwitz, W. Notes in the history of intercultural communication: The foreign service institute and the mandate for intercultural training. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, v76 n3 p262-81 Aug. 1990.

^x These comments are based on Hall's several presentations at the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication, 19???. 19???

^{xi} Barnlund, D. (19) *Public and Private Self in Japan and the US*.

^{xii} Condon, J. & Yousef, F. (1975) *An introduction to intercultural communication*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill

^{xiii} I co-authored a revised edition of this book with Stewart in 1991 that is still in print.

^{xiv} Hanvey, R. G. (1976) *An attainable global perspective*. Monograph

^{xv} Barna's practical article (1971), "*Stumbling Blocks to Intercultural Communication*" has been included in collected readings in many fields

^{xvi} Renwick, G. (1994). *State-of-the-art study: A longitudinal analysis and assessment of intercultural education, training and research 1932-1984*. PhD dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.

^{xvii} The following discussion is based on two historical theses: Abinader, J. *The laboratory approach to learning in intercultural workshops*, University of Pittsburgh, 1971; and Pusch, M. *A Historical perspective on intercultural training*. Antioch University, 2004.

^{xviii} Material drawn from "A synthesis: The task force on intercultural communication workshops. NAFA, 1973

^{xix} Clifford Clarke, Stanford University; Anthony Griffin, University of Tennessee, Knoxville; Lowell Ingram, University of Washington, Seattle; Laurette Kirstein, University of Illinois,

Chicago; Robert Moran, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; George Renwick, University of Pittsburgh; and Tulsi Saral, Governors State University, Park Forest South, Illinois.

^{xx} Edward Stewart of ACTION; Arthur F. Byrnes of USAID; Cyril Hill of NTL; Elaine Comegys of SIT; and Neil Boyer and Claudia Anyaso of the US Department of State

^{xxi} This and other principles of intercultural presentation are demonstrated in the first chapter, “Current Perspectives,” of *Basic Concepts of Intercultural Communication*. Specific training techniques can be found in various NAFSA and SECUSSA publications. A complete bibliography of intercultural training materials can be found at www.intercultural.org

^{xxii} This idea is known as the “contact hypothesis,” first suggested by Gordon Allport and used here in an application by Amir, Y., “Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations, *Psychological Bulletin*, 1969, 71, 319-343. See also Barnlund, D., *Communication in a Global Village*. In M. Bennett (Ed.), *Basic Concepts of Intercultural Communication*. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press, 1998.

^{xxiii} Abrams, Irwin.(1960) *Study Abroad. New Dimensions in Higher Education*. US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

^{xxiv} Morgan, EE. (1975) *Study abroad: A process of adaptation and change. International Review of Education*, XXI/1975/2. UNESCO Institute for Education. (p 207-215)

^{xxv} “What’s up with culture?” <http://sis.pacific.edu/culture/welcome.htm>

^{xxvi} Martin, J.N. (1989). *Predeparture orientation: Preparing college sojourners for intercultural interaction. Communication Education*, 38(3), 249-257.

^{xxvii} www.ipsl.org/programs/advisors/philosophy.html

^{xxviii} Now known as Northwest Council on Study Abroad (NCSA), at the time of the study it represented several colleges and universities in Oregon and one in Washington State. Logistic and intercultural education administration was supplied by American Heritage Association, now know as AHA international in Portland, Oregon

^{xxix} Myself and Janet M. Bennett, and eventually several other interculturalists, including Dean Barnlund. Janet Bennett conducted research on cultural self awareness on the group, leading to her Ph.D. dissertation. I used observations made during this time to form part of the grounded theory underlying the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity.

^{xxx} Bennett, Janet M. (1985) *Intercultural communication training in cultural self-awareness for study abroad*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

^{xxxi} *Transcultural Study Guide. Volunteers in Asia*. First edition 1972, Second edition 1975, edited by Grey Bryan, Ken Darrow, Dan Marrow, and Brad Palmquist

^{xxxii} *SECUSSA Sourcebook: A guide for advisors of U.S. students planning an overseas experience*. Washington DC: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. 1975

^{xxxiii} Baron, Marvin. *The first 50 years: A walk-through of NAFSA’s history to 1998*

^{xxxiv} Smith, E.C. & Luce, L.F. (1979) *Toward internationalism: Readings in cross-cultural communication*. Rowley, MA: Newbury

^{xxxv} Pusch, M. (1979) *Multicultural education: A cross cultural training approach*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press

^{xxxvi} D. Batchelder, & E. G. Warner (Eds.), *Beyond experience: The experiential approach to cross-cultural education*. Brattleboro, VT: Experiment Press.. (1977) Revised edition Gochenour, T (1993) *Beyond experience: The experiential approach to cross-cultural education*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press

^{xxxvii} Awarded jointly to Janet M. Bennett and Milton J. Bennett for establishing the Intercultural Communication Institute, which fosters professional development in intercultural education.

-
- ^{xxxviii} Reid, J.(Ed) (1988). Building the professional dimension of educational exchange. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- ^{xxxix} “Student Development and Experiential Learning Theory” by Janet Bennett; “Foundations of Knowledge: Intercultural Communication” by Milton Bennett; and “Models for Comparing and Contrasting Cultures” by Robert Kohls.
- ^{xl} Paige, R.M. (1993). *Education for the intercultural experience*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press
- ^{xli} <http://www.carla.umn.edu/culture/initiatives.html>
- ^{xlii} Bennett, J, M., Bennett, M. J. and Allen, W. (2003) Developing intercultural competence in the language classroom. In D. L. Lange & R. M. Paige (Eds.), *Culture at the Core: Perspectives on culture in second language learning*. Greenwich, CN: Information Age Publishing.
- ^{xliii} 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.
- ^{xliv} Bennett, M. J. (2004). Becoming interculturally competent. In J.S. Wurzel (Ed.) *Toward multiculturalism: A reader in multicultural education*. Newton, MA: Intercultural Resource Corporation.
- ^{xlv} 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*, 27, 467-486.
- ^{xlvi} <http://www.carla.umn.edu/maxsa/guides.html>
- ^{xlvii} Paige, R.M. (2008). Personal communication. Interview May 3, 2008, Boston, MA
- ^{xlviii} Vande Berg, M., A. Balkcum, M. Scheld, B. Whalen (2004). “The Georgetown University Consortium project: A report at the halfway mark.” *Frontier: the Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, X, 101-116.
- ^{xlix} Vande Berg, M. (2003). A Research-based approach to Education Abroad Classification. *Forum on Education Abroad*: www.forumea.org/goalsactivities.html; based on the original discussion in Engle, L and J. Enge (2003). “Study abroad levels: toward a classification of program types” *Frontier: the Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, IX, 1-20.
- ^l Vande Berg, M. IDI data presentation at the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication Portland, Oregon July, 2007.
- ^{li} www.frontiersjournal.com
- ^{lii} www.forumea.org