In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced
degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it
freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive
copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my
department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or
publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written
permission.

Department of **Educational Studies**

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada

Date **Dec 10, 2001**
ABSTRACT

This study explores the effects of intercultural training from the perspectives of learners and facilitators. Three central questions are addressed: How does participation in an intercultural studies program affect the way learners approach intercultural interactions? How do learners engage learning between the educational and practice contexts? What are the implications for program planning?

In-depth interviews were conducted with eleven learners and eight facilitators from a certificate program in intercultural studies at a Canadian university. The program is delivered through a combined on-site and online format. With its emphasis on practice-based learning, this program offered a unique opportunity to explore learner change and the application of learning in the workplace.

This study was undertaken to inform program planning for intercultural training. The conceptual resources that guided the study are frameworks for program planning and transfer of learning. Perceived learner change as a result of training is explored through multiple lenses of transfer, including application (engaging and creating knowledge in practice) and diffusion (sharing ideas with others formally and informally in the workplace). Factors that contribute to engagement of learning between the practice and training contexts include the integration of theory and practice and the building of an online learning community. The study explores the concept of emotional safety, the impact of identity and representation on intercultural interactions within the training context, and the challenges of facilitating difficult dialogues related to race, power and identity.

This study is situated within the larger context of the field of intercultural training. This is contested terrain comprised of two major streams: international and domestic training. Domestic training is represented by three frameworks: diversity, multicultural and anti-racism training. The study indicates that learning is influenced by the degree to which analyzing power or respecting differences is emphasized in the exploration of intercultural interactions. The study concludes with suggested reflective questions for planners of intercultural programs.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

This project has taken me on a journey of discovery exploring the foundations of my practice. I began with the idea of developing an understanding of how individuals negotiate or engage learning between an intercultural training program and their work environment. As the study proceeded I began to explore the embedded concepts about culture and intercultural relations that influenced program planning and facilitation. These concepts contributed to the learners' experience in the program, and the nature of their learning about intercultural interactions. The study has given me an opportunity to examine my own practice through the eyes of the learners.

For the past fifteen years, I have been planning and facilitating diversity and intercultural training programs in the public, private and non-profit sectors in British Columbia, Canada. I have worked with several thousand learners in hundreds of workshops and the learner reactions, based on informal comments and end-of-training feedback forms, are generally very positive. In the last few years, however, I have questioned the meaning of my work. Workshop reaction forms do not help me understand what learners feel, think or do differently in their workplace contexts. I became increasingly preoccupied with the question “what difference does training make in the way learners think about and respond in intercultural situations?” I hoped that understanding more about the learners’ experiences of training could inform the way I design programs.

In 1997, I learned of the University of British Columbia's doctoral program in Educational Leadership and Policy (EdD program). This new program was “designed to provide advanced preparation for education practitioners with leadership responsibilities in both formal and nonformal settings.”¹ I was attracted to this unique program because of its goal to encourage a “critical reflection on practice.” I had reached a place in my career where I was hungry for the opportunity to engage in understanding, constructively criticizing and improving my

practice. The program provided the opportunity to conduct an "applied research project" related to my practice and to produce a document that would enhance my own practice and provide leadership for practitioners in my field. For my research site I selected the Intercultural Studies Certificate program at the University of British Columbia (UBC). I have been a contract facilitator with the program since its inception in 1996.

This study and the EdD program have provided an opportunity to bridge the distance between traditional academic literature and lived experience in practice. The program has allowed me to systematically examine my practice through dialogue with others in my cohort and through exposure to new literature. As a result of my involvement in the EdD program, and my work on this study, I bring to my practice a new "wide-awakeness," intentionality and leadership. Other individuals frequently approach me asking how they can become diversity or intercultural trainers. I hope this study will help others understand the complexities of intercultural work, the dilemmas with which they will grapple as they undertake the work, and the factors to consider in planning and facilitating intercultural training.

**Organization of the Chapters**

In this chapter, I introduce diversity and intercultural training, explain my own practice, state the purpose of the study and research questions, review the general approach to the research, discuss the significance of the study and examine the use of terms. The intercultural training field is multifaceted and diffuse, requiring elaboration beyond the introduction in this chapter. In Chapter Two, I map the development of the field of intercultural training. In Chapter Three, I discuss the conceptual resources that inform this study: program planning and transfer of learning. In Chapter Four, I describe the research site and explain the methodology and data analysis process. This chapter sets the stage for the analysis of the findings by introducing the themes explored in Chapters Five, Six and Seven.

In Chapter Five, I examine learner and facilitator definitions of intercultural competence, learner views of the program, perceptions of change as a result of participation in the program, and efforts to share their learning with others. In Chapter Six, I discuss the learners' experience of engaging learning between the training context and their practice contexts. This
chapter includes participant perceptions of the connections between theory and practice and their experience of building an online community. In Chapter Seven, I explore factors that contributed to the learning experience. These include safety, support and challenge, and the difficulties of engaging in dialogue around issues related to ethnic and racial identity. In Chapter Eight, I discuss the implications of the study for program planning, possibilities for further research, and implications for my practice.

**What is Diversity Training?**

To establish the context for discussing diversity training I will briefly explore the genesis of the concept of diversity. “Many corporations’ quest for diversity is motivated by their need to influence organizational members to value and respect human differences in an effort to maximize their ability to work together productively” (Chung, 1996, p. 3). Diversity training is intended to help people recognize, accept, respect, and welcome differences. It is intended to foster positive relationships among coworkers, with customers, and between managers and employees. Larry Gardner, Labor Relations Manager for the City of San Diego, captures the prevailing notions of diversity with the statement “A diversity commitment is conceptual in nature; [it is] not tied to specific legislation. Diversity is a state of mind, a fabric that becomes woven into the workplace” (AARP, 1994, p. 9). It has been a long road to this perspective on diversity.

The term diversity began appearing in the human resource management literature in the 1980s and gathered momentum with the publication of the Hudson Institute’s *Workforce 2000* report (Carrell & Mann, 1995). This report, widely cited in the United States and Canada, predicted dramatic changes in workplace demographics. The authors forecast that increasing numbers of women, people of colour, persons with disabilities, and older workers would enter the labour pool by the year 2000. The report was issued in 1988 at a time when “people had begun to reframe the work of eliminating discrimination in organizations toward creating an organizational work culture, environment, system, and infrastructure so that each person could offer her or his full potential in the workplace” (Swanger, 1994, p. 18). The concept of diversity gained strength with the publication of Roosevelt Thomas’ (1990) now-classic
Harvard Business Review article *From Affirmative Action to Affirming Diversity*. Thomas said this about diversity:

> The reason you then want to move beyond affirmative action to managing diversity is because affirmative action fails to deal with the root causes of prejudice and inequality and does little to develop the full potential of every man and woman in the company. In a country seeking competitive advantage in a global economy the goal of managing diversity is to develop our capacity to accept, incorporate, and empower the diverse human talents of the most diverse nation on earth. It’s our reality. We need to make it our strength. (p. 117)

This pronouncement came 26 years after the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964 in the United States that prohibited discrimination in employment based on race, color, religion, national origin, and sex (Swanger, 1994). The Civil Rights Act marked the requirement for legislative compliance. When the Act did not result in significant change in hiring practices, “affirmative action became the strategy used to force organizations to comply with the law” (Swanger, p. 10). The concept of equal opportunity defined hiring practices in the 1960s, the concept of affirmative action defined the 1970s, and the concept of diversity defined the late 1980s to the 1990s (Gordon, 1992). Swanger (1994) points out that by the 1980s the “salad bowl,” “stew pot”, and “mosaic” analogies were replacing the melting-pot paradigm of the 1950s. Instead of insisting on assimilation, society and organizations were recognizing the value of individuals retaining their unique characteristics.

In both the United States and Canada, the concept of diversity grew out of human rights legislation. “When Canada became a signatory to the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, it embarked upon a series of social changes which, although unintended at the time, has helped to create an infrastructure that facilitates democratic citizenship” (Ungerleider, 1996, p. 38). In 1944, the province of Ontario passed what is considered to be the first Canadian human rights statute in order to “counter the discriminatory treatment which lay behind signs proclaiming ‘Whites Only’ or ‘No Jews or Dogs Allowed’” (Ungerleider, 1996, p. 20). During the 1950s, other provinces enacted legislation to address discrimination in employment and accommodation.
Lum (1995) points out that in this “heightened social and political environment of justice, human rights, and equity, the Progressive Conservative government passed the Employment Equity Act in 1986” (p. 46). The purpose of the Act is to reduce employment discrimination by eliminating systemic barriers and increasing access and opportunity for historically marginalized citizens: women, visible minorities, persons with disabilities, and aboriginal people. Equity legislation requires employers to set targets for change rather than establishing the hiring quotas associated with affirmative action. Employers charged with implementing employment equity were required to implement a workforce analysis to determine representation among members of the so-called “designated groups”. The legislation also required a systems review to find and eliminate barriers to employment and career opportunities. As part of developing “positive policies and practices to accelerate the integration of designated group members” (Employment Equity Guidelines, 1996, p. 4) employers implemented training for staff and managers. The purpose of the training was to explain the rationale for the legislation and the organizational plan for implementing change.

In the early 1990s, Canadian employers adopted the “workplace diversity movement” (Bond & Pyle, 1998) that had begun in the United States. The shift from employment equity training to diversity training evolved in response to the changing demographics predicted by Workforce 2000 together with the recognition that dominant culture individuals and those who were not members of the designated groups did not see themselves as part of the diversity discussion. In an effort to create a broader sense of employee inclusion employers began to develop diversity policies. They began to focus their communication and training initiatives around diversity which (in the case of federally regulated companies) includes employment equity. Cox (1993) suggests that there are three goals that motivate organizational leaders to pay attention to diversity: (1) moral, ethical, and social responsibility goals; (2) legal obligations; and (3) economic performance goals.

Employers make a business case for diversity citing such factors as keeping and gaining market share by providing better service to a diverse customer base in domestic and

---

international contexts; reducing turnover costs through attracting and retaining employees from a larger pool of candidates; increasing productivity by drawing on the potential of diverse skills, knowledge, and perspectives; and improving management practices by creating flexible, responsive work environments (Jamieson & O’Mara, 1994; Loden & Rosener, 1991; Thomas, 1990). “While affirmative action is known to be a legal duty, in much recent writing, ‘diversity’ is described as a desirable condition to be sought as an internal or external benefit to the organization” (Carrell & Mann, 1995, p. 100).

The term cultural diversity training is often used synonymously with diversity training because many organizations define culture broadly. DeSensi (1995) links the concepts of multiculturalism and valuing diversity. She defines cultural diversity as “differences associated with gender, race, national origin, ethnicity, social class, religion, age, and ability/disability, but it can also be extended to include differences in personality, sexual orientation, veteran status, physical appearance, marital status, and parent status (Kessler, 1990; Morrison, 1992)” (p. 34). There is a concern that broadening the definition of diversity minimizes recognition of the oppression and marginalization faced by the groups who have been systemically oppressed (Bond & Pyle, 1998). On the other hand, broadening the definition diminishes the “us versus them” situation that was set up within the circumscribed definition in employment equity legislation and recognizes the intersection of multiple identities. Definitions of culture are discussed in more detail in the “use of terms” section of this chapter.

Diversity training is frequently considered within the concept of multicultural organizational change (Cox, 1993). For example, Chung (1996) suggests that the goal of diversity programs is to “create a multicultural organization which facilitates and endorses the training that organizational members receive to help them understand and value diversity and consequently increase their ability to function productively within that multicultural organization” (p. 12).

Diversity training generally has three main objectives: increasing awareness about diversity issues, reducing biases and stereotypes, and changing behaviours to manage or work more effectively within a diverse workforce (Hanover & Cellar, 1998). Diversity training takes many forms, ranging from one-hour auditorium style sessions to lunch and learn sessions to
half-day or one-day workshops to week-long residential training. It may be designed to increase awareness of all the dimensions of diversity (Loden & Rosener, 1991); it may focus on specific issues (e.g., cross-cultural communication, sexual orientation, intergenerational differences, gender communication) or on a specific group (e.g., persons with disabilities, First Nations). It could include components on prejudice, discrimination, human rights, harassment and creating respectful workplaces. The training might focus on increasing sensitivity to the impact of differences in the workplace; it might focus on challenging personal assumptions and stereotypes; it might emphasize eliminating systemic barriers; it could address changing individual or team behaviours to create a more inclusive and welcoming workplace.

It is important to note the complexities surrounding First Nations or aboriginal issues, terms that appear to be used interchangeably in the literature.\(^3\) The division of policy issues related to multiculturalism and aboriginal peoples is represented by separate federal government ministries and legislation. The historical, social, and political context of First Nations in Canada has lead to sensitivity among most dominant culture trainers with regard to speaking for First Nations. There are some cases of dominant culture individuals presenting “how to’s” of communicating with aboriginal people. For example, McDonald (undated publication, approximately early 1990s) states that “All staff should become familiar with the different meanings of various communication devices; i.e., lack of eye contact is more a sign of respect than the mainstream Canadian meaning of disrespect; silence is acceptable in conversations with Aboriginal people but most other Canadians tend to fill all the gaps in a conversation” (pp. 47-48). In the early days of equity and diversity training, this type of training, which serves to exacerbate stereotypes and does not address the realities of the aboriginal experience in society or the workplace, was common. More recently, First Nations individuals have begun to offer training that focuses on the historical and current perspectives of aboriginal peoples in Canada. This training addresses myths and misunderstandings (e.g.,

\(^3\) Michael Marker (2000) states in his article *Lummi Identity and White Racism: When Location is a Real Place* that “In this article I use the terms Indian, Native, First Nations, and aboriginal to refer to the indigenous people of North America. First Nations is the preferred term in Canada while in the USA, tribal peoples tend to refer to themselves as American Indians. All of these terms are somewhat interchangeable and selected for particular tone or emphasis” (p. 412). I follow Marker’s (2000) lead, and the increasingly common convention of using lower case for the term “aboriginal” except when quoting an author who uses the upper case.
the impact of the Indian Act and Residential Schools Act), examines exclusionary practices in society and organizations, and explores strategies for community consultation and partnerships (Key an ow Consulting, 1998). Like much diversity training material, the content is available as workshop handouts and is generally unpublished. While there is some attention to First Nations issues in the education literature, the topic is largely absent from the intercultural literature. The question of where the subject of First Nations "fits" in intercultural training came up in several interviews for this study and will be discussed in the final chapter of this thesis.

Thomas (1991) differentiates between valuing diversity and managing diversity, suggesting that "conceptually, valuing differences assumes that lack of understanding, not racism or sexism, is the major challenge" (p.31). It is incumbent on facilitators to clarify an employer's intentions and expectations about diversity training. Facilitators cannot assume that their definition of and expectations about diversity training are the same as those of the individual who requests the training. As Roosevelt Thomas says:

Unless you take time to define "it" conceptually and insist on precision with terminology, you risk chaos. Individuals have agreed to do "it," but vastly different understandings of "it" guide their efforts. There is a great deal of bumping around. (1991, p. 37)

**What is Intercultural Training?**

The terms cross-cultural, intercultural, transcultural and multicultural are used interchangeably in the literature and by practitioners. Hoopes and Pusch (1979) stated that:

"Intercultural" and "cross-cultural" refer to interaction, communication and other processes (conceptual analysis, education, the implementation of public policy, etc.) which involve people or entities from two or more different cultures. There has been some effort to limit "intercultural" to that which is interactive between cultures and "cross-cultural" to that which is comparative or conceptual, but the distinction doesn't hold. In fact, they are used more or less synonymously and tend to vie with each other for predominance. (p. 6)

Hoopes and Pusch (1979) described cross-cultural, or intercultural, training as "all kinds of programs that train people to live, work, study or perform effectively in a cultural setting
different from their own. Several other phrases are sometimes used, such as “race relations training” or “cultural awareness training” (p. 7). Intercultural training, at that time, clearly had an international focus.

In a more recent paper on the development of the intercultural communication field, Pusch (1997), building on Hoopes' (1979) history of the field, describes the development of intercultural training in response to three factors: Americans going overseas to study or work after World War II, and in large numbers with the Peace Corps in the 1960s; cross-cultural adaptation issues for students and business trainees entering the United States; and the civil rights movement that raised racial consciousness during the 1960s and was the impetus for efforts to understand interethnic relations. Pusch (1997) traces the literature that informed an understanding of culture. She highlights Edward T. Hall's (1959, 1976) books on culture and communication, Kluckhohn and Strodbeck (1961) on value orientations, Gordon Allport (1979) on prejudice, and Carl Rogers (1961) and Abraham Maslow (1970) on human relations. Although Pusch (1997) does not make this explicit, as a practitioner I see that different aspects of the literature were used to develop training for different purposes. The literature on communication patterns within societies and comparative values across cultures was widely used in the development of cross-cultural training for international sojourners. The literature on race and prejudice provided the foundation for training related to domestic race relations. I explore the distinction between the two streams in Chapter Two, Mapping the Intercultural Training Field. Humanistic psychology influenced the personal growth dynamic present in both training contexts.

Pusch (1997) notes that early funding for intercultural communication workshops and training materials came from international education, from the training of Peace Corps volunteers, and from the military. “Much of what is known about cross-cultural training and contact is due to research with Peace Corps volunteers” (Brislin, 1977). As multinational corporations expanded during the 1970s, cross-cultural training emerged in international business. Training

---

4 The paper does not address the development of the field of intercultural communication outside of the United States. Implicit in Pusch's (1997) review is that the field was founded in the United States and expanded internationally with the establishment in 1975 of the Society for Intercultural Education, Training, and Research (SIETAR).
materials were adopted and adapted for pre-departure briefings for business professionals and
existing and new research on comparative cultural values was applied to management
strategies across cultures (Trompenaars, 1993; Harris & Moran, 1991; Hofstede, 1997;
Rhinesmith, 1996). At the same time, during the 1960s and 1970s, "the inherently culturally
pluralistic nature of American society could no longer be ignored. The demand for minority
and ethnic group rights, coupled with an assertion of cultural identity, brought intercultural
communication home to the United States" (Pusch, 1997, p 5).

Even within the domestic focus, there is significant debate about the relationship between
multicultural/intercultural training and race relations or anti-oppression training. In their meta­
analysis of research on programs designed to change teacher attitudes and behaviours toward
ethnic minority groups, McGregor and Ungerleider (1993) outline the differences between
cross-cultural training and anti-racism training. They define the purposes of cross-cultural
training as "a) convey social, cultural, economic and political information about other cultures
and countries; b) train people to communicate and interact with people from different cultural
backgrounds; and c) develop cultural self-awareness by examining one's cultural values,
beliefs and assumptions" (p. 60). They define the purposes of a racism awareness approach as
"a) increase people's understanding of the dynamics of racism; and b) increase people's ability
to combat harassment based upon race" (p. 60). These brief definitions served the purpose of
highlighting the differences in the programs examined in McGregor and Ungerleider's (1993)
review. In actuality, the definitions are more complex, and are examined in Chapter Two.

May (1999) points out that cross-cultural training has been criticized for not addressing
racism, discrimination, and prejudice. In a critique of multicultural training Gillbörn (1995)
states that:

Work on difference and diversity is important, but it is not an end in itself.
Unless teachers retain a concern with 'race' and racism, as distinctive factors
(that connect directly with issues of power and oppression) antiracist work
might revert to the worst kind of multiculturalism (typified by a fascination
with difference and exotica): what is sometimes disparagingly referred to as
'the three Ss' - saris, samosas and steel bands. (p. 137)
Kehoe and Mansfield (1993) take exception to this type of attack on multiculturalism. They respond to criticisms of multicultural education with this comment:

"Critics who define multiculturalism as "food, clothing, song and dance" are simply creating a "straw person" which can easily be destroyed. Certainly since 1971 no one could seriously suggest that such a narrow definition of multicultural education is accurate. (p. 3)"

From their perspective, "in most instances the differences between multicultural and anti-racist education appear to be a matter of emphasis" (Kehoe & Mansfield, 1993, p. 3). Ungerleider and Sherlock (1988) found that practitioners of domestic cross-cultural training would agree with this statement. Practitioners describe their work as including both cross-cultural and race relations issues. Nieto (2000), writing about multicultural education in the public school sector, states that:

"To be effective, multicultural education needs to move beyond diversity as a passing fad. It needs to take into account our history of immigration as well as the inequality and exclusion that have characterized our past, our present, and our educational record. (p. 3)"

Attention to the dichotomy between multicultural and anti-racist training is mirrored in recent efforts to bring together the fields of international and domestic intercultural training. Paige and Martin (1996) define intercultural training as:

"Educative processes intended to promote culture learning, by which we mean the acquisition of behavioral, cognitive, and affective competencies associated with effective interaction across cultures. Such interactions can occur within and across societies -- that is, in both domestic and international settings. (p. 36, italics added)"

Pusch (1997) suggests that the two streams of intercultural training are merging, stating that:

"One of the more significant problems in the field has been its division into two parts which have remained unnecessarily separate -- the international/intercultural focus and the domestic interethnic/interracial focus. The international focus initially found its place in higher education and in training personnel for overseas service. The interethnic interest was initially located in elementary and secondary education and the civil rights movement, and has concentrated on teacher education at the university level. Eventually
domestic diversity efforts in both the public and private sector burgeoned in the United States in the 1980s. In the 1990s the movement toward globalization is bringing the two elements—international and domestic—together within the rubric of culture. The thrust of both communities is in the same direction: toward the development of knowledge and skills needed to interact effectively across cultures and to bring about a more equitable distribution of the social good. (p. 5)

While practitioners and theorists alike agree that cross-cultural interactions occur both domestically and internationally, there has been no discussion in the literature of what it looks like to bring these elements together. Issues of race, power, and oppression are not addressed in the international literature, which focuses on interpersonal communication and adaptation. Pusch (1997) does not explain how the social justice approach to which she alludes would become a part of international cross-cultural training. To date, there is slim evidence of a movement in this direction. In the same volume that includes Paige and Martin’s (1996) definition of intercultural training, the editors note that since the first edition of the handbook “the intervening years have not changed the conclusions [about the positive effects of cross-cultural training]” (Landis & Bhagat, 1996, p. 10). They go on to present an international focus as they describe positive changes in people’s thinking, affective reactions and behavior. They use such language as “a greater understanding of host nationals”, “an increase in the feeling, from a given person’s perspective, that he or she has a good working relation with hosts”, and “better adjustment to the everyday stresses of life in another culture” (p. 10).

A recent publication by the Centre for Intercultural Learning5 presents a profile of the interculturally effective person. There is an attempt to recognize both domestic and international components as stated in the following introduction to the profile:

Someone who is interculturally effective has three main attributes:

• an ability to communicate with people of another culture in a way that earns their respect and trust, thereby encouraging a cooperative and productive workplace that is conducive to the achievement of professional or assignment goals;

5 The Centre for Intercultural Learning (CIL) is part of the Canadian Foreign Service Institute in the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade.
The profile makes a contribution to the international field with its identification of nine “essential qualities” or “major competencies”, divided into thirty “core competencies”. The major competencies are 1) adaptation skills, 2) an attitude of modesty and respect, 3) an understanding of the concept of culture, 4) knowledge of the host country and culture, 5) relationship building, 6) self-knowledge, 7) intercultural communication, 8) organizational skills, and 9) personal and professional commitment. The authors note that “with some adaptation, this profile could be useful in defining the intercultural competencies required of workers in many domestic fields where multiculturalism is a major factor in the work environment (diverse workforces, police, educational organizations)” (Vulpe, 2001, p. 13).

While I recognize the efforts of the authors to create an inclusive document, I suggest that the profile would require substantial modification to be applicable for a domestic intercultural training context. The approaches, assumptions, and theories that guide intercultural program planning will be explored in Chapter Two. I have attempted to illustrate the relationship between the development of the two streams of intercultural training, domestic and international, in the diagram that follows.
History of Intercultural Training: Two Streams

Explaining My Practice

I will introduce this section with a short autobiographical note. My personal motivation for engaging in diversity and intercultural work is grounded in a social justice perspective, informed by the lives and histories of my parents and my own experiences as a child from a mixed heritage home (Jewish with roots in Eastern Europe and West Indian Catholic with roots in India). In the small Canadian community in which I was raised I learned the lessons early about being “other”. This experience has shaped my way of being in the world and influenced the direction of my work and education.

Becoming a Diversity and Intercultural Trainer

Let me start by noting that the terms intercultural trainer and diversity trainer are not well-defined. Individuals may have studied sociology, psychology, anthropology, education, or business. They may have had personal experience living or working overseas. Trainers have developed their skills by working as ESL teachers, human resources practitioners, counsellors,
and international business professionals. Their experience may derive from multi-national corporations, non-governmental organizations, grass-roots community development, or personal experience of living and working in diverse cultural contexts. Trainers may work primarily from an international perspective or from a domestic perspective. Their work may be framed by multicultural, international, or anti-oppression conceptualizations of "difference".

My own background includes a bachelors degree in psychology, ten years as a human resources practitioner in progressively senior roles in the public and private sectors, over ten years of experience teaching human resources courses at the post-secondary level, a masters degree in counselling psychology focusing on cross-cultural counselling, and several years counselling international students and students with disabilities at post-secondary institutions. I learned about group process in the counselling psychology program and about corporate training from hands-on experience developing management and staff development programs. I explored cultural identity, cross-cultural adaptation, and cross-cultural training in the counselling psychology program and while working as a counsellor. Before enrolling in the EdD program, I attended several "training for trainer" workshops, which were less about theory and more about training techniques. My learning about adult education, program planning, and diversity training is grounded in practice. Like most people who are involved in diversity and intercultural training, I have developed my understandings about how to design and lead this type of training in the spaces where I teach. As one of my colleagues describes the process, we have "learned on the ground" through co-facilitation, informal conversations with other trainers, and interaction with diverse learners in varied contexts.

Conceptual Framework

My work is shaped by both multicultural and social justice or anti-oppression frameworks within a domestic context. As a result of conducting this study, I have a heightened awareness of the degree to which, depending on the circumstances, one or the other of these frames dominates my workshop design. The demand for my work is generated both by business

---

6 This introduction was adapted from Finding a Good Diversity Trainer (Margolis & McLean, 1998).
7 The notion of social justice encompasses the distribution of rights, responsibilities, and economic goods, as well as relational dimensions and power, including how people treat each other (Gewirtz, 1998).
imperatives and by public policy (e.g., multiculturalism, employment equity, and human rights legislation). These two driving forces shape my practice. I design and facilitate training in cross-cultural communication, building intercultural teams\(^8\), and cross-cultural customer service. This training has a multicultural, interpersonal relations focus -- acknowledging, respecting, welcoming and including individuals with diverse backgrounds. I also facilitate training in valuing and managing diversity, understanding employment equity, and harassment and intervention skills. This training includes both an interpersonal relations and organizational systems focus -- addressing prejudice, discrimination, and systemic barriers. I work with employees in many different functions at all organizational levels.

The training approach is informed by the nature of my client requests, the organizational context in which the training occurs, and the time allotted for the training. It is difficult to open up meaningful conversations dealing with discrimination, oppression, and power relationships in a two- or three-hour session, especially if the training is a one-time delivery without ongoing work by either the organization or myself. In the last year, I have created opportunities with organizations committed to making systemic changes to combine intercultural team work with harassment and discrimination work. I still struggle with how to do this because, although I have the chance to work with all the employees, I work with each employee group for only one day.

Doing what I think of as the “real work” around intercultural issues requires high levels of trust in the workshop group and in the organization. I have developed the habit of checking in with participants at the breaks, although it is difficult to obtain privacy for this. For example, during a break in a recent team session, I encountered one participant in the hallway. She seemed somewhat hesitant when I asked for her thoughts about the workshop. When I pursued her answer of “it’s fine”, she asked if I could address an issue without drawing attention to her. At the time, there was extensive media coverage of the ethnic conflicts in Eastern Europe. This person, along with her colleagues from the same ethnic background,

\(^8\) The overlap of international and multicultural training is particularly evident in this training. For example, I facilitate “Strengthening Intercultural Teams” workshops in the high tech industry in which a ten-member team based in Canada may include individuals from half a dozen different cultural backgrounds, most of whom are recent immigrants.
was faced everyday with negative comments from co-workers about her peoples' role in the conflict. It was causing her great distress and exclusion from her work group.

Later in the day I asked the group to look at what factors in the environment contribute to prejudices and stereotypes, what role the media plays, and how people might have conversations around sensitive topics that they hear in the news. During the small-group activity, as she heard other people sharing examples, the woman who had talked with me expressed her feelings. She said that if her co-workers were interested in learning more about the situation in her country, she would answer questions; she just did not want to feel attacked. The group explored the appropriateness of such conversations in the workplace and how they could talk about cultural and political issues in a respectful way. This, of course, does not address all the issues that the learner's situation raises, but it is a small step to shifting the awareness of her co-workers about her experience and the impact of their behaviour.

Organizational constraints related to time, staffing and budgets result in most training being offered in short-term instructional formats such as half-day or one-day workshops. I was becoming increasingly frustrated with “one-shot” training approaches to intercultural issues when I was invited to join the facilitation team for a new program.

A Different Approach to Intercultural Training

The Intercultural Studies certificate program offered through the Continuing Studies Department at the University of British Columbia was designed to engage learners from various organizational contexts in long-term intercultural training. The only program of its kind in Canada, the program takes approximately one year to complete. It is offered in a combined face-to-face and online format. While they are working, learners participate in five courses designed to integrate formal and practical knowledge. The program is unique in its length, its format, and its integration of theory and practice. In the Intercultural Studies program, I have the chance to work with a team of people who are passionate about intercultural training, in its many forms, and learners who have made a long-term commitment to participating in the program. The program, a significant part of my practice, is the site for
my research. The program development, objectives, learners, and facilitators will be described in more detail in Chapter Four, Research Site and Method.

**Purpose of the Study and Research Questions**

In recent years, I have been troubled by several events that fueled my questions about what difference training makes in the way people interact with others who are different from themselves. A couple of examples will illustrate the tensions that have surfaced for me. One participant wrote on an evaluation form how much she had enjoyed the training and stated “The training is Rhonda, Rhonda is the training!” While I was pleased that she had had a positive experience, I was left with nagging questions about what the training would mean “after the applause” (Ottoson, 1997b). In another situation, some months after an individual attended a one-half day session on cross-cultural communication, she attended an Intercultural Studies course. I facilitated both courses. It seemed from her responses that she was treating all the information in the Intercultural Studies course as new. In yet another example, a manager expressed concern that an employee’s behaviour toward “culturally different” clients had not improved after several cross-cultural courses. The person was still abrupt with clients who had non-Canadian accents and unhelpful with new immigrants who did not know the system. Incidents like these contributed to my questions about what difference training makes in the way learners approach intercultural situations and spurred my interest in conducting the current study. To set the stage for my research questions, I will briefly review the research on the effects of diversity and intercultural training.

**Effects of Diversity Training**

In the past 10 years, in response to globalization, demographic changes in the cultural make-up of Canada and the United States, and increased competition in the marketplace, organizations have devoted extensive resources to training management and staff in diversity issues (Hayles & Russell, 1997; Loden & Rosener, 1991; Morrison, 1992; Thiederman, 1991). Demographic imperatives have spawned a new field of “diversity management” and few organizations have stopped to question what difference the training actually makes (Friedman & Friedman, 1993).
A review of the literature indicates that some attention is now being paid to whether or not diversity programs are successful. Rynes and Rosen (1994) conducted a survey of human resources practitioners in the United States asking about characteristics and effects of diversity programs. Thirty percent of the 785 respondents reported positive long-term effects, including “reduced grievance and lawsuits, increased diversity in hiring and promotion outcomes, increased employee self-awareness of biases, and increased consultation of human resource specialists on diversity-related issues” (Rynes & Rosen, 1994, p. 70). The published article did not provide examples of employee self-awareness.

The assessment of diversity success in organizations has primarily focused on collecting data to demonstrate the hiring, promotion, and salary information related to the hiring of women and minorities (Majors & Sinclair, 1994; Taylor, 1995; Van Eron, 1995). While these numbers may indicate changes in the makeup of the organization, they do not tell us anything about what kinds of relationships and communication occur within the changing workforce. Few organizations have assessed the effects of the diversity training that typically accompanies diversity hiring efforts. The assessment work that has been done has generally consisted of post-workshop reaction forms, or survey-based self-reports of increased levels of knowledge and awareness about diversity issues, stereotyping, prejudice, and harassment (Tan, Morris & Romero, 1996). As a facilitator, I am interested in what aspects of the training or post-training environment help learners understand, articulate, apply, or share what they have learned. This type of research is not a priority with organizations that have limited budgets for training follow-up.

Effects of Cross-cultural Training

In their extensive review of studies pertaining to cross-cultural adjustment in international assignments, Black and Mendenhall (1990) suggest that there is some evidence that “cross-cultural training is effective in developing important cross-cultural skills, in facilitating cross-cultural adjustment, and in enhancing job performance” (p. 133). However, they point out that most of the research lacked a theoretical framework to explain why cross-cultural training is effective and that “more rigorous research designs [are needed] before definitive conclusions about the impact of training over time can be made” (p. 119).
Kealey and Protheroe (1996) suggest that Black and Mendenhall (1990) are “too optimistic” (p. 156) in their views of the positive effects of cross-cultural training. They state that the literature review “treated ‘cross-cultural’ training as an undifferentiated, generic entity, which unfortunately makes it impossible to identify more precisely the different impacts that various types of cross-cultural training might have” (p. 156). Kealey and Protheroe (1996) are concerned about the lack of “scientific rigour” in evaluating the effects of cross-cultural training. They recommend that interculturalists undertake a major study of expatriate training to answer the question “Is cross-cultural training for expatriates effective?”. They outline five criteria for assessment: experimental group controls, random assignment, pre- and post-tests, longitudinal outcome measures, and multiple outcome measures. I recognize the potential value of this type of research for governments and organizations that invest in employee training. As a practitioner, my interests lie primarily in domestic cross-cultural training. I am interested in understanding not only what the outcomes are, but in how learners experience the process of the training.

In their comprehensive review of race relations and cross-cultural training, Ungerleider and Sherlock (1988) created a data-base with examples from three sub-categories of cross-cultural literature: description of training methodologies, evaluation of training effects, and conceptual research. Priority was given to the first two categories. The latter was reported only briefly. As with the review conducted by Black and Mendenhall (1990), domestic and international cross-cultural research was undifferentiated, although the majority of the studies reviewed represented a domestic context. In contrast to Black and Mendenhall’s (1990) “optimistic” discussion of international cross-cultural training, Ungerleider and Sherlock (1988) found that “the outcomes of race relations and cross-cultural training, in the research reviewed, demonstrated a low success rate in improving interracial or cross-cultural attitudes and behaviour” (p. 54). Nevertheless, Ungerleider and Sherlock (1988) caution that it is difficult to draw overall conclusions about the effects of cross-cultural training because “a survey of the research reveals a wide range of training methods, populations [primarily students, police and military], settings, experimental procedures, measurements and results” (p. 55).
Based on their review of the international cross-cultural training literature, Gannon & Poon (1997) contend that “there seems to be general agreement that cross-cultural training can be beneficial [although] there is no consensus as to what instructional approaches are most appropriate or effective for delivering this kind of training” (p. 430). Wide variations in the study populations and methodologies make it difficult to comment unequivocally on the effects of cross-cultural training. The general confusion in the cross-cultural training field, which gives rise to the question, “what is the field?”, has contributed to lack of agreement on the effects of training. There does, however, seem to be consensus about the value of further exploration of the effects of cross-cultural training (Black & Mendenhall, 1990; Gannon & Poon, 1997; Kealey & Protherhoe, 1996; Ungerleider & Sherlock, 1988).

Statement of Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to explore learners’ and facilitators’ perceptions of the effects of intercultural training in order to inform program planning. The study explored learner and facilitator experiences in the Intercultural Studies certificate program and learner perceptions of change as a result of participating in the program.

The central question for this study was: How does participation in the Intercultural Studies program affect the way learners approach intercultural interactions? Related questions included: What are the learners’ experiences of the program? How does training contribute to changes in the way individuals think about and respond to people from cultural backgrounds different from their own? What aspects of the training environment contribute to change? How do learners engage or negotiate learning between the educational and practice contexts, including sharing their learning with others? What are the implications for program planning and facilitator training?

General Approach to the Research

I conducted in-depth interviews with nineteen individuals -- eleven learners who completed the certificate program in Intercultural Studies and eight facilitators who participated in designing the program and/or individual courses. The learners represented a mix of gender, age, ethnic backgrounds, and occupational environments. During the interviews, I explored
learner reasons for participating in the training and the aspects of the training which contributed to a change in how they perceive and work with others from different cultural backgrounds. During the interviews with facilitators I explored their intentions, their conceptual frameworks, their dilemmas, and their reflections on learner change. Before beginning the interviews, I reviewed course curricula and materials related to the development of the program. This document review helped me understand the context for the planning, development, and implementation of the program.

A discussion of the approach to the research would not be complete without commenting on my role as the researcher. Marshall & Rossman (1995) state:

In qualitative inquiry, initial questions for research often come from real-world observations, dilemmas, and questions and have emerged from the interplay of the researcher’s direct experience, tacit theories and growing scholarly interests... Especially in applied fields, such as management, education, and clinical psychology, a strong autobiographical element often drives the scholarly interest. (p. 16)

This is certainly the case in my situation. I am researching part of my practice and thus am intimately involved with the research setting. Marshall and Rossman (1995) state that in such cases “the researcher’s challenge is to demonstrate that this personal interest will not bias the study” (p. 17). I do not think it is possible to make such an assertion. Instead, I have endeavoured to make my biases transparent by “openly discuss[ing] values that shape the narrative and includ[ing my] own interpretation in conjunction with [the] interpretation of participants” (Cresswell, 1998, p. 75). Sumara and Carson (1997) state:

The educational researcher must, in some way, find ways in which to represent not only the conclusions of inquiry, but, as well, the path of thinking and inquiry that has led to these conclusions... It means showing the connections between the researcher and the subject of inquiry. (p. xvi)

Throughout this paper I have tried to give precedence to the voices of the individuals I interviewed and, at the same time, include my thoughts and questions in the discussion. In the final chapter, I bring my own voice to the foreground as I consider implications for practice.
I must acknowledge the particular challenge of examining my own practice. The Intercultural Studies program is more than a research site. It is a site of work and learning for me. The facilitators I interviewed are more than participants in a study. They are my colleagues, my teachers, and my friends. The learners I interviewed are not simply participants in a study. They are my co-learners in the contested territory of intercultural relations. At times, I have struggled with my dual role as an insider with the program and a researcher of the program. The opportunity to examine my practice, which was what drew me to the EdD program, carried with it an ethical responsibility that I only fully appreciated when I found myself standing in the middle of the program while trying to stand outside it. In a true partnership of theory and practice, I found that using the conceptual resources of program planning and transfer of learning helped me clarify my thinking and frame my discussion, particularly in the last chapter, in which I discuss implications for planning. These conceptual resources have helped me negotiate the challenges of studying my own world by giving me some theoretical understandings with which to connect my practice.

I have also made every effort to ensure that I “make [my]self think of unlikely possibilities” (Becker, 1998, p. 24) and not define the problem so well that I have “ruled out of consideration a lot of potentially interesting processes” (p. 23). For example, I conceived the study within the framework of program planning and transfer of learning. The interviews led me on new paths. I have explored conceptual frameworks for intercultural training, cultural identity, safety, challenge, and learning community -- critical factors in intercultural learning.

**Significance of the Study**

This study has the potential to be of value to planners and facilitators of intercultural training because it makes known the experience of individuals who participated in, and those who designed and facilitated, an intercultural training program. I hope the study will contribute to our knowledge about how learners integrate their new understandings into their thoughts and actions. Hayles and Russell (1997) state that:

Diversity work for individuals involves what we know, how we act, and how we feel -- head, hand and heart. If we focus on any two of these three, the third is consistently likely to follow. Diversity change begins in the head as we learn
more about people who are different from us. It continues as a process of modifying behaviour - the “hand” - to become more effective in our interactions with people who reflect different cultures, speak different languages, communicate with different styles, or bring different experiences to their interactions with us. Third, diversity change involves emotional growth in the heart as we develop authentic relationships with people who are different. (p. 1)

I do not know if focusing on two of the three will result in changes in the third element and I would not state with such certainty that diversity change begins in the head. It might just as easily be said that diversity change begins with the heart. Diversity and intercultural trainers hope to contribute to change in all three areas. This study can make a unique contribution to the literature on intercultural training by exploring in depth with learners what they know, how they feel and how they act as a result of participating in intercultural training.

I hope these understandings will inform the ways in which planners and facilitators think about their practice. I would like the study to spark reflection, discussion, and action around questions such as what is the conceptual framework for their program plan -- international, multicultural, anti-racist, integrated? How does each approach affect the training design? How do they define culture and intercultural competence? Who is invited to participate in the planning? How do they establish the opportunity and the guidelines for difficult conversations around culture, race, and power? After all, as Cervero and Wilson (1994) say: “[Program] planning is worldmaking, which is why it matters and why planners should care about doing it better” (p. 171).

As discussed in the final chapter, I have been able to use what I have learned from this study in other aspects of my practice. Readers of the study will have to make their own decision about the degree to which the findings can be applied to their training contexts. Of particular importance for me, as a practitioner, is that the study has the potential to make a significant contribution to the practice of intercultural training by providing a foundation for the reexamination of the frameworks within which planning decisions are made, the reconceptualization of the design of training programs, and the training of trainers.
Use of Terms

Understanding language as competing discourses, competing ways of giving meaning and of organizing the world, makes language a site of exploration, struggle. (Richardson, 1994, p. 518)

Of necessity in introducing my practice, I have already begun to explore the imprecise language that surrounds my work -- diversity, intercultural, multicultural, anti-racism -- and the tensions that are at the core of developing intercultural training programs. Debate abounds in two other areas relevant to this study: definitions of training and education, and more importantly, definitions of race, ethnicity, and culture and the related terminology such as dominant, mainstream, and minority. Without attempting to duplicate the depth of discussion available from other sources, I will provide a brief discussion of the terms, beginning with some thoughts on training and education.

Training and Education

I include a short discussion of training and education to respond to perceptions readers may hold about the meaning of the term training. Historically, when contemplating the learning activities of adults, the term training was used to describe practical, “vocational, utilitarian or specialized pursuits” (Peters et al., 1973, p. 19). Peters and associates (1973) suggest that in contrast to achieving a skill such as pottery making or ballet dancing through training, “an educated person must also have an understanding of the ‘reason why’ of things” and that ‘education’ implies that a [person’s] outlook is transformed by what he knows” (p. 19). (Pottery makers and dancers might disagree with the distinction). In the past, education has been associated with universities and training has been linked to technical, trades or non-formal organizational learning. Marsick and Watkins (1990) suggest that training generally refers to short term courses or workshops that emphasize practical skills, while education is longer-term and formal (i.e., taking place at post-secondary institutions). These distinctions between learning opportunities for adults have become less precise in recent years.

As new definitions of work and learning are emerging, the boundary between employer training and academic education is becoming blurred. An increasing number of employers are
using terms such as *leadership education* and *corporate university* and there is a trend toward using the term *learning centre* and *learners* in place of *training, education,* and *students.* The distinctions among formal (post-secondary), nonformal (organizational training), and informal (self-directed, team-based) education are further blurred by technology (Russell, 1999). There is a strong growth in business and post-secondary partnerships to offer e-learning opportunities for employees that ladder to post-secondary credentials (Frankola, 2000; Kaeter, 2000).

With respect to intercultural training, Gudykunst and Hammer (1983) review a number of characteristics that have been used to describe how training differs from education. These include "an awareness of the different approaches which are most appropriate to the teaching of content..., special attention to how adults learn, a strong preference for the experiential approach, emphasis on learning how to learn, and special attention paid to the sequence and mix of training activities" (Kohls 1980, pp. 86-87, cited in Gudykunst & Hammer, 1983, p. 120). In my experience teaching at post-secondary institutions, I include many of the activities that have been defined as training. In my experience conducting training in organizations, I include many of the activities that have traditionally been identified as education. I am not alone in seeing the two as overlapping. Gudykunst and Hammer (1983) note that they "see a high degree of conceptual similarity between the activities that Harrison and Hopkins (1967) and Kohls (1980) label ‘training’ and those activities that Nadler (1970) and Miller (1979) call ‘education.’" (p. 120). In their chapter in the *Handbook of Intercultural Training,* they stipulated that their use of the term training includes activities that have been considered as education. Stringer and Taylor (1991), on the other hand, differentiate between diversity education and training, stating that:

Training includes both information giving and skill building. For example, training can help managers communicate more effectively across gender, negotiate with Japanese visitors, or do teambuilding with physically challenged individuals. Training is often chosen as a response to specific problem areas or challenges within a work setting. Education includes broader information about culture, values, perceptions and behaviors. This approach helps participants understand their own responses and contrast their cultural values, behaviors and perceptions with those of others...Education programs are preferred if an
organization wants long-term effects across a variety of groups, and if it is seeking changes in its organizational culture. (p. 10)

Similarly, Acton (1997), based on her interviews with diversity trainers, describes diversity training content as "having two components: an education component and a training component. The education part involves information sharing and increasing knowledge. The training portion is described as practicing skills, techniques, and developing strategies to apply back to the work environment" (p. 82). These definitions seem to me to be imposing an artificial dichotomy between training and education. When I facilitate diversity training, I typically include the areas Stringer and Taylor (1991) call education – understanding culture, values and perceptions. Teambuilding, negotiation and communication cannot be decontextualized from these concepts.

Like Gudykunst and Hammer (1983), throughout this study I use the term training to describe my work, the Intercultural Studies program and the field at large. The term includes activities that others may call 'education'. I make this choice because training is the term typically used to describe the educational activities offered within the organizational contexts where much of my work is situated, it is the term used by the facilitators in describing the Intercultural Studies program, and it is the term used in most segments of the field. The exception is multicultural education, which reflects the work in the public school sector and teacher education. The use of the term training to describe the Intercultural Studies program may be because it is part of a continuing studies area at a university where such programs have historically been identified as training. Facilitators may also use the term training because that is the language of the environments in which they do their other work, for example, organizational development and international briefings.

When referring to the literature I use the language used by the authors. In the case of training practitioner and human resources journals, continuing education and organizational development literature, the word of choice is training. In the case of adult education journals and texts, the term used is education. It is not the purpose of this thesis to resolve the training versus education debate. I do want to alert the reader, though, that the use of the label
training does not connote a narrow conceptualization of diversity and intercultural training, or the Intercultural Studies program.

The terms used to describe the people who teach adults also vary. Post-secondary institutions use the terms faculty or instructors. Organizations use the term trainer or facilitator. The term program planner is used in the planning literature to describe people who have multiple responsibilities for planning educational programs. These may include identifying training needs or program ideas, developing learning objectives, designing curriculum and instructional plans, budgeting, scheduling, staffing, marketing, and evaluating programs (Caffarella, 1994). Some program planners also deliver training.

The individuals who design and conduct the learning activities for the Intercultural Studies program are officially called facilitators. In describing themselves, the facilitators use the term trainer interchangeably with facilitator. None of the facilitators I interviewed use the term program planner to describe themselves although they are involved to different degrees in program planning activities as are many trainers, including myself. I have, therefore, used the terms planner, trainer and facilitator interchangeably. At points in this paper where I felt that the terminology might be unclear I have offered a clarifying comment or explanatory footnote.

Race

The complexity of the language around race, ethnicity and culture is well-documented (Elliott & Fleras, 1992; Helms, 1990; James & Shadd, 1994; MacNiel, 1997; Nieto, 2000). These few pages cannot do justice to the multilayered dimensions of race, ethnicity and culture. The New Webster's Dictionary (1993) defined race as a “distinct group of people, the members of which have inherited physical characteristics (skin color, form of the hair, etc.) and transmit them.” The resulting socially created ranking of races, with non-whites at the bottom rung of the ladder, has caused a rethinking of the term race (Rattansi, 1999). In recent years “scientific racism, which was biologically rationalized... has also gone out of fashion and has become largely discredited” (Moodley, 1999, p. 151). Race, instead, is recognized as “…a social construction [and] racism is based on sociopolitical attitudes that demean specific racial characteristics” (Robinson, 1999, p. 76). We cannot, however, simply do away with the term
race. To do so would be to deny that race is a “sociological reality with devastating effects” (McLaren & Torres, 1999, p. 49).

It is within the context of these discussions on race that we understand white\(^9\) to be more than just a colour. It “is socially and historically embedded; it is a form of racialization that carries with it a history of social, cultural and economic relations” (McLaren & Torres, 1999, p. 61), relations which are generally characterized by white privilege (Helms, 1999; McIntosh, 1988). Helms (1999) states that “terms such as *mainstream, majority*, and *dominant* have been used to refer to European (and other White) Americans” (p. 27). In the Canadian context, when I use the terms *mainstream culture, majority culture*, or *dominant culture* I am referring to people of white, Anglo European heritage who hold the social and economic power in Canada.

Schick (2000) points out, “…whiteness is experienced differently across various identifications... I observed the construction of various shades of whiteness, premised on distinctions of class, ethnic background, personal experiences, public and private histories, liberal attitudes, education, gender, sexual orientation and other associations...” (p. 93).

Tatum (1999) too, notes that “White lesbians sometimes find it hard to claim privileged status as Whites when they are so targeted by homophobia and heterosexism” (p. 104). Nonetheless, “the salience of whiteness cannot be overstated” (Schick, 2000, p. 87). As McIntosh (1988) observes in her classic essay on white privilege, “I can be reasonably sure that if I ask to talk to ‘the person in charge’, I will be facing a person of my race” (p. 80) and “I can be fairly sure of having my voice heard in a group in which I am the only member of my race” (p. 79). In her poignant description of “growing up as a Chinese woman in Canada”, Yee (1993) describes her experience of not being white, of “never quite belonging” saying “at home in one’s skin -- taken for granted by most people in this society, but not if that skin is not white” (p. 13). Thus, notions of privilege and power are embedded in my use of the term white.\(^10\)

---

\(^9\) In the absence of universal agreement, I use the more common lower case “black” and “white” except when quoting an author who uses a different form.

\(^10\) This discussion is informed by a Canadian and American context. Definitions of dominance will vary in other contexts. Even within Canada, in Quebec, white is not the sole determinant of dominance.
In contrast to white, the term *visible minority* is used to describe non-white racial minorities, including both recent immigrants and second or third generation Canadians. While visible minority is a term widely used in Canada, particularly with the entrenching of the words in the federal Employment Equity legislation, *people of color* is more commonly used in the United States. This phrase is not without its own problems. Nieto (2000) describes her discomfort with the phrase, saying:

The term *people of color* encompasses those who have been labeled “minority”, that is American Indians, African Americans, Latins, and Asian Americans, and it emerged from these communities themselves. Two problems are] a shared historical experience among all people of color is an illusion [and] people of color is also inaccurate when referring, for example, to Latinos of European background, as is the case with many Argentineans and Cubans...

(p. 28)

Bannerji (1993), too, is uncomfortable with the language and its connotations, describing visible minority as a “perplexing” concept. She notes

On the surface it seems to be a simple euphemism; it seems to work as a way of classifying or categorizing, without appearing to be in any way racist... But its first impact is one of absurdity to anyone who bothers to reflect on it. All forms of material existence except air, have visibility... Some people, it implies, are more visible than others... The category visible minority, then is actually based on notions such as “different,” “not normal,” “not like us,” “does not belong.” This category of “visibility,” and the construction of one’s self as a “minority” (a suffered member of society, even though a citizen and socially productive), are ways of rendering people powerless and vulnerable. (pp. 148-149)

Helms and Cook (1999) echo Bannerji, stating that the “use of the terms *minority-majority* serve to codify the existing racial power” (p. 28) Minority is used to describe people from *visible racial/ethnic groups* and “*majority* is used to describe Whites regardless of the reality of their numerical circumstances” (Helms & Cook, 1999, p. 28).

Visible minority does not account for the experiences of immigrants who are white in colour. Thus, the phrase *invisible* or *non-visible minorities* has evolved in Canada to describe white individuals of “northwestern European extraction (as well as Australia, New Zealand, or United States)...[who] have in common their light skin colour and common cultural heritage...
which, together make them virtually indistinguishable from the mainstream in the West” 
(Elliott & Fleras, 1992, p. 334). Non-visible minority is also used to describe white eastern 
European immigrants who have different linguistic and cultural backgrounds than mainstream 
Canadians. Both visible and non-visible minorities are included in the term ethnic groups 
which “is used primarily to refer to immigrants from non-British and non-French 
backgrounds” (Ng, 1993, p. 185).

The less common term, white ethnics, is used to “refer to those White people who themselves 
or whose ancestors were not successfully assimilated into White American culture, and for 
whom cultural markers signaled the group’s lowly racial or cultural status relative to other 
White Americans” (Helms & Cook, 1999, p. 41). In Canada the terms visible minority and 
ethnic group are generally not used to describe indigenous peoples who are referred to as 
First Nations or aboriginal peoples. The history of cultural genocide, oppression, and 
exclusion of First Nations in Canada adds another layer of complexity to the already 
complicated terrain of intercultural training.

