

Department of
Education



UNIVERSITY OF
BATH

Working Papers Series
International and Global Issues for Research

*Globally-minded students:
Defining, measuring and developing intercultural sensitivity*

Simon Taylor
Germany

No. 2015/3 June 2015

The working papers series aims to recognise the excellent work produced by the large community of graduate students and distinguished associates of the Department of Education at the University of Bath. The series has been designed to create opportunities to disseminate high quality research through our Departmental webpages, in a timely manner. The working papers series aims, in particular, to reflect and contribute to the global standing of the Department of Education as a leader of research in the areas of activity of its research clusters:

Internationalisation and globalisation of education

Educational leadership, management and governance

Language and educational practices

Learning, pedagogy and diversity

Correspondence and discussion relating to papers in this series are welcomed via the EducationResearch@Bath website, available at <http://bathedresearch.weborium.net>

Abstract

In this paper, it is argued that intercultural sensitivity is a critical part of being globally-minded and therefore needs to be understood, measured and developed in international schools.

A case is made for the validity of culture as a concept; a prerequisite for discussion of intercultural awareness, intercultural sensitivity and intercultural competence. Intercultural sensitivity is then advanced as central to the notion of globalmindedness. In the context of international schools, perspectives on globally-mindedness are considered and it is proposed that, irrespective of which view is taken, intercultural sensitivity is a core principle.

It is argued that, if a school is to help students become globally-minded, an interculturally sensitive staff must drive the process. Various models for assessing intercultural sensitivity are reviewed and one, the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), is considered in more detail. Its use in schools, as a starting point in the development of intercultural sensitivity among staff, is examined. Other means by which intercultural sensitivity can be heightened are also evaluated.

The paper concludes with a brief look at culture shock and a case to limit its role in discussion of intercultural sensitivity.

Introduction

Munich International School (MIS) enrolls 1200 students (4-18yrs) from 50 countries. Its primary role is to serve the needs of the transient international community but it also attracts local students wishing for an international education in English.

With the arrival of a new head, the guiding statements of the school were reassessed. This led to the establishment of a new mission in 2011 - *Excellence in Education for globally-minded students*. The school now seeks to meet its mission.

In this paper, I will argue that intercultural sensitivity is a critical part of being globally-minded and therefore needs to be understood, measured and developed at MIS.

I will begin with a study of culture, identity and group interaction. After examining the validity of culture as a concept, I will examine the associated ideas of intercultural awareness, intercultural sensitivity and intercultural competence. The case for fostering intercultural sensitivity, as a core principle of global-mindedness, will then be made. Methods for assessing intercultural sensitivity will be reviewed with an extended look at one instrument, the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI). I will discuss raising intercultural sensitivity in a school and conclude with a brief look at culture shock.

The Concept of Culture

Anthropologists and social psychologists use this term to describe humanity and the kaleidoscope of human groups that constitute our world. Authors, such as White (1959), Weiss (1973) and Rohner (1984 cited by Smith and Bond, 1993) have tried to capture the essence of this concept. Hofstede (1980) defines culture quite tightly as the “Collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one group from another.” whereas UNESCO (2001) has a more expansive definition in its *Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*. It states that culture should be

...regarded as the set of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features of society or a social group, and that it encompasses, in addition to art and literature, lifestyles, ways of living together, value systems, traditions and beliefs.

(UNESCO 2001)

Patterson (1975 cited by Fennes and Hapgood, 1997) offers a similar view that “Culture is an identifiable complex of meanings, symbols, values and norms that are shared consciously or unconsciously by a group of people.” For those working in an international school, it is perhaps the view of Avruch and Black (1993 cited by McCarthy 2011) that resonates most clearly. They said, “Our own culture provides the lens through which we view the world; the logic by which we order it; the grammar by which it makes sense”. Therefore, culture can be seen to give shape and meaning to life for an individual or group.

In a school aiming for globally-minded students and where fifty or more cultures come together, the need to understand different groups and how they can interact successfully is of fundamental importance. The concept of culture therefore warrants further analysis.

If, as described, culture describes so much about an individual or group it may seem too complicated to analyse. Nonetheless, a number of scholars including Lawton (1975 cited by Thompson, 2010), Trompeanaars (1993 cited by Hayden, 2010) and, most notably, Hofstede, Pedersen and Hofstede (2002) have suggested that there are certain components that are common to all cultures. Hofstede et al (2002) state that “culture is complex, but it is not chaotic; there are clearly defined patterns to be discovered”. They suggest that culture can be described in five dimensions: Individualism and Collectivism; Large and small Power Distance; Masculine and Feminine; Strong and weak Uncertainty Avoidance; Long Term and Short term orientation. The last of these was proposed by the Chinese Culture Collection (1987 cited by Smith and Bond, 1993) whose research was based on the view that Hofstede’s earlier seminal work (1980) was “Western”. They concluded that there was a fifth dimension. In 1991, Hofstede agreed and incorporated it into his model.

Hofstede, Pedersen and Hofstede (2002) acknowledge that difficulties still exist after classification. They point to the lack of universal acceptance of the notion of culture; the multi-layering of cultures; the difficulty of deciding who should interpret culture; the difficulty of separating the effects of culture from context; the difficulty of measuring culture due to their dynamism and finally, the difficulty in articulating one's own culture because it is implicitly based on one's own values. With respect to the latter question, Hofstede, Pedersen and Hofstede (2002) liken this to "a fish trying to understand water".

Nonetheless, these difficulties do not negate the argument for the concept of culture. As humans we think, feel, believe and behave. As social beings we form groups with others who share something with us. Over time, cultures are born. It has been suggested that these commonalities are values-based. Schwartz and Bilsky (1990) worked on this idea and identified 56 values. They tested their ideas in 25 countries and concluded that there were ten value-types: Self-direction, Universalism, Benevolence, Tradition, Conformity, Security, Power, Achievement, Hedonism, Stimulation. Dahl (2004) supports the idea that the concept of culture describes underlying values but adds that the concept is also used to describe behaviour that can be observed.

In this latter view of culture, the casual observer may not look further than the actions seen and characterize what is seen as representative of a culture. Any underlying values or driving forces may not be recognized. Fennes and Hapgood (1997) posited in their Iceberg Concept that cultures consist of conscious aspects of behaviour, which they described as "above the water line" and unconscious aspects of behaviour, which they said were "below the water line". Larcher (1993 cited by Fennes and Hapgood, 1997) touched on this when speaking of culture as a continuum from unconscious habits through routine behaviour and tradition to custom, rule and finally law. Applying this to the Iceberg Concept we would find the first three below the water line and the second three above the water line. Among scholars, there seems to be a general agreement on the notion of culture having different levels, some of which are deeply rooted within individuals.

