Developing intercultural understanding and skills: models and approaches

Laura B. Perry & Leonie Southwell

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Developing intercultural understanding and skills: models and approaches

Laura B. Perry* and Leonie Southwell

School of Education, Murdoch University, Murdoch, Australia

Researchers from a range of disciplines have been theorising and empirically examining intercultural competence and intercultural education for decades. This review article synthesises the research literature about these concepts around three questions: What is intercultural competence? How can it be developed? And how can it be measured? Our aim is to provide an overview of current theories and empirical findings, as well as to show gaps in the literature.

Keywords: intercultural education; intercultural competence; conceptual frameworks; student outcomes; measurement

Introduction

Intercultural interactions have become part of everyday life in our increasingly globalised world. There are strong economic, technological, demographic and peace imperatives for gaining competency in intercultural interactions (Lustig and Koester 2006). The fields of intercultural studies and intercultural education have grown as a response to these imperatives, with most research revolving around the following questions. Firstly, what are the attributes and skills that make a person successful in intercultural interactions and how can they be conceptualised? Secondly, how can they be developed or learned? Thirdly, how can they be measured? This article aims to discuss some answers to these questions: to discuss and compare the competing concepts, models and definitions of 'intercultural competence' and related constructs; to discuss the research on the teaching and learning of intercultural competence; and lastly, to discuss some of the measurement instruments available. The term intercultural competence is the most commonly used term in the research literature and is used throughout this article in a generic way for the sake of clarity. Consistent with most scholars, we conceive intercultural competence as the ability to effectively and appropriately interact in an intercultural situation or context (J.M. Bennett 2008; Deardorff 2006a; Lustig and Koester 2006). We acknowledge that this is a broad conceptualisation that begs the question, 'what is effective?'

Conceptual models

Intercultural competence is increasingly necessary in our multicultural and globalised world and, as a result, scholars from a number of disciplines have attempted to define, model and assess it. The result of the diverse backgrounds and goals of

*Corresponding author. Email: l.perry@murdoch.edu.au

these scholars is that multiple terms, definitions and models have been created, some that attempt to broadly depict intercultural competence and others that focus on specific dimensions of the construct. In this section we describe the main models that have been used to conceptualise intercultural competence. We start with intercultural understanding, which encompasses concepts related to the cognitive (knowledge and awareness) and affective domains, then move to intercultural competence, which builds on intercultural understanding by including behaviour and communication.

Intercultural understanding

Intercultural understanding encompasses both cognitive and affective domains (Hill 2006). The cognitive aspect of intercultural understanding comprises knowledge about one's own as well as other cultures (Hill 2006). It also includes knowledge about the similarities and differences between cultures. While knowledge is an important component, it is not enough for intercultural understanding (Hill 2006; Pusch 2004). Positive attitudes towards other cultures are also necessary, such as empathy, curiosity and respect (Arasaratnam and Doerfel 2005; Deardorff 2006b; Heyward 2002; Hill 2006; Matveev and Nelson 2004).

A person's affective response to intercultural difference has been called 'intercultural sensitivity' (Straffon 2003, 488). Intercultural sensitivity has been conceptualised in two ways: (1) as the affective aspect of intercultural communication competence (Chen and Starosta 2000) and (2) developmentally as the subjective (phenomenological) *experience* of cultural difference (M.J. Bennett 1993). It is conceptualised as an important element of intercultural competence (Hammer, Bennett, and Wiseman 2003), wherein increased intercultural sensitivity leads to increased intercultural competence.

In the first conceptualisation, intercultural sensitivity is described as a person's 'active desire to motivate themselves to understand, appreciate and accept differences among cultures' (Chen and Starosta 1998, 231). Chen and Starosta argue that intercultural sensitivity needs to be confined to the affective aspect of intercultural competence 'to distinguish it from intercultural awareness', the cognitive aspect and 'intercultural adroitness' and the behavioural aspect of intercultural competence (Chen and Starosta 2000, 5). Their Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS) measures intercultural sensitivity using five factors: interaction enjoyment, respect for cultural differences, interaction confidence, interaction enjoyment and interaction attentiveness (Chen and Starosta 2000, 12).

Intercultural sensitivity is also defined as the experience of cultural difference, an experience that is dependent on the way a person constructs that difference (M.J. Bennett 1993). This definition is the foundation of the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) developed by M.J. Bennett (1993). The DMIS explains how people understand or view cultural difference. According to the DMIS, interculturally sensitive individuals have an ethnorelative orientation, while their less sensitive peers are ethnocentric. The model includes six stages moving from complete denial to complete acceptance of cultural difference. The stages are progressive and linear, with each stage moving to a deeper level of cultural sensitivity. It is based on the belief that as a person's experience or understanding of cultural difference becomes more complex, his/her potential for intercultural competence increases (Hammer, Bennett, and Wiseman 2003). One possible critique

of the DMIS is that it assumes that individuals develop intercultural sensitivity in a step wise fashion, omitting the possibility that individuals may move backwards as well as forwards in the six stages. The experiences of many individuals who have lived extensively overseas would suggest that the process of embracing an ethnorelative orientation, the final stage of the DMIS, is often not as simple and straightforward as the DMIS conceptualises.

