White Paper

Bridging Education Abroad and Domestic Multicultural Relations with Intercultural Learning

Milton Bennett, Keshia Abraham, Omolabake Fakunle, Julie Ficarra, Amy Henry, Marissa Lombardi, Quinton Redcliffe, Melissa Torres, Barry Van Driel

Abstract

This white paper is a conceptual summary of a think tank discussion sponsored by The Forum on Education Abroad. Following the traditional use of "white paper" as a call to action in specific contexts, this paper defines the contexts of programming for education abroad and for domestic diversity education and argues for an incorporation of their differing perspectives into the general category of intercultural learning. The result of the application would be that intercultural learning in education abroad would continue to expand its current emphasis on the developmental experience of contemporary global cultures to include more transformational experience of historical and political context, while domestic diversity education would expand its current focus on transformational experience of historically situated power inequities to include more developmental experience of contemporary domestic multicultural relations. Several illustrations of practical application of the ideas follow the call to action.

Keywords

Diversity; education abroad; intercultural learning; social Justice

Background

In mid-2022 a group of professionals were invited to a think tank session sponsored by *The Forum on Education Abroad* for the purpose of exploring common ground shared by international and domestic educational programs. The participants

were selected because each of them combines experience and expertise in both international exchange and domestic diversity issues, and they were available to be present in Milan, Italy for the session. The group included professionals with cultural and professional roots in Europe, USA, and Africa; gender, age, and race diversity; and a mix of educational, NGO, and business consulting institutional affiliations. All agreed on the importance of the session's stated purpose of exploring how educational programming focused on either international experience (such as education abroad) or on domestic multicultural experience (such as diversity training) could, if practiced in combination, be more effective in supporting institutional and organizational agendas.

This white paper is a conceptual summary of that think tank discussion, appended by some brief case studies that illustrate various practical applications of ideas presented in the paper. Following the traditional use of "white paper" as a form of government policy exploration, the purpose here is to define a conceptual context and suggest how its application could be beneficial to educational practice. The context we suggest is that of *intercultural learning as a conceptual bridge* that could better coordinate aspects of education abroad and domestic diversity work towards preparing people to thrive in multicultural communities and societies, both globally and domestically. We provide a series of examples of initiatives, called here "case studies", which can serve as models for ways of implementing the bridging process. While the paper provides some external referencing of factual statements, the positions it takes on appropriate definitions and appropriate applications are entirely those of the think tank discussion group.

There is already substantial interest in exploring the interface of international exchange and domestic diversity work in educational contexts (Goldstein, 2022). For instance, many international education programs are attempting to '"decolonize" their curriculum by incorporating perspectives from indigenous, Global South, and Global North contexts, and they are coupling that expansion with increased attention to systemic racism, sexism, and other abuses of social dominance (Gozik & Hamir, 2022; Lorenz, 2013). An example of this process in education abroad is presented in Case Study (2). Domestic diversity programs focusing on equity, inclusion, and social justice[1] are, in some cases, also expanding their focus by incorporating global examples of multicultural relations and by attending to the equity and inclusion issues

---

[1] This paper will not argue for any particular usage of acronyms to refer to the domestic issues of diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice. We use the acronym DEIJ, but we could have as easily used EDI, an acronym commonly used in the UK, or JEDI, another acronym commonly used in the US.

of international immigrant groups (Goldstein, 2022). In addition, education abroad programs are attempting to be more inclusive of participants from non-dominant domestic groups (e.g., Case Study 3), while domestic diversity programs are attempting to be more inclusive of dominant culture members as allies (Melaku et.al., 2020; Sweeney, 2013).

The group addressed three general questions in a preliminary discussion: 1) What are some possible conceptual structures (paradigms, epistemologies, theoretical models) that could underpin "engagement with otherness" in both international education abroad and in domestic multicultural contexts? 2) What are some implementation strategies that could allow intercultural learning to be pursued jointly in both domestic diversity and education abroad programs? 3) What are some resources that could support the joint pursuit of intercultural learning both internationally and domestically?

This white paper promotes a course of action. It is divided into sections according to specific questions of implementation:
1. How are we defining significant terms?
2. Why is bridging international and domestic contexts important?
3. What are some objections and/or political considerations regarding this action?
4. What is the best approach to implementing a bridging action?
5. What are the next steps in implementing the action?

How are we defining significant terms?

The concepts under discussion are commonly defined in various ways, sometimes accompanied by controversy. We therefore thought it would be appropriate to generate some consensus around terminology at the beginning. We take "diversity" to be a descriptive term that should refer to cultural difference in general, without a connotation of it being dealt with in any particular way. However, we will use "diversity program" to indicate an educational effort (usually in the form of workshops, seminars, or various forms of training) that focuses on issues of equity, inclusion, and social justice in a domestic context. "Equity" is a normative term referring to the value of treating diverse people in ways that recognize their equal and unique humanity and worth; simply treating people with equality may not address people's unique circumstance and experience. "Inclusion" refers to a strategy of equitable engagement with diversity: people's unique voices are actively solicited and heard. "Social justice" refers to understanding and remediation of inequity and abuses of power that are embedded in institutional structures and processes. These

definitions generally follow those of the American Council on Education (2022) and those of The Forum on Education Abroad's *Standards of Good Practice, 6th edition*, although we do not mean to elevate these definitions over other terms and acronyms that usefully describe similar concerns.