Identity and encounters

Bruner (1996 cited by Hayden, 2010) said that culture shapes the mind of individuals and "provides us with the toolkit by which we construct not only our own worlds but our very conceptions of ourselves and our powers". This suggests that individuals and the lives they lead are fashioned by their social environment. Tajfel (1981 cited by Smith and Bond, 1993) supports this view, believing that "the social part of our identity derives from the groups to which we belong". This later became known as Social Identity Theory. Tajfel (ibid) explains that we identify ourselves with certain groups and then these groups reinforce our view of self. This also results, he says, in our view of "in groups" and "out groups", as well as how we should behave with each. When someone joins a group, members will

often orientate the individual further to what is right and what is wrong, what is good and what is bad, how to behave and how not to behave.

So, as the culture of a group influences individuals, their identity not only reflects the culture but can reinforce it. There are further effects. Hofstede, Pedersen and Hofstede (2002) noted that “We perceive the values of our culture in moral terms, and therefore we tend to view other people’s values as morally inferior”. This can be termed ethnocentrism. Smith and Bond (1993) claim that Sumner’s 1940 definition of ethnocentrism, “the view of things in which one’s own group is the center of everything, and all others are scaled and rated with reference to it”, as rather neutral and they claim that many cultures have a more active view of difference. Gross (2001 cited by van Oord, 2008.) noted that a favourable social identity can be built by holding negative views of others. Hinkle, Brown and Ely (1990 cited in Smith and Bond, 1993) had earlier claimed that, with respect to in-groups and out-groups, feelings are heightened when there are shared values and a degree of competition between the different groups.

Ethnocentrism leads to varying degrees and forms of discrimination. Drawing on the work of Brown (1995), Gross (2001) and Nelson (2006), Van Oord (2008) claims that “...the very act of categorization in itself is a sufficient condition for prejudice and discrimination”. This implies that prejudice and discrimination will happen easily and suggests that merely identifying cultures and labelling them will lead to these effects. Smith and Bond (1993) described this process though hold back from stating that negative effects are inevitable.

The encounter with anybody unknown produces anxiety and a need to develop expectations of their behaviour in order to interact effectively with them. The process of person perception is the first step in this direction. This initial identification of the other often elicits stereotypes associated with the other’s group of cultural membership. We then use this set of assumptions about the other to guide our behaviour towards them and to structure our interpretation of their behaviour towards us, often negatively.

(Smith and Bond, 1993)

I would suggest that any encounter between one individual and another will lead to a response based on his or her own experience, something that will have been influenced by the cultural milieu to which the individual has been exposed.

Van Oord (2008) claims that “intercultural encounters hardly differ from...intergroup encounters”, and this can be explained by Social Identity Theory. He considers the cultural model too static and, quoting Keesing (1974), scorns the concept of culture as meaning “whatever we use it to mean”, ergo

no true meaning. He believes that as soon as human differences are labelled as “cultural” or “ethnic” we accept these as fundamental. Van Oord (2008) cites Versnel (1990) who said, in summarising the work of Mary Douglas (1992) on categories or schema, that they “...not only enable people to make sense of the visible world, but they also provide the rules for directing action and thoughts in the social world”. In other words, we “box” everything and let the structures determine our thinking. The “boxing” or categorisation thus becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. Van Oord (ibid) warns that teaching students about culture will mean that they frame all encounters as cultural encounters. However, other than offering the argument that encounters are intergroup, not intercultural, he does not explain how a mind-set towards people, their lives or interactions might differ. Still further, he does not state if this intergroup perspective facilitates or hinders successful interaction or if it limits discrimination. His assertion that an understanding of culture will shape our thinking has foundation but that it implicitly leads to discrimination seems no more likely than if one’s understanding of different groups shapes one’s thinking.

If we take a broad view on culture namely “the way we do things around here” or as Dahl (2004), describes it, “the modus operandi of a group”, I believe that the arguments for *intercultural* or for *intergroup* become no more than distinctions based on size or degree of inertia. Indeed, at times the difference may be no more than semantics.

The argument for accepting the concept of culture remains strong. As a minimum, it provides a working idea when considering groups and their interactions. Therefore the notion of intercultural sensitivity, one predicated on the validity of culture, can be considered.

A defining moment

Before going further, it might be useful to try and clarify some definitions. Though Marshall (2007) warns us that, in the “Global Education Terminology Debate”, definitions abound and that there are few agreements, for the purposes of this paper, an attempt will be made.

Intercultural awareness (ICA) and cultural awareness seem to be synonymous. In this paper I will use the definition of Fritz, Möllenberg and Chen (2000) who said that ICA is, “a person’s ability to understand similarities and differences of other’s cultures.”

Intercultural sensitivity (ICS) is defined by Intercultural (n.d.) as “the ability to recognize multiple perspectives of an event or behavior, to recognize one’s own cultural values and those of others, and to pick up on verbal and nonverbal signals”. This, I believe, sounds more like ICA. Fritz, Möllenberg and Chen (2000), on the other hand, infer that ICS is more about mind-set. They refer to ICS as an “...emotional desire...to acknowledge, appreciate and accept cultural differences”.

Intercultural competence (ICC), according to Kwintessential (n.d.), is simply “the ability to work well across cultures” whereas, Fantini (2005) sees intercultural communicative competence (ICCC) as a “complex of abilities needed to perform effectively and appropriately when interacting with others who are linguistically and culturally different from oneself”. However, Wikipedia’s definition of ICC is fuller still and indicates that an element of ICS is needed:

The ability of successful communication with people of other cultures. A person who is interculturally competent captures and understands, in interaction with people from foreign cultures, their specific concepts in perception, thinking, feeling and acting. Earlier experiences are considered, free from prejudices; there is an interest and motivation to continue learning. (Wikipedia, n.d.)

Abbe, Gulick and Herman (2007), when referring to the cross cultural competence (3C), also see “engagement” and mind-set as essential; their definition of 3C includes, "...knowledge, skills and affect/motivation that enable individuals to adapt effectively in intercultural environments". This sounds similar to ICC and Heyward (2002) writes about intercultural literacy in a similar way.

World Learning (n.d.) lists twenty related terms, including those mentioned, that are frequently used. It does not state which, if any, are synonymous but concludes in a rather too tidy and convenient way that they all add up to a concept that they term Intercultural (communicative) competence (ICC).

It is clear from the literature that intercultural sensitivity and intercultural (communicative) competence are generally considered to be something more than knowledge of different cultures. I believe Chen (1997) distils the essence of ICA, ICS and ICC accurately and succinctly. He elegantly distinguishes between them as follows. “Intercultural awareness, intercultural sensitivity and intercultural competence form the cognitive, affective and behavioural aspects of intercultural communication”. I will use Chen’s understanding of each in this paper.

The concept of cosmopolitanism should also be mentioned at this point as global-mindedness is sometimes mentioned in the same breath. Gunesch (2004) says cosmopolitanism is “feeling at home in the world”. However, when one goes beyond this rather informal definition, one finds a noisy debate among academics best summarized by Hansen (2009) who discusses the work of Nussbaum (1994), Appiah (1997) and Kleingeld and Brown (2006). Nonetheless, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (n.d.) suggests that at its core cosmopolitanism is a belief that “all human beings, regardless of their political affiliation, do (or at least can) belong to a single community, and that this

community should be cultivated". This definition suggests a shared humanity, something often associated with global-mindedness.