Intercultural competence

Intercultural competence is the most commonly used term in the literature. While it has been used and defined by various scholars over the last 30 years, no single definition has been agreed upon (Deardorff 2006a). All definitions and conceptualisations acknowledge, however, that intercultural competence involves the ability to interact effectively and appropriately with people from other cultures. Interaction is commonly taken to include both behaviour and communication. Intercultural competence is generally related to four dimensions: knowledge, attitudes, skills and behaviours. Beyond these commonalities a number of differences exist among the models and conceptions.

The four dimensions – knowledge, attitude, skills and behaviours – can be seen in many definitions of intercultural competence. Lustig and Koester (2006) describe intercultural competence as requiring knowledge, motivation, skills in verbal and non-verbal communication and appropriate and effective behaviours. Hiller and Wozniak (2009) link intercultural competence to a tolerance for ambiguity, behavioural flexibility, communicative awareness, knowledge discovery, respect for others and empathy; each of these dimensions has a cognitive, emotional/attitudinal and behavioural dimension. Byram's definition (1997) comprises five elements: attitudes, knowledge, skills of interpreting and relating, skills of discovery and interaction and critical awareness. Heyward's model of intercultural literacy, a very similar construct, includes 'the understandings, competencies, attitudes, language proficiencies, participation and identities necessary for successful cross-cultural engagement' (Heyward 2002, 10). Bennett points to the similarities between definitions, noting that most theorists agree that intercultural competence comprises 'a set of cognitive, affective and behavioural skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts' (J.M. Bennett 2008, 16).

Intercultural competence has also been described as a process. Deardorff's (2006a) pyramid model of intercultural competence places particular attitudes as a fundamental starting point for the development of intercultural competence. The acquisition and use of particular sets of knowledge and comprehension, including self-awareness and skills, are built on this foundation. The next level is an informed frame of reference which includes empathy and an ethnorelative view. Intercultural competency is conceptualised as dependent on these foundations. Deardorff's (2006b) process model of intercultural competence contains the same elements as her pyramid model but is conceptualised as an ongoing process that can be achieved via different routes. Once again these models include cognitive, affective and behavioural components.

Models have also been created for specific situations or contexts. The model of the intercultural behaviour process (Landis and Bhawuk 2004) particularly relates to the situation of living overseas. Landis and Bhawuk draw from a range of other research and theory to construct five smaller models which together make up the

overarching model. This model shares many of the aspects of previously discussed models, including attitude, intercultural sensitivity, the seeking and attainment of particular knowledge and behaviour with the addition of aspects related to living overseas such as 'host reinforcement' (Landis and Bhawuk 2004). The model attempts to explain the relationships between these components and the influences acting upon them while maintaining testability. Testing is possible because the overarching model is made up of a number of smaller testable models, which can 'provide a "roadmap" to each succeeding investigation' (Landis and Bhawuk 2004, 458).

Intercultural communication

A separate and extensive set of theory and research exists about the communication aspect of intercultural competence. Intercultural communication 'occurs when large and important cultural differences create dissimilar interpretations and expectations about how to communicate competently' (Lustig and Koester 2006, 52). Intercultural communication competence has been defined as the ability to effectively and appropriately communicate with people from different cultures (Arasaratnam 2009). Conceptualising intercultural communication requires the incorporation of culture into communication theory, a task which has been approached in a number of ways (Gudykunst et al. 2005). It is not an easy task due to the inherent complexity of conceptualising 'culture' itself and the fact that there are degrees of variability and difference within a culture as well as between cultures.

It is unclear whether intercultural communication competence is transferable across contexts. While certain characteristics have been identified as increasing the likelihood of intercultural communication competence, the relational and situational context of communication is important. In other words it has been argued that communication competence is not an individual attribute but rather a characteristic of the association between individuals (Lustig and Koester 2006). Despite this, there are particular characteristics that have been identified as being related to intercultural communication competence. Matveev and Nelson (2004) conceptualise these as comprising four dimensions in a team situation: interpersonal skills, team effectiveness, cultural uncertainty and cultural empathy. Arasaratnam and Doerfel's (2005) study suggested that five particular qualities are associated with intercultural communication competence: empathy, intercultural experience/training, motivation, global attitude and ability to listen well in conversation. Perhaps not surprisingly, these qualities are much the same (although not as extensive) as those identified in models of intercultural competence such as Deardorff's (2006b).

