

**UNDERSTANDING AND ASSESSING INTERCULTURAL
COMPETENCE: A SUMMARY OF THEORY, RESEARCH, AND
PRACTICE (TECHNICAL REPORT FOR THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE
PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT)**

CASTLE SINICROPE, JOHN NORRIS, & YUKIKO WATANABE
University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa

INTRODUCTION

In its broadest sense, intercultural competence can be defined following Fantini (2006) as “a complex of abilities needed to perform *effectively* and *appropriately* when interacting with others who are linguistically and culturally different from oneself” (p. 12, emphasis in original). Throughout the literature, researchers and theoreticians use a range of more or less related terms to discuss and describe *intercultural competence*, including *intercultural communicative competence* (ICC), *transcultural communication*, *cross-cultural adaptation*, and *intercultural sensitivity*, among others (Fantini, 2006). What all of these terms attempt to account for is the ability to step beyond one’s own culture and function with other individuals from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds. College foreign language and study abroad programs play a unique role in offering students the opportunity to develop their intercultural competencies. The acquisition of such competencies may be important not only for individual enrichment and communicative proficiency but also for providing future educators, professionals, and leaders with the capabilities necessary for promoting successful collaboration across cultures.

In this report we summarize theory and research on intercultural competence, paying particular attention to existing approaches and tools for its assessment. We also review examples of the assessment of intercultural competence in the specific contexts of general education and college foreign language and study abroad programs. It is our hope that these resources will provide a useful basis to foreign language (and other) educators as they seek to understand and improve the intercultural competencies of their students.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS FOR INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE

Background

Historically, a major focus on intercultural competence emerged out of research into the experiences of westerners working abroad (e.g., Peace Corp volunteers) in the 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. This early research was typically motivated by perceived cross-cultural communication problems that hampered collaboration between individuals from different backgrounds. In the late 1970s and 1980s, the contexts for intercultural competence research expanded to include study abroad, international business, cross-cultural training, expatriates living overseas, and immigrant acculturation. During these formative years, research on intercultural competence utilized assessments of individuals' attitudes, personalities, values, and motives, usually through short self-reports, surveys, or open-ended interviews. The purpose and focus of ICC assessment using these tools centered around four main goals: "(1) to explain overseas failure, (2) to predict overseas success, (3) to develop personnel selection strategies, and (4) to design, implement and test sojourner training and preparation methodologies" (Ruben, 1989, p. 230).

Today, intercultural competence research spans a wide spectrum, from international schools to medical training, from short study abroad programs to permanent residency in foreign cultures. The purposes of research also range widely, from the selection of appropriate participants for sending abroad to cross-cultural mediation to the determination of learning outcomes associated with a variety of educational experiences. As the focus and purpose of intercultural competence research has expanded, approaches to its description and assessment have evolved as well, from short attitude and personality surveys to more complex behavioral self-assessments, performance assessments, portfolio assessments, and others. At the same time, nearly twenty years after Ruben (1989) declared the "need for conceptual clarity" (p. 234), a multiplicity of frameworks and approaches to defining and assessing intercultural competence persists today. Thus, although the broad range of theories and models provides language educators with a variety of approaches to understanding and investigating intercultural competence, it also complexifies the task of communicating about related ideas in a systematic and consistently interpretable way.

By way of example, Table 1 presents 19 terms that have been utilized as alternatives for discussing intercultural competence. Though often used interchangeably with the most frequent

labels of *intercultural competence*, *intercultural communicative competence*, *intercultural sensitivity*, and *cross-cultural adaptation*, each alternative also implies additional nuances that are often only implicitly addressed in research.

Table 1
Alternative Terms for Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) (Adapted from Fantini, 2006, Appendix D)

transcultural communication	international communication	ethnorelativity
cross-cultural communication	intercultural interaction	biculturalism
cross-cultural awareness	intercultural sensitivity	multiculturalism
global competitive intelligence	intercultural cooperation	plurilingualism
global competence	cultural sensitivity	effective inter-group communication
cross-cultural adaptation	cultural competence	
international competence	communicative competence	

Hammer, Bennet, and Wiseman (2003) attempted to overcome some of the murkiness of ICC definitions by drawing a major distinction between *intercultural sensitivity* and *intercultural competence*. From their perspective, intercultural sensitivity is “the ability to discriminate and experience relevant cultural differences” whereas intercultural competence is “the ability to think and act in interculturally appropriate ways” (p. 422). Their distinction between knowing and doing in interculturally competent ways offers a fitting prelude to the themes that have emerged from most contemporary work on ICC. In the following sections, we introduce four major frameworks for conceptualizing intercultural competence. Additional theoretical frameworks for intercultural competence are described briefly as well, but the main focus in this report is on those approaches that have served as bases for assessments developed to gauge intercultural competence. Following the overview of theoretical frameworks, we then turn to their operationalization in research and assessment in Section 3.

Ruben’s Behavioral Approach to Intercultural Communicative Competence

One of the earliest comprehensive frameworks was Ruben’s behavioral approach to the conceptualization and measurement of intercultural communicative competence (Ruben, 1976; Ruben & Kealey, 1979). In contrast to the personality and attitudinal foci of previous approaches,

Ruben advocated a behavioral approach to linking the gap between knowing and doing, that is, between what individuals know to be intercultural competent and what those individuals actually do in intercultural situations.

It is not uncommon for an individual to be exceptionally well-versed on the theories of cross-cultural effectiveness, possess the best of motives, and be sincerely concerned about enacting his role accordingly, yet be unable to demonstrate those understandings in his own behavior. (Ruben & Kealey, 1979, pp. 19-20)

For these reasons, Ruben (1976) argued that to understand and assess individuals' behaviors, it would be necessary to employ "measures of competency that reflect an individual's ability to display concepts in his behavior rather than intentions, understandings, knowledges, attitudes, or desires" (p. 337). Ruben theorized that observing individuals in situations similar to those for which they are being trained or selected would provide information for predicting their performances in similar future situations.

Based on findings in the literature and his own work, Ruben (1976) identified seven dimensions of intercultural competence:

1. *Display of respect* describes an individual's ability to "express respect and positive regard" for other individuals.
2. *Interaction posture* refers to an individual's ability to "respond to others in a descriptive, nonevaluative, and nonjudgmental way."
3. *Orientation to knowledge* describes an individual's ability to "recognize the extent to which knowledge is individual in nature." In other words, orientation to knowledge describes an individual's ability to recognize and acknowledge that people explain the world around them in different ways with differing views of what is "right" and "true."
4. *Empathy* is an individual's ability to "put [himself] in another's shoes."
5. *Self-oriented role behavior* expresses an individual's ability to "be flexible and to function in [initiating and harmonizing] roles." In this context, initiating refers to requesting information and clarification and evaluating ideas for problem solving. Harmonizing, on the other hand, refers to regulating the group status quo through mediation.

6. *Interaction management* is an individual's ability to take turns in discussion and initiate and terminate interaction based on a reasonably accurate assessment of the needs and desires of others.
7. Lastly, *tolerance for ambiguity* describes an individual's ability to "react to new and ambiguous situations with little visible discomfort". (Ruben, 1976, pp. 339-341)

For assessment purposes, Ruben operationalized the seven dimensions with observational procedures and rating scales. These were subsequently employed and further developed by additional researchers (see Section 3.1). Ruben's call for a behavioral model and the assessment of behavioral outcomes, that is, describing an individual's competence based on observed actions, can also be regarded as a precursor to performance assessments of ICC (see Section 3.2). In sum, from Ruben's (1976) perspective, ICC consists of the "ability to function in a manner that is perceived to be relatively consistent with the needs, capacities, goals, and expectations of the individuals in one's environment while satisfying one's own needs, capacities, goals, and expectations" (p. 336), an ability that is best assessed by observing an individual's actions rather than reading an individual's self-reports.

European Multidimensional Models of Intercultural Competence: Byram and Risager

Based on their experiences in the European context, Byram (1997) and Risager (2007) have also theorized multidimensional models of intercultural competence. In *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*, Byram (1997) proposed a five-factor model of intercultural competence comprising the following:

1. The *attitude* factor refers to the ability to relativize one's self and value others, and includes "curiosity and openness, readiness to suspend disbelief about other cultures and belief about one's own" (p. 91).
2. *Knowledge* of one's self and others means knowledge of the rules for individual and social interaction and consists of knowing social groups and their practices, both in one's one culture and in the other culture.
3. The first skill set, the *skills of interpreting and relating*, describes an individual's ability to interpret, explain, and relate events and documents from another culture to one's own culture.

4. The second skill set, the *skills of discovery and interaction*, allows the individual to acquire “new knowledge of culture and cultural practices,” including the ability to use existing knowledge, attitudes, and skills in cross-cultural interactions (ibid, p. 98).
5. The last factor, *critical cultural awareness*, describes the ability to use perspectives, practices, and products in one’s own culture and in other cultures to make evaluations.

Byram further clarified that the interaction factor (skills of discovery and interacting) includes a range of communication forms, including verbal and non-verbal modes and the development of linguistic, sociolinguistic, and discourse competencies.

Building on Byram’s theoretical foundation, Risager (2007) proposed an expanded conceptualization of intercultural competence. She argued that a model for intercultural competence must include the broad resources an individual possesses as well as the narrow competences that can be assessed. Risager claimed her model to be broader in scope; however, it is noteworthy that the 10 elements she outlined are largely manifested in linguistic developments and proficiencies:

1. Linguistic (languastructural) competence
2. Linguacultural competences and resources: semantics and pragmatics
3. Linguacultural competences and resources: poetics
4. Linguacultural competences and resources: linguistic identity
5. Translation and interpretation
6. Interpreting texts (discourses)
7. Use of ethnographic methods
8. Transnational cooperation
9. Knowledge of language as critical language awareness, also as a world citizen
10. Knowledge of culture and society and critical cultural awareness, also as a world citizen.

(Risager, 2007, p. 227)

Extending ideas from these foundations, Byram and other European researchers (Kühlmann, Müller-Jacquier and Budin) have collaborated to combine existing theories of intercultural competence as the basis for developing their own assessment tool. Named INCA (intercultural competence assessment), the research project has adopted a multidimensional framework. Their overall model consists of two sets of dimensions, one for the assessor and one for the examinee, with three skill levels for each dimension: basic, intermediate, and full. From the assessor’s point

of view, intercultural competence consists of 6 different dimensions, as defined by the INCA assessor's manual:

1. *Tolerance for ambiguity* is “the ability to accept lack of clarity and ambiguity and to be able to deal with it constructively” (ibid, p. 5).
2. *Behavioural flexibility* is “the ability to adapt one's own behaviour to different requirements and situations” (ibid, p. 5).
3. *Communicative awareness* is “the ability [...] to establish relationships between linguistic expressions and cultural contents, to identify, and consciously work with, various communicative conventions of foreign partners, and to modify correspondingly one's own linguistics forms of expression” (ibid, p. 6).
4. *Knowledge discovery* is “the ability to acquire new knowledge of a culture and cultural practices and the ability to act using that knowledge, those attitudes and those skills under the constraints of real-time communication and interaction” (ibid, p.6).
5. *Respect for otherness* is “the readiness to suspend disbelief about other cultures and belief about one's own” (ibid, p. 6).
6. *Empathy* is “the ability to intuitively understand what other people think and how they feel in concrete situations” (ibid, p. 7).

From the examinee's point of view, intercultural competence consists of three dimensions, in a simplified version of the assessor's model:

1. *Openness* is the ability to “be open to the other and to situations in which something is done differently” (respect for others + tolerance of ambiguity) (ibid, p. 11).
2. *Knowledge* is the characteristic of “not only want[ing] to know the ‘hard facts’ about a situation or about a certain culture, but also [...] want[ing] to know something about the feelings of the other person” (knowledge discovery + empathy) (ibid, p. 11).
3. *Adaptability* describes the ability to “adapt [one's] behaviour and [one's] style of communication” (behavioural flexibility + communicative awareness) (ibid, p. 11).

Given the assessment orientation of this ICC framework, the different dimensions have not only been explained theoretically, as above, but have also been given concrete descriptions for each skill level. For example, Table 2 provides descriptions for each level of the first dimension, *tolerance for ambiguity*.

Table 2
Skill Levels for Tolerance for Ambiguity Dimension

Basic	Intermediate	Full
Deals with ambiguity on a one-off basis, responding to items as they arise. May be overwhelmed by ambiguous situations which imply high involvement.	Has begun to acquire a repertoire of approaches to cope with ambiguities in low-involvement situations. Begins to accept ambiguity as a challenge.	Is constantly aware of the possibility of ambiguity. When it occurs, he/she tolerates and manages it.