Global-mindedness says much and yet so little. The word global is well understood in general terms but global-mindedness is less well defined. The term suggests an encompassing mind-set but how would one define this concept more precisely? Bearing in mind its importance in the Mission of MIS, an extended examination of this term is needed.

Global-mindedness

I would suggest that there are two ways to look at global-mindedness. In broad terms we might distinguish these as ideological and pragmatic, a distinction drawn by Cambridge and Thompson (2001).

First, there is the ideological approach. I believe there are two nuanced perspectives that can be considered: socio-political and humanist. It could be argued that students should become socio-politically aware and active in addressing the issues facing society. On the other hand it could be said that education is apolitical and that its primary goal is to help students become more aware of the human condition, to understand our world better, to understand the commonalities as well as the differences of humanity, in order to seek harmony. Both these approaches imply a need to develop intercultural sensitivity.

Second, is the pragmatic approach where there are also two possible perspectives: socialisation and economic. The first relates to the need for people in an increasingly connected and diverse world to understand their culture and to learn to live and work together successfully. Knowing the complexity and diversity of cultures in an international school of 1200 students representing 50 nationalities and a staff of 200 from 20 nations, it is perhaps a given that one should work towards understanding the different cultures and their impact on school life. Certainly, "intercultural blunders" (Heyward 2002) are more likely to be minimized. However, a more positive view would be that one could benefit from the cultural variance. Through consensus one could build an inclusive school culture. In so doing, students might learn to understand the challenges and benefits of diversity develop greater intercultural sensitivity and feel at one living and working in a multicultural world.

The second pragmatic approach is driven by economics. Students learn to appreciate that they are competing in a global market and therefore need to be prepared for that. The curriculum outcomes would emphasize the tools and skills needed for success in a multicultural capitalist environment characterised by competition and global interconnectivity and communication. Intercultural sensitivity might be considered "useful" in this approach; Phillips (2002) covers this well.

Mitchell (2003) feels that the spirit of multiculturalism in education, which in this paper I see as part of global mindedness,

...has shifted from a concern with the formation of tolerant and democratic national citizens who can work with and through difference, the ideological and humanist approach, to a more instrumental individual focused concern for the strategic use of diversity for competitive advantage in the global workplace.

(Mitchell 2003)

More succinctly, Marshall (2010) sees one approach as having goals related to global social justice and the other having goals related to the global knowledge economy while Cambridge (2003) describes the education of the idealistic approach as a values based process and the latter as a product with portable capital.

So, how is the concept of global-mindedness and intercultural, awareness, sensitivity and competence viewed at MIS?

The role of international schools

Many international schools, such as MIS, offer the International Baccalaureate (IB) programmes the basic tenets of which are, in part, an ideological approach to global-mindedness. George Walker (2004), a former Director General of the IB lists “understanding cultures” as one of six skills needed in international education and as one of his five aims of international education. Ian Hill (2007a), also of the IB, writes that the concept of international education in the Diploma Programme should include the following, among others: Intercultural understanding, learning more than one language and values that promote wise choices for the good of humankind. Indeed, in the first paragraph of its Mission statement, the IB (2005) declares that “The International Baccalaureate Organization aims to develop inquiring, knowledgeable and caring young people who help to create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect” and in the third paragraph, “encourage students across the world to become active, compassionate and lifelong learners who understand that other people, with their differences, can also be right.” Significantly, intercultural awareness is one of the IB’s 3 fundamental concepts. The IB also believes that only through acquiring the ten attributes of “The Learner Profile” will students become “truly internationally-minded”. (IB 2006) There may be other ways to become globally-minded. Putting IB to one side, James (2005) feels that “...most of the goals and principles of international education can more accurately be described as interculturalist...” and so hints that developing global-mindedness is essential to the role of international schools.

A more specific view of global-mindedness can be found in the work of Parker, Ninomiya and Cogan (1999), who state that global citizens would, among other things, work cooperatively, understand, accept, appreciate and tolerate cultural differences and be sensitive to and defend human rights. Catling (2001) also sets out similar ideas. Both suggest that the role of an international school should be to work towards ideological goals with intercultural awareness, sensitivity or competence, a vital part of this.

However, as mentioned, there are also the pragmatic goals and these may drive some international schools, at least to some extent. The question arises as to whether these approaches are mutually exclusive. I agree with Phillips (2002) who believes not and that the two approaches can indeed be brought together.

At MIS, there are subtle expectations of intercultural awareness, sensitivity and competence in the Mission - "Excellence in education for globally-minded students" - the Vision and the Values. Such a Mission suggests both provision for and development of globally minded students. While these guiding statements lean towards an ideological approach, pragmatic advantages are also understood and expected by the community. There is an underlying belief that MIS students will have an ideological compass to guide them when in the positions of responsibility they are likely to hold.

In any case, whether for ideological or pragmatic reasons, there is a compelling argument to raise intercultural awareness, sensitivity and competence among those in an international school. This can be achieved through the curriculum or through the general school culture. Most importantly, it will be the staff who must steer this.

School culture and the promotion of ICS

The opportunities for the development of intercultural awareness, sensitivity and competence at MIS are great, yet there can be a range of mind-sets. The coming together of students, teachers and parents from different parts of the globe could be viewed as sufficient for intercultural awareness, sensitivity and competence to grow and flourish, particularly when it appears that everyone gets on so well. However, to paraphrase and expand on the words of Gray Mattern (1991), I suggest that our cocktail of cultures may be stirred at best but rarely shaken. In other words, co-existence and tolerance may exist but the potential for cultural exchange and understanding is not fully developed.

The international school environment is often one where different groups of staff, students and parents from different cultures "agree" on a school culture. While the "agreed" culture may be considered functional it may either be an arrangement that happily includes a wide range of beliefs and values or,

conversely, an imposed culture that hides or suppresses underlying cultural issues, positions and perspectives.

International schools are areas where different cultures operate within the same environment, where there is often a dominant cultural ethos, both among the faculty and the students, and where the culture of the host country can impinge on the school culture to varying degrees and in various ways, producing a school culture with individual and specific characteristics.
(Allan, 2002)

Sometimes the culture in a school provides opportunities for cultural exploration and exchange both in day-to-day life and through the taught curriculum. This provides fertile ground for raising levels of intercultural awareness, sensitivity and competence in the community. Global mindedness can develop and the school can become a model of intercultural understanding and agreement.

At other times, a school culture may reflect the view of Zaw (1996 cited by Cambridge 2010) who noted caustically, when commenting on multiculturalism in international education, that a “substantial monoculturalism as to values, mitigated by tolerance of exotic detail, exists”. This suggests a dominant culture that gives cursory acknowledgement to cultural variance and scant regard to any need for inclusion of cultural perspectives. At worst cultural imperialism and discrimination could exist and members of the school community could hold ethnocentric views. Intercultural awareness may or may not be present but intercultural sensitivity, intercultural competence or global mindedness would certainly not be evident.