Ethnicity

Van den Berghe (1978) points out that “there is considerable debate in the literature on the 
meaning and definition of both race and ethnicity” (p. xv). He states that “ethnic groups, like 
race... are socially defined but on the basis of cultural criteria [instead of physical criteria]” 
(1978, pp. 9, 10, italics in original). He notes that the word ethnicity was coined during the 
1960s when “it became fashionable to discover, cultivate and cuddle ‘ethnic identities’ and 
‘roots’” (Van den Berghe, 1981, p. 4). He suggests that in theory, ethnicity is defined by 
kinship and geography. He contends that ethnicity is “defined in the last analysis by common 
descent... and that ethnic boundaries are created socially by preferential endogamy [rules for 
marrying within kinship groups] and physically by territoriality” (1981, p. 24). However, he 
goals on to call the notion of kinship a “biological fiction” and states:

Clearly for 50 million Frenchmen or 100 million Japanese, any common kinship 
that they may share is highly diluted, and known to be so. Similarly, when 25 
million Afro-Americans call each other “brothers” and “sisters”, they know that 
they are greatly extending the meaning of these terms... and yet, the fiction of
Van den Berghe (1981) suggests that markers of ethnicity include “genetically transmitted phenotype such as skin pigmentation”, “body mutilations and/or adornments carried a visible badges of group belonging”, “[and] “speech [language], demeanor, or manners...characteristic of the group” (p. 29). Consistent with Van den Berghe, Elliott and Fleras (1992) define ethnicity as “a sense of identity and belonging among those who share an identification or affiliation with a common set of symbols pertaining to birthright, homeland, language, culture and heritage” (p. 133). In their view birthright means “persons with descent from a common source” and homeland means “territory” (p. 135). These characteristics serve to identify who is included and who is excluded from a particular group. Similar definitions, recognizing biological and social aspects of ethnicity, are presented by others in the cross-cultural field. Christensen (1980) defines ethnicity as “biological and sociological criteria such as actual or assumed common ancestry, cultural heritage and a territorial homeland” (p. 12). Aboud and Skerry (1984) suggest that an ethnic group is “a socially or psychologically defined set of people who have a common culture or cultural background, often because of similarity of race, nationality, or religion” (p. 3). Although a number of authors have included biology in their definitions of ethnicity, according to Allport (1979) “Unlike ‘race’, the term [ethnicity] does not imply biological unity” (p. xviii). Ponterotto and Pedersen (1993) noted that:

Ethnicity has been conceptualized by Rose (1964) as a group classification of individuals who share a unique social and cultural heritage (e.g., language, custom, religion) passed on between generations. Here the focus does not rest on a biological or genetic foundation as was the case for race. (p. 6)

Culture

Elliott and Fleras (1992) contrast ethnicity and culture, describing culture as “a complex and evolving system of shared knowledge that contributes to community adaptation and survival” (p. 136) and “ethnicity [as the] collectivities who are aware of their cultural distinctiveness because of wider social trends... they become conscious of themselves as unique and threatened, with a heritage and lifestyle worth preserving despite pressure to do otherwise” (p.
As Banton (1983) points out, the usage of the term ethnicity has been called "a 'minus one' definition of ethnicity: the dominant group insists upon its power to define; members of that group perceive themselves not as ethnic but as setting the standard by which others are to be judged" (p. 65).

The common thread among definitions of culture is the emphasis on the "learned, non-biological aspects of human society, including language, custom and convention" (Abercrombie, Hill & Turner, 1994, p. 98). Samovar, Porter and Stefani (1998) note that:

As early as 1952, Kroeber and Kluckhohn listed 164 definitions of culture that they found in the anthropology literature. And of course, many new definitions have appeared since. Definitions of culture range from all-encompassing ones ("it is everything") to narrower ones ("it is opera, art, and ballet")... We define culture as the deposit of knowledge, experience, beliefs, values, actions, attitudes, meanings, hierarchies, religion, notions of time, roles, spatial relations, concepts of the universe, and artifacts acquired by a group of people in the course of generations through individual and group striving. Culture can therefore include everything from rites of passage to concepts of the soul. (p. 36, italics in original)

The collective and learned nature of culture is captured in the following definition:

Culture is about how people interpret the world around them by developing shared understandings. People learn collectively how to interpret what is important and unimportant and how to behave in specific circumstances. Culture provides people with rules about how to operate in the world in which they live and work. (Rubin & Rubin, 1995, p. 20, italics in original)

A similar notion of culture is presented by Schein (1992) who defines culture as "a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration..." (p. 12, italics in original) and by Hofstede (1997) who defines culture as "the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one group or category or people from another." (p. 5, italics in original). These writers also suggest that culture has different layers or levels. Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) describe three levels of culture -- national or regional society, corporate or organizational culture, and professional and ethical orientations within organizations. Hofstede (1997) states that "as almost everyone belongs to a number of different groups and categories
of people at the same time, people unavoidably carry several layers of mental programming
within themselves, corresponding to different levels of culture” (p. 10).

Hofstede’s (1997) layers of culture include a national level, a “regional and/or ethnic and/or
religious and/or linguistic affiliation level” (p. 10), a gender level, a generation level, a social
class level, and a corporate level. A number of other writers have suggested that all
encounters are cross-cultural, broadening their definition to include not only ethnic or racial
background, but also characteristics such as gender, ability, age, lifestyle, socioeconomic
status, norms, values, and belief systems (Pedersen, 1978; Paradis, 1981; Atkinson, Morten &
culture in this way:

The narrow definition of culture is limited almost totally to anthropological
descriptors such as nationality and ethnicity. A broader social-systems
definition of culture includes demographic variables, such as age, gender, and
place of residence; status variables, such as social, educational, and economic
level; and affiliation variables to formal and/or informal groups, in addition to
ethnographic variables of nationality, ethnicity, religion, and language. (p. 127)

Ponterotto and Pedersen (1993) point out that culture sometimes refers to artifacts or
behaviours that can be seen by others or it may be subjective and invisible to others as defined
by attitudes, feelings, opinions, and assumptions held to be important by a group.

The broader social-systems definition of culture has received increasing attention as
organizations have implemented diversity training in the last decade. Such a definition is not
without controversy. Does subsuming all differences under the heading of culture make the
concept meaningless or does the broadening of the concept encourage people to understand
the complexity of culture? Hayles and Russell (1997) acknowledge that “diversity leaders are
sometimes accused of diluting the much-needed work on racism and sexism by discussing ‘all
the ways in which we differ’” (p. 13). They make a strong statement that:

It must be made clear that broad inclusion will enhance the work on race and
gender, not dilute it. Initiating diversity by dealing exclusively with race and
gender often causes disengagement on the part of those who most need to face
race and gender issues… All of us must do this work; all of us will benefit from it. (p. 13)

Robinson (1999), too, argues for a recognition of the “multiple identities that compose our lives. Included are race, gender, class, sexual orientation, ability and disability” (p. 73). She discusses in detail the dominant discourses across intersecting identities. She introduces her discussion with the following comments about “invisible isms”:

Far too often, many of us erroneously believe that if we do not have membership in a particular group, then we are immune from the ways in which this group is affected by oppression... One of the dominant discourses of race is that European Americans think that they do not have to think about being White and what this means because race is often not viewed as salient to their identities. As a consequence, many Whites do not consider race or racism to be an issue that directly affects them and those who look like them... For some time, many women have been and need to continue pondering the effects of gender on their lives, yet neither gender nor sexism is the sole domain of women. Men, as gendered beings, are influenced by rigid and sexist discourses whereby they are oriented toward success, competition, and the need to be in control... Is there room for substantial concern among heterosexuals about the dominant discourse of heterosexism that blankets this nation? If there are adverse consequences of heterosexism for persons who are gay, lesbian, or bisexual, and there are, then surely there are consequences for me as a heterosexual, professional woman residing in the “conservative South”. (pp. 73, 74)

As we see from this short discussion of race, ethnicity and culture the terms are not easily defined nor are they easily separated. “Because of the centrality of ‘whiteness’ within the dominant national identity, Americans generally make few distinctions between ‘ethnicity’ and ‘race’ and the two concepts are usually used interchangeably” (Marable, 1988, p. 364). Rattansi observes that “the difficulties of drawing neat boundaries around concepts such as ethnicity, ethnocentrism, ‘race’, racism, and so forth are now becoming more widely acknowledged as are the difficulties of finding unambiguous and acceptable ethnic labels in practices of regulation and policy…” (1999, p. 84).

It is a constant challenge to find language that represents the experience of the people about whom I speak. I am painfully conscious that any labels “oversimplif[y] how race is experienced” (Thornton, 1988, p. 97). A number of the individuals I interviewed voiced
similar concerns about their choice of language. They tended to use the terms white, mainstream, majority and dominant cultures interchangeably, and used both person of colour and visible minority to describe non-white identities. Both of the latter terms seem to be preferred to non-white, which privileges whiteness. In avoiding non-white, there is an attempt to “resist the white referent point while knowing full well that the language we use and the systems we live in daily still bind us to it” (Sheth & Handa, 1993, p. 41).

It is important to have a discussion about terms like culture, ethnicity, and race, not to arrive at a definition, but to illustrate the plurality of meaning surrounding the language and the assumptions embedded in the use of terms. In the field of intercultural studies, there are many questions that have no answers. It is the process of inquiry and dialogue that creates opportunities for learning.

**Summary**

In this chapter I explored the history and current state of diversity and intercultural training, explained my practice, described the research questions and significance of the study, and elaborated on the terminology of the intercultural training field. In short, I laid bare the messy world in which I practice.

The intercultural training literature divides into two major streams: intercultural training for the international context and intercultural training for the domestic context. International training emphasizes preparation for expatriate work assignments or study opportunities, cross-cultural adjustment, and cross-cultural management. Training within the domestic context encompasses three major areas: multicultural or cross-cultural training, anti-racist or race relations training and cultural diversity training. Cross-cultural or multicultural training tends to focus on increasing awareness of the impact of culture on values, communication and

---

11 The terms cross-cultural, intercultural, multicultural, and cultural diversity are used interchangeably in the literature. The UBC program uses “intercultural” because it “implies a dynamic or movement between cultures. As in a cross-cultural situation, there is a comparison of cultural systems in an effort to better understand one another and to build ways of working well together. In addition, the term implies the potential that the interaction between the two or more cultures will lead to a changing of the cultures themselves” (Foundations course manual, 1997). Despite this differentiation, facilitators agreed that they use intercultural and cross-cultural interchangeably.
behaviour and developing cross-cultural communication and problem-solving skills. There is some overlap with the goals in international or expatriate training. Race relations, anti-racism, or anti-oppression training addresses prejudice, discrimination, power and racism. Cultural diversity training is offered within organizations in an effort to eliminate systemic barriers and improve working relationships and productivity. This training includes elements of multicultural and race relations training. It evolved out of affirmative action initiatives in the United States and employment equity legislation in Canada and often encompasses broad diversity factors including gender, disability, sexual orientation, and age. In my practice, as in the practices of a number of the facilitators with whom I spoke, elements of multicultural and anti-racism training may overlap. The impetus for the Intercultural Studies program came from expressed needs of international student advisors. The program design was influenced by both international and multicultural perspectives.

Efforts to determine the effects of intercultural training have been hampered by the lack of differentiation in the field, the multiple contexts in which training occurs, and the varied research methodologies used to assess training effectiveness. Evaluation of training has focused on training outcomes with little attention being paid to the experience of the learners or facilitators during their participation in the programs. In this study, I interviewed learners and facilitators in an intercultural studies program to gain an understanding of what difference training makes to learners, and what factors in the training contribute to learner change. This study has the potential to make a unique contribution to practitioners who plan and facilitate intercultural training.

In order to situate the Intercultural Studies program and the experiences of learners and facilitators, Chapter Two maps the development of the field of intercultural training.
CHAPTER TWO
MAPPING THE INTERCULTURAL TRAINING FIELD

It is not surprising, given the varied interests of the people involved, that there has been little agreement over the meaning and focus of the concept of intercultural training or education. For instance, these terms have been applied to such diverse activities as “taking a bus in Japan” to “synergistic management practices in multinational corporations”. Similarly, definitions of intercultural training/education have ranged from sensitizing managers to “the influence of culture on their own behavior and the behavior of the host nationals” (Thiagrajan, 1971, p. 69) to “teaching members of one culture ways of interacting effectively with minimal misunderstanding in another culture (Brislin & Pedersen, 1976, p. 1)” (Gudykunst & Hammer, 1983, pp. 118-119).

The field of intercultural training is interdisciplinary. It has roots in anthropology, sociology, psychology, linguistics, and political science. As discussed in Chapter One, training programs for intercultural communication developed in two streams: first, from the practical needs of international sojourners and second, from the American civil rights movement. In 1979 Hoopes wrote:

Intercultural communication as a field in itself is relatively new. Anthropologists, political scientists and linguists have for a long time, of course, been concerned with various dimensions of culture and communication, but until recently, none put them together in a broad framework of intercultural relations...[The field] is most easily dated, however, from the publication in 1959 of Edward T. Hall’s Silent Language. This book gave us the first comprehensive analysis of the relationship between communication and culture. (p. 10)

Almost twenty-five years later, intercultural training is still considered an emerging field. Paige and Martin (1996) review the characteristics of a profession, stating that:

It possesses a distinctive body of knowledge shared by its members. It has a sanctioned and specified program of academic study and related experience leading to the acquisition of knowledge and skills. It has strict procedures by which its members are certified and equally strict membership rules. It has a set of professional ethics that governs behavior and that sets standards against which the activities of members are judged. (p. 39)
Paige and Martin (1996) observe that “given these criteria, one could argue that the field of intercultural training has not yet achieved the status of a profession” (p. 39). One of the efforts toward achieving this goal was the formation of The Society for International Education, Training and Research (SIETAR) in the early 1970s. SIETAR grew out of a cultural training conference sponsored by the US Peace Corps in the 1960s and its purpose, according to Wight (2001), was to “promote intercultural, interracial, and international understanding, communication, and cooperation” (SIETAR website). Paige and Martin (1996) describe the purpose in different terms, stating “it was formed expressly for the purpose of legitimating and promoting the fledgling field of intercultural training” (p. 40). SIETAR holds annual conferences around the world and attracts presenters and participants from a range of disciplines including education, psychology, social work, linguistics, and business. In the 1980s SIETAR established a committee to develop a certification procedure, however the idea was dropped when the committee could not reach agreement (Paige & Martin, 1996, p. 42). Symbolic of the growing pains of the field is the fact that SIETAR is currently “in a state of transition” and the Executive has extended “an open invitation to all the Society’s members to participate in the discussion of our future” (SIETAR website, 2001).

A second organization that has made a significant contribution to the field is the Intercultural Communication Institute (ICI) in Portland, Oregon. The directors, Janet Bennett and Milton Bennett, and the associate director, Margaret Pusch, have had a strong influence on the field. The ICI is home to the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication (SIIC). M. Bennett’s (1993) Development Model of Intercultural Sensitivity is widely cited in the intercultural literature. Bennett and Bennett (1996) and Pusch (1994), along with Paige and Martin (1996) have been at the forefront of recommending sequencing training activities with attention to risk levels and learning emphasis (cognitive, affective, behavioral). The work of these authors is included in the examination of safety, risk, and challenge in Chapter Seven, Difficult Dialogues.

The SIIC was founded in 1976 at Stanford University, and since 1986 it has come under the auspices of the ICI. So well known is the SIIC that among intercultural trainers it is described
as "going to Portland". The SIIC offers workshops in six topic areas: intercultural consulting, training, and organization development in business; intercultural teaching and training design and methods in organizations; domestic diversity topics and diversity training in education and business; intercultural conflict, counseling, and leadership; intercultural identity development; and special application and culture-specific topics. Like the SIETAR conferences, the SIIC attracts individuals from multiple disciplines in an international context. In recent years, the SIIC has offered an increasing number of workshops related to domestic diversity and anti-racism issues. The SIIC provides a forum for the sharing of academic research and unpublished practitioner knowledge.

In Canada, two organizations offer professional development for individuals interested in intercultural relations, including intercultural trainers -- UBC's Intercultural Studies program, which has an international/multicultural focus, and the Cultural Diversity Institute (CDI) at the University of Calgary, which has a domestic diversity focus. The UBC program was developed in the early 1990s in response to the needs of international student advisors. The program is described in detail in Chapter Four. CDI was established in 1998 through an agreement between the Government of Alberta (Ministry of Community Development) and the University of Calgary. Its mandate is to "create and disseminate knowledge and information regarding cultural diversity and effects on human interaction, and to look at ways of developing greater understanding and appreciation for the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary to fully realize the benefits of cultural diversity" (CDI website, 2001). CDI hosts a Diversity Institute each summer. The workshop topics relate to implementing organizational diversity programs, designing diversity training and addressing racism.

It is evident from the nature of the organizations that have been established and the types of training programs offered that the separation between international and domestic intercultural training continues. Other problems exist in the field. Gudykunst and associates (1996) described seven issues that affect the design of intercultural training: 1) unrealistic expectations of short-term training, 2) lack of theoretical foundation, 3) confusing terminology (e.g., intercultural training, diversity training, cultural diversity training, multicultural training, multicultural education, cross-cultural training), 4) cultural bias in
training design, 5) reluctance of organizational representatives or program planners and
trainers to include the confrontation of prejudices in training, 6) political pressures that
influence the allocation of resources and the objectives of training and 7) lack of
organizational support to reinforce training. These issues are reflected in the analysis of
learner and facilitator experiences in this study in Chapters Five, Six and Seven.

In the next three sections I review approaches to international training and two forms of
domestic training, multicultural training and anti-racism training, and explore the differences
and similarities.

**International Training**

Kealey and Protheroe (1996) describe three major purposes of intercultural training
interventions in the context of overseas adaptation: “increased knowledge and appreciation
about a country, its culture, and its development challenge; increased awareness of the skills
and behaviour needed to be successful in another culture; and increased skills in
that “unlike diversity training, which is often social change oriented, the emphasis in
international training is generally on preparing individuals to live and work in another culture
by and large on its terms” (p. 102, emphasis in original). They point out that intercultural
training is “strongly informed by the intercultural communication perspective” (p. 101).

Training components include practical, specific information on the destination country,
language phrases for everyday use, and communication styles across cultures (e.g., titles,
degree of formality, eye contact, gestures, degree of directness of conversation). In addition
to this culture-specific content, the training includes culture-general aspects including
increasing understanding of one’s culture in comparison to other cultures, exploring the
impact of culture on values, thinking patterns, and behaviour, and developing strategies to
cope with culture shock (Brislin et al., 1986; Chase & de Silva, 1995; Stringer & Paige,
1997). Developing cultural self-awareness is a key component of intercultural training
(Gudykunst & Hammer, 1983). Training techniques include didactic approaches (giving
information, lecture), experiential approaches (simulations, role plays), analytical approaches
Brislin and associates (1986), in their book, *Intercultural Interactions, A Practical Guide*, propose a critical incident training methodology based on their three-part criterion of success for international sojourners: good personal adjustment, good interpersonal relations with hosts, and attainment of goals or performance in another country. They point out that individuals make judgments about others based on their own perceptions of “right and wrong”. They suggest that when sojourners are confronted with unexpected and perceived “improper” behaviours of others they may experience “intense dislike of culturally different others (leading to prejudice), negative labels (stereotypes), and a refusal to interact with the others (discrimination)” (p. 16). Within a framework of attribution theory, they created 100 critical incidents related to host customs, interacting with hosts, tourist experiences, making adjustments, the workplace, family, schooling, and returning home. The training is designed to encourage learners to explore interpersonal situations from the perspective of another culture. Although the incidents are prefaced and followed by brief discussions of prejudice, without the guidance of a facilitator, it would be easy for readers to ignore issues of prejudice and discrimination. Before discussing multicultural training, I will provide a short review of attribution theory, perceptual field theory and intercultural communication theory.

**Attribution Theory**

Attribution theory developed in the field of psychology in an attempt to understand the perceptual and cognitive processes involved in explaining behaviour. Brislin and associates describe attribution in this way:

> Attributions refer to the conclusions we make after observing behavior: whether other people (or the observers themselves) are competent, well-intentioned, effective, naïve, power-hungry, pressured by external forces, and
so forth. One type of judgment which has received a great deal of attention is *causal attribution*... [for example] A graduate student from Saudi Arabia studying in the United States has a term paper assigned to him by a professor. The student turns in a paper, but the professor marks it “F” and writes “plagiarized” on the front page. This is a problem that demands disciplinary action at American universities. But given that it is a student from overseas, the professor calls the foreign student adviser on campus rather than the college dean. The professor asks “Is there something going on here that I don’t know about?” (1986, p. 320)

In this example, the professor is uncertain as to the reason for the student’s behaviour. According to Brislin and associates (1986), if the professor labels the student “a cheat”, he or she may be making a fundamental attribution error, that is assigning a trait label without taking into account situational factors, one of which is the student’s cultural context. At the same time, the professor would have to be careful that in looking for a cultural explanation, he or she did not respond to the individual, or others, based on a cultural stereotype. I like the critical incident approach (Brislin et al., 1986) for its intention to encourage individuals to step outside their own cultural frame of reference. I have some concerns about the potential that learners will assume that a particular set of traits applies to everyone from that cultural group, and that certain behaviours will be appropriate in response to those traits. The critical incident approach may inadvertently reinforce learner stereotyping of individuals from different cultures than their own.

Although it is not always explicitly acknowledged, attribution theory underpins much of the training in intercultural interactions. It is conveyed in the messages asking learners to look for alternative explanations from the perspective of other cultural values, norms, and communication patterns. Brislin (1993) emphasizes the importance of context in the communication process and suggests that to understand behavior we must have knowledge about individual personalities, attitudes and values, and situational variables such as formal and informal rules, amount of structure, and notions of public and private information.

**Perceptual Field Theory**

Related to attribution theory is perceptual field theory. Lewin (1997/1948), a social psychologist whose work in field theory is foundational to the field of perceptual psychology,
proposed that the conceptualization of a person's "life space" or "perceptual field" is fundamental in understanding behaviour. The perceptual field is constituted by the individual's perception of self and others. It is "the experience in which each individual lives the everyday situation of self and surroundings which each person takes to be reality" (Snygg & Combs, 1949, p. 15). Rogers (1961) uses the terms "private perceptual worlds" and "cognitive maps of experience" to describe an individual's perceptions of reality. Perceptual psychologists suggest that "people do not behave according to the facts as others see them. They behave according to the facts as they see them" (Combs et al., 1976, p. 20, italics in original). They suggest that people are more comfortable with others whose perceptual fields have more in common with their own, for example, people who share a common culture.

A perceptual model of intercultural interactions was proposed by Marshall Singer (1998) in the late 1960s. Drawing from work in psychology, linguistics and anthropology, Singer proposed that "people behave as they do because of the ways in which they perceive the external world" (1998, p. 97). Hoopes (1979) builds on Singer's work describing a theoretical framework for cross-cultural training. He states that:

The key to achieving effective cross-cultural relations is to become functionally aware of the degree to which our behavior is culturally determined... One of the simplest and yet most difficult ideas to internalize is the concept of perceptual difference -- the idea that everyone perceives the world differently and that members of one culture group share basic sets of perceptions which differ from the sets of perceptions shared by members of other culture groups... The way we perceive the world, what we expect of it and what we think about it, is so basic and so ingrained, is buried so deep in us and in our unconscious that we continuously act and react without thinking why -- without even realizing that we might think why. (pp. 13-14)

One of the key aspects of intercultural training is the facilitation of awareness of one's own and others' "cultural maps". The intention in training is that an understanding that individuals are influenced by different maps or worldviews will lead to fewer faulty attributions and greater willingness to accept different ways of thinking, feeling, and behaving. In this view of intercultural relations, power is alluded to only in passing. Singer (1998) notes that:
There is one additional concept I would like to introduce here. Every communication relationship has a power component attached to it. We might as well recognize that and deal with it openly and consciously... It is also my contention that any study of communication relationships that ignores the power aspect of those relationships is one that misses a very important element of all communication. (pp. 106-107)

Like Singer (1998), Hoopes (1979) acknowledges power but does not explore it. Hoopes (1979) comments that "dealing with prejudice tends to be political. You have to defuse and render powerless the prejudiced person. Behavior based on contrary cultural assumptions and values, on the other hand, is a different matter and may be approached through the communication process" (p. 34). It seems that at the same time as he recognizes power, he separates it from the study of intercultural interactions.

Intercultural Communication Theories

This review of intercultural communication theory is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather to provide a backdrop from which to understand the experiences of the learners interviewed for this study. In introducing an anthology of intercultural communication theories, Kim (1988) states that "The term, intercultural communication, is conceived in the present theories primarily as direct, face-to-face communication encounters between or among individuals with differing cultural backgrounds" (p. 12, italics in original). She suggests that intercultural communication theories can be classified as following one of three traditions: "1) Positivist tradition, emphasizing the goal of prediction; 2) Humanist tradition emphasizing the goal of understanding; and 3) Systems tradition emphasizing the goal of understanding and prediction" (p. 16). I have some difficulty with this definition of systems theory which I will return to later in this section. An often-cited representative of the positivist tradition is William Gudykunst. His uncertainty reduction theory is based on the premise that individuals experience anxiety when confronted with unfamiliar individuals and situations and that "reducing uncertainty/controlling anxiety are necessary and sufficient conditions for intercultural adaptation" (1988, p. 124). Gudykunst and Kim use the term strangers to refer to "those people in relationships where there is a relatively high degree of strangeness and a relatively low degree of familiarity" (p. 1997, p. 26). Gudykunst (1988) suggests that both
interpersonal and intergroup communication involve predicting the behaviour of strangers using cultural, sociological, and psychological data. Anxiety will be reduced by such things as increasing knowledge of the host culture, second language competence, recognizing stereotypes, and having positive contact with “outgroup” members. Individual factors that influence the process of uncertainty reduction include willingness to seek information, ability to modify behaviour to accommodate different social situations, and control over emotional reactions. Fundamental to uncertainty reduction theory is the notion of “adaptive communication” due to the fact that “the power of individual strangers to change the host environment is minuscule, at least in the short run” (Gudykunst & Kim, 1997, p. 338). Like Brislin and associates (1986), Gudykunst and Kim (1997) emphasize the role of biased perceptual processes and misattributions in causing cross-cultural misunderstandings.

Kim (1988) points out that the positivist tradition has been challenged by alternative humanistic approaches including interactionist and constructivist approaches that emphasize description and understanding of behavior, not prediction and control. From a constructivist perspective, intercultural training would focus on producing “process competency, enhancing communicators’ ability to flexibly adapt to situations through accessing strategies at multiple levels” (Applegate & Sypher, 1988, p. 57). Samovar and associates (1998), for instance, emphasize the dynamic process of culture and communication. They suggest that, not only do cultures change, but that individuals change in the process of communication. They state that “Communication is an ongoing activity. We constantly are affected by other people’s messages and, as a consequence, are always changing” (p. 24). They also underscore that communication occurs in context and is part of a larger system.

Starting with the premise that systems theories are about understanding and prediction, Kim (1988) includes in this category models that are related to acculturation, “the changes that occur as a result of continuous firsthand contact between individuals of differing cultural origins” (Ward, 1996, p. 124). Kim included adaptation theories in the anthology of intercultural communication because an individual’s stage of acculturation affects their interactions with others. There are a number of theories of cross-cultural adaptation, all of which recognize both individual psychological variables and societal variables (Berry, 1985,
Kim, 1997; Ward, 1996). The models may differ in the description or portrayal of the adaptation process, however they have in common a recognition that each individual's acculturation process will include psychological and social adjustment that will be affected by the interaction of individual characteristics and societal receptivity. The models are predictive in that culture shock "is viewed as an integral and inevitable part of the process" (Kim & Ruben, 1988) of adaptation.

My understanding of systems theory is different from Kim's (1988) portrayal. It is informed by the notion that "Systems thinking is a discipline for seeing wholes. It is a framework for seeing interrelationships rather than things, for seeing patterns of change rather than 'static' snapshots" (Senge, 1990, p. 69). It is not about prediction. One systems model, developed by Jacques Proulx, a French-Canadian researcher, incorporates notions of cultural identity and representation of self to others, situational variables, and context. The key elements of Proulx's (1997, 1998) systemic approach to intercultural interaction are the identities of the individuals, the situation in which individuals are involved, the context in which the interaction takes place, and the strategies the individuals use to work through the situation. Potential stress points in each interaction can result from contextual, individual, and interpersonal differences. Each person brings different levels of identity (e.g., national, ethnic, religious, professional, organizational) to the situation and represents a particular image to the other. Individuals understand and respond to that image from their history, personal experience and societal knowledge. "In problematic intercultural situations, identity boundaries are stressed [and] individuals often feel attacked and reluctant to disclose their perspective on the situation" (Foundation course notes, 1997, p. 34). The model encourages an analysis of the interaction of all the variables.

Not surprising, as the model grew out of the particular political context of Quebec, is the recognition of "economic and political forces in culture and communication" (Martin & Nakayama, 1997). Proulx could strengthen the model by explicitly addressing the issues of power embedded in his description of context and identity. Proulx uses the model for intercultural training within the university, corporate, and public sectors. Proulx's work is available only in French. I have had access to his model by hearing him present at a summer
institute held by the Intercultural Studies Program and through translated material in the program course notes. With its attention to context and interaction of multiple aspects of individuals and situations, it is a model deserving of wider attention in the intercultural training field.

Like international training, multicultural training draws on intercultural communication theory, attribution theory and perceptual field theory in its intention to encourage individuals to explore the impact of culture on values, communication styles, assumptions, expectations and judgments. Martin and Nakayama (1997) observe that:

Early scholars and trainers in intercultural communication defined *culture* narrowly, primarily as "nationality." Scholars mostly compared middle-class U.S. citizens to residents of other nations. Trainers tended to focus on helping middle-class professionals become successful overseas. One might ask why so few scholars focused on domestic contexts, particularly in the 1960s and 1970s when the United States was fraught with civil unrest. One reason may be the early emphasis of the FSI [Foreign Service Institute] on helping overseas personnel. Another reason might be that most scholars who studied intercultural communication were themselves middle-class; they gained their intercultural experience through international contexts such as the Peace Corps, the military or business abroad. (p. 28, italics in original)

Unlike international training, multicultural training has its roots in social change in a domestic context. To varying degrees, multicultural training addresses prejudice, discrimination, exclusion, and systemic barriers.

**Multicultural Training**

The introduction of multicultural training into organizations has its beginnings around the same time as the multicultural education movement in the United States and Great Britain. Multicultural education developed in response to policy shifts that recognized cultural pluralism (May, 1999; Seelye & Wasilewski, 1979). The multicultural education movement at both the public school and the post-secondary levels include recruitment of teachers from

---

12 This raises an interesting question of how knowledge is disseminated. There may well be unpublished practitioner material or material in languages other than English to which English-speaking trainers do not have widespread access. Much of what we learn as practitioners is shared by other practitioners at conferences and informally. I have received permission from Dr. Proulx to have his manuals translated into English.
minority groups, training for teachers in cross-cultural understanding, and training for students in recognizing and valuing differences (Gillborn, 1995; McArthur-Blair, 1995; Seelye & Wasilewski, 1979; Nieto, 2000). It also includes infusion of ethnic and cultural content into subject areas, helping students analyze the cultural assumptions that shape knowledge construction, helping students reduce prejudice and develop positive attitudes toward different cultural and racial groups, modifying teaching to facilitate the achievement of students from all groups ("equity pedagogy"), and creating a school culture that empowers students from diverse groups (Banks, 2001). May (1999) raises concerns about the central claim that "multicultural education can foster greater cultural interaction, interchange and harmony both in schools and beyond" (p. 1). He holds out hope for the potential of multicultural education although he states that it "has had a largely negligible impact to date on the life chances of minority students, the racialized attitudes of majority students, the inherent monoculturalism of school practice, and wider processes of power relations and inequality that underpin all these" (p. 1, italics in original).

As acknowledged in Chapter One, there is significant debate about the degree to which multicultural education is, or should be, focused on fostering "sensitivity and appreciation for all cultures" (Pusch et al., 1979, p. 95) or "invit[ing] students and teachers to put their learning into action for social justice" (Nieto, 2000, p. 314). Tatum (1999) points out that "Not only do children need to be able to recognize distorted representations, they also need to know what can be done about them. Learning to recognize cultural and institutional racism and other forms of inequity without also learning strategies to respond to them is a prescription for despair" (p. 49). Similar issues arise in organizations in the business sector which, as described in chapter one, has embraced intercultural or multicultural training to enhance harmony and productivity in the workplace. Stringer and Paige (1997) describe intercultural training in the workplace as:

Help[ing] participants examine the nature of culture and the impact it has in shaping their lives. Through the exploration of cultural differences in values, perceptions, and patterns of behavior, and intercultural communication skill building, it is intended to provide the participant with an enhanced capacity to work effectively with persons from other cultures. This form of training also examines oppression and discrimination as a significant part of a culture
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group’s history and a major contributor to how members perceive the world, but it does not place the anti-oppression agenda at the center of training. Instead, it encourages each individual to see how other groups and individuals have been affected by their unique history.” (p. 101)

From a practitioner perspective, I am aware that cross-cultural or multicultural training, including some of my own work, is implemented with varying degrees of attention to discrimination or oppression. The focus is on individual awareness and interpersonal relations from a “respecting differences” perspective. Particularly in the case of short workshops in which in-depth explorations are not possible, prejudice and systemic oppression hovers on the periphery of the training and is not directly addressed. The impact of emphasizing a respecting differences approach over an anti-oppression approach is examined in Chapter Seven, Difficult Dialogues.

The components in multicultural training are similar to those in international training with two key differences: multicultural training is culture-general instead of culture-specific, that is, the training is designed to prepare individuals for interaction with any culture (Brislin & Pedersen, 1976) and the training does not usually emphasize cross-cultural adaptation strategies. There is no unifying conceptual framework. Both international and multicultural training are shaped by intercultural communication theories, attribution, and perceptual field theory. Depending on the purpose of the training other theories such as cross-cultural adaptation, intergroup dynamics or stages of team development, may underpin the training design. Theoretical frameworks are rarely explicit, which may contribute to the confusion in the field (Black & Mendenhall, 1990; Gudykunst et al., 1996; Paige & Martin, 1996). Elements of anti-racism training may be included in multicultural training.

**Anti-Racism Training**

The groundbreaking work that informed anti-racist, anti-oppression, and unlearning racism training in the United States was Judith Katz’ (1976) dissertation (and subsequent book) -- *Systematic Handbook of Exercises for the Re-education of White People with Respect to Racist Attitudes and Behaviors*. Katz’ training is designed from the premise that “racism is a
white problem in that its development and perpetuation rests with white people” (p. 14) and that:

The racial prejudice of white people coupled with the economic, political and social power to enforce discriminatory practices on every level of life -- cultural, institutional, and individual, is the gestalt of white racism. Therefore, the “race” problem in America is essentially a white problem in that it is white people who have developed racism, who perpetuate it, and who have the power to destroy it. (p. 15)

Katz (1976) outlined the assumptions which form the basis for the training: 1) “racism is predominantly a white problem”; 2) “… no person in the US can grow up without being exposed to and developing some prejudiced attitudes about another person or group; 3) “white people can learn about racism with other white people”; 4) “white people need to be re-educated”; 5) “it is advantageous for whites to learn about racism for their own survival: physically, socially and psychology” (pp. 70-71).

Katz (1976) draws on the fields of psychology and human relations training in the development of her training program. She references Festinger’s (1957) theory of cognitive dissonance as the basis for analyzing how behaviour change occurs, that is, behaviour change will occur once people recognize the inconsistencies between what they do (behaviours) and what they say they believe (attitudes). The foundation for the use of dissonance theory is Myrdal’s (1962) presentation of the American dilemma described as:

The ever-raging conflict between, on the one hand, the valuations preserved on the general plane which we shall call the “American Creed,” where the American thinks, talks, and acts under the influence of high national and Christian precepts, and, on the other hand, the valuations on specific planes of individual and group living, where personal and local interests…group prejudice against particular persons or types of people…dominate his outlook. (p. lxxi)

Katz adopts the premise that “once the inconsistency is discovered, it activates and directs a person to take action to reduce the tension caused by the awareness of the inconsistency” (1976, p. 26). In this way, she proposes, individuals experience an unlearning and relearning of attitudes and beliefs. The model presupposes an interest in confronting racism, which is not
always the case in organizational diversity training. Concerns and challenges with implementing this training in organizations are addressed below.

Katz' adopted a “systematic training” method incorporating understandings from cognitive behavioural therapy. In response to concerns that black-white encounter groups serve “as another form of exploitation of black people for white people’s purposes and learnings” (p. 32), Katz designed her training for “white-on-white” participant groups. Tatum (1999) concurs stating “…all-White support groups serve a unique function. Particularly when Whites are trying to work through their feelings of guilt and shame... Even when Whites feel comfortable sharing these feelings with people of color, frankly, people of color don’t necessarily want to hear about it…” (p. 111). The requirement for white-only groups is not universally held. For example, at the Portland Institute, I had the opportunity to attend a session led by facilitators who hoped to engage black and white participants together in critical reflection and coalition building for social action (Johnson & Smith, 1997).

Katz reminds facilitators of several critical aspects in conducting the program: the workshop is designed in developmental stages and it is crucial that the design be followed in sequence; anyone who facilitates this training must be working on their own racism and have gone through a similar process of re-education; the program is a beginning - participants must continue to do their own work. The six stages of the twenty-six hour workshop (originally conducted over two weekends) are: Stage 1: Definition and awareness of inconsistencies between values and behavior: The American dilemma; Stage 2: Confrontation with the reality of racism; Stage 3: Guidance and support in dealing with feelings; Stage 4: Cultural differences: an exploration of cultural racism; Stage 5: Individual racism: The meaning of whiteness; and Stage 6: Developing action strategies. An exploration of prejudice, power and racism is part of Stage 1. Participants work with such questions as: “Is power part of your group’s definition of racism? What is power and how do you define it (institutional, political, economic)? Who has the power in our society?” (p 105).

Katz clearly situates her recommendations in an American race relations context. In Canada, one example of an anti-racism model, produced through the Ministry of Multiculturalism, is
Barb Thomas and Charles Novogrodsky's (1983) widely used anti-racism training guide entitled *Combatting Racism in the Workplace: A Course for Workers*. The course is designed in ten three-hour sessions. The guiding assumptions in the program design are as follows: 1) Although it can be divisive to talk about racism, not talking about it is worse; even though it can produce conflict, it is important to learn to deal with racism; 2) dominant workers (i.e., white, Anglo Canadians) must recognize and come to terms with their relative privilege; 3) framing training from a perspective of white guilt is not helpful; because racism affects everybody, dominant and minority workers need to share how racism affects them, and work together to “attack the conditions that breed such racism” (p. 5); 4) the term ethnicity does not refer only to those outside the dominant culture -- English and French Canadians possess ethnicity, “this course encourages all workers to explore their own and each other’s ethnic and cultural backgrounds” (p. 5); 5) a knowledge of Canada’s history of discrimination (e.g., against Native peoples and other ethnic groups who settled and developed the country), class and cultural divisions “helps understand why visible minorities are among the most victimized by modern racism” (p. 6), 6) “a healthy learning environment allows for a fair amount of ambiguity in both learners and teacher...a particular explanation of the reasons for racism does not cover each and every historical case. It is by honestly confronting these questions that racism is combated -- not by moralizing and oversimplification” (p. 6), 7) “anti-racist education should avoid blaming individuals for systemic racism...a major course objective is to unearth old attitudes and patterns between people in order to help workers explore the larger, systematic, and historically-conditioned underpinnings of racism in society” (p. 7).

The ten sessions address these topics: Session 1: Racism hurts workers; Session 2: Analyzing racial situations in the workplace; Session 3: The employer’s connection to racism; Session 4: Canadian immigration history: the workers' experience; Session 5: Immigration policy and misconceptions about immigrants; Session 6: The creation and perpetuation of racist attitudes; Session 7: Legislation against discrimination: limits and possibilities; Session 8: Using the collective agreement to combat racism; Session 9: Union practices to resist racism; Session 10: Planning for action.
Common to both American and Canadian models is an understanding of prejudice informed by the work of Gordon Allport (1979) who defines prejudice in this way:

Ethnic prejudice is an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group as a whole, or toward an individual because he is a member of that group. (p. 9)

The definition leads to a framework for understanding racism that shows the development from stereotypes to prejudice to discrimination (behaviour based on prejudiced feelings) to racism (discrimination supported by institutional power) that might lead to segregation, expulsion or extermination (Thomas & Novogrodsky, 1983). Also common to both approaches is the recognition that a significant time commitment must be made for anti-racism training. This is not the kind of work that can be accomplished in a half-day session.

Typically, in American anti-racism training, there is an expectation that individuals will explore their personal identity and racist attitudes and acknowledge white guilt (Barlas et al., 2000; Sue & Sue, 1990). In Canadian anti-racism training, the emphasis is generally on understanding historic inequities and ensuring that individuals do not feel blamed. American models tends to focus on “white on white” training, while Canadian models assume mixed ethnic and racial groups. In practice, organizational anti-racism work (sometimes implemented under the diversity umbrella), often requires attendance of all employees. This training can leave minorities feeling vulnerable (Caudron, 1993) and result in “backlash” from participants, particularly white males who feel blamed and excluded (Mobely & Payne, 1993; Riccucci, 1997). The result is increased tension, hostility, and separation in the workplace.

Contributing to the problems with anti-racism training in an organizational context are: ethical issues about placing individuals in a mandatory situation where their identities will be challenged and they will be required to self-disclose; short time frames which do not allow for trust building in the group or with the facilitator; lack of control over the work environment to which the employees return; degree of facilitator skill; and extent of organizational commitment to address systemic issues instead of perceiving training as the way to “fix” intercultural or interracial issues. It is little wonder then, that, organizational managers and
trainers may be reluctant to address issues of prejudice in intercultural training (Gudykunst et al., 1996), or if they do, to keep the discussion at a level that requires minimal personal introspection. A "respecting differences" model may be a safer choice, although such an approach does not mean that racial issues will stay below the surface, and invites the question, "should they stay below the surface?" These issues are explored in greater detail in Chapter Seven, Difficult Dialogues.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to map the field of intercultural training and to contextualize the study findings. International training is designed to prepare individuals to live and work in other cultures. Particular attention is paid to culture shock, cross-cultural adaptation, and cross-cultural comparisons of values and behaviour. Multicultural and anti-racism training developed in response to cultural pluralism and racism in a domestic context. Multicultural training emphasizes awareness and sensitivity to cultural differences. Anti-racism training addresses power, prejudice and discrimination at both individual and societal levels.

The choice of intercultural training framework has implications for program design. Multicultural training and international training draw on intercultural communication theories, attribution theory and perceptual field theory. Anti-racism training draws on theories of prejudice, racism, and identity. Multicultural and international training focus on respecting differences. Anti-racism training centers on analyzing power and challenging structures. While multicultural training sometimes includes elements of anti-racist training, international training and anti-racism training generally do not overlap.

My decision to conduct this study is grounded in an interest in designing better programs. In the next chapter I explore the conceptual frameworks which underpin the study -- program planning and transfer of learning.
CHAPTER THREE
CONCEPTUAL RESOURCES

This chapter provides an introduction to two areas in the adult education literature that are particularly relevant to the current study: program planning and transfer of learning. The site for this study – the Certificate in Intercultural Studies (CIS) -- is a relatively new program. It was developed under the guidance of a small group of people who had the vision and commitment to create a unique approach to intercultural training. The program faces the challenge of meeting diverse learner needs and, at the same time, remaining financially viable in its tenuous location as part of a continuing studies branch of a university. Program planning and transfer of learning concerns have been largely the domain of adult educators and exist quite separately from the intercultural training literature. Yet, they hold promise for illuminating our understanding of learner and trainer experiences of the CIS, and for thinking about the planning of other intercultural training. Conceptualizations of program planning help us make sense of the design and sustainability challenges of the CIS; conceptualizations of learning transfer help us understand what difference training makes for learners.

Program Planning

Historically, program planning has been characterized as a rational process following a series of sequential steps. Wilson and Cervero (1997) trace these “rational roots” to the dominant discourse of scientific inquiry. They suggest that adult educators embraced rationality in an effort to legitimize and professionalize the field, and that a stepwise approach was a “comforting” one, that encouraged planners “to follow the same principles, regardless of the organizational context” (Cervero & Wilson, 1994, p. 4). In practice, planning is not a linear process. Caffarella (1994) describes the planning and evaluation of educational programs for adults as like “trying to negotiate a maze”. Houle (1996) acknowledges the complexity of program planning in his statement that:

The full reality of what occurs in the mind, emotions and body of each participant and the nature of its effect are so intricate that they defy complete
Houle (1996) attempts to address the complicated nature of program planning in his system which incorporates elements of Dewey, Tyler and Lewin. He draws on Tyler’s (1949) sequential planning steps (defining purpose, producing objectives, determining instructional activities, evaluating the degree to which objectives have been achieved), Dewey’s (1916) notion of education as growth, and Lewin’s (1948) work in change theory. He points out that “the learning activities of men and women must ordinarily be introduced with some care into a complex milieu that includes work, home, civic and other responsibilities (1996, p. 67), and that “those who plan or conduct programs of adult education must sometimes confront the fact that the cultural or institutional climates in which they operate are indifferent or hostile” (p. 220). In recent years, the “cause and effect”, stepwise model has been pushed aside in favor of more interactive notions of planning. Current conceptualizations include responsiveness to context, stakeholder involvement, negotiating power, and recognition of unintended outcomes (Adams, 1991; Ottoson, 1997b; Wilson & Cervero 1997). Cervero and Wilson (1994) are at the forefront of examining “program planning practice [as] a social [and ethical] rather than a scientific activity” (p. xiii).

The acknowledgment of context has been important in moving the program planning field forward. One of the criticisms levelled at technical rational approaches is the notion that planning can be accomplished in a series of “neat” steps. The deeply entrenched technical-rational approach to planning crystallized by Tyler (1949) and widely adopted by practitioners is an attempt to bring order to what, in my experience, is not a tidy activity. Wilson and Cervero (1997) argue that technical rationality has “limited our understanding of practice” (p. 104). They suggest that in focusing only on the steps in the process, planners run the risk of not attending to the “people-work of adult education”, which is “what really matters when imagining possibilities” in program planning (1997, p. 104). Their recognition of Freire’s (1993) “profound influence” on adult education practice is evident in their encouragement of dialogue and reflection in the planning process and in the significance of power as a factor in planning. They point out that “without political savvy and an ethical vision, without knowing
who counts and why, without both a sense of "how to" and a vision of "what for", even faithful following of the prescribed planning process will have little consequence" (1996, p. 6).

Power and Negotiation in Planning Programs

The work of Cervero and Wilson (1994, 1996) has been particularly useful in deepening my understanding of program planning. The challenges I experience in developing diversity training programs have derived from both the technical aspects, such as determining "reasonable" objectives and content for short instructional time frames, and the "people work", a term which only hints at the complexity of the issues. For example, I recently designed a two-day 'communicating across cultures' workshop for front-line service providers. During the discussions with the internal planning committee, I suggested that we consult with the First Nations coordinator. At my request the committee chair contacted the coordinator and was advised that the First Nations office would be conducting a separate workshop to address First Nations issues and would not participate in the development of the cross-cultural communication training. When I facilitated the workshop, an individual from the First Nations office attended. At the beginning of the session I acknowledged the importance of First Nations issues and explained that the First Nations office would offer a separate session. Afterwards, the person spoke with me privately and indicated that although it had been a good training session, she was concerned about the omission of First Nations issues. The political and emotional sensitivity of situations like these permeates my work. Power, politics and ethics are not just "noise" that interfere with planning – they are at the heart of planning (Cervero and Wilson, 1994).

Cervero and Wilson (1996) assert that:

All planners know that they are not free agents able to directly model the purposes, content, and format of a program to satisfy their own interests. Rather, planning is always conducted within a complex set of personal, organizational, and social relationships among people who may have similar, different, or conflicting interests. (p. 1)

They propose four concepts central to planning programs: power, interests, negotiation, and responsibility. They define power as "the capacity to act, distributed to individual planners by
virtue of the enduring social relationships in which they participate” (1994, p. 119) and interests as “a complex set of dispositions, goals, values, desires, and expectations that lead people to act in certain ways and to position themselves in a particular manner when confronted with situations in which they must act” (1994, p. 123). They suggest that the interests of five groups of people are always represented in planning programs: learners, teachers, planners, institutional leaders, and the affected public (Cervero & Wilson, 1994). These groups, and individuals within the groups, hold asymmetrical power which affects their degree of influence on the planning process. For example, by virtue of their positions, institutional leaders, who hold the key to resource allocation, have the power to determine the nature of programs that will be funded. Teachers and planners, who might be one and the same, hold the power to make choices about course content and the degree of learner input into course design. Within a planning or teaching group, individuals may differ in their capacity to influence others in the group or to influence institutional leaders. The affected public (e.g., clients, co-workers) are typically the farthest removed from a place of power and influence.

I would like to see more attention to the intersecting dynamics of race, gender, class, and other dimensions of diversity that are implicit in Cervero and Wilson’s (1994) notion of “enduring social relationships”. Cast in an anti-oppression framework, definitions of power and interests may be conceived differently. For example, power is not only the capacity to act, but also the capacity to exclude. To illustrate, I share this example from a recent workshop. In an exercise designed to promote a discussion about power, I showed a video scenario of two male coworkers. In the scenario, one of the men came out about his sexual orientation to his colleague, who had been persistent in encouraging him to date women. The straight male was not comfortable with this new knowledge and began to limit their formerly friendly contact. The gay male left the organization. In analyzing the scene, several participants felt that the gay male had power because he had chosen to leave rather than stay in a negative situation. Other participants recognized that the power in that situation resided, not in the employee who left, but in the dominant culture employee who excluded and marginalized the minority employee. This example illustrates the limitations of defining power as “the capacity to act”.
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Cervero and Wilson (1994) suggest that individuals enter the planning process with multiple and often competing interests, and that a key element of planning programs is the negotiation of these interests. Such negotiation is complicated by asymmetrical power relationships and by the existence of “real”, “expressed” and “ideal” interests. Real interests are the implicit purposes, values and norms that guide planners’ work. Expressed interests (which are also real) are the interests that are revealed to others. Ideal interests are the “shoulds” in planning practice, that is what we ought to do if we are involved in “good” planning practice. For example, a planner may have an expressed interest in making courses more responsive to learners from diverse backgrounds, and a real interest in ensuring the viability of the program by capturing larger markets. Further, he or she may have an ideal interest in ensuring equitable access and participation for diverse learners. This ideal principle of equity may be at odds with capturing larger markets. The internal tension this might cause for planners is not examined by Cervero and Wilson, who focus on negotiation of interests with others.

While I can see that implicit purposes may differ from expressed interests, it is not clear to me how Cervero and Wilson differentiate between the values implicit in real interests and the concept of ideal interests. And since all interests are real, as Cervero and Wilson acknowledge, the language used to separate the three types of interests is somewhat problematic. Although Cervero and Wilson (1994) make the point that interests are not unchanging characteristics and are affected by the planning situation, I wonder if ideal interests might be better characterized as the “constant” that a planner carries with them. This constancy is implied in the ideal interest of democracy that is fundamental to Cervero and Wilson’s notion of planning. Notwithstanding these questions, I find the concept of publicly expressed and privately held interests a useful one in understanding tensions that might arise among planners. For instance, a planner of intercultural training, who has experienced racism, may be guided by different interests than one who is not. Although both planners may express an interest in addressing cross-cultural conflict, for example, the planner who has examined racism may want to design a course that addresses power issues. The planner who has not examined racism may choose to design a course that focuses on communication style differences. I am not suggesting that only those planners who are minorities or who have been targets of racism care about confronting oppression. Majority culture trainers who have
engaged in a “deliberate practice of self-examination and experiencing” (Thompson & Carter, 1997, p. 17) of racial identity and privilege may choose to challenge racism.

Embedded in Cervero and Wilson’s concept of “responsible planning” is the assumption that all planners are committed to democratic planning processes. This is a culturally bound Western notion that may not be universally held. I value the idea of involving multiple constituents in the planning process. In practice, given time and other resource constraints, I, and other planners with whom I work, continually face the need to make choices about constructing programs without input from a broader constituent base. Whether the planning process occurs between a group of planners, between one planner and an institutional leader, or planners and learners, a negotiation of interests takes place. In my experience, the negotiation process is complicated when those involved do not share their private or underlying interests, which they may hold back for fear of being judged, ignored, or marginalized, but which nonetheless shape their expressed interests. The significant emotional component of negotiating interests is missing from Cervero and Wilson’s (1994) analysis. Absent, too, is attention to relationship-building with its connotations of trust and empathy.