"Intercultural learning" refers to the educational outcome that can be derived through facilitated encounters with otherness. Education abroad, exchange, internships, and service learning are usually designed to generate contact with difference engendered by national, cross-status, and cross-ethnic/racial boundaries. Insofar as the contact and reflection upon it are related to defined educational goals (which is not always the case), it constitutes intercultural learning. Elements of intercultural learning generally include consciousness of cultural identity, recognizing differences in cultural worldviews, and the development of adaptation strategies for living and working successfully in multicultural contexts.

The Milan think tank discussion attempted to approach the issue of bridging international and domestic cultural differences in a non-ideological way. To that end, the "ism" suffix for the terms "multicultural" and "intercultural" was avoided. Following the tenor of that discussion, this white paper will use the term "intercultural" in the descriptive sense of referring to the interaction of people who share different collective worldviews, aside from any intrinsic valuation of that activity. This usage assumes a definition of "culture" as the coordination of meaning and action maintained by groups of people operating within an identity boundary such as national, ethnic, racial, gender, social class, sexual orientation, or other such groupings. This kind of broad definition of culture that considers both international and intranational cultural boundaries is common in constructivist intercultural, anthropological, and sociological theory (e.g., Bennett, 2013a; Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Hall, 1979). Similarly, the term "multicultural" will be used in the descriptive sense of referring to contexts in which multiple worldviews are represented, such as a multicultural classroom. And again, any valuation of that situation will be considered separately from its actual existence. By separating descriptive from normative uses of these terms, the group felt that they could better identify pragmatic approaches to bridging international and domestic educational contexts without arguing the ideological merits of one context over the other.

The group took a similarly non-ideological definition of "otherness" in the tradition of phenomenology (e.g., Husserl, 1982) and existentialism (e.g., Sartre, 1943), and as represented more recently in Baudrillard's (2008) treatment of *alterity* as the necessary concomitant to "usness." In taking the relatively value-free position of

intersubjectivity rather than the more normative definition of "othering" as the intentional marginalization of others (Foucault, 2003), the group hoped to maintain a definitional base consistent with the assumption that cultural difference is, in itself, not bad or good – it is just different. Observing cultural differences should not be a subject of evaluation, but how people choose to engage those differences can certainly be evaluated. In fact, a major purpose of the paper is to suggest better ways of engaging otherness in both international and domestic educational contexts.

A concept that can bridge the contexts of education abroad and diversity, equity inclusion and justice (DEIJ) issues is that of *encounters with otherness*. Such encounters are sought and often facilitated as learning opportunities by education abroad programs. In domestic contexts, encounters with otherness may be more fraught; such encounters often are neither sought nor facilitated, and the very concept of "otherness" may seem prejudicial. But in both contexts, encountering cultural differences can be generally described in the developmental terms of ethnocentrism/ethnorelativism. When people ethnocentrically fail to humanize others, it applies equally to domestic or global diversity; in both cases, people ignore cultural otherness as irrelevant, denigrate others as inferior, or minimize otherness as trivial. In contrast, when people humanize others in a more ethnorelative way, in either domestic or international contexts, they affirm the value of others, attempt to engage in mutual cultural adaptation, and integrate cultural diversity into ethical action[2].

An additional dimension of bridging is that the issue of social justice is pertinent to both domestic and international contexts. Within a society, social justice issues of systemic and institutional inequity, exclusion, and exploitation may be related to racism and sexism. These same injustices can occur between societies in situations where colonialism and imperialism are factors. While these issues are particularly notable in service-learning forms of education abroad where the need for humility and avoidance of problematic power relations prevail, they are present whenever members of a dominant society are "making the world their classroom" (Ogden, 2007).

---

[2] This last phrase follows the definition of "integration" in the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, which is the basis of the preceding list of ethnocentric and ethnorelative perceptual conditions. The model posits that people can develop their perception in ways that allow increasingly complex experiences of otherness, culminating in the integration of ethnorelative perception into all relevant decision making (see Bennett, 2017).

Why is bridging international and domestic contexts important?