Beyond the INCA project, the multidimensional approach and the dimensions Risager and Byram ascribe to intercultural competence can be seen in both commercial assessment tools (Cross-Cultural Adaptability Index) and non-commercial assessment practices (Intercultural Sensitivity Index in Olson and Kroeger, 2001, and Assessment of Intercultural Competence in Fantini, 2006). Key to these European-oriented frameworks, and distinct from Ruben’s early work, is the emphasis on acquisition of proficiency in the host culture—moving well beyond the ability to interact respectfully, non-judgmentally, and effectively with the host culture.

Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS)

In the North American context, a different model of intercultural competence has been widely discussed, researched, and explored in recent years: Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) (Bennett, 1993; Hammer et al., 2003; Paige, Jacobs-Cassuto, Yershova, & DeJaeghere, 2003). On the basis of research in the 1970’s and 1980’s, Bennett developed a dynamic model to explain how individuals respond to cultural differences and how their responses evolve over time.

The Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) consists of six stages grouped into three *ethnocentric* stages (the individual’s culture is the central worldview) and three *ethnorelative* stages (the individual’s culture is one of many equally valid worldviews), as follows:

1. In the first ethnocentric stage, *denial*, the individual denies the difference or existence of other cultures by erecting psychological or physical barriers in the forms of isolation and separation from other cultures.
2. In the second ethnocentric stage, *defense*, the individual reacts against the threat of other cultures by denigrating the other cultures (negative stereotyping) and promoting the

superiority of one's own culture. In some cases, the individual undergoes a reversal phase, during which the worldview shifts from one's own culture to the other culture, and the own culture is subject to disparagement.

3. Finally, in the third ethnocentric stage, *minimization*, the individual acknowledges cultural differences on the surface but considers all cultures as fundamentally similar.

The three ethnorelative stages of development lead to the acquisition of a more complex worldview in which cultures are understood relative to each other and actions are understood as culturally situated.

1. (4) During the *acceptance* phase, the individual accepts and respects cultural differences with regard to behavior and values.
2. (5) In the second ethnorelative stage, *adaptation*, the individual develops the ability to shift his frame of reference to other culturally diverse worldviews through empathy and pluralism.
3. (6) In the last stage, *integration*, the individual expands and incorporates other worldviews into his own worldview.

Together, these six stages comprise a continuum from least culturally competent to most culturally competent, and they illustrate a dynamic way of modeling the development of intercultural competence.

In the past ten years, Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity has served as the basis for several assessment tools addressing intercultural sensitivity and cross-cultural competence, both commercially available (Bennett, 1993) and locally developed (Olson & Kroeger, 2001). Although Bennett does not explicitly describe the role of communication in the development of intercultural sensitivity, he references communication as a developmental strategy, particularly in the ethnorelative stages:

Participants moving out of acceptance are eager to apply their knowledge of cultural differences to actual face-to-face communication. Thus, now is the time to provide opportunities for interaction. These activities might include dyads with other-culture partners, facilitated multicultural group discussions, or outside assignments involving interviewing of people from other cultures... communication practice could refer to homestays or developing friendships in the other culture. (Bennett, 1993, pp. 58-59)

A Culture-Generic Approach to Intercultural Competence

The most recent developments in intercultural competence theory have emerged in the research of Arasaratnam and Doerfel (2005). In their work, Arasaratnam and Doerfel call for a new, culture-wide model of intercultural communication competence. Previous models, they argue, have often been subjective and limited by the cultures of the individuals involved in their conceptualization and assessment. Instead of imposing factors and dimensions in a top-down fashion, Arasaratnam and Doerfel have adopted a bottom-up approach, in which themes and dimensions come to light in interviews. To identify these themes, they conducted a semantic network analysis of interview transcripts with 37 intercultural competent participants. Participants were affiliated with a large university and included U.S. students ($N = 12$) and international students from 14 different countries ($N = 25$). U.S. students were selected based on their involvement in international student organizations, study abroad programs, and international friendship/host programs. During the interview, participants responded to the following prompts:

Q1: How would you define intercultural communication?

Q2: Can you identify some qualities or aspects of people who are competent in intercultural communication?

Q3: Can you identify some specific individuals whom you think are particularly competent in intercultural communication and say why you perceive them as such?

Q4: What are aspects of good communication in your culture/opinion?

Q5: What are aspects of bad communication in your culture/opinion?

Semantic analyses of participants' answers revealed four to five dominant clusters of words for each question. For example, definitions of intercultural communication (Q1) included: (a) *able, cross, language, talking, verbal, cultural, and religious*; (b) *backgrounds, countries, across, message, ideas, understand, and coming*; (c) *beliefs, group, information, exchange, individuals, communicating, outside, and town*; and (d) *communicate, cultures, different, people, ethnic, two, differences, and trying*. Based on semantic analyses for all five questions, Arasaratnam and Doerfel identified 10 unique dimensions of intercultural communicative competence: heterogeneity, transmission, other-centered, observant, motivation, sensitivity, respect, relational, investment, and appropriateness. Although this approach has not led to the development of widely practiced assessment methods, it promises a culture-generic, bottom-up approach to

eliciting definitions and dimensions of intercultural competence that may be used in future assessment tools.

Other Theoretical Approaches to Intercultural Competence

In addition to the theoretical approaches described above, at least three other models have been conceptualized and investigated: anxiety/uncertainty management (Gudykunst, 1993, 1998); an integrative system's theory (Kim, 1993); and identity negotiation (Ting-Toomey, 1993).

In anxiety/uncertainty management (AUM), Gudykunst (1993, 1998) argues that individuals experience both anxiety and uncertainty when interacting with foreign cultures. In order to adapt, individuals must develop the ability to manage their anxiety through mindfulness. For Gudykunst, mindfulness includes identifying and focusing on the sources of anxiety, which may include concept of self, reaction to host culture, situations, and connections with the host culture. In Kim's integrative model (1993), cross-cultural adaptation is seen as an interactive and integrative process, in which the individual is dynamic, "never a finished product but, instead... in the business of growing and maturing" (p. 173). Her model comprises six different dimensions including communication competence, social communication, environment, predisposition, and intercultural transformation. Individuals who experience cross-cultural adaptation undergo phases of acculturation (acquiring elements of the host culture) and deculturation (unlearning elements of the old culture) in a cyclic pattern of stress-adaptation. Lastly, Ting-Toomey's negotiation model (1993) includes three components that contribute to adaptation when individuals are faced with foreign or unfamiliar settings: cognitive, affective, and behavioral factors. These components "contribute to effective identity negotiation and outcome attainment processes" (p. 106) and enable individuals to interact with strangers. Although these models for intercultural competence have been theorized, none (to our knowledge) has led to the development of assessments for estimating levels or degrees of intercultural competence. Nevertheless, they do offer further insights into the factors that may be related to learners' development of ICC.

In sum, the difficult-to-pin-point nature of intercultural competence has led to a range of definitions, theories, and models that have served as the basis for different approaches to its assessment. Some models stress the communicative nature of intercultural competence, while

others emphasize an individual's adaptation and development when confronted with a new culture, and still others focus on empathic and tolerant reactions to other cultures. Ultimately, these models seek to explain the types of skills and abilities individuals need to function in culturally diverse settings and the processes they undergo in developing the needed skills and abilities for being interculturally competent. How such skills and abilities might best be observed and understood is the focus of the next section.

ASSESSING INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE

In recent years, intercultural competence and intercultural sensitivity research has flourished in a variety of contexts: doctors in sensitivity training programs, expatriates living abroad, students in international schools, and students in study abroad programs. This section summarizes major assessment approaches that have been utilized in the study of intercultural competence.

Studies Using Indirect Assessment Tools for Intercultural Competence

Before 1996, a handful of researchers developed their own scales for survey research, such as the Behavioral Assessment Scale for Intercultural Competence (BASIC) (Koester & Olebe, 1988; Ruben & Kealey, 1979) and the Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ISCI) (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992). The ISCI utilized responses on a self-report instrument to assess individuals' abilities to interact and modify their behavior in cross-cultural situations. By contrast, the BASIC instrument was used by observers to assess individuals' cross-cultural communication competence based on their actions. More recently, two commercial procedures/scales have dominated the research landscape: the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) and the Cross-Cultural Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI). However, recent years have also seen the sustained use of non-commercial and locally developed assessment practices including the Intercultural Sensitivity Index (ISI) (Olson & Kroeger, 2001) and the Assessment of Intercultural Competence (AIC) (Fantini, 2000; 2006). Furthermore, innovative researchers sometimes have developed their own assessment scales in combination with commercially available scales or as replacements for commercial assessment tools like the IDI and the CCAI. In the following

sections we review these various instruments and procedures in turn, providing example items, scales, and procedural notes.

Behavioral Assessment Scale for Intercultural Competence. The Behavioral Assessment Scale for Intercultural Competence (BASIC) (Koester & Olebe, 1988; Ruben & Kealey, 1979) was developed from Ruben’s pioneering work in behavioral approaches to ICC. In Ruben (1976), observers used 4- and 5-point Likert scales to assess individuals on each of the seven dimensions: display of respect, interaction posture, orientation to knowledge, empathy, self-oriented role behavior, interaction management, and tolerance for ambiguity. Table 3 shows an early version of the scale used for assessing the “interaction posture” dimension.

An early factor-analytic study of the scales (Ruben, 1976) revealed three clusters, described by Ruben as three types of participants: Types I, II, and III. Type I participants showed high tolerance for ambiguity, high interaction management, and high respect plus base personal knowledge, and Ruben called these participants competent cross-cultural communicators. Type II participants, with some respect, some tolerance for ambiguity, and some degree of empathy plus low self-oriented role behavior and low interaction management, were described as a mixed behavioral group with potential for successful cross-cultural communication. Type III individuals, with high self-oriented role behavior plus low orientation to knowledge, low interaction management, low group maintenance, low empathy, low tolerance for ambiguity, and low interaction posture, were described as individuals who might face difficulties when attempting to communicate cross-culturally.

Table 3

Example Item from Precursor to BASIC: Interaction Posture (Ruben, 1976, p. 347)

Instructions: Responses to another person or persons in an interpersonal or group situation range from *descriptive, nonevaluating* to *highly judgmental*. Indicate on a 1 to 4 continuum which interaction pattern was most characteristic during the observation.

DESCRIPTION

1. *Highly Evaluative.* The individual appears to respond to others’ verbal and non-verbal contributions in a highly judgmental and evaluative manner. He or she appears to measure the contributions of others in terms of a highly structured, predetermined framework of thoughts, beliefs, attitudes, and values. Responses therefore communicate clearly whether the individual believes others to be “right” or “wrong.” Reactions are made in declarative, often dogmatic fashion and will closely follow the comments of others, indicating little or no effort to digest what has been said before judging it.

2. *Evaluative.* The individual responds to others verbally and nonverbally in an evaluative and judgmental manner and measures the responses and comments of others in terms of a predetermined framework of thoughts, beliefs, attitudes, and values. The framework is not totally rigid but does provide a clear basis for determining whether others’ contributions are “right” or “wrong.” Reactions to others tend to follow fairly closely on the heels of termination of discussion by other interactants, but there is some break, indicating a minimal attempt to digest and consider others’ ideas before responding positively or negatively.

3. *Evaluative-Descriptive.* The individual appears to measure the responses of others in terms of a framework based partly on information, thoughts, attitudes, and feelings gathered from the particular interaction and the individuals involved. He or she offers evaluative responses, but they appear to be less than rigidly held and subject to negotiations and modification. The time lapse between others’ comments and the individual’s response suggests an effort to digest and consider input before reacting either positively or negatively.

4. *Descriptive.* The individual responds to others in a manner that draws out information, thoughts, and feelings and provides evaluative responses, but only after gathering sufficient input so that the evaluative framework fits the individual(s) with whom he or she is interacting. He or she asks questions, restates others’ ideas, and appears to gather information prior to responding evaluatively.

RATING

1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---

(Place “x” to indicate position on continuum)

Subsequently, Ruben and Kealey (1979) expanded the behavioral model to nine dimensions by dividing *self-oriented role behavior* into three distinct dimensions: *task-related roles*, *relational roles*, and *individualistic roles*. They then analyzed assessments of pre-deployment and one-year post-deployment individuals and their spouses moving and living abroad. Results revealed that three dimensions were the best predictors of how participants reacted to immersion in a new culture, also known as *culture shock*: orientation to knowledge, relational role orientation, and empathy. Ruben and Kealey also found that two dimensions, display of respect and interaction management, predicted how participants adjusted to their surrounding culture. Finally, two other dimensions, moderate task-related and low individualistic role behavior, also correlated with the individuals' abilities to function effectively in the host culture. Building on Ruben and Kealey's work, Koester and Olebe (1988) adopted and further developed the nine BASIC scales, adding an overall score based on the nine individual scales. In their 1988 study, Koester and Olebe focused on rephrasing the scales for untrained raters by reducing sentence length and nominal forms, eliminating redundancies, avoiding technical language, and clarifying main ideas. Table 4 shows an example prompt for assessing the dimension *interaction posture*.