Wilson and Cervero (1997) use the 1976 *Webster’s New World Dictionary* definition of negotiation as “to confer, bargain, or discuss with a view to reaching agreement” (p. 10). They proposed a matrix identifying negotiation strategies which might be used in conflictual (different interests) and consensual (similar interests) situations (Cervero & Wilson, 1994). The matrix was framed as “rational action in planning” (1994, p. 126). I found this terminology somewhat jarring given the authors’ attempts to move away from technical rational assumptions, although I appreciated the attempt to further define what negotiation might look like. The original four strategies – satisfice, network, bargain, and counteract – were expanded by Yang and associates to include seven tactics: reasoning, consulting, appealing, networking, bargaining, pressuring, and counteracting (Yang, 1998; Yang & Cervero, 2000). In a study designed to develop an instrument to measure power and influence tactics in program planning practice, Yang and associates categorized patterns of power and influence into four clusters: bystander, tactician, ingratiator, and shotgun. Although I welcome the efforts to extend Cervero and Wilson’s work, I do not find the labeling of four types of
program planners to be a helpful approach. The terminology selected for the clusters carries potentially unfavourable connotations. The discussion of tactics, a word which itself may connote something other than ethical interaction, treats planners as existing in fixed categories instead of responding with contextually influenced choices of negotiation strategies.

Cervero and Wilson (1996) have made a major contribution to the program planning field by drawing our attention to issues of context, power, interests, and negotiation. No theory can account for everything, and in the case of Cervero and Wilson’s work, they have not adequately addressed ethical issues in planning. They state that ethical thinking “is the capacity to think about questions of values, significance, and responsibility when deciding what action to take” (1994, p. 137). However, they miss the opportunity to sharpen our understanding of ethical practice when they present a series of cases, absent critical examination, in their text, *What Really Matters in Adult Education Program Planning: Lessons in Negotiating Power and Interests*. In at least one of the cases, the strategies described contradict my notions of ethical practice (e.g., “withholding information”, “clandestine strategy”). Although the intent may be to rebalance asymmetrical power, the strategies sound more like manipulation than negotiation (Sork, 1996).

**Technical, Social-political and Ethical Domains in Planning Programs**

While Cervero and Wilson (1996) foreground people work, particularly power and negotiation, Sork gives equal attention to the people work and the technical. Building on notions of interaction, non-linearity, context, and power in program planning, Sork’s (2000) framework for planning educational programs brings together the technical and the people-work of planning in three key domains: the technical, the social-political and the ethical. Sork describes six basic elements of planning. These echo the elements described in traditional program planning approaches, with the addition of context: analyze context and learner community, justify and focus planning, clarify intentions, prepare instructional plan, prepare administrative plan, and develop summative evaluation plan. However, unlike traditional approaches which prescribe planning steps, Sork (2000) proposes these elements as descriptive categories, “which may be used to cluster related planning questions, decisions and actions” (p. 184).
Sork (2000) points out that critiquing the paradigm of technical rationality “does not lead to
the conclusion that the technical domain of planning should be ignored, only that it should not
be regarded as the essence of planning” (2000, p. 177). He extends the discussion of
sociopolitical and ethical issues in planning stating that:

Decisions about whose interests will be represented, what aims will be
pursued, how the learner community will be defined, how resources will be
allocated, what instructional approaches will be used, how the program will be
financed, and how “success” will be determined all involve making moral
commitments. (Sork, 2000, p. 178)

Although Sork (2000) states that he considers the three domains – technical, sociopolitical
and ethical “equally important”, it seems to me that he places ethical considerations at the
centre of planning and has infused them into the other two domains. As a practitioner, I
appreciate the framework because it acknowledges the technical side of planning, which
Cervero and Wilson minimize in highlighting power and negotiation. Sork’s inclusion of the
basic elements of planning is useful because these are the decision areas around which power
and interests come into play. Sork (2000) acknowledges Cervero and Wilson’s role in
bringing power and interests to the forefront of program planning, although he notes that he
has “some concerns about how well ‘negotiation’ works as a key analytical concept” (p. 174),
an observation on which he does not elaborate.

Sork’s (2000) suggested question-based framework is a helpful guide for planners, directing
our attention to important areas without being prescriptive. To explain how planners could
use the framework, Sork (2000) gives examples of questions planners might ask themselves.
In the technical domain one might ask “How should I define the learner community and what
do I need to know about it?”; in the social-political domain the questions might include “Why
aren’t more women involved in planning this program and what will be the consequences of
not changing this?”; and in the ethical domain planners could consider “How can this be done
in a way that is consistent with the ethic of care that is the focus of the program?” This
question-based approach is designed to help planners examine the dynamics of planning and to
uncover biases and assumptions that affect how program intentions are developed, who is
included in program design, who the learners are, and what content and learning activities are included.

In this section I provided a brief history of program planning and a review of several planning frameworks. I selected the work of Cervero and Wilson (1994) and Sork (2000) as conceptual tools for understanding program planning practice because they speak to my experience as a planner and facilitator and help explain some of the dilemmas and struggles I encounter in my work. I have been influenced by questions of power, interests, and representation as the reader will see in Chapters Seven and Eight.

At the core of this study is my interest in what difference training makes, that is, how do the programs I plan affect the learners who participate in them? To support my exploration of this question I examined the program planning literature for perspectives on how training relates to practice. This led me to the literature on transfer of learning.

**Transfer of Learning**

At the heart of developing adult education programs is the intent to facilitate change in adult learners (Dewey, 1916; Engstrom, 1994; Galbraith, 1990; Houle, 1996). Caffarella (1994) includes this intent as a key underpinning to her interactive planning model, stating that “planners should be able to articulate what change will or could come about as a result of the educational program” (p. 23). Just what “change” means has been widely discussed by educators. Tensions between an emphasis on individual growth and a focus on social change are evident in the literature. Arising out of the so-called “third force” of humanistic psychology, Knowles (1980) conceptualized educational endeavours as supporting the achievement of personal goals. In recent years, this focus on the individual has come under scrutiny as educators contemplate the role of education in changing individuals, institutions, and communities (Caffarella, 1994; Collins, 1991; Freire, 1993; hooks, 1992).

**Historical Overview of Transfer**

Historically, program planning models focused on determining needs and designing training with particular attention to developing clear objectives and instructional activities (Gagne,
1985; Knowles, 1980). It seems that transfer or application of learning was simply assumed. Explicit attention to application of learning is a more recent phenomenon, with recommendations in the adult education literature that more attention be paid to transfer of learning strategies (Broad & Newstrom, 1992; Noe & Ford, 1992; Parry, 1990; Wenz and Adams, 1991). The terms “transfer of training” and “transfer of learning” tend to be used interchangeably, although it seems that training is used primarily in the business and human resource development literature, and learning is used in the adult education literature. For the purposes of this paper, the term transfer of learning will be used in preference to transfer of training unless the work of a particular author is being cited. The use of learning is congruent with my belief that a training or educational program should be primarily concerned with the experience of the learner, not the trainer. For this reason, I use the term learner in preference to trainee unless the work of a particular author is being cited.

The concept of learning transfer is described in a variety of ways, typically encompassing the common themes of “change” and “application of learning”. Definitions include “the degree to which trainees apply the knowledge, skills, behaviors, and attitudes learned in training to their jobs” (Bates et al., 1996, p. 426), “the effective and continuous application, by trainees to their jobs, of the knowledge and skills gained in training - both on and off the job” (Broad and Newstrom, 1992, p. 6), and “the effective application by program participants of what they learned as a result of attending an educational program” (Caffarella, 1994, p. 108). The latter two definitions invite the questions “what is effective application?” and “who decides?”

Baldwin and Ford (1988) reviewed seventy studies of learning application conducted between 1901 and 1987. Most of the studies dealt with easily measurable skills transfer such as mechanical skills, shipbuilding skills, basic military training, and time management. Based on their review Baldwin and Ford (1988) identified a combination of factors including trainee abilities and motivation, and workplace support as characteristics that may improve learning transfer. Other adult educators (Broad & Newstrom, 1992; Caffarella, 1994; Gielen, 1996; Bates et al., 1996) identify training design, along with trainee and work environment characteristics, as another major contributor to transfer of learning. I was pleased to find the literature related to transfer of learning because it addressed some of the questions I had been
asking in my own practice. I have struggled with the term transfer because of its connotations of intact transfer of knowledge, although I recognize that this is not necessarily how the term is intended by the authors cited above. The term has been broadened from its origins to represent both intact transfer and adaptive application.

Multiple Lenses for Assessing Learning

According to Ottoson (1997a), “the literature on transfer of training is rooted in industrial psychology and is concerned with the positive or negative influence of prior learning on later learning. Transferability is the ability to move between different jobs or tasks with little or no modification” (p. 88). Ottoson (1997a) notes that much of the research on transfer is related to immediate retention by college students of memory and psychomotor skill tasks. She states that “The transfer lens is used often in business and industry, the military and other skill training contexts [in which] it matters that the pilot, the surgeon, or the chemical worker transfer skills with fidelity and precision” (p. 89). Ottoson (1997a) suggests that ‘transfer’ is not the only way of assessing the effects of an educational or training program. The original concept of training transfer represents an instrumental view of learning and does not consider context. Ottoson (1997a) describes other lenses through which program effects can be viewed, such as knowledge utilization, application, diffusion, and implementation. Ottoson’s (1997a) multiple lenses approach supported my thoughts that other terms than transfer may be more appropriate for describing how learners interact with the intercultural training environment and work contexts.

Ottoson (1997a) distinguishes between a traditional academic perspective of knowledge as an end in itself and a program evaluation perspective of knowledge as a product that can be used in making decisions, solving problems, and taking actions. This notion of knowledge utilization “overlaps with the instrumental understanding of use found in the transfer-of-training models” (1997a, p. 90). By contrast, according to Ottoson, an enlightenment model of knowledge utilization posits that “enlightenment occurs over time, takes varied forms, and crosses multiple contexts” (p. 90). This model helps explain change over time, but “not to credit a single cause for the effect” (Ottoson, 1997a, p. 90). An enlightenment model seems particularly relevant for intercultural training, which sometimes focuses on skills building, but
more often emphasizes thinking about the way we think. Similarly to enlightenment, diffusion examines the movement of ideas into action over time. As one would guess from the word diffusion, this perspective involves the spread of ideas from an educational context into a larger practice context than the learner’s immediate environment (Rogers, 1995).

While transfer assesses how effectively individuals have moved skills from the training to the practice context, enlightenment considers changes over time, and diffusion considers the spread of ideas beyond the original learner, application looks for the contextual use and creation of knowledge. Instead of looking for the replication of an exact skill from training to practice, researchers would look for the ways in which principles of learning are engaged in practice. “This approach to application leads with the social consequences of knowledge rather than with the psychological processes of transfer” (p. 92). The final lens, implementation, overlaps with transfer, knowledge utilization and enlightenment. Ottoson (1997a) summarizes her discussion of these multiple lenses for assessing the effects of adult education programs, stating “In contrast with the in-depth view of transfer, utilization, and application and the wide view of diffusion, implementation takes the long view, linking ideas, programs, and practice” (p. 94).

Using Transfer Concepts in this Study

In exploring the changes experienced by learners in this study, I draw on the application lens (engaging and creating knowledge in practice) and the diffusion lens (sharing ideas with others formally and informally in the workplace). The transfer of exact skills is not a helpful tool for analysis of change in a program designed to support learners in developing understandings within the context of their own practice. From my perspective, enlightenment is embedded in both application (as the term is used by Ottoson) and diffusion. It was outside the scope of this study to explore the long term organizational systems and policy implications anticipated in using an implementation lens. Another lens that is relevant for this study is that of situated learning theory which suggests that critical reflection and adaptation of ideas and skills to the learner’s real life experience is the key to a successful program (Lave & Wenger, 1991).
Situated learning theory is foundational to the integrative learning model proposed by Montgomery and Lau (1996) in their article exploring the links between work, learning and performance. They begin with the premise that "each person brings to a potential learning experience the sum total of his integrated experience and wisdom" (1996, p. 442). Borrowing from Schon's (1983) work on reflective practice, they suggest that as individuals are exposed to new information, perspectives and ideas, they engage in a reflective learning process which allows them to integrate the new experiences with their life experience, and to move beyond "pre-existing limits to thought, attitude, and action" (p. 442).

Montgomery and Lau (1996) suggest that the learner will test their new learning over time in their work environments, continually reassessing its value. They identify four components for integrative learning: providing a learning-safe work environment that encourages learning from both mistakes and successes; working in teams to question the status quo and create innovative ideas; a resource person to coach the 'learn-by-doing' team; and trust and synergy in the team. A limitation in the model is that it assumes cooperation and harmony within the team, and does not address potential intra-team or intra-organizational conflict. However, it is a useful addition to the transfer of learning literature because it focuses on learner reflection and sharing of learning with work teams, which in turn has the potential to challenge the status quo. This approach combines a situated learning approach and a diffusion of learning approach, both alternatives to a traditional transfer of training model.

Integrating the research on transfer, situated learning and diffusion, Ottoson (1992) developed a conceptual framework to analyze the post-continuing professional education experience: 1) characteristics of the educational intervention (e.g., methods, design, practice time), 2) innovation or the nature of the proposed change, 3) predisposing factors (e.g., knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, values), 4) enabling factors (e.g., support, reward), and 6) contextual factors (e.g., timing, organization, climate). In a study which tested this framework with thirty-five health professionals, participants were introduced to the framework and completed a follow-up survey three months later. Ottoson (1993) found that application of learning is a "multiphase process" and that "multiple contextual, personal, and educational factors affect application" (p. 218). Barriers to application were assigned to five categories: lack of support,
insufficient resources, no opportunities for use, difficulty in adapting technology and lack of authority. Ottoson (1993) suggests that if application is judged solely on the basis of behavioural change, the factors which predispose, enable or reinforce participants’ learning may be overlooked. In Chapter Five, I explore learner perspectives on change from cognitive, behavioural, and social perspectives, including some of the challenges in diffusing learning and implementing change in organizations.

Caffarella (1994) suggests that the transfer of learning is the “so what, now what” phase of the learning process; “so what does this all mean and how can what was learned be applicable to my situation?” (p. 108). In talking through the issue of transfer with Judith Ottoson (1999), I explored language that might be more reflective of the learner’s experience of negotiating between the formal learning and the practice environments. I was looking for language that would connote an active engagement with, and movement between, the training and practice environments, a term that would conjure images of interactivity, reflection and action. Thus, I have adopted the term engage learning to indicate the learner’s active involvement and learning between the training and work environments.

The Intercultural Studies program, from which study participants are drawn, is a form of situated learning. The program was designed so that the conversation continues when learners return to their worksites after a two-day on-site training session. They engage in six weeks of online assignments and dialogue. Learners are encouraged to integrate theory and practice as they work together to reflect on their feelings, thoughts and actions in intercultural situations. In Chapters Five and Six, I explore how study participants engaged learning between the formal training and practice contexts, and what factors contributed to the participants’ application and diffusion of learning.

**Summary**

In this chapter, I explored the history and current perspectives on program planning and multiple lenses which might be used to assess effects of training programs. Technical rational notions of planning have been supplanted by concepts of planning that include attention to the interaction of various elements in the planning process, the influence of context on planning,
and the impact of power, interests, and representation in planning programs. Cervero and Wilson's (1994) analysis of the negotiation of power and interests and Sork's (2000) framework integrating the technical, social-political, and ethical domains of planning provide the conceptual tools for analyzing the experiences of trainers and learners in this study, particularly in Chapter Seven, Difficult Dialogues.

The purpose of educational programs is to facilitate change in learners, and potentially to the wider community in which the learner lives and works. Learning can be viewed through multiple lens including transfer, knowledge utilization, application, implementation, situated learning, and diffusion (Caffarella, 1994; Ottoson, 1997; Rogers, 1995). Of particular relevance for this study are the lenses of application, situated learning, and diffusion. These will guide the discussion of findings in Chapters Five, What Difference Does Training Make? and Six, Learning in the Midst of Everyday Practice.

Program planning theory has implications for the Intercultural Studies program. Initially, the Intercultural Studies program's intentions, learner community, instructional approaches, and notions of success appeared quite straightforward. The complexity of the program emerged as I reviewed program documents and interviewed participants. The program focuses on individual change, yet the individuals work in organizational and societal contexts that affect intercultural interactions. One of the issues that arose out of the interviews was how the program addresses individual and systemic racism. Another significant issue was the impact of resource allocation and funding, which have been major factors in the need for the program to expand its originally intended learner community. The inclusion of learners outside the international education group, for whom the program was originally developed, has resulted in a need to reexamine the intentions and approaches of the program. These issues are threaded throughout the study findings in Chapters Five, Six and Seven and elaborated in the final chapter. In Chapter Four, I describe the research site, research methodology, data analysis process, and trustworthiness of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESEARCH SITE AND METHOD

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research site, the methodology and the data analysis process for this study. This section describes the Certificate in Intercultural Studies (CIS) program, how it developed, how it is structured, and who are the learners and facilitators. The information in this chapter was gathered through document review and interviews.

Research Site

My selection of the CIS as the context for my study seemed to be a natural outgrowth of my work as a facilitator with the program. When I was invited to work with the program in 1996 (on a course-by-course basis), my interest was captured by several unique elements of the program: the linking of theory and practice, the combined face-to-face and online learning format, and the opportunity to co-facilitate with other intercultural trainers. The benefits of joining a community of intercultural facilitators was echoed by several of the facilitators whom I interviewed. One facilitator offered this comment: “The certificate program has brought us together as colleagues and we’re able to share our experiences… I see it as part of my professional development…”.

Since I began facilitating intercultural and diversity training, I have typically worked alone to design and deliver training programs. My practice has been enriched by the opportunity to share joys, challenges, dilemmas, and strategies with the other facilitators in the certificate program. My questions about learning transfer, the integration of theory and practice, and the role of online learning in this process were shaped by the contrasts between my one-day training sessions and my involvement in the seven-week courses in the certificate program.

In a typical one-day training session, I work with a group of 15-25 individuals from one organization, with little or no opportunity for pre-work, post-work or individual contact. Sometimes the training is offered within the context of a strong organizational commitment to diversity and respectful workplace. Sometimes it is “just in time” training, offered to meet a
particular need related to cross-cultural customer service, or building intercultural teams. Rarely do I have the opportunity to explore how individuals engage learning in their own “community of practice”. The certificate program, which brings together individuals from different organizational contexts, to participate in five courses over an extended time, offered an opportunity to understand how learners might engage in an integrative learning process.

Document Review

In order to understand the history and development of the certificate program, I reviewed a number of documents provided by the CIS program assistant. These included two needs assessment surveys conducted in 1993, advisory committee minutes (October 1996), UBC Certificate in Intercultural Studies Program overview and curriculum (June 2000), administration/registration process (Summer 1999), Guidelines for online facilitators (2000), Continuing Studies brochure (2000), UBC-SFU MA in Applied Intercultural Relations working draft (2000), course manuals (1993-1999), CIS survey results (May 2000).

Current Program Status

The UBC Certificate in Intercultural Studies (CIS) is an exciting and innovative program for people from any sector who want to communicate effectively across cultures and adapt successfully to cultural change. This interdisciplinary program is practice-based and combines experiential workshops and online seminars. (marketing brochure Winter/Spring 2000)

The CIS is one of the programs offered under the auspices of the Centre for Intercultural Communication (The Centre) in Continuing Studies at the University of British Columbia. Seventy-one individuals completed the program from its inception in the Fall of 1996 to the Spring of 2000. While the program was initially developed in response to expressed needs for a professional development certificate for international student advisors and international educators, learners include healthcare professionals, corporate managers, intercultural trainers, and workplace diversity specialists.

The objectives as stated in the program brochure (2000) include “providing participants with intercultural knowledge and skills adapted to their professional and personal situations, a theoretical framework of intercultural studies and practice, references, materials and tools to
support their work, and a venue for networking and alliance-building with other professionals."

The program reached a crossroads in 1999 with the departure of the associate director who led the program development process, and a quest to determine the viability of the program in the corporate marketplace. At the same time as efforts are being made to reach into the business community, a process is in place to expand the academic potential of the program by offering a UBC-SFU M.A. in Applied Intercultural Relations. The concept of the degree was initiated by the Centre in 1998 and has received approval to commence in 2002. This degree will build on knowledge and skills developed in UBC's CIS program and SFU's Certificate in Ethnic and Intercultural Relations, both of which will be pathways to the M.A. program.

The departure of the associate director, the outreach to the business community, and the plans for the MA degree, significant developments in the life of the program, came to my attention after I had made the commitment to use the CIS as the context for my research. Although my focus has been on understanding the learning experience from learner and facilitator perspectives, I will acknowledge throughout my discussion issues associated with the sustainability and evolution of the program. I will preface my discussion of the CIS program with an overview of the Centre within which it operates.

Development of the Centre for Intercultural Communication

The Centre was started in 1994, and at the time was known as the Intercultural Training and Resource Centre. As the director describes it, the Centre was born out of the "dying moments" of the Canada - China Language and Cultural Program (funded by the Canadian International Development Agency - CIDA), the mandate of which was to prepare Canadian and Chinese professionals for technology projects and academic exchange programs. The director saw an opportunity to build on the knowledge, networks, and program planning work that had been done in the previous ten years. The then associate vice-president academic of continuing education, who had a strong commitment to developing intercultural communication, agreed to support salaries for the director and half of a support person's time
with the goal of achieving cost-recovery within one year. The cost for the program is $3100 (Program Brochure, 1999/2000).

At the present time the Centre delivers a range of programs and services for UBC, other educational institutions and the private sector. The Certificate in Intercultural Studies is one of a number of programs offered by the Centre. Other Centre programs include the International Teaching Assistants Training Program; Executive Training Programs (in partnership with the UBC Faculty of Commerce) for European, Korean and Chinese managers; the Japan Coop program which involves preparing 3rd and 4th year science and engineering students from across Canada for extended placements in Japanese companies; and a Faculty Development Program for Tech de Monterrey in Mexico. The Centre also offers business briefings, and on-arrival and pre-departure international student orientations. The Centre is increasingly being approached by, and marketing its services in, the private sector, focusing on both international and domestic intercultural issues.

Development of the Certificate in Intercultural Studies

When the Centre began to take shape in 1994, one of its first undertakings was a needs assessment of the interests and requirements in professional development for intercultural training. This project was funded by the Canadian Bureau of International Education (CBIE), the BC Centre for International Education (BCCIE), and The Commonwealth of Learning. The project arose out of the expressed interests of the membership of CBIE (primarily people involved in international student exchange and support services on campuses across Canada) for professional development.

The first stage of the project, prior to the Centre’s involvement, was the collection of information about resources which already existed in Canada. In the Fall of 1993, questionnaires were sent to CBIE members to gather details of training programs, professional associations, intercultural training expertise, and willingness to sponsor or participate in the project. There were a few places in the United States where individuals could access training, but CBIE members felt that the US perspective, which emphasized inner city racial issues and affirmative action, did not directly address the issues on Canadian campuses. These issues
included cross-cultural adjustment of international students and issues faced by students born in Canada to immigrant parents, and "caught between two worlds". In addition, CBIE members were often expected to generate revenue through international student initiatives and they wanted training to be able to provide support and advocacy for those students.

After reviewing the results of the survey, two UBC faculty members who were on the board of CBIE approached the director of the Centre to conduct a needs assessment and develop a pilot program. The CBIE board, in consultation with UBC, supported the development of a certificate program because the message from CBIE members was that they wanted a credential, not just a professional development workshop. Timing played a role here, too, as the need for professional development was identified at a time when UBC was starting to offer certificates in continuing studies, and when funding was available to introduce online learning programs.

During the Spring of 1994, the Centre sent questionnaires to international student advisors and international education professionals across Canada. The questions were designed to collect data about work experience, education/training, experience working or living with individuals or groups with different cultural backgrounds, and preferred format, timing and topics for the proposed certificate program. The respondents identified interests in cross-cultural counselling, theoretical foundations, preparation for international assignments, and cross-cultural communication. They were also concerned about accessibility, the ability to take courses while they worked full time, and an emphasis on the "practical" nature of the courses. The Centre produced a pilot module, Training for International Assignments, which was delivered to positive reviews at the CBIE conference in the Fall of 1994. Working with a thirteen member advisory committee which included faculty from UBC, SFU and University College of the Cariboo, CBIE and BCCIE board members, and several training consultants, the Centre developed and piloted the program in 1995, and received approval for the program in 1996.
Program Design

Based on the survey feedback and input from the advisory committee and the Centre director, and her own vision of the program, the associate director designed the program to include two core courses -- Foundations of Intercultural Studies (a prerequisite to other courses) and Intercultural Communication Skills, and three electives to be selected from Intercultural Problem-Solving and Advising, Training for International Assignments, Intercultural Negotiation, and Managing Intercultural Teams. Learners enroll on a course-by-course basis. Although this is not a cohort model, many of the learners encounter each other in several courses.

To facilitate accessibility to training, each course consists of a two-day workshop followed by a four week online seminar. Until recently, the online piece was seven weeks. Due to a complex set of factors, including learner time pressures, maintaining learner involvement and momentum, facilitator availability, and budget, the online seminar has been compressed to four weeks. The facilitators I interviewed had not had enough experience with the new format to comment on it. The learners I interviewed were familiar with the seven-week format.

During the face-to-face workshop, the learning approach includes small and large group discussions, case studies, role plays, lectures, and simulations. The online seminar is designed to continue the conversation which begins during the workshop. Each course has assigned readings and written assignments linked to the learner’s “real world”. Each learner has the opportunity to apply the workshop learning and readings to their personal and professional lives. They submit their assignments to the group for feedback from both the online facilitators and the other learners. Privacy and confidentiality guidelines developed in the workshops continue in the online seminar, to which only the learners, the facilitators for a particular course, and the web coordinator have access.

13 As part of the program review commenced in 1999, in 2001 the Problem-Solving and Negotiation courses were blended and reconfigured into a new course called Bridging Cultural Differences; Training for International Assignments was changed to Supporting International Assignments.
Who are the Learners?

The program was originally proposed as professional development for people working with international students, but as the director noted “from the beginning we thought if [those are] the only people involved, that would be a big disadvantage, for two reasons. One, it would not be sustainable, and two it would not be very interesting because you need to expose [learners] to other people’s perspectives.” So, although the program started out with input from one group, there was an effort to encourage people from a wide variety of professional backgrounds to attend. The embedded conceptual framework in the program design comes primarily from an international intercultural perspective and is also influenced by multicultural perspectives. The inclusion of learners who work in a variety of organizations in the domestic context has introduced some challenges for the program. These are explored in Chapter Five.

The learners have diverse cultural backgrounds and experiences. The educational backgrounds of the learners range from high school graduation to doctorates in a wide range of subjects including education, science, engineering, English as a second language, psychology, and business. The learners range in age from twenties to sixties, predominantly forties and fifties. While the majority of the learners are women working in the post-secondary institutions, the program attracts both men and women from the corporate sector, health care, social services, and government. The diverse professional backgrounds of the learners pose challenges for course developers. For example, there are differences between the needs and expectations of post-secondary service providers, who are concerned with the cultural adaptation experiences of students, and private sector workers, who are interested in international business relationships and team building. Some learners expect a focus on international intercultural issues and others look for an emphasis on domestic intercultural issues. On a course-by-course basis, all the facilitators make the effort to adapt their training to meet the needs of a broad range of learners. There have recently been suggestions from both learners and facilitators that the Centre consider developing two streams of courses, one for the education sector and one for the business sector.
As part of its planning process, in May 2000 the Centre sent a survey to learners to determine the courses they had taken, which were most useful, how they learned about CIS, the significance of certain factors in their decision to take certificate courses, how they learned about the program and to whom they would recommend the CIS services. The survey was sent to two hundred and thirteen individuals who have taken courses with the CIS; fifty-four responded. The most important features of the program were rank ordered as credit toward an MA, modular format, the course fee, the online seminar, granting of a certificate, workshop location, and face-to-face workshops. The most useful courses were Foundations of Intercultural Studies and Intercultural Communication Skills, a finding mirrored in my interviews with learners. The Centre is in the process of determining private sector needs, developing a corporate learner profile, and creating a marketing plan.

Who are the Facilitators?

The facilitators are men and women from diverse ethnic, personal, and professional backgrounds. The program draws on approximately eight to twelve trainers to facilitate the face-to-face workshops and moderate the online seminars. An additional dozen individuals across Canada and in the United States, and others in Australia and Europe, are available to facilitate the online seminars. The facilitators have extensive international experience, both living and working in different parts of the world, and in providing pre-departure briefings and re-entry sessions in the education and corporate sectors. The facilitators consult to the CIS program on a course-by-course basis, and many of them consult in the private, government and post-secondary education sectors, offering organizational development services and intercultural training around domestic and international issues.

The educational backgrounds of the facilitators include bachelors degrees, masters degrees, and doctorates in a variety of areas including education, English as a second language, history, business, psychology, and counselling. Their work experience includes teaching, counselling, corporate training, private and public sector management, working with CIDA, managing organizational change, human resources management, and coordinating international student exchange programs. Each person brings a different blend of personal experience, academic
education, work experience, and intercultural training preparation to their facilitation approach.

The Centre values the unique contribution of each facilitator and invites and welcomes different perspectives and facilitation styles. To both honour these differences and provide learners with some consistency, with the input of the facilitators, guidelines have been developed to ensure a common understanding of the role of the online facilitator. Facilitators are encouraged to engage in a conversation, continued from the face-to-face workshop. The guidelines state that the role includes the facilitation of "the learning of the participant by acknowledging, appreciating, reflecting, probing, questioning, or clarifying" and by offering relevant personal examples "to reinforce the learning". The guidelines advise that "evaluative comments like 'you did a great job' are not appropriate for this facilitator role". Facilitators are expected to provide concrete feedback, explaining specifically where the person has met the criteria or where they need to expand or deepen their analysis. Facilitators are responsible for determining whether or not each assignment satisfies the stated competency requirements, and for supporting individuals toward meeting those competencies.

In order to support new facilitators, first-time online facilitators submit their responses to the first two assignments to the program coordinator for feedback before sending them to the group. The guidelines also provide information on the workshop process, the assignments, response times, guidelines for assessing competency and providing feedback, the role of the moderator, fees, and invoicing.

Facilitating intercultural training is a complex, challenging endeavour fraught with the potential for triggering emotional pain, hurt feelings, and misunderstandings. For this reason, when the program was developed, the pool of facilitators was carefully selected. The director and program coordinator invited individuals they knew, and with whose work they were familiar, to participate as facilitators. Particular attention in the selection process was paid to previous experience facilitating intercultural training, willingness to learn with the learner group (not prescriptive in their approach), and lived cross-cultural experiences. There was a deliberate intent to involve men, people of colour and individuals from diverse ethnic
backgrounds. While "word of mouth" selection has advantages, particularly with the start-up of a new program, it may limit access to a broader network of facilitators. New workshop facilitators, regardless of how much other experience they have, work with existing facilitators before facilitating on their own. This "apprenticeship" includes attending the workshop as a participant, facilitating online, then co-facilitating with an experienced facilitator before leading a workshop.

This section has provided a description of the context from which study participants were drawn. Further information, collected during the interviews, about the motivations and expectations of the learners and the motivations and preparation of the facilitators is included in this chapter following the description of the research method.

Research Method

In this section I review the research design, the selection of the study participants, the data collection procedures, and the trustworthiness of the study.

Research Design

In order to understand what factors contribute to changes in the way individuals think about and respond to people from different cultures, I explored learners' experiences of the Intercultural Studies program, their insights into their own responses to the training, and the changes in how they interact with co-workers, staff and clients. To add depth to my understanding of these factors, I explored facilitators' intentions and experiences of learner change. I used in-depth, focused interviews (i.e., guiding the discussion using specific questions) to gather information from learners and facilitators. Additional sources of information included a review of program planning documents and course curricula. The learner interviews, facilitator interviews, and document review allowed me to view the information from several perspectives.

Much of the research related to the effects of diversity and cross-cultural training has consisted of survey based self-reports of increased levels of knowledge and awareness about diversity issues (Kealey & Protheroe, 1996; Tan, Morris & Romero, 1996). Survey and
checklist approaches to determining the effects of intercultural training limit the information that is gathered. When an individual responds by circling a “three” on a five-point scale to a question like “[since the training] I am more sensitive to customers from minority groups”, the response does not provide information about who the individual is (except, perhaps, general demographic information), who their customer is, in what context the interaction takes place, how the respondent defines sensitive or minority, or in what situations sensitivity is more or less likely to be demonstrated. Even with open-ended questions, as Patton (1980) points out, there are “...limitations related to the writing skills of respondents, the impossibility of probing or extending responses, and the effort required of the person completing the questionnaire” (p. 29).

Conducting in-depth interviews afforded me the opportunity to explore words, phrases, nonverbal cues, and hesitations in a way that a survey would not have permitted. I wanted to know what was going on for learners as they participated in the training and as they encountered individuals different from themselves -- what were they thinking, feeling, doing, and why. This is the type of information that will help inform trainers about the concepts, content, and processes that may be most useful in designing intercultural training programs. I decided that the trade-off of breadth (i.e., greater number of respondents that would be achieved with a large-scale survey) for depth would provide the richest information from which to generate some guiding notions for planners and trainers.

It is important to note that this study is not an evaluation of the certificate program, nor of the facilitators in the program. The focus of this study is the exploration of learners' experiences of the training, their perceptions of change and the engagement of learning between the training and work environments.

Rationale for Selecting Participants from the Certificate Program

Short-term instructional formats, such as one-or two-day workshops, or two-hour seminars are commonly used in business settings. The advantages of such formats may include savings in cost and time, as well as being able to enroll greater numbers of employees in training. The limitations include “information overload”, limited opportunity for individual learner feedback,
and difficulties in demonstrating that change in behaviour is attributable to the training intervention (Cervero, 1984; Sork, 1984). Kemerer (1991) states that “Most companies have found out the hard way that the ‘garage approach’ to skill development is not only expensive but is of limited value” (p. 73). He describes the garage approach as one in which employees are removed from their natural work environments and placed in short-term training to “get fixed”. Wenger (1998) raises concerns that providing training separate from learner’s “community of practice” is often ineffective and may lead to little improvement in the work practice. These observations echo the anecdotal evidence from my practice.

The Certificate in Intercultural Studies has attempted to address some of the concerns with short-term training by offering courses over an extended time frame, engaging learners in online dialogue and linking the training to practice. The theory-practice link is a unique feature of the certificate program of particular relevance for this study, as it attempts to integrate the educational and practice contexts, and to encourage learners to take a “reflective practitioner” approach. A number of adult education researchers have proposed that integrative learning models are most likely to lead to improvements in work practice (Engstrom, 1994; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Montgomery & Lau, 1996). They suggest that as individuals are exposed to new information, perspectives and ideas, they engage in a reflective learning process which allows them to test and integrate their learning over time in their work environments.

I chose the Intercultural Studies program as my research context for a number of reasons. First, it is an important part of my practice, and the EdD program is designed to encourage an in-depth reflection on practice. Second, the goals of the program are similar to the goals in other aspects of my practice, but offered in an innovative format which integrates on-site training with continuing dialogue embedded in practice, a model that may have some applicability for my other work. Third, I am concerned with how individuals engage learning between the classroom and their work environment. With its emphasis on “practice-based” learning, this program offers a unique opportunity to explore what aspects of the training situation contribute to the transfer of learning.
Selection of Study Participants

I conducted in-depth interviews with eleven individuals who had completed the program between 1997 and 1999 and eight facilitators involved in various aspects of program planning and delivery. The CIS program director provided support and assistance in obtaining documents and in initiating contact with learners and facilitators.

In order to protect the confidentiality of learner and facilitator records, the director contacted individuals for permission to give me their names and contact information (see Appendix One for letter from director). Once permission was granted, I contacted potential participants by letter (see Appendices Two and Three) and a follow-up telephone call or email to determine interest in participating in the study and schedule an interview. My aim was to interview ten to twelve learners. Anticipating a high response rate, fourteen learners -- ten women and four men (a balance which reflects the predominantly female learner base) -- were sent letters by the director. Learners were purposefully selected to meet the criteria of having completed the program and representing different gender, age, ethnic backgrounds, and occupational environments. This information was determined through consultation with the director of the Centre for Intercultural Communication and the coordinator of the certificate program. A conscious effort was made to include learners who had expressed both positive feedback and criticisms of the program. I discovered just prior to the interview that one of the learners had completed only four of the five courses, and decided to include that learner interview in the sample.

Twelve learners replied with expressions of interest, and all agreed to be interviewed. One of the twelve was unable to participate due to changes in personal circumstances, and so the final number of learners interviewed was eleven, eight women and three men from diverse cultural and occupational backgrounds including government, private sector, and education. The director and coordinator also supplied the names of facilitators who participated in the design of the program or individual courses and are involved in both face-to-face and online facilitation and moderation of individual courses. Of the nine facilitators who received letters from the director, eight -- six women and two men from diverse cultural backgrounds -- agreed to be interviewed (see Appendix Four for consent form). I discovered during the
interview process that several of the facilitators had also been learners in the certificate program before becoming facilitators. The interviews focused on their experiences as facilitators. I have included one example provided by a facilitator of her experience as a learner.

Treating the testimony of study participants with respect and honouring their privacy is of critical importance (Langness & Frank, 1981; Slim & Thompson, 1995; Spradley, 1979). Because of the small number of participants, I will not provide individual cultural, personal, or occupational profiles of the participants. To do so would affect confidentiality as they may be readily recognizable within the intercultural training community. Instead, below, I provide a summary of the learner and facilitator backgrounds, education, and age. I have used quotations extensively throughout this paper, for, as Spradley observed “A good ethnographic translation shows; a poor one only tells” (1979, p. 210). For the same ethical reasons noted above, I have not identified quotations. Coded quotations are available for audit purposes.

Consistent with the general demographic profile of program participants, the learners ranged in age from late twenties to late fifties, with a majority of six in their forties. Further reflecting the general learner makeup, eight of the learners were white. One was American born and five were Canadian born -- all of white Anglo European heritage. One person of French heritage and another of Dutch heritage had emigrated to Canada from Europe as adults. Three of the interviewees were visible minorities, one individual was second generation Japanese Canadian, one was of South Asian descent born in Canada, and one individual was Ismaili who emigrated from Kenya as a young adult. Six of the interviewees live in British Columbia, four in Ontario and one in Alberta. The educational backgrounds included two learners with post-secondary diplomas, six with bachelors degrees, one masters degree, and two doctorates. Four learners work in the corporate sector (including one self-employed), three in government, and four in post-secondary settings. All the learners work in culturally diverse settings, teaching or counselling international students, working with diverse colleagues and clients, or recruiting and managing diverse teams. In relation to socioeconomic status, the learners and facilitators live a middle-class lifestyle.
The facilitator group included six women and two men who were involved at various stages of the development of the certificate program during the last five years. They ranged in age from late thirties to early fifties. Their educational backgrounds included bachelor's degrees in Asian Studies, Business, Education, History, and Psychology. Three interviewees had masters degrees in Education and three were enrolled in masters or doctoral programs. One interviewee was Chinese, born in Hong Kong, and came to Canada as an adult. Seven of the interviewees were white. Three were born outside Canada - in the United States, South Africa, and Greece. Two came to Canada as adults; one came to Canada as a teenager. Four of the facilitators were born in Canada of white Anglo European backgrounds, one of whom is gay. Experience with intercultural training ranged from two to twenty years. Other work experience included diversity and intercultural consulting, organizational training and development, project management, public school teaching, and teaching English as a second language. All are involved in a wide range of consulting and training around cross-cultural issues in the workplace or with international students.

**Data Collection**

In this section I explain the development of interview questions and the procedures I used for participant interviews and data management, including audiotape transcription and participant feedback.

**Development of Interview Questions**

Drawing on the transfer of learning and intercultural training literature, as well as my professional and personal experiences (described as “sources of theoretical sensitivity” by Strauss and Corbin, 1990), I developed separate sets of interview questions for the learners and the facilitators (see Appendices Five and Six). Before piloting the guides with study participants, I asked myself the questions. Several of the questions sounded more like a test than invitations to a conversation. I rewrote the questions, retaining the content, and creating a warmer conversational style. For example, “what conceptual frameworks or theoretical foundations guided your decisions around content and learning activities?” became “I wonder who or what has guided your thinking? What ideas have influenced you?” Instead of “what is
your formal education in intercultural program planning?” I asked “what led you to become involved in cross-cultural training?” and “I’m curious how you learned to do this”. This conversational style felt more inviting than the original questions and demonstrated my genuine interest in the responses. The questions provided me with information about both formal education and informal learning processes that I might have otherwise missed.

As my interviews proceeded, I adjusted the questions to reflect new understandings. For example, based on responses from early interviews with learners, I expanded my question about the role of other people in the learning process to include what aspects of the online seminar worked well or were particularly challenging. Within each interview I adapted questions and followed-up areas raised by participants. I piloted the guides with one facilitator and one learner before interviewing the study participants. Because the pilot interviews resulted in only minor changes in the questions, I included the interview results in the study.

Interview Procedure

The location and time of the interviews was arranged in accordance with the preferences of the interviewees. All the facilitator interviews were conducted in person, two in my home, two in interviewee homes, and four at their offices. Of the learner interviews, six (outside Vancouver) were conducted by telephone -- one from the interviewee’s home, and five from their offices. Five interviews were conducted in person, four in the interviewee’s homes, and one in their office. The interviews were conducted during July and August 2000. Each interview was one and one-half to two hours long.

As I reflect on this factual description of the study participants, I am struck by how little this description says about what the interview process was like. As part of creating a safe, respectful environment for the individuals that I interviewed, I considered the participants as “conversational partners”. In the words of Rubin and Rubin:

Unlike survey interviews, in which those giving information are relatively passive and are not allowed the opportunity to elaborate, interviewees in qualitative interviews share in the work of the interview, sometimes guiding it in channels of their own choosing. They are treated as partners rather than as objects of research. (1995, p. 10)
I am deeply grateful for the enthusiasm and openness with which all the participants welcomed me. Several interviewees continued the conversation in-person and by email, sending me additional stories and discussing cross-cultural resources. Everyone was generous with their time. When I interviewed people in their homes, they were gracious and hospitable. When I interviewed individuals in their offices, by telephone or in-person, they were unhurried and made every effort to minimize interruptions and distractions.

Data Management

I created a data management binder, or "fieldwork journal" (Spradley, 1979), with colour coded sections to store program documents, letters of invitation, signed consent forms, methodology notes, contact summary forms, interview schedules (coded by number), and transcription procedures. To protect interviewee confidentiality each interviewee was assigned a code known only to me.

I tape recorded the interviews as well as taking notes, which were useful in capturing the occasional pieces of dialogue that were not picked up by the recording process, one of the potential drawbacks of telephone interviews. I conducted all the interviews personally and had the tapes transcribed by two transcriptionists, both of whom had previous experience. Both transcriptionists signed confidentiality agreements which included a commitment not to save the transcripts to their computer hard drives. The interview tapes were labelled with a code number, to which only I have access, to protect the identities of the interviewees. All participants were informed of the third party transcription process and the backgrounds of the transcriptionists, and agreed that they were comfortable with the approach. I kept the disks and hard copies of transcripts in a locked cabinet in my home office, and no one else had access to my computer.

Following each interview, I sent a personalized thank you note by email to each individual, and following Miles and Huberman (1994), completed a "contact summary form" which allowed me to record where and when the interview took place, the interview length, my prior relationship with the interviewee, any interruptions or distractions, my sense of the "tone" of the interview, my feelings about the interview, and ideas or questions that the interview
provoked. These notes proved to be useful in helping me recapture the spirit of the interviews as I listened to the tapes and reviewed the transcripts.

As part of my process of internalizing the data, I listened to each tape before I gave it to the transcriptionist. Before the transcriptionists began their work we agreed on a transcription protocol which included verbatim transcription including “ums” and “uhs”, line numbering, inserting blank lines [_____] to indicate missing words, including notations to indicate pauses, laughter, sighing, and using curly brackets to contain my interjections. The turnaround time on the transcription was two to seven days. When I received a completed transcript, I reviewed it line by line, listening to the tape, filling in missing words or phrases with the help of my notes and correcting the spelling of names or jargon with which the transcriptionist was unfamiliar.

Participants were sent a copy of their interview transcript within one to three weeks of their interview with an explanation of the transcript format and an invitation to review it for accuracy. Two of the facilitators replied, one by telephone to say “it looks fine”, and one returned a marked up copy of the transcript with minor changes to “correct grammar, not substance”. Two learners responded, one by email to indicate that the transcript was fine, and the other sent a marked up copy requesting that I not use information that might identify the interviewee or their employer, and adding the comment that reviewing the transcript was “a humbling experience!” I received informal comments from a couple of facilitators that they had received my package, but felt somewhat hesitant to open it right away. I had a similar reaction when I was interviewed for a project -- I was not quite ready to look at what I had divulged and how I might have come across. When I informally checked in with these facilitators, they commented that they had enjoyed reading the transcripts and were satisfied with the accuracy of the transcription work.

As I proceeded with the analysis, where I felt learners or trainers might have concerns about confidentiality I sent copies of specific sections for their comments. Everyone I contacted was satisfied that I had respected confidentiality and only minor changes were requested. In the final stages of the writing, I sent draft Chapters Four, Five, Six and Seven (which, at the time, were Chapters Three to Six) to all study participants. I requested their feedback to ensure that
I had appropriately protected confidentiality and not misunderstood, misinterpreted or misrepresented any aspect of the Intercultural Studies program or their interview. I was particularly concerned that the study participants have the opportunity to read my use of their comments in context. I had some trepidation about the process of decontextualizing individual stories and comments, and then recontextualizing them in the company of the stories of others and in the literature. It was an awesome responsibility and I am honoured by the participants’ trust in me.

In response to the draft, I received feedback from four facilitators who provided updates on the program status and minor corrections to historic and current information. These facilitators also engaged in conversations about the conceptualization of intercultural training and implications for the program. Two facilitators were planning to be outside of Canada for extended periods and did not have time to review the document. One learner contacted me by email to say she was “very impressed” with the chapters. Another learner, whom I met by chance, said she was enjoying reading the chapters and especially appreciated the clear explanation of how I developed themes from the interview material.

I gave participants a further opportunity to respond by sending an email to advise them of my deadline. At the same time, I reassured them that I was not pressuring them for a response. There is a fine line between inviting people and pushing people. It was important for me to maintain the respectful relationships I had developed with the participants during the interviews and subsequent contacts. In response to the email I heard from two facilitators and six learners, one of whom had a minor clarification to a quotation I had used, and two of whom had several comments regarding editorial changes and structure unrelated to their examples. One of the facilitators commented on how the stories and quotations made the pages “come alive”. Two learners said they appreciated the way I had synthesized and analyzed the material from the literature and the interviews. One wrote “I find it accurate where you refer to my comments” and another wrote “You very accurately and insightfully reflected parts of our discussion”. In summary, all of the facilitators responded and all but three of the learners responded. I am satisfied that all participants had ample opportunity to reflect on, and respond to, my analysis of their stories.
**Data Analysis**

Although there is no one best convention for analyzing interview data (Janesick, 1994, p. 215), the writings of Strauss and Corbin (1990), Denzin (1994) and Miles and Huberman (1994) were helpful in navigating the complex transition from “field to the text to the reader” (Denzin, 1994, p. 501). Carney’s (1990) “ladder of analytical abstraction” was a useful framework for organizing the analysis. The steps include: 1) summarizing the data by first creating a text to work on and then trying out coding categories to find a set that fits; 2) aggregating the data by identifying themes and trends in the data overall and searching for relationships in the data; 3) analyzing the trends and synthesizing the data into one explanatory framework (Carney, 1990 cited in Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 92).

The reality of working with the data was not as tidy as these steps might suggest. The “detection [of patterns] proceeds by a kind of ‘rummaging’ process. The investigator must use his or her experience and imagination to find (or fashion) a match of the patterns evidence by the data” (McCracken, 1988, cited in Clinchy, 1996, p. 210). Nonetheless, the framework helped me organize my understandings as I sat down to discover the story that emerged from the interviews. In this chapter I will describe the first stages of data analysis -- summarizing the data and aggregating the data. In Chapters Five through Seven I synthesize the findings and expand the interpretation.

**Summarizing the Data**

As described in the data management section of this chapter, I created the text by verbatim transcription of recorded interviews. My first step in the data analysis was to create a “start list” (Miles & Huberman, 1994) of coding categories for facilitator and learner interviews. I created this list based on my interview questions (see Appendices Seven and Eight).

To facilitate the data analysis, I began the coding process as I received the transcripts. Working with hard copies of the transcripts I coded interviewee responses in the margin and highlighted the response. Strauss and Corbin (1990) point out, “Since discovery is our purpose, we do not have beforehand knowledge of all the categories relevant to our theory” (p. 50). As I worked through the coding process, new categories became apparent that I had
not included in my original list. I highlighted these responses and added the new codes to my list. I also added notes such as "see L1 and L3 for similar thoughts". The size of the data set allowed me to become quite familiar with the responses of each individual and I was able to link similarities and note differences in perspectives within a particular coding element.

Next, I used the cut and paste option on my word processing program to combine all comments relevant to a particular category for each transcript. This was necessary because participant comments relating to particular codes were not located in discrete sections of the interview, but were dispersed throughout the conversation. After coding the individual transcripts, I moved to the next phase -- aggregating the facilitator data, aggregating the learner data, and aggregating across facilitator and learner data.

Aggregating the Data

Again, using the cut and paste option in my word processing program, I pulled together all facilitator comments relating to each code and all learner comments relating to each code. I worked with hard copies of the comments looking for patterns and themes first within the facilitator group, then within the learner group, and finally across both groups. Orbe (2000) notes that the initial review of the transcripts "typically produces an overwhelming number of possible themes" and that subsequent reviews "typically reveal that several themes are interconnected, redundant or incidental" (p. 165). This observation reflects my experience as the final phase of the data review resulted in a number of overlapping codes being collapsed. For example, "insider/outsider" and "strengths and limitations" were collapsed under identity and representation; "embedded usefulness" and "organizational issues/support" were integrated into the concept of diffusion; "metaphors" were included in the context they were made, rather than separated out. Additional examples are provided in the explanation of key themes.

The learners in this study brought an array of motivations, preparation, personal and professional experiences to the certificate program. The facilitators, too, brought a diverse set of lenses to the program. Both learner and facilitator voices are essential to the exploration of learning and change. It took me some time to find a structure and rhythm for writing the
themes. I started by writing separately about the experiences of learners and facilitators. This
tack resulted in redundant discussions of key concepts and literature references. The
separation of stories felt artificial and incomplete. Learners and facilitators both shape, and are
shaped by, each other. Interweaving the stories allows us "to adopt multiple perspectives in
the process of comprehending [them]" (Kroeber, 1992, p. 105).

I took to heart my responsibility in making "carefully considered judgments about what is
really significant and meaningful in the data" (Patton, 1980, p. 313). I was cognizant of the
trust placed in me by the study participants and, at the same time, daunted by the task of
presenting an "authentic portrait" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 278). As Lincoln and Denzin
(1994) observed:

The problem of representation will not go away. Indeed, at its heart lies an
inner tension, an ongoing dialectic, a contradiction, that will never be resolved.
On the one hand there is the concern for validity, or certainty in the text as a
form of isomorphism and authenticity. On the other hand there is the sure and
certain knowledge that all texts are socially, historically, politically, and
culturally located. (p. 582)

The themes I have selected to explore are ones that emerged over and over again as I read the
transcripts. They are themes that were expressed by at least half of the participants and in
some cases, all of the participants. In the introduction to each discussion, I have noted the
number of participants for whom a theme was implicit or explicit in their comments. I have
made a conscious effort to foreground the voices of the learners and facilitators I interviewed.
My discussion of the findings in the next three chapters elaborates my understanding of the
experiences of the learners and facilitators who shared their stories. Inevitably, though, my
voice is layered in the text by virtue of the fact that I am the "connection between the field
text, the research text, and the consuming community" (Lincoln and Denzin, 1994, p. 577).
My voice moves to the foreground in the final chapter as I explore the implications of this
research.

In most theses, the key themes uncovered in the analysis of the interviews would be described
in a chapter on "findings". Because I have chosen to organize my findings into three chapters,
each oriented thematically, I outline the key themes here.
Key Themes

My discussion of the findings is found in Chapters Five, Six and Seven. In Chapter Five, What Difference Does Training Make?, I discuss learner and facilitator views of intercultural competency, feedback on specific courses in the program, and learner perceptions of change and sharing learning. In Chapter Six, Learning in the Midst of Everyday Practice, I discuss two key themes related to how learners negotiate or engage learning between the program and their work contexts -- “theory and practice” and “online learning community”. Together these themes capture the key factors that contributed to how learners made sense of the course material individually and working together. In Chapter Seven, Difficult Dialogues, I discuss two strong themes -- “safety, challenge and support” and “identity and representation”. The first theme emerged from the original coded categories of emotional safety, gender issues, focused reflection and challenge strategies. The second theme emerged from the original coded categories of facilitator qualities, strengths and limitations, factors which hinder and facilitate learning and insider/outsider experiences. Together these two themes capture the key factors which affected how learners experienced the training program. Implications for program planning are foreshadowed in the chapter summaries and explored in the final chapter.