As Laszlo says (1989 cited by Sylvester, 1998) “Respect for the differing views of others and a readiness to learn from them are among the most difficult human virtues. They are, however, among the most needed...”.

Many students belong neither to their home/passport cultures nor to the local culture, they are part of, what Heyward (2002) describes as, a “global transculture- an international diaspora of globally mobile expatriates”. Other students, primarily local, may not be part of this group but have chosen the school, one hopes, to share the ideas associated with international education. Both groups present potential challenges when considering raising intercultural sensitivity. Ironically, the globally mobile expatriates may not be culturally sensitive, as they may not have had to fully engage with other cultures, only with other transculturals in the school community. Local students, on the other hand, may not be interculturally sensitive, as they have not had to engage with other cultures until entering the international school. And both these groups have to be taught by teachers, whether international or local, who may also share similar experiences.

Banks feels that the interface between teachers and students is critical in addressing such issues.

The school is a microculture where the cultures of students and teachers meet. The school should be a cultural environment where acculturation takes place: both teachers and students should assimilate some of the views, perceptions and ethos of each other as they interact. Both teachers and students will be enriched by this process and the academic achievement of students from diverse cultures will be enhanced because their cosmos and ethos will be reflected and legitimized in the school.

(Banks, 1986 cited by Sylvester, 1998)

Teachers clearly play a significant role in raising intercultural sensitivity and helping students become globally-minded. However, are they prepared for this? Bayles (2009) believes that teachers need more professional development when she writes that,

If educational organizations are truly dedicated to the higher purposes of education, namely cultural democracy and global citizenship, an interculturally competent workforce of educators seems imperative to facilitate the intercultural development of students.

(Bayles 2009)

Some years earlier Heyward (2002) and Straffon (2003) had also addressed this, with the latter making a particularly important point. “Determining the level of intercultural sensitivity of the faculty is a first step toward increasing faculty awareness of the importance of their role in modelling intercultural sensitivity”

So, having made a case for greater intercultural sensitivity (ICS) among staff in schools, the question arises as to how one might measure the degree to which it already exists and how one might develop it further.

Measurement of Intercultural Sensitivity (ICS)

Drawing on the work of Bennett and Stevens (2011), an instrument for measuring intercultural sensitivity should be:

- a) Grounded – Built from data on universal aspects of intercultural sensitivity and recognized degrees of development
- b) Reliable – Repeatable
- c) Valid - free from *systematic* built in error

It should have:

- Content validity—Measure what it says it will measure? Balanced and weighted appropriately.
 - Predictive validity—Help us predict results?
 - Convergent validity— Be consistent with other similar measures?
 - Face validity—Use simple language and be unambiguous. It should appear to participants to measure what it purports to measure. It will work in translation and lead to responses that are independent of language.
 - Differential validity—Be free from cultural bias. The right questions are asked and the administration is culturally appropriate. It takes into account cultural norms on response values.
- d) Transparent- Free from possibilities for participant manipulation resulting from perceived social desirability.

A number of “intercultural assessments” have been put forward and in one survey, Fantini (2007) identified eighty-seven.

Abbe, Gulick & Herman (2007) identify four main types of assessment. The first of these is the “Multi-Dimensional Construct” where cognitive, behavioural, motivational and strategic (meta-cognitive) aspects are assessed. The Cultural intelligence (CQ) model is of this type. The second is the “Developmental Construct” of which The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) is a good example - The IDI aims to measure one’s experience of cultural difference based on the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) of Bennett (2004). Third, are the “Trait-Based” models, such as the Multicultural Personality Questionnaire (MPQ), where culture-general traits considered to contribute to intercultural adjustment and performance are assessed. All of the above are self-reporting models.

A fourth approach is termed “Behavior” (*sic*). Fantini (2005) claims that “competence is abstract and cannot be witnessed; consequently, it must be inferred by observing how one performs”. He believes that in assessment, what one does, not what one thinks one would do, should be measured. This implies that any instrument that asks questions about beliefs, values and potential responses is not as valid as recording an individual’s specific actions. This type of assessment requires a trained person to shadow a participant in multiple situations (or fixed scenarios) in order to record accurately what is witnessed. The process of qualitative assessment instruments is challenging but could be considered more authentic.

An extensive list of assessment resources is listed by the Intercultural Communication Institute (n.d.).

A good assessment should differentiate levels of ICS. A number of authors favour a developmental approach to ICS with continua that define different degrees of ICS. Hill (2007b) summarises three: Chapman and Hobbel (2005), who consider multicultural education, Fennes and Hapgood (1997), who consider a continuum of intercultural learning and Heyward (2002) who look at intercultural literacy. The Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) formulated by Bennett (2004) should be added to these as he proposes something similar. In all but Heyward’s model, the emphasis is on the development of mind-set, with adaption from a “closed” mind to an “open” mind. However, Heyward refers to learning, rather than adaption, a subtle but important difference. While it includes attitudes to some extent, the focus is primarily on skills.

Table below adapted from Hill (2007b).

Multicultural (Fennes and Hapgood 1997)	Multicultural (Chapman and Hobbel 2005)	DMIS (Bennett 2004)	International (Heyward 2002)
1. Awareness	1 Monoculturalism	Denial	1. Limited awareness (monoculture I)
2. Understanding	2. Tolerance	Polarization-Defense/ Reversal	2. naïve awareness (monoculture II)
3. Acceptance and respect	3. Acceptance	Minimization	3. Engagement-distancing (monoculture III)
4. Appreciation and valuing	4. Respect	Acceptance	4. Emerging intercultural literacy
5. Intercultural competence	5. Affirmation and solidarity	Adaptation	5. Transcultural literacy

Intercultural sensitivity is an affective condition, a mind-set, and intercultural competence, resultant behaviour. As both can develop over time an assessment that measures the degree of development, such as the IDI, would seem to be appropriate. A closer look at the IDI, its origins and its development is called for. This begins with a look at the DMIS, the basis for the IDI.

Developmental Measure of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS)

In his work on intercultural competence, Bennett (2004) refers to a continuum that extends from ethnocentrism, where one’s own culture is central to reality, to ethnorelativism, where one’s own

beliefs and behaviors are experienced "...as just one organization of reality among many viable possibilities".

As Hammer, Bennett and Wiseman (2003) see it, the DMIS is "an explanation of how people construe cultural difference".



Bennett (ibid) states that those in denial are "generally disinterested in cultural difference" and do not recognize or understand the distinctive characteristics of different cultures.

In defense, the person's culture is considered the only correct one and alternatives are seen as a threat, says Bennett (ibid). He notes that in non-dominant cultures this can lead to a solidifying of cultural identity. On a larger scale, this approach is also seen in "nation-building". An interesting twist at this stage, he notes, is when an adopted culture is seen as better than one's original, a phenomenon Bennett (ibid) terms reversal.