Table 4

Revised BASIC Example: Interaction Posture (Koester & Olebe, 1988, p. 240)

4. *Descriptive*. My roommate responds to others in a manner that draws out information, thoughts, and feelings. *She or he provides evaluative response, but only after gathering enough information to provide a response that is appropriate* to the individuals involved. She or he asks questions, restates others' ideas, and appears to gather information before answering evaluatively.

Koester and Olebe (1988) found that untrained observers (university students living in dorms) were able to use the rephrased scales to evaluate their roommates. They reported correlations between a global measure of intercultural communication effectiveness (not described in their study) and each individual BASIC scale as ranging from $r = .10$ (individualistic roles) to $r = .51$ (empathy). When the individualistic role scales were excluded, the correlation between the overall BASIC score and communication effectiveness was $r = .62$. Koester and Olebe interpreted this correlation as support for the claim that BASIC provides a good measure of intercultural communication competence. Unfortunately, they did not provide

the prompt or tool that elicited the communication effectiveness score or explain how the overall BASIC score was computed. Despite limitations, the study showed that untrained peers can use the BASIC scales to provide a picture of an individual's intercultural communicative effectiveness based on their familiarity with the individual's behavior.

Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory. The Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI) (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992) was developed to measure an individual's ability to modify behavior in culturally appropriate ways when moving between different cultures. In particular, the inventory was used in comparing behavior in an individualistic culture (United States) versus a collectivistic culture (Japan). The self-report instrument comprised 46 questions on a 7-point Likert scale with the following descriptors: 1 = very strongly agree, 2 = strongly agree, 3 = agree, 4 = not decided, 5 = disagree, 6 = strongly disagree, and 7 = very strongly disagree. The instrument was divided into two parts. In the first part, participants were asked to respond to the same 16 questions while imagining living and working in (a) the United States and (b) Japan. In the second part, participants responded to 14 generic items on flexibility and open-mindedness. Table 5 shows several sample items from the ICSI. A business orientation in Bhawuk and Brislin's research is clear from these items, the majority of which deal with interactions in the work-place.

In their study, Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) administered the survey to two groups of participants, MBA students and graduate students living in international dormitories. To examine the potential effects of social desirability—a phenomenon in which respondents perform on the basis of what they believe is socially acceptable rather than as an accurate depiction of their behaviors—Bhawuk and Brislin also administered the Marlow-Crowne Social Desirability scale. Correlations between the Marlowe-Crowne scale and the total ICSI scale were relatively low ($r = .35$ for MBA students and $.37$ for graduate students), suggesting that participants were not overly affected by social desirability when answering items. Overall results from the study showed that participants with three or more years of cross-cultural experience exhibited a greater degree of intercultural sensitivity. No difference, however, was shown between the MBA students and the graduate students living in international dormitories.

Table 5
Sample Items from Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI)

Individualism and Collectivism Ties	
Item	Statement
1.	When I disagree with a group, I would allow a conflict in the group to remain, rather than change my own stance on important issues.
3.	I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people.
5.	I am very modest when talking about my own accomplishments
7.	If I want my subordinate to perform a task, I tell the person that my superiors want me to get that task done.
13.	It is important to develop a network of people in my community who can help me out when I have tasks to accomplish.
16.	If I want a person to perform a certain task I try to show how the task will benefit others in the person’s group.
Flexibility and Open-mindedness Items	
Item	Statement
33.	When I am living abroad, I assess situations as quickly as I do when I am living in my own country
36.	I do not like to receive unannounced visitors at my home.
38.	We all have a right to hold different beliefs about God and religion.
44.	I would not allow my subordinate to promote his nephew if there is someone marginally better than him. The person who is better must be promoted at all costs.
46.	While living abroad, I spend most of my personal time with people from my own country.

Based on their findings, Bhawuk and Brislin concluded that individualism and collectivism (i.e., the main components of the ICSI) can be used to estimate intercultural sensitivity. Furthermore, their work suggested that individuals may require three or more years of cross-cultural experience to attain a level of cross-cultural competence that is desirable for international business operations. The role of language competence and developmental aspects of intercultural competence over time were not considered in the Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory.

The Intercultural Development Inventory. The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) is based on Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) and has been used to assess the intercultural competence of high school students at international schools (Straffon, 2003), university students abroad (Engle & Engle, 2004), and physician trainees (Altshuler, Sussman, & Kachur, 2003). Studies by the developers have also examined the scales in detail (Hammer et al., 2003; Paige et al., 2003). The IDI is a 50-item self-assessment with five-point

Likert scales using the following descriptors: 1 = disagree, 2 = disagree somewhat more than agree, 3 = disagree some and agree some, 4 = agree somewhat more than disagree, and 5 = agree. Table 6 shows sample IDI self-assessment items (Paige et al., 2003, pp. 470-472).

Table 6
Sample Items from Intercultural Development Inventory

	Developmental Stage	Sample Item
1	Denial	Society would be better off if culturally different groups kept to themselves.
2	Defense	People from other cultures are not as open-minded as people from my own culture.
3	Minimization	People are the same despite outward differences in appearance.
4	Acceptance	It is appropriate that people from other cultures do not necessarily have the same values and goals as people from my culture.
5	Adaptation	When I come in contact with people from a different culture, I find I change my behavior to adapt to theirs.
6	Integration	<i>no example provided</i>

In-depth evaluations of the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) and studies using the instrument have lent support to the validity and usefulness of the IDI for estimating changes in intercultural competence. Results from Straffon’s (2003) one-time administration of the IDI revealed that 97% of high school students attending one international school were categorized in the acceptance and adaptation stages of the DMIS, the fourth and fifth stages respectively. His findings also indicated that the level of intercultural sensitivity, as measured by the IDI, was positively correlated with the time students had attended the international school. However, note that correlations were low for section and overall scores on the IDI (ranging from $r = .12$ to $r = .19$), suggesting only a marginal relationship with time at the school.

Using a repeated-measures methodology, Engle and Engle (2004) found that students in a study abroad program in France experienced the greatest intercultural competence gains in the whole-year programs (versus semester-long programs) as measured by the IDI. In addition to the measurement of cultural learning, Engle and Engle also assessed students’ proficiency gains in French. Results from the proficiency test complemented the IDI results: students experienced the

greatest percentage gain on the proficiency test after their first semester and on the IDI after the second semester.

In the field of medicine, Altshuler et al. (2003) used the IDI to provide baseline information on physician trainees and to evaluate the IDI as an assessment tool for intercultural competence. After exposing three different groups of participants to (1) didactic intervention using workshops and behavioral rehearsals, (2) behavioral rehearsals alone, or (3) no additional input, Altshuler et al. compared pre- and post-treatment results on the IDI and found no statistically significant differences for either of the training groups (groups 1 and 2). However, the results showed a trend toward greater intercultural sensitivity, particularly toward the stage of adaptation. To explain the lacking significance, Altshuler et al. cited several factors including small sample size, shortness of intervention, and different delays in treatment post-tests.

The creators of the IDI have gone to some lengths to provide support for the reliability and validity of their instrument, including two published reports on the IDI's reliability and content/construct validity (Hammer et al., 2003; Paige et al., 2003). Paige et al. (2003) reported that the IDI's reliability for the six-stage Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) ranged from .74 to .91, with four of the six scales above .80 (Cronbach alpha). Factor analysis showed that test data from IDI generally follows the six stage DMIS but fits a five-stage model better (Paige et al., 2003). To demonstrate content validity of the IDI, Hammer et al. (2003) described the instrument's development, which followed a series of steps. First, interviews with intercultural communicators were recorded. Second, expert raters selected statements for each of the six stages of the DMIS based on the interview transcripts. Finally, after piloting items twice, the instrument was reduced to 50 items. To test the construct validity of the IDI, Hammer et al. compared the relationship between respondents' scores on the IDI and their responses on two related scales, the Worldmindedness Scale (Sampson & Smith, 1957 as cited in Hammer et al., 2003) and the Intercultural Anxiety scale (Stephen and Stephen, 1985 as cited in Hammer et al., 2003). The researchers reported that participants' responses on their instrument and the other related scales were comparable and categorized participants in similar ways; that is, participants who were categorized in the Defense and Denial stages on the IDI had lower Worldmindedness scores and higher Intercultural Anxiety scores, whereas participants who were categorized in the Acceptance and Adaptation stages had higher Worldmindedness scores and lower Intercultural Anxiety scores.

The Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory. The Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) has also been used to assess study abroad experience (Kitsantas & Meyers, 2001; Williams, 2005; Zielinski, 2007) and sensitivity training for medical students (Majumdar, Keystone, & Cuttress, 1999), as well as the effects of experiential training on cross-cultural adaptability (Goldstein & Smith, 1999). The CCAI scales were developed by Kelley and Meyers in the early 1990's. Although they have published several manuals, only limited information on the underlying theory or development of the model is accessible.

As described in Williams (2005), the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) is a “training instrument designed to provide information to an individual about his or her potential for cross-cultural effectiveness” (Kelley & Meyers as cited in Williams, 2005). The CCAI consists of four dimensions that measure an individual's ability to adapt to different cultures: (1) emotional resilience, (2) flexibility and openness, (3) perceptual acuity, and (4) personal autonomy.

1. The *emotional resistance* dimension reflects an individual's ability to cope with stress and ambiguity and recover from mistakes and unexpected turns of events with a positive attitude and resourcefulness.
2. The second dimension, *flexibility and openness*, assesses an individual's openness to others and flexibility with regard to new and unfamiliar situations.
3. *Perceptual acuity*, the third dimension, assesses both behavior and perception with emphasis on the individual's ability to interpret communication cues (verbal and non-verbal) cross-culturally.
4. The final dimension, *personal autonomy*, measures both the individual's sense of identity and his ability to respect differing cultural values.

Overall cross-cultural adaptability is calculated by summing responses to the four dimensions, as measured with a 50-item survey of items using six-point Likert scale self-ratings with the following anchors: 1 = DNT (definitely not true), 2 = NT (not true), 3 = TNT (tends to be not true), 4 = TT (tends to be true), 5 = T (true), DT (definitely true). Examples to illustrate the four dimensions can be seen in Table 7 (Williams, 2005, pp. 363-364).

Table 7
Sample Items from Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI)

Dimension	Items (<i>k</i>)	Sample Item
Emotional resilience	18	When I am working with people of a different background, it is important for me to receive their approval
Flexibility and openness	17	If I had to adapt to a slower pace of life, I would become impatient
Perceptual acuity	10	I pay attention to how people’s cultural differences affect their perception of me.
Personal autonomy	7	I feel free to maintain my personal values, even among those who do not share them.

Mixed results have emerged from studies that used the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) to measure change in individuals’ intercultural competence. In their research on the impact of study abroad, Kitsantas and Meyers (2001) found statistically significant differences between study abroad and non-study abroad groups for all four dimensions and total score. Prior to the study abroad program, minimal differences were shown between the experimental group (study abroad) and the control group (non-study abroad). Similarly, Goldstein and Smith (1999) found differences between control and experimental groups along all four dimensions; however, they followed a post-test only design and, therefore, their results may or may not have been attributable to the hands-on, cross-cultural experiences.

By contrast, three other studies (Majumdar et al., 1999; Williams, 2005; Zielinski, 2007) did not find overall differences between experimental and control group performance on the CCAI. Findings in Williams and Majumdar et al. showed differences for only two dimensions of the CCAI: emotional resistance and perceptual acuity. Trends toward improvement in other dimensions were observable, for example flexibility and openness (Majumdar et al., 1999), but the results for these dimensions were not statistically significant. In her analysis of length of study abroad program and degree of cross-cultural adaptability, Zielinski (2007) also reported statistically significant differences for some dimensions in cross-group comparisons of the following four groups: (a) no study abroad experience, (b) short study abroad experience, (c) medium length study abroad experience, and (d) lengthy study abroad experience. She concluded

that length of study abroad and cross-cultural adaptability appear to be related, although overall differences were not statistically trustworthy.