Trustworthiness

Marshall and Rossman (1995) point out that “all research must respond to canons that stand as criteria against which the trustworthiness of the project can be evaluated’ (p. 143). Drawing on the work of Lincoln and Guba (1985), they discuss four constructs to demonstrate the soundness of a qualitative inquiry: credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability. The goal of the first construct, credibility, is to ensure that the setting and population are accurately described, and that the research has been conducted within a guiding conceptual framework. I have described the research site and process of selecting participants and collecting data in detail. I have also submitted these descriptions to participants for their feedback. The study was designed using conceptual frameworks from the program planning, transfer of learning literature and cross-cultural training literature.
The second construct is transferability. Marshall and Rossman (1995) point out that the first “span” of decision-making rests with the researcher to “generalize the findings about a particular sample to the population from which the sample was drawn” (p. 144). There are no other long-term intercultural training programs available in British Columbia, so the participants were drawn from one program. It might be the case that a certain type of learner, perhaps more academically inclined, was drawn to a continuing education program offered within the context of a university. This means that readers who are concerned with intercultural training in an organizational context (another facet of my practice), especially if such training is mandatory will need to carefully consider the applicability of these findings to that environment.

With consideration for the amount of data that would be generated and the time involved in conducting, transcribing, coding and analyzing in-depth interviews, I kept the number of participants relatively small, eleven learners and eight facilitators. However, I made an effort to interview a cross-section of learners who reflected the age, gender, ethnicity and occupation of learners in the program. The findings of this study may be applicable to other learners in the certificate program. Marshall and Rossman (1995) note that other researchers “who make policy or design research studies within those same parameters can determine whether or not the cases described can be generalized” (p. 144) to their contexts. They and others (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Richardson, 1994) suggest that using multiple methods or gathering data from multiple sources, as I did in interviewing learners and trainers as well as reviewing program documents, can strengthen the usefulness of the study for other contexts.

The third construct, dependability, contrasts with the positivist notion of reliability, which assumes unchanging conditions that would lend themselves to replication. Qualitative, interpretive researchers assume that the circumstance being studied is always changing. Dependability means understanding, responding to, and accounting for these changes. For example, the certificate program has been undergoing changes since I first requested permission to use the program as my research site. Changes in the Intercultural Studies program coordinator, in the structure of the online process, in the creation of a master’s degree program all took place while I was conducting my research. During the final stages of
my analysis, changes were being made in the content of the courses themselves. I am aware that my research is a “snapshot of the events that occur[ed] when the research [took] place” (Jarvis, 1999, p. 31). I have tried to take into account these changes in the final chapter of this thesis.

The fourth construct, confirmability, comprises two key elements: the possibility for confirmation of the findings by another researcher and processes for balancing researcher bias. A methodology audit trail including thorough notes on methodology decisions and procedures allows others to inspect the research design and strategies. I kept a “data management binder” that would allow another researcher to analyze the data collected at a particular point in time and in a particular context. As Marshall and Rossman (1995) point out:

> Qualitative research does not pretend to be replicable. The researcher purposefully avoids controlling the research conditions and concentrates on recording the complexity of situational contexts and interrelations as they occur. The researcher’s goal of discovering this complexity by altering research strategies within a flexible research design, moreover, cannot be replicated by future researchers, nor should it be attempted. (p. 146)

With regard to researcher subjectivity or bias, I believe that no research undertaking is value-free. In interpretive research, there is no one right answer to a question and no assumption that researchers can eliminate biases through objective data gathering (Howe, 1998; Clarke et al., 2000). Rather, there are many questions, which may change as the research develops, and multiple realities. It is the responsibility of the researcher to be aware of her own values and biases, to look for “contrary evidence” and seek input from others. For example, I struggled during the writing of a particular section of this thesis, “identity and representation” because it brought up issues around my own identity and my personal responses as a trainer. Realizing that my personal feelings might be shaping my interpretation of the data, I presented my dilemmas to several colleagues in the EdD program, while protecting the confidentiality of the study participants. Using Brookfield’s (1995) three-role structure for setting up critical conversations my colleagues helped me “hunt for assumptions” (p. xiii) in my writing. Recognizing that there may be personal biases of which I was unaware, as I worked on different sections of the thesis, I received feedback from members of my committee and the
study participants. At times these readers brought to my attention areas where I could ask different questions or consider alternative explanations.

I have also tried to clearly situate myself in the research by explaining the ways in which my personal, educational, and work history have shaped my interests in the cross-cultural training field and in this research project. I have been a facilitator in the Intercultural Studies program since 1996. This has certain advantages in that I understand the on-site and online processes and the program content. I was not involved in the initial program planning, although I have had input into the course that I usually facilitate, Intercultural Problem-Solving and Advising. I had personally worked with three of the interviewees in one of their five courses. This seemed to be an advantage in terms of an already established rapport and trust. While I considered the possibility that these individuals might be reluctant to share negative feedback about their learning experiences, this did not pose a problem. My focus was on their integration and application of learning, rather than on evaluating the program or facilitators. Additionally, I was just one of a number of facilitators with whom they had contact, so unlike my work in other settings, the learners did not identify me as “the program”. My existing collegial relationships with the facilitators contributed to open and honest sharing of their perspectives and experiences. From a more traditional research perspective, my closeness to the program might be seen as problematic. From interpretive approaches to research, and from the EdD program perspective, which is designed to allow practitioners to shine a light on their practice, my familiarity with the certificate program has been valuable.

In summary, I have made every effort to meet the tests of trustworthiness by honestly situating myself in the research, documenting my methodology decisions and procedures, acknowledging limitations for transferability of the findings, and carrying out the data collection, analysis and interpretation in an ethical and transparent fashion.
CHAPTER FIVE

WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES TRAINING MAKE?

[I've gained a] huge awareness -- the cultural layers, and layers and layers. I'm less likely to react to a situation than I am to pull back for a minute or two and say "okay, what's actually going on here" first. [I try] to come at it a little slower and with, I hope, a little more perception on all levels. I think I've become a lot better at that. (Learner)

Sometimes there's a huge surprise at the end when people write what the course meant to them and what they learned, and you think "oh really? You learned that?" [You're] so surprised because this person didn't seem to be doing much, and at the end you see that they're expressing all kinds of [learning]...Or there may be people who've learned a lot who don't give you feedback. (Facilitator)

Educators discuss the goals of education in terms of changing individuals, institutions, and communities (Caffarella, 1994; Houle, 1996; Guy, 1999). Activist educators have argued that the purpose of education is to disrupt oppressive societal structures (Freire, 1993; hooks, 1992). Collins (1991) laments the "narrowing of the pedagogical focus...to individual behaviors" (p. 72). His vision of adult education is one which challenges "repressive social and political structures" (p. 72). Cross-cultural training has been criticized for not addressing racism, discrimination, and prejudice (May, 1999). One of the facilitators I interviewed commented "I think that there is a difference in where these two fields [international and domestic intercultural training] come from. There is a social justice dimension to [domestic] diversity work that doesn't seem to be there in international work." At the same time, several of the facilitators, who come from doing international work, expressed the goal that learners would translate personal growth into larger system changes. One facilitator said "We'd love to be agents of change on the grand scale." Another spoke of the potential for individuals to inspire institutional change, saying:

Well, I guess ultimately as we change behaviour, which is what I think we're working towards, there's an element of cognitive understanding that you can get with a program like this...There's also an "aha", gut sense of "this feels different"... That still doesn't necessarily change that person's relationship with three other persons back in the workplace. I don't think we, within the
certificate, can ever get at that piece... It may be a different piece of a bigger puzzle... Now that doesn't mean that you can't impact the system. Because if somebody goes back and re-engages with that system in a different way the system can be changed.

The facilitators with whom I spoke wanted to know what learners carried away with them from the program. One of the difficulties with determining the effects of training is that “not all attitude changes and heightened awareness necessarily translate into actual behaviors” (Gannon & Poon, 1997, p. 443). The way in which learners think about cross-cultural interactions was a key factor for facilitators in contemplating learner change. As one facilitator said:

[I would want to know] whether it made any difference in their visions of themselves and in the way they see or look at problems. I’d love to hear if they’ve got stories that show that they now stand back a bit or notice their own behaviour or assumptions in a way that is different for them.

Another facilitator’s comments reflect the unanimous goal of contributing to lasting behaviour change in learners. She commented:

I’d like to ask [learners] six or twelve months down the line, not right after [completing the training] ... two or three ideas that they still carry around with them that came from their experience in the program. What, if any concrete strategies do they still use that were part of that experience? It’s important to me that it be significantly after they have completed the program [because] I want to know whether [the learning] lasts and whether it can grow on its own.

In this chapter, I discuss learner and facilitator perceptions of change. I introduce the discussion with a discussion of learner and trainer motivation followed by an exploration of definitions of learning. I then focus on learner examples of changes in the ways they think about and interact with others in intercultural interactions and the ways in which they have tried to share their learning with colleagues. In the remainder of the chapter, I discuss intercultural competence and learner views on specific courses within the program.

**Learner and Trainer Motivation**

To help situate the learners' experiences, and to add depth to my earlier sketch of the demographic backgrounds of the participants, I begin this chapter with a discussion of learner...
and trainer motivation. I collected this information by asking the learners specific questions related to reasons for enrolling in the program, expectations of the program, and other cross-cultural experiences and training. I asked the facilitators specific questions about why and how they became involved in intercultural training and how they learned to be trainers.

Learner Motivation for Enrolling in the Certificate Program

When I asked about their reasons for enrolling, learner responses included curiosity, professional development, personal growth, and certification. Two individuals enrolled after hearing presentations by the associate director of the certificate program. One person was encouraged by a corporate training manager. Two people received program brochures “on their desks” and two were inspired to attend after participating in organizational diversity programs. One individual’s interest was sparked in a positive way to get “tools I could use in personal life and work life as I coach and develop people.” Another individual was frustrated by the negativity and adversarial approach of internal diversity courses. He wanted to see what other type of diversity training was available. Three people saw the program as an opportunity for personal and professional development. One individual hoped it would provide a “stronger base for my work,” including more theory and a credential that would reinforce experience. Six of the learners received tuition support from their employers. One individual was self-employed. The other four learners did not request support, citing employer budget constraints, no need for financial support, and no expectation for employer support for personal development.

“There are, of course as many reasons as students, and as Merriam and Caffarella (1991) remind us, the research on motivation is thick” (Daloz, 1999, p. 90). Houle (1961) proposed a widely-used typology of three adult learning orientations. These included goal-oriented learners, for whom continuing education is a means of achieving a particular goal; activity-oriented learners, for whom the activity itself and social interaction are most important; learning-oriented learners, for whom the enticement is in seeking knowledge for its own sake. The goal- and learning-oriented categories best describe the motivations of the learners in this study. For those with specific goals, the majority were motivated by wanting to do a better job
in their current work situations, although three were considering promotion or expanding consulting opportunities. Examples of learner comments included:

- *I felt like I was just floating in the air. I was drowning... where do you start to learn about this... I needed some grounding on what it was I was talking about [when implementing diversity training].*

- *I had been thinking that I would like to sort of add a little diversity to my own [consulting] work and felt that because I lived in Vancouver and it was quite a culturally diverse area that this program would fit in with my work.*

- *For me it was kind of forward thinking. I have an interest in taking a position internationally with the company... so I wanted to get myself more tools to be successful in that environment.*

Learner motivation did not fall neatly into separate categories. All of the learners had multiple reasons, needs, and interests for participating in the program. For example, one learner, who felt that this program might give her tools with which to better do her job, also expressed an interest in learning about culture because of a passionate personal interest. As well, her children had grown up and she had the time to pursue her own interests. Another learner described his interest in the program as a "hobby", and at the same time found some application for the concepts personally and professionally. Three learners mentioned that they were in transition, a common experience of adult learners who enroll in formal education (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). Two people described feeling the need for professional development but being uncertain as to what avenue to pursue until, by chance, they heard about the program. One learner said:

*I never thought about doing it before and then the brochure was put on my desk... and I thought hey, this sounds interesting and I've been wanting to go back to school and this seems like a good way for me to try it without getting into doing a degree.*

One learner cited work reasons as her primary motivation for taking the program, saying "I need to make people feel motivated and valued and I can only do that if I understand them and I understand their backgrounds and how they think and the differences they have from me so
I'm not caught in my paradigm.” She also described herself as being “passionate about this area”, explaining:

I think of myself as being pretty open minded because of how I've been raised... I myself am a visible minority, an immigrant to the country. [I practice] a faith that's not of the majority. I've grown up with racism, grown up with gender issues. I face that at work all the time. There are not many women in [my industry]. So you become very aware of it. I think my awareness and desire to do something about it is very heightened because of those experiences. I grew up all my life knowing I was different. That was always a very poignant fact when I was at school -- that I was different from everybody else. So that's driven me to want to make sure that people feel accepted... that they feel like they can be part of things, and still be different.

Consistent with Houle's (1961) activity orientation, three learners also indicated that sharing experiences with others was an important factor. This interest was captured in the following statement:

[I thought] this is something that’s going to help me do my job better ... not just to fly by the seat of my pants, but to understand some of the theories and ... to share with other people what their cultural experiences are and to form some kind of allegiance so that we can share common challenges and common success.

Another motivating factor identified by six of the learners was the need for validation. This need was as expressed in their use of such phrases as “verification that I'm doing this right”, “affirmation”, and “external validity” [from having a certificate]. The push toward certification has been well-documented (Engstrom, 1994; Grubb, 1996; Matthews, 1998). However, for the four learners who felt that a certificate would add to their credibility with employers or colleagues, it was seen as valuable, but not the primary reason for participation.

**Learners' Cross-cultural Experiences**

When asked about cross-cultural learning experiences apart from the certificate program, all learners commented on their experiences travelling, living, or working outside of Canada, including Japan, Indonesia, South America, Western Europe, Africa, South East Asia, and the United States. Four of the learners described extensive experience with Canadian First Nations, either growing up with, or working closely with First Nations communities. Four
learners stated that they were married to someone from a different cultural background than themselves. Three learners commented that they had grown up in multicultural neighborhoods in Canada and have friends from diverse cultural backgrounds. Two learners described encountering racism while living in a large Canadian city.

With regard to other experiences with cross-cultural training, six interviewees described prior training. One individual had received pre-departure briefings in preparation for working overseas. Two learners had participated in cross-cultural communication courses at the Portland Summer Institute (described in Chapter Two). One person had taken an international business course at a community college, and two people had participated in internal diversity training offered by their organizations. Three of the learners have been involved in coordinating and facilitating cultural briefings or staff diversity training. This, then, is a group of individuals with broad-ranging personal and professional interests and experiences, including experience with cross-cultural interactions domestically and internationally, and experiences with racism.

This history means that it is sometimes difficult to link learning directly to participation in a training program. As two cross-cultural researchers have stated in traditional evaluation language, we “cannot unambiguously attribute all observed effects to the training intervention” (Gannon & Poon, 1997, p. 443). In the words of one facilitator interviewed for this study: “It’s not an instant thing. It’s not like they can say ‘yesterday I was this way and today I’m this way.’ It’s something that is cumulative I think…”

Merriam and Caffarella (1999) state that “experiences that provide learning are never just isolated events in time. Rather, learners must connect what they have learned from current experiences to those in the past as well as see possible future implications” (p. 223). Despite the difficulties of separating life experience learning from formal education learning, all the learners were able to describe specific examples of learning they attributed to their involvement in the certificate program. As one learner commented:

You can’t really say for sure in this kind of thing...It all gets mixed up in the pot of course...You can never prove it...but that [particular assignment] was actually quite illuminating. I would have never [have realized the cultural
Facilitator Motivation for Becoming Involved in Intercultural Training

When I asked the facilitators how they became involved in intercultural training, two key themes emerged. Four of the facilitators became involved as a result of their own experiences living and working in different cultures. Three of the facilitators whose origins were in Canada or the United States began offering pre-departure briefings on their return to Canada from living overseas. Each one has been conducting briefings for about fifteen years. Such briefings involve helping individuals and their families prepare for temporary sojourns to different countries. The training includes psychological factors of cross-cultural adjustment, practical strategies for settling in a new environment, and discussion of culture-specific norms. After many years of business experience in several different countries, the fourth facilitator made a recent transition to intercultural training. The international sojourner experiences of these facilitators formed the foundation for their interest in working as intercultural trainers.

The other four facilitators described early childhood, family and social experiences as being motivational in choosing to work in the field of cross-cultural training. One person grew up with the experience of being a white person in South Africa. Three individuals described early experiences of “being different” and “being an outsider,” reflecting on ethnic background, family dynamics, and sexual orientation, as pivotal experiences. One facilitator reflected on her early experiences, saying “I think of coming to Canada and being the outsider and being the immigrant kid that found her parents jobs...”. One facilitator commented:

It [is] one of those things where you can then empathize with anyone else who’s from any other cultural group trying to break in, trying to fit in...I don’t think I was visible [as a gay person] so at least I had that level of protection, but it isn’t a big leap to understand [the experience of visible minorities]. It would only take a small slip and I would be exposed, so I think that’s formative...It becomes a bigger issue [as you] mature [and] come out to friends and family, and that process has parallels to being a minority. Questions of identity. Who you are. Very profound things.

Each of these individuals has about ten to fifteen years experience doing intercultural consulting and training. The work of all the facilitators now encompasses pre- and post-
departure training for international students and business people, and intercultural communication training for domestic situations. Common to all the facilitators is their interest in “making a difference” at an individual, organizational or societal level, as evidenced in these comments:

- [The program] touches them at a core part of themselves... They have to think it through. [They ask themselves] ‘I wonder why I’ve done this [in] this way. And I wonder who I’ve excluded or included by doing that. And, I wonder if there’s some other way I could do it.’
- That’s the exciting [part]. For people to really get past the ‘me’ and [starting to think about] the team. This is communicating. It’s working successfully. It’s sharing goals.
- A fair amount of my work...was focused on issues related to...race relations issues, trust building across divisions of power and privilege...[I try to work] in a more systemic way around organizational issues related to diversity and multicultural interaction and looking at organizational processes and obstacles...
- It surprises me that these [race, culture, gender] are such important topics in our lives and we don’t have the most fundamental words and tools to discuss them... People are scared of racism and diversity... They’re not such foreign concepts, but they do need to be organized... Think of the consequences when we don’t know how to deal with these things in our lives - divorces, family breakdowns, and the worst end -- wars.

I found it surprising that it was easier to locate literature related to adult motivation to learn than it was to find material exploring what motivates people to become teachers of adults. There are many articles and books exploring how to teach, but not why we teach. Collins (1991) recommends that “adult education practice needs to be more concerned with the role of the educator, de-emphasizing a prevailing sharp and unremitting focus on the situation of the adult learner” (p. 48). He exhorts teachers to be less driven by “advanc[ing] personal career aspirations” and a predominant “cult of efficiency”, and more focused on “ethical considerations as a basis for day-to-day practice” (p. 42). He suggests that we think of teaching as a “calling” which “entails careful, self-conscious reflection about one’s work” (p. 42).
Collins' (1991) beliefs about what motivates teachers (or perhaps what "should" motivate teachers) are echoed in the work of Apps (1996) who states that "Teaching from the heart is an authentic endeavor. Teachers strive to touch the hearts of learners, to form a connection" (p. 17). Palmer (1998), too, asserts that "...good teaching cannot be reduced to technique; good teaching comes from the identity and integrity of the teacher" (p. 11). One of the learners I interviewed captured the feelings of most of the learners when she said "I was just so impressed by the calibre of their [facilitator] training, the support...and the personal commitment." These qualities, along with facilitator knowledge of formal theory related to intercultural relations contributed in a positive way to the learning experience.

**Preparation for Being an Intercultural Trainer**

As indicated earlier, all the facilitators I interviewed have bachelors or masters degrees in such disciplines as Asian Studies, Business, Education, History, and Psychology. They all described their journey to becoming intercultural trainers as a self-directed process, combining personal experience, professional development workshops, and informal apprenticeships. The theoretical resources that the facilitators cited most frequently as influential on their work included Hall (1959, 1976), Hofstede (1997), Trompenaars (1993), and Janet and Milton Bennett (1996), whose work I touched on in Chapters One and Two. One facilitator noted that her work was informed by Schein's (1992) writing on organizational leadership, particularly as it applies to developing teams. Another commented on the helpfulness of Adler's (1997) work on cultural synergy in organizations. Another facilitator noted the influence of Proulx (1997, 1998), whose model is described in Chapter Two, on her approach to intercultural training. One of the facilitators critiqued some of the resources at the same time as she recognized their contribution to the field:

*Edward Hall's work was terrific in context, when it was all there was. It sounded as though [cross-cultural communication] was an American invention after the Second World War, a whole new field that was made up by people like him going off to the South Seas and then to Japan and labeling all cultures as high context or low context and it was just too facile and a bit too sure of itself. So, actually, we've come a long way just getting other voices in there...We try to put [the readings] in context [and to] encourage people to notice the bias behind it...Edward Hall, Hofstede, Trompenaars gave us some frameworks to look at and I still find those frameworks useful...I'm glad to...*
have those models, but, every time we come up with one more example [from 'real life'] you can see the weakness of the model and the strength of it at the same time. You can see that it's not really quite concentric, or it isn't quite linear.

The facilitator went on to describe the challenge of designing a training for First Nations and government officials in which “we had to throw out our agenda after half an hour and listen”. The models that had framed the training design did not address issues of dominance, power, oppression, and pain.

Although there are degree programs in intercultural relations, I am not aware of (nor were the facilitators I interviewed) a formal educational program for diversity or intercultural trainers. University programs in intercultural relations incorporate courses from sociology, psychology, political science, and anthropology. They provide a grounding in theories of intercultural or interethnic relations. They do not include courses in adult education, program planning, facilitation skills, or group process. There are various short-term (two to three day) “training for trainer” workshops for diversity, anti-racism or intercultural training that are available without prior experience or education. These courses tend to focus on training methodologies. Courses offered through the Portland Institute include a blend of theory and techniques. Two of the facilitators had attended courses at the Institute, and four had attended SIETAR conferences.

The facilitators learned about cross-cultural issues through their personal experiences of being “outsiders”, living and working in other cultures, teaching English as a second language, and coordinating student exchange programs. They use their first-hand experience to help others navigate the process of cross-cultural adaptation. Three facilitators who had taught English as a second language commented on their growing awareness that language was most effectively taught within the context of culture. Consequently, they began designing programs that integrated language and cultural awareness training. Building on their personal intercultural experiences and related academic education, the facilitators were largely self-taught through a combination of professional development courses, self-directed reading, mentoring and practice. One facilitator commented:
I always wonder about this question because I bring it up also in the course that I facilitate. What's more important - the actual experience and background or the training methodology... You could [have] all the techniques of being an effective trainer but if you haven't had the experience of actually living overseas yourself and going through all of this then [you're missing a key element]... I have brought in resource people who have the theory... but it becomes apparent that they might not have had the experience... and the issue of credibility has come up... whereas because I'm able to relate some of my stories and experiences, that says a lot [even] if I don't have the theoretical background. But I still believe it's really important to have both the theory and the [practical experience].

The cross-cultural literature offers recommendations about what to do in cross-cultural training, but does not address how to become trained in this field. For example, trainers can find writings on ethical issues (Paige, 1996), training interventions (Bennett, 1993), and cross-cultural training methods (Triandis & Brislin, 1984). They can locate a number of materials that provide instructions for conducting cross-cultural activities (Kogod, 1991; O'Mara, 1994; Singelis, 1998). They can draw content from large bodies of literature on cross-cultural communication, counselling, and management. I am not aware of a formal systematic approach for integrating program planning, training techniques, ethics, cross-cultural content, and self-exploration. To borrow Merriam and Caffarella's (1999) description of adult education, cross-cultural training is an “amorphous field of practice with no neat boundaries” (p. 45). Trainers have created their own varying paths for entering and developing in the field. The following comments illustrate the experiences of the facilitators who described being in on the “ground floor” of international briefing work in Canada:

- I was overseas making a fool of myself and came back to [Canada]... and the CIDA [Canadian International Development Association] Briefing Centre called me to be a resource... and they were really just getting going... trying to figure out how you could make people more effective and save them the time of adapting and all the mistakes you have to make to figure it out. So I was there when that was all coming along... and started with no academic knowledge at all but there wasn’t much around, this would have been 1981. I read journals from SIETAR [Society for International Education, Training and Research]... I just listened to other trainers who were doing it too, were all kind of flying by the seat of our pants.
• All that stuff [CIDA briefings] was happening, and the federal government was paying for us to go to international conferences, forums and an opportunity to meet with each other. And it was a fabulous sort of learning. I'm just trying to think of the right word, but it was sort of like this cauldron of people who were struggling with how to solve a lot of crises and how to design programs and training that would be really useful...

The “apprenticeship” nature of the trainer preparation was captured in these comments:

• I got a contract and... I had absolutely no training. I had absolutely no adult education experience. I was terrified. So I just picked up another program and [used] it and brought in experts... to do cross-cultural communications... I tried to pull it all together... and that's how it started. I learned by experience.

• I worked with really good people and I learned from them and I'm grateful to them for that... [I had] chances of working with really good trainers who taught me all kinds of things about what's effective and what's not. You know, there's no perfect model and some things work well in some places and they don't work well in other places

Both learners and trainers bring a diverse set of experiences to the certificate program. As is apparent in the findings discussed in this and in the following chapters, these experiences influenced their views of the program and their interaction with others. As facilitators, it is important to “recognize that we are only a part – however important – of a whole set of forces affecting the growth of our students” (Daloz, 1999, p. 183).

What Does Learning Mean?

Merriam and Caffarella (1999) point out that “learning defies easy definition” (p. 248) “although... most definitions include the concept of behavioral change [or potential for change]” (p. 249). Mezirow's (1991) theory of transformative learning offers one lens through which to view the individual changes described by learners. Mezirow (1991) states that “making meaning is central to what learning is all about” (1991, p. 11). He describes four processes of learning as meaning-making: extending existing frames of reference; learning new frames which complement existing “meaning schemes”; transformation of meaning schemes through a disorienting experience which leads to questioning assumptions underlying existing perspectives; and perspective transformation over time.
The first type of learning involves learning more about something we already know, such as "naming" an experience. For example, theory relating to women's ways of knowing may resonate with a learner who has experienced gender discrimination. In the second type of learning, a learner may integrate this understanding with theories of systemic discrimination in organizations. The third type of learning might occur when the learner interacts with a visible minority woman assuming they have the same experience. The woman may react to the learner with anger, throwing the learner off-balance and causing her to reflect on her assumptions. The learner then recognizes that there is a layer of systemic racism which, in fact, she may represent and enact to the other woman. This recognition changes the way she sees her relationship with the other woman and her understanding of the other woman's experience. It causes her to rethink her assumptions about gender and race. The fourth type of learning, gradual perspective transformation, is one which the learner may not recognize until some years later. Upon reviewing her hiring and training procedures from several years earlier, the learner may be surprised at how much her approach has changed. The four processes do not constitute a linear process. Individuals may experience any or all of these aspects of learning.

All the learners in the study described extending existing meaning frames, learning new frames, and questioning their assumptions. Several learners described a cumulative, gradual transformation of perspectives of which they were not aware until some time after completing the program. Nonetheless, I have been hesitant to use the term transformative to describe the learning process. As Brookfield (2000) says:

> No matter how much it might be described as an incremental process, transformative learning has for me connotations of an epiphanic, or apocalyptic, cognitive event -- a shift in the tectonic plates of one's assumptive clusters...having a more informed, nuanced, sophisticated, or deeper understanding of something (such as an idea, an assumption, or an educational practice) is not, for me equivalent to transformative learning...I believe that many working adult educators have this understanding of the word transformative. (p. 139-140)

---

14 This example was inspired by the experience of one learner in the study. It has been adapted for purposes of illustration and modelled after Dr. Dan Pratt's (1998) examples of Mezirow's four processes of learning.
Brookfield’s reflections on the meaning of transformative have helped me identify my reluctance to characterize the learner experiences in this study as transformative. Several learners described “aha” moments in which they achieved new insight into intercultural interactions. However, only one learner described an experience that might be characterized as a disorienting catalyst for rethinking her core assumptions. Her story inspired my example of the four learning processes, and is included as part of “individual change” in this chapter. The lack of a disorienting episode is perhaps not surprising given the prior intercultural experiences and training experienced by the learners. Several learners talked about experiences outside of the training program which would be considered as transformative in the sense of “causing a fundamental reordering of the paradigmatic assumptions” (Brookfield, 2000, p.140). One learner described an experience from many years earlier saying:

I’m a perfect WASP. I came from a totally White Anglo Saxon Protestant family. We worked hard and [I assumed] we were only successful because we worked hard. It had nothing to do with anything else. [I had] a fairly protected life. We were economically fine. [I went overseas to work] and all of a sudden I discovered that I didn’t really do all this by myself. I was just born lucky. [I was] in the right place at the right time and just happened to come from this culture that controls a lot of other things. And that [was] a battering to find that out because [I had] to turn around and examine everything about my own values.

This event caused the learner to rethink her sense of self in the world; it was truly a disorienting experience. The learners I interviewed did not describe having this type of experience in the Intercultural Studies program. However, many of them did describe the program as an integrating experience. Clark (1993), cited by Taylor (2000) and Merriam and Caffarella (1999), pays attention to the influence of context on perspective transformation. Clark (1993) suggests that “integrative circumstances” also trigger transformative learning. Taylor (2000) describes these circumstances, for example, participating in an adult education program, as “a more subtle [event] and less profound, providing an opportunity for exploration and clarification of past experiences” (Taylor, 2000). From this perspective, the Intercultural Studies program may be seen as an integrating experience leading to transformation.
Mezirow's model has been critiqued for its focus on internal change without attention to social context (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). In recent years, Mezirow (2000) has acknowledged that learning takes place in a social, cultural, historical context but this context is not central to his theory. Situated learning theorists such as Lave and Wenger (1991), on the other hand, raise concern about the notion of “knowledge [as] largely cerebral” (p. 41) and argue that “learning, thinking, and knowing are relations among people in activity in, with, and arising from the socially and culturally structured world” (p. 51). They suggest that “in contrast with learning as internalization, learning as increasing participation in communities of practice concerns the whole person acting in the world” (p. 49).

I am uneasy with an either/or proposition -- learning as internalization or learning as social practice. Listening to the stories of the learners, it seemed to me that there was a process of internal change occurring at the same time as learners engaged in constructing knowledge through both the online learning community and their community of practice. I will explore this process in Chapter Six, Learning in the Midst of Everyday Practice.

During my conversations with learners, I explored both what they learned and how they applied this learning, including sharing with others in their workplaces. As discussed in Chapter Three, these learner experiences can be viewed through multiple lenses, including situated learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991), diffusion (Rogers, 1995), and application (Ottoson, 1997). Lave and Wenger (1991) describe sharing with others as the “social reproduction of communities of practice” (p. 57). Rogers (1995), too, contemplates the transfer of learning as a process of diffusing learning to others in a social context. He suggests that this occurs through “both the planned and the spontaneous spread of new ideas” (Rogers, 1995, p. 7). Spontaneous diffusion occurs when individuals seize an opportunity as it arises to share learning. Planned diffusion describes a dissemination of new ideas in a more formal way, such as a training session or policy implementation.

Although learners in this study did not use the language “planned” and “spontaneous” diffusion, all the learners gave examples of one or the other, and sometimes both, of these methods of sharing learning. For ease of discussion I will separate the following discussion
into individual change and sharing learning. Individual change refers to the understandings, thoughts, feelings, or actions of the learner in interactions with others from different cultural backgrounds, what Ottoson (1997) would call application. Sharing or diffusion of learning refers to the ways in which the learners tried to share their learning with colleagues in order to contribute to change in others or in the system in which they work. Application and diffusion are forms of what I have called, borrowing from Ottoson (1999), “engaging learning”.

**Individual Change ("I think it through more carefully")**

Many of the learners talked about challenging their assumptions in intercultural interactions. One learner said:

> I was working on gender issues [in my organization] and I said to L. [an aboriginal woman] “Aboriginal women are discriminated against and that must be a concern for you.” I made the assumption that it would be a concern for her... and it became a sore point with L. that I couldn’t understand that it was aboriginal people who were discriminated against [and that it wasn’t related to gender]. Now, the research I have supports aboriginal women are more discriminated against than aboriginal men. So it’s not just aboriginal, it’s a gender [issue], too. Especially in this organization. So the aha moment came when I [realized] that I had made this carte blanche assumption, thinking that she would understand because we were both women, and really for her, the primary identifier was that she was aboriginal, not a woman. And for me, I was a woman, not an aboriginal...Given the learning with the certificate I would not say [something like] that anymore. I wouldn’t even make that assumption with anybody I happened to meet...I’ve got to be careful with my assumptions. You know, I probably would not have known that and I think that’s the greatest gift that I’ve gotten from the course. I would not have know that if I hadn’t taken the course.

Challenging assumptions was at the top of her mind for another learner who said:

> I don’t assume as much anymore. I don’t assume that the person is thinking or seeing it the way I see it. I’m a bit more cautious. I’ve got it in the back of my mind that I can’t make all these assumptions, that I have to check this out before I move forward. I have to think it through more carefully. It’s heightened my sensitivity. I’m more aware of the complexity [of cross-cultural interactions] and I have to keep learning about it.

Another learner summarized her learning in three key points, emphasizing the need for self-understanding as the first step to understanding and adapting to others:
Through the courses [I learned] that one - you’ll do it [make assumptions];
two - it’s natural to do it [and] you need to understand your [preconceived]
notions; three -- that you can control it... In order to be successful in cross-
cultural interactions you need to understand yourself first. You need to
understand who you are, why you are the way you are [and] how you became
that way. You need to...really explore that... I think it’s really important to
understand, when you go into interactions with someone, why something they
do bothers you... You can’t explore that unless you understand who you are.
Once you’re comfortable with that, then you’ll be willing to do what I think is
really important. You’ll be willing to adjust and change.

For one learner, what began as a necessity for tolerance has become something she welcomes.
In her words:

I’ve tried to do away with my own stereotypes, to look deeper, to take time to
see where people are coming from, to see the value in the way they think, to be
tolerant. At first, it was out of necessity, now I enjoy it.

The process of “thinking it through” is an invisible one, although the effects might be visible
to someone who has interacted with the learner before. For instance, it might be apparent that
the learner is asking more or different kinds of questions or working through issues
differently. Unseen cognitive processes contribute to the challenge of understanding what
difference training makes for individuals. The changes are internal and their external
manifestation is not necessarily obvious to others. One person described the following
learning, which changed both her thinking and her behaviour in ways that would not be
necessarily be apparent to someone else:

I had a real aha experience when I was talking to a friend of mine [as part of
a course assignment for Problem-solving] who is an aboriginal man and he
said something like “Sometimes it’s not a problem”. We’re always into this
solving of problems. And I [had] this aha experience -- maybe it’s not a
problem for [the other person] but I see it as a problem... I thought, he’s
absolutely right. We may see a problem from our cultural perspective but [the
other person] might not recognize it as a problem. So, it’s your problem, it’s
not their problem. So you don’t have to take control. It’s just letting it sit, you
know? Sometimes you do. You just let something sit. We don’t always have to
act. I think it’s a Western European belief that you have to fix it. You have to
act on it. It was a real aha kind of thing for me.

One learner described receiving feedback from employees who noticed her behaviour change:
The Communication Skills course...helped me a lot to bring back to my work... I [understood] that people use time and silence differently than I do and that’s okay but I need to be more sensitive to that and allow them the time to digest what I was saying. And understand the silence. I shouldn’t panic at silence. That helped me personally and professionally...I’ve always been one to jump right in and just hear myself. But by listening, I could understand how to respond... A primary adjustment I’ve made is when I’m having one-to-one conversations with people at work, particularly those who work for me. [I allow] periods of silence that I don’t interpret as it’s now my opportunity to speak or clarify. I allow them that time for processing...as a normal part of the conversation. I consciously wait so that the processing time is there and people can complete their thoughts versus jumping in. I used to talk in almost a staccato style because as soon as you finish your sentence I’m right there. Even before you’ve ended your sentence. It’s made a lot of difference. I’ve received feedback [from colleagues] that they feel like I’m really listening to them. I give them the opportunity to share ideas with me and they feel comfortable to do that because there is no time limit, because I’m just listening. I’m focused on them and I’m quiet. And, because of that they just feel valued. So it’s been very positive.

While most of the learners described work related experiences, two learners described personal changes. For one person, her involvement in a specific activity in a specific course increased her sensitivity to her spouse:

With “Ensuring Success in International Assignments” [there was] a checklist [which had] all of the things you need to think about when you go internationally. [It had] all of the things you think about for your spouse and your children and it was “Wow!” I never thought it was that much. To be honest, you don’t always think about how your spouse is going to adjust. You just figure they’re going to because you have to. So that really jumped out because I wasn’t really thinking about my spouse...It really sensitized me to what the spouse goes through. It made me think really hard about whether it’s right for me and my spouse.

For a minority culture learner, it was the opportunity throughout the program to address issues of race that created a shift in her perceptions of herself and others in interracial interactions:

I think in the beginning when we started talking about issues of race, it really took me back to high school. There’s still a lot of emotion around that stuff. When I started talking about it and opening up all these issues again, it became quite emotional for me. I started second guessing everything that happened to me. I got to deal with that. I found a way to go back and bring
closure to some things and then come back to a place where I have this happy medium, and hopefully a healthy outlook on how I see these things.

One example of a shift for this learner was her willingness to engage in potentially conflictual discussions of culture, which she described as follows:

There is one incident I remember with a woman from the Philippines... I really admired her research project and decided that I wanted to go out to dinner and pick her brains. I decided to open it up to other people in the office in case they were interested. As an introduction I sent out [the abstract from her thesis - research on violence against women in a small community] to people in the office and a couple of friends as well... One of my friends, who was the only guy invited, emailed me back with all of these questions and things that he didn’t necessarily agree with in her abstract so we got into this debate. It lasted a month over email. We were getting into things about culture, and it was great. I don’t know if I would have taken it that far if I hadn’t had this training, [and developed] the confidence to talk about some of the [feelings I had].

The changes in confidence, empathy, and challenging assumptions described by these learners may not be immediately recognized by others, except perhaps friends or colleagues who observe the individual before, during, and after the training, or other learners or facilitators with whom they have interacted over time. One facilitator said “you will see some people [return to] some of the issues and you [think] they’ve tried something different or they are now really thinking hard about it”. Another facilitator commented on the subtle changes they observed in language and “the attitudes that were implicit within the language”, for example:

Sometimes [I would see change in] the language and attitudes that were implicit within the language. Somebody talking about a particular group with whom they were working [might use] language of exclusion [like] “those people” and the stereotyping [that went along with the it]. Then [I would notice] a shift from that to self-questioning. [In a more obvious example] there was one person I remember particularly who started out saying “I struggled with this exercise you’ve asked me to do because this is all pat stuff and been there, done that”. Later, on [she said] “Wow! Wasn’t I arrogant? Look what I said in my first piece. I said X. Now I see that what I was saying was reflecting a particular attitude. I see that differently now and you’ve helped me to understand that.”

Several learners commented on their increased empathy for others. One learner described taking the time to meet with an employee to get to know more about him. In the process she
discovered that he had experience delivering training in German. She invited him to design a new course and “his eyes lit up”. She told him “I [will] take it to our manager and you’re going to get credit for it.” The learner attributed her increased empathy for the employee and willingness to spend more time with him to her participation in the “Managing Intercultural Teams” course. She described the learning as “a gift”.

One dominant culture learner gave a particularly detailed example of how her learning from the program changed her interaction with a young Asian student. She shifted from impatience to empathy and support as she understood the cultural values that may have been affecting the student’s behaviours. For example, his reluctance to see a counsellor may be due to different cultural views of mental health professionals. His difficulty in speaking to his parents may have been related to traditional filial obligation. The learner described the situation and her response this way:

I see so many students, and they have so many excuses for why they haven’t done things. Sometimes you can just get jaded about it. I know from what I’ve learned from Intercultural Studies that it would take a great deal for a young Asian man to break down to tears. I just have more empathy for him. And I treat him differently. I’m not -- what’s the word I want -- cut and dry with him. It’s like “Okay, I understand now that this is making him really upset.” Where before I would have [thought] “Oh, just another kid who isn’t doing what he’s supposed to in school and now he’s upset.” [Now] I’ll listen to him more, find out what we can do, find out where he can go next, and understand why he doesn’t go there. Then not get angry about the fact that he doesn’t do what you tell him to do. Because it’s not part of the cultural background to go and open up and tell [everything]. [For example] This would be the kind of student [to whom] I would tend to say “You need to go and see the counsellor. You need to go right away. Would you like me to make an appointment?” So then I would do that [but] I’m not allowed to ask whether they go or no...I [might] never see him again [and] he could end up being suspended. But I wouldn’t [say to myself] “why didn’t he do what I told him to do?” [I would realize that his behaviour] made sense...

If I did end up getting him back into the office, I can ask him if he’s gone to counselling and I can also ask him ...if there is someone in[the] family [who could help]. “If you’re having problems with your parents [about] how much time it takes you [to study] and therefore you can’t work in the family store, is there someone else that the family knows and respects. Maybe someone who’s in business, like an uncle, who understands the importance of getting a degree, that could talk to your parents. Also, [I would] say to him, “It makes
sense that your parents wouldn’t understand this. They’ve never been through this. All they’ve done is work really hard to keep the store going. They haven’t come to university and it would be very difficult for them to understand the demands that are made on you.” [And I would say] “Can you go to counselling, because they can teach you skills to talk about that with your parents. They’re not ‘head shrinkers’. They are people who teach you skills.”

While most of the learners discussed their learning in terms of verbal communications with others, several commented on how the training affected their sensitivity to racial, cultural, political and power issues in written documents. One learner described how her awareness had changed with regard to relationships with First Nations communities:

[In one of our internal memos someone wrote] “We want to work with a [First Nations group] so that we can take advantage of their connections to [the community].” [But] we don’t want to “take advantage of”. Three years ago I may not have even noticed that. All sorts of things came in [to my office recently] and I just crossed them off and put in other words. They say the same thing, but it doesn’t put us in a relationship of ‘power over weak’...So we don’t want to say “we want to take advantage of you.” We say “we would like to partner with you and together we will work ...to provide [opportunities] for your people. [When I was thinking about the words] “we want to take advantage of”, [it sounds like] “we’ll use all of your resources.” Now, that may not have even phased me three years ago. That learning has come for the program and then it’s been sensitized with working with the communities.

A second learner who spoke about interacting with First Nations communities said:

[Being in the program] just gave me a lot more confidence to keep going [with my recommendations for communications to First Nations communities]. I worked that way, anyway, but this gave me more confidence to [be assertive] about what will work and what won’t work in communicating with [people in the First Nations community].

A third individual described his experience working with committees from a number of provinces to develop a strategic planning document. His participation in the Intercultural Studies program heightened his sensitivity to language as a “trigger” for cultural and power issues between Canadians in Quebec and Ontario:

On the basis of regular telephone conferences I drafted a strategic document. The document has been sent out to a whole lot of committees...[After receiving feedback] I sent out...the last draft...All of a sudden I got a letter
from Quebec directed two levels higher than me. It was not sent to me. It was not an e-mail. It was a hard copy letter which meant they were really upset. I had an hour conversation with the [person] in Quebec about what their [concerns] were. At that time I thought that the Intercultural Studies course came in handy because of course their context is different from our context. There's quite a cultural difference in the way the world is viewed. The particular example here is the use of the word strategy in the singular versus the use of the word strategies in the plural....I thought that if you use the singular it refers to Canada as a whole, and Quebec of course, does not subscribe to that notion, so the word strategies means that every province and territory has its own strategy. Together they form strategies and then you make them cooperative and it becomes cooperative strategies rather than cooperative strategy. ...I have no problem changing the singular to the plural...One thing I should say is that if I had not taken the Intercultural training I might have been much less equanimous to that request. I [was] not phased by this. I just took it all in stride. I wasn't irritated. Whereas if I hadn't taken the training I might not have been as quick to catch onto the fact that, of course, they live within their context, and I live within my context.

**Sharing Learning ("Offering other perspectives")**

Rogers (1995) suggests that innovations, ideas, or practices that an individual perceives as new, are communicated in a spontaneous or planned way by individuals to others in a social system. He proposes that there are five steps in the adoption of new ideas by others: knowledge of the idea; persuasion to view the idea favourably or unfavourably; decision to adopt or reject the idea; implementation of the idea and confirmation or reinforcement of the decision. He further suggests that there are five characteristics of innovations that make them easier or more difficult to adopt: the relative advantage of the new idea; the compatibility with existing values and norms; the complexity of the innovation; the trialability or opportunity for experimentation, and the observability of the results to others. In this study, I did not talk with other members of a social system. I had access only to the learner, or what Rogers (1995) would call an "early adopter" who embraced a new idea. I will discuss their perceptions of the diffusion or sharing process, beginning with a discussion of spontaneous diffusion.

---

15 I use this term with caution in the context of organizational development. Kapoor (1999) points out that the notion of early and late adopters of innovation in an international development context contains value judgments symbolic of the power of whiteness. The terminology is emblematic of "The assumption, by the overindustrialized world, of 'knowing what is best' for the less industrialized world" (p. 261).
Spontaneous Diffusion ("I don't see myself as a beacon, but...")

Rogers (1995) suggests that we are more likely to pay attention, and respond positively, to new ideas when they are introduced by someone with whom we have a common culture. He states that:

When [individuals] share common meaning, a mutual subcultural language, and are alike in personal and social characteristics, the communication of new ideas is likely to have greater effects in terms of knowledge gain, attitude formation and change, and overt behavior change. (p. 19)

From the work I have done with cross-cultural teams, Rogers' comments make sense. It is difficult for outsiders or newcomers, and especially difficult for someone who is both, to have their ideas heard. One of the key components of intercultural team building workshops involves looking at the factors that affect who is included, who is excluded, who is listened to, whose opinions and knowledge are valued. At the same time as it can be difficult for outsiders to be heard, there is also a risk for insiders who try to introduce changes. While a "like insider" may increase the potential for other individuals to listen to new ideas, the early adopter may be seen as breaking rank with the group. One learner described his informal approach to sharing knowledge as a process of persuading his co-workers of the value in changing their behavior toward clients. As can be seen in the following example, the learner communicates his insights and suggestions carefully so as to slowly build credibility. He does not want to alienate his colleagues by sending the message that he knows more than they do, as he expressed in the following statements:

I'm dealing with a homogeneous group of [colleagues]....I reach into the tool bag of intercultural [techniques] and try to find something to get me over that hill [of other people's assumptions about the clients]...I don't see myself as some beacon but hopefully what I have to say is going to have some effect when those people that I'm working with are out there [doing their jobs].

I try not to bring up [my ideas] ad nauseam because then it would just become "there's that guy saying that again". So I try to pick my shots and make an effect with it there. And it's generally accepted very well. I've never seen racists or bigot in our [organization]. What I have seen is people that have very strong personalities...If I go in there and start to tell them exactly
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how I want them to do everything, I'd get beat down pretty quick. [There are
two approaches I can use]. One is to tell them what I think is going to happen
[if they act in a certain way] and then they can accept it. The other one is they
can ignore it and go out and if it happens I can phone them up and say “see I
told you so”. Both of those really work. It's not so much rubbing their face in
it, it's just that you know these things will [happen]... I would say that's my
goal is [to build credibility].

Another learner who has a supervisory role described sharing of knowledge “in the moment”:

The people in [my] office have some need to be exposed [to the training]. One
of the team leaders here is an American [woman] who had some difficulty
understanding that in some other branches of the company people do not
operate based on the same values. [For example, in Sweden] they have to pick
up the kids from the State owned kindergarten. They are not going to stay late.
[She questioned] “But why do we have to wake up early to meet [by
conference video] with them?” [I answered] “Because we are not Swedes and
we are dedicated to our work and we don’t care about being here at six a.m.”
Maybe we can accommodate both systems of values. I’d like her
to...understand that there are different systems of values.

Several learners commented in general terms about their informal approach to sharing their
learning. One person said:

I remember wishing I could take [one of the facilitators] and put [her] in my
office because I thought that the [workshop] was amazing. By the time you got
through the whole weekend, you really felt that you could do things with a
group of people to get them more unified...I try to [share what I learned]
informally because there are several distinct cultures in the group and they do
tend to misunderstand each other’s motives for doing things...my life would
be a lot easier [if more people at work took the training]. It's too bad more
people don't do it.

In this case the individual does not have formal power in the organization, and was hoping
that others would follow her example to participate in the training. To her disappointment,
they did not. From her comments it sounded as though the lack of interest from the
departmental supervisor may have contributed to the lack of participation by others.

Another learner spoke about helping colleagues to see another point of view. She said:

When I [have] discussion with my colleagues [when] they’re sharing with
me...issues they’re having with certain people, I play the role of helping them
see it from the other side. I try to make sure they’re not stuck in their
paradigm. [I suggest] maybe [the other person] was thinking this... just trying
to open up their mind a little bit to that particular situation -- not agreeing or
disagreeing but trying to add something useful.

She offered this example of trying to help another manager think through misunderstandings
about a co-worker from a different cultural background:

I remember having a conversation [at work] with a manager. [I was] offering
other perspectives because of something that had happened in the past with
the termination of a manager who was from Hong Kong. The comment that
the manager made was that they just weren’t performing. I was helping that
individual, who is Canadian, to understand, or at least see it from the other
side that the expectations could have been different, that there were some
cultural differences. Some of the things he pointed out [as problems] were
very North American. I was just sharing some thoughts and that person was
very open to it. They said “hey, I never thought of that and I can keep that in
mind for the future”. So that was good.

Another learner described an interaction in which he was not able to convince a team leader of
the “validity of another [cultural] perspective”. Instead, he found a way to intervene in the
situation to try to save face for a team member:

There was one case when we [had just gone] to self-managed teams. In one of
the teams there was a Chinese fellow and I started discovering -- it took a
while to figure it out -- hierarchy was very important to him. Culturally
speaking [the team leader] was the opposite extreme of what we read in the
books about oriental cultures. I tried to use what I learned but I’m not so sure
I was successful. I could not convince [the team leader] of the validity [of
another perspective]... He’s a hard core computing expert. Here I’m
stereotyping already but in his world things have lots of structure and if it
ain’t got structure it’s worth nothing. The Chinese fellow was very obstinate
in his ways but he used what I clearly recognized from our classes the
methods open to him to express his obstinacy. He was very deferent to
authority. He was never open in his criticism. Everything was implicit and
there [were] lots of hints between the lines that never got recognized...It was
very difficult for me to sort out the intercultural side from the work issues and
so it became all a bit messy...In the end he had to leave the team because our
teams were given full rights to vote a member out, and [we knew they were
going to vote him out] which in my opinion [would] make him lose face...I did
a lot of shuttle diplomacy and before he got kicked out by his team, I
transferred him... On the surface face was saved. I think the [courses at UBC
and another college] influenced me.
Another learner described her approach with a colleague who was frustrated with the behaviour of her teenage son who was about to embark on an overseas study trip. The learner explained how her learning from the program gave her the insight to coach her colleague:

One of my staff members has a young son who...had an opportunity to go and live and work and study in China one summer. He was terribly excited about this wonderful opportunity. And as time went on, she was becoming more and more frustrated with him because he had done no preparation. He had done no packing. [With just two weeks before he left] he hadn't done anything except get his passport. We were talking one day and I said, “Has it ever occurred to you that he’s scared? He’s excited, but he’s frightened. He’s going to something totally unknown. It’s like walking off the pier and not knowing how deep the water is.” She came back a couple of days later and said “Thank you for that. That’s exactly what was going on.” [Before taking the program] I wouldn’t have seen the cultural [aspect]. [I wouldn’t have recognized] that it was such a huge step to go into that setting without really knowing [what it would be like]... It’s one of the things I try and keep in mind whenever I’m working with international students. How would I feel if I were in a like situation? How would I react? And would I just sit there and go “uh?” to every sentence because I [would be] working so hard, not only to [translate] the language, but to [translate] the meanings. [And I would be struggling] to interpret what was going on and what is expected [of me because] it’s just so foreign to everything I’ve ever known and ever been taught.

All the learners described informal, spontaneous efforts to share their learning as situations arose in their work environments. With regard to planned change, seven of the learners shared examples of efforts to introduce change in a more formal way. Their stories are highlighted in the next section. The other learners did not have the authority to initiate formal programs or policies. They were limited to trying to achieve change informally through their collegial spheres of influence.