In minimization a person is said to recognize cultures and assumes that the basic elements of their culture are universal or absolute. People minimize difference and see a "humanness" in everyone, says Bennett (ibid). Aspects of other cultures may therefore be marginalised, or trivialized as he puts it. Bennett (ibid) claims that people cannot see their own culture clearly and therefore cannot see the culture of others clearly. I see weaknesses in Bennett's definition of this phase. One could argue that common ground is chosen through a clear understanding of commonalities and differences between one's own culture and another's. I will touch on this later.

The first stage of ethnorelativism is Acceptance when, according to Bennett, one sees one's own culture as one among others and where there is a struggle to understand relative values. Due to a superficial understanding this is also where political correctness and faux cosmopolitanism are sometimes seen. This is a logical evolution if the definition of minimization is accepted.

Adaption involves moving oneself into another culture and being able to express oneself in culturally appropriate ways. One's view of the world expands as understanding and experiences of other cultures shapes one's thinking, says Bennett (ibid). The challenge for those at this stage, he says, is "authenticity" and people might ask the question "How is it possible to perceive and behave in culturally different ways and still "be yourself"?".

Bennett’s sixth phase is Integration, which involves a shift to an identity of many or perhaps no cultures. It is moving comfortably in, out and around different cultures as one person. This can be considered “constructive” but where it involves skirting around the margins of different cultures with a feeling of separation, Bennett (ibid) considers this negative and refers to it as ”encapsulated” cultural marginality.

It is understood, despite some misgivings about detail, that as one acquires greater intercultural sensitivity and demonstrates greater intercultural competence, one moves along a continuum.

Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI)

The IDI, developed in 1998, by Hammer, Bennett and Wiseman (2003) is based on the DMIS. It does not aim to identify approaches to specific cultures through development of skills or knowledge but aims to reveal approaches to culture in general through a measurement of the underlying values and identities of individuals - a measure of intercultural sensitivity. The Intercultural Development Continuum (IDC) was created.



Following its introduction, version 1 was studied further by Paige, Jacobs-Cassuo, Yershova and Dejaeghere (2003). It’s internal consistency reliability, connection between the six factor structure and the data, predictive validity, social desirability bias and the creation of an IDI mean were considered. From their empirical evaluation of the IDI they concluded that it was a “...sound instrument, a satisfactory way of measuring intercultural sensitivity as defined by Bennett 1993 in his developmental model.” However, Hammer, Bennett and Wiseman (2003) reported that this analysis also suggested that “the factors identified in the 60-item IDI might not be as stable as desired”. Greenholtz (2005) highlights validity issues relating to the use of version 1 in different cultures other than the US and in different languages other than English. This led to the development of a 50-item version 2 in 2003.

In further research, Hammer, Bennett and Wiseman (2003) looked at, among other things, construct validity. To do this they used the Worldmindedness Scale by Sampson and Smith (1957, cited by Hammer, Bennett and Wiseman, 2003), and a modified version of Stephen and Stephen’s Social Anxiety Scale (1985, cited by Hammer, Bennett and Wiseman, 2003). They concluded that

“confirmatory factor analyses, reliability analyses and construct validity tests best validated five main dimensions of the DMIS”. The five were DD(Denial/Defense), R(Reversal), M (Minimization), AA (Acceptance/Adaption) and EM (Encapsulated Marginality). Nonetheless, they felt more research was needed. In particular they highlighted the need to look at what the IDI might actually predict at the ethnorelativism end of the scale, integration. They wondered if it meant,

1) less stress for sojourners, 2) more satisfaction with living/working in a foreign culture, (3) greater job accomplishment in culturally different environments, (4) lower levels of prejudice and discrimination against culturally different others, (5) less resistance to diversity initiatives in organizations, and (6) decreased conflict and/or violence toward people from different cultures?

(Hammer, Bennett and Wiseman, 2003)

Hammer (2011) reported on the phase 3 testing with “4763 individuals from 11 distinct, cross cultural samples” who each took the IDI in their own language. He concluded that a seven factor model was best. The factors were: Denial, Defense, Reversal, Minimization, Acceptance, Adaption and Cultural Disengagement (formerly Encapsulated Marginality). However, the last of these he felt was a measure of “identity” rather than a measure of intercultural sensitivity. As such, he stated, it should sit apart on the IDC and not be considered a part of the DMIS “integration”.

Hammer (ibid) also underlined the advances in version 3 including the ability to distinguish between an individual’s Perceived Orientation (PO), a measure of what the individual believes to be his or her ICS, and what the IDI actually measures, the so called Development Orientation DO. Still further, he noted a normal distribution of scores about the mean score of 100, located in minimization. Finally, he concluded that predictive validity is good and that a readability analysis suggests that the IDI is suitable for individuals with a grade 10 reading level.

Version 3 involves self-reporting on 50 items, an exercise that takes about 20 minutes.

The question of whether an instrument can truly reflect the intercultural sensitivity of a person remains. While the validity of the IDI seems high, it is based on the validity of the DMIS. With regard to the latter, Sparrow (2000) asks if there is only one end state and whether it would look the same for all. Moreover, one might ask if there is still a possibility that people could misconstrue questions or that people might respond differently in a professional role than they would as a private individual. While my concerns over the definition, manifestation and status of minimization also remain, it is acknowledged that the IDI has been used widely, including for the assessment of ICS in schools. For this reason, we should look more closely at its application.

IDI in schools

Davies (2010), in his excellent summary, notes that many studies using the IDI have focused on students. However, he does highlight the work of Mahon (2003), Westrick & Yeun (2007), Fretheim (2007), DeJaeghere and Zhang (2008) and Bayles (2009) as important studies with teachers.

Fretheim (2007, cited by Davies, 2010) in his study of 58 teachers in an American international school in South Africa found a range of mean scores from 92.96, for those with less than five years experience “overseas“, to 101.52, for those with more. Bayles (2009) also found, in her study of 233 elementary teachers in a Texas school district, that there was a statistically significant difference between teachers with more than ten years teaching ethnically diverse students and those with less. The overall mean was 95.09 whereas for those with less than five years it was 90.95 and for those with more than ten years experience, 98.10.

In other studies, DeJaeghere and Zhang (2008) found means of 96.00 to 110.00 for 284 teachers and teacher aides in 9 different schools while Westrick and Yeun (2007 cited in Davies, 2010) found a mean score of 91.32 from 160 participating teachers.

A sample of 50 members of staff at MIS took the IDI and returned a mean perceived orientation of 125.85 and a developmental orientation of 103.94. An orientation gap score of more than 7 points can be considered significant so this group substantially overestimated its level of ICS, according to the IDI.

In all the above studies, the participating teachers were in the minimization stage. This is a surprising result.

Intercultural sensitivity among teachers

Though the research is limited, it does give rise to some concern. There are three possible interpretations of the results. Teachers do not exhibit high levels of ICS, teachers may “seek minimization” in their role or the IDI does not measure what it purports to measure.