Davis and Finney (2006) is the only widely available study of the instrument itself. Motivated by the lack of published validation studies, Davis and Finney undertook a factor analysis to provide researchers in the field with detailed information on the CCAI's construct validity. They administered the instrument to 725 college-age students. Responses were "fairly normally distributed" (p. 323), but Cronbach alpha reliability ranged from a low .54 (flexibility and openness) to .80 (emotional resilience). More troublesome, however, was the high correlation among the dimensions, which indicated substantial overlap in the operationalization of the CCAI's four dimensions. Factor analysis also revealed that several items were more strongly related to dimensions other than the dimension they were intended to represent. Davis and Finney concluded that the four-dimension model described in the CCAI does not fit data gathered using the CCAI. As a result, they recommended that the CCAI not be used until it has been further studied, researched, and developed.

The Intercultural Sensitivity Index (ISI). Based on Bennett's (1993) theoretical framework of the Development Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) and multidimensional models of intercultural competence, Olson and Kroeger (2001) developed their own instrument for measuring global intercultural competency, the Intercultural Sensitivity Index (ISI). The instrument's items represent not only the six stages of the DMIS (denial, defense, minimization, acceptance, adaptation, and integration) but also three dimensions of global competency (substantive knowledge, perceptual understanding, and intercultural communication). Sample items for both theoretical orientations follow in Tables 8 and 9 (Olson & Kroeger, 2001, pp. 126-131). The total number of items and the number of items for each dimension were not reported. Each question is answered on a five-point scale (note that the scale-point descriptors were not provided in the study).

Table 8
Sample Items for Bennett’s (1993) Developmental Model of Intercultural Competence

	Stage	Sample Item
1	Denial	I feel most comfortable living and working in a community where people look and act like me.
2	Defense	I believe that aid to developing countries should be targeted to those efforts that help these countries evolve toward the types of social, economic, and political systems that exist in the United States.
3	Minimization	I understand that difference exist [<i>sic</i>] but believe that we should focus on similarities. We are all human.
4	Acceptance	I believe that verbal and nonverbal behavior vary across cultures and that all forms of such behavior are worthy of respect.
5	Adaptation	I have two or more cultural frames of reference, and I feel positive about cultural differences
6	Integration	I am able to analyze and evaluate situations from one or more chosen cultural perspectives.

Table 9
Sample Items for Global Competency

Dimension	Sample Items
Substantive knowledge	I think that the choices one makes at home have relevance for other countries and vice versa
	I am linguistically and cultural competent in at least one language and culture other than my own.
Perceptual understanding	I appreciate how people from other cultures are different from me.
	I question my own prejudices as well as national and cultural stereotypes.
Intercultural competence	I incorporate the attractive aspects of other cultures into my way of doings things.
	I have the ability to deal flexibly with and adjust to new people, places, and situations.

Olson and Kroeger (2001) piloted their survey with faculty members of the New Jersey City University and found that 69% self-rated at 4 or 5 on the scale for stage 4, acceptance. Next highest, 44% self-rated at 4 or 5 on the scale for stage 5, adaptation, while 17% self-rated at 4 or 5 on the scale for stage six, integration. None of the respondents rated themselves high on the scale for stages 1 or 2, denial and defense respectively, and only 10% rated themselves highly on stage 3, minimization. Olson and Kroeger provided two explanations for these results. First, the faculty at New Jersey City University live in a diverse and metropolitan area. Second, only 10% of 500 faculty members responded to the survey. Olson and Kroeger argued that individuals in stages of denial and defense might be less likely to complete and return such a survey, thereby depressing the numbers for the lower end of the scale.

Only one other study, Williams (2005), was identified that employed the ISI, which was used in combination with CCAI to assess and compare the intercultural communication skills of students before and after study abroad programs. Williams found that students who studied abroad averaged an 11.28 increase on the ISI (out of a potential 192 points). Despite these positive findings, Williams concluded that the results should be interpreted cautiously given the self-study format, the small sample size, the broad scope of study abroad programs, and the moderate reliability of the ISI ($r = .56$ on the pretest; $r = .67$ on the posttest). For future research, she suggested longitudinal studies with improved assessment instruments.

The Assessment of Intercultural Competence (AIC). In another approach, the Assessment of Intercultural Competence (AIC) was also developed in-house for specific purposes (Fantini, 2000, 2006). The Federation of the Experiment in International Living (FEIL) developed the scale as a first step in a larger project of exploring and assessing the intercultural competence outcomes of its programs. As the basis for its research, the FEIL researchers proposed the definition of intercultural competence as “a complex of abilities needed to perform effectively and appropriately when interacting with others who are linguistically and culturally different from one’s self” (Fantini, 2006, p. 12). Within this definition, Fantini specified different components: characteristics of intercultural competence, domains of intercultural competence (relationships, communication, and collaboration), dimensions of intercultural competence (knowledge, attitude, skills, and awareness), language proficiency, and developmental level.

In initial research on this recent assessment, two-way procedures (self and other-reported) and hour-long interviews were employed. In total, the self-assessment instrument consisted of

seven sections and 211 items. Participants for the research were British and Swiss individuals in FEIL volunteer projects in Ecuador, including both alumni, current volunteers, and project mentors. Topics ranged from personal characteristics to intercultural abilities, as shown in Table 10 below. Questions on a 0-5 point scale had descriptors ranging from 0 = none/not at all to 5 = extremely high/well.

Fantini (2006) presented findings from the self-assessment instrument, the AIC, and interview data from participants. He interpreted results to provide evidence for overall improvement in intercultural competence. To support the validity of these findings, he reported reliability estimates of 0.70 and greater and factor loadings of 0.60 and greater for each item on each of the four dimensions of intercultural competence: knowledge, attitude, skills, and awareness. Using the alumni interview data, he completed fine-grained analyses to address assertions underlying the intercultural competence model in the AIC, such as: ICC is a complex of abilities, learning the host language affects ICC development, and all parties in intercultural contact are affected to some degree and in various ways. Evidence in the interview data offered support for most of the assertions that were researched. Future development plans for the AIC include revising the instrument and expanding its use to other cross-cultural contexts.

Overview of indirect assessment tools for intercultural competence. Table 11 summarizes major indirect assessment tools that have been developed for estimating intercultural competence. Existing tools consist mostly of self-reports, in the form of surveys, with a focus on multiple dimensions that comprise the overall construct of ICC. One exception to this generalization is the other-assessment tool, BASIC, which includes assessment by others using pre-specified guidelines and scales. Another exception to this generalization is the IDI, which measures an individual's development along a continuum of ICC rather than dimensions of an overall ICC construct.

Table 10
Sample Items from Assessment of Intercultural Competence (AIC)

Section	Items (N)	Sample Items ask respondents to...
1 About the respondent	37	<i>provide name, nationality, gender, education level, past intercultural relationships, etc.</i>
2 Personal characteristics	28	<i>rate themselves as they perceive themselves in their own cultures and as they believe their hosts perceived them in the other culture (0-5)</i> example characteristics: 1. intolerant 2. flexible 3. patient 4. lacks sense of humor 5. tolerates differences
3 Motivation and options	18	<i>rate level of interest and characterize motivation towards host culture (0-5)</i> example levels of interest: 1. Before arriving 2. Mid-way through the experience. example motivations: 1. Sometimes wanted to return home 2. Desired to adjust as best as you could.
4 Language proficiency	15	<i>describe proficiency at beginning and end of stay (yes or no)</i> example proficiency items: 1. no ability at all 2. able to satisfy immediate needs with memorized phrases
5 Communication styles	47	<i>compare their responses to situations in their own and in the host culture</i> example situation: When disagreeing in my/the host culture, I prefer a) to be told directly and openly about the problem no matter the consequences b) not to speak openly so as to not offend anyone c) not sure
6 Intercultural areas	12	<i>rate their situations (0-5)</i> example situation: I was able to communicate in Spanish with a) my host family b) my host colleagues c) other host natives
7 Intercultural abilities	54	<i>rate intercultural abilities at the beginning and the end of the program for knowledge, attitudes, skills, and awareness (0-5)</i> example of knowledge ability: I could contrast important aspects of the host language culture with my own. example of attitude ability: I demonstrated willingness to interact with host culture members. example of skills ability: I adjusted my behavior, dress, etc., as appropriate, to avoid offending my hosts example of awareness ability: I realized the importance of my negative reactions.

Table 11
Indirect Assessment Tools for Intercultural Competence

Assessment Tool	Format	Constructs
Behavioral Assessment Scale for Intercultural Competence (BASIC) Ruben, 1976; Ruben & Kealey, 1979; Koester & Olebe, 1988	7-9 questions 4- and 5-point scales	display of respect interaction posture orientation to knowledge empathy self-oriented role behavior interaction management tolerance for ambiguity
Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI) Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992	46 questions 7-point scale	individualism ties collectivism ties flexibility open-mindedness
Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) Hammer & Bennett, 1993	50 questions 7-point scale	denial defense minimization acceptance adaptation integration
Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) Kelley & Meyers, 1995	50 questions 6-point scale	emotional resistance flexibility and openness perceptual acuity personal autonomy
Global Competency and Intercultural Sensitivity Index (ISI) Olson & Kroeger, 2001; Williams, 2005	30 questions 5-point scale	denial defense minimization acceptance adaptation integration substantive knowledge perceptual understanding intercultural competence
Assessment of Intercultural Competence (AIC) Fantini, 2006	multiple survey components	knowledge attitude skills awareness

Concerns with self-assessment instruments. Some researchers have voiced concerns over the potential short-comings of the self-report formats that characterize most of the indirect assessment instruments (Altshuler et al., 2003; Arasaratnam & Doerfel, 2005; Hammer et al., 2003; Jacobson, Schleicher, & Maureen, 1999; Ruben, 1989; Ruben & Kealey, 1979; Williams, 2005). Findings in Altshuler et al. (2003), for example, revealed a “discrepancy between participants’ self-perception of their intercultural awareness and sensitivity and their actual abilities” (p. 397). To control for the likely influence of social desirability, Hammer et al. (2003) and Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) administered the Marlowe-Crown scale. Correlations between

Marlowe-Crown's social desirability scale and responses on the IDI and ICSI did not reveal any substantial relationships between assessment responses and social desirability. Despite such findings, researchers continue to doubt the ability of individuals to provide accurate self-assessments.

According to Arasaratnam and Doerfel (2005), the issue with self-assessment may not be that individuals choose to respond inaccurately, but that they may not be able to respond accurately: "a major short-coming in studies in the past is that often participants who have little experience in intercultural situations are asked for self-reports of behavioral choices in hypothetical intercultural situations" (p. 141). Although this factor may not apply in post-study abroad or post-training assessments, it could affect the pre-study abroad and pre-training results that are used as a baseline to determine individual gains in intercultural competence. Despite potential theoretical and methodological drawbacks, self-report surveys remain the most widely practiced form of indirect assessment, owing to the availability of ready-made instruments and the speed and ease of data collection and analysis.

Direct Assessments of Intercultural Competence

Direct and combined assessment designs are not as common as indirect assessments of intercultural competence, which may be due largely to the time-consuming nature of collecting and analyzing direct assessment data. Nevertheless, these approaches potentially offer more complete assessments of intercultural competence because they can provide more detailed, nuanced, and individualized accounts while avoiding many of the issues inherent in indirect or self-report assessment approaches discussed above.

Direct assessment tools. Direct approaches to assessing ICC include performance assessment (Byram, 1997; Ruben, 1976), portfolio assessment (Byram, 1997, Jacobson et al., 1999; Pruegger and Rogers, 1994), and interviews (Fantini, 2006; Straffon, 2003). Common to these is the elicitation of an individual's ability to display intercultural competence in his or her behavior, whether in real-time situations (performance assessment), in reflections and collections of work (portfolio assessment), or in one-on-one conversations with interlocutors (interviews).

Proponents of direct assessment suggest including performance assessment because it reveals an individual's ability to use any acquired intercultural competence in real-time situations. For example, to assess the skills of discovery and interaction, Byram and Morgan (as cited in Byram,

1997, pp. 99-100) utilized an interview with a native speaker on a personal topic. Before the interview, interviewees prepared for a discussion on the topic of regional identity. During the interview, they were asked to explain how their feeling of social identity was related to their place of origin. After the interview, they were encouraged to reflect on the content and form of their discussion, which could also include self-assessing their skills via analysis of audio-recordings of the task.