Planned Diffusion (“You win some, you lose some”)

One individual started with an informal approach before approaching his Human Resources department with a recommendation. He used a course assignment as a basis for sharing some of his thoughts with the team he managed. He felt that this led to a better understanding of head office and departmental unit dynamics:
I focused on the value orientations that I thought would have the biggest impact on getting the work done, and that is the approach to time. [I also considered] the approach to hierarchy [and] public versus private space [and] individualism versus collectivism. It was not a thorough study by any means. I talked to some people in my unit and I knew my unit inside out and I talked to a number of people at head office... I came to the conclusion that there were a couple of very noticeable and strong cultural differences. It made me recognize places where it was obvious that there would be problems in interaction because there was a different outlook on the work. ..With respect to hierarchy, [at] head office, the hierarchical structures were observed much more than in my unit. Second, with respect to the difference between public space and private space -- in head office private space was more important than in our unit... Time in head office was much more structured. In our unit it was less structured but more urgent.

The learner then made a proposal to the Human Resources department to do a survey of the groups to confirm his initial observations. There had always been tension between the field offices and the learner hoped that sharing the results of such a survey could contribute to improving communication and relationships. He had the authority to use the information within his own group, but “there was no money” to implement his proposal organizationally. He was disappointed but optimistic that he had planted the seeds for change. As he put it:

You win some and you lose some... The very fact that I was able to get the unit of Human Resources interested was [an] achievement. [It] opened their eyes to this kind of approach [but] they didn’t have the resources to put behind it.

Budget considerations were cited by other learners as a factor in implementing widespread change. Two learners discussed the challenges of organizing cultural orientation or briefing programs for staff with international assignments. One person commented on her frustration in trying to talk to people in her organization about offering international briefings, saying:

When people are transferred internationally I have yet to see someone [receive] any type of training or acclimatization to where they’re going. They’re just sent. [I wonder why more corporations don’t do this kind of training]. [They’re] moving people all over the place and this type of training is affordable, or [the organization] could work with the [academic] institution to get something catered to their specific needs. I was [surprised] because most of the participants [in the program] were from education and academia [not business]... It could be funding. When corporations... are trying to save money, a lot of times [it is] pulled from the training budget.
Another spoke of her frustrations in trying to get organizational support to develop an orientation program:

[When doing business with other countries] they didn't allow us any time to get over those cultural differences. It was never included in the training plan. I said, “What we really need is an orientation program”. Now when we’re talking about doing work in other countries... I [try to] build that intercultural component [into the plan]. If we are[sending or receiving delegations] there should be a [cultural] briefing... [One of the problems, though] is that [it’s hard] to get organizational support [because everyone] is pushing themselves to the very end to meet deadlines. [We were able to arrange a brief[ing] on the fly. And they didn’t support it in-country so essentially a lot of the [people] took their manual and when [we] followed up on it afterward and asked ‘did you actually use it?’, they said, “You know, I didn’t even get a chance to open it.” I think in a way our company let them down and they still expected them to be fully functional with the customer, and they weren’t interested in the cultural differences.

Learners also faced challenges in implementing domestic diversity training. One learner was actively involved in a diversity working group that was trying to increase awareness, understanding, and acceptance of individuals with diverse backgrounds in the organization. She described her challenge in this way: “Sometimes when I talk about the diversity working group I get a negative response from others. Sometimes I am able to make them see [why we have this group]. Sometimes I don’t have the energy.” She felt that individuals in the organization have so many preconceived notions about what diversity means (i.e., employment equity or affirmative action for “special” groups) that it is difficult to implement change. Another learner who coordinates diversity training for her organization described the challenges she faces in sharing her learning, especially when there is a backlash from previous training efforts:

[Sometimes it’s seen as “fluff”, too soft]. Let me see if I can give you an example of fluff... I was [in a diversity training session] with senior leaders [in the organization]... We had this woman who was making a presentation about diversity and gender issues. She said “I want to congratulate all you gentlemen about how attentive you are. I don’t know whether you noticed, but I’m wearing two shoes of different colours. One’s red and one’s brown. Did anybody notice?” Well, these are trained [professionals who do complex work]. No, they’re not noticing her shoes... [She said] “I’m wearing different shoes because I want to emphasize diversity.” Fluff! Lost credibility. They just
rolled their eyes and laughed... [There are other exercises like] “I want you to reach out and touch the other person’s hand. I want you to share with them some experience from your past”. You can’t do that [in this organization]. It may have experiential value in some certain workplaces, it doesn’t here. If you’re going to do something like that, where you’re going to bring people into an emotional experience of some sort, you gather their experiences and let them experience an aha moment in their own way. Then you need to back it up with what the research says [and address questions like] “how did this affect their behaviour?”, “how does it affect the workplace?” You just don’t leave them dangling, with “oh, love is in the air”.

Comments from another learner illustrate the importance of appropriate organizational support for the introduction of training:

All of a sudden you get a memo on your desk and it says you’re going to have to go to intercultural courses. You guys have got to go and learn how to talk to Native people and learn about how many Chinese people live in Canada and things like that... I want to temper that by saying there was a significant group of people who were there to learn. They had an open mind and didn’t bring a lot of baggage and preconceived ideas. Hopefully I was one of those people. But there were some strong personalities who had an influence... [Some] of the supervisors were [saying] “this course is a real pain in the butt and no one likes it”. So, right from the get go, everybody showed up [with the attitude] “where’s the fight?”

These types of experiences make it difficult to introduce new diversity efforts. It is problematic to assume that a half-day or one-day training session is the answer to creating a welcoming and inclusive environment because “training rarely takes on the system” (Sussman, 1994, p. 48). Like any other major organizational change process, the implementation of diversity training has to be managed with sustained corporate commitment (Hayles & Russell, 1997). One model includes the following eight elements: 1) diversity champions from all levels of the organization; 2) shared commitment from senior managers; 3) a guided plan with clear stakeholder roles and responsibilities; 4) communication and education; 5) effective policies, 6) widespread involvement from cross functional committees; 7) measurable results; and 8) examples of change that demonstrate how the organization looks and functions differently as a result of attention to diversity issues (Kanter et al., 1992). Thomas (1991) emphasizes that managing diversity is a process, not a program. He states that “Managing diversity is not for
everyone. It requires either vision or pain” (p. 15). It may require both. The process takes
time, money, and ongoing support, all of which are often in short supply in organizations.

Whether it was encouraging individuals in an organization to offer pre-departure briefing
programs, support diversity policy initiatives, provide domestic diversity training, or develop
interdepartmental communication processes, learners who tried to introduce planned
innovations into organizational systems faced significant hurdles. They fared better when they
shared their learning in spontaneous and informal ways within their own teams with mostly
receptive colleagues. This experience is consistent with Rogers’ (1995) contention that “the
heart of the diffusion process” (p. 18) relies on individuals who are willing to try new
behaviours suggested or modelled by respected colleagues.

In this section I discussed examples of changes in thinking, feelings and behaviours
experienced by learners. In the next section I look at learners’ views of the change process.

**Perceptions of Change (“It was something that evolved”)**

Zinn (1990) states that “education has as a central focus an intent to effect change -- whether
that change be an increase in knowledge, the acquisition or improvement of a skill, or a
change in attitude or behavior” (p. 41). Without exception, when I asked learners in a general
way to talk about their work and their experience in the training, the learners with whom I
spoke described ways in which their knowledge, thinking, feelings, and behaviours had
changed in intercultural interactions. When I asked direct questions such as “how have you
changed?”, “how have you applied what you learned?”, “what helped you ‘transfer’ your
learning?”, learners were sometimes hesitant in responding.

One learner described having a way to “name” (e.g., by using Hofstede’s notions of power
distance) behaviours he observed in an intercultural team. At the same time he said “I don’t
think that many things have changed for me. I do not see the impact”. He added “Maybe these
changes have been so internalized that I’m not seeing them,” thereby signalling one of the
challenges in identifying the effects of training. Other learners, including those who had given
examples of change through their stories, also struggled to articulate just what they had
learned. One learner commented:
It was something that evolved. I can’t say one thing stands out in my mind as being “oh that is what caused me to have a different approach to someone culturally different from me”. It was something that evolved through the whole process.

Another learner echoed the notion of “wholeness” and “integration” saying:

It consolidated stuff for me. I’ve taken a lot of intercultural courses... It just brought things together that I had been exposed to before and helped me to make sense out of my experience. I don’t know if I could say that I’ve some out with something concrete. It brought things together in a more integrated way ... Because this was done over a period of a year I think it tends to integrate more... into my everyday experience.

Another learner commented that she did not recognize the changes she was experiencing until about six months after completing the program:

I didn’t know that at the time. It wasn’t really until much later I went “okay, this all makes sense”. I didn’t take the course and say “okay that’s great, I’ve got it all locked down now”. That just didn’t happen for me... The last three years have been such a whirl. I’m only now settling down and going AHHHH! You have no idea how much I know now! It was sort of this integration that came last Fall [after doing five or six internal training sessions].

Yet another person wrote to me after our interview providing a specific example of change and saying:

Thanks again for making me think about all this stuff. It’s interesting to think about how so much of what I’ve learned has become an integral part of me and I forget to attribute it back to the actual learning experience.

The learners’ comments remind me of a Zen story reproduced by Becker (1998) in his guide to thinking about research:

In the middle of the ocean, there is a special place, which is a Dragon Gate. It has this wonderful property: any fish that swims through it immediately turns into a dragon. However, the Dragon Gate does not look any different from any other part of the ocean. So you can never find it by looking for it. The only way to know where it is is to notice that the fish who swim through it become dragons. However, when a fish swims through the Dragon Gate, and becomes a dragon, it doesn’t look any different. It just looks like the same fish it was before. So you can’t tell where the Dragon Gate is by looking closely to find just where the change takes place. Furthermore, when fish swim through the
Dragon Gate and become dragons, they don’t feel any different, so they just don’t know that they have changed into dragons. They just are dragons from then on. (p. 219)

This story helps me understand the apparent contradiction of learners who told stories of change when questioned indirectly (e.g., tell me where you work and what you do; how did you become interested in the program?) and yet had more difficulty making the link between training and learning when asked directly (e.g., what has changed for you?). If they have become “dragons” their experience emerges naturally as they talk about their everyday lives and work. I discovered that if I moved away from the “what has changed for you?” or “what helped you transfer the learning?” types of questions, learners would come back with a response later in the conversation. Through the ebb and flow of as natural a conversation as I could create, a picture of learner change emerged.

In response to the dragon story, one might pose the question, as did one of my committee members, “Isn’t self knowledge and self-awareness part of learning?” In the certificate program, self-knowledge and self-awareness are part of learning as the courses are designed to encourage individuals to reflect on their experiences, responses, feelings, thoughts, and behaviours. Even so, the cumulative effects of learning may be taking place at a subconscious level unless learners are asked to engage in a project or interview in which they synthesize the learning that has taken place over time. The interviews I conducted with learners gave them an opportunity reflect on the whole program and make explicit what they had learned and how they had changed. I have had personal experience with this in preparing for the oral comprehensive exam for the EdD program. It was in the act of reflecting on and sharing how my practice had changed that I realized how much, and in what ways, I had changed.

Interestingly, neither the learners nor the facilitators referred directly to the competencies outlined for each course in their discussion of learning and change. This may be because the competencies are related more to specific assignment completion than to overall intercultural competencies. Nonetheless, there are certain assumptions embedded in the course designs related to becoming aware of personal values, challenging assumptions, understanding others’ cultural maps, respecting differences, and seeing situations from diverse perspectives that have
clearly influenced the nature of the learning. Because the term “competency” is used in the course material and notions of intercultural competence are implicit in the program, I asked learners and facilitators for their perspectives on competencies. My findings are discussed below.

**Defining Cultural Competence ("I almost think it is an oxymoron")**

Early learning theories focused on observable behaviour change as indicators of learning (Galbraith, 1990). This focus translates into behavioural objectives and competency-based learning (Galbraith, 1990; Mager, 1997), still the most commonly used methods of describing program goals. Mager (1997) describes objectives as “tools for describing intended outcomes” (p. 13) and states that objectives should define “what a learner is expected to be able to do and/or produce to be considered competent” (p.46). These expectations are often phrased as “by the end of the training, the learner will be able to understand, feel, know or do”. The terms *objective, competency* and *learning outcome* seem to be used interchangeably, perhaps an outgrowth of Mager’s influential work. An essential element of objectives or competencies is that they are measurable. The Ontario College Standards and Accreditation Council (CSAC) states that competencies (which they term *generic skills*), must meet a number of criteria including “generic skills are to be expressed through learning outcomes, all graduates must achieve all generic skills outcomes, graduates must ‘reliably demonstrate’ each generic skills outcome, and it must be possible to evaluate the attainment of the generic skills outcomes” (CSAC, 1993).

Adult educators acknowledge the lack of consensus on the number and categorization of learning theories (Galbraith, 1990; Merriam and Caffarella,1999; Tennant, 1991). Merriam and Caffarella (1999) identified five basic orientations for discussion: behaviourist, cognitivist, humanist, social learning and constructivist. Each theory links to certain approaches or methodologies in adult education. Behaviourist approaches concentrate on identifying expected behaviour change through objectives or competencies; cognitive approaches involve attention to the way learners acquire and process knowledge; humanist approaches lead to personal growth and self-directed learning; social learning theory leads to modelling and mentoring; constructivism leads to facilitating individuals in making sense of their experience.
through dialogue (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). Humanist and constructivist orientations were implicit in the conversations with facilitators as illustrated in comments such as “the learning multiplies because of the rich dialogue and diversity of contributions” and “[it involves both] looking inward at how your own ‘stuff’ impacts on how you [interact cross-culturally] and building a sense of group and starting to see how knowledge can be used in different ways.”

As seen in the previous section, there were also frequent references to behaviour change in the facilitator interviews.

During the program planning process, tensions emerged between facilitator beliefs about knowledge construction and advisory committee expectations of competence demonstration, a reminder that planners work in contexts that affect their planning decisions and often have to negotiate aspects of educational programs (Wilson & Cervero, 1996). The competency issue was articulated by one facilitator in the following statement:

At one point in the discussion [with the advisory committee] people had actually wanted us to list [the] ten intercultural competencies we wanted people to be able to display by the end of the program. [We] felt very strongly that we could not come up with a universal list of intercultural competencies that could be displayed because of the same argument that we use all the time with people about understanding difference... People who want to go into competency testing or assessment are looking for behaviours. Well, the behaviours have multiple meanings... It felt quite presumptuous of the advisory committee to think that they could have an exhaustive list of behaviours that would demonstrate competence. You know [we] really wanted there to be enough space in the program for there to be the real honoring of difference.

This perspective is echoed by Jacobson and associates (1999) who investigated the potential of using portfolio assessment to demonstrate intercultural competence. They state that “principles of intercultural competence are clear, but the specific forms it may take are infinitely diverse and we chose not to specify in advance what students’ portfolios ideally ought to include” (p. 470). I am not sure that the same principles are clear to everyone. Jacobson and associates state that:

Intercultural competence is not simply a personal trait or a learned skill, but a social phenomenon... intercultural competence is an individual’s ability to take part in social interactions in ways that are appropriate to the setting and
satisfactory to the interacts, even though interactants do not share the same
cultural background as a basis for interpreting the social setting or acting in it.
(p. 470)

This view of intercultural competence does not address potential for conflict in determining
what is “appropriate” or “satisfactory”, nor does it address the role of prejudice or power in
intercultural interactions. Bennett and Bennett (1996) echo the valuing of pluralism implicit
commenting:

The maintenance of a vision that stresses the dignity of all cultures and the
productivity of pluralism; the development of a mindset that recognizes
ethnocentrism and seeks the value of difference; and the adoption of a skill set
that employs intercultural communication in effective and ethical ways. (p. 5)

They go on to describe the following skill set:

Recognize the impact of our own culture on perception, respond to others in
non-judgmental ways, generate more than one cultural interpretation for
behavior, mediate conflicts and solve problems in culturally appropriate and
effective ways, recognize and address the impact of culture in all aspects of our
personal and professional lives, motivate others in the context of their cultural
values, promote effective intercultural interaction through mutual adaptation to
style difference, respect cultural differences through analysis of the strengths
and limits of different perspectives, skills and knowledge, model culturally
sensitive behavior and attitudes, seek out new learning about cultural
difference. (Bennett & Bennett, 1996, p. 5)

Unlike the definition proposed by Jacobson and associates, the Bennetts’ definition implies a
recognition of prejudice in the use of the term ethnocentrism. However, the definition raises
questions because it assumes we can respond non-judgmentally and that adaptation to style
differences and recognition of different perspectives will lead to “effective” interactions. The
definition does not address power, historic, systemic, or structural contexts which may affect
intercultural interactions.

The certificate program does not have a set of overall competencies. Instead, competencies
were introduced for each course after the pilot program. Facilitators found in the pilot phase
that it was difficult to ask people for more in-depth assignments without being able to refer to
written expectations. It became apparent that facilitators and learners needed guidance about
what was expected while still allowing latitude for individual differences. The competency statements allow facilitators to go back to participants who have submitted assignments and say “Can you go a little deeper? We don’t feel you’ve quite examined [what we asked for]”. The competencies also give learners a sense of what they are working toward in each course. As one learner said “I appreciated that facilitators would be willing to point out that I’d missed the boat completely.”

One competency, for example, reads “assess their own intercultural communication skills and create a plan for further development” (Communication Skills course manual, 1996, p. 2). Another requires learners to “create an alternate problem-solving process for an intercultural scenario, incorporating the use of effective communication skills” (Intercultural Problem-Solving and Advising course manual, 1999, p. 2). Although these completion requirements may not fit Mager’s (1997) definition of a competency, what is important for this study is that the inclusion of competencies in each course led me to ask learners and facilitators what intercultural competence meant to them. The comments of the facilitators are exemplified in the following two comments in which the ability to “reflection-in action” is a key component:

- **I think somebody is interculturally competent when they recognize that there is miscommunication and they know how to back up and start inquiring and reexamining what they’ve done and what the other [person] has done, and what they’ve perceived and what the other [person] has perceived.**

- **Somebody who is interculturally competent knows what questions to ask and when, in a variety of situations and environments. They may be questions that they ask out loud or they may be questions that they ask internally, or questions that they go to a third party or a third place to find out. But they’re aware enough of the range of values and processes and expectations that people hold to be able to generate those questions.**

One facilitator addressed issues of inclusion and exclusion in her comments, stating:

**Somebody who has been successful in the program is somebody who, at some point in their day says, I wonder why I’ve done this [in] this way? And I wonder who I’ve excluded or included by doing that and I wonder if there’s some other way I could do it and I could probably talk to Joe about that and find some new ways [of approaching a situation].**
In defining competence, learners tended to emphasize recognition of differences, acceptance, empathy, and adaptation, as illustrated in the following comments:

- **What [competence] means to me is that you can first of all recognize cultural differences where they exist. You are not threatened by them and you can work your way around them if that is what you have to do. If you're very successful...you can make the solution of the problem benefit from the presence of the intercultural [differences].**

- **To me [competence] would be somebody who has the ability to see another perspective, to be able to empathize and to function in a group that's different from his or her own.**

- **I think it's an individual who has the awareness, the desire and the skills to adjust.**

The discussion of competence elicited specific comments related to race, power, and structural inequities by three learners who work with First Nations individuals or communities, a facilitator from South Africa, and a facilitator with a history of working with organizational change. Reflecting on how his experiences in South Africa have shaped his preference for systems-oriented approaches to intercultural training said:

*In some cases somebody’s got fifty years of learning the rules and it is a process to bring somebody around because even after you have an intellectual understanding there is a lot of cognitive dissonance involved in recognizing that the way you’ve behaved in the past may be wrong. One of the interesting things for me running an International Student Exchange from South Africa was sending black and white kids overseas for a year [who were] coming back to apartheid South Africa. It was usually not the black kids that had a problem returning even though they returned to be second class citizens and live in squalor. They were affirmed as people [in their overseas experience]. The kids that tended to have the problem were those who returned to a conservative position of privilege where those they looked up to like teacher, church ministers and so on were now people who they didn't agree with and that was tough for them individually. It’s learning that you [intercultural trainers] are playing in a sandpit and you fiddle with a few grains of sand here and you can’t really understand how that’s going to affect the whole sandpit.*
Another facilitator, who has experienced racism herself and works in private sector training as well as with the certificate program, expressed some of the challenges in facilitating courses with learners who had little experience in organizations:

If [the learners] are going to manage a truly diverse team where [they] might be one [of a couple of] members of the power group...[they're] operating from the position of privilege...they are in a power position [and] it's harder to deal with [inexperienced] people to make them aware of that because then you're getting into...some underlying beliefs...

Definitions of competence seem to have been shaped by personal experience and work contexts. For most participants, the definitions had to do with adjustment, empathy, and recognition of different perspectives. For a number of individuals with experiences with racism or organizational development, issues of power and inequity played a stronger role, although these factors were not raised by every individual who had experienced racism.

Almost unanimously, learners reacted with discomfort to the word “competent”. They felt that competence implied that the learning is complete when, in their experience, it is a lifelong process. One learner responded with the comments:

I'm not sure what you mean by culturally competent. I almost think that's an oxymoron... It's being aware and sensitive enough that you would never cause a situation to become uncomfortable or worsen because of that lack of intercultural awareness. And again, I really don't think that's achievable totally because as individuals we all bring our own baggage... It's a work in progress.

Several learners equated “competence” with “expert” and were reluctant to describe themselves in this fashion. One learner said:

Competent is a big word. From my training, when you say someone is competent it means they're an expert so I would have to question who's really interculturally competent. I would like intercultural competence to be a good understanding of the theories behind intercultural mechanisms, intercultural issues and why certain things happen. And this is where I found the program really benefited me. It helped not to look at individual cultures but it looked at features and common elements [e.g., values] that go across [cultures].
Another learner gave a particularly impassioned response to the notion of competence. She provided a number of examples as to why she struggles with this concept. Embedded in her response is a concern that colleagues who perceive her as “the expert” might abandon their own responsibility for working through intercultural or interracial challenges in the workplace.

I don’t know that you ever get [there] because there’s culture and then there’s personality. Just because you’ve got Asians [in your workforce] that doesn’t mean they’re all the same. You can have gender issues. You can have personality issues. You have historical issues of the family.....Just because you recognize that they’re Asian and that they may have a different communication [style] verbally and non-verbally [doesn’t mean] that you understand them or that you can be a competent person. I think it takes much more. I don’t like those words - expert and competent. It leads you to the end of the road [to say] “I’m competent” ....They [colleagues] say to me “you’re the expert. You know what you’re doing.” It’s sort of the same thing as saying you’re competent. No, I’m not the expert. I have more knowledge in this area perhaps than you do. I have more experience in this area perhaps than you do, but I don’t have all the answers. There’s no cast, no formula. [You can’t say] “meet an Asian, do this”. [You can’t say] “Cree aboriginal speak this word. It gives you insight into their soul, their spirit, their psyche”. It just doesn’t occur. You never know what’s going on in that person’s mind unless you have that basis of trust and you can then work through all the miscommunication.

She went on to explore a specific situation in which she questioned the use of “competence” to describe her interactions with a colleague:

I’ve taken the course. Am I any more competent with [my colleague] than I have been in the past? I don’t think so. I mean it’s always going to be work. We’re always going to be struggling with one another. She’s got a history of residential schools that is always interfering with us...If you don’t understand her experiences and where she comes [from] in these comments sometimes, then you can be very much affronted and want to quit. So it’s more than intercultural...You need to want to work with people. It’s not always pretty is it? People say things that are hurtful because this stuff hurts. That’s what Hofstede says, but this stuff really does hurt and [my colleague] get[s] offended. [I think] “I’m trying so hard -- why am I not [making this situation work]” and then I’m supposed to be competent. Yeah! I don’t know. I think it’s a very big word...I certainly wouldn’t be where I am right here, right now, with the degree of confidence I have if I [hadn’t done] the program...but I’m not naive in thinking that’s the end of it. It’s not ever the end of it. You don’t ever become interculturally competent.
This learner’s comments point up the concern that considering herself “competent” may lead to a sense of failure in intercultural situations which are rooted in historical systemic inequities or structural issues which she cannot control. At the same time, as a consequence of participating in the certificate program she does have a feeling of increased self-confidence in working through intercultural challenges.

One learner questioned whether or not everyone who had completed the program could be considered interculturally competent, saying that competence is more than academic understanding. From her perspective, it involves empathy, openness, and responsiveness to others:

I think that anyone who has gained something from taking the first three courses [foundations, skills, problem-solving] would be considered to be interculturally competent, but then I think there are also people who don’t want to let go of certain ideas. So not everyone who takes those courses is interculturally competent. It’s not just academic. It’s an emotional thing, too... and you have to keep changing with it. There’s always going to be something new that comes up [to] challenge your idea of what is acceptable and what isn’t. Especially if you are from a society where you are white middle class... I think there are people who can go through all the training and may not be interculturally competent. [People] who have very strong ideas of what they feel is right and wrong and not being willing to think of things differently, or look at things differently.

I was struck by the emotional response of the learners to the term “competence”, particularly the reluctance to be seen as an “expert”. I wonder if this comes from the messages in the program that learning never stops, and from facilitators who do not claim status as experts, but as co-learners (albeit ones with experience that allows them to be guides in the learning process). Learners are exposed to the notion, through readings and through the facilitators, that cross-cultural interactions are complex, there are no recipes, and there is always more to learn. Further, it could be that individuals in organizations are reluctant to claim expert status because they might then be charged with the responsibility for everything to do with culture, which they might well be expected to do “off the side of their desk”, without resources or support. There may also be some concern about being expected to make the “right” decisions about matters related to intercultural relations, and to be solely accountable for these decisions.
Trainers and learners alike will benefit from further exploration of intercultural competence as the term *interculturalist*, with its attendant assumptions of competence, enters the lexicon of the intercultural studies field. A discussion about the meaning of competence is relevant for the field as a whole and will be examined in the final chapter. I would like to conclude this chapter with the views of the learners on specific courses.

**Learner Views of the Courses ("You butt up against your own intercultural biases")**

Learners described gaining increased confidence, credibility, empathy, theoretical knowledge, and practical skills from their participation in the program, specific examples of which were included in previous sections. One learner observed:

> *The program gave me a good overview of the field... some contacts with the readings, and good resource people that were very valuable. [you had to] look at your own personal beliefs [and] butt up against your own intercultural biases... there was something, like a real gem [that I took away from] each one of [the courses]... there were tools [and] exercises within the program that made you look at some of your own experience... I also found it enlightening when I could hear about other people's experiences... and see how they analyzed it, or see their perspective on it. That part was really rich.*

All the learners stated that the core courses, Foundations and Communication Skills, were essential and valuable because they provided "a good theory base". One person commented:

> *[I was] surprised at how much there was to [intercultural interactions] that I just thought was common sense, how much research and academic content there was. I wasn't necessarily planning to do the whole certificate. I did one course... and ended up completing the whole [program].*

Three learners had been previously exposed to the key elements of the core courses because they had taken similar courses at other institutions. They believed that these courses are essential and still found them useful, although less so than those for whom this was their introduction to intercultural theory. Learners' responses to theory comprised a strong theme

---

16 As noted in Chapter Four, the Problem-Solving and Negotiation courses have been reconfigured into a new course called Bridging Cultural Differences; Training for International Assignments was changed to Supporting International Assignments. The changes were introduced to address learner concerns, similar to those documented here, which had been expressed to facilitators.
in the interviews, and are explored more fully in Chapter Six, Learning in the Midst of Everyday Practice.

Learners' views on the most useful elective courses depended on their practice contexts. As one person said about the course Internationalizing the Organization, which included developing an internet site "I could see the connections but it wasn't relevant to me at that point". For three people whose work involves communication with international students and First Nations individuals, the Intercultural Problem-Solving course was particularly valuable because it provided the opportunity to gain insight into how others define and experience problems, and it allowed the opportunity for skills practice. One learner said "It really gave me the opportunity to deal with my own issues of not being such a good [communicator]". Another said "I thought it was amazing because by the time [we] got through the whole weekend [I] felt that [I] could do things with a group of people to get them more unified.

One person found the Problem-Solving course "too counsellor-oriented" and thought it would be "great for someone working in school setting...as a counsellor". Two people who work in business contexts felt that the Problem-Solving course was confusing. They felt that the focus needed to be clarified. One said "Is it problem solving in an intercultural context or is it solving an intercultural problem...is it a counselling and advising course to solve intercultural issues, or is it a course about problem solving in an intercultural context?" The other person said that she came into the course with a counselling background, "so it was stuff that I'd learned in counselling...some consideration of prior learning of individuals in the group is important."

The comments about the course point out some of the difficulties in planning a program for learners from different contexts. In its original form, the course was designed for international student service providers who were not trained as counsellors. For learners who do not fit this profile, the course may not be as applicable. This raises the questions as to whether or not one course should be designed to meet the needs of learners from different settings, and if so, how this can be achieved. As one of the facilitators for this course, I have struggled with this,
bringing in problem-solving models and case studies from business contexts to try and reflect learner experiences and needs.

Four learners cited the Managing Intercultural Teams course as the most useful because it met immediate needs. As one person said, “because I’m there now”. On the other hand, one learner found the Teams course the least useful “because it wasn’t something I could apply. I was hoping for the Negotiations course [but it wasn’t available]”. One learner appreciated that the course was demanding and that the instructor was structured and thorough. Another appreciated the instructor’s knowledge, although he found it frustrating to participate in the course because “most of the [other learners] had no clue about hiring, compensation, performance reviews, monitoring the progress of people”. He said that the facilitator was an “agile presenter” and so managed to deal with it, but that the course should be “recast or have a prerequisite so you understand what managing is about”. His comments were echoed by a facilitator for the Teams course who said “Over the years our audiences really changed and I actually find it quite frustrating now because [there are] a lot of people taking this program who have no management experience”.

Two learners said that Training for International Assignments was most useful for them because it is directly related to their work. One learner said that she appreciated that this course required a lot of work and that it included academic literature, which in her mind gives courses more substance. Two others found the course less useful because it was outside their current “direction”. One said “I was shocked when I walked in and found it was a Train the Trainer program. I had no idea that’s what it was, and no intention of doing that training.” A facilitator for the course acknowledges that “there are some fundamental design issues with that particular course... In the early design of the course it was like Train the Trainers plus giving people the content expertise to run [international briefing] programs.” This resulted in some confusion, for example:

There were a couple of people who came into the programs who thought this was a training program for themselves who just happened to be going overseas, so they were coming as participants as opposed to learning these skills [to help others get ready for international assignments].
She noted that the course has been through several name changes and that different approaches are used by different trainers. Among the facilitators there are “some different ideas about who would be taking [the course] and that [the course tries] to appeal to a really broad audience.” Again, for both the Teams and the International Assignments courses the question is raised about the “target” audience and objectives of a course, and whether it can be designed to accommodate varying degrees of experience and knowledge.

Two people mentioned that they found the Negotiations course particularly useful. They said it “was good because I hadn’t learned anything about negotiations before” and “I loved Negotiating Skills because it was new”. One of the learners said:

> The instruction was really good. [The facilitator’s] area of expertise was doing international negotiations. We always talked about big negotiations between countries [and] there were a lot of skills I picked up that I think about now when I’m working. [For example], working on proposals, trying to figure out project design...working with colleagues to try to get them involved in international work and seeing the value of that...I do it all the time. Every day. It made me realize how much of that I do.

Another learner appreciated that the Negotiations course tried to address aboriginal issues by working with the example of the Nisga’a Agreement. She added “now to me it would have been really rich if [they] had had an aboriginal person there...it would have been more meaningful... [because] they might have provided more personal insights ...[into the issues]”.

As with the other courses, there are challenges in trying to meet divergent learner needs and interests. (i.e. domestic and international negotiating issues).

Two learners commented in general about the mix of learners who attend the program. One said:

> I felt like kind of an oddball in the group, kind of on the outside...I was distinct from everybody else...because I’m from the business world and they’re all in education...I’m not disappointed that I took the course, but if I had known beforehand, it might have been different. If I had known that it was focused for people involved at the university and college environments, I probably wouldn’t have taken it.

Another learner who came from a business context had a very different perspective. She said:
At first when we introduced ourselves and I realized that I was one of the few who were from the corporate world I thought maybe I wouldn't get as much out of it but the examples people had in the academic world are very easily taken into the corporate world. When a person, for example, [works with] international students, it's very similar to how I would be approached as a leader if someone is looking for guidance or coaching. So [it was] the same type of spirit. There were a lot of similarities if you just opened your mind to it... I noticed that in most of the workshops when the facilitators [gave] examples to explain the theory or concepts or through their discussions [they] were very good at giving two or three examples and then catering them to the audience. Basically, they were reading their audience...whether it was business, academia, [government], they made sure there were at least two examples... You could connect with one of them.

A number of factors affect the CIS program planning and the learners' experience. The need to appeal to broad audiences to ensure the viability of the program is a key factor in framing planning decisions. Trainer diversity, which adds to the creativity and depth of experience brought to the design and facilitation, also contributes to differences of opinion about the objectives of the courses. Individual learner backgrounds and needs determine their responses to different courses and their experiences of value or usefulness at a given time. The fit between learner schedules and course offerings may also be a determining factor in which electives a learner chooses, and may result in a learner enrolling in an elective that is not directly relevant to their work. Another factor that affects learning is the definition of intercultural training.

**Defining Intercultural Training ("Everybody has a different definition")**

The facilitators I interviewed observed that it is difficult to separate diversity, intercultural, and anti-racist training. Their thoughts were summed up in this facilitator comment:

> I have always had a hard time trying to distinguish what the difference is and when I'm really cynical I feel in many ways we've (society in general or trainers), come up with a lot of different terminology to divide the area. Maybe as a group of professionals that's fine, but I think we've created a lot of misunderstanding when we use all this different terminology to divide the area. [For example] you might be contacted and [asked to do] diversity training and [the client] has their own definition and it leads to a lot of confusion... If somebody phones for intercultural or cross-cultural or international or globalization [training]... I ask them to tell me what [they] need... I let them come up with the definition [and then we work out what...
training is needed]. I feel uncomfortable with all of those terms. Everybody I've met has a different definition....

The Intercultural Studies program was originally developed in response to expressed needs of post-secondary providers of services for international students. However, the program attracts learners and facilitators who are interested in cross-cultural issues from both domestic and international perspectives. This contributes to tensions within the program. For example, one learner expressed her interest in domestic intercultural issues, saying:

_I was hoping to get a better handle on domestic diversity issues [in the program]...For me, what that means is not about me as a Canadian going overseas to work but me as a Canadian and my interactions with people who might be new immigrants for second or third generation Canadians...or working with aboriginal people._

Another learner commented:

_There's a systematic bias in the certificate...which I found a little bit disappointing. [It] is that intercultural always stood for...across nations or ethnicity, whereas there are cultural issues across rich versus poor, hi-tech versus low-tech....gender [that were not addressed]._

The definition of culture in the Foundations course includes the statement:

_The concept of culture is therefore not restricted to the nationality or ethnicity of a group. Any group which shares learned values and behaviours and passes those along from member to member can be considered a culture. Culture can therefore encompass age, generation, sexual orientation, gender, socio-economic status, ability, etc. (Foundations Course Manual, 1997, p. 5)_

Although culture is broadly defined, the emphasis is on national and ethnic culture. This focus makes sense given the origins of the program. As the program planners consider the future of the program and potential learners, they may wish to explore how the definition of culture is addressed in the program.

Learners in the Intercultural Studies program are introduced to the complicated notions of race, ethnicity, and culture in their first course, Foundations of Intercultural Studies. During the initial two-day face-to-face workshop they are asked to consider a number of definitions of race and respond to these questions “How would you define ‘race’? How much of the
notion of race is socially constructed? Where does one race stop and the next one start? What other questions would you like to see here?” (Foundations Course Manual, 1997, p. 5).

The course manual includes definitions of race, ethnicity, and culture which are starting points for discussion. Facilitators encourage learners to explore the language of race relations. Differences of opinion are expected and encouraged. One facilitator described his approach to opening up the discussion:

*It's too easy to get into that mold where you're asking everyone to come to understand these concepts [culture, race, prejudice, power] on your terms and that's a very academic approach to things, [i.e.] “We are going to now define a bunch of [terms] for you and you have to buy in to understand where we're going with all this.” I hope that with the certificate that's not what's been going on... I think we can allow people... to play with those concepts. [For example] is there even such a concept as race? [Does] the fact that we use it mean that we're giving it some legitimacy?*

Following the introduction to the concepts of race, ethnicity, culture, prejudice, and racism in the Foundations course, the Problem-solving course includes an exploration racial/cultural identity and white identity models, and the inherent problems in these models. The program as a whole is grounded in an international perspective that does not consistently integrate issues of race and power into the exploration of intercultural relations.

As is evident in the discussions of challenge, support, identity, and representation in Chapter Seven, depending on the backgrounds and experiences of learners and facilitators in each course, issues of race, prejudice, marginalization, and power emerge to a greater or lesser degree. The facilitator and learner stories illuminate the need for further exploration of these issues by the facilitators in the Intercultural Studies program.

**Summary**

In this chapter, I explored the difference training made to a group of learners in the Intercultural Studies program. I described the changes reported by learners in the way that they think about and respond in intercultural situations, explored their spontaneous efforts to share their learning, and identified the challenges they face in contributing to planned change within their organizational contexts. I discussed trainer and learner perspectives on
intercultural competence and examined learner experiences with specific courses in the program.

Throughout their involvement in the Intercultural Studies program, learners interwove theory and experience as they moved between their online community and their community of practice. Out of the common experience of the program, the learners described a range of changes including having theory to help them name their experiences, challenging their assumptions about “right” behaviours, increasing their empathy in intercultural interactions, increasing their awareness of the effects of their behaviour on others, increasing their sensitivity to issues of power, increasing their confidence in intercultural situations, increasing their understanding of themselves, changing their communication strategies and encouraging others to view intercultural interactions from new perspectives.

A number of issues surfaced in this analysis with implications for the Intercultural Studies Program and other aspects of my practice. Program planning involves a complex set of factors, including the fundamental practical matters of marketing and enrollment of learners to sustain the program. The evolution of course objectives, course content, and course scheduling is affected by the need to attract learners from a broad cross-section of the population. These effects are deserving of attention before a marketing campaign is expanded. (Beginning in early 2001, the courses came under review, with a view to designing them to be applicable to learners in the fields of education, health care, and business).

Part of program planning involves making explicit the conceptual frameworks which underpin the program. The ways in which program planners and facilitators define culture, intercultural training, and intercultural competence affect learners’ understandings about intercultural interactions. In the introduction to the program, the “concept of culture is not restricted to the nationality or ethnicity of a group” (Foundations of Intercultural Studies course manual, 1997, p. 5). The focus of the readings and assignments, however, is around national or ethnic culture. Facilitators are open to learners including other examples such as gender, age, or sexual orientation, although this may not always be perceived by learners. To support the concept of a broad definition of culture it might be appropriate to provide readings on broad
topics. On the other hand, the program planners and facilitators may feel that they do not want to shift the focus from national and ethnic culture to include areas typically addressed in diversity training. There is an opportunity for program facilitators to explore the definition of culture in more depth as they make decisions about course content.

The definition of intercultural training has a profound effect on the program content and the experience of the learners and has implications for the definition of intercultural competence. As we have seen, domestic and international intercultural training are not mutually exclusive. There can be significant overlap in the content and approaches. In general though, if the meaning of intercultural training develops from an anti-racist perspective, the focus will likely be more on race, power, discrimination, systemic barriers, and structural inequities. If the meaning of intercultural training is derived primarily from an international relations perspective competence will be defined from a perspective of pluralism -- recognition and respect for differences, welcoming and valuing of different perspectives, empathy, and adaptation. This in turn may lead to an emphasis on thinking about culture in terms of interpersonal communication without an analysis of organizational systems or societal structures.

For example, as described earlier in this chapter, the difference between Canadians and Swedes was illustrated as a difference in "dedication to work". The behaviour might also be considered from the perspective of difference between a social welfare state and a free-market economy. In the example of a person who did not fit in with the team, the manager found a way to save face for the individual by relocating him. In this process, he tried to honour individual differences and accepted the team structure as the unchanging norm. In the example of the Asian student, the focus was on intervention with the student, not with the system. The latter two actions not only reflect the emphasis in the Intercultural Studies program, but also the difficulty of challenging the systems within which one works. The examples raise the question as to whether other aspects of intercultural interactions could be brought to bear in an examination of intercultural interactions.
This chapter provided an exploration of the changes experienced by the learners. In the next chapter I explore factors that affected engagement of learning between the program and practice contexts, in particular, the link between theory and practice and building an online learning community.
CHAPTER SIX
LEARNING IN THE MIDST OF EVERYDAY PRACTICE

I feel you take the theory, you learn the theory, and then you start applying it and examining how it is applied, how things might have a cultural aspect to them that you hadn't considered before...I had absorbed a lot by [the time I took the program]. I had been working in this setting for seven years by then...But I think it was still really good for me to go back and get that theory. [It gave me] validation that I'm not alone in what I'm perceiving or doing. (Learner)

The learners have made a commitment to spend some time [getting training] because they feel that they would like to have some kind of theoretical base to hang the experience that they have. Many of them have actually learned a tremendous amount through their life experience, their work experience, their international experience about how complicated this process is and they've already got a lot of skills. But [they benefit from] an explanation as to what's going on, and what other people have been talking about and feel, and...what are some other examples of how people have made sense of it, so they can articulate it to themselves and others. (Facilitator).

In this chapter, I explore the factors that influenced how learners engaged learning between the program and practice contexts. The two aspects that contribute to “learning in the midst of everyday practice” (Lagache, 1993) are theory-practice connection and online learning community. The quotes above are examples of the theory-practice connection.

Theory - Practice Connection

Learner perspectives on the reciprocal relationship of theory and practice were at the forefront of what they considered most positive about the program. Care is taken in the program not to privilege theory over practice, nor to “reverse the ‘theory practice’ dualism by privileging ‘practice’...”(Usher et al., 1997, p. 130). Learner experience and knowledge is highly valued and affirmed. At the same time, formal theory is integral to the program. As noted in Chapter Five, the first course, Foundations of Intercultural Studies, begins with a brief introduction to terms (culture, race, stereotypes, racism, prejudice), and includes an overview of models of
cultural variables\textsuperscript{17} and intercultural communication\textsuperscript{18}. Learners are introduced to a “framework for the integration of theory and practice”. Theory is described in terms of models to help describe or explain intercultural interactions and strategy or sets of steps and tools to resolve and prevent problems. Practice includes situations and actions including professional and personal activity. Each subsequent course is designed around this framework, although the framework is not explicitly referred to after the first course. Throughout the program, learners are invited to test their informal theories of intercultural interactions against formal theories. For example, in the Intercultural Negotiation course learners are asked to read an article that explains a five-step negotiation process and consider how it makes sense from their own experience as well as using the process to analyze a specific negotiation situation. Similar exercises are used throughout the program.

It was not surprising, then, that when asked about positive aspects of the training, all the learners commented on the value of learning about theories of intercultural communication and interactions. At the same time, they were clear that practical application was a necessary component of their learning. As one learner said:

\textit{It's one thing to have the theory... It gives you a layer to work from. It sits there in the back of your mind but it doesn't always come to the forefront. When I'm working with people from different cultures [I] don't hark [back] to an example from Bennett... but interestingly, over time [I realized] the learnings that [I] have acquired. Some of the learnings are more soft than academic but not all academic is the way [to go] either. You need a blend of both.}

For this individual, the notion of learning through practice or experience as “soft”, as perhaps less worthy than academic learning is quickly followed by a caution that academic learning alone is not enough. This learner’s views are illustrative of the tension between theory and practice embedded in comments from both learners and facilitators. Usher, Bryant and Johnston (1997) note that:

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
Practitioners are never sure what their attitude should be towards theory. On the one hand, they tend to be suspicious of theory, which they associate with the unworldliness of the academy. However, theory signifies rigour, a rigour which is supposedly achieved either prospectively, through application, or retrospectively, through reflection. Rigour, the relationship to a scientifically validated body of knowledge, appears therefore to warrant practice. Yet, it is precisely this rigour which often makes theory seem remote, irrelevant and unworldly. (p. 122)

Perhaps as a way of reducing potential reluctance by some learners to engage with theory, learners are given ample opportunity to explore their own feelings and experiences as theories are introduced. One facilitator expressed concern that an academic approach to defining terms like culture, race, and prejudice requires people to “buy in to understanding where we’re going with all this”. This facilitator’s own experience with the academy seemed to be one in which theory was presented as truth. In contrast, his approach is to use the textbook definitions of such concepts as race and culture as “excellent material to provoke discussion” and help learners see “how messy this is”. Facilitators in the Intercultural Studies program encourage learners to use theory as a conceptual resource which may help them examine, interpret and make sense of their experience. Learners are asked to examine theory from their practice perspective and discuss what aspects of their experience are accounted for and not accounted for by a particular theory. This approach to theory and practice is implicit rather than explicit and is apparent in the structure of the workshop activities and course assignments. One facilitator noted that “practice is central, but it’s anchored in [theory], in the thinking through of things in significant ways...”. Another facilitator was careful to explain that theories give learners tools but are not the ultimate authority, saying:

[Learning] is cumulative because it doesn’t stop with the course. Nor does it necessarily start with the course. You’ve got people who come in with all this wealth of experience. The course provides them with some tools in terms of models and frameworks that other people are using or have used. Not that those are the ultimate ones but they’re helpful. [Learners see] that there really are identifiable patterns going on, distinctly different responses to ways of problem solving, ways of seeing the world, ways of building relationships, ways of motivation, ways of giving feedback.

Throughout the interviews the linking of theory to practice was a strong theme. One learner explained the relationship this way:
It's one thing to go on the training, but you need to solidify it... You can learn [in the course] but you can chuck it into a little piece of your brain and never use it again... Your mind's not a computer. You can't just hold all of this stuff at once. It comes from both ways [academic and practice]. I mean the program just wasn't enough. The program was a stepping stone. [It] gave you a little bit of grounding [i.e.] this is what's out there [in terms of models, frameworks], this is what's being done [by others]. It gave you that base to work from but it's certainly not enough.

Although the integration of theory and practice was universally welcomed by the learners, there were different individual expectations of which element should play the dominant role in the program. One learner commented on his attraction to models and theory building and explained his preference in terms of personal style and cultural background:

*I'm a very structured person. I work well at the construction. I build mental models... So I need the structure and the books give me some of that structure. Just simple books like Hofstede or Trompenaars already provide some way to organize structure... [I would have liked] more theory, framework and models... I kept bugging [one facilitator] for some more stuff to read... The one book [the facilitator] pointed me to is one of those oversimplified North American recipe books, Getting to Yes. I said “Well, okay, nice book, thank you very much”, but I was looking for something a bit more substantial. My colleagues are enamoured with Covey and the Seven Habits of Successful People which is a book I (sigh) - but okay, I come from another culture.*

Another learner wanted more analysis of the theories that were presented, stating:

*We could have had more articles. We could have had some discussion on [contradictions]. [For example] Ward contradicts Oberg [on cross-cultural adaptation theory] so we could have discussed that. We could have looked at the research [in more detail].*

On the other hand, one person said they would have liked more opportunities for application and skills practice.

*[I would have liked it if] there would be opportunities created around [the program] that would give a person a chance to try out some of these skills in a setting that is more focused on intercultural [relationships that my job is]... It's difficult to get into a situation where I apply this kind of stuff specifically.*
Learner examples of the relevance of theory for practice underscore the point made by Wilson and Hayes (2000) that “there is a constant swirl of knowing and doing, an intertwining of our reflexive selves (Giddens, 1990) and our cognitive actions spread across the activity, tools, and culture of our work (Lave, 1988)” (p. 23). For instance, the learner, whose story of changing her communication style with her employees was noted in the last chapter, acknowledged Hall’s theory of communication styles, including the structure and speed of messages, as the catalyst for her understanding. As described in the previous chapter, one learner found the values orientation approach (Brake et al., 1995)\(^\text{19}\) of culture helped explain the behaviours he observed between the head and branch offices of his department. He said “These [orientations] provided a context for understanding the problems and not getting too excited about it.” Although the human resources department did not approve funding for training, he did share his observations within his own department and felt quite positive about the contribution this information made to his team’s understanding the dynamics of the departmental interactions.

On a more personal note, one learner found the iceberg model\(^\text{20}\) of culture helpful in her understanding of how people respond to her as a visible minority woman. The theory helped her to shift from a place of anger, hurt and withdrawal to “including them in doing things in my world” (such as invitations to community events). She described the value of theory in this way:

That course [Foundations] helped me...think about my values and why I believe the things I do. [I] started to challenge myself and that came out of that course...One of the things that sticks out was the iceberg diagram. This happens to me a lot when people find out that I’m [a member of a particular minority group]. A lot of people are focused on the very outward things - the dress is different, the food is different, you look a little different, but that’s as far as they go - kind of the surface level. But the differences or similarities can go much further than that. It’s how you’re raised, the norms you have. For example, the concept of time in my community is a bit different than in

\(^{19}\) Brake et al. (1995) propose a framework for profiling a culture and exploring key characteristics. They identify ten major variables: Nature, Time, Action, Communication, Space, Power, Individualism, Competitiveness, Structure, and Formality.

\(^{20}\) The tip of the iceberg is “ways of doing” (food, dress, religious rituals). Below the water line (the subconscious) are “ways of thinking” (attitudes, communication styles, perceptions, assumptions) and “ways of being” (beliefs, values, world view) (Foundations Manual, 1997).
the North American context. People in my community are always late. That's normal. But people don't always think of going that far down in the iceberg model so that's where I think some of our frustration and miscommunication [and] judgments come in.

Another learner found theory useful in understanding the behaviour of others:

I remember there was a model that we looked at. When people first come to live in Canada from a different country they [go through] three or four stages... They abandon their own culture and really embrace ours and dislike their own. For me that was great because that was a definition of behaviour that I've seen. I thought, "oh, okay, that's what's happening here". So learning the models was great for me because it gave me a framework - some information rather than just intuitive stuff. I've got this kind of picture that I can - I don't want to say that I've put it in a box but it's more than an intuitive [understanding]. I can see where it's coming from and I can see that it has a trend. So in a sense the formal aspect was helpful for me. It kind of tidied things up a bit.

The notion of theory as "tidying up" or "ordering" came up in a number of conversations. Another learner described it in this way:

When I took the course I was able to make more sense of what I learned because before I had this huge data base. I had this big vat of information but it didn't have any sense of order.

For learners, the power of theory lies in both its explanatory possibilities and its potential to validate experiences. One learner cited the value of "academic logic", saying

[On a personal level] to go through the Intercultural Studies courses and to finally find academic logical reasons for how I felt for years having one foot in one country and one foot in the other. That made an immense difference to me.

Another noted that she did not value her own knowledge until she saw it reflected in the knowledge of experts:

I think the best [facilitators] were people who came back with information... They said "okay, I see what you're saying here and there's someone else [a researcher] who feels this way or have you looked at this person [researcher] who doesn't think that way?". There were times when I felt like the online facilitator was just sort of giving me their opinion. Not that I don't appreciate their opinion but it was always helpful to have something
else in terms of...theories, materials...I knew on a very emotional level that
certain [situations] should be approached a certain way but I didn't have the
academics to back it up so I didn't see [my knowledge] as being [valuable].

From these statements the notion of theory as “validation” might be seen as honouring theory
over practice. Yet I would say that, taken in context, the learners viewed theory as
“interwoven with and inseparable from practice” (Usher et al., 1997, p. 134). Instead of
finding theory “remote, irrelevant and threatening” (Usher et al., 1997, p. 131), the learners in
this program experienced the exploration of theory as illuminating. This was the case whether
or not they agreed with the theory presented, as in the case of the learner who challenged
Oberg’s (1960) view of acculturation or the learner who critiqued the “Getting to Yes”
approach to conflict resolution.

In his discussion of professional preparation for teachers, Jarvis (1999) observed that:

 Learners are being invited to question the practice, to reflect on it, and to solve
questions about it ... students are expected to discover things for themselves,
and discovery learning is the beginning of research. It is in continuing
education, however, that this approach has found a significant place. (p. 18)

He goes on to say that:

 Continuing education has changed the face of universities... [in one course] all
the assignments are about their own practical knowledge as they reflect on it
and research their practice...In some of these programs, we actually specify
that we expect the participants not to apply the theory we give them to their
practice but rather to try it out and see if it works for them...this is not their
“theory in use” (Argyris and Schon, [1974]1992), but rather their evolving
theory and their own body of current knowledge as they continue to develop
their own practice. (pp. 19 & 20)

The Intercultural Studies program is an example of continuing education which has adopted
the “reflection-in-action” (Schon, 1983) approach described by Jarvis (1999). As one
facilitator noted:

 We base assignments on personal and professional experience so we’re
hoping that by having an online [seminar] the link [between theory and
practice] is happening during the learning...I like the model a lot. It makes
sense that people are learning as they’re also at work.
At the same time as Schon's (1983, 1987) concept of "reflection-in-action", that is, thinking about practice while engaged in practice, has been widely adopted, it has been critiqued as "individualistic" and "psychologistic" and missing the "social nature of practical knowledge" (Usher et. al., p. 132). The notion of knowledge as socially constructed is asserted by situated learning theorists led by Lave and Wenger (1991), who suggest that "reflection strategies... are maximized... when co-learners are encouraged to make [and articulate] connections between theory and application" (Schell & Black, 1997, p. 23). Although none of the facilitators I interviewed mentioned learning theorists like Schon and Lave, the principles of situated learning were implicit in the structure of the program. The combination of formal and practical knowledge, individual reflection and group learning was described by one facilitator in this way:

*The program is about taking the knowledge and practice that some of those experts have made public and published, and working through that with senior practitioners in order to build professional skills in terms of understanding the issues, learning techniques, figuring out how to approach things but also looking inward at how your own "stuff" impacts on how you do this. If we're going to spend those two days together then it's about working through some of the [formal] knowledge, building a sense of group and starting to see how the knowledge can be used in different ways, and [it's] really about applying it.*

Situated learning theorists emphasize the concept of "communities of practice" (Lagache, 1993; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger & Snyder, 2000). A community of practice is the context or setting in which individuals engage in activities and learn through interacting with others. Communities of practice are based on the practical knowledge of their members and may be informal or formally established. The concept has been adopted by organizational training departments as a method of encouraging people to share their knowledge at work. The educational organization of Andersen Consulting, for example, has created a community of practice with a formal structure including an advisory committee, an administrative team that organizes communications and activities, a written charter, and regular conferences (Graham et al., 1998). In the Intercultural Studies program, each learner comes from a different work environment and becomes a member of an online learning "community of
practice" for each course in which they enroll. The value of being part of an online learning community was a strong theme among the learners I interviewed.