Developing intercultural competence

Having discussed what intercultural competence may entail, the next task is to ask how it can be developed. A few principles underlie all forms of intercultural education. The first is that some form of challenge is necessary for education in intercultural competence (Paige 1993; Talkington, Lengel, and Byram 2004). Another is that teaching intercultural competence requires the development of critical cultural awareness (Talkington, Lengel, and Byram 2004). It is also argued that teaching 'culture' (e.g. the institutional, historical and political aspects of culture) is not enough, and that the development of intercultural competence requires the teaching of subjective culture, in which the focus turns to exploring alternative worldviews

and cultural self awareness (M.J. Bennett 2009). All of these theorists argue that cultural knowledge alone does not lead to intercultural competence. Students must critically examine culture, not just accumulate facts and knowledge about a culture, to develop intercultural competence.

While many in this field of education have been aware for some time that knowledge alone is inadequate for intercultural competence (Pusch 2004), other assumptions relating to education for intercultural competence have also been challenged. J.M. Bennett (2008) argues that: (1) language learning may not be sufficient for culture learning; (2) disequilibrium need not lead to dissatisfaction (and thus an attempt to learn); (3) cultural contact does not necessarily lead to competence and (4) cultural contact does not always lead to significant reduction of stereotypes. While studies have examined various approaches for developing intercultural competence, much of this research has also been critiqued as lacking in rigour (Mendenhall et al. 2004). In the following sub-sections we discuss the main pathways for developing intercultural competence.

Intercultural training

'Intercultural training' has predominantly been associated with the training of adults whose work requires them to interact with people from other cultures. Intercultural training has been informed by a number of fields including 'cultural anthropology, cross-cultural psychology, sociolinguistics, multicultural education, intercultural communication and international business management' (J.M Bennett, Bennett, and Landis 2004, 1). Government institutions, universities, aid organisations and international/multinational corporations have all developed techniques for intercultural training (Pusch 2004).

Intercultural trainers frequently draw on models such as the DMIS (M.J. Bennett 1993), the intercultural development inventory (IDI) (Hammer, Bennett, and Wiseman 2003) and the cross-cultural adaptability inventory (CCAI) (Kelley and Meyers 1995). In their review of intercultural training studies, Mendenhall and associates (2004) found that the most common instructional methods are lectures, culture assimilators and class discussions. Even though computers/computer programmes were not commonly used, online games and tests are beginning to play a role in intercultural training (Pusch 2004). Mendenhall et al. (2004) showed that training programmes ranged in duration from a couple hours to more than 50, were delivered on one day or over a time period of up to 8 months, and that the programmes were culture general, culture specific or in a minority of cases, a mixture of both.

Mendenhall et al.'s (2004) review suggests that further research needs to examine the effects of intercultural training. Studies have shown that intercultural training can enhance knowledge and satisfaction but not necessarily change behaviour and attitudes (Mendenhall et al. 2004). As knowledge alone is not enough for intercultural competence, this suggests that either testing needs to improve so that behaviour and attitudes are also properly tested and/or that training programmes need to more effectively target these areas.

Learning intercultural competence at school

While intercultural training typically takes place as a discrete programme or offering in the workplace or post-secondary educational institution, teaching and learning

about intercultural competence can also be done at primary or secondary school. In school settings, education for intercultural competence, if it is taught at all, is typically embedded in an academic subject such as foreign languages or social studies. However, the degree to which subjects such as foreign languages and social studies are intercultural depends on the orientation of the curriculum (Davies and Read 2005). The potential for intercultural understanding to be embedded in the curriculum is increasing in some countries. For example, Australia has recently included intercultural understanding as a general capability in its national curriculum (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority 2010).

The cultural dimension of foreign language education has grown in the last two decades. However, research exploring the relationship between language learning and insights and attitudes towards culture is limited and studies have not been able to show if there is a causal relationship between the two (Byram and Feng 2004). It is recognised that language is not neutral and foreign language teaching can involve exposing students to a variety of texts and representations of a culture in order to develop students' critical understanding of the cultural aspects of language and cultural representations (Byram and Feng 2004; Kinginger, Alison, and Simpson 1999; Shanahan 1997; Ware and Kramsch 2005). Kinginger and associates (1999) argue that developing an intercultural stance or 'third place' in language teaching involves a critical understanding of both culture and 'language as culture' (853), and an awareness of self and identity. However, theorists argue that experiential learning about culture is more effective than learning that is confined within a classroom (Byram and Feng 2004).