Ruben (1976) advocated performance assessments in which individuals are observed in situations that are similar to what they will face in the future. If these situations are not naturally occurring, they can be created “using a simulation, game, or structured experience” (p. 337). However, Ruben did not provide a suggested list of potential simulations, games, or structured experiences. In his study, nineteen participants were observed during a seven-day intercultural adaptation training program, which was aimed at preparing the participants for upcoming cross-cultural assignments. Staff members completed the BASIC scales using their observations of participant behavior during formal and informal parts of the program, including training sessions, coffee breaks, cocktail hours, and meals. Based on the description of the study, it is unclear whether participants were aware that their intercultural competence performance was being evaluated.

Others have emphasized the potential of portfolio assessment for gauging intercultural competence. Jacobson et al. (1999) argued that learning is not always quantifiable and may be represented best by self-selected work. In their study, the process of developing a portfolio encouraged students to reflect on their evolving intercultural competencies, thereby increasing the potential for learning and growth. The final product was assumed to represent the students’ intercultural competence level at the end of the research period. To guide the portfolio process, participants in Jacobson et al. (1999) received the following directions:

Learning to communicate in a new culture is like learning a new type of art. Words alone cannot really show what you have learned, and there is no simple way to take a test or give yourself a grade that will show what you have learned. Instead, think of good examples from your experiences in this country that show what you have learned about communicating in the culture here. (p. 476)

Although portfolio entries for some students were encouraging, in that they showed how students developed and grappled with their understanding of and ability to adapt to cultural

phenomena (e.g., small talk and the meaning of time and punctuality in the United States), Jacobson et al. noted two limitations: (1) selective representation of students' intercultural ability, as the students themselves chose examples that represented them in particular ways; and (2) confusion over the concept of a portfolio, because some students did not follow the directions for the portfolio assignment. Many students focused their portfolios on broad cultural differences between their home countries and the United States instead of focusing on more narrow issues of intercultural communication. Despite these drawbacks, Jacobson et al. concluded that portfolios can provide a useful alternative means for assessing intercultural competence.

Byram (1997) also advocated portfolio assessments for estimating the dimensions of attitude, skills of interaction/discovery and relating/interpreting, and critical awareness. However, Byram did not provide concrete ideas or examples of portfolio assessment designs. Similarly, Pruegger and Rogers (1994) suggested the use of content analysis of personal documents. In this approach, three-page follow-up papers were analyzed for positive change, mixed change, no change, and no comment after cross-cultural training.

Finally, interviews may also function as a form of direct assessment, both as a means for eliciting authentic performances, in the case of Byram (1997) above, or as a supplement that adds rich layers to the preliminary results of indirect assessments (Fantini, 2006; Straffon, 2003). During in-depth interviews, Fantini (2006, p. 37) used the following questions to elicit data on the nature and development of intercultural competence:

1. What abilities do you think are important toward intercultural success?
2. To what extent did you develop these abilities? Why or why not?
3. Was learning of the host language important to your success? Why or why not?
4. What impact did this intercultural service experience have on your life?
5. How and to what extent have you utilized any of these abilities in your own life and work?
6. Any additional comments?

Similarly, Straffon (2003) utilized the following questions and responses as a basis for comparison to indirect assessment results in his analysis:

What do you think is more important to pay attention to, cultural differences or cultural similarities? (p. 495)

When you encounter a cultural difference, what is your first reaction? (p. 496)

What does the word culture mean to you? (p. 497)

Combining assessment tools. Several researchers have also combined direct and indirect assessment methods to provide more comprehensive accounts of intercultural phenomena (Fantini, 2006; Pruegger & Rogers, 1994; Straffon, 2003). In their combined approach, Pruegger and Rogers (1994) compared indirect and direct assessment findings. Although the indirect tool, the Cross-Cultural Sensitivity Scale (CCSS), did not reveal any changes in cultural diversity and sensitivity after experiential treatment, data from personal documents did show some effects. Based on these findings, Pruegger and Rogers (1994) argued that researchers should consider the appropriacy of using and interpreting assessment scales alone to measure a construct like intercultural competence: “It has been suggested that sensitive and complicated issues that may contain inconsistencies, contradictions, or ambiguities are not amenable to paper-and-pencil analysis” (p. 382). Similarly, the combined indirect and direct analyses in Fantini (2006) and Straffon (2003) revealed more layers and nuances in the growth of intercultural competence than those discernable by indirect assessments alone.

A recent blended approach to assessing intercultural competence is the suite of tools developed by the Intercultural Competence Assessment project (INCA). Based on research in the European context (Byram, Kühlmann, Müller-Jacquier and Budin), INCA’s battery includes three assessment types that combine direct and indirect ways of measuring ICC: questionnaires, scenarios, and role plays. Although published research using the INCA tools is not available, INCA’s assessment tools, available on-line, are a promising example of the blended approach to assessing ICC.

Each of the three components, questionnaires, scenarios, and role plays, consists of multiple subcomponents. The questionnaire component consists of two different questionnaires, a biographical part to be filled in by the user and an intercultural profile based on responses to 21 survey questions. Sections of the intercultural profile survey address three topics: encounters with people in one’s home country, encounters with people in other countries, and encounters with colleagues from different cultural backgrounds. Examinees may respond with one of three answers: not applicable, maybe, or fully applicable. Table 12 provides example questions for each topic.

Table 12
INCA Intercultural Profile Questions

Topic	Statement
home country	When other people don't feel comfortable in my presence, I notice it. When talking to other people I always watch their body language.
	When conversation partners use gestures and expressions that are unknown to me, I ignore them. When talking to other people I always watch their body language.
host country	When I observe people in other countries, I often guess how they are feeling. When the behaviour of people from other cultures alienates me, I avoid making contact with them.
	I always follow the rules of my own culture if I am not sure of how to behave properly when dealing with people from other cultures.
work colleagues	When there are colleagues in my work area who constitute an ethnic minority, I try to involve them in the majority group. When colleagues or superiors from abroad criticise my work, I consider changing my work habits accordingly.

The scenarios and role plays represent the direct assessment approach in the INCA suite. Scenarios are text- or video-based and require examinees to respond to multiple choice and open-ended questions. Each scenario covers one of the six dimensions of intercultural competence. In the example scenario given below, examinees are asked to read the text and respond to the prompt questions:

One disadvantage of your work placement is that the weekends are rather lonely. You normally spend time with friends and family and you miss this social side of your life. At work you become friendly with a colleague who can speak your language. This colleague says that he will telephone to invite you to the house during the weekend. The telephone does not ring. There could be a number of explanations for this.

1. On the Monday morning you decide to talk to a local colleague about this. How would you explain what had happened and how would you find out from the colleague what the explanation could be?
2. Later in the morning you meet the colleague who did not phone. He/she tells you he/she could not phone because 'My mother asked me to go shopping for her'.

Write a few lines as part of a letter/e-mail to your family telling them about this incident and explaining why it happened. (INCA Intercultural Encounters, n.d., p. 3)

During the role plays, examinees are evaluated on their behavior while completing tasks with other examinees and assessors. In the example role play provided on-line, two groups from different cultures with distinct customs are required to work together to complete a project while discovering and respecting the other culture’s customs. For example, in one of the cultures, the eldest member of the group must be asked for an opinion, and it is forbidden to touch objects that are colored black. More details on INCA’s questionnaires, scenarios and role plays are available on-line at (<http://www.incaproject.org/tools.htm>).

Given trends toward combined designs (Fantini, 2006; INCA, n.d.; Pruegger & Rogers, 1994; Straffon, 2003), educators should consider whether a combination of indirect and direct assessments will produce a more comprehensive picture of intercultural competence development in their foreign language and study abroad programs. Although direct approaches may be time- and labor-consuming, they may also reveal changes not identifiable in indirect assessments. Table 13 summarizes direct and blended approaches to assessing intercultural competence.

Table 13
Overview of Direct and Blended Approaches to Assessing Intercultural Competence

Assessment type	Advantages	Disadvantages	Literature
Performance	-authentic, real-world situations -avoids issue of self-reporting	-difficult to elicit/create authentic scenarios -requires expert raters and/or clear assessment guidelines	Byram (1997) Koester & Olebe (1988) Ruben (1976) Ruben & Kealey (1979)
Portfolio	-shows development over time -active role for participant	-not an objective presentation of self	Byram (1997) Jacobson et al. (1999) Pruegger & Rogers (1994)
Interview	-in-depth data	-time-consuming collection, transcription, and analysis	Byram (1997) Fantini (2006) Strafford (2003)

Availability and Cost of Assessments

Tables 14 and 15 summarize the format, availability, costs, and contact information for each of the major assessment tools reviewed in this report. Table 14 provides details for the commercially available tools, Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) and the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI), while Table 15 outlines the non-commercial assessment tools. The IDI can be purchased from the Intercultural Communication Institute, as listed on its webpage. According to the webpage, the IDI is available in 12 languages, including Malay, Chinese, English, German, Russian, and Spanish. The cost for implementing the IDI is \$10 per survey plus \$65 for the manual, \$250 for the software, and \$1200-\$1500 for a required three-day certification seminar (\$1200 for non-profit, education tuition, \$1500 regular tuition). The CCAI is provided by different companies that specialize in organization design, development, and assessment (e.g., *Creative Organizational Design, Vangent*, and *Jopie Van Rooyen and Partners*). On their websites, none of the organizations quote costs: the prices in Table 43 were provided by Creative Organizational Design upon request. Although both the IDI and the CCAI are comparable in cost for the individual instruments (~\$9-\$10/instrument), the IDI's required seminar for test administrators raises the cost of using the instrument. In contrast with the commercially available instruments, non-commercial tools developed in contexts of local practices are often available in published studies (Byram, 1997; Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992; Fantini, 2006; Jacobson et. al., 1999) or might be obtainable by requesting materials from the original researchers (Koester & Olebe, 1988; Olson & Kroeger, 2001).

Table 14
Overview of Availability and Cost of Commercial Indirect ICC Assessments

<u>Assessment</u>		Availability and cost	Contact
Type	Instrument		
survey	Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) Hammer & Bennett, 1993	Instrument: \$10 Manual: \$65 Software: \$250 Required certification: \$1200-\$15000	http://www.intercultural.org/idi/idi.html
survey	Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) Kelley & Meyers, 1995	Planning guide: \$6.55 Cultural passport: \$9.82 Facilitators guide: \$18.00 Manual: \$43.51 Multi-rater set: \$27.82 Instrument (1-49): \$10.65 Instrument (50-99): \$9.82 Instrument (100-249): \$8.64	Quotes from Creative Organizational Design: http://www.creativeorgdesign.com/ccai.htm Other providers: Vangent: http://www.interactive-media.com/Solutions/ Jopie Van Rooyen and Partners: http://www.jvrafrica.co.za/

Table 15
Overview of Availability and Accessibility of Non-Commercial ICC Assessment Tools

		<u>Assessment</u>	
Approach	Type	Instrument	Availability
		Behavioral Assessment Scale for Intercultural Competence (BASIC)	Original scales: Available in Ruben (1976)
direct	performance	Ruben, 1976; Ruben & Kealey, 1979; Koester & Olebe, 1988	No revised scales in Koester and Olebe (1988)
		Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI)	all items available in article
indirect	survey	Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992	
		Global Competency and Intercultural Sensitivity Index (ISI)	some items in article
indirect	survey	Olson & Kroeger, 2001	
		Assessment of Intercultural Competence (AIC)	complete instrument in appendix
mixed	survey and interview	Fantini, 2006	
		Intercultural Competence Assessment Project (INCA)	surveys, scenarios, and one role play available on-line
mixed	surveys, scenarios, and role plays	Byram et al., n.d.	
		Byram, 1997	no portfolio prompt included
direct	portfolio	Jacobson et al., 1999	portfolio prompt included
		Pruegger & Rogers, 1994	no writing prompt included
		Byram, 1997	no questions included
direct	interview	Fantini, 2006	complete questions included
		Straffon, 2003	some questions included

ASSESSING INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE OUTCOMES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Building from earlier work that focused primarily on the needs of special-interest groups, businesses, and public-sector professionals, large-scale academic organizations, such as the American Council on Education (ACE) and the Association of International Education Administrators, have recently acknowledged a broad-based need to internationalize¹ U.S. colleges and universities by producing interculturally competent graduates who can succeed in a global society. Accordingly, many institutions of higher learning now target a variety of intercultural outcomes among their prioritized educational goals, especially within general education courses, foreign language requirements and degrees, and study abroad programs. In concert with growing demands for accountability and improvement, there is also increasing pressure to evaluate the educational effectiveness of such internationalization efforts within curricula and programs (Deardorff, 2004), and with a specific focus on what students know and can do as a result of their college learning experiences. Student learning outcomes (SLO) assessment has been promulgated as the primary means for providing evidence of student learning to be used in strengthening programs (English, 1998). Of course, as noted above, assessing ICC learning outcomes depends considerably on the theoretical approach adopted, the constructs or factors assumed to comprise it, the particular learning opportunities that are provided within a given educational context, and the available means for assessment. In SLO assessment, adopting or developing assessment instruments that are feasible, credible, and useful to the program and educators in question adds another layer of complexity. Indeed, given the variety of approaches to assessing (and defining) ICC reviewed above, it is imperative for educational institutions to develop a very good idea of both (a) why they want to engage in assessment in the first place, and (b) what they want to assess under the cover term of intercultural competence (Norris, 2006).