**Online Learning Community**

*I enjoyed the fact that I always had a lot of time to think about my responses when I was wanting to respond to someone...I liked to have time because you're talking about some issues that can be quite contentious and it's easy to come from an emotional place or to be misunderstood. Part of the contract we made in each of our groups was rather than get upset at somebody if you don't necessarily agree with what they say, ask for clarification first, and see what they really meant. (Learner)*

*From the beginning I was astonished at the level of intimacy. I feared that wouldn't happen. [But it does]. They are afraid of exposing themselves online and then [I see] their delight at the end of that first course with what they've heard and learned about each other. I'm amazed what they reveal, and frankly...I think we do make it safe by setting it up that way in the workshop. (Facilitator)*

In 1995, when the certificate program in Intercultural Studies was established, it was at the forefront of a growing trend toward e-learning. 21 As learner demands grow for accessible, convenient learning, directly applicable to their everyday work, technology mediated learning, or e-learning, has become a matter of “survival for higher education” (Cox, 1999, p. 20). Corporate e-learning is growing at a rapid pace, expected to “explode” in the next few years (Broadbent, 2001). Increasingly, businesses are delivering employee training online and new partnerships between business and post-secondary institutions are growing (Frankola, 2000; Kaeter, 2000). As Kaeter (2000) puts it “online learning is the common catalyst that fuses the convergence of corporate, university and individual interests” (p. 115). Stated another way, “the use of technology often blurs the traditional distinctions among formal, nonformal, and informal education” (Russell, 1999, p. 28). A virtual partnership of six Canadian universities 22 has recently been announced. Students will be able to choose between 1,500 university courses, including 160 online courses that can be combined to complete recognized university

---

21 "E-learning refers to anything delivered, enabled, or mediated by electronic technology for the explicit purpose of learning" (Tanquist, 2000).
22 The Canadian Virtual University includes Athabasca University, BC Open University, Brandon University, Laurentian University, Royal Roads University, and The University of Manitoba.
credentials (The Training Report, 2001). Internationally, nineteen universities from various parts of the world are planning to launch a joint e-university "targeted at the Asian market", to begin offering Masters level courses in business and information technology (Yeung & Yow, 2001).

Responding to the business imperatives of education, in recent years, researchers have begun to collect data on students' online learning experiences, particularly factors which affect completion rates. NYUonline has developed best practices which include "a well-designed course, an experienced and engaging instructor, a high level of technical support, and a detailed pre-course orientation" (Frankola, 2000, p. 6). According to Frankola, the NYU online study found that one of the most critical factors in learner completion is "high interactivity". She (2000) reports that:

The best kind of interactivity not only creates a sense of community for participants; it also stimulates learning through discussing ideas and practicing skills. Blending highly integrated live sessions with an asynchronous course may well be the gold standard when it comes to keeping e-learners motivated and involved. (p. 6)

Completion rates aside, educators argue that from an ethical perspective, program planners must pay attention to psychological and social factors associated with e-learning (Cox, 1999; Palloff & Pratt, 1999). The psychological factors have to do with safety and comfort; the social factors are related to creating a sense of community, participation and collaboration (Cox, 1999). Adult education research emphasizes that learners need safety, support and challenge (concepts more fully explored in Chapter Seven) to learn, grow and develop (Knowles, 1980; Daloz, 1986). Learner safety increases in complexity in an online learning setting as interactions take place without the contextual cues provided by nonverbal communication (e.g., voice tone, eye contact, facial expression, body language). Palloff and Pratt (1999) point out the benefits of virtual communication stating "Textual communication is a great equalizer and can prompt us to be more thoughtful about what we say online" (p.

---

23 Members include New York University, the Universities of Melbourne, Birmingham, Edinburgh, Glasgow and Nottingham, the University of British Columbia, the National University of Singapore and The University of Hong Kong.
Some people who might be shy or more introverted and not feel comfortable speaking out in a face-to-face format may feel more comfortable writing their ideas out and thinking about it more and expressing themselves through words as opposed to expressing themselves verbally... There was one woman who was very quiet and hardly said anything in the workshop and yet when she was online I found her to be very vocal and had some really great points to make. [I had thought] maybe she was really inexperienced because she wasn’t contributing [in the workshop] but when I saw her contribute online it was like a totally different person.

Palloff and Pratt (1999) also note the potential for misunderstandings and misinterpretation when people are isolated from face-to-face contact. One learner expressed her concern with these issues, saying:

We talked about it in the workshops, about remembering you can’t see the person’s face. You lose all that body language stuff and interpretation, when you’re on the email. It’s not even as good as the telephone in that sense because you don’t have intonation... There’s the danger of being misunderstood or misinterpreted, or touching on sensitive areas that you might not if you actually face-to-face with the person because you could pick up on some non-verbal cues that would tell you “Oh better not go there.”... I think you just have to be really careful, really sensitive about that.

Cox (1999) comments on the “double edged sword” of cyberspace (p. 163). She notes the “energy and power” of “words on the screen” and observes that “people [might] infer certain meanings or feel a teasing remark as a painful dart” (p. 164). One learner captured the special challenges of online communication, saying:

The first time I had to put something on the Internet that I had written, I thought I was going to have a nervous breakdown [because]... you don’t know how it would be taken... That was the most challenging [part of the program for me]... What if I say something here that someone is not only going to disagree with but is going to be upset about?... That was the hard thing to feel my way through. And then once I realized that people were very accepting of what you said, then it was a lot easier.

24 When the program started, all of the postings were done by email. At the present time, the program uses Web CT.
The Intercultural Studies program is a “blended program” which begins with a face-to-face workshop followed by an online seminar. The in-person contact with the facilitator and other learners eases the transition to the online seminar, described by one learner in this way:

I believe that it’s important to have that face-to-face interaction... because you can get ... to know the person a bit in the two days and then when you interact with them again online you [have a feeling for] their sense of humour... I think I would have a hard time [doing a whole course online]. The group interaction I think is very important.

Another learner emphasized the value of the face-to-face sessions, saying:

I think to do an entire course via email is not a good idea because [after a face-to-face workshop] when you are online you can put a face to words, it makes you understand in a different context, what [their comments] mean... Psychologically speaking, it seemed like I could identify that this was the guy I had this discussion with [in the workshop] so I understand better where he's coming from...

Typically, the facilitators who lead the workshops act as the moderators for the online component, and also as online facilitators for two or three learners. In most cases, the online facilitators who each respond to three or four students, have not attended the workshop. They will have had the opportunity to read introductions and workshop guidelines posted online. They may also talk, by telephone or email, with the workshop facilitator to get a sense of what happened during the session. One facilitator mentioned her discomfort with the online only approach, saying:

I still struggle with it because I like the face-to-face component. I actually just wrapped up my first [total] online course. It wasn't as bad because I had met most of the participants, but there were two that I hadn't met and I felt a kind of distance... It wasn't only physical although they were physically much further away. Because I couldn't see the face in my mind's eye and because I hadn't met them and I hadn't worked with them before, I found myself not really connecting with them like I connected with the other people. I found that a bit unfortunate. At the same time, I think what's great about it is that we are able to get really varied perspectives [from people living in different parts of the country or the world].

One learner would like to have seen more face-to-face meetings along with the online work. She said:
I would have really liked it if there had been... a time prearranged where people could get together... just to talk about what they felt about what they had learned so far before they went to the second half... [to] talk about how you feel about the assignments, what you've gotten out of [the course], what you think about the different theories. I missed that. I miss that contact.

Another individual had different reasons for describing the computer-based format as the most challenging aspect of the program. He was not worried about the content of his messages or the interaction with others, but was uncomfortable with the technology itself:

_I just hate sitting at a computer terminal... First of all you have this technology thing in front of you... It's very unnatural, and secondly the computer is in a separate room so you separate yourself from [what's going on] in the rest of the house and you sort of hide in there until you're done. I didn't find that very pleasurable._

Several other learners also mentioned frustration with the technology, focusing on the actual systems that were used. One learner, for whom the technology was a new process for learning said:

_From the technical point of view, once we got hooked up and we got running on the first four courses, they were great. You learned how to use the system, for those that are not technically capable, you got your work in and you knew what was going on. But the fifth course technically drove me nuts... They changed the format on how to input the information and it took a long time and I kept losing things. It wasn't user friendly and that was really very, very frustrating._

Another learner, who was knowledgeable about the technology, observed:

_The Web CT tool is bad. It's not well-designed... I spend a lot of time just helping other members go around the weaknesses of the tool... it's not helping [the program] to rely on such a bad piece of software especially [because]... most students don't know much about computers._

These comments were interesting in light of the increasing number of articles on intergenerational differences which are appearing in practitioner training journals. One of the salient differences when comparing the "Generation X" (born between 1960 and 1980) and the "Net Generation" (born after 1980) with the "Baby Boomers" (born between 1943 and 1960) is the degree to which Gen X and Net Gen individuals are "cyberliterate" and
"technosavvy" (Alch, 2000; Ruch, 2000; Salopek, 2000; Zemke, 2001). The fact that baby boomers are the dominant demographic among trainers and learners in the Intercultural Studies program may affect the ease with which they interact with technology.

Despite the growing pains of sorting out the technology, one attractive feature of the technology is the freedom it gives learners to take the course under a variety of personal circumstances. Comments included:

- The flexibility of being able to do your work when you wanted to do it was a big plus for me and I think for anyone who is working. Because if I chose to work at night or on the weekend I could do that.

- I liked the convenience, you can read the responses at your leisure. You can do up the assignments and post them. You don’t have to worry about being somewhere or handing something in.

- The format was so good for somebody who’s working full-time and running a home...it was great and I really liked the way it was set up.

Most of all, though, what stood out for learners and facilitators alike was the positive experience of the learning community that was created online.

Building the Community ("The learning multiplies")

Cox (1999) defines community as “a set of relationships...as the unit that people live, work, and play within” (p. 13). Palloff and Pratt (1999) use the following definition:

Shaffert and Anundsen (1993) define community as a dynamic whole that emerges when a group of people share common practices, are interdependent, make decisions jointly, identify themselves with something larger than the sum of their individual relationships, and make a long-term commitment to well-being (their own, one another’s and the group’s). (p. 25, 26)

Janov (1995) suggests that learning communities are ones in which “members engage one another in making their underlying assumptions explicit and in constantly questioning them” (1995, p. 53). Interdependence, safety, and trust are important elements in creating what Ponterotto and Pedersen (1993) call a “community of inquiry” (p. 90). Palloff and Pratt
(1999) outline five essential components and specific learner and instructor responsibilities for building a learning community online: 1) agreeing to guidelines and procedures, including "netiquette"; 2) establishing agreements for levels of participation (e.g. posting introductions and assignments, participating in dialogue); 3) collaborative learning (learner to learner interactions instead of just learner to facilitator); 4) exploring how online learning is different from other learning; and 5) providing feedback to each other. Instructors and learners contribute to community building in different ways. Instructors are responsible for pedagogy or educational facilitation, facilitating social interaction, managing or administering the course and technical facilitation. Learners are responsible for generating knowledge, collaboration, and process management.

Responsibility for educational facilitation includes constructing the framework for the course (topics, readings, assignments), commenting on student postings, stimulating critical thinking and motivating students to "go deeper" by posing challenging questions. Facilitating social interaction includes ensuring that students introduce themselves, working together to create group guidelines, using simulations and group activities to promote inclusion, and establishing a virtual café where learners can chat informally about personal and course related topics just as they might if they met for coffee. Managing the course includes facilitating the flow of the course, negotiating assignment completion dates, and evaluating outcomes related to both the learning process and learner satisfaction. Palloff and Pratt (1999) point out that evaluation of outcomes "is a more complex process in the online classroom ... It becomes a more qualitative process [that includes] evaluating the quality of posts throughout the course in terms of evidence of critical thinking ability and the learner's ability to generate knowledge and make meaning of the course material" (p. 79).

Technical facilitation includes not only proficiency with the technology, but also an understanding of "the impact that this form of learning has on the learning process itself" (Palloff & Pratt, 1999, p. 81). This is an area that is beginning to receive more attention as program planners recognize that online learning is not simply a matter of interacting with a

---

25 Following Palloff and Pratt, I will use the term instructor instead of facilitator or trainer in summarizing their work.
computer. According to Frankola (2000), UCLA requires all online instructors to participate in a five- to six-week training program before they instruct online. One area the Intercultural Studies program has not addressed in depth is that of exploring with facilitators and learners how online learning is different from other learning. This is being remedied, in part, by current revisions to the courses which include a debriefing component in which learners look not only at what they learned in the course, but also at how technology affected the way they experienced the learning.

Palloff and Pratt (1999) describe the roles of the instructors and learners as interdependent. The role of the learner in knowledge generation includes questioning assumptions (their own, other learners', the instructor's), considering problems and questions from various perspectives, researching resources, and reflecting on their own learning. Collaboration includes sharing resources, working together on projects, and giving each other feedback. Process management includes participation in accordance with the guidelines, encouraging each other, and speaking up if they are uncomfortable or offended with a discussion.

Hanna and associates (2000) in their book of tips for teaching online groups state that:

Learning community centred courses are intentionally created environments that recognize and emphasize the social aspects of learning [and that] through the intentional creation of a safe psychological climate, learners with diverse backgrounds are able to learn from each other intensively and cooperatively.

(p. 3)

Learners and facilitators alike described the benefits of the online community. One facilitator said:

*The great thing about it is everyone is sharing an open forum and... the learning multiplies because of the rich dialogue and the diversity of contributions. We each get to share in each other's learning. It's a really exciting environment.*

This feeling was echoed by a learner who said:

*I...felt like the participants who are in all my courses...were so rich with experiences...I felt like I was getting a lot from their contributions, their assignments... There were lots of resource people in the group, not just the*
facilitators... the participants were very helpful, too. It gave me a good theory base.

One of the facilitators pointed out that connecting with people who were taking the certificate program provided learners with a community of people with a commitment to dealing at deeper levels with intercultural issues, something that they would not find as easily in their workplaces. She said:

There aren’t people like the people you meet in the certificate courses in mass numbers in workplaces. I think that it is really important to know that you build a connection with somebody and they are working through similar kinds of stuff and it’s not absurd for you to think that it’s important to resolve or at least voice the issues. The group’s commitment to go beyond the surface stuff is one of the things that I think made it useful for people but I’m not sure anybody ever articulated it that way. Because the facilitators will model the challenging and the group would do it too. And the way the online stuff was set up they had to talk to each other about things. ... They always had the option to make it fairly easy but not many of them chose to do that in their responses to each other. Sometimes, yeah, but you let people learn where they’re at as well.

The Intercultural Studies program, without the benefit of an extensive research base during its development in 1995, has evolved a process that encompasses most of the essential components outlined by Palloff and Pratt (1999). Each course has a moderator who helps keep the discussion flowing by posting reminders of assignment deadlines and requirements. Online facilitators, who are responsible for giving feedback to two or three learners each, respond to each learner’s assignment with comments and questions, and determine whether or not a learner has met the requirements for each assignment. Course outlines, requirements, and assignments are posted on the website. Learners have a virtual café in which to meet informally. Learners and facilitators are asked to post introductions online before a course begins. In the face-to-face workshop, the online process is reviewed, and guidelines are developed for working both face-to-face and online. Learners are required to read journal articles, conduct mini-research assignments to explore both the literature and practical knowledge, share their thoughts and findings with each other, give each other feedback (in structured assignments which require giving feedback to two other learners on two occasions
during the online seminar). Here is an example of a set of guidelines that was developed for the Intercultural Problem-Solving and Advising course (August 1999):

1) Confidentiality -- We have all shared information that can help us all learn about cross-cultural problem-solving and advising, but that should remain within this discussion group only (unless permission is given from the original source to use stories or examples).

2) Consideration of language -- We have agreed to consider our language and be careful to be non-discriminatory in the use of language and to show respect for diversity. However, we agreed that this is a forum to learn and that we do not want to silence people, especially as this is an opportunity to challenge ourselves and grow. We also agreed to be responsible for our own interpretations, by taking the initiative to check and clarify our perceptions, understanding and the meaning we read into other peoples’ comments.

3) To be aware of each other as readers -- to keep our assignments and responses a reasonable length, format for easy reading, etc.

4) To be punctual -- to hand in the assignments on time (and to respond as facilitators on time) to enable the discussion to flow and develop.

5) “Suffering is optional” -- To be responsible to give feedback. It may be that others think the same, and that adjustments may be made. Let us know.

The guidelines help to create a space where learners can support, encourage and challenge each others’ ideas and perspectives. As one learner said:

_They encouraged us to get into [debate] with people... If you don’t agree with somebody, let’s talk about it and bring it out and debate online and, in some cases, that’s a safer way to do it because you’re not there and [having] to perform on the spot - especially when we’re dealing with stuff that I have emotion around. I needed that time to just go away and take a breath and then come back._

Still, not all learners felt that they could speak up if they disagreed or were uncomfortable with something that was said online. Palloff and Pratt (1999) do not address some of the trickier issues around facilitation. For example, they give examples of how students speak up on difficult topics, but do not address the reality that speaking up when they are uncomfortable may not always feel like a viable option for learners. They point out that
facilitators are charged with helping learners deepen their thinking but do not explore the dilemmas in pushing for critical thinking, especially in relation to sensitive subject areas. These are issues which warrant examination by facilitators in the Intercultural Studies program, as I will discuss in Chapter Seven, Difficult Dialogues.

The online environment gives learners the opportunity to integrate theory and practice. One facilitator felt that the value of having people continue online while they were working was that it gave them the chance to ask questions born out of their real life experiences. “It gives them [the time] to think about what has been learned and also time to put some of the things we suggest into practice, and then they can come back [and examine it].” The extended time frame of the course in which learners could come back to the group with their practice experiences was highlighted by another facilitator:

There’s more of an impact by doing two days plus online because when you take [a typical] two day course [it] can have a lot of impact in the week you [take] the course [but] maybe even two weeks later, it doesn’t have much of an impact on you or you’ve forgotten about it. With the online piece it extends you another two or three months because you’re doing it weekly. That really brings [the issues] to the forefront for you and allows you more time to really think about things. If any change is going to occur, it’s more likely to occur when you’ve got time to think and digest.

The changes were evident to the facilitators as they saw the online discussions taking place. As one facilitator said:

There’s a real richness that takes place in some of the collective...group discussions... Somebody will make a statement and somebody else comes back and says “wow, you know I think you haven’t done this because you’re [experiencing] homophobia here”, or “you’ve missed this”. And the person [says] “well I didn’t see it that way, thanks for pointing it out.” There are expressions of growth, of received value, from the participants, in terms of the way they feel.

Another commented:

You can see people changing their thinking which is very, very exciting... You see someone saying “This is what happened to me...and that’s why those people were behaving the way they were”. Then you see these other voices coming and saying “Yeah, but did you think about this?” And then you see
that person looking at the situation with new eyes and seeing all kinds of things they didn’t see.

One of the ways in which learners helped each other see different perspectives was through storytelling. Cajete (1994) reminds us that:

Story is the way humans put information and experience in context to make it meaningful. Even in modern times we are one and all storied and storying beings. At almost every moment of our lives, from birth to death and even in sleep, we are engaged with stories of every form and variation. (p. 137)

Power of Story (“The good stuff is storytelling”)

The power of storytelling is implicit in all the learners’ comments about the online discussions, and it was mentioned explicitly by six learners and five facilitators as they explored what helped people “connect” with each other. One facilitator expressed her perspective on the power of story as a catalyst for learning.

Personal stories have a kind of power to stay with people...You can make the most stupendous academic presentation of materials and models and information and data and cases...but when it comes down to it, hearing the personal stories of people - those are the things that stick in your mind. And if you’re in a situation, you can say “oh, yeah, it is like that”...or “I remember when so and so told me about that”...Your own values and ways of operating are so fundamental to how you see yourself and how you feel and you don’t want to have somebody push that around too much. But, it’s very different when somebody is not saying “this is the way to do it” or “that’s the way to do it”, but just “this is my story”.

Kouzes and Posner (1999), writing about the role of story in “sense making”, observe that “Well told stories reach inside us and pull us along. They give us the actual experience of being there and learning what is really important about the experience” (p. 104). One learner gave an example of how another learner’s story opened her eyes to the challenges faced by a visible minority woman in a management position:

I remember one young woman who worked [in a business setting] who was a visible minority [and not Christian]...She was a manager. Her perspective on dealing with people who were white Canadians and being in a manager position...was fascinating. It’s things like this...besides the course material, the people that go to these courses that really make it worthwhile. [She talked
about] how she would deal with certain situations [and] what situations [came up] because she was a visible minority.

Another facilitator had similar views on story as essential to communication and learning. He said:

No matter what, we're telling each other stories. Whether it's finger puppets we flash on the wall, or expressions we have, we're inclined to communicate via storytelling so online we are storytelling [a lot]... When it gets down to it, there's a little bit of information exchange, but...as soon as we can, we get down to the good stuff, which is the storytelling. Workshops are much the same. So I guess [I'm acknowledging that] this is our method. We seem to work in metaphor and in order to do that you want people to hear each other's stories...[whether] I'm asking people to establish contact [at the start of a face-to-face workshop], or [explore] racism or some other rough topic [I do it with stories].

All but one of the learners who raised the concept of story described storytelling as creating “intimacy” and “connection”. One of the learners who found stories a valuable way to learn said “You tend to remember stories more. And I think through storytelling you can bring it more to life, the experience, depending on the storyteller”. One learner found the experience of hearing stories online less valuable. He said:

I found that there were too many [stories] for me... When I'm done reading six or seven of those novels [lengthy learner postings], [I] say “What does that have to do with it?” So she's relating a very painful thing that happened to her [years ago]. So what? What have I learned from that? ...Okay, maybe after [all those] years, she finally found the right audience to get it out of her system... How does that relate to the topic at hand? ...Once they go beyond the discovery of how hard it is [to have that intercultural interaction]...and have people say “such a great story”, like that has some value in itself...[maybe] it has some therapeutic aspect there. Catharsis.

One of the facilitators had a similar perspective, saying:

It's [culture] complicated and there aren't any really quick answers. [Sometimes] the responses [to assignments] came back [with the person saying] “When I was in [a certain country], this is how I dealt with it”. No. You can tell me your story again, but it's not going to make you any more effective [in a cross-cultural interaction], if that's where it stops, is with [a] story.
Cajete (1994) suggests “storying (sic) is a natural part of all learning” (p. 139) and that what is needed is an understanding of how to “guide its development in students” (p. 139). He says “The Cree believe that a three-way symbiotic relationship unfolds between storyteller, story, and listener. Ultimately, if people nourish a story properly, it tells them useful things about life” (p. 139). Clearly, stories resonate with most learners and provide powerful images that heighten awareness and shift understanding. As I reflected on the facilitators’ and learners’ comments about “richness”, I realized that much of this richness had to do with the sharing of stories. One learner and one facilitator in this study drew attention to the notion that the value of storytelling might be increased if a discussion of “lessons learned” from the story was part of the process. Allison Cox, a storyteller and health promotion specialist in multicultural settings, who works with healing through story, has written about giving narrative structure to “events that might otherwise seem random and meaningless” (2000, p. 10). At the end of her stories, she asks her audience questions to deepen their self-exploration. She says that:

The storytelling experience invites people to draw upon their memories and allows them to add new information to the old memories, when listeners view their life in the context of the story. Personal change can be enacted by changing the way one views one’s own history and from the meaning taken away from this encounter. (2000, p. 13)

Learners in the Intercultural Studies program are not training to be storytellers. However, because stories are such an integral part of community building, learning about each other, and learning about culture, facilitators might consider making the place of story, the purpose of storytelling, and ways to listen and learn from story an explicit part of the learning. As Allison Cox says, “Story wells up from within us - it is part of what makes us uniquely human. And stories cross over all boundaries, for they speak the language of the heart” (2000, p. 23).

For two learners, the online discussions, often in the form of personal stories, had a life after the courses ended. One learner refers to the online discussion notes she has kept in hard copy to get ideas to take back to her work group. She is sensitive to the confidentiality issues surrounding her use of these materials:

There was so much richness that I wanted to keep those. A situation will arise and I’ll think “you know, I remember somebody talking about that.”
And I’ll go back through my notes until I find the assignment... that [the situation was similar to]. I find it helpful to read through and see what other people have experienced and how they’ve dealt with it. Or how they haven’t dealt with it and how other people online have discussed it and the facilitator has said “well, do you think this could have happened?” It’s like being able to back into the workshop and rework that moment. I use them as reference. I don’t use names - I would never do that without somebody’s permission, but I just use them for my own personal reference.

Another learner felt reassured that he was not alone in the challenges he experienced in intercultural situations on the job. He, too, found comfort and helpful problem-solving information in his stored online discussions:

[I liked] the fact that you could have a record [of the online discussions]. You could take this person’s assignment and keep it... [I found myself] thinking about it six months later. I’ll go back and read it again... I have most of the assignments in a folder and that’s quite a valuable thing for me. All of the problems have occurred before so my problem is [a] problem that someone else has had. They’ve talked about it and investigated it and they also [had a] professional [facilitator] who’s [helped them work it out]. So if I have a problem, I can go to those files, read through all of the answers (maybe ten people have their input into this issue) and I might find a solution [that might work in my environment].

The examples from the learners and facilitators about their experience with an online community illustrate the integration of practical knowledge, theory, and current experience that contribute to what Cox (1999) calls the “web of wisdom”.

Summary

In this chapter, I explored the learners’ experiences of engaging learning between the program and practice contexts. I examined the learners’ perspectives on integrating theory and practical knowledge and the power of theory in validating and illuminating experience. I explored the process of building an online community -- the bridge between the program and practice contexts -- and the challenges of adapting to a new way of learning. I examined the ways in which the Intercultural Studies program has addressed the technical, psychological, and social aspects of developing an online community. Finally, I considered the embedded nature of storytelling in developing learning communities and making sense of experience.
Of note for the Intercultural Studies program are three areas for further contemplation. Certain assumptions have been made about learners' and facilitators' understanding of being reflective learners, of online learning, and of storytelling. The program is undergoing changes that will incorporate an opportunity for learners to debrief their experience as online learners. Program planners may want to add to this an orientation to online learning that addresses facilitator and learner roles and examines the learner-learner interaction, the learner-content interaction, and the learner-facilitator interaction. Facilitators may also want to include an examination of what it means to be a reflective learner and how to listen for learning in stories.

This chapter focused on the factors that support learners in negotiating learning between their virtual classroom and their real world. In Chapter Seven I expand on specific challenges in facilitating conversations about culture and race in both face-to-face and online environments.
CHAPTER SEVEN
DIFFICULT DIALOGUES

You sort of open the gate a little bit and you're not too frightened of being vulnerable because that person [facilitator] isn't going to attack you, they're going to say yes, I understand, too, where you came from. (Learner)

It's a lot of facilitator skill...how do you challenge somebody on something so hard? ...It's a real talent to do it safely...It's a minefield, and you have to be pretty confident to get through it all. (Facilitator)

Acceptance, respect, empathy, caring and trust, hallmarks of "humanistic clinical psychology, ...[have] had a substantial impact on adult education" (Tennant, 1991, p. 198). Psychologists, group facilitators, and educators remind us that consideration for the feelings of learners and creation of a supportive learning climate are fundamental to learner growth²⁶(Corey & Corey, 1982; Knowles, 1980; Rogers, 1961; Wlodkowski, 1985). At the same time as "the learner must feel safe and secure in order to grow" (Merriam, Mott & Lee, 1996), challenge, risk-taking (Blanchard, 1985; Daloz, 1986; Paige & Martin, 1996), even disequalibrium (Mezirow, 1991), are important ingredients in learner development and change.

Daloz (1986) suggests that it is when we feel most safe that we can experience challenge, not as a threat to self, but as an opportunity to grow. Providing the appropriate blend of challenge and support for all learners requires significant skill (Bennett & Bennett, 1996; Cameron-Jones & O'Hara, 1997; Daloz, 1986; Pusch, 1994). This is especially relevant in cross-cultural training, where learners are encouraged to explore their identities and core beliefs (Paige & Martin, 1996). The concept of emotional safety in cross-cultural training is complex. I will begin the exploration by interweaving learner and facilitator stories of safety, support, and challenge. In the second part of the chapter, I will focus on issues of cultural identity and representation, that is, perception by others. Taken together, notions of safety, challenge, support, identity, and representation are elements of what some writers have called the "difficult dialogues" (Goodman, 1995) that are essential to a meaningful exploration of cross-cultural interactions.

²⁶ Daloz (1986) suggests that "growth can be understood as a series of transformations in our ways of making meaning" (p. 137).
Safety, Challenge and Support

Pusch (1994), in her recommendations for sequencing cross-cultural training, describes four phases. The first phase includes orientation, becoming acquainted, expectations and rapport building. The second phase includes providing a common conceptual foundation through various learning methods including lectures and exercises. The third phase “is the heart of the program” (p. 121). This is the phase where “the trainer must decide how the participants can be encouraged to take greater risks, [which] requires an atmosphere of trust and respect for each individual and for the group as a whole” (Pusch, 1994, p. 121). Phase four brings the program to an end, with a summary of significant learning and consideration of application to learners’ “daily lives”.

In practice, the distinction between these phases is less clear and, in my experience, the elements overlap. In the certificate program, an orientation to the course and an introduction to conceptual foundations would typically occur during the two-day workshop. Encouragement of risk taking and application to the learners’ daily lives would form key components of the online seminar following the workshop. However, elements of phase one, introductions and expectations, occur online before the onsite workshop. Elements of phases three and four, challenge and application, occur during the onsite session, although they would largely occur online. There is a key difference between the certificate program and the programs described by Pusch. In the certificate program, instead being considered at the end of a course, application in the learner’s real world is contiguous with the online seminar. In this way, support, challenge, and application become intertwined.

Although I did not ask direct questions about safety, the concept of safety was embedded in the interviews of all study participants. Facilitators told numerous stories that illustrate their deep sense of responsibility for providing a safe learning environment. They also described their responsibility to “clarify, probe, stimulate thought” and to challenge, as well as support, learners toward deeper levels of understanding about themselves and others in cross-cultural interactions. During the interviews they shared their strategies for challenging learners and the accompanying dilemmas. All but one of the learners described the value of experiential
activities that involved a blend of challenge and safety, as well as examples of being challenged in a supportive way.

Five of the learners also gave examples of one or more occasions on which they felt tense or uncomfortable. In particular, learners advised that the establishment of group guidelines played an important role in their safety and comfort. Building on Knowles’ (1980) notion of climate setting, and congruent with the literature on group process (Corey & Corey, 1982; Schutz, 1994), group norms are jointly developed with the facilitators and learners at the beginning of each workshop. Guidelines usually include confidentiality, choosing what to share, respectful listening, recognizing different learning styles and ways of participating, welcoming all questions and non-judgmental listening (a complicated notion that I will explore later in this chapter). One learner found the role-playing activities helpful and appreciated that “Nobody was judging anybody... everybody was there for that purpose, just to learn it.” As discussed in the previous chapter, Paloff and Pratt (1999) place particular emphasis on the importance of establishing clear norms about learner roles and participation in an online learning environment. One learner reflected on the value of establishing guidelines, commenting that she “enjoyed the way they [facilitators] set up the groups in the first two days. They really created a safe environment for us to be able to go away and just be over a computer.” The examples in this chapter are drawn from both the face-to-face and online environments.

This section is divided into four subsections. The section “experiential approaches” illustrates the potential for learning from simulations and role plays. “Culturally responsive training” spotlights the potentially discomforting effects of icebreakers and energizers and challenges trainers to inspect our culturally embedded practices of training design. “Frameworks for understanding differences” highlights the challenges of engaging dominant culture learners in dialogues on diversity. “Critical thinking” explores the dilemmas associated with ‘non-judgmental’ listening and pushing learners to deeper reflection. As facilitators, these examples remind us of the need to examine the tensions between our intentions and the effects on the learners.
Experiential Approaches ("That was a real eye opener")

Almost all of the learners commented on the learning they gained from experiential activities such as role playing, games and exercises. Although the learners did not comment directly on issues of safety, as someone who has facilitated the activities described by the learners, I am aware that participants need to feel a certain level of trust or safety with the facilitator and each other in order to engage in these activities and participate in the debriefing. This is particularly true in the case of the Barnga simulation (Thiagarajan, 1990) described below.

Comments about positive learning experiences included this statement from one learner:

*I found the role playing parts of [the program most useful]...that one [activity] where you stand up close to each other and then you back away. And, wow, that kind of hit me right between the eyes...I think that was a real eye opener [about interpretations of body language and eye contact].*

The learner is referring to an activity in which participants are asked to find a partner and given instructions to stand certain distances apart while having a conversation. The instructions are changed three times so that participants experience standing at their natural distance or comfort zone, too far apart, and too close together. The exercise is debriefed by having participants describe their feelings during the exercise, examine the assumptions attached to use of personal space, explore their personal and cultural expectations of personal space, and examine personal and cultural differences in use of space and its impact on interactions. Another learner referred to her experience with a cross-cultural simulation called Barnga:

*[I liked that] you saw all the different responses to...having different rules for the game. So some people were very defensive and said, well, no, this is the way we play it...all the way through [the program] you get that on different levels - that you just can't assume that if you have a perspective on things, everyone else has the same perspective.*

In this simulation similarities and differences among cultures are represented by different rules for a card game. Participants can communicate only with gestures and pictures. The simulation is debriefed by exploring what happened from the participants' perspectives and how they felt and using the experience to examine various aspects of cross-cultural interactions. Debriefing elements include sharing unwritten rules, cultural maps, cross-cultural
adaptation, and may include who is included or excluded, who accommodates to whom, who holds power, who gets to make decisions, and other issues relevant to the group and the context. Another learner commented on the value of an activity called “the ambassador’s cocktail party”:

[What stood out for me was] one exercise...a cocktail party. We were pretending we were [at] a cocktail party and...it was intriguing that when you did that role playing and you had to have a conversations with other people, how quickly you judge...and how quickly frustrated you got...it was a five or ten minute exercise, but it was eye opening.

In this activity, each learner is given a fictitious identity and set of behaviours to follow. The behaviours represent various cultural differences including physical space, eye contact, and conversational pacing. The activity is debriefed by exploring the participants' experiences and engaging them to think about who accommodates to whom, what it is like to be inaccurately judged for your behaviours, and how quickly we make judgments about others from the perspective of our own cultural worldview.

Simulations serve to heighten learner awareness of their own responses in intercultural situations, and as catalysts to encourage them to confront their own expectations, assumptions, belief, and biases. Handled sensitively, they can be powerful factors in shifting self-awareness. Handled insensitively or inappropriately debriefed, simulations can cause learners to shut down or see the exercise as frivolous. Facilitators need to be aware of cultural and personal differences in how individuals respond to workshop activities.

Culturally Responsive Training (“Come up and tell us a little bit about yourself”)

With respect to ethical principles in cross-cultural training, Paige and Martin (1996) suggest that:

Trainers must strive to create a learning environment that is supportive of learners and use a pedagogy that responds to diverse needs and learning styles. Trainers should also be prepared to assist learners who are not responding well to certain learning approaches and be prepared to offer alternatives. Finally, trainers must know their audiences and the context (social, cultural, historical, political, and economic) within which training is occurring so as to create appropriate environments. (p. 48)
During the interviews, facilitators emphasized the importance of being aware of people with different personal, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds, as well as varying levels of computer and online communication experience. One person commented on her efforts to "appeal to people's individual styles" and skill levels. Another facilitator gave an example of responding to learner needs:

What we found in the first [course] in particular was that there was a huge range of skill levels, from people who had never done this before to people who had done a lot of workshops before...I think some people were intimidated when they saw others who appeared to be so skillful at doing this.

Recognizing the learner discomfort, in future workshops the facilitator gave learners a choice of ways to practice skills, for example, analyzing case studies or demonstrations in front of the group. Another facilitator described the experience of a colleague who asked a group to visualize key events in their lives. It was the anniversary of a significant loss in one of the learners' lives and the exercise caused the person great distress. The facilitator described the support that was provided for the individual and expressed concern about ethical questions, saying:

You're unleashing a lot of stuff and I think there's some ethical questions...do you need to have some sort of back-up counselling or do you have a disclaimer at the beginning, which we've never done, to say 'this may open up personal pain'.

The facilitator raised the concern that sometimes "people are revealing things that you don't think they will feel happy that they revealed." Facilitators need skills to respond 'in the moment' to the individual and the group when such sensitive situations arise. It requires constant vigilance, awareness of nonverbal cues during the workshop and heightened sensitivity to the tone of online communication to understand, check out, and respond to what is going on with learners. Occasionally, as one facilitator observed, people stop responding or participating online. She said:

[Sometimes] you're not sure why. And for a while that used to be quite painful. We would phone them to see...[but] we just got people saying they were too busy and feeling guilty. And so, even if it was something more than that, I'm not sure that they'd have told us.
This was an astute observation in light of the fact that five of the learners described situations with which they experienced some degree of discomfort, none of whom said anything to anybody at the time. One learner described her discomfort with the workshop structure being designed for a "Western culture". She gave the examples of icebreakers such as "jumping up and down" or "come up and tell us a little bit about yourself" had the opposite effect to what was intended. Instead of relaxing her, the activities contributed to her discomfort. The learner said:

*The worst part that I don’t like about all these courses are all the ice breaking ideas and exercises. And I don’t think I’m alone in this. It’s quite cultural because how you get to know people, how you get to relax is quite different amongst cultures and if we don’t talk about this [it’s a problem]. [For example] jumping up and down is not a very good icebreaker, at least for someone of my culture and professional background. It depends on what stage of life they are [at] and what kind of mix there is. You are just making them do some monkeying around and don’t tell me that is going to ease tension. It’s just going to build the tension.*

When I asked the learner how she handled the discomfort she said:

*Even if I’m uncomfortable I’d do it because that’s what’s needed and that’s fine. It’s just that at the back of my mind I said ‘this is not working’, but I understand why it is there. [Other alternatives might be] If they don’t want to participate, let them not participate the way that you are participating because I think participating can be both passive and active. I’m more of an observer, [just because I didn’t jump up] doesn’t mean I’m not participating. You could probably ask me later on as to who is jumping highest, who has more energy and what’s the force. So, as a facilitator, I think you can solicit the participants in a number of ways.*

In this learner’s culture, it would not be appropriate to question a facilitator, especially in a public setting. It would also be uncomfortable to draw attention to herself by being the only person in the group to disagree with or not participate in the exercise. This learner was not alone in feeling discomfort with some of the exercises. Nor was she alone in keeping her feelings to herself. Another person described his reactions to a workshop closing exercise, saying:

*At the end of one of the workshops there were these pictures that were painted and stuck to the wall...and everybody was asked to join the picture that was*
most like them... I don't know. I felt very uneasy. I felt as though I was participating in something that wasn't real. That was make work, make do, make believe, not honest. I'm not saying that for other people it was dishonest but to me it felt fake... anyway I should mention it because I was quite upset about it [but] it wasn't as though it kept me awake at night. No, it was just a momentary thing.

He participated in the activity although it did not have any meaning for him. He described it as a “small thing”. Like the learner who was uncomfortable with the jumping activity, he chose not to share his response with the group. These examples remind us that, as facilitators, we must be constantly aware of how our choices affect learners in unseen ways.

Icebreakers, energizers, and closing activities are ubiquitous strategies for trainers. They are generally designed to increase comfort in a group, decrease tension, and encourage people to interact with each other (Eitington, 1989; Forbess-Green, 1983; Scannel & Newstrom, 1994). There is scant attention paid in the general training literature to the applicability of such activities in diverse groups. In the group I interviewed, the individuals were not likely to tell trainers when they felt uncomfortable. For personal and cultural reasons, they preferred not to create tension by making their feelings known. Each course binder and the website for the Intercultural Studies program contain a note acknowledging that “There is always an implicit bias in intercultural materials and research. We welcome your input as we strive to recognize the assumptions inherent in our own work and the work of others.”

While participants may be willing to point out bias in materials, they may be less likely to share their personal discomfort with activities. It is incumbent on trainers to determine how they might adjust activities in order to create an environment that recognizes individual differences or models cultural respect. At a deeper level, thinking about culturally responsive training raises questions about who participates in planning the training and how diverse perspectives are represented in the planning process (Sork, 2000).

Frameworks for Understanding Difference (“I’m a master of nothing”)

Several learners noted that in both the online seminars and the workshop sessions, they were uncomfortable with occasional comments made about Americans and men. One of the women said:
There are very few men in those groups. There is one dynamic that goes on in those groups that bothers me a little bit... And actually one of these guys [a colleague who had taken one course] mentioned it to me one day, and I agreed with him totally. It’s that because there are very few men in those groups sometimes there would be some male bashing going on. And I don’t feel very comfortable with [comments like] “it’s because they’re guys” or “because they’re men”, or “what do you expect, it’s a man”. And sometimes it’s said in jest, but not always. And if you’re in a workshop about cultural awareness, then I think that’s where they should start, is with... awareness and sensitivity for those around you... At the beginning of each of the workshops, when you’re setting up and [exploring] what are our guidelines, one of them is always respect and sensitivity and awareness. And yet, wham, there goes [the comments about men]. That’s one that really bothers me. I don’t think it’s a huge problem. I just think it’s a heads up.

When I asked how she handled her feelings about this type of exchange, the learner said that she did not do anything. She tends “not to speak up about those things and that’s something I’m working on.” One of the men, when asked what surprised him in the program, observed that there were sometimes negative comments about Americans and males. He gave this example:

I guess there was one thing. It might be a small issue, I haven’t really decided... Everybody had their own value, and every culture is important. Every person is important, but I found there was a little bit of distrust and a little bit of anger or resentment towards, number one, Americans, and number two, males. Especially white males. You’ve probably heard me talk about white males here a bit, but that’s because I am [a white male]. I’ve got a pretty thick skin and I don’t get offended but I was thinking to myself that just isn’t right. How can it be that I’m supposed to accept this, and I’m trying to learn here and figure out where I fit in the world, but at the same time I’m a pin cushion. It just didn’t make a lot of sense.

They were just flippant side comments. Nobody directed anything at me, like “you’re an evil, bad person” or anything. It was just innocuous comments to them, I’m sure. One of those higher level thinkers [an on-line facilitator] said it’s okay to make fun of white guys because they’ve ruled the world for so long that it’s time that we sort of woke them up and this is the only way to do it.... I’m paraphrasing but that was basically it. My response to that, although I didn’t say anything was, “I’ve ruled nothing. I’m master of nothing. I have a few debts and I have a meagre wage and that’s all I rule.” And I didn’t take great offense to it... what I noticed about it was even in the intercultural perspective everybody needs a whipping boy, I guess. Nobody is perfect. And
in some ways I was a little relieved because I saw there was a little chink in the armour there. These people weren't completely there yet.

He experienced a mixed emotional response to the comments. On one hand he was frustrated with what he heard. He saw himself as an ally and he had just been named as the problem. On the other hand, he was reassured that everyone has biases; he felt a sense of relief that it was okay to make mistakes. From his perspective, this does not make someone a bad person. It shows him that individuals may have reached different places on a learning curve toward intercultural understanding, and in a sense, gives him permission to struggle with intercultural issues. While these may be useful lessons about cross-cultural interactions, there may be other lessons to be learned.

It may be useful to think about the framework we are using to understanding difference. The expression of “anti-male” sentiments, as one woman described it, is not congruent with the goals of the training, which she understood to be a recognizing, accepting, and valuing of different backgrounds and perspectives. Nor is it consistent with the spirit of the group guidelines, treating each other respectfully. Facilitators or learners could address the comments from a respecting differences perspective. If, however, the framework for understanding differences included an analysis of dominance and power, then comments about men or Americans could be explored by the group from that perspective. For example, it could be that for a group of mostly female learners, this type of comment is a way of rebalancing power and is not perceived as hurtful to an individual man. In this online community, the mostly female learners are the “in-group” and perhaps making men the “out-group” is a way of dealing with historic inequities. These examples may serve as illustrations of the difference between multicultural and anti-oppression approaches to intercultural training. As trainers, we are prompted to examine whether respect for difference or analysis of power is at the heart of our work.

An examination of group dynamics may be useful in understanding why the learners chose not to express their feelings to the group or the facilitators. A complex interaction of individual personality, cultural norms, and group dynamics is at play in determining how individuals participate in groups. The learners remained quiet for a variety of reasons including personal
preferences to avoid tension, cultural norms of maintaining harmony in the group, and uncertainty as to how to broach the issue. Social psychology researchers in the 1960s and 1970s conducted studies that demonstrated social pressure to conform to the group (Ruch & Zimbardo, 1971). Cross-cultural researchers have demonstrated the effects of cultural norms on the degree to which individuals will make their personal thoughts or feelings known in a group (Richard-Amato & Snow, 1992; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998). Researchers in the area of small group process suggest that where group trust is high, individuals will feel more safe to express disagreement. Beebe and Masterson (1986) state that “In a highly cohesive group, members will know that they will not be rejected for their views and, therefore, are more willing to express them -- even though such expression may provoke disagreement” (p. 99). It is important to note that implicit in their work is an assumption of a monocultural majority culture group. While the research has implications for planning activities, building trust, and fostering dialogue, trainers need to view the group dynamics literature through a cross-cultural lens.

Although the learners downplayed the significance of the events, it is telling that they took the opportunity of the interview to express their concerns. There are lessons here for trainers not to equate silence with agreement, not to accept acquiescence as comfort. Furthermore, we must ask ourselves how we can encourage an examination of the embedded power structures in ways that are sensitive to all group members, including those from the dominant group. We must think about how we can invite dominant and non-dominant group members into a conversation about the “interlocking systems of race, class, gender, and sexual oppression” (Dei, 1994, p. 290). It is likely that feelings of discomfort or defensiveness will be inevitable, and will be part of the learning process.

Levinson (1997) presents an instructive analysis of the dilemma of engaging dominant and non-dominant group members in a dialogue on power. Drawing on Arendt’s work, she uses the concept of “belatedness” to understand the dilemma of non-dominant group members who are weary of making themselves heard on the subject of oppression and dominant group members who do not see themselves as part of the structural problems in society. Belatedness refers to the “baggage” we all carry as a result of our position in a social context. Whether or
not a dominant culture individual is personally responsible for discrimination or oppression
does not change the fact that the individual benefits from their position of dominance,
represents the dominant culture to other individuals, and may act unintentionally in ways that
reinforce their dominant position. Levinson (1997) states:

Belatedness poses a problem when students feel so weighted down by their
social positioning that they see no point in attempting to transform the
meanings and implications that attach to their positioning, and little point in
engaging with those who have different self and social understandings. But
equally problematic is the opposite response which is what happens when
students refuse to see the ways in which they are belated and insist on their
status as newcomers. After all, they protest we were not there, we are not
directly responsible, our whiteness (or maleness, for example) is an accident of
history. What is lost in these invocations of innocence is an understanding of
the ways in which our belatedness not only constitutes who we are, but affects
what we do. In other words, our social positioning has effects on others. As
Melissa Orlie points out, these are not necessarily deliberate wrongdoings.
They are rather “collective trespasses” that “arise as we live our locations”. (p.
437)

For trainers, it is a challenge to facilitate conversations addressing power and structural
inequities. “The goal here is not to elicit white feelings of guilt for white racism [or sexism]
but to encourage insight into the nature of historical oppression and its contemporary
manifestations” (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1998, p. 19). As noted earlier, practitioner journals
have identified a “backlash” to diversity training in which white men were singled out for
blame (Karp & Sutton, 1993; Mobley & Payne, 1992). Positioning discussions from an
adversarial stance does not help learners or facilitators “interrogate knowledge from diverse
perspectives” (Tarule, 1996, p. 299). Although Tarule may not have had white males in mind
in writing this, it seems that if we choose to work with social justice issues, we must try to
hear all voices. Facilitators need to think about how to create an environment where members
of both the historically oppressed and the historic oppressor groups can listen to each other.
This might include an examination of how any of us feel when “we find ourselves approached
not as unique and distinctive beings but as members of a social group” (Levinson, 1997, p.
440). At the same time, we must also be sensitive to the inequalities in risk taking that exist in
the attempt to hear “all voices.”
Critical Thinking ("Get everybody to change?")

All the learners gave examples of positive experiences of being "pushed" to reflect on their comments, as illustrated in the following statements:

- [I appreciated] that they are not afraid to criticize what I have done. They would be able to put his or her criticisms in a clear form and would suggest other ways of looking at it...

- It’s really nice to be hauled up short once in awhile and step outside [my own perspective] and see it from the perspective...of the people it might be affecting.

- I started looking at things from different sides...[and realized I had] been looking at things with blinders.

- You know these people [facilitators] are so busy. They eat, sleep and breathe this all the time and yet they take time to analyze each of our responses...To me that was...one of the greatest benefits I had. Somebody actually took time to critique what I'd done and make recommendations and provide additional information. That, to me, was the greatest value.

Learners described being “forced to think it through”, “challenged”, and “critiqued”. The language may evoke negative images. Indeed Daloz (1999) cautions against “pushing” students, describing it as a “risky way to think about helping people [grow]” (p. 182). The learners, however, used the terms with a positive inflection noting the importance of balancing support and challenge. One learner described it this way:

> It's kind of a balance between understanding what the participant is saying...it's that reading between the lines...And then throwing out those challenges and those questions...it's leading the person rather than telling the person. Or at least knowing when it's appropriate to lead and when it's appropriate to come right out and say "I've had some experience in this and this is what happened and maybe that will help you."

Pusch (1994) describes an integration phase in cross-cultural training, in which she states that:

>[Participants] can be encouraged to take greater risks, moving from the less difficult intellectual and emotional demands of the first two phases to exploring their own attitudes and behaviors in greater depth...For example, in Phase Two the trainer might introduce the idea that a nonjudgmental approach to culturally different people is more constructive than a judgmental one. During
the discussions and exercises in Phase Three, the trainer might point out instances where a judgmental remark hindered mutual understanding, or where a nonjudgmental response has led to additional constructive conversation. (p. 121)

The sequencing of activities and interventions from less to more challenging has been documented by several writers in the cross-cultural training field (Bennett, 1993; Carney & Kahn, 1984; Pusch, 1994). In making decisions that affect a group, there is always the dilemma that “what is support for one person may be challenge to another” (Daloz, 1999, p. 207). Thinking about training phases may be a useful starting point, however, it needs to be tempered with the necessary attention to individual and cultural differences.

At first glance, the differentiation between judgmental and non-judgmental seems to be helpful. In practice, it is tricky to work with the concepts. At least one facilitator chooses not to use the terms. She stated:

> If we can fool ourselves into believing that as human beings we don't judge, I think we're in major trouble. [Instead, let's] recognize that we do, that it's rooted someplace and that we can work with it instead of against it. So I've changed [from using words like] 'culture bound' or 'culture biased' and now I [use the term] 'anchored'. Because we need an anchor...It just means we know a bit about who we are and what grounds us.

In the following discussion, I will use a facilitator experience to explore the tensions inherent in “non-judgmental listening” and challenging learners.

When thinking about the concept of challenge, it is useful to keep in mind to what end facilitators engage in challenging learners. Facilitators expressed their goals of respect for differences, critical thinking, and skills development in the following statements:

- [If] they were engaged in looking at a different perspective of things...[then] I've done what I'm supposed to do [which is to] give them something different [to think about].

- One of my key principles around intercultural issues is that it's not about agreement. It's about “can we recognize the equal validity of alternative perspectives?”
• I would like to see that people get underneath the things that aren't working well and see that there's often an honourable and legitimate reason for it, rather than a nuisance.

• Helping [the learners] get to a place where people can see that, “oh, my God, what did I just say?” because once they recognize it they can work with it but it's the recognizing that sometimes is a real struggle and can be quite sensitive.