Interaction between learners and native speakers of a language or 'tandem learning' is often used to enhance both language learning and cultural understanding (Byram and Feng 2004). In the past this would have generally required travel, but web-based technologies are also now being used by foreign language teachers as a tool. For example, Elola and Oskoz (2008) discussed how blogs were used to connect language learners in Spain and the US for the purpose of developing students' intercultural competence and language skills. Even miscommunication, as in a web collaboration between German and US students, can be a valuable learning opportunity (Ware and Kramsch 2005). Technology facilitated intercultural interactions can also lead to unintended negative outcomes such as reinforcing cultural stereotypes (Fabos and Young 1999). The degree to which intercultural competence can be developed via digital technologies has not yet been examined thoroughly. Most of the current research is limited to exploring the pedagogical dimensions and potential of digital technologies for developing intercultural competences rather than its effectiveness per se.

Intercultural competence can also be taught across subjects as part of a school's mission. This approach is particularly common among international schools and curriculum providers, such as the International Baccalaureate Organisation (IBO). The IBO is a major player in the international education arena, providing its curriculum to students from the age of three to pre-university in 138 countries. A key goal of the IB curriculum is to develop students' 'international mindedness' and intercultural understanding (Hill 2006). Inquiry-based learning is used to help students understand that people can hold different worldviews, to examine those views and respect them, although not to necessarily accept them (Stathers 2008). An important aspect of this curriculum is the encouragement of critical inquiry and interaction with local communities and cultures.

Studies have shown that students at international (including IB) schools have higher levels of intercultural understanding (Hayden and Wong 1997), intercultural sensitivity (Straffon 2003), and international understanding (Hinrichs 2003) than their peers at non-international schools. Unfortunately their cross-sectional and non-experimental research designs prevent these studies from showing that attending an international or IB school *caused* students to develop these outcomes. For example, the studies discussed above did not account for non-school experiences, such as home environment and previous travel. It could be the case that students who already have an international mindset are more likely to enrol in an IB school than students who do not. They also did not differentiate among different aspects of the IB experience, for example between curriculum and cultural diversity among the student body. As Hayden and Wong (1997) suggest, the international environment of many IB schools may be more important than the IB curriculum per se for fostering intercultural understanding. Additionally, not all of the studies explicitly compared students at international and non-international schools, leaving open the possibility that most students' intercultural attitudes develop over time regardless of which school they attend. Overall, no research study so far has been able to show that IB or other international schools develop students' 'soft skills', values and attitudes such as international-mindedness, intercultural understanding or intercultural competence (IBO 2008; Waterson and Hayden 1999).

Researchers have theorised that attending a culturally diverse school has the potential to develop students' intercultural competence. Hayden and Wong (1997) suggest that cultural diversity could be the main mechanism by which international schools are able to develop students' intercultural competence. This belief was also found among teachers and students from international schools in Thompson's (1998) study, who perceived school cultural diversity to be the most important school-based influence on the development of students' intercultural understanding and competence. The relationship between school diversity and intercultural understanding or competence has yet to be examined empirically, however. It is plausible that even if school cultural diversity has the potential to develop students' intercultural capabilities, it does not automatically guarantee that it will. Studies have shown that students tend to limit their interactions to fellow students from the same cultural background (Halualani et al. 2004; Volet and Ang 1998) or from only one other cultural group (Halualani et al. 2004), which suggests that providing the opportunity for intercultural interaction may not be enough.

Visits abroad

The effect of visits abroad on intercultural competence has been much more extensively studied. Study abroad has been shown to enhance intercultural understanding among university students (Kitsantas and Meyers 2001; Medina-Lopez-Portillo 2004; Olson and Kroeger 2001). The magnitude of the change has been linked to students' goals (Kitsantas 2004) and to the length of the stay (Medina-Lopez-Portillo 2004; Olson and Kroeger 2001). Olson and Kroeger found that substantive stays abroad, defined as repetitive visits to the same location or a stay of at least three months, are related to higher intercultural competency or sensitivity. Medina-Lopez-Portillo's (2004) study of US students abroad suggested that the longer students are immersed within a culture, the more they learn and the more their intercultural sensitivity develops. Short study abroad programmes may also result in

increased intercultural sensitivity. Anderson and associates (2006) found that students in a short term, non-language based study programme experienced significant growth in their overall intercultural sensitivity as measured by the IDI, especially at the less sophisticated level of sensitivity. However, Williams (2005) found that overseas study can develop intercultural capabilities only if students actually interact with the locals. Thus, it is not enough to simply study or work overseas; cultural immersion is important.