Cushner (2008) ventured that “today’s teachers may not be up to the tasks required of an international educator”. Davies (2010) cites evidence from the studies of Mahon (2003), Grossman and Yeun, (2006), Frentheim (2007), DeJaeghere and Zhang (2008) and Bayles (2009) in support of this view. All of these scholars found few respondents in the ethnorelative stages of acceptance or adaptation and that teachers tended to believe they were interculturally sensitive by minimizing difference.

Davies (ibid) noted that “teacher scores on the IDI are in stark contrast to student scores who were substantially more likely to be in the ethnorelative stages” and cites the works of Pederson (1998) who found 70% of respondents to be in high minimization or acceptance, and Straffon (2003) who found just 3% of students on the ethnocentric side of the scale.

Cushner (2008) clearly believes that to improve teachers’ intercultural sensitivity, professional development is needed:

If we are truly serious about preparing teachers, and subsequently the pupils in their charge, to better understand the increasingly intercultural and complex world in which they live and to develop the skills necessary to interact effectively with people from a variety of cultural backgrounds, then applying what we know about culture learning is essential. Teachers as architects of educational experiences and opportunity, must understand how closely intertwined the relationship between cognition and experience is—they are just inseparable when it comes to culture learning.

(Cushner 2008)

The above evidence from IDI results suggests that we need to raise ICS in schools. Irrespective of the validity of the IDI, a case exists.

Raising intercultural awareness (ICA), intercultural sensitivity(ICS) and intercultural competence (ICC) in school

If we are to achieve heightened levels of ICA, ICS and ICC, we need to know what is important. Chen (1997) believes that,

In order to develop a positive emotion towards understanding and appreciating cultural differences and eventually promote the ability of intercultural competence, interculturally sensitive persons must possess the following elements: self-esteem, self-monitoring, open-mindedness, empathy, interaction involvement and on judgment”.

(Chen, 1997)

There are three approaches to raising ICA, ICS and ICC in schools: Recruit the right people, offer professional development and set the right culture.

With respect to recruitment, the work of Abbe, Gullick and Herman (2007) is useful. They list four predictors of intercultural effectiveness (ICE) - an objective outcome of ICA, ICS and ICC. The first are antecedent variables. These include dispositions such as openness and intellect, conscientiousness,

extraversion, agreeableness and emotional stability. Biographical variables, such as prior experience of cross cultural events and interest in cross cultural experiences are also included. Culture specific variables, such knowledge of language and a specific culture, are the second predictors while situational and organizational variables the third. Last, they cite cross cultural competence (CCC) where knowledge and cognition of cultural awareness, culture general schema and an understanding of the complexity of culture are important along with attitudes, initiative, empathy and motivation.

At the time of recruitment all but situational variables can be taken into account when screening candidates.

The second approach to raising ICA, ICS and ICC is through professional development. In his extensive study, Davies (2010) notes that DeJaeghere and Zhang (2008) and Westrick and Yuen (2007) believe that the DMIS and IDI are useful professional development tools to assist understanding of one's own culture and develop a consciousness of other cultures, a view supported by Bayles (2009). While I too agree, it should be noted that the IDI does not specifically assess ICA, the cognitive aspect of intercultural communication but ICS, the affective aspect.

At MIS, a group will soon look at how ICS can be raised among staff, beginning with the IDI results of 50 teachers. Specific learning goals will be planned and the means to achieve these goals determined.

Drawing on the work of many authors, including Brislin, Landis and Brandt (1983); Gudykunst, Guzley and Hammer (1996); Gudykunst, Hammer and Wiseman (1977) and Seidel (1981), Chen (1997) identifies 6 categories of intercultural training programmes: affective, cognitive, self awareness, cultural awareness, area simulation and behavioural.

The first four of these, said Chen (*ibid*), focus on understandings about culture while the latter two are concerned with how to behave in various specific cultures. Interestingly, Abbe, Gulick and Herman (2007) note that ICC is enhanced more with a general understanding about culture than with culture specific knowledge.

DeJaeghere and Cao (2009) reported on the professional development of 910 teachers in a US school district that began in 2003 guided by Bennett's DMIS. It included values and identity simulations, raising awareness of learning styles, information on intercultural conflict styles, culture specific workshops and discussions on critical incidents that had occurred. They concluded their study by stating that "...it is possible for schools to improve the intercultural competence of teachers through a concerted

effort of professional development and assessments” but added, disappointingly, that “...this study cannot determine the effects of any specific professional development”

Setting the right culture might also contribute to raising ICS. This can be accomplished in part by ensuring that there are policies and practices in place. Tung (1981) suggests that a number of factors assist cross cultural communication. These include having a policy supporting cultural pluralism and employing various practices such as modelling cultural accommodation by management; providing social support for newcomers from fellow culture members; attending to spouse adjustment; providing an in house cultural mediator and including cross cultural effectiveness in appraisal. All of these seem reasonable based on what we know about how groups work.

Cushner (2008) believes that the Contact Theory of Allport (1954, cited in Wikipedia, n.d.) could be useful. The theory suggests that, “under appropriate conditions, interpersonal contact is one of the most effective ways to reduce prejudice between majority and minority group members”. Four conditions are needed: Social and institutional support where the authority creates and supports a framework for goals of integration; high acquaintance potential where more contact leads to more understanding; equal status among contacts and cooperation to establish common goals. However, in his research, Davies (2010) found that the slight positive correlation between years in an international school and ICS was insignificant and that targeted professional development was more likely to lead to a significant increase in ICS. DeJaeghere and Cao (2009) also acknowledge that various studies suggest that cultural exposure and professional development may raise intercultural competence (ICC), but state that “no studies to date...have examined ICC development in teachers over a period of time to assess the effects of different environmental or programmatic experiences”.

The research to date is not very helpful in identifying specific professional development for raising ICS and only indicates that various activities seem to help. Further research is clearly needed.

One final point of interest with respect to ICA, ICS and ICC is the effect of cultural exposure or culture shock. Schools and organisations often provide support and help to new staff in “getting to know” the local culture and adjusting to culture shock. However, I would suggest that as this is local it is not sufficient to raise ICS significantly.

Effects of cultural exposure

When individuals are affected by exposure to a culture it is often termed culture shock.

Lysgaard (1955 cited by Hayden, 2010) is often credited with being the first to define the path from first cultural exposure to adjustment. The U curve describes various stages: the honeymoon period, the

culture shock, the recovery and the adjustment. In the latter stage the individual “gets on” in the culture, day to day. Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1962 cited by Hayden, 2010) expand on this with their W curve, which adds a re-entry crisis and a final adjustment. Zapf (1985) provides a good overview of the work of early authors on this topic.

While “culture shock” describes a path of reactions to cultural experiences that concludes with “adjustment” it generally describes an adjustment to one specific culture; it does not necessarily imply a generic change of mind-set. In other words, while a person might adjust to living in Germany it does not mean that a similar adjustment would be made elsewhere or, more importantly, that a deep-rooted approach to cultural variance has changed. The fact that culture shock is often described as a cycle that leads one back to one’s own culture (re-entry) hints that perhaps something comes and then goes.