• Ultimately the ideal is to give people skills to help them build very positive long term working relationships.

During the online component of each course, learners are presented with assignments designed to integrate theory with practice. Learners submit their assignments for the reflection and response of both the facilitators and the other learners. Assignments are created to encourage a reciprocal transfer of learning between the course and the learners’ professional and personal lives. The following is an example of the type of assignment learners are asked to complete taken from *Intercultural Problem-Solving and Advising* course manual (1997, p. 7).

Think of an example from your own professional or personal experience of an intercultural situation involving problem-solving. You will want to give some thought to your choice of an example, because Assignment 5 will build upon it.

1. Give a very brief description of the problem (only the problem, not any of the problem-solving). Describe the context, the problem and all the players. We are expecting two or three sentences on each of these.

2. From the perspective of each of the players, explain the implication of no action being taken at all to resolve the problem - what would happen if ‘nothing happened’?
3. Choose one of these two readings. Chapter Five of Sue and Sue\textsuperscript{27} about Racial/Cultural Identity Development (keep in mind that this is from an American text) or “Use of validationgram in counselling: Exploring sources of self-validation and impact of personal transition” by Ishu Ishiyama.\textsuperscript{28}

4. Consider your case. Describe what might be going on in the case by applying either Sue and Sue’s model or Ishiyama’s validationgram: Are the characters displaying characteristics described in the models? Is there a possibility that their behaviour is being influenced by something described in the model?

For Assignment 5 - Think back to the case you described in Assignment 1. Taking into account what you have learned about intercultural problem-solving, tell us the steps you wish you had used in the problem-solving process, including sample dialogues that demonstrate the basic communication skills of active listening, empathy and probing.

Each course has a set of competencies which learners must meet in order to complete the course (see Appendix Nine). It is up to the online facilitators to determine if an individual has met the competencies. There is some tension between the concepts of “non-judgmental listening” and competency assessment, which necessitates judgment. Recommendations for “incomplete” are rare as facilitators work with individuals to meet the requirements. One facilitator had this to say about making decisions about competency demonstration:

\textsuperscript{27}Sue and Sue (1990) propose a five-stage Racial/Cultural Identity Model: Conformity (preference for dominant values over one’s own), Dissonance (breakdown of denial of own group), Resistance and Immersion (reaction against dominant group and strong endorsement of own ethnic group), Introspection (discomfort with views of own group about dominant culture), Integrative Awareness (develop more of a belief that there are acceptable and unacceptable aspects in all cultures). Each stage has four components: attitude toward self, attitude toward same minority others, attitude toward different minority others, and attitude toward dominant group. Of note, is that stage five -- attitude toward dominant group -- includes the recognition that White racism is a sickness and White people are also victims in need of help. Sue and Sue also propose a White Identity Model: Conformity (minimal awareness of self as a racial being, ethnocentric attitudes and beliefs), Dissonance (information or circumstances which force them to acknowledge their ‘Whiteness’ and cultural values, Resistance and Immersion (questioning their own racism), Introspection (acceptance of being White, less guilt and shame associated with this), Integrative Awareness (nonracist White identity begins to emerge, more appreciation of cultural diversity and commitment to combat racism).

\textsuperscript{28}Ishiyama’s (1995) validationgram involves mapping sources of validation from four domains in an individual’s life: relationships, activities, things and places. The model is used primarily with international students to help them examine their inner resources and strengths and what validation sources they have lost. Loss of validation sources threatens self-identity. In this model, the experience of self is holistic and multidimensional encompassing a spirituality, education, socio-cultural, familial, physical, gender, and ethnicity.
[The competencies] are really linked to the assignments and the online facilitators have a lot of latitude about whether they feel somebody has demonstrated that competency or not. Is there rigor? Yes. Is it prescriptive? No. Do you rely on the team? Absolutely. [And it’s okay that we wouldn’t always agree] as long as the facilitator felt comfortable with their assessment...This team of facilitators has to be able to go to the wall around this description [of competencies]. We need to feel committed to what we’ve got here and make sure that it makes sense to us. [Then] we can say “No, you haven’t successfully completed this course because you didn’t demonstrate this.”

Another facilitator described the difficulties of determining at what point learning has occurred, and how much to push someone on a particular assignment:

As an online facilitator you try to be politely pushing people. [You might think] “Yes, that part was interesting”, but you feel that the person was only seeing a very, very small part. You can try probing questions and you can get sometimes very frustrated if you get back questions or responses where essentially they have just returned to the same thing and they haven’t moved on...They can’t get up above and look down on it...it may be that they’re just not ready to move. It may be that there are limitations to the facilitator’s ability, too, to find the right button to push to get them to unlock. Often you are helped out by other participants in the group because they will have talked about something themselves that the person has responded to...Or the situation is so small that there really isn’t anything to say about it...When I see that I think that they want to be very safe. They don’t want to expose themselves. ...It may not mean that there is no learning going on. It may mean that they’re holding on to their privacy and they’re not exposing themselves, not taking a dangerous step...Sometimes you hear afterwards from those people that they have learned all this stuff and you don’t think that they have because they’ve been...putting in the safe little things that aren’t going to shake anybody up and not expose anything.

As I write this section, I have become increasingly aware of the delicate balance between my self-described role as a “partner-in-learning” and my role as a provider of critical feedback. Brookfield (1995) notes that “our attempts to increase the amount of love and justice in the world are never simple, never unambiguous” (p. 1). He captures the tensions saying:

Teachers committed to working democratically often declare their “at-oneness” with students...We’re colearners and coteachers, you and I...Like it or not, in the strongly hierarchical culture of higher education, with its power imbalances and its clear demarcation of roles and boundaries, teachers cannot simply wish away their students’ perception of their superior status. (p. 10)
A non-credit, continuing studies certificate program is less formally structured than the world Brookfield describes. Nonetheless, his words illuminate an often hidden corner of educational practice. Experienced trainers struggle with the dilemmas of power and collaboration, judgment, and acceptance. New and experienced facilitators alike could benefit from an examination of their assumptions about their role in being a co-learner, making judgments, determining if competencies have been met, and “pushing” or challenging learners.

In the interviews I conducted, facilitators described responding to learners’ assignments in various ways including empathy, affirmation, sharing personal experiences, literature references, questions, probing, and challenging assumptions. One facilitator explained the importance of empathy, building trust and not backing away from tough issues, saying:

"[In order to be able to] call [the learners] on stuff you build up trust. Not to shatter them, but to be able to say...wait a minute what is that about actually, and work it through with them. Otherwise there’s no point [in doing the training]. And sometimes you can’t do that in the large group. It’s too threatening...on the one hand the participants, the learners need to feel safe enough to talk about what they really think about what they’re doing and then they need to feel safe enough with you for you to be able to say, “do you know, this is what you just said. Is that what you meant to say? What do you think you said and how do think the person that you’re trying to work with...may think about that?”...So for me that was really important and if...I ever felt like I was backing away from a discussion with a participant, I would find a way to make it okay to have it. Sometimes it was in a large group and I didn’t feel it was appropriate. It was going to crush the person and you know that’s not what this stuff is about.

This facilitator tries to challenge learners in a supportive way to confront their biases and assumptions. Another facilitator took a more direct and argumentative approach:

"I’m one of those odd online facilitators...sometimes you need to pull them out of it [a particular point of view]. Sometimes it’s just saying “you’re doing this but it isn’t good enough”. You want to make them feel mad [so they] challenge you. I like the challenge because at least they need to think of something [in order] to challenge you...Sometimes they are building up such a momentum one way that the only thing to do is just derail them. I know [it] could be a disaster but somehow it’s better than them going one way...It might not be a very good evaluation at the end, but to me I’ve [done] my work. Hopefully they will [be] engaged in looking at a different perspective on things."
Both facilitators feel a responsibility to help learners see another perspective. Their approaches are quite different and will elicit different responses from different learners. Facilitators used metaphors like “breaking it down” and “crack a little light” to describe their attempts to reach learners. They used the phrases “glimmer of reflection” and “whole new flood of understanding” to describe individual responses to their interventions. The notion of readiness to change was addressed by learners who used metaphors like “I was a sponge waiting” and “you have to be ripe for the information” to describe their experience. I did not talk with learners who had not completed the program. Of the many possible reasons for non-completion, I wonder how many of learners were not “ripe” for this experience.

Although most facilitators stated that their challenges usually resulted in what Pusch (1994) describes as “additional constructive conversation” (p. 121), one facilitator described an interaction with a learner that was stressful for both of them. The story illustrates the tension between “recognizing the equal validity of perspectives” and judging one perspective as “better” than another. It highlights the ways in which “Adult learning thus becomes both a moral activity and a social intervention accompanied by dilemmas over good versus bad and right versus wrong” (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999, p. 371). The facilitator described the situation this way:

There was one person... I took quite a lengthy response to their assignment because they had actually written really racist, really scary kind of [language]. But you can’t say that so you have to be really diplomatic. So I did the process of asking questions and [gave them] some other examples that I was hoping would help in the process of looking at the questions I was asking... I didn’t hear from them for two weeks and then got this response which was just lambasting me. How dare I be critical. I wasn’t understanding [a particular ethnic group] and this is what [the ethnic group] would like and they have every right to say so and I went Whoa! So I printed it out and I took about five days and I responded to it. I responded to it out loud and I went through everything... Before I sent it [to the person], I sent it to [course moderator]...and [they] said oh this is wonderful. So I sent it to [the person] and it was funny, everybody was waiting for [their] response and it was interesting. [The person’s] reply said “well, I see your point, but I still think they’re all wrong”. And I responded and said (in so many words) “well that’s your choice, but maybe you shouldn’t be working in this field then”. That’s all you can do, you know I mean you can’t get everybody to change right?”
It was clear from the facilitator’s expression and tone that she was troubled by this interaction at the time and as she recounted the story during the interview. The facilitator felt a responsibility, not only to this learner, but to the other learners, to confront (gently at first) apparently racist comments. To let such comments go by would be an unacceptable choice for the facilitator, yet to address them opened up the risk of conflict with the learner. After the interview, as I explored this further, the facilitator commented that “You have to take the risk. If you don’t, you’re condoning it.” She went on to say:

_Sometimes you have to let it go and accept it as part of the process [of a learner’s development] because you only see one part of the process [and] you never really know what drives them -- is it something that happened in their own life ... Somebody [a facilitator] who is part of a privileged group may not have that strong a reaction. We’re all affected by our experiences. How can it be otherwise?”_

Without hearing the learners’ perspective I have only half the story. I might conjecture about what led to the tension in this situation. Daloz (1986) suggests that support without challenge may result in a “[failure to] help students acknowledge the legitimacy of a world different from their own...” (p. 214) and that “too much challenge in the absence of appropriate support, on the other hand, can drive the insecure student into ‘retreat’, forcing a rigid epistemology to replace the promise of a more fluid and complex worldview” (p. 215).

Knowles (1980), too, contemplates a psychological explanation, stating:

_Because adults define themselves largely by their experience, they have a deep investment in its value. And so when they find themselves in situations in which their experience is not being used, or its worth is minimized, it is not just their experience that is being rejected -- they feel rejected as persons. (p. 50)_

Validating the individual while challenging their interpretation of their experience requires particular facilitator skill. The facilitator in this scenario did not want to be seen as validating racism and felt an ethical responsibility to challenge the individual to consider the situation from another perspective. The facilitator felt that it was essential to say “let’s reexamine that experience”, recognizing that the first reaction might be defensiveness and believing that it was important to try to get past that initial response. This example is a powerful reminder of the risks of intercultural training, which include fear of “self-disclosure and failure
...embarrassment, threat to one's cultural identity, cultural marginality and cultural alienation, and self-awareness" (Paige & Martin, 1996, p. 48).

Just as not all learners accept being pushed to reflect on and question their assumptions and actions, not all facilitators accept, without question, the task of challenging learners. In fact, a number of facilitators struggled with the questions of how does a facilitator decide if someone has "got it" (i.e., self-awareness, cross-cultural understanding), how far does the facilitator "push" for more, and even "who am I to make these decisions?" The dilemma was captured by one facilitator who said:

This is a point that I've wrestled with sometimes...we're not here to judge the participants but to support their learning. I know as a facilitator I quite often have some strong discussions where I was saying I don't think the person's got it...Having said that, it's a terribly arrogant perspective on one hand and I think there is real value in recognizing that individuals learn in their own way and some individuals are ready to learn certain things well, we're all only ready to learn what we're ready to learn. So it's easy for me to say you're not duplicating my experience, well, who the hell says my experience is the right one. So that's something that I wrestle with.

Mezirow (2000) poses the question "What right do we have to impose our values...on our students? And yet...the right of communities to safety, social justice...may transcend the right of an individual...How do we hold our own convictions while honoring our students' rights to theirs?" (p. 119). This question is complicated when facilitators are charged with determining whether or not someone has met certain competencies. One facilitator describes her struggle with the subjectivity of the process:

[We] go back and say "Can you go a little deeper, you know, I don't feel you've quite examined [the issues]...It's very subjective, of course it's subjective. If I thought somebody was tossing it [an assignment] off because they didn't give a damn or they didn't respect the process and they just wanted the certificate, then I'd push them again. And it hasn't ever happened that we've pushed and not got anything. And I'm always glad for the other participants if there's pushing seen [that others see us saying] "this hasn't satisfied the criteria." I'm always glad for the ones who've been really knocking themselves out to get those assignments in. I'm glad when some very light-weight one does get challenged, because it's got to be seen. I don't care at all about somebody doing something to my satisfaction, but I care that the
participants see that the course is legitimate and that a certificate has some worth. So it sometimes is a bit of a tough call.

One learner seemed particularly sensitive to the dilemmas surrounding facilitator responses to learners. He stated:

*Sometimes people sent an assignment that in my opinion had little to do with the question were not called to order. Now on the other hand if you call them to order there’s a whole other thing involved. I realize that, I mean you also do not want them to lose face. But at the same time if you dance around it too much you give everybody else the impression that it’s not a serious learning place.*

Intercultural training is a highly sensitive, potentially emotional and occasionally explosive experience. There are no easy answers to the dilemmas surrounding judgment, critique, and competency assessment. There is, however, value in surfacing the contradictions. As Briskin (1994) states “The struggle with contradictions shifts consciousness. The recognition of alternatives highlights the possibility of change if not the possibility of resolution” (p. 460). As trainers, we need to talk about our work as a moral endeavour. We need to develop ethical guidelines for engaging in the “difficult dialogues” that are an inevitable aspect of intercultural training.

“Our values and sense of self are anchored in our frames of reference. They provide us with a sense of stability, coherence, community and identity. Consequently they are often emotionally charged and strongly defended” (Mezirow, 2000, p. 18). Intercultural training is a particularly complex form of training which has the possibility for touching the head and the heart. Indeed, some might argue if the heart is not reached, the training will not be meaningful (Hayles & Russell, 1997). Reaching the heart without breaking the heart is a challenge which can pose great dilemmas for the facilitator, who has an ethical imperative to “understand the risks [to learners] associated with training” (Paige & Martin, 1996) and who “must be aware of their own needs and expectations and how they affect their role in a program” (Pusch, 1994, p. 123). The following discussion of identity and representation reflects the challenges and the pain experienced by learners and facilitators around issues of race.
Identity and Representation

I felt I had to take an extra step to get with the rest of the class. In the first class, and maybe in the second too, I was the only person of colour...Because I'm from [another country] my outlook on a lot of things isn't Canadian...That didn't prevent me from speaking. Once I'd seen it from that [Canadian] angle I always gave my opinion, too, so that they could see that there was a different point of view. (Learner)

The reality is I can never become a black woman who's been marginalized...We are all biased. We cannot not be biased. And...if who I am is going to inhibit the learning in the group then that's not helpful. There's some work that I cannot do simply because of who I am. (Facilitator)

Trainers have long accepted that one of their essential responsibilities is to “create protected learning environments” (Mezirow, 2000, p. 31). As discussed in the previous section, the concept of safe learning environments is more complex than would first appear. With the recognition that the “forces present in the wider society always intrude into the classroom” (Brookfield, 1995, p. 9), facilitators are challenged with building trust in the presence of “our various histories [which] are not left at the door when we enter a classroom to critically reflect” (Razack, 1993, p. 90). Paige (1996) states that “competent intercultural trainers must have a clear sense of their own cultural identity...[which] refers to the sense persons have of their own values, attitudes, beliefs, style of communication, and patterns of behavior” (p. 155).

Cultural identity is not a single, static concept. Every individual has multiple identities, the salience and intensity of which are affected by the context and socio-cultural environment (Collier, 1997, Collier & Thomas, 1988; Nakayama & Martin, 1999). As Martin (1997) notes: “Identities are dynamic and context-related. I am not just a female, a professor, a white German American. I am all of these, and any one identity may be highlighted or suppressed depending on the situation or context” (p. 55). Paige (1996) asserts that facilitators should have a sense of what they represent to others. Proulx (1998) describes “representation” as the image others have of an individual, that is, the characteristics attributed to an individual based on their outward appearance and their apparent belonging to a particular group. Collier (1997) uses the terms “avowal”, “this is who I am”, and “ascription”, “the process by which
others attribute identities to an individual" (p. 40) to explain identity and image. “Identity is very much tied to how others see us, and how we see ourselves in relation to others”. (Nakayma & Martin, 1999, p. 126). I did not set out to explore identity, yet it was a theme that demanded attention.

As adult educators began to pay attention to the increasing diversity of learners in their classrooms “The idea that the classroom should always be a ‘safe’, harmonious place was challenged” (hooks, 1994, p. 30). Jeffrey Ring (2000), in his acutely personal paper reflecting on his experiences as a white male anti-racism trainer, articulates the dilemma, stating:

I am very careful about the potential for casualties among anti-racism training participants, yet I still struggle with what it means to create a “safe” environment, and whether this is always the optimal condition for racial learning. 30 What some students see as a safe context (e.g., “Let’s not get angry, let’s not raise our voices”) others may view as an effort to squelch expression of the angering experiences with racism that they have lived through and want to talk about...(p. 79)

The tensions in managing “difficult dialogues” were evident in my interviews, in which the influence of race, gender, and ethnicity on participation, interaction, and learning were noted by all the facilitators and all but one learner. One learner focused on his profession and preferred learning style to explain his responses to various aspects of the training (for example, a preference for structure and analysis over feeling-oriented activities). Learner observations related to the role of identity in their experience ranged from brief comments to more detailed stories, two of which will be profiled later in this discussion.

Learner and facilitator stories raised a number of questions which echo the issues being raised in current feminist, adult learning, and anti-racism literature. These questions include: How credible is someone from the privileged, dominant culture in addressing issues of oppression and power?, What issues emerge when minority facilitators are working with primarily mainstream participants?, What is it like to be a minority learner in a largely mainstream

---

29 Ring notes that he uses “the terms ‘diversity training’, ‘cultural sensitivity training’, and ‘anti-racism training’... interchangeably, since [he] cannot distinguish among them in any meaningful way” (2000, p. 77).
30 From the context of the quotation, I interpret this to mean learning about each other as racial beings, and exploring the effects of racism.
While these questions are being explored in the scholarly adult education literature, this uneasy terrain has been only superficially addressed in the training and human resources journals in which diversity articles for practitioners are published. Among the dozens of diversity training articles published through the 1980s and 1990s, only a handful mention the effects of identity and representation, and the attendant implications for credibility and communication in the training environment. The comments are typically framed as short tips or techniques as illustrated in the following examples:

- An established diversity awareness training team at PG&E begins diversity awareness training by asking trainees to make assumptions about the team. One of the trainers, who is a person of color, found that trainees tend to assume she lives in Oakland, which is a predominantly black community. They also tend to assume that she has two or three children and is Baptist. In fact, they’re wrong on all counts. (Johnson & O’Mara, 1992, p. 48)

- A lack of white males on the diversity team can send participants the wrong message—that diversity work is still only about women and minorities... Co-facilitate a group with someone who is visibly different from you. This avoids the chances for dealing with resistance and avoiding backlash. (Mobley & Payne, 1992, p. 47 & p. 52)

- Ask the potential trainers to describe their strengths and weaknesses. Often, this will uncover the extent of the diversity work the trainers have conducted on themselves. (Caudron, 1993, p. 62)

A somewhat amplified discussion is presented by Karp and Sutton (1993), who state, in part:

- The current tendency is to avoid having white males do diversity training... The ideal would be to conduct diversity training with a two-person team, one trainer presenting a minority point of view and the other reflecting the participant group... Just as the SWAM [straight white able-bodied male] trainer, while expert in technique and well-intentioned, may not be completely aware of the impact of some of his statements on female trainees, so the African-American female trainer may not be totally empathic with the Hispanic men in the class. This is just fine. Trainers who acknowledge their own shortcomings increase their credibility... (p. 30)

---

31 For example, Training, Personnel Journal and Training and Development.
The aforementioned examples prompt trainers to think about who facilitates the training. Nevertheless, they miss the opportunity to engage trainers in critical reflection about their own practice. There is the risk that trainers will be lulled into thinking that the act of co-facilitating with someone "visibly different" or "acknowledging shortcomings" in experience will be sufficient response to identity dynamics in the classroom. As I reflect on the stories shared with me by learners and facilitators, it becomes clear that while an acknowledgment of differences (a more appropriate descriptor than "shortcomings") in experience may be a starting place, it does not necessarily lead to "engender[ing] trust" (Daloz, 1999), to a "deconstruct[ion] of ways of knowing" (Bing & Reid, 1996), or to "collaborating across the power line" (Romer & Whipple, 1991).

Two stories, in particular, illustrate the complex forces at play in creating a space for what is variously described as "dialogue" (Tarule, 1996), "conversation" (Tisdell, 1995), "critical reflection" (Brookfield, 1995), and "community" (hooks, 1994). The first story is told from two perspectives -- a majority culture trainer and a minority culture learner who were both present during a training session. The second story is told from the point of view of a majority culture learner about an interaction with a minority trainer. The power of these stories is in the language used by the tellers so I will quote at length from the interview transcripts.

Incident One - "Dead Man Walking"

We had one woman who had a terribly, terribly emotional reaction to something that I did...to showing a film that I thought was going to be brilliant and it really backfired. It was the Dead Man Walking piece where a white guy, the condemned murderer, went on and on about blacks in a very nasty way. And then the nun in the movie has this lovely strategy of saying "Well, why do you hate them all?" "I hate them because they're lazy." "What do you think about lazy white people?" "I hate them". "Oh, so it's lazy people you don't like!" So it's this lovely technique of labeling the behaviour, not the group. But I had noticed how vicious his attack on blacks was. I thought it was a great, powerful example. And there was a black woman in the room who was overcome. And it was very painful...I really thought I was doing a great thing. The woman said, "Why would you show that while I'm here?" I said, "It's even worse than that, I thought you would think, "Oh good, somebody sees how awful it is. I thought you'd think I was being an ally when I showed it. I'm embarrassed to tell you that now." I'd just caused her huge pain.
I experienced a myriad of reactions as I listened to this story. My first feeling was one of empathy for the learner who no longer felt that the classroom was a safe place. This was followed closely by empathy for the trainer, who thought she was doing the right thing by not remaining silent “around the scorching issues of racism [which would be] a manifestation of my own white privilege” (Ring, 2000, p. 76). Indeed, one of the critiques of multicultural training is that it “fails to address the central issue of racism within society” (May, 1999, p. 2). In attempting to foreground issues of race and power, the trainer's actions inadvertently triggered suffering for at least one individual and created conflict in the group. The group did not reach closure with the situation or the learner. This interaction took place late in the second day of the training. The learner stayed until the session ended but did not continue online, her absence a palpable loss throughout the seminar. The trainer and the learner did come to an understanding through their private communication, in which the learner said “I know you didn’t mean to offend me, I’m just not okay [around personal experiences with racism]”. However, the learner did not respond to a request for permission to share a letter she had written with the group, and so the group remained separate from the conversation. The trainer described it as “one of the most painful training moments I’ve been through” and as a “powerful learning experience”. After much examination, she decided against showing the video in future sessions. The facilitator recognized the burden placed on the minority learner who endures recurring messages of oppression for the benefit of the learning of dominant group members.

This incident raises valuable questions for facilitators about the implications of the choices we make in addressing issues of race. One course of action was to drop the video from future training. Another course of action might be to do something differently to set up the showing of the video. How does the way we frame intercultural training affect the way we use such a video? Are there differences in a multicultural or an anti-racist approach? Ring (2000), speaking about overcoming his fear of tackling issues of race and power said, “I have come to understand that it is through the active processing of these encounters gone awry that I can evolve better ways of respectfully engaging with those who are different from me” (p. 76). One has to wonder what the experience is like for the minority learners who are part of these “encounters gone awry”. Can such a situation result in mutual learning, or is it a case of a
dominant culture individual learning at the emotional expense of an oppressed individual? The episode called to mind Sherene Razack's observation that, with the burden on the person of colour to share or explain their experiences of racism, "the risks taken in the course of critical reflection are never equally shared" (1993, p. 94). Reflecting on this incident, I see an opportunity for working with minority learners and facilitators to develop understandings of ways we might address race and power.

The incident was also described as a learning experience by one other person in the room. In a surprising moment, one of the learners I interviewed offered her experience of what appeared to be this same situation. The learner, a person of colour born outside Canada, was talking about how the training had brought up "a lot of emotion around [race]". She said that through the training she "found a way to go back and bring closure to some things". When I asked "how was the group helpful in that process?", she responded:

"There was one incident in one of our classes where there was a woman of colour and she reacted to something that the facilitator was talking about - a movie clip that was shown. I sensed at the beginning of the class that she felt an affinity for me and I was the only other person of colour in the class. I always have a bit of a problem with that. I mean it's great to find things in common, but that doesn't make us the same. But that was fine, I experience that all the time and it's okay. And so, we were sitting in this class and it was great. The morning went really well and in the afternoon we started talking about racism and how a lot of it is about ignorance rather than malice and we were shown this clip of this video. After the clip was over she got up and she was so upset and she said I cannot believe that we 're sitting here in a class like this and there is such blatant racism. In my opinion she took it completely the wrong way. The clip used the "N" word. It was not a pleasant clip, but it was an example of what some people have to deal with. She got really upset and I just watched the rest of the room react to that and everybody suddenly became the oppressor. All the white people in the room suddenly felt guilty and they were [saying things like] 'this isn't how we feel'. She kept looking at me to support her, and I said 'you need to explain yourself, I don't understand you'. I was the only person that was allowed that power to say what I really thought and try to change the dynamic in the room from oppressor/oppressed to just plain different. Watching her and the way she reacted helped me to learn a lot about how I might react and how I don't want to react when I'm faced with racism."
The learner went on to describe a situation she encountered at work after this session, in which she decided that she was overreacting to a racially based comment she had overheard. She thought that the person to whom the comment was made should have said something about it. In talking it over with someone else and, on reflection, she reached the conclusion that "it wasn't an okay comment [but] I realized that some people just say things without thinking and it doesn't make them bad." She also noted that "at the time I thought the woman that was talking to him should have said that it wasn't an appropriate comment. Of course, now I know that's not as easy as it sounds and it [may not be] necessary." The learner felt that the classroom experience she witnessed changed the way she handled the work situation.

The trainer and learner perspectives on this event illuminate the dilemma of a dominant culture individual trying to open up discussions of racism, oppression, and power. Leslie Sanders, a white teacher of African American literature, states that:

I think that I do fully understand how problematic my being in the field is for others, how it has meaning that I may not intend, but still must take responsibility for. Yet I do not think that my presence and my work are intrinsically wrong or offensive, although I must always give thought to what I am doing... What is at stake is power: who gets to say what about whom, and who gets to decide what is true...the problem isn’t resolved simply by insisting that, for example, only Black people should teach Black Studies.’ (1994, p. 142)

The learner who observed the situation felt that the trainer “perfectly modelled what she was teaching us” in the way that she responded to the learner who was angry and hurt. We do not know, however, without speaking with the learner who was offended, how she felt, nor how her response might have differed had the trainer been a person of colour. We also do not know how the learner felt when another learner of colour did not join with her. The second learner of colour felt that the first learner’s response of anger was “wrong” because she saw it as blaming white people. This is one perspective. It is not the only perspective. The facilitator wonders if the anger “was about my shattering her hope for safety in this place [the training situation].” As facilitators we need to “think about our responsibilities as educators to create conditions so that we can listen to this anger and not dismiss it” (Butterwick, 2001). I am uncomfortable that the voice of the first learner is not represented here, and I struggled with
whether or not to include this story. In the end, I decided that it was too important a story to leave out although I have excluded some “hearsay” dialogue which I felt was inappropriate to use without the learner’s perspective and permission.

This story highlights the need to be attentive to the risks of essentializing individuals based on their outward appearance. The two people of colour in the training session did not have the same experience, or even if some of their experiences of racism might have been similar, they did not process them in the same way. The dominant culture facilitator has life experiences which were not known to the learners, and which contribute to her understandings of life outside the mainstream. We all have multiple identities which shape our experiences in ways that are not necessarily immediately known to others (Loden & Rosener, 1991). It could be that an individual, who on the surface appears to represent the dominant culture has, in actual fact, experienced prejudice and injustice. For example, one of the learners, a person of colour, expressed her appreciation for a facilitator who described his experiences as a gay man. They were connected by their common experience as “outsiders”. The learner said:

I’ve had to deal with being brown all my life, but there’s never been a doubt in my mind that I’m brown and if I tell you that you can see it — there’s tangible evidence of my difference but for you to have had to go through that explanation in your own head and then have to deal with it, being a victim of prejudice, I just can’t imagine what that would be like. And, he said, “well you know, I can walk down the street and I can just be a white guy. You can’t”...I thought it was nice that he was willing to say, in my opinion, “you’ve got it worse than I have”. A lot of people wouldn’t have that courage.

Both learners and facilitators expressed a belief in the value of cultural and racial diversity among facilitators and participants. One learner, for example, felt that “it would have been really rich if [there had been] an aboriginal person there...It’s important that [the program] have facilitators who were from different ethnic groups and different experiences...they had some but not a lot of it.” It may be tempting to conclude that intercultural trainers must have experience as outsiders to the dominant culture. From the point of view of several learners, other kinds of facilitator experience (e.g., having lived and worked in different countries, or with people from different cultures) also contributed to their diversity. As one learner said “I think it does validate their role as facilitator -- that they do have some experience or
expertise... if they're trying to help you see something from a different angle if they have an experience that can corroborate that, that may help you to understand that and see it from their [perspective].” All but one of the facilitators felt that dominant culture trainers can effectively facilitate diversity training provided, as one facilitator said, “we are sensitive to the whole issue around speaking from our own voice and respecting that boundary where other experiences lie and check[ing] in with [learners].”

A reader might argue that, of course, a group of mostly dominant culture trainers would hold the point of view that outsider status is not a prerequisite for being an intercultural trainer. This has long been a debate in the cross-cultural counselling literature. Recent research indicates that it is not so much the race or experience of oppression that determines whether or not a counsellor can work effectively with a client as it is the racial identity and attitudes both parties bring to the encounter. In Helms’ (1990) words “whether and how race is important in the therapy process depends upon the individual racial attitudes of the participants who are involved…” (p. 165). Helms makes the case that these understandings of dyadic racial interactions might be generalizable to group work, although she acknowledges that little research has been done in this area.

One facilitator felt strongly that people who have not had the experience of being an outsider approach cross-cultural training with enthusiasm but they miss the “bottom line [which] comes down to power”. She stated emphatically:

*I react from being the outsider, from trying to understand, trying to fit in and... I really resent it sometimes when people who have never had that experience trying to training in intercultural [relations] and have no... idea of what it feels like to be the outsider... the bottom line comes down to power... What cross-cultural communication is really all about is not just understanding each other, but... [asking the questions] do we all have power? Do we all have access to power? Do we have the same understanding of power? What are our barriers? What barriers do I have [from my cultural context]? Are they the same barriers you would have? Are they the same barriers a black man would have? If you don’t know that, don’t know that, don’t train... It’s the distinction about preaching about ethnic culture and the rituals... the manifestations of culture to those underlying values, beliefs, issues of culture that will allow us to communicate and create synergy or will keep certain issues systemic [and] will keep racism in place. [For example]*
working with aboriginal people...there are a lot of issues there ... power issues, historical issues [we have to think about what we are doing].

Again, the question of how cross-cultural training is framed comes into the foreground. From this facilitator's perspective, dominant culture individuals would tend not to frame intercultural training from the perspective of power because they have not had the experience of being oppressed.

The question arises as to how a trainer makes his or her own voice and experience transparent. Decisions about identity disclosure came up in all the trainer interviews. Diversity trainers, especially white males, struggle with how their representation or image predetermines the assumptions learners may have about them. They are aware that by virtue of their appearance they may be, to borrow Fuss' (1989) phrase, “deauthorized from speaking on the basis of lack of experience” (p. 116).

Strategies for addressing this concern include sharing personal experiences, framing the issues with theory, co-facilitation, or, in some circumstances, not engaging in the training. One interviewee explained how he addresses the ethical questions of being a white male working in this field:

> Ethically, one of the issues that one wrestles with in this work is...you can only be who you are in the process but [you need] to be aware of your own biases, your own prejudices ...I don't think you need to have that experience [as an outsider]. I do think that different people, because of their life experiences bring an ability to speak to different parts of the whole intercultural mosaic. I tend to come at issues as...how do we embrace the richness of diversity? There are many other people that come to diversity and multicultural issues out of deep pain and out of exclusion...And that tends to inform a very different approach. I don't think the one invalidates the other...I have people [in the training] who are coming from a point of pain and saying “How the hell do you know what you're talking about. You're a white male, part of the privileged. How the heck can you have a perspective which is valid?” Our point around multiculturalism is all about perspectives...

> I quite often use some of the work of Victor Frankl - the Dimensional Ontology (this is a drawing so it's not particularly helpful for the tape recorder). If I have a big drum and it's lying in the middle of a field and I had a group of people standing, looking at [the drum from the] end on, they see
that, and those looking at it [from here] see it from the side and a lot of the
debate gets around who is right which is the wrong question... It's easy with
the drum because I can simply turn the drum or move around the field, but the
reality is I can never become a black woman who's been marginalized, who's
been raped, so that can be an intellectual understanding but how do I live
when I only see the world that way and I'm only capable of seeing it and
understand that that's someone else's reality... So I try to use models like that,
and I think that in the way that I used that model also informs my thinking
about who can work in this field. ... Where I believe that the ability of the
listeners to hear my message is going to be coloured by who I am, I would
tend to raise it, or I might address it by getting a co-facilitator up-front who's
nominally, at least, going to appear to be from the other side.

Another facilitator drew attention to the need to look below surface appearances to
understand someone's identity. Speaking about the facilitator group, one facilitator said:

You know we're very white... and there was a point where we were also very
female, me being one of the exceptions, and educated, and a certain affluence.
But if we stop and look at the complexities of who any individual is and
what they bring to the table and their experiences... You know, on the surface,
you may look homogeneous, but we're not. Most people wouldn't perceive
me as gay - that's a certain layer that wouldn't necessarily be
obvious... Surface perceptions belie the complexities. There are times when
you feel that you're leading a workshop [and wonder] how do you establish
credibility when you're trying to talk to people about issues of oppression or
issues of multiculturalism and they may not be seeing anything more than [a
white male]? We need to talk about it and to recognize that. Sometimes you
have to start by establishing a credibility yourself. You have to just say where
you're coming from - explain some of that complexity to people out loud.

A third facilitator analyzed the dilemma of being a trainer from the majority culture with a
specific example of when she might not accept a request for training:

It's really important for people like me who are from the dominant culture,
and even globally, I'm quite ready to say I'm part of the dominant culture
globally... It's absolutely essential to understand and accept that my set of
experiences will always be framed by... belonging to that predominant group.
That's the reality and it doesn't really bother me. I won't ever have that set of
experiences and there's some training contexts and some intercultural
working context where I will not be an effective person, and that's not about
me as an individual. That's about the experience that the group have had and
what I will mean to them just because of what I represent to them... [in
describing a particular situation] As I thought about it more and more I
thought, this is a group I wouldn't work with. Not because there's nothing to
work on there. Just because I don’t make any sense to them. I don’t speak the right kind of French. I’m a woman. I don’t have experience in their profession...If there was a way to do it and make it work, maybe I would work with somebody within that group. Like if there were somebody who was advocating for change within one of their peers then I would certainly work with that person, but on my own it’s wasting their money because it’s not going to have any effect.

Diana Fuss states:

Nowhere are the related issues of essence, identity, and experience so highly charged and so deeply politicized as they are in the classroom. Personal consciousness, individual oppressions, lived experience -- in short, identity politics -- operate in the classroom both to authorize and to deauthorize speech. “Experience” emerges as the essential truth of the individual subject, and personal “identity” metamorphoses into knowledge. (1989, p 113)

Both the previous and the following stories are testimony to the strength of Fuss’s assertion. This next story is told from the perspective of a white learner about an interaction with an online facilitator who was a black woman. Unlike the first situation, which occurred during face-to-face training, this interaction arose during an online seminar. The online seminars consist of four assignments which require the learners to present and analyze personal or professional experiences in the context of the readings, theory or models under discussion. In this case, the learner had had some difficulty in producing an example. She had, after giving it a lot of thought, recalled a problem to discuss. Here is her story of what transpired after she submitted her assignment online. The context for the story is a meeting, the details of which are confidential, with a First Nations woman.

Incident Two - “It’s not a race thing”

[The problem I wrote about was this]. I went into her office and sat down and said “this is what I want and this is how you should do it” and it was really stupid. And I know why I did it. I had twenty minutes to get this idea across to her and I was in a hurry and she just looked at me and she said, “well, I don’t know if I like you telling me what to do”. And I just went OH! And I just knew. I left her office because I was not welcome there anymore. I went out and there was another woman there. I said “you know I have just really done something terrible, and I have offended [the woman] and I did not mean to. I am not what she’s thinking and I need to repair this”. I didn’t have any problems apologizing and falling over myself because I was really wrong and
it was just stupidity and I was just in a hurry. So we all made up and it was just great.

I told the story because I thought this was a great problem [to share with the group] but I did resolve the problem, and I knew as soon as I did it, what I had done wrong. And I remember the [facilitator] wanting to make this a race thing. And that it was because I was white and the woman was First Nations and I was just being dominant. And you know what? It was not a race thing. It was [that] I had a job to do. I tried to explain this to [the facilitator]and she just felt I was in denial. And I can see that, and I can understand that, and maybe she had a point. But I really did know myself that well...and we had an argument [online] about that. I felt that she was really insulting me. [I didn't tell her]. I just argued with her and it was probably the wrong approach. It just kept getting sort of more and more, that sort of web you weave. I said it had nothing to do with the fact that she was First Nations and I was not using my dominant position. I was using my dominant personality...It's the wrong approach but it's not a race thing.

It is ironic that in the midst of an intercultural training course focusing on communication and problem-solving that the learner and facilitator could not hear each other. In the words of Maher and Tetreault (1996), this example:

Dramatizes the tensions inherent in the interplay of personal voice, the languages of theory and experience, and the construction of personal identities. It shows what can happen when personal narratives of race and gender oppression and invisibility emerge into public discourse and intersect in the classroom. (p. 165)

The learner would have appreciated some acknowledgment of her efforts in coming up with a situation to discuss, of her honesty in sharing a situation which she had initially not handled well, and of her willingness to correct her behaviour. She would have liked the facilitator to take the time to understand her background and experiences. She expressed concern that:

The facilitator [told me] that this was a racist problem and that I was using my white domination over the First Nations culture which had been repressed for centuries and she did get into a lot of detail about what white people had done to the Indian culture of this country. And I'm quite aware of it. I don't think she knows where my sympathies lie and she made a lot of assumptions which pushed a lot of buttons.

Without the voice of the facilitator, we can only speculate about her intentions. The facilitator may have wanted to point out the "imbalance of power between White women and women of
color that is often overlooked" (Bing & Reid, 1996, p. 188). She may have wanted the learner to acknowledge the location of privilege from which she speaks. She may have hoped to convey the message that “racism is oppressive not because white folks have prejudicial feelings about blacks...but because it is a system that promotes domination and subjugation” (hooks, 1992, 15). The facilitator may have wanted to push the learner to explore beneath the surface for hidden bias.

Perhaps the facilitator was familiar with calls from the literature for trainers to “diagnose” the stage of intercultural sensitivity or identity development of the learner (Bennett & Bennett, 1996; Helms, 1990). Hence, the facilitator’s description of the learner as being in “denial”. The literature does not address the risks of such a diagnosis, nor does it question the right of the trainer to make such a judgment, although both Bennett and Bennett (1996) and Helms (1990) do mention that the trainer needs to “attend to the quality of his or her own racial identity development as well” (Helms, 1990, p. 204).

Perhaps something in the scenario triggered strong personal feelings which shaped the facilitator’s response. As I re-read this learner’s story, the following words from bell hooks (1992) surfaced in my mind:

And it struck me that for black people, the pain of learning that we cannot control our images, how we see ourselves (if our vision is not decolonized) or how we are seen is so intense that it rends us. It rips and tears at the seams of our efforts to construct self and identity. Often it leaves us ravaged by repressed rage, feeling weary, dispirited and sometimes just plain old brokenhearted. (p. 4)

---

32 Bennett (1993) proposed a six-stage process by which individuals move through denial (there are no differences), defense (acknowledgment and denigration of differences), minimization (trivializing differences), acceptance (respect for differences), adaptation (empathy, change behaviour), and integration (becoming a multicultural person). The model has been critiqued for describing the development of dominant culture members and not being appropriate for describing the development process for minorities. As well, the proposed training interventions at each stage do not recognize differences in power, perhaps because the model was originally proposed within the context of developing cultural competence for international sojourners (Helms, 1990). Helms (1990) uses Cross’s (1971) model of Black identity development in her research with counsellors. This model consists of five stages - pre-encounter (identifies with White culture), encounter (rejects White culture, seeks identification with Black culture), immersion-emmersion (denigration of White culture), internalization (transcends racism), internalization-commitment (fights cultural oppression) (Helms, 1990, p. 13).
Natasha Levinson (1997) discusses the “weariness” of people of colour trying to teach whites about racism. She also observes “I dare say many of us [whites] are equally weary and frustrated at having to ‘prove’ our race consciousness in each new encounter” (p. 448). She goes on to say:

However, rather than signaling a struggle gone awry, these frustrations actually indicate that an ethical encounter is under way... The fact that we still take on these encounters indicates that on some level we are aware that these are necessary repetitions. This is why the weariness that attends these encounters is not a mark of failure... The problem... is... located in the governing expectation that conversations and confrontations like this will get us to a predetermined somewhere. (p. 448)

Whatever the facilitator’s thoughts, feelings, or intentions may have been, the effect on the learner was to invoke a need to defend herself against being labelled “racist”. The public forum in which the online communication took place contributed to the learner’s reaction to the feedback.

As facilitators, we may stumble in this rocky territory. Navigating issues of race, power, privilege and identity often leave both trainers and learners shaken, fragile and struggling to sort out what was going on. At the same time as the learner was hurt by the exchange, she tried to express understanding for the experience of minority facilitators, saying:

*It would take a fairly sophisticated person to go through all the experiences of repression and discrimination, then get up and try to put someone else in those shoes and to do it without being angry... There was another woman [of colour] who taught the course that I enjoyed the very best. I felt that I could talk to her about anything. But she wasn’t using herself personally. She was using some of her experience but not her own personal being and I think there’s a difference.*

Jon Mills, in his essay exploring the benefits and risks of provocative teaching, notes that “we must be aware of our own personal biases, preferences and agendas that may be foisted upon students and seen as an attack” (1998, p. 2). When I invited the learner to offer advice for facilitators she said:

*I guess my advice would be that you do have to take your own experience because that’s how you’re teaching somebody else about how it felt for you to*
be in that position. My advice would be - which is pretty difficult - to look at how you’re going to do that. Are you going to do that because of your own anger. And so the facilitator has to be really honest about what they’re doing there and why. ...I think if there’s lots of personal anger behind that approach that dominates how you are doing it - and that body language, way of presentation does filter across to people - if you’re taking people out of their comfort zone and asking them to experience something that is not pleasant ...If you’re going to do that and they see your anger, you’re not going to get any response from them because they’re going to be frightened and guilty and defensive. So they’re just going to be quiet and listen to you and then they’ll go away and they’ll talk about you and say “well I really didn’t like what she was telling me I did to her”.

I am intensely conscious that this story does not reflect the facilitator’s voice. In its absence I feel bound to acknowledge “new literature [which] reports the particular difficulties minority women teachers face in establishing their authority and expertise. Homa Hoodfar, a minority teacher, talks about student response to her attempts to employ a progressive pedagogy. She suggests that ‘What works for a white female teacher may not work for a black female teacher’” (Briskin, 1990, p. 449). Related to this comment, one of the majority culture facilitators I interviewed observed:

One of the things that I noticed consistently was there were very different reactions to facilitators who were not part of the predominant culture and at first I thought maybe it’s just that people have a different communication or training style, and for me that was just one of the tenets of the program. There had to be difference... it has to be okay that there is another way to do it. If it’s not, the program isn’t worth anything... Those learners are people who self-select into an intercultural studies program, so they’re not aggressive around this stuff but there’s still feedback that’s negative. It’s subtle, but it’s there. [For example], I didn’t get enough culture specific information from [the facilitator] or I need more information about how to deal with this particular difference... I’m guessing that part of it is that people who have been through those oppressed experience, or clearly they’re part of a different group that’s not dominant, need to expect some kind of subtle backlash. It’s just part of the pent-up frustration [of dominant culture individuals] of having to always be the one’s who are adapting.

This same facilitator offered her insights about the minimization of the contribution of both learners and trainers of colour:
The other way it would manifest itself was in “she’s so charming”, “she says the most wonderful things.” Yes, absolutely, but it sort of minimizes what the person is contributing because it takes it to a kind of surface prettiness or pleasantness instead of “this is pretty heavy stuff and we’ve got to find some ways to deal with it.” It think it’s a way for people to be able to distance themselves at some levels so [it’s not] backlash in a negative sense, but [they feel] “it’s too much, I can’t deal with...I can’t take myself down that path of really empathizing and so instead I would like to minimize it.”

Social context, individual histories and “personal vulnerabilities” (Mills, 1998) shape the location from which learners and trainers speak. We are challenged to name the tensions between us and search for ways to make meaning together. “Rather than ask who can speak, then, we should ask how we can speak together, and more important, how we can move the dialogue forward” (Shohat, cited in McLaren, 1998, p. 74).

Can We Have this Conversation?

These stories wake us up to the need to think through how we can create the conditions for “free full participation in discourse” (Mezirow, 2000, p. 12). Stephen Brookfield (1995) shares the instructions he uses to create “ground rules for critical conversation”. He outlines specific steps which include: asking individuals to reflect on and take turns sharing the features of the best and worst group conversations they have been involved in, getting majority (more than two thirds) agreement on the rules they would like to see for the group, and drafting a charter. He notes the importance of revisiting the rules as the group progresses. Brookfield suggests that the group groundrules will contribute to ensuring equal participation and stopping the replication of existing societal power relationships. This process has some similarities to the one used in the training context of this study. I would suggest, from the stories I heard, that while the technique may be a useful starting point it needs to be married to a more critical approach.

The feminist and anti-racism literature calls for the explicit examination of identity, power, and safety in educational settings. Fuss (1989) suggests bringing the topic of essentialism “to the fore”. Ring (2000) recommends discussing the definition of “safety” at the beginning of a training session. Razack (1993) highlights the need for “ethical guidelines for listening” (p. 92). Razack does not list a set of rules. Rather, embedded in her discussion of “storytelling for
social change”, is the counsel to pay attention to “how our multiple identities are constructed and played out at any one time in any one context” (p. 100), critically examine who is asked to tell their stories and to what end, and ask ourselves what affects our understanding of events.

In the midst of writing this section, as I reviewed the stories with one of the facilitators, I asked if this intricate, tangled web of human relationships ever caused her to question continuing with intercultural training. As I struggled with the question myself, she replied, “No, it makes me want to do it more. This is what it’s all about.” It is about passion. It is about asking ourselves hard questions. It is about working with others to figure out answers and access hidden questions. It is about belief in the possibility of making a difference for and with individuals. It is about contributing to social transformation. She said “It’s been very helpful for me to have this window on the whole thing... because some of the [issues] scare me, you know. I wonder, have we figured this [cross-cultural training] out, do we know what we’re doing, is it useful?”

Levinson (1997) suggests that teachers “draw attention to the disjunctures experienced by the students” by asking such questions as “What kinds of responsibilities do we bear by virtue of our social positioning? And what kinds of freedoms do we have in relation to this social positioning?” (p. 450). Is this easy work? No. “Does this mean we [teachers] should not dare talk about any of this until we ‘have it all together’? Absolutely not. This can be an easy excuse for perpetuating the status quo. What I think it does mean is an honest, ongoing commitment to our own self-education” (Goodman, 1995, p. 4). This education includes an exploration of our own identities, motivations, needs and skills in doing intercultural work. It also requires us to talk about the choices we make in program planning before we enter formal learning spaces, whether “bricks and mortar” or virtual.

**Summary**

In this chapter I explored the nature of the difficult dialogues that are part of intercultural training. I examined the concepts of safety, challenge and support and addressed culturally responsive training, frameworks for understanding difference, and encouraging critical thinking. I discussed the factors that contributed to a sense of learner unease or discomfort. I
explored the challenges faced by facilitators who sometimes struggle with validating individuals while challenging their interpretations of their experience. In the latter part of the chapter I captured the struggles of learners and the dilemmas of trainers in addressing issues of personal identity, representation, race, and power.

A number of issues came to the fore with implications for both the Intercultural Studies program and other aspects of my practice. The way in which trainers design activities for cross-cultural training affects learners’ participation and experience in the program. Chosen carefully, and debriefed sensitively and thoroughly, experiential activities such as simulations can be powerful catalysts for learning. Facilitators need to be aware that culturally embedded practices such as icebreakers and activities designed to elicit emotional reactions can exclude some learners. Learner feedback prompts us to ask if these activities might be adjusted in some way to be more inclusive and if other activities developed from different cultural perspectives could become an integral part of the training.

A second area for deeper exploration is that of the framework used to understand difference. A multicultural framework with an emphasis on the recognition and respect of differences lends itself to different kinds of discussions than an anti-oppression framework. Confronting issues of race, power and interlocking systems of oppression becomes more difficult in a multicultural framework because the groundwork has not been laid, nor have guidelines been constructed, for engaging in those discussions. The question arises as to the possibility of providing training within an integrated framework. Facilitators might find it helpful to examine their guiding framework for making planning decisions about intercultural training.

A third aspect of difficult dialogues has to do with how facilitators negotiate between their roles as a co-learner, as a person who has the power to determine whether or not someone meets required competencies, as a guardian of a safe environment for learners, and as a person who “pushes” for deeper thinking or “calls” learners on their behaviour. Facilitators may find it helpful to examine their role, explore their responsibilities, and consider the expectations of the learners, the institution which offers the program and their own beliefs about facilitation.
A fourth opportunity for analysis by facilitators is the question of who should do intercultural training. What are the strengths and difficulties of having dominant or minority culture trainers? How are facilitators selected and developed? A related issue that arises out of this chapter is the question of how to create the space for difficult dialogues. Facilitators might explore what guiding principles would be helpful to dominant culture and minority culture trainers in tackling issues of race and power.

This chapter explored factors which affect conversations about culture, race, and intercultural interactions. In the final chapter I discuss the implications of the study results for the Intercultural Studies program, possibilities for further research, and implications for my practice.
CHAPTER EIGHT
LOOKING BACK – MOVING FORWARD

The purpose of this study was to explore learners’ and facilitators’ perceptions of the effects of intercultural training in order to inform program planning. The central question for the study was: How does participation in the Intercultural Studies program affect the way learners approach intercultural interactions? Related questions included: What are the learners’ experiences of the program? How does training contribute to changes in the way individuals think about and respond to people from cultural backgrounds different from their own? What aspects of the training environment contribute to change? How do learners engage or negotiate learning between the educational and practice contexts? What are the implications for program planning and facilitator training? With these questions as my starting place, I looked to the literature on program planning and transfer of learning to help inform my interview questions and data analysis.

As the analysis of the interviews proceeded, a new question emerged. How does the conceptualization of intercultural training affect learning? This question is a useful addition to “How does training contribute to changes in the way individuals think about and respond to people from cultural backgrounds different from their own?” because it appears that the degree to which training emphasizes respecting differences or analyzing power shapes how learners think about and approach intercultural interactions. As I explored the stories of the study participants I realized that their experience in the training program and the nature of their learning about intercultural interactions was shaped by the embedded conceptual framework of international training.

The impact of intercultural training frameworks on program design and learning has been largely unexplored in the intercultural field. There has been some acknowledgment in the field of the dichotomy between international and domestic training, and there is debate about the character of multicultural and anti-racism training, particularly within the public school system. However, the impact of these conceptual underpinnings on the planning of programs for adult learners and on the learner experience has not been a focus of inquiry. As my analysis
unfolded, I expanded my review of the literature to include the history, contemporary status and relationships of international, multicultural and anti-racism training as well as feminist and anti-racist readings from the adult education literature.