Summary

Attempts have been made to develop intercultural competence in a number of ways and there is some evidence that it may be developed through lived experience. However, despite the importance of intercultural competence, it seems that work is still required to assess the effectiveness of many programmes that purport to develop it. Mendenhall et al.'s (2004) literature review on the effectiveness of intercultural training suggests that many studies lack rigour, making it difficult to confidently assess how effective it actually is. While education in its various forms may effectively develop some aspects of intercultural competence such as cultural knowledge, there is little or no evidence that it develops other aspects of intercultural competence, particularly those that are more difficult to test. Carefully designed studies, both qualitative and quantitative, are needed to further our understanding of the ways in which intercultural skills, attitudes and knowledge can be developed.

How can intercultural competence be measured?

The third key question is how to measure intercultural competence. Researchers agree that intercultural competence can and should be measured, and that both qualitative and quantitative methods are appropriate (Deardorff 2006b). Measuring intercultural competence can be used to assess a person's intercultural competence and then highlight which dimensions should be further developed. It can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of intercultural learning experiences. And it can help researchers build and refine theory about intercultural competence and ways to develop it. As those interested in teaching and learning intercultural competence come from diverse backgrounds and have a diversity of requirements, it seems likely that no single instrument can be used for all purposes.

A method of measurement must suit its purpose. Some available instruments are most appropriate for those involved in empirical research, while others may be more appropriate for school teachers who are engaged in intercultural education. Researchers, teachers and trainers also need to know what research tells us about the validity of these instruments. What theory has informed their construction and do they test what they purport to? It is not clear which instrument is most effective for testing intercultural competence as the plurality of conceptualisations of intercultural competence makes comparing instruments difficult.

First we will describe quantitative scales of intercultural competence and related constructs. One instrument that is used by researchers and trainers alike is the IDI (Hammer, Bennett, and Wiseman 2003). This instrument was developed from the DMIS (M.J. Bennett 1993) and tests a person's experience of cultural differences rather than their behaviour or skills (Pusch 2004). The original instrument was

revised to five factors that represent increasing levels of intercultural sensitivity: denial and defence (least sensitive), reversal, minimisation, acceptance and adaptation and encapsulated marginality (most sensitive) (Hammer, Bennett, and Wiseman 2003). This inventory consists of 50 items and a study by Hammer, Bennett, and Wiseman (2003, 421) showed that 'the measured concepts are fairly stable'. They concluded that researchers can confidently use the IDI to assess the five dimensions of the DMIS (Hammer, Bennett, and Wiseman 2003).

While the IDI is widely used to measure intercultural sensitivity, some criticisms have also been levelled at it. Greenholtz (2005) questions whether the IDI and DMIS are transferable across cultures, and calls for further research, particularly in non-US and non-English speaking cultures. Paige and associates (2003) have suggested that there is more evidence for the broader two factor ethnocentric and ethnorelative structure of the test than for the five factor test. They also note that it is challenging to create a single IDI score, something that would be useful for trainers and employers as a single practical point of reference. However, despite these criticisms, Paige et al. (2003) conclude that the IDI is a sound instrument and a satisfactory way of measuring intercultural sensitivity as defined by M.J. Bennett (1993). However, they add that it needs further refinement and needs to be used with caution in research where the relationships examined are theoretical (Paige et al. 2003). We argue there are other weaknesses of the IDI. First, it assumes that individuals become more interculturally sensitive in a linear progression, an assumption that is not borne out by empirical research. Second, it forces individuals into stages (e.g. 'minimisation') without allowing for the possibility that individuals can express multiple, complex and conflicting aspects of intercultural sensitivity. Third and related to the second critique, it does not break down the construct into different dimensions, thereby removing the possibility of showing the ways in which an individual is interculturally sensitive as well as the ways in which he or she is not.

The ISS, developed and validated by Chen and Starosta (2000), addresses many of the weakness of the IDI. It breaks down intercultural sensitivity into five dimensions: engagement, respect for cultural differences, self-confidence, enjoyment and attentiveness. Research has found that the ISS predicts intercultural decision quality, specifically measuring attitudinal aspects of intercultural sensitivity (Chen and Starosta 2000; Graf and Harland 2005). As suggested by its name, it does not measure behaviour or skills per se.

To measure behaviour, the Behavioural Assessment Scale for Intercultural Competence (BASIC), developed by Koester and Olebe (1988), can be used. It assesses eight domains of intercultural communication competence: display of respect, orientation to knowledge, empathy, interaction management, task role behaviour, relational role behaviour, tolerance for ambiguity and interaction posture (Lustig and Koester 2006). The scale has been found to be cross-culturally equivalent and was validated with 263 university students in the USA (Olebe and Koester 1989). Two of the eight dimensions of the BASIC have been found to correlate with intercultural decision quality. One suggestion is that the BASIC is of most use 'if the objective is to assess the degree to which a person tends to judge and interact with people from different cultures in a respectful, empathetic and non-evaluative way' (Graf and Harland 2005, 57).