The ID continuum is based on generic approaches to culture, a mind-set relating to intercultural sensitivity. The unexpected results of MIS participants, indicated by the higher perceived orientation than actual orientation, might be explained by the participants’ understanding of their experience in Germany. Many of the group may have passed through a classic culture shock cycle and have made a cultural adjustment to Germany yet, more fundamentally, have not changed their mind-set.

In professional development, I believe that a clear distinction needs to be drawn between work related to culture shock and to ICS.

Conclusion

Fennes and Hapgood (1997) state somewhat cynically, that inter-cultural learning has become a “fashionable term” and used too freely. They argue, it is used, without definition, in the hope that it will provide solutions to the world’s problems.

Intercultural awareness, intercultural sensitivity and intercultural competence will not ensure successful human interaction. However, with the increase in global communication and migration, there is not only the “ideological” humanist dream of bringing peoples together but also a “pragmatic” need to understand how to interact with the other – this is a day to day reality in an international school. Ironically, though such schools can be microcosms of the world the question of intercultural awareness, sensitivity and competence is rarely broached directly.

Yet, finding approaches to raising intercultural understanding, sensitivity and competence in the cultural mix of this miniature environment will not only be important in school but also encourage

mind-sets that will enhance interactions beyond school, an idea captured in the Mission, Vision and Values of MIS.

There is some evidence to suggest that with the right policies, practices intercultural sensitivity will be enhanced. However, the professional development of staff also appears important. The IDI may be useful in this process both in raising awareness and measuring development. If there is a greater understanding of self and of difference, even if only through reductive cultural generalities, this is a beginning. If this is coupled with exposure to “the other”, through shared activities and goals, intercultural sensitivity should be heightened and the possibilities for successful group interaction should be greater. This approach does not demand agreement with difference but only acknowledgement of it and a willingness to learn and respect it.

However, at its best, intercultural sensitivity is understood to be a mind-set focused not only on knowing and understanding the other but on assimilating ideas and being able to move seamlessly between different cultures, without losing one’s own identity. Those putting intercultural sensitivity into practice and so demonstrating intercultural competence might well be termed globally-minded and so become a model for MIS.

References

Abbe, A., Gulick, L., & Herman, J., 2007. *Cross-cultural competence in Army leaders: A conceptual and empirical foundation*. Washington, DC. U.S. Army Research Institute.

Allan, M., 2002. Cultural Borderlands : A Case Study of Cultural Dissonance in an International School. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 2002 (1), pp. 63-90.

Bayles, P., 2009. *Assessing the intercultural sensitivity of elementary teachers in bilingual schools in a Texas school district*. Dissertation. (Doctor of Education (EdD)). University of Minnesota.

Bennett, J. 2004. *Becoming Interculturally Competent* [pdf]. Available at: http://www.newonline.org/resource/resmgr/mcw_ppt/becominginterculturallycompe.pdf [Accessed 25.2.12].

Bennett, J. and Stevens, M. 2011. *How to select an assessment instrument* [pdf]. Available at: <http://www.intercultural.org/documents/select.pdf> [Accessed 14.1.12].

Cambridge, J. and Thompson, J., 2001. 'A Big Mac and a coke'? *Internationalism and globalisation as contexts for international education*. [pdf] University of Bath. Available at: staff.bath.ac.uk/edsjcc/intedandglobaldoc.pdf [Accessed 27.12.11].

Cambridge, J., 2003. Identifying the globalist and internationalist missions of international schools. *International Schools Journal*, XXII (2), pp.54-58.

Cambridge, J., 2010. Reframing internationalism and globalization as contexts for international education. *ED60278 International education: philosophy and practice*. [online via internal VLE], University of Bath. Available at: <http://moodle.bath.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=2499>. [Accessed Date 10 July 2010].

Catling, S. 2001. Developing the Curriculum in International Schools. In: Blandford, S. and Shaw, M. eds., 2001. *Managing International Schools*. Routledge/Farmer.

Chen, G-M., 1997. A review of the concept of intercultural sensitivity. *Biennial Convention of the Pacific and Asian Communication Association*. Honolulu, Hawaii. January 1997.

Cushner, K. 2008. International socialization of young people: Obstacles and opportunities. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 32 (2008), pp. 164-173.

Dahl, S. 2004. *Intercultural Research: The Current State of Knowledge*. 12 January 2004. Middlesex University Discussion Paper No. 26.

Davies, A., 2010. *The Applicability of the intercultural development inventory for the measurement of intercultural sensitivity of teachers in an international school context*. Thesis (Doctor of Education (EdD)), University of Bath.

DeJaeghere, J. and Zhang, Y., 2008. Development of intercultural competence among US American teachers: Professional development factors that affect competence. *Intercultural Education*. 19(3), pp. 255-268.

DeJaeghere, J. and Cao, Y. 2009. Developing US teacher's intercultural competence: Does professional development matter? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 33 (2009) pp. 437-447.

Fantini, A.E., 2005. *About intercultural communicative competence: a construct [Electronic version]*. Brattleboro, VT: School for International Training. [Accessed 20 December, 2011] http://www.sit.edu/SITOccasionalPapers/feil_appendix_e.pdf.

Fennes, H. and Hapgood, K., 1997 *Intercultural Learning in the Classroom – Crossing Borders*. London: Cassell.

Fritz, W., Möllenberg, A. and Chen, G-M., 2000. *Measuring Intercultural Sensitivity in different cultural context* [pdf]. Technische Universität Braunschweig. Available at: <http://www.wiwi.tu-bs.de/marketing/publikationen/ap/download/AP00-11.pdf> [Accessed 14 January 2012].

Greenholtz, J., (2005). Does intercultural sensitivity cross cultures? Validity issues in porting instruments across languages and cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29 (2005), pp. 73-89.

Gunesch, K., 2004. Education for cosmopolitanism: Cosmopolitanism as a personal cultural identity model for and within international education. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 2004(3), pp. 251-275.

Hammer, M., Bennett, R and Wiseman, R., 2003. Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27 (2003), pp. 421-443.

Hammer, M., 2011. Additional cross-cultural validity testing of the intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35 (2011), pp.474-487.

Hansen, D., 2009. Chasing butterflies without a net: Interpreting cosmopolitanism *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 2009(29) Issue 2, pp. 151-166.

Hayden, M., 2010. The role of culture in international education. ED60278 International education: philosophy and practice. [online via internal VLE], University of Bath. Available at: <http://moodle.bath.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=2499>. [Accessed Date 10 July 2010].

Heyward, M., 2002. From international to intercultural: Redefining the international school for a globalized world. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 2002 (1), pp.9-32.

Hill, I., 2007a. International Education as developed by the International Baccalaureate Organization. In: Hayden, M., Levy, J. and Thompson, J.J. eds *Handbook of Research in International Education*. London: Sage Publications.