In the following sections, we review a handful of examples wherein educators have developed assessments of international/intercultural learning outcomes in higher education, both

¹ A working definition of internationalization is “the process of integrating an international and intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service function of the institution” (Knight, 1994, p. 7).

within general education programs across campus and in specific foreign language and study abroad programs.

Intercultural/International Learning Outcomes Assessment in General Education

The American Council on Education (ACE) has taken a leadership role in identifying and disseminating practices and strategies for campus-wide internationalization of the college curriculum. Most recently, ACE conducted a three-year study (2004-2007; Project title: *Lessons Learned in Assessing International Learning*), involving six two- and four-year colleges across the United States, in order to “increase knowledge of international learning assessment at the six project sites, develop skills in implementing assessment and using assessment results, and enhance the knowledge and tools available to the higher education community for assessing international learning” (ACE, 2007, para. 4). The six colleges (Dickinson College, Kalamazoo College, Kapi‘olani Community College, Michigan State University, Palo Alto College, and Portland State University) collaboratively prioritized a set of international learning outcomes as outlined below:

Knowledge

- Understands his [*sic*] culture within a global and comparative context (that is, the student recognizes that his [*sic*] culture is one of many diverse cultures and that alternate perceptions and behaviors may be based in cultural differences).
- Demonstrates knowledge of global issues, processes, trends, and systems (that is, economic and political interdependency among nations, environmental-cultural interaction, global governance bodies, and nongovernmental organizations).
- Demonstrates knowledge of other cultures (including beliefs, values, perspectives, practices, and products).

Skills

- Uses knowledge, diverse cultural frames of reference, and alternate perspectives to think critically and solve problems.
- Communicates and connects with people in other language communities in a range of settings for a variety of purposes, developing skills in each of the four modalities: speaking (productive), listening (receptive), reading (receptive), and writing (productive).

- Uses foreign language skills and/or knowledge of other cultures to extend his [*sic*] access to information, experiences, and understanding.

Attitudes

- Appreciates the language, art, religion, philosophy, and material culture of different cultures.
- Accepts cultural differences and tolerates cultural ambiguity.
- Demonstrates an ongoing willingness to seek out international or intercultural opportunities.

(ACE, 2006a, para. 2-4; see more specific interpretation of the international learning outcomes at Kapi'olani Community College in Appendix A)

The next step in this project involved generating performance indicators for each outcome and devising rubrics to assess them. After reviewing a variety of assessment methodological alternatives (see ACE, 2006b for options), an electronic portfolio was selected as the most workable assessment method to collect evidence of learning. Some of the suggested artifacts to be collected for the e-portfolio include term papers, essays, journal entries, study abroad application and reflection essays, photographs or other artwork with a narrative explanation, videos of interview or student performances, audio that demonstrates foreign language competency, etc. (The ACE/FIPSE Project Steering Committee, n.d.a, p. 3-4). In addition to the e-portfolio assessment, each institution also had the option to utilize a quantitative instrument, such as the instruments outlined in earlier sections of this paper.

Kapi'olani Community College (KCC), for example, implemented e-portfolio as a strategy to improve student learning, to create a culture of evidence by assessing SLOs, and for students to showcase their work for career advancement (Kirkpatrick, 2005; see Kapi'olani Information Technology Emphasis, 2005 for their e-portfolio implementation efforts). Along with the e-portfolio assessment, KCC chose to use a quantitative tool called the Beliefs, Events, and Values Inventory (BEVI). BEVI is an instrument that “identif[ies] and predict[s] a variety of developmental, affective, and attributional processes and outcomes that are integral to” the acquisition and maintenance of beliefs, values, and worldviews (Shealy, 2004, p. 1075). KCC has been administering BEVI as pre- and post- test to evaluate students’ attitudinal changes in various international and global education programs.

Once an e-portfolio was chosen as the appropriate instrument, the six institutions, facilitated by the ACE, developed rubrics for each global learning outcome (knowledge, skill, and attitude). The global learning outcomes were further clarified in detail to be assessable. For example, the

knowledge outcome, “*Demonstrates knowledge of global issues, processes, trends and systems*” (ACE, 2006a), was broken into four indicators:

1. Basic concepts (e.g., political events, major world organizations, major trends such as globalization, the role of non-governmental organizations.)
2. Principles, theories, and models that underlie global issues, processes, trends and systems.
3. Subject-specific techniques and methods used to investigate global issues, processes, trends, and systems.
4. Basic world geographical knowledge (e.g., countries, borders, capitals, populations, linguistic groups, economic, geographic, political/economics groupings).

(ACE/FIPSE Project Steering Committee, n.d.b, Knowledge Rubric)

The rating scale for assessing *knowledge outcomes* ranged from inadequate to extensive, with the following criteria:

- 1 = Inadequate: Descriptions are inaccurate or poorly developed
- 2 = Minimal: Describes basic points accurately
- 3 = Moderate: Compares and contrasts perspectives, uses examples to illustrate
- 4 = Extensive: Content knowledge is extensive, analyses are sophisticated.

(ACE/FIPSE Project Steering Committee, n.d.a, p. 5-6)

These outcomes and rating scales were then combined into assessment rubrics, as exemplified in Table 16.

Table 16
Example Rubric for Knowledge Outcomes

I. Demonstrates knowledge of global issues, processes, trends and systems	1 Inadequate	2 Minimal	3 Moderate	4 Extensive
1. Basic concepts (e.g., political events, major world organizations, major trends such as globalization, the role of non-governmental organizations.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Principles, theories, and models that underlie global issues, processes, trends and systems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Subject-specific techniques and methods used to investigate global issues, processes, trends, and systems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Basic world geographical knowledge (e.g., countries, borders, capitals, populations, linguistic groups, economic, geographic, political/economics groupings).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In addition to your ratings, please provide additional information regarding the student's performance in this area. Information regarding why you assigned the ratings you did—as well as specific examples from the portfolio—would be particularly useful.				

As for the *skills outcomes*, the rubric was aligned with the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages’s (ACTFL, 1999) Proficiency Guidelines for Speaking. The raters were asked to align the skills rubric with ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines using the following criteria:

<u>ACTFL Rating</u>	<u>Skills Rubric Rating</u>
“Novice Low”, “Novice Mid”, “Novice High”	→ 1 “Inadequate Proficiency”.
“Intermediate Low”, “Intermediate Mid”, “Intermediate High”	→ 2 “Minimal Proficiency”.
“Advanced Low”, “Advanced Mid”, “Advanced High”	→ 3 “Moderate Proficiency”.
“Superior Low”, “Superior Mid”, and “Superior High”	→ 4 “Extensive Proficiency”.

(ACE/FIPSE Project Steering Committee, n.d.a, p. 7)

Lastly, the raters evaluated the degree (inadequate, minimal, moderate, extensive) of learners’ “awareness of, openness toward, or engagement with” each of the attitudinal indicators, such as:

1. ... his or her experiences with individuals from different cultures.
2. ... the desire to participate in international or intercultural experiences in the future.
3. ... the ways in which his or her thinking has changed as a result of exposure to different cultures.

4. ... feelings or emotions that he or she experienced as a result of an international and/or intercultural learning experience(s).
5. ... the feelings or emotions of others as a result of this international and/or intercultural experience.

(ACE/FIPSE Project Steering Committee, n.d.b, Attitude Rubric)

After collecting e-portfolio data, all six institutions are expected to utilize the findings to improve student's global learning and to strategize the continuation of global learning outcomes assessment practices (ACE/FIPSE Project Steering Committee, n.d.a, p. 3).

The ACE also has been guiding other institutions in their own articulation and development of models for assessing learning outcomes. Drafts of international and intercultural learning outcomes by eight institutions can be found on the ACE website (see ACE, 2005 for further information). Cleveland State University, for example, surveyed department chairs, faculty, and students to identify and map international and cross-cultural course offerings under each department. They then produced a draft of the SLOs for their undergraduate general education program as follows:

- (a) Demonstrate critical thinking abilities and skills in geography, other cultures, international relations, and global issues.
- (b) Demonstrate open-minded attitudes and an absence of ethnocentrism (including an awareness of racial, ethnic, and international issues).
- (c) Understand the importance of cultural diversity in a global community.
- (d) Demonstrate willingness to learn and practice critical thinking skills that will develop the competencies required to live in a global community.

(ACE, 2005, Cleveland State University, Draft Learning Outcomes, para. 1)

These efforts also led to a reformulation of the undergraduate general education curriculum (e.g., clustering of courses into themes, reconceptualizing requirements related to intercultural learning).

Other colleges and universities are engaged in similar activities, as revealed by institutional review reports or plans posted to their web pages. For example, the four institutions listed in Table 17 reflect some of the different ways that educators go about gathering evidence for their stated intercultural SLOs, as summarized here:

- *California State University, Los Angeles*: Use internally developed writing proficiency examinations and rubrics based on diversity SLOs in the general education program.

- *Johnson County Community College*: Student work embedded within the curriculum is collected and assessed using holistic grading. They recommend essays and report assignments for assessing intercultural learning.

- *San Diego Community College District*: Course grades are used as learning assessment criteria for SLOs of intercultural competencies.

- *Scottsdale Community College*: The Intercultural Development Inventory has driven their SLOs assessment activities.

Note that Scottsdale Community College provides a very detailed report of their development of an intercultural awareness assessment plan, implementation, findings, and actions taken in each academic year.

Table 17
Learning Outcomes on Intercultural Competence for College General Education

Institution	Outcomes related to intercultural competence	Assessment
California State University, Los Angeles	<p>Goal: Students understand and appreciate diversity, and develop a greater awareness of ethical and social concerns, and respect for others.</p> <p>1. Students can analyze similarities and differences among individuals and groups, including those based upon race, ethnicity, class, gender, and social concerns.</p> <p>2. Students develop greater sensitivity to perspectives and cultures other than their own.</p> <p>3. Students develop skill in recognizing, analyzing, and resolving ethical and social problems.</p>	<p>- <i>Instrument:</i> Writing Proficiency Exam (WPE) and survey</p> <p>- <i>Prompts:</i> The WPE Director, the Writing Center Director, the GE Assessment Coordinator, and selected faculty teaching diversity courses will create diversity assessment prompts.</p> <p>- Conduct assessment every 2 years.</p> <p>- <i>Scoring:</i> Holistic scoring of diversity</p> <p>http://www.calstatela.edu/academic/aa/ugs/geassess/default.htm</p>
Johnson County Community College	<p>Demonstrate knowledge of the major cultural issues of a person's own culture as well as other cultures.</p>	<p>- <i>Instrument:</i> Assignment (e.g., essay, research paper, report, journal, portfolio) allowing students to demonstrate one or more of the following: (a) fundamental knowledge of world geography; (b) knowledge of the major cultural issues of one's own and other cultures; (c) knowledge of major historical events affecting one's own and other cultures; (d) familiarity with contemporary global issues and an understanding of major ethical concerns.</p> <p>- <i>Rubric:</i> Holistic grading for the diversity and ethics outcomes:</p> <p>4 = Compares and contrasts cultural issues affecting one's culture and other cultures</p> <p>3 = Analyzes major cultural issues</p> <p>2 = Identifies major cultural issues in other cultures</p> <p>1 = Identifies major cultural issues from one's culture.</p> <p>- <i>Criteria:</i> 60% of the students will score 2 or higher on each outcome</p> <p>http://cai.cc.ca.us/Resources/Johnson%20CCC%20Assessment%20of%20GE%20Outcomes.doc see also http://www.jccc.net/home/depts/S00015/site/plan/culture</p>
San Diego Community College District	<p>1. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the common human experience and knowledge of intercultural issues and viewpoints.</p> <p>2. Students will be able to recognize individual and cultural differences and demonstrate knowledge for these differences.</p> <p>3. Students will demonstrate good listening and information processing skills.</p>	<p>- <i>Sample instrument:</i> Course grade</p> <p>- <i>Criteria:</i> Completion of an intercultural communications course (students learn to work in small, diverse teams to complete projects and activities that focus on intercultural communication issues) with a grade of C or better.</p> <p>http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=IntCurrent&Template=/CM/HTMLDisplay.cfm&ContentID=1583#sandiego</p>
Scottsdale Community College	<p>30 different student outcomes related to multicultural education (see Appendix A in CAAT_Annual_Report 2005-2006 under the webpage)</p>	<p>- <i>Instrument:</i> The Intercultural Development Inventory</p> <p>- <i>Design:</i> Pre (less than 16 credits) and post (30 or 45 credits and over) cross-sectional assessment</p> <p>- <i>Criteria:</i> Level 4 as college-level interculturally competent learner.</p> <p>http://www.scottsdalecc.edu/outcomes_assessment/cultural_awareness/</p>