The CCAI was developed by Kelley and Meyers (1995) to measure a person's ability to adapt to other cultures. It consists of 50 questions that measure four skills

areas: emotional resilience, flexibility/openness, perceptual acuity and personal autonomy. It has been used extensively among adults in a variety of workplace settings (Kitsantas 2004; Williams 2005). Kitsantas and Meyers (2001) used the scale in their small scale study of US university students ($n = 24$) and found potential for predictive validity of the scale. Given the limited evidence of the scale's validity, however, Davis and Finney (2006) performed factor analysis on the scale using a large sample ($n = 709$). They found that the scale was not replicable and that the four dimensions were highly correlated with each other. They conclude that the scale requires further research and development at the construct and item level.

The previously discussed scales are quantitative measures of intercultural competence and related constructs, most of which rely heavily on self-reporting. Researchers have argued, however, that qualitative methods such as observations, interviews and portfolios should also be used to asses intercultural competence more deeply, authentically and perhaps accurately (Byram 1997; Ingulsrud et al. 2002; Jacobson, Sleicher, and Burke 1999; Mendenhall et al. 2004). Written reflection work could also serve as a source of qualitative data. For example, participants could be asked to describe how they would respond to a hypothetical intercultural situation. If these written reflections were administered both pre- and post-tests (say, before and after a study abroad programme), researchers could analyse growth in intercultural competence as well.

Portfolios are a relatively new method of assessing intercultural competence. A portfolio is a collection of various materials that demonstrates intercultural interaction and competence (Ingulsrud et al. 2002; Jacobson, Sleicher, and Burke 1999). An advantage of portfolios is that they 'better represent the complexity of the cross-cultural experience' (Ingulsrud et al. 2002, 476), capturing aspects of intercultural learning that are argued to be lost using other measurement instruments (Jacobson, Sleicher, and Burke 1999). A major advantage of portfolios is that they can be used to collect rich and detailed evidence of learning over time. They also encourage students to reflect on their experiences, which can promote learning (Jacobson, Sleicher, and Burke 1999). The main disadvantage of portfolios is that they are time consuming to construct and difficult to assess (Jacobson, Sleicher, and Burke 1999). Ingulstrud and associates (2002) found that assessing instances of cross-cultural recognition and reflection within the portfolio, in combination with impressionistic marking, was reliable between scorers. While portfolio methods of assessment may be familiar to many school teachers, the time demands for assessing them may limit their usefulness.

Conclusion

Conceptualising, developing and assessing intercultural competence continue to be topical as our world becomes more interconnected and our societies more multicultural. Corporations and other employers, universities, international education providers such as the IB, and even national educational systems (see, e.g. Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority 2010) are increasingly calling for the development of intercultural competence as a desirable outcome. Yet, we have limited understanding about the ways in which intercultural competence can be developed. The literature about intercultural competence and similar constructs is vast and crosses many disciplines, making navigation through it demanding and complex. The aim of this review is to bring current theory and research together to

facilitate further study of intercultural competence. Much work remains to be done in this exciting and growing field.

We believe three areas in particular need further study. First, we need to improve our understanding of the myriad ways that intercultural competence can be developed. Intercultural training programmes and overseas stays are not readily accessible, so researchers should explore other types of learning experiences and settings for ways to develop intercultural competence. Second, we need more empirical studies that assess the ability of different approaches to develop intercultural competence. What works best, for whom and under what conditions, and why? Third, we need more studies that examine how intercultural competence can be developed among school-aged children and youths as well as the more commonly studied populations of adult employees and university students.

Notes on contributors

Laura B. Perry is a senior lecturer of comparative/international education, socio-cultural contexts of education and education policy at Murdoch University. A major thread connecting all of her work is a quest to understand how school and system-level factors influence student outcomes. In 2010, she received an Australian Research Council Discovery grant to examine the association between school socio-economic composition and academic achievement. She is also interested in other student outcomes, in particular intercultural competence. This paper is the beginning of a research project that will examine how curriculum programmes (e.g. the International Baccalaureate) and school cultural diversity can develop students' intercultural competences and awareness.

Leonie Southwell is a master's student and research assistant at Murdoch University. Her master's thesis is examining parental involvement in school governance. She worked as a secondary school English teacher for many years and has also taught English as an Additional Language. She has significant experience teaching in multicultural educational settings. In addition to research and tutoring, she has been involved with intensive short-term teaching and acculturation of student delegates from Indonesia for the last two years.