**Summary of Findings**

I began this paper with a quotation about the interaction of heart, hand and head in diversity work. In my interviews I tried to explore these elements. The findings of the study are organized into three major areas: perceived changes in feelings, behaviours and thoughts as a result of participating in training, factors that contributed to the learners’ engagement of learning between the practice and training contexts, and challenges in facilitating difficult dialogues. The conceptual tools that helped frame the findings came from the program planning and transfer of learning literature. The facilitation of change is a key element of adult education programs (Caffarella, 1994; Galbraith, 1990; Houle, 1996). Multiple lenses for thinking about learner change include application – the contextual use and creation of knowledge (Ottoson, 1997), diffusion – the sharing of ideas with others in the workplace, and situated learning – the integration of work and learning in communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). All of these lenses reflect the concept of engaging learning, a term that reflects the dynamic, interactive, reciprocal nature of learning between the practice and training contexts.

**Perceived Changes**

Perceived changes are discussed under two main themes: individual change and sharing learning. All the learners in the program described ways in which the program contributed positively to their feelings, thinking processes and behaviours in intercultural interactions. Their learning varied with a number of factors including their work context, goals, previous knowledge, training and experience, and training content and approach. Learners gave specific examples of changes -- head, heart, and hand -- that included: greater understanding of their own and others’ experiences in cross-cultural interactions, increased challenging of their own assumptions and attributions, increased empathy, increased awareness of the effects of their behaviour on others, increased confidence in intercultural situations, increased understanding
of themselves, increased adaptation of communication strategies, and increased sensitivity to issues of power.

All the learners described informal efforts to encourage others to view intercultural interactions from new perspectives and a number of learners explained their formal attempts to introduce changes to their organization. For the most part, the learners found that they received positive responses from their colleagues within their immediate sphere of influence. They found greater barriers to attempts at organizational change, particularly with regard to organizational diversity training. A number of learners commented that the changes they experienced were more of an evolution over time than an immediate shift, and that they were not fully aware of the changes until they had to articulate them in some way, such as during the interview for this study or designing training programs for their organization. Perhaps this signals the need for the inclusion of an integrative component, such as a paper or portfolio, as part of the program.

Factors Affecting the Engagement of Learning

The factors that contributed to the learners’ change and engagement of learning between the training and practice contexts included the integration of theory and practice and online learning community, particularly storytelling. Of note were the introduction to intercultural communication theories, assignments designed to link theory and practice, the opportunity to explore diverse perspectives with facilitators and other learners online after the on-site training. Learners provided specific examples of how theory helped them validate, illuminate, and question their experiences. Examination of theory helped them name their experiences, understand the dynamics in their work team, have empathy for the cross-cultural adaptation experiences of others, make sense of their intercultural experiences, and try new communication strategies. Particularly significant in the learners’ experiences was being “pushed” by facilitators to deepen or extend thinking.

Online learning has the obvious benefits of offering flexibility and convenience; it poses some challenges with regard to learning how to interact with technology. The most important feature of continuing online after returning to work was the opportunity to move between a
community of learners, and facilitators, and the work environment. The "web of wisdom" created in the sharing of stories, reflection on past and current experiences, exploring difficult situations, receiving feedback, and being challenged to consider other perspectives was invaluable for learners. Assumptions have been made that learners and facilitators have common understandings of being reflective learners, of online learning and of storytelling. Exploring and clarifying these assumptions would benefit both learners and facilitators.

Challenges in Facilitating Difficult Dialogues

Two themes emerged which related to difficult dialogues in intercultural training. The first of these, safety, challenge and support is organized into four subthemes, experiential approaches, culturally responsive training, frameworks for understanding differences and critical thinking. The second theme, identity and representation, is discussed in the context of two vignettes about race, identity and power. Experiential learning approaches including cross-cultural simulations such as Barnga enhanced awareness of the impact of values and assumptions on attributions and behaviour. Several learner examples exhort us to be mindful of cultural bias in interactive exercises and the importance of inviting diverse perspectives into the design of training. Other learner examples highlight the need to be aware of the frameworks used to understand difference. A respecting differences framework lends itself to different analyses than a challenging structures or analyzing power framework.

The final element explored under "safety, challenge and support" was that of critical thinking. All the learners gave examples of being "pushed", "challenged", and "critiqued" and emphasized the value of these to their learning. Facilitators raised the question of the difficulties involved in making judgments about the submissions of learners, particularly if the learner is making comments that indicate bias, faulty assumptions, or racism. Facilitators struggle with how much to "push" and when to "let it go". They are cognizant of the different degrees of readiness in individuals to receive such feedback and concerned about the emotional impact of challenging a learner. At the same time they feel an obligation to other learners to address such comments. Two questions that deserve attention by facilitators are how they handle the delicate balance of challenge, safety and support and how they negotiate
between their role as co-learners and as individuals who determine if required competencies have been met.

The second key theme related to difficult dialogues is that of identity, how we see ourselves, and representation, what our image represents to others. The tensions in holding conversations about race were evident in the interviews. Two stories highlighted the issues: one example of a dominant culture learner receiving feedback from a minority culture trainer, and another example of a minority culture learner responding to a dominant culture trainer’s efforts to address racism. In both cases, strong emotions were sparked on all sides. Trainers struggle with how to address racism without causing more pain for minority learners. The examples raised questions of how to address power and identity in intercultural training.

**Implications for the Intercultural Studies Program**

The Intercultural Studies program is unique in its approach to intercultural training. It is at the forefront of innovation in its long-term format, its blended onsite workshop and online community of inquiry, and its integration of theory and practice – all factors that support learners in engaging learning between the training and practice contexts. Testament to its special place in the world of intercultural training is that it attracts dedicated trainers who constantly search for ways to make the program better, and who do so for little more than an honorarium for their time. The program operates under constant pressure for cost-recovery, although, as one facilitator wondered aloud “How real is that expectation? The program has been operating at a deficit since it began.”

The program is still relatively new. It was developed under the leadership of a small group of people who had a vision of creating a program that integrated theory and practice and that was accessible across borders; people who had in-depth knowledge of the intercultural field and the talent for pulling a team of people together to get a new program off the ground. The program is experiencing growing pains as its current leaders face institutional demands to capture new markets. Program leaders encounter particular challenges in trying to meet the needs of diverse learners from business and education environments, and learners who come with differing interests in domestic and international intercultural issues. The catalyst for the
development of this program was the needs of international student service providers. As a broader cross-section of learners has been invited to participate in the program, the limitations of the respecting differences approach of international sojourns have become apparent.

The Intercultural Studies program is not alone in its task of balancing different interests. In an interesting parallel, I see the EdD program in which I am enrolled experiencing similar challenges as its leaders grapple with the diverse expectations of the learners, the institution, and the professors. In another post-secondary program in which I teach, I am involved in comparable discussions about facilitator, learner, and institutional interests. In all cases there is a tension between the obligation to generate revenue and the commitment to meeting learner needs. There are also differences between what the original program leaders envisioned and the perspectives of new leaders. Programs are shaped by multiple interests, not all of which are compatible (Cervero & Wilson, 1996). One of the challenges for program leaders is to determine if, and how, they will negotiate among those interests. This raises questions about who is in a position to negotiate and whose interests receive attention, given the existence of asymmetrical power relations between program leaders and facilitators and between facilitators and learners (Cervero & Wilson, 1994).

The current efforts of the CIS on redesigning courses is a natural response to the pressure to increase enrolment. The response has focused on technical rather than socio-political aspects of program design. It is difficult to justify the time and costs involved in addressing some of the questions that arise with respect to the larger context of planning. Such questions might include “Whose needs are being served in the program?”, “What expectations have we set up for learners?”, “Whose interests are being represented in planning the program?”, “How representative of the diverse community is our facilitator group?”, “Who is being left out and what are the consequences to the program of not including them?” (Cervero & Wilson, 1996; Sork, 2000). Yet, it seems that an exploration of the conceptual framework of the program and its intentions in concert with some of the questions in the social-political and ethical domains of planning would be a critical step in the growth of the program.
Understanding the resource constraints, and setting them aside in the interests of sharing what I have learned, I propose the following ideas in the spirit of contributing to the conversation about the evolution of the program.

**Strategies to Support Learners**

I learned from my interviews that building a sense of community online, promoting critical reflection and encouraging storytelling were powerful contributors to learning. As facilitators we could support learner experiences by sharing our reflections, and inviting their perspectives, of what it means to work together using these processes.\(^{33}\)

**Online Learning**

The process of online learning is still relatively new. In the CIS program there are currently introductory notes on how to navigate the system, including how to post to different conversational threads. To help learners adapt to learning in a virtual community it may be helpful to explore definitions of community, roles, and responsibilities of facilitators and learners. For instance, Palloff and Pratt (1999) suggest that learners are responsible for questioning assumptions, considering issues from various perspectives, researching resources, reflecting on their own learning, giving each other feedback, encouraging each other, and speaking up if they are uncomfortable or offended. Facilitators are responsible for commenting on postings, stimulating critical thinking, motivating students to go deeper in their analyses, working with the group to create guidelines and promoting inclusion.

These roles may not be very different from regular classrooms, but they happen in asynchronous time, without the benefit of access to nonverbal communication, and with the possibility that postings could be forwarded by pressing a key. These differences add complexity to already existing issues of emotional safety when working in groups, particularly with sensitive subject areas. As we have seen in this study, individuals may find it difficult to speak up when they are uncomfortable. Perhaps reviewing roles and responsibilities would

\(^{33}\) Learners are required to attend the Foundations course before taking any other courses, so it would be the likely place for these discussions. Because time is a factor, it would also be possible to introduce the discussion online before the course starts.
create the opportunity to begin to address the challenges of confronting difficult situations online. Many individuals welcome challenging questions from facilitators; others may react to being pushed to extend their thinking. Clarifying the role of the facilitator in stimulating critical thinking would be helpful to learners new to the process.

**Critical Reflection**

One of the underlying suppositions of the program is that the learners will engage in critical reflection, particularly during the online portion of the training. Brookfield (2000) makes the point that “reflection is not, by definition, critical” (p. 126) and asserts that “critical reflection would focus on making explicit and analyzing that which was previously implicit and uncritically accepted” (p. 131). Compatible with this definition, learners in the Intercultural Studies program are encouraged to examine their responses in intercultural situations and to question what they are doing, why they are doing it, what are their assumptions and what are the implications of their choices. They are encouraged to make connections between theory and practice. From the comments of facilitators and learners it is apparent that the notion of critical reflection, and the facilitator’s role in developing this form of thinking, including sharing their own thinking processes and asking learners to reflect more deeply, are interpreted differently by different learners. The process becomes complicated when the challenging questions are related to race, identity, and power, and this is an area that could be explicitly acknowledged.

As an introduction to the program, it might be useful to explore the concept of critical reflection. One strategy that could be useful is that of “hunting assumptions” (Brookfield, 1995). I mentioned earlier that several of my colleagues worked through a hunting assumptions exercise with me during the writing of this paper. I was struggling with whether or not to include the Dead Man Walking Story in Chapter Seven because I did not have access to the learner who expressed her hurt. My colleagues listened to the story of my dilemma and helped me reflect on certain assumptions: to do justice to the material I need to hear everybody’s story; I was trying to control and contain something that cannot be controlled and contained because readers will always make their own interpretations; I wanted to protect the learner of colour from judgments by the reader. This raised the following questions: why
do I think she will need my protection, and is that a “paternalistic” attitude or an ethic of care? My response is informed by workshop experiences in which I have seen individuals exposed and vulnerable after expressing strong emotion in a workshop setting. The story echoes the tension between acknowledging and supporting a learner without operating in a paternalistic fashion. Through this conversation I came to understand that: stories are about other people; I cannot know everyone’s story; stories will always be peopled with other stories; I cannot manage others’ interpretations of story, although I can establish a context in which the stories can be heard; and that this is not the final story, it is a contribution to the discussion.

The Use of Story

The process for engaging in this critical conversation with my colleagues was a three-role structure with a storyteller, listeners who ask questions about the events described by the storyteller, and a moderator who ensures that previously agreed ground rules are maintained (Brookfield, 1995). The ground rules for the listeners include listening carefully, instead of giving advice, focusing on clarifying the issue, reporting and checking assumptions, and asking questions about possibilities, such as, “Is it possible that this is what is going on?” At the end of the conversation the storyteller and listeners share what they have learned. This much-simplified version of Brookfield’s process holds some possibilities for creating guidelines for online storytelling, with adaptations to account for it not taking place in real time, so that the sharing of stories is grounded in critical reflection.

I am mindful that there is cultural bias in this type of structured approach to story, and there may be other ways of “nourishing story” (Cajete, 1994) that facilitators and learners would want to explore. For instance, following Razack’s (1993) counsel to be aware of the interplay of identity and context and how these affect our understanding of events, we might take a different approach. We might explore why the person chose to tell that particular story, what was important about it for them, what risks were taken in sharing the story, how we are responding to the story from our own place in the world, and what we learned from the story. For example, my location as a female of mixed background and as a counsellor influenced my

---

34 I have used the terms listeners and moderator in place of Brookfield’s detectives and umpire.
questions about whether or not, and how, to include the Dead Man Walking story. As a counsellor I was particularly concerned with privacy and about making someone else's pain public. As a person who has experienced racism, I responded from a place of concern about using as a learning tool the experience of a person who has been visibly hurt. My colleagues were two white women and one white male -- a therapist, a documentary filmmaker and a sociologist. At the time, early on in my analysis of the interviews, we focused our discussion on my location. On reflection it would have been useful to explore how their locations influenced their responses to my story.

There are other ways of listening to stories. One of the facilitators, in her work with a First Nations group, was instructed in a friendly way by a First Nations woman:

> Before our elders speak, I want you to know it's going to be [very] important for you to listen. Do not look at your watches. When we say listen, we mean listen with your hearts and all your attention, and don't worry about how long it takes, and don't try to put them in a box, or a half-hour framework, just listen.

So, storytelling might involve structured listening for assumptions, exploration of the meaning of the location of the storyteller and the listeners, or listening from the heart as a bridge to analyzing interpersonal and social relations. These and other perspectives on the use of story, and how they can be introduced into an online environment, could be explored by facilitators and learners to create a shared understanding of the place for story in intercultural learning.

**Conversations for Facilitators**

Intercultural training is complicated, uncertain terrain. Individuals follow many paths on the road to becoming intercultural trainers. This diversity is part of the strength of the facilitation team. On the other hand, without consistent grounding in program planning, adult education, ethics, intercultural, and anti-racism theories, facilitators are differently equipped to lead onsite and online training. With the program at a crossroads it is an opportune time for facilitators to have conversations about their beliefs about intercultural training – how it is defined, what is important, what are the goals, how they perceive their role, and how to balance safety, challenge and support in working with learners.
These conversations may involve the negotiation of interests. Trainers will vary in their attachment to respecting differences, diversity, and anti-oppression frameworks. They will bring with them personal experiences that inform their interests and it will take time and skill to bring these interests out in a constructive way. They will bring differing personal and cultural expectations of the degree to which disagreement should be openly expressed. At the table, there will be facilitators with unequal power by virtue of such characteristics as their length of association with the program, their position with the institution, the nature of their experience in intercultural training, and their social location. Negotiation, though, does not explain everything that may occur in these conversations. As with many programs, the facilitators are colleagues and friends, and an ethic of care and commitment to relationship is a significant component of any interaction. The concept of negotiation as proposed by Cervero and Wilson (1994), does not address the emotional aspects of exploring differences. Trainers may be concerned that an airing of differences could jeopardize relationships. Questions we need to consider include “Does the ethic of care in the group prevent us from talking about differences?” and “How can we move forward in a caring way as we enter unknown territory?”

Conceptual Framework

The ways in which trainers define culture, intercultural competence, and intercultural training affect the program content and the experience of learners. A broad definition of culture including multiple identities carries a different expectation of the focus of readings, assignments, and dynamics that will be explored in the training than a definition that focuses on ethnicity and national culture. A training design that has its roots in international training leads to different definitions of intercultural competence than one that has its origins in anti-racism training or in a diversity perspective. The latter may incorporate elements of anti-racism training and include all aspects of identity and representation. Defining intercultural competence in terms of respecting differences leads to a different analysis of intercultural interactions than defining it in terms of power relationships.

For example, if a visible minority woman is silent in a group, a facilitator working from a framework of respecting cultural differences may explain this silence as a difference in cultural
communication patterns or rules (e.g., “wait time” before speaking or rules around interrupting). A facilitator working from the perspective of power might explain this silence as the result of having been silenced historically by dominant culture members. I have presented the explanations as dichotomous for the purposes of highlighting the different approaches. Of course, these are not the only explanations. We have to guard against assuming we know a person’s experience based on the colour of their skin. There may be many other factors including personality, family upbringing, previous experiences, the immediate situation and so on that may account for the woman’s silence. Any of these may overlap with either or both communication style differences or oppression. We need to find out what is happening with this learner. When we ask “what is going on here?”, we need to consider multiple contributors of experience, identity, context, situation, and history and try to understand the learner’s experience from her perspective. The risk in becoming attached to a particular framework is that we see everything through one lens. Part of our challenge as facilitators is to remain alert to the range of possibilities that influence interactions.

Relationships with First Nations are threaded throughout this study. Several learners, whose primary intercultural interactions are with First Nations communities, gave examples of how they integrated their learning in working with First Nations individuals and communities. A number of facilitators discussed their experiences of working with First Nations issues or choosing not to work with First Nations issues because they felt it would be, in a sense, reproducing a colonial past. In the world of organizational diversity training, First Nations individuals facilitate training on First Nations issues; out of sensitivity to the history of First Nations issues in Canada, dominant culture trainers do not typically facilitate this type of training.

As noted earlier, First Nations are virtually ignored in the intercultural literature which tends not to address racism and oppression, although there is attention to First Nations issues in the multicultural education literature, and an increase in programs designed for teachers in the public school system. Although only one learner stated explicitly that she would like to have seen more attention to First Nations, First Nations examples were referred to with a frequency that demands our attention. I have not found any literature pertaining specifically to the
inclusion of First Nations issues in intercultural training. However, in his paper on the experience of First Nations students in higher education, Michael Marker (2000) writes:

When I examine the research on multicultural education and minority student achievement I am frequently confounded by the attempts to talk about Native peoples in the same breath as other ethnic minorities. There is a careless distortion in the portrayal of multicultural North America as including aboriginal people without placing them in a separate and distinct category. Not only do they represent an "outside case scenario" with regard to historical, cultural, political, and economic factors, but Native students experience these distinctions in a very personal and local fashion... (p. 401)

Marker’s (2000) research heightens our awareness of the need to explore the relationship between First Nations and intercultural studies. As intercultural trainers, it is important to reflect on how, with whom, and under what circumstances we can create a conversation on this topic.

Ethical Issues

Ethical issues are embedded in intercultural training, however it is conceptualized. Whether or not training objectives include explorations of identity, power and social relations, there are risks. If these subjects are explicitly raised, there is a risk that minority learners and facilitators become the learning object for the rest of the group, at the potential cost of much personal pain. If training does not include explorations of power, race, and identity, there is a concern that core aspects of intercultural relations and of individuals' lived experiences are being disregarded. Individuals who have experienced racism and exclusion may feel that the real issues are being ignored if the discussion focuses on differences in communication and behaviour without attention to an historical and societal context. Majority culture individuals who have examined their identities and place of privilege may feel the same way. As we have seen in this study, even if identity and power are not expressly named, they shape the experience of learners and facilitators. There may be other dimensions of identity that affect intercultural interactions that were not apparent in this study. For instance, the issue of class was mentioned by only a few participants. Perhaps its lack of salience is a consequence of the learners and facilitators similar location, as noted in Chapter Four. The lack of discussion of
class is not to diminish its importance, rather, it is a reflection of the experiences of the participants in this study.

I encourage facilitators to examine the possibilities and consequences of integrating the following elements: understanding the impact of different values and communication patterns, understanding the impact of prejudice and systemic barriers and understanding the dynamics of identity, power, and oppression. Whether or not issues of power are explicit in program conceptualization, it was clear from the stories of learners and facilitators that racial, ethnic and gender identity, and contextual issues of power and oppression permeate intercultural interactions. This finding lays the groundwork for a conversation about facilitator conceptualization of intercultural training and how to create spaces for having the difficult conversations that may occur however the training is framed. This would include a discussion about facilitator comfort and skill in engaging in dialogues in which there are no tidy answers, in which there will likely be emotion and tension. In the words of James Baldwin, “Not everything that is faced can be changed. But nothing can be changed until it is faced” (cited in Tatum, 1999, p. xix).

It would be useful to acknowledge with learners some of the struggles about conceptualizing the field, and dilemmas about grappling with issues of power, race, and identity which are introduced in the Foundations course and could be continued throughout the program. Explicit attention to the underlying tensions in the field, coupled with an exploration of building community, critical thinking, and storytelling may contribute to creating the conditions for difficult dialogues. The ethical belief, “do no harm” is paramount among trainers, and may explain some of the reluctance to address issues of identity, power, and race. It raises, though, another question about the ethics of not addressing these issues. We cannot assume that there is no harm if we do not address these issues.

It would be helpful for facilitators to have a conversation about how they could create conditions under which these issues could be addressed, how to facilitate around the tensions that might arise and what resources and support are available for individuals for whom personal issues get opened up in the training session. A number of cross-cultural writers have
suggested that facilitators need to understand learners' readiness for risk and sequence training activities to move from low risk to high risk, assessing learner responses along the way (Bennett & Bennett, 1996; Paige & Martin, 1996; Pusch, 1994). This is all the more challenging because learners will be at different places in their heads and hearts. Trainer understanding of the dynamics of identity, safety, and risk combined with self-understanding and facilitation experience are essential in making decisions about how to support difficult dialogues.

Facilitator Development

The study pointed out the need for attention to how facilitators are selected and developed. In my experience, the strategy of word-of-mouth hiring is typical in program start-ups, as was the case with the Intercultural Studies program. Hiring known individuals has the advantage of promoting the formation of a cohesive team very quickly, and of meeting immediate needs for consistency in the quality of the training being delivered. It may also limit the diversity of individuals who are brought into the program. This study raised questions as to who gets invited to the planning table, who “should” do intercultural training, how dominant culture trainers can negotiate their role especially around discussions of race and power, and how minority and dominant culture trainers can work together to design programs.

Several facilitators sounded a cautionary note that selecting individuals to design and facilitate training simply on the basis of race or ethnicity is not enough to address issues of diversity in the facilitation team. Factors to consider include an individual’s grasp of the field, and all the difficulties of defining what the field is, the conceptual framework that underpins their beliefs about intercultural training, their understanding about working with adult learners, their sensitivity to the cultural assumptions embedded in dominant culture readings and learning activities, their ability to work with groups in exploring sensitive issues, their understanding of the role of identity in intercultural interactions, and their analysis of identity and power. That is not to say that every individual who is interested in participating as a facilitator will bring all of these elements at the start. Program planners could consider having new facilitators not only “apprentice” with existing facilitators as they now do, but be part of the conversations I am suggesting here.
In recent years, the requirement for cultural competence among trainers and counselors has received attention in the literature. Paige (1996) suggests that intercultural trainer competencies include knowledge, skills, personal qualities, and ethics. In the category of knowledge, trainers need to understand the psychological and social dynamics of intercultural experience; the stages of intercultural development; the design elements of intercultural training; and the challenges for both learners and trainers associated with learning about intercultural issues. For trainers involved in diversity training, Paige (1996) adds that they must be knowledgeable about “power (dominance and subordination), oppression, socioeconomic inequalities, and marginality as experienced and perceived by their clients” (p. 153). I would suggest that this knowledge is not limited to those who do organizational diversity training, but rather is essential for anyone engaged in intercultural work.

Sue, Arredondo and McDavis (1992) developed a detailed set of multicultural counselling competencies to guide the practice of counsellors. These include counsellor self-awareness of attitudes, beliefs, biases, and assumptions; knowledge and understanding of the effects of oppression, racism, discrimination, and stereotyping; and skills to develop culturally sensitive intervention strategies. The counselling field has been explicit in its attention to racism and power. For example, “culturally skilled counselors possess knowledge and understanding about how oppression, racism, discrimination, and stereotyping affect them personally and in their work”, and “culturally skilled counselors understand and have knowledge about sociopolitical influences that impinge on the life of racial and ethnic minorities”, [and] “can explain the relationship between culture and power” (Arredondo, 1999, p. 107). The intercultural counselling guidelines may serve as a catalyst for trainer discussions around these issues.

The facilitators who read draft chapters of the findings said that they found it enlightening to read about the experiences of other facilitators and learners and the related literature. My sense is that facilitators would welcome the opportunity to participate in a forum, or ongoing series of conversations in-person and online, in which they could rekindle a sense of community and create a space for their own learning.
Implications for Program Planning

One of the learners I interviewed asked me “what were your lessons learned from this study?” I undertook this study because I wanted to improve my practice. I hoped that by better understanding how training makes a difference for learners and what aspects of training help learners apply and share their learning, I would gain new insights into planning programs. I outlined above the lessons learned specific to the Intercultural Studies program. About planning intercultural training programs in general, I have translated my lessons learned into a set of reflective questions for program leaders (Sork, 2000). These questions are offered as examples; they are not the only questions that might be asked. The guiding themes for the questions are transparency and intentionality.

1. **Who is invited to the planning table?** Who have we included? Who have we excluded? What factors are influencing these choices? What are the implications of these choices? What have we done to expand the possibilities? Have we looked outside our usual contacts to invite people from diverse cultural and professional backgrounds? How have we maintained the involvement of the advisory group as the program has grown? What have we done to create an opportunity for new members to bring fresh perspectives to the program?

2. **What is the conceptual framework of the program?** What are the implications of developing training from an international, multicultural, diversity, or anti-oppression perspective? How have we involved the facilitation team, clients, and other constituents in a discussion about potential frameworks when making program planning decisions? How have we acknowledged underlying tensions between facilitators with different beliefs about the appropriate framework? How much time have we taken to explore the differences? How do we explain the selected framework and intentions to learners so that they can engage in informed discussion, including challenging the framework?

3. **How are facilitators selected?** What implications are there for the program in the processes used to bring new members to the facilitation team? How much do we rely on word-of-mouth or advertising or other vehicles that promote awareness of our program?
What criteria have we developed? How can the literature inform our knowledge about competencies? What can we learn from the practical knowledge of planners, trainers and learners? What qualities and skills do we look for in a trainer? How do we determine if the trainer has these, or has the potential to develop these – interviews? observation? references? Who have we included and excluded, how does this happen and what are the consequences of the selection process?

4. *How are minority trainers invited and included in the program design?* How are we defining minority? Does this mean ethnic or racial minority? Does it mean visible minority? Does it include multiple dimensions of diversity such as age, sexual orientation, disability, class? If minority trainers are choosing not to participate, why is this? What relationship might there be between the conceptual framework underpinning the program and the individuals who express an interest in working with our program? What impact does it have if our program is grounded in international, multicultural or anti-racism approaches, in terms of who is attracted to the program?

5. *What cultural assumptions guide our curriculum?* What assumptions shape our selection of materials and activities? What other resources, methods, and perspectives might we include? Who can help us with this? How have we acknowledged the complexities of identity and power in intercultural interactions? How prepared are we to address issues of prejudice, discrimination, exclusion, and dominance even if our program design is not grounded in these concepts?

6. *How do we create the conditions for difficult dialogues?* What is our belief about the role of emotion in intercultural training? How do we respond to tension in the training situation? What are our expectations about safety in intercultural training? How do we define safety? What kinds of discussions have we had in the facilitation team about an ethic of care and what that looks like?

7. *How do we integrate theory and practice?* What creative methods do we use to help learners engage learning between the training and practice contexts? What are the possibilities for including online components, storytelling, work-linked assignments and
community building between learners or in the worksite? How do we approach transfer of learning? What are our beliefs about the factors that help learners apply and share their learning? How do we work with learners to make the links between research, academic literature, and practical knowledge?

8. What kind of professional development opportunities do we provide for facilitators? What agencies, organizations or individuals can we connect with to broaden our perspective? What are we doing to bridge the gap between scholarship and practice? How do we acknowledge the value of the lived experience of facilitators and initiate a connection to theory? What research endeavors might we engage in to further our understanding of intercultural work?

9. How do we support the development of a trainer community? What kind of budget do we allocate for trainers to meet? What venues do we create for trainers to exchange ideas, to share how they explore difficult territory in training sessions, to talk about what is working, what is not working, what is surprising them, what lessons they are learning? How do we pay attention to relationship-building? How do we facilitate majority and minority culture trainers hearing and acknowledging each others’ experiences?

10. How do we define responsible planning? How do we respond to the dynamic nature of program planning? How do we encourage learners, planners, and facilitators to bring new knowledge and questions to the program? How do we address the technical, socio-political and ethical issues in program design? How do we educate funders about the planning process? Have we explored the expectations and limitations of the program? Have we considered what other organizational responses could contribute to working with intercultural issues?

I present these questions, not as a formula, but rather, as a stimulus for opening up new ways of looking at how we plan intercultural programs. The questions are a way of helping us examine what is possible in a particular context and what is not. They encourage us to reflect on the constraints placed on us by the external environment and those we have unwittingly
placed on ourselves. I think of these questions as a way to inspire mindfulness in program planning. Often, in my experience, training is the method of choice for communicating an organizational message about creating respectful, welcoming, and equitable workplaces. However, at the same time as we want to maximize learning opportunities, we need to recognize that training is not the only intervention to address intercultural issues. It is outside the scope of this study to examine organizational change, however, it is important to acknowledge that there are other commitments that organizations need to undertake to move from an "exclusive, resistant" environment to one that is "transformed and inclusive" (Hayles & Russell, 1997).

Let me briefly describe how I have attempted to integrate these questions into my practice. Out of respect for confidentiality, this is not a full account of the complexities of the situation. Recently, I have consulted with leaders in a post-secondary institution to design a diversity program and provide training for internal diversity trainers. I have had the opportunity, on a small scale, to use the questions to guide the process. For example, we invited a broad spectrum of representatives from student, staff, faculty and interest groups, such as International Student Services, First Nations Office, Disability Services, and the Gay and Lesbian Club, to participate in the planning process. We explored the preferences of the representatives for working from multicultural, diversity and anti-oppression perspectives, considering the implications of each. There was significant interest in multicultural training from a "communicating across cultures" perspective and a smaller interest in working within an anti-oppression framework. We made every effort to explore the interests of everyone at the table. Taking into consideration the allotted half-day training time, the organizational mandate, and the level of experience of the trainers, the group agreed to a diversity framework. Several of the representatives who expressed an interest in an anti-oppression framework did not participate as trainers, an outcome that is being followed-up by the institutional leaders. As noted above, training programs are not the only alternative. There may be other ways in which these individuals can address their concerns within the organization.
Guided by the findings in this study, during the training for trainers session we introduced concepts of identity, difficult dialogues, emotion and safety. We incorporated into the workshop design activities based on Proulx’s (1998) framework, discussed in Chapter Two. One of the significant challenges faced by the organization is how to support the application and sharing of learning. Recognizing the difficulties of one person trying to initiate change, the facilitation team is exploring the possibility of small groups of co-workers attending training together and creating a plan to take back to their workplace. The institutional leaders have agreed to offer small financial grants to individuals or departments who develop and implement plans to move from awareness into action. The leaders are supporting regular meetings among the trainers to help them build a sense of community; they have agreed to fund a small resource library; and have invited suggestions from the trainers regarding their professional development needs. One trainer has established a listserv and website to which trainers may post experiences, questions, resources and events.

In contrast, I consulted with an organization in the early 1990s, when diversity training was still quite new, to organize a similar training for trainers. The process was quite different. The organization determined what shape the training would take and who the trainers would be. There was little thought given to conceptual frameworks, conditions for difficult dialogues, integration of theory and practice, transfer of learning or community building for trainers. I have benefited from conducting this study and participating in the EdD program. I now bring to my work new perspectives on educational leadership and the role I can take as a consultant in joining scholarship and practice.

The process I engaged in with the program described above has not been easy. It has been a time-consuming, frustrating and sometimes emotional experience, particularly as we made the effort to include diverse perspectives and embrace difficult conversations. It has also been a richer and more rewarding experience than similar work I have done. I received this feedback from the train the trainers session: “Everything about [the training for trainers] was outstanding. We covered tension, conflict, humour, serious discussions, intellectual debates…”
In response to a highly charged situation which I chose to address during the session, one learner stated, "[The most useful part of the training] was the handling of the difficult situation at the end of the three days." Another learner said she thought that the tension had been staged so the group could see a "live" demonstration of the issues we had been exploring. It had not been staged. It was my real experience, my attempt to practice what I say I believe, that "difficult dialogues" offer powerful learning opportunities. That said, a facilitator needs to be mindful of the risks to the learners, and themselves, in how they approach these moments.

**Possibilities for Future Research**

This study suggests at least five areas for additional research: the relationship of First Nations to intercultural training, the role of identity in the experience of intercultural trainers, the exploration of other theoretical frameworks for examining intercultural training, the place for storytelling in intercultural learning, and the nature of training for intercultural facilitators. I outline each area below.

I see the potential for a valuable contribution to the literature in an analysis of First Nations and intercultural studies. What would be gained in integrating the two? How is the separation viewed by First Nations and by dominant culture individuals? Is separation necessary in order to ensure that appropriate attention is paid to issues of power and oppression, or to prevent the replication of historic dominant culture practices of absorbing First Nations into existing structures? How could facilitators do justice to First Nations issues if they are integrated with a study of other intercultural relationships? What are the ways in which First Nations might be included in intercultural training?

I did not focus on issues of race and identity in my original questions for this study, therefore these topics are reported in only one chapter of this thesis. There is potential for a deeper analysis of who does intercultural training. What is the representation of dominant culture and minority culture trainers in this field? What is the experience of doing intercultural training like for minority culture individuals? How does the conceptualization of training affect the degree to which minority culture individuals participate as trainers? Are minority culture individuals
necessarily more concerned with identity and power than dominant culture individuals? How are minority individuals perceived by dominant culture institutions?

I have used program planning as the conceptual resource for analyzing intercultural training. Future research could investigate other theoretical resources that might open up new ways of examining intercultural training. For instance, one of my colleagues is drawing on conflict theory to explore the notion of “learning in sites of conflict” (Fisher, 2000). This model for intercultural training embraces as its content the relationships of the learners. Instead of learning about culture, learners explore identity, power and social relations through their dialogue.

Storytelling was important for the learners in this study as they developed the trust over time in working together. I wonder how storytelling could be used in corporate settings, particularly in short time frames. How would an organization and a facilitator create the conditions for stories to be heard? Whose stories would be told - the facilitator’s? the learner’s? guest’s? How are identity, oppression, and power part of storytelling? What are the risks in bringing storytelling into organizational training? What are the benefits?

How does one become a competent or sensitive intercultural trainer? Is it by apprenticeship? Are there courses that trainers “should” have? How do we assess if someone is an effective facilitator? Perhaps a program for facilitators could be designed and evaluated, building on the findings from this study, and including conceptual foundations of intercultural training, exploration of personal identity, balancing safety, challenge and support, facilitating difficult dialogues, using story in cultural learning, and ways of integrating theory and practice.

Implications for My Practice

I am both the researcher and a part of the Intercultural Studies facilitation team. The implications for the program and the facilitators also affect me. I hope that this study will help us, as a team, to continue to develop the program, bearing in mind that the program exists in a context of fiscal and political constraints over which we have no control.
I, too, grapple with the issues that have come up in the study: what are the foundations of my practice, how do I create a space for difficult dialogues, how do I urge deeper reflection, challenge learners and maintain an ethic of care? In the other parts of my practice, these questions are even more difficult because of the organizational constraints within which I work. Short programs in organizational contexts in which I am the sole planner and facilitator pose particular constraints in fostering an analysis of identity and power. Still, I am thinking about ways that I might open up the conversation, including introducing a theoretical framework that includes context, representation, and identity.

When I saw how powerful the link to theory was for the learners in this study, I decided to try introducing an explicit theoretical framework in my training. Like many trainers, I had not articulated the conceptual frameworks for my work. In conducting this study, I recognized the embedded theories of perceptual psychology, attribution, and dynamics of prejudice that informed my work. One framework that incorporates these theories and adds the elements of context and identity is that of Proulx (1998). The framework recognizes multiple identities, including race, gender, age, generation, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic status. It illustrates the interaction of identity, context, and strategies, and allows for both theoretical examination and practical application. A limitation in the framework is its lack of explicit attention to power, although notions of power are embedded in Proulx’s view of context, and the framework lends itself to introducing discussions of power. The framework can be used to analyze cases or individual experiences. Although learners have not commented directly on the framework, my own sense is that the training is more grounded. Perhaps this is because the end-of-session feedback has focused more on what participants learned and less on perceptions of me. I hasten to add that I am in the exploratory stages of using this framework and have not collected data as to its usefulness.

At the beginning of this study I said that I was attracted to the EdD program because of the opportunity to shine a light on my practice. The light has illuminated a contradiction in my practice, that I was aware of at some level, and did not confront until working with this study. My motivation for doing intercultural and diversity work comes from a social justice perspective. The reality of my practice is that while some of my work deals with
discrimination, oppression and power, much of it does not. As I discussed in the review of anti-racism training, to address these issues in short sessions conducted without a supportive organizational context is fraught with ethical concerns. What right do I have to require people to explore personal identity in a mandatory workshop? What happens if personal issues get opened up that cannot be addressed in the time frame, and will not be supported in the organizational system? What about the pain of minority individuals in the group who become the unwanted focus of the session? Ethically, I cannot do all the work I want to do because it could put learners at risk. So, I have been doing work that in varying degrees approximates the work I would like to do. The question I am struggling with is “is approximation enough?”

Conducting this study led me to an exploration of the roots of intercultural training and an examination of my own conceptualization of intercultural training. I explored the assumptions and focus of international, multicultural and anti-racism training. In the process, I clarified the location where I stand in my heart and the location where I stand in my practice. I will use my understandings of the nature of different conceptualizations of intercultural training as a touchstone for discussions with potential clients. These understandings will guide my conversations with clients as I encourage them to explore their intentions in planning intercultural programs. I have not reached answers to the difficult questions in my practice, but I see the questions, and frameworks for exploring them, with greater clarity.

**Closing Comments**

During the writing of this thesis, I learned many lessons about designing intercultural training programs. Of all the findings explored in this study, it is the challenge of engaging in conversations about race, identity and power that has most strongly captured my attention. I was deeply touched by the stories shared with me by the learners and facilitators in this study. One story stays with me and guides my work. That is the story that began “I want you to know it’s going to be important to listen, to listen with your hearts and all your attention, just listen.” Of course, the hard work of intercultural training requires much more, but this is a place to begin. And so, I have titled this thesis *Listening with the Heart*. I hope the participants in this study feel that I have listened with my heart.
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Appendix 4: Participant Consent Form

Thesis Title: Exploring the effects of a cultural diversity training program

Principal Investigator: Dr. Thomas Sork
Professor, Adult Education
Educational Studies, University of British Columbia

Student Investigator: Rhonda L. Margolis
Ed.D. (Leadership and Policy) Candidate
University of British Columbia

Purpose and procedures:

The purpose of this study is to gain an understanding of what aspects of cultural diversity training are meaningful for learners and what elements of the training and post-training environments help them use, transfer, apply and share what they have learned. This study has the potential to make a significant contribution to the practice of diversity training by providing a foundation for the reconceptualization of the design of training programs and for the training of diversity trainers. The results will contribute to my doctoral thesis, part of which will be a guide for diversity trainers.

Program planners/facilitators involved in the design of the Intercultural Studies Certificate Program will participate in individual interviews lasting approximately 1 - 1.5 hours. With the permission of the participants, interviews will be tape recorded. Planners will be asked about their experiences developing and facilitating courses in the Intercultural Studies Program (including intentions, planning processes, and ethical issues), what ideas have influenced their thinking, and perceived changes in learners over time. Participants will be given the opportunity to review a transcript for accuracy. Following the interviews, planners will be asked to participate in a focus group (approximately 1.5 hours) to provide feedback on a summary of the interview results. With the permission of participants, the focus group will be tape recorded and participants will be given a summary of the focus group findings to review for accuracy.

Individuals who have completed the certificate program will be interviewed. Interviews will be conducted at the convenience of each individual and will last approximately 1 - 1.5 hours. Individuals will be asked about their experiences as learners in the program, including reasons for enrolling in the program, how the training contributed to changes in the way they think about and respond to individuals from different cultural backgrounds, what other factors contributed to such changes, and how they have applied or shared learning in their workplace. With the permission of participants, the interview will be tape recorded. Participation in the study will require approximately 2 hours of time including scheduling the interview, participating in the interview and reviewing interview transcripts for accuracy.
Appendix 5: Interview Questions for Learners

Background, Reasons for taking the program

1. I'd like to start by asking you to tell me a bit about where you work and what you do.

2. How did you become interested in the intercultural studies program? (Was there a particular situation that was the catalyst? Organizational or manager support? Other cross-cultural training? Explore personal, cultural, educational experiences)

3. What were your expectations coming into the program? (Have your expectations been met? Why/why not? If not, why did you continue?)

Experiences in the program

4. What learning experience was most positive for you?

5. What surprised you?

6. Can you tell me about your most challenging experience in the program?

7. Which courses did you take? (Which ones were most useful/why?, least useful/why?)

8. I'm interested in the role of the other people - participants and facilitators - can you think of a time when working through a problem with the group was useful?

9. What about a time when working with the group became a problem?

10. What works well about the workshop portion? (What doesn’t work well?)

11. What works well about the on-line portion? (What doesn’t work well?)

12. What makes a “good” on-line facilitator?

13. Sometimes, when I have taken a training course, I have had an “Aha” about something - an important learning - can you think of a time when you experienced this?

Transfer or Application

14. What has changed for you because of participating in the program? (When have you noticed “I handled that differently?” Probe for thinking, feeling, understanding differently. How would someone else know?)
15. What kinds of things are important to you now in intercultural interactions?

16. Can you tell me about something you have tried to do differently as a result of participating in this training? (Probe for thinking, feeling, understanding differently - work, personal, social)

17. What aspects of the program or the facilitators helped you transfer or apply what you were learning in your “real world”?

18. What support have you received from others? (family, co-workers, clients?) (How could others have been more supportive? What barriers have you experienced in trying to make changes? How does your organization support the concept of “valuing diversity” - policies, activities)

19. What does being “interculturally competent” mean to you?

20. We’ve been focusing on the training program, and it’s effect on your life and work. Thinking back to any point in your life (if you’re comfortable sharing) - what have been your most powerful learning experiences about cross-cultural interactions?

**Summary/“Lessons learned”**

21. How do you feel about the program overall?

22. What was missing?

23. What would you say are the key “lessons learned” for you through participating in this program?

24. Is there anything you would like to add that I haven’t asked you?
Appendix 6: Interview Questions for Facilitators

Background, Planning and Facilitation Experiences

1. I'd like to start by asking you how you describe your work. (clarify intercultural, cross-cultural, international, diversity training; full-time planners or trainers).

2. What led you to become involved in cross-cultural training? (explore international experiences, personal experiences, education, cultural background).

3. I'm curious how you learned to do this (cross-cultural training). (courses, books, personal experiences). What other training would have been helpful for you?

4. I wonder what/who has guided your thinking, what ideas have influenced you? (has there been a particular person or writer who has influenced you? what is it about this person, or these ideas that has captured your attention?)

5. Can you tell me about your involvement with the CIS program development? (explore who invited you to participate, at what point in the program, which courses, who did you work with, who established the objectives, format, length of courses, combination of assignments, no exams, awarding of certificate, changes in program or course over time, frustrations, challenges)

6. Can you give me an example of a dilemma you faced in the planning process? (who was involved, what were your concerns, how did you handle the situation, how do you feel about how you handled it?)

Experiences with learners/learning transfer

7. I'm curious about who the program was designed for - who did you think would enrol? (are those actually the people that attended? what is the “typical profile” of the learners? who would you like to see enrolling in the program?)

8. What do you hope to accomplish with this training? (How do you define cultural or intercultural competence? How do you define “success” in the program or in a course?)

9. I’m interested in your experiences of working with learners - can you think of a time where you felt a learner was making “no movement” - can you tell me about that, what were the “signs”, how did you approach the situation? (what do you think was getting in the way? How did you, or other facilitators or other learners affect the situation)

10. Think of someone who really changed - tell me about that. (what do you think contributed to the changes; your role, role of other learners)
11. I'm interested in your thoughts on the on-line process - what do you think works well? (What is problematic or challenging? What do you think your role is as an on-line facilitator?)

12. Can you think of an example of an ethical issue that came up in developing or facilitating a course? (who was involved, what were your concerns, how did you handle the situation, how do you feel about how you handled it?) (example: someone posts sweeping generalizations about a particular ethnic group)

13. I've been thinking a lot about how people engage learning between the "classroom" and the workplace - what kinds of things do you do in the program/course (s) that helps people think about "transferring" their learning?

14. What about when people go back to the workplace - what seems to help people do things differently? What gets in the way of people doing things? (an example?)

"Lessons learned"/recommendations

15. We often talk about how much we learn as facilitators - what "lessons learned" do you take from your experience in developing or facilitating in this program?

16. What recommendations would you have for others developing or facilitating cross-cultural training programs?

17. What are your thoughts/feelings about the program overall?(what has been the best part of being involved in this program? about working in the field of cross-cultural training)

18. If you were going to interview learners in the program, what would you want to ask them?

19. Is there anything you'd like to add that I haven't asked you about.
## Appendix 7: Coding Categories for Learner Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embedded Usefulness (emerge) - sharing with others</td>
<td>EMBED</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>EXPEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator qualities</td>
<td>FACQUA</td>
<td>Feedback on courses/program</td>
<td>FEED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused Reflection (emerge)</td>
<td>FOCUS</td>
<td>Gender issues (emerge)</td>
<td>GENDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinders learning</td>
<td>HIND</td>
<td>Insider/Outsider (emerge)</td>
<td>INOUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Competence</td>
<td>INTERCOMP</td>
<td>Interaction with other learners</td>
<td>INTERLEARN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Community</td>
<td>LEARNCOM</td>
<td>Metaphor (emerge)</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>Other cross-cultural/ diversity training</td>
<td>OTHTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Communication</td>
<td>ONCOM</td>
<td>Organizational issues/support</td>
<td>ORGISS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cross-cultural experiences</td>
<td>THCR</td>
<td>Positive conditions for learning</td>
<td>POS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power of theory (emerge)</td>
<td>POWER</td>
<td>Self-reflection (emerge)</td>
<td>SELF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift in thinking, feelings, behaviours</td>
<td>SHIFT</td>
<td>Strategies/tools used from training</td>
<td>STRAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories (emerge)</td>
<td>STOR</td>
<td>Theory/practice (emerge)</td>
<td>THPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of learning</td>
<td>TRF</td>
<td>Results (of training)</td>
<td>RES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who are the learners</td>
<td>LEARN</td>
<td>Work experience and Education</td>
<td>WORKED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 8: Coding Categories - Facilitators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenge strategies (emerge)</td>
<td>CHAL</td>
<td>Definitions (emerge)</td>
<td>DEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemmas</td>
<td>DIL</td>
<td>Embedded Usefulness (emerge)</td>
<td>EMBED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Issues</td>
<td>ETHIC</td>
<td>Goals of training</td>
<td>GOAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding Influences</td>
<td>GDIN</td>
<td>Insider/Outsider (emerge)</td>
<td>INOUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with colleagues</td>
<td>INTERCOL</td>
<td>Interaction with learners</td>
<td>INTERLEARN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing strengths and limitations (emerge)</td>
<td>STLIM</td>
<td>Involvement in planning</td>
<td>INVPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural competence</td>
<td>INTERCOMP</td>
<td>Learner Success</td>
<td>LEARNSUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing the program (emerge)</td>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>Metaphors (emerge)</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>No shift in learner thinking, behaviour, feelings</td>
<td>NOSHIFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online communication</td>
<td>ONCOM</td>
<td>Organizational Issues</td>
<td>ORGISS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift in thinking, behaviour, feelings</td>
<td>SHIFT</td>
<td>Theory/practice issues (emerge)</td>
<td>THPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator preparation, including education</td>
<td>FACPREP</td>
<td>Safety (emerge)</td>
<td>SAFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories (emerge)</td>
<td>(STOR)</td>
<td>Transfer of learning</td>
<td>TRF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who are the learners</td>
<td>LEARN</td>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>WORK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9: Intercultural Studies Program Course Competencies (from Course Binders 1996 - 2000)

Foundations of Intercultural Studies (1997)

Participants are required to demonstrate the following competencies through the e-mail assignments:

1. Understanding of selected intercultural research, and synthesis of this research into their own experience.
2. Identification and analysis of an example of a challenging intercultural communication situation, and the formulation of a research plan to clarify the underlying cultural issues.
3. Collection and Reporting of data to verify or alter their hypothesis, generating new strategies or perceptions, and identifying areas of strength and needs in intercultural analysis.
4. Application of theories of ‘values and world-view’ to their awareness of their own cultural values, their roots, and their evolution.

Intercultural Communication Skills (1996)

In order to successfully complete CIS 102: Intercultural Communication Skills, participants will demonstrate the following competencies through their assignments:

1. Identify an example of intercultural communication, hypothesize about the basis for the misunderstanding, and describe a strategy for repairing the breakdown.
2. Assess their own non-verbal communication skills in intercultural interactions.
3. Understand the skills required by people in different contexts to adapt interculturally.
4. Build a ‘culture map’ to interpret their own culture and to transfer culture-specific skills.
5. Assess their own intercultural communication skills and create a plan for further development.

Intercultural Problem-Solving (1998)

Participants are required to demonstrate the following competencies through the e-mail assignments:

1. Describe and analyze an intercultural problem-solving scenario, recognizing the perspectives of the individuals involved, and applying an established identify model to the situation.
2. Develop an interview instrument designed to learn more about cultural aspects of looking at and solving problems.
3. Conduct and analyze intercultural interviews to expand awareness of cultural actors that define problems and ways of solving problems.

35 In 2001, this course was changed to Bridging Cultural Differences with a new set of competencies.
4. Create an alternative problem-solving process for an intercultural scenario, incorporating the use of effective communication skills.

**Training for International Assignments (1997)**

Participants are required to demonstrate the following competencies through the e-mail assignments:

1. Recognition of the skills and complexities involved in effective intercultural training, and an application of these issues to their own experience.
2. Creative application of intercultural training strategies to challenging training assignments.
3. Understanding of the factors that indicate whether intercultural training is effective or not, with reference to their own work or experience.
4. Ability to assess the strengths and weaknesses of a training session for adults, with particular emphasis on the effectiveness of the needs assessment process, and to make recommendations for improvements.

**Intercultural Negotiation (1997)**

Participants are required to demonstrate the following competencies through the E-mail assignments:

1. Capacity to assess the impact of culture on negotiations, using supporting examples.
2. Identification of negotiation strategies and techniques that best fit their own negotiating situations.
3. Ability to analyze and comment on the effect of the culture of an individual negotiator on the negotiation process: the position taken, the strategies and techniques used, and the possible concessions.
4. Understanding the effect of culture on the choice of process for intercultural negotiations.
5. Ability to analyze and comment upon the effect of different approaches to negotiating in a complex international situations, and identify any links to culture.

**Managing Intercultural Teams (1999)**

In order to successfully complete *CIS 204: Managing Intercultural Teams*, participants will demonstrate the following competencies through their assignments:

1. Identification and analysis of the impact of cultures on organizations and projects and the relating of this analysis to an intercultural project team in which they have been involved.
2. Analysis of the process of building cultural synergy and make recommendations for a synergistic approach to one challenge of intercultural project teams identified from their own experience or from a case study.

---

36 In 2001, this course was changed to *Supporting International Assignments* with a new set of competencies.
3. Identification of greatest personal skills for creating culturally synergistic solutions to intercultural project team management issues.
4. Generation of strategies for successful establishment of intercultural project teams.
5. Generation of strategies for providing feedback to members of intercultural project teams.

**Internationalizing the Post-Secondary Organization** (2000)

1. You will be able to provide an initial outline of why your institution is involved in international work, how the institution is undertaking this work and the motivations for international work within your school.
2. You will be able to outline key trends in international education and relate these to your own institution.
3. You will be able to identify the approach your institution has taken to managing the risk of international education opportunities for students and outline some of the key issues and questions concerning this approach. You will also be able to balance the pros and cons of the approach to health insurance taken by your institution.
4. You will be able to identify the benefits to students of international education and formulate a rationale to present to stakeholders at your institution.
5. You will identify specific ways in which culture impacts the various internationalization stakeholders within your institution. You will then present a plan addressing the intercultural needs of the stakeholders as your institution proceeds to internationalize.
6. You will identify the goals, rationale and process for global partnerships and relate this to your own organization through a plan for potential partnership or description of a current one.
7. You will build a process for implementing a staff or faculty exchange or a plan to internationalize the curriculum within your organization.