Intercultural Learning Outcomes Assessment: College Foreign Language Programs

Intercultural competence has also been argued to play a key role in the specific area of tertiary foreign language curriculum; indeed, language and culture are often treated as inseparable constructs (e.g., Byrnes, 2002; Crawford-Lange & Lange, 1984; Kramsch, 1993; among others). Research regarding intercultural outcomes associated with foreign languages study or study abroad has been approached from the perspective of pragmatic competence and language socialization (e.g., Agar, 1994; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986), as well as learner motivation (Gardner & Lambert, 1972). However, there are few comprehensive treatments on the assessment of ICC outcomes in tertiary foreign language programs. Schulz (2007) has highlighted a basic problem of intercultural assessment in the field of second language learning and teaching, reflecting key tensions that we have raised in preceding sections of this report:

Despite a vast body of literature devoted to the teaching of culture, there is, however, no agreement on how culture can or should be defined operationally in the context of FL learning in terms of concrete instructional objectives, and there is still less consensus on whether or how it should be formally assessed. Indeed, despite all the claims about the importance of cultural content and culture learning in the language classroom, the profession has no tradition of assessing cultural understanding in the context of language instruction, either at the pre-collegiate or collegiate level. (p. 10)

Nevertheless, a few educators have published recent accounts of ICC outcomes assessment. For example, Baumann and Shelley (2006) reported on advanced German learners' growth of intercultural competence via a distance learning program at the Open University, in the United Kingdom. Within eight SLOs assessed, two categories were related to intercultural competence: (a) knowledge of cultures, communities, and societies; and (b) intercultural awareness and understanding. A questionnaire was administered at the end of the course to obtain information on students' language learning background, perception of the SLOs, intercultural knowledge and attitudes, and self-assessment of learners' achievements. The course assessment indicated high performance overall, and the questionnaire results showed positive attitudinal change towards German people, a varied but well-retained understanding of German culture, and high self-ratings on the achievement of SLOs.

In a second example, Mathews and Hansen (2004) reported an ongoing formative evaluation study of the department of Foreign Language and Literatures at Weber State University in Utah.

The purposes of the evaluation were to develop a departmental mission statement, goals, and SLOs in reference to the National Standards (National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project, 1996; see Appendix B for details), and to examine whether the program is helping students achieve the targeted outcomes. Among five SLOs, two were mapped with the “Culture” goal of the National Standards:

Outcome 4: Read and understand popular literary texts in the language; analyze literary works and discern moral, cultural, and aesthetic values.

Outcome 5: Demonstrate an awareness of the similarities and differences among the cultures of the language being studied as they compare to other cultures.

(Mathews & Hansen, 2004, p. 633)

Students submitted a senior portfolio assessment (writing samples) as evidence for their achievement of SLOs. The assessment rubric for *Outcome 4* reflected skills from language courses and concentrated on literary knowledge and analysis skills, whereas the assessment criteria for *Outcome 5* simply reflected Standard 2 (Cultures: Gain knowledge and understanding of other cultures) and Standard 4 (Comparisons: Develop insight into the nature of language and culture). From their results, Mathews and Hansen felt that *Outcome 5* was the weakest addressed in the curriculum, since students were able to major in a foreign language without actually taking ‘culture’ courses. They also concluded that an internally devised assessment criterion was needed above and beyond the Standards, to reflect the local educational values.

Most recently, Schulz (2007) proposed five fundamental objectives for cross-cultural awareness and understanding for four-year high school or four-semester college foreign language programs, as follows:

I. Students develop and demonstrate an awareness that geographic, historical, economic, social/religious as well as political factors can have an impact on cultural perspectives, products and practices, including language use and styles of communication.

II. Students develop and demonstrate awareness that situational variables (e.g., context and role expectations, including power differentials, and social variables such as age, gender, social class, religion, ethnicity and place of residence shape communicative interaction (verbal, non-verbal, and paralinguistic) and behavior in important ways.

III. Students recognize stereotypes or generalizations about the home and target cultures and evaluate them in terms of the amount of substantiating evidence.

IV. Students develop and demonstrate an awareness that each language and culture has culture-conditioned images and culture-specific connotations of some words, phrases, proverbs, idiomatic formulations, gestures etc.

V. Students develop and demonstrate an awareness of some types of causes (linguistic and non-linguistic) for cultural misunderstanding between members of different cultures. (Schulz, 2007, p. 17)

As development of cultural awareness and understanding is an iterative process, she recommended the use of portfolio assessment for tracking development, and she provided example learning tasks for each of the five fundamental objectives. For example, in order to achieve the first objective, learners will: (a) search for information on geography, history, economics, religion, politics, education, etc. in German-speaking countries to compare with that of the U.S.; (b) hypothesize how those differences and similarities could affect the two cultures; and (c) examine the reasons behind the popularity (or non-popularity) of some cultural products in the U.S. and the German-speaking countries from contextual factors (i.e., geographic, historic, etc.) (Schulz, 2007).

Beyond such published reports of ICC assessment practices, other college foreign language programs have developed and disseminated their own SLOs and assessments via publicly accessible web sites. Table 18 summarizes intercultural SLOs and assessment practices from five college foreign language programs at distinct institutions across the United States. In the same vein as Schulz (2007), several programs have been implementing senior portfolio assessment as one way to track students' development of their cultural awareness, sensitivity, and understanding. Note also that, in contrast with general education programs, none of these foreign language programs has adopted commercially available instruments for assessing ICC. Instead, course-embedded assessments (e.g., essays, mid-terms and finals, projects, portfolios) and program-specific questionnaires, self-assessments, and interviews seem to be more commonly used for assessing ICC outcomes in college foreign language programs in the United States.

Table 18
Learning Outcomes on Intercultural Competence for College Foreign Language Education

College	Outcomes related to intercultural competence	Assessment
Brigham Young University, Asia and Near Eastern Languages Dept., Japanese Major	1. Enact the principles expressed in the Aims of a BYU education through the acquisition of language and cultural fluency, thereby enabling the interpretation and presentation of Japanese language and culture to others in a manner that will promote mutual understanding and respect for peoples of the world. 2. Analyze and discuss salient aspects of Japanese thought and their effect on language, behavioral patterns, and interpersonal relationships. 3. Analyze and discuss Japanese literary genres, works, and authors in their social, historical, and religious contexts. 5. Converse and act in Japanese in linguistically, socially, and culturally appropriate ways on a broad variety of topics in a wide range of settings.	- Instruments: Critical analysis papers (Outcomes 1,2,3), essays in Japanese (Outcomes 1,2,3), presentations in spoken Japanese (Outcomes 1,2,3), capstone project (Outcomes 1,2,3,5), bypass test (Outcome 5), Japanese Language Proficiency test (Outcome 5), OPI examination (Outcome 5), pre/post exam scores for international study programs (Outcome 5), FLATS test for 101-202 (Outcome 5) , exit survey (Outcomes 1), exit interview (Outcomes 1), alumni tracking survey (Outcomes 1). https://learningoutcomes.byu.edu/wiki/index.php/Japanese_BA
Saint Louis University, (3 sem. language requirement)	Goal 4. The learner will display an awareness of, a sensitivity to, and an appreciation for cultural diversity. Goal 5. The learner will demonstrate an understanding of the knowledge of language and culture through comparison of Spanish and English.	- <i>Instruments:</i> Student satisfaction survey (most important goals, how program are meeting the goals), and learner portfolio (video). - Rubric for information/cultural appropriateness 1. Able to satisfy most routine travel and survival needs and some limited social demands. 2. Can ask and answer questions on very familiar topics and in areas of immediate need. 3. Can ask and answer questions and carry oral conversation on topics beyond basic survival needs or involving the exchange of basic personal information. - Scale: 0 = lack of evidence of the learner ability; 1= learner ability below minimum expectations; 2 = learner ability at the level; 3 = learner ability beyond minimum expectations. See Houston (2005)
University of Alaska, Fairbanks, FL and Literature	Students will demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the literature, history, and culture of the target language, as appropriate to an undergraduate degree.	- <i>Instrument:</i> A capstone course (final year of study): Final written projects that require students to draw their understanding and application of the literature, culture and history of the area. http://www.uaf.edu/provost/outcomes/PlansHtmlFormat/flba.htm

Table 18 (continued)

College	Outcomes related to intercultural competence	Assessment
University of Arizona, French & Italian	1. Ability to process information and knowledge that enrich a student’s values, attitudes and perspectives. 2. Knowledge of modern cultures and literatures in their contexts.	- <i>Instrument:</i> Major portfolio for graduating seniors in the last semester before graduation. The major portfolio is reflective of the student’s progress over time and illustrative of his/her best work as a senior. http://www.oir.uiuc.edu/assessment/plans/french.html
University of Arizona, German studies	1. Identify and discuss (a) some of the influences of German-speaking cultures on other cultures around the world; (b) problematic aspects of German history in terms of their origins, development, and consequences; (c) some major social and political issues in the German-speaking world today; (d) stereotypes to demonstrate their awareness that cultural behavior differs according to age, gender, ethnicity, socio-economic background, religion, and region; (e) the impact of major historical, social, and political events and developments with dates. 2. Identify the major German-speaking countries, their states, capitals, and other major cities. 3. Explain how specific historical and cultural contexts shape particular perceptions, practices, and products of individuals, for example literary texts. 4. Identify, describe and discuss key historical, cultural, and literary milestones in the development of German speaking countries, including minority voices and issues. 5. Enjoy critical engagement with the target culture. 6. Question how the larger context shapes individual expression both in the present and the past. 7. Accept challenges to explore ideas and ways of knowing that are outside of their own paradigm of individual and cultural understanding. 8. Contribute to a culturally diverse global community. 9. Seeks interaction with people of another culture.	- <i>Instruments:</i> 1. Course-specific tests and quizzes (achievement tests: comprehensive tests, topic and factually focused exams, tests of key terms and vocabulary). 2. GPA in German classes (for all majors and minors, every semester) 3. The “Capstone” course and its grade (Every Spring Semester, requirement for all graduating seniors) 4. Indirect qualitative measures Exit interviews (student reflections and self-assessment), student and alumni surveys, input from advisory committees, and/or focus groups.(Graduating seniors) http://outcomes.web.arizona.edu/data.php?uid=388

CONCLUSION

In sum, it is apparent that notions of intercultural communication and associated competences are of increasing importance, not only as outcomes of foreign language and study abroad programs, but also as fundamental targets of adult and higher education. Faculty, programs, institutions, and society at large are coming to value the capacity of individuals to think and act beyond their particular cultural circumstances. Assessment should play a key role in helping educators to understand and improve students' ICC capacities, providing an empirical basis for tracking development, motivating learning, examining outcomes, and indicating areas for instructional improvement. However, it is also apparent that there is large variability in the available practices that have been recommended and implemented for assessing ICC, and these assessment forms depend considerably on the particular models of ICC adopted. While commercial and non-commercial assessments are readily available, they clearly differ (sometimes dramatically) in terms of what gets assessed and what interpretations may be made on their basis; accordingly, their use in any given program will also have differential impact on the teaching and learning that occurs. For any individual foreign language program, then, a key first step in deciding on how best to assess ICC will be to determine: (a) the specific purposes or uses to which the assessment will be put; and (b) the particular local conceptualization of ICC that characterizes what is to be learned and/or how learners are intended to change. With these foundational decisions achieved, FL programs and faculty will be in a much better position to select among the array of possibilities reviewed in this report, seeking a fitting alignment between assessment method, the particular version of ICC learning in question, and the ways in which assessment can be put to use in making sure that ICC learning really happens.