Hill, I., 2007b. Multicultural and international education: never the twain shall meet? *Review of Education*, 53, pp 245-264.

Hofstede, G., 1980. *Culture's consequences: international differences in work-related values*. London: Sage.

Hofstede, J.H., Pedersen, P.B. and Hofstede, G., 2002. *Exploring Culture*. Boston: Intercultural Press.

International Baccalaureate, 2005. *Mission and Strategy*. [online] Available at: <http://www.ibo.org/mission/> [Accessed 20 March 2012].

International Baccalaureate, 2006. Teaching from the heart. *IB World Magazine* [online], May 2006. Available at: <http://www.ibo.org/ibworld/may06/teachingfromheart.cfm> [Accessed 9 April 2012].

Intercultural Communication Institute, n.d. *Intercultural Training and Assessment Tools*. [online] Available at: <http://www.intercultural.org/tools.php> [Accessed 25 February 2012].

Intercultural, n.d. *Competencies*. [online] Available at: <http://www.intercultural.nl/content/competencies.asp> [Accessed 25 February 2012].

Kwintessential, n.d. *Definition of Intercultural Competence*. [online] Available at <http://www.kwintessential.co.uk/articles/info/definition-intercultural-competence.html> [Accessed 25 February 2012].

Marshall, M. 2010. Defining international education. *ED60278 International education: philosophy and practice*. [online via internal VLE], University of Bath. Available at: <http://moodle.bath.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=2499>. [Accessed Date 10 July 2010].

Mattern, W.G. 1991. Random Ruminations on the Curriculum of the International School. In: Jonietz, P. and Harrid, D. eds., 1991. *World Yearbook of Education 1991 : International Schools and International Education*. London: Kogan Page, pp.209-216.

McCarthy, C., 2011. *Intercultural Awareness at MIS*. Starnberg, Germany. 16 November 2011. Unpublished.

Mitchell, K., 2003. Educating the national citizen in neoliberal times: from the multicultural self to the strategic cosmopolitan. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 28 (4). pp.387-403.

Paige, R., Jacobs-Cassuto, M., Yershova, Y. and DeJaeghere, J., 2003. Assessing intercultural sensitivity: an empirical analysis of the hammer and Bennett Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27 (2003), pp.467-486.

Paige, M., 2004. "Instrumentation in Intercultural Training" in Landis, D., Bennett, J. and Bennett, M. eds. 2004. *Handbook of Intercultural Training. 3rd ed.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Parker, W., Ninomiya, A. and Cogan, J., 1999. Educating World Citizens: Toward Multinational Curriculum Development. *American Education Research Journal*, 36 (2), pp.117-145.

Phillips, J., 2002. The third way: Lessons from international education. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 1 (2), pp.159-181.

Schwartz, S. and Bilsky, W., 1990. Toward a Theory of the Universal Content and Structure of Values: Extensions and Cross-Cultural Replications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(5), pp. 878–891.

Smith, P.B. and Bond, M.H., 1993. *Social Psychology Across Cultures: Analysis and Perspectives*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Sparrow, L., 2000. Beyond multicultural man: complexities of identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24, (2), pp.173–201.

The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, n.d. *Cosmopolitanism*. [Online] Available at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cosmopolitanism/> [Accessed 20 March 2012].

Sylvester, B., 1998. Through the lens of diversity: inclusive and encapsulated school missions. In: Hayden, M and Thompson, J. eds. 1998. *International Education: Principles and Practice*. London: Kogan Page.

Thompson, J., 2010. Towards an International Curriculum, *EdD unit International Education: Philosophy and Practice*. University of Bath, unpublished.

Tung, R., 1981. Selection and training of personnel for overseas assignments. *Columbia Journal of World Business*. 16 (1), pp.68-78.

UNESCO, 2001. *Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity* [online] Available at: <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/diversity.htm> [Accessed 29 October 2011].

Van Oord, L., 2008. After Culture: intergroup encounters in education. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 7, pp.131.

Walker, G. R., 2004. *To educate the nations 2: Reflections on an International Education*. Saxmundham: Peridot Press.

Weiss, G., 1973. A Scientific Concept of Culture. *American Anthropologist*, 75 (5) pp.1376-1413.

White, L., 1959. The Concept of Culture. *American Anthropologist*, 61 (2), pp.227-251.

Wikipedia, n.d.. Contact Hypothesis. In: *Wikipedia: the online encyclopedia*. [online] St. Petersburg Florida: Wikimedia Foundation. Available at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Contact_hypothesis [Accessed 5 March 2012].

World Learning, n.d. *A list of alternative names for ICC*. [online] Available at http://www.sit.edu/SITOccasionalPapers/feil_appendix_d.pdf [Accessed 30 December 2011]

Zapf, M., 1985. Cross-cultural transitions and wellness: Dealing with culture shock. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*. 14, pp.105-119.

Appendix

Munich International School Guiding Statements

Mission

Excellence in education for globally-minded students

Vision

We will be recognized world-wide as an outstanding and innovative international school. An inspirational staff will create an exceptional learning environment that motivates all students to be globally-minded, academically successful, well balanced and prepared for future challenges and responsibilities.

Values

Our values are encapsulated in the IB learner profile. All members of the MIS community strive to be:

“Inquirers They develop their natural curiosity. They acquire the skills necessary to conduct inquiry and research and show independence in learning. They actively enjoy learning and this love of learning will be sustained throughout their lives.

Knowledgeable They explore concepts, ideas and issues that have local and global significance. In so doing, they acquire in-depth knowledge and develop understanding across a broad and balanced range of disciplines.

Thinkers They exercise initiative in applying thinking skills critically and creatively to recognize and approach complex problems, and make reasoned, ethical decisions.

Communicators They understand and express ideas and information confidently and creatively in more than one language and in a variety of modes of communication. They work effectively and willingly in collaboration with others.

Principled They act with integrity and honesty, with a strong sense of fairness, justice and respect for the dignity of the individual, groups and communities. They take responsibility for their own actions and the consequences that accompany them.

Open-minded They understand and appreciate their own cultures and personal histories, and are open to the perspectives, values and traditions of other individuals and communities. They are accustomed to seeking and evaluating a range of points of view, and are willing to grow from the experience.

Caring They show empathy, compassion and respect towards the needs and feelings of others. They have a personal commitment to service, and act to make a positive difference to the lives of others and to the environment.

Risk-takers They approach unfamiliar situations and uncertainty with courage and forethought, and have the independence of spirit to explore new roles, ideas and strategies. They are brave and articulate in defending their beliefs.

Balanced They understand the importance of intellectual, physical and emotional balance to achieve personal well-being for themselves and others.

Reflective They give thoughtful consideration to their own learning and experience. They are able to assess and understand their strengths and limitations in order to support their learning and personal development.”

(IBO, 2008. *The IB learner profile booklet*. Cardiff: International Baccalaureate.)

Munich International School. 2011. *Mission, Vision and Values*. [internal document] March.2011.
Starnberg: Munich International School.