References

Anderson, P.H., L. Lawton, R.J. Rexeisen, and A.C. Hubbard. 2006. Short-term study abroad and intercultural sensitivity: A pilot study. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 30, no. 4: 457–69.

Arasaratnam, L.A. 2009. The development of a new instrument of intercultural communication competence. http://www.immi.se/intercultural/nr20/arasaratnam.htm (accessed August 15, 2010).

Arasaratnam, L.A., and M.L. Doerfel. 2005. Intercultural communication competence: Identifying key components from multicultural perspectives. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 29, no. 2: 137–63.

Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority. 2010. General capabilities. http://www.acara.edu.au/australian_curriculum/general_capabilities.html (accessed December 21, 2010).

Bennett, J.M. 2008. On becoming a global soul. In *Developing intercultural competence and transformation: Theory, research and application in international education*, ed. V. Savicki, 13–31. Sterling: Stylus.

Bennett, J.M., M.J. Bennett, and D. Landis. 2004. Introduction and overview. In *Handbook of intercultural training*, ed. D. Landis, J.M. Bennett, and M.J. Bennett, 1–10. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bennett, M.J. 1993. Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In *Education for the intercultural experience.*, ed. M.R. Paige, 21–71. Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Bennett, M.J. 2009. Defining, measuring, and facilitating intercultural learning: A conceptual introduction to the intercultural education double supplement. *Intercultural Education* 20, no. 4: 1–13.

Byram, M. 1997. *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Byram, M., and A. Feng. 2004. Culture and language learning: Teaching, research and scholarship. *Language Teaching* 37, no. 3: 149–68.

Chen, G.-M., and W.J. Starosta. 1998. *Foundations of intercultural communication*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Chen, G.-M., and W.J. Starosta. 2000. The development and validation of the intercultural sensitivity scale. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association, Seattle, WA.

Davies, L., and A. Read. 2005. Globalising citizenship education? A critique of 'global education' and 'citizenship education'. *British Journal of Educational Studies* 53, no. 1: 66–89.

Davis, S.L., and S.J. Finney. 2006. A factor analytic study of the cross-cultural adaptability inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 66, no. 2: 318–30.

Deardorff, D.K. 2006a. Assessing intercultural competence in study abroad students. In *Living and studying abroad: Research and practice*, ed. M. Bryam and A. Feng, 232–56. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Deardorff, D.K. 2006b. Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 10, no. 3: 241–66.

Elola, I., and A. Oskoz. 2008. Blogging: Fostering intercultural competence development in foreign language and study abroad contexts. *Foreign Language Annals* 41, no. 3: 454–77.

Fabos, B., and M.D. Young. 1999. Telecommunication in the classroom: Rhetoric versus reality. *Review of Educational Research* 69, no. 3: 217–59.

Graf, A., and L.K. Harland. 2005. Expatriate selection: Evaluating the discriminant, convergent, and predictive validity of five measures of interpersonal and intercultural competence. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies* 11, no. 2: 46–63.

Greenholtz, J.F. 2005. Does intercultural sensitivity cross cultures? Validity issues in porting instruments across languages and cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 29, no. 1: 73–89.

Gudykunst, W.B., C.M. Lee, T. Nishida, and N. Ogawa. 2005. Theorizing about intercultural communication. In *Theorizing about intercultural communication*, ed. W.B. Gudykunst, 3–32. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Halualani, R.T., A. Chitgopekar, J.H.T.A. Morrison, and P.S.-W. Dodge. 2004. Who's interacting? And what are they talking about? – Intercultural contact and interaction among multicultural university students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 28, no. 5: 353–72.

Hammer, M.R., M.J. Bennett, and R. Wiseman. 2003. Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 27, no. 4: 421–43.

Hayden, M., and C.S.D. Wong. 1997. The International Baccalaureate: International education and cultural preservation. *Educational Studies* 23, no. 3: 349–61.

Heyward, M. 2002. From international to intercultural. *Journal of Research in International Education* 1, no. 1: 9–32.

Hill, I. 2006. Student types, school types and their combined influence on the development of intercultural understanding. *Journal of Research in International Education* 5, no. 1: 5–33.

Hiller, G.G., and M. Wozniak. 2009. Developing an intercultural competence programme at an international cross-border university. *Intercultural Education* 20, no. 4: 113–24.

Hinrichs, J. 2003. A comparison of levels of international understanding among students of the International Baccalaureate diploma and Advanced Placement programs in the USA. *Journal of Research in International Education* 2, no. 3: 331–48.

Ingulsrud, J.E., K. Kai, S. Kadowaki, S. Kurobane, and M. Shiobara. 2002. The assessment of cross-cultural experience: Measuring awareness through critical text analysis. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 26, no. 5: 473–91.