REFERENCES

- ACE (2005, April). *Statements of international learning outcomes*. Retrieved July 30, 2007, from <http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Search&template=/CM/HTMLDisplay.cfm&ContentID=9425>
- ACE (2006a, December). *International learning goals*. Retrieved July 24, 2007, from <http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=goodPractice&Template=/CM/HTMLDisplay.cfm&ContentID=2769>
- ACE (2006b, December). *Summary of assessment instruments*. Retrieved July 24, 2007, from <http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=goodPractice&Template=/CM/HTMLDisplay.cfm&ContentID=2771>
- ACE (2007, June). *Lessons learned in assessing international learning*. Retrieved July 22, 2007, from <http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=goodPractice&Template=/CM/HTMLDisplay.cfm&ContentID=9387>
- ACE/FIPSE Project Steering Committee (n.d.a). *Handbook for eportfolio raters: Lessons learned in assessing international learning*. Unpublished manuscript.
- ACE/FIPSE Project Steering Committee (n.d.b). *Rater Instructions*. Unpublished manuscript.
- ACTFL (n.d.). *National standards for foreign language education*. Retrieved September 1, 2007, from <http://www.actfl.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3392>
- Agar, M. (1994). *Language shock: Understanding the culture of conversation*. New York: William Morrow.
- Altshuler, L., Sussman, N. M., & Kachur, E. (2003). Assessing changes in intercultural sensitivity among physician trainees using the intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27, 387-401.
- Arasaratnam, L. A. (2006). Further testing of a new model of intercultural communication competence. *Communication Research Reports*, 23(2), 93-100.
- Arasaratnam, L. A., & Doerfel, M. L. (2005). Intercultural communication competence: Identifying key components from multicultural perspectives. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29, 137-163.
- Baumann, U., & Shelley, M. (2006). Distance learners of German and intercultural competence, *Open Learning*, 21(3), 191-204.

- Bennett, J. M. (1993). Toward ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 21-71). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural.
- Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Brislin, R. (1992). The measurement of intercultural sensitivity using the concepts of individualism and collectivism. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 16, 413-436.
- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters.
- Byrnes, H. (2002). Language and culture: Shall ever the twain meet in foreign language departments? *ADFL Bulletin*, 33(2), 25-32.
- Crawford-Lange, L. M. & Lange, D. L. (1984). Doing the unthinkable in the second language classroom. A process for integration of language and culture. In T.V. Higgs (Ed.) *Proficiency: The organizing principle* (pp. 139 – 177). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.
- Davis, S. L., & Finney, S. J. (2006). A factor analytic study of the cross-cultural adaptability inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66, 318 - 330.
- Deardorff, D. K. (2004). *The identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization at institutions of higher education in the United States*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC.
- Engle, L., & Engle, J. (2004). Assessing language acquisition and intercultural sensitivity development in relation to study abroad program design. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 253–276.
- English, S. L. (1998). Internationalization through the lens of evaluation. In J. A. Mestenhauser & B. J. Ellingboe (Eds.), *Reforming the higher education curriculum* (pp. 179-197). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx.
- Fantini, A. E. (2000). A central concern: Developing intercultural competence. *SIT Occasional Papers Series, 1*. Retrieved May 18, 2007, from <http://www.sit.edu/publications/docs/competence.pdf>
- Fantini, A. E. (2006). Exploring and assessing intercultural competence. Retrieved May 1, 2007, from http://www.sit.edu/publications/docs/feil_research_report.pdf
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. (1972). *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.

- Goldstein, D. L., & Smith, D. H. (1999). The analysis of the effects of experiential training on sojourners' cross-cultural adaptability. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 23(1), 157-173.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1993). Toward a theory of effective interpersonal and intergroup communication: An anxiety/uncertainty management (AUM) perspective. In R. L. Wiseman, and J. Koester (Eds.), *Intercultural communication theory* (pp. 33-71). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1998). Applying the anxiety/uncertainty management (AUM) theory to intercultural adjustment training. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 22(2), 227-250.
- Hammer, M. R., Bennett, M. J., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27, 421-443.
- Houston, T. (2005). Outcomes assessment for beginning and intermediate Spanish: One program's process and results. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(3), 366-376.
- Intercultural Competence Assessment Project (INCA). (n.d.). Intercultural competence assessment. Retrieved July 23, 2007, from <http://www.incaproject.org/index.htm>
- Jacobson, W., Schleicher, D., & Maureen, B. (1999). Portfolio assessment of intercultural competence. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 23(3), 467-492.
- Kapi'olani Information Technology Emphasis (2005). *The e-portfolio initiative: A work in progress*. Retrieved August 23, 2007, from <http://www2.hawaii.edu/%7Ekirkpatr/kite/kiteloa/index.htm>
- Kim, Y. K. (1993). Cross-cultural adaptation: An integrative theory. In R. L. Wiseman, and J. Koester (Eds.), *Intercultural communication theory* (pp. 170-193). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kirkpatrick, J. (2005). National coalition for electronic portfolio learning. Retrieved August 22, 2007, <http://www2.hawaii.edu/%7Ekirkpatr/kite/eportcop.htm>
- Kitsantas, A., & Meyers, J. (2001, March). *Studying abroad: Does it enhance college student cross-cultural awareness?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the San Diego State University and the U.S. Department of Education Centers for International Business Education and Research, San Diego, CA.

- Knight, J. (1994). Internationalization: Elements and checkpoints. *Research Monograph, 7*. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- Koester, J., & Olebe, M. (1988). The behavioral assessment scale for intercultural communication effectiveness. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 12*, 233-246.
- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Majumdar, B., Keystone, J. S., & Cuttress, L. A. (1999). Cultural sensitivity training among foreign medical students. *Medical Education, 33*, 177-184.
- Mathews, T. J., & Hansen, C. M. (2004). Ongoing assessment of a university foreign language program. *Foreign Language Annals, 37*, 630–640.
- National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project. (1996). *Standards for foreign language learning: Preparing for the 21st Century*. Lawrence, KS: Allen.
- Norris, J. M. (2006). The why (and how) of student learning outcomes assessment in college FL education. *Modern Language Journal, 90*(4), 590-597.
- Olson, C. L., & Kroeger, K. R. (2001). Global competency and intercultural sensitivity. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 5*(2), 116-137.
- Paige, R. M., Jacobs-Cassuto, M., Yershova, Y. A., & DeJaeghere, J. (2003). Assessing intercultural sensitivity: An empirical analysis of the Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27*, 467–486.
- Pruegger, V. J., & Rogers, T. B. (1994). Cross-cultural sensitivity training: Methods and assessments. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 18*(3), 369-387.
- Richards, L., & Franco, R. (2006). Engagement and global citizenship: Local roots and global reach. In B. Holland & J. Meeropol (Eds.), *A More Perfect Vision: The Future of Campus Engagement*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact. Retrieved August 21, 2007, from http://www.compact.org/20th/read/engagement_and_global_citizenship
- Risager, K. (2007). *Language and culture pedagogy: From a national to a transnational paradigm*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Ruben, B. D. (1976). Assessing communication competency for intercultural adaptation. *Group and Organization Studies, 1*, 334-354.
- Ruben, B. D. (1989). The study of cross-cultural competence: Traditions and contemporary issues. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 13*, 229-240.

- Ruben, B. D., & Kealey, D. (1979). Behavioral assessment of communication competency and the prediction of cross-cultural adaptation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 3, 15-48.
- Sampson, D. L., & Smith, H. P. (1957). A scale to measure world-minded attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 45, 99-106.
- Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (Eds.) (1986). *Language socialization across cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Schulz, R. A. (2007). The challenge of assessing cultural understanding in the context of foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40(1), 9-26.
- Shealy, C. N. (2004). A model and method for “making” a combined-integrated psychologist: Equilintegration (EI) theory and the beliefs, events, and values inventory (BEVI). *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 60(10), 1065–1090.
- Stephen, W. G., & Stephen, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41, 157-176.
- Straffon, D. A. (2003). Assessing the intercultural sensitivity of high school students attending an international school. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27, 487–501.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1993). Communicative resourcefulness: An identity negotiation perspective. In R. L. Wiseman, and J. Koester (Eds.), *Intercultural communication theory* (pp. 72-111). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- 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(4), 356-371.
- Zielinski, B. A. Z. (2007). *Study abroad length of program influence on cross-cultural adaptability*. Unpublished master’s thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA.

APPENDIX A

Selected Intercultural and International Learning Outcomes at Kapiolani Community College

(Richards & Franco, 2006, para. 5)

Knowledge Outcomes

1. Demonstrates knowledge of global issues, processes, trends and systems
 - i. Basic concepts (e.g., political events, major world organizations, major trends such as globalization, the role of non-governmental organizations.)
2. Demonstrates knowledge of other cultures
 - i. Cultural practices (e.g., religious, secular, political, governmental, educational, family structures.)
3. Understands his/her culture in a global and comparative context
 - i. Self in cultural context (e.g., aware of one's own origins, history, ethnic identity, communities, etc.).
 - ii. The history of his or her own culture.
 - iii. The history of his or her own culture in relation to the history of other cultures.
 - iv. Understands his/her historical space and place in a global and comparative context (e.g., geography, migration, diasporas, exploration, regional identity, etc.).

Skill Outcomes

1. Uses knowledge, diverse cultural frames of reference, and alternate perspectives to think critically and solve problems.
 - i. Recognizing the importance and validity of others' perspectives
 - ii. Providing culturally-grounded evidence to make points (e.g., recognizes the cultural underpinning of evidence, opinion, and arguments).
 - iii. Identifying solutions to social issues and/or global challenges that take cultural considerations into account.
2. Uses foreign language skills and/or knowledge of other cultures to extend his/her access to information, experiences, and understanding.
 - i. Using foreign language skills to locate and use resources (e.g., foreign language texts) in various disciplines.
 - ii. Using foreign language and cultural knowledge gathered from a fluent/native speaker.
 - iii. Using foreign language skills and knowledge of other cultures in experiential learning (e.g., service-learning, internships, study abroad).

Attitude Outcomes

1. Demonstrates a willingness to seek out international or intercultural opportunities.
 - i. his or her experiences with individuals from different cultures.

- ii. the desire to participate in international or intercultural experiences in the future.
 - iii. the ways in which his or her thinking has changed as a result of exposure to different cultures.
 - iv. feelings or emotions that he or she experienced as a result of an international and/or intercultural learning experience(s).
2. Appreciates different cultures (e.g., language, art, music, religion, political structures, philosophy, and material culture).
 - i. the language(s) and/or literature(s) of the culture(s).
 - ii. the arts and performing arts of the culture(s).
 - iii. the systems or structures (e.g., political, social, economic, etc.) of the culture(s).
3. Accepts cultural differences and tolerates cultural ambiguity.
 - i. the similarities and/or differences among cultures.
 - ii. the nuance and complexity evident among various cultural perspectives.
 - iii. the potential legitimacy of both majority culture and minority culture beliefs and values.
 - iv. the importance of providing comprehensive and balanced support for his or her conclusions regarding cultural differences and similarities.
 - v. the importance of interpreting cultural events and experiences "through the eyes of" individuals from different cultures.
 - vi. cultural experiences that are different from what could be experienced in one's "home" culture.
 - vii. the process of reflecting upon his or her own thoughts and feelings toward different cultures.
 - viii. the specific ways in which he or she has been changed and/or transformed as a result of cross-cultural experiences.
 - ix. his or her own biases, prejudices, or stereotypes in relation to a different culture.

APPENDIX B

Standards for Foreign Language Learning

(American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, n.d., para. 4)

COMMUNICATION

Communicate in Languages Other Than English

- **Standard 1.1:** Students engage in conversations, provide and obtain information, express feelings and emotions, and exchange opinions
- **Standard 1.2:** Students understand and interpret written and spoken language on a variety of topics
- **Standard 1.3:** Students present information, concepts, and ideas to an audience of listeners or readers on a variety of topics.

CULTURES

Gain Knowledge and Understanding of Other Cultures

- **Standard 2.1:** Students demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between the practices and perspectives of the culture studied
- **Standard 2.2:** Students demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between the products and perspectives of the culture studied

CONNECTIONS

Connect with Other Disciplines and Acquire Information

- **Standard 3.1:** Students reinforce and further their knowledge of other disciplines through the foreign language
- **Standard 3.2:** Students acquire information and recognize the distinctive viewpoints that are only available through the foreign language and its cultures

COMPARISONS

Develop Insight into the Nature of Language and Culture

- **Standard 4.1:** Students demonstrate understanding of the nature of language through comparisons of the language studied and their own
- **Standard 4.2:** Students demonstrate understanding of the concept of culture through comparisons of the cultures studied and their own.

COMMUNITIES

Participate in Multilingual Communities at Home & Around the World

- **Standard 5.1:** Students use the language both within and beyond the school setting
- **Standard 5.2:** Students show evidence of becoming life-long learners by using the language for personal enjoyment and enrichment.