International Baccalaureate Organisation (IBO). 2008. *A review of research relating to the IB Diploma Programme*. Bath: International Baccalaureate Organisation.

Jacobson, W., D. Sleicher, and M. Burke. 1999. Portfolio assessment of intercultural competence. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 23, no. 3: 467–92.

Kelley, C., and J.E. Meyers. 1995. *The cross-cultural adaptability inventory*. Minneapolis, MN: National Computer Systems.

Kinginger, C., G.H. Alison, and V. Simpson. 1999. A tele-collaborative course on French-American intercultural communication. *The French Review* 72, no. 5: 853–66.

Kitsantas, A. 2004. Studying abroad: The role of college students' goals on the development of cross-cultural skills and global understanding. *College Student Journal* 38, no. 3: 441–52.

Kitsantas, A., and J. Meyers. 2001. Studying abroad: Does it enhance college student cross-cultural awareness. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the San Diego State University and the US Department of Education Centers for International Business Education and Research, San Diego, CA.

Koester, J., and J. Olebe. 1988. The behavioral assessment scale for intercultural communication effectiveness. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 12, no. 3: 233–46.

Landis, D., and D.P.S. Bhawuk. 2004. Sythesizing theory building and practice in intercultural training. In *Handbook of intercultural training*, 3rd ed. D. Landis, J.M. Bennett, and M.J. Bennett, 453–68. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lustig, M.W., and J. Koester. 2006. *Intercultural competence: Interpersonal communication across cultures*. 5th ed. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Matveev, A.V., and P.E. Nelson. 2004. Cross cultural communication competence and multicultural team performance: Perceptions of American and Russian managers. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 4, no. 2: 253–70.

Medina-Lopez-Portillo, A. 2004. Intercultural learning assessment: The link between program duration and the development of intercultural sensitivity. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad* 10: 179–200.

Mendenhall, M.E., G.K. Stahl, I. Ehnert, G. Oddou, J.S. Osland, and T.M. Kuhlmann. 2004. Evaluation studies of cross-cultural training programs. In *Handbook of intercultural training*, 3rd ed. D. Landis, J.M. Bennett, and M.J. Bennett, 129–43. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Olebe, M., and J. Koester. 1989. Exploring the cross-cultural equivalence of the behavioral assessment scale for intercultural communication. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 13, no. 3: 333–47.

Olson, C.L., and K.R. Kroeger. 2001. Global competency and intercultural sensitivity. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 5, no. 2: 116–37.

Paige, M.R. 1993. On the nature of intercultural experiences and intercultural education. In *Education for the intercultural experience*, ed. M.R. Paige, 1–20. Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Paige, M.R., M. Jacobs-Cassuto, Y.A. Yershova, and J. DeJaeghere. 2003. Assessing intercultural sensitivity: An empirical analysis of the Hammer and Bennett Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 27, no. 4: 467–86.

Pusch, M.D. 2004. Intercultural training in historical perspective. In *Handbook of intercultural training*, 3rd ed. D. Landis, J.M. Bennett, and M.J. Bennett, 13–36. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Shanahan, D. 1997. Articulating the relationship between language, literature, and culture: Toward a new agenda for foreign language teaching and research. *The Modern Language Journal* 81, no. 2: 164–74.

Stathers, K. 2008. Enlightenment through understanding. *IB World*, January. http://www.ibo.org/ibworld/jan2008/index.cfm.

Straffon, D.A. 2003. Assessing the intercultural sensitivity of high school students attending an international school. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 27, no. 4: 487–501.

Talkington, B., L. Lengel, and M. Byram. 2004. Setting the context, highlighting the importance: Reflections on interculturality and pedagogy. www.llas.ac.uk/resources/paper.aspx?resourceid=2048 (accessed September 3, 2010).

Thompson, J.J. 1998. Towards a model for international education. In *International education: Principles and practice*, ed. M.C. Hayden and J.J. Thompson, 276–90. London: Kogan Page.

Volet, S.E., and G. Ang. 1998. Culturally mixed groups on international campuses: An opportunity for inter-cultural learning. *Higher Education Research & Development* 17, no. 1: 5–23.

Ware, P.D., and C. Kramsch. 2005. Toward an intercultural stance: Teaching German and English through telecollaboration. *The Modern Language Journal* 89, no. 2: 190–205.

Waterson, M., and M. Hayden. 1999. International education and its contribution to the development of student attitudes. *International Schools Journal* 23, no. 2: 17–27.

Williams, T.R. 2005. Exploring the impact of study abroad on students' intercultural communication skills: Adaptability and sensitivity. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 9, no. 4: 356–71.