Integrating international and domestic contexts of intercultural learning makes sense both conceptually and practically. If we take *encountering otherness* as the core of intercultural learning, then it is clear that such encounters can just as easily occur within multicultural and diverse societies as across national borders (Tarozzi & Torres, 2016). But there are some different ways of approaching the two kinds of encounters that, if shared, might be mutually beneficial. For instance, national and/or regional cultural differences in the context of education abroad are usually considered interesting; learning about them is one of the motivations for engaging in intercultural learning. Host culture members associated with education abroad programs may even highlight these differences and try to make them accessible to program participants for various reasons such as national pride. Domestic cultural differences, on the other hand, are more likely to be considered problematic, particularly by those who continue to demand assimilation or seek to simply exclude others from equal participation in society. Motivated more by protecting their cultures than by sharing them, members of diverse domestic cultures may discourage mutual understanding. But, just as a goal of education abroad is to generate a kind of "global citizenship" that values global diversity, it would be a beneficial goal for domestic diversity education to look beyond power/equity issues and to additionally view domestic cultural differences as interesting and valuable assets to multicultural citizenship (Castiglioni & Bennett, 2018).

To engage otherness, we need to perceive others in complex ways. When we simplify others compared to ourselves, we attribute less humanity to them than we do to our own more complex selves – a kind of group-level *fundamental attribution error.* In domestic multicultural relations, the attribution error is that members of dominant cultural groups tend to experience themselves as "normal" in the society where they define what is normal. Being largely unconscious of that circularity, they tend to perceive cultural differences as simple deviations from normal – troublesome departures from some romanticized notion of homogeneity. Even if successful non-dominant groups have overcome disadvantages or faced difficult adaptive demands, those groups are nevertheless perceived in the relatively simplistic and patronizing terms of their relationship to the dominant group. But when members of dominant cultural groups sojourn in a different national culture, they are (with facilitation) less likely to experience themselves as "normal" and therefore more likely to engage otherness as difference rather than deviance.

Members of both dominant and non-dominant domestic groups still tend to stereotype otherness in international as well as domestic contexts. Stereotypes are applications of group generalizations (whether or not they are accurate) to every individual in the group, thereby simplifying individuals as being *representatives* of the group rather than as being unique *members* of the group (Bennett, 2013b). In terms of the venerable "contact hypothesis" (Allport, 1954; Amir, 1969), such stereotyping is the natural result of unfacilitated cross-cultural contact. However, international stereotypes tend to be a mix of romanticized positive images and demonized negative images that often vary over time, while cultural stereotypes within multicultural societies usually remain stubbornly negative, with just a few exceptions. The reason for this may be that group differences in a domestic context are more likely to be experienced as status differences, which the contact hypothesis predicts will be more likely to increase prejudice and exacerbate negative stereotypes. The avoidance of all stereotyping – positive or negative – is a common goal of intercultural learning in either context. An example of the facilitation of this process is described in Case Study (1).

Another rationale for bridging international and domestic approaches is to encourage recognition and study of contemporary as well as historical/political contexts of different populations. In the US, for example, non-dominant ethnic/racial groups may be associated with a history of slavery or low economic status, and, in many domestic contexts, immigrant groups may be exclusively associated with the politics or religion of their national heritage. However, sojourners outside their own countries are more likely to focus on contemporary national cultural worldviews and relegate historical context to the classroom. Participants in education abroad programs would benefit from being able to perceive their national-culture hosts in more complex historical and political contexts, and participants in domestic diversity programs would benefit from being able to appreciate the complexity of contemporary cultures rather than reducing otherness to simple manifestations of historical context.

In many cases, education abroad participants are accepting the hospitality of societies formerly colonized, invaded, or occupied by the participants' home societies. Through careful facilitation in those situations, members of dominant ethnic groups can learn important lessons about the effects of cultural oppression that they might be less open to in their own domestic context. Along those same lines, the simple distinction of dominant/non-dominant or oppressor/victim that sometimes accompanies domestic perceptions of otherness may be less clear in cross-national situations, where participants' membership in domestic non-dominant groups may be

heavily outweighed by their membership in an imperialistic national culture. This kind of conflict in identity affiliation and ascription is a rich learning opportunity for education abroad participants with direct relevance to domestic intercultural relations.

To derive the synergistic benefits of international/domestic approaches to encountering otherness, it is important for separate offices of international education and offices of domestic diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice to work together more closely. As discussed in greater detail later, and as exemplified in the Case Study (4) and (5), these two offices need to coordinate their logistic and educational resources for each to make their approach accessible to the other.

What are some objections and/or political considerations regarding this action?

Probably the main obstacle to bridging international and domestic forms of encounters with otherness is that they are perceived as intrinsically different things. It is certainly true that international sojourns, including education abroad, tend to be temporary and therefore can be accomplished with only temporary intercultural adaptation. Domestic encounters, on the other hand, demand ongoing, everyday adaptation.

We are using the term "adaptation" in contrast to "assimilation," where the latter means something like "substituting one cultural worldview with another" while the former means "negotiating meaning and action among multiple unique worldviews." While international sojourners sometimes naively or superficially assume assimilation as the goal of their cross-cultural experience (e.g., the non-European student who says, "I've become so French in my semester studying in Paris"), the typical goal of education abroad programs is to "turn cross-cultural contact into intercultural learning" (Bennett, 2012) by encouraging adaptation, not assimilation, to the intrinsically different worldviews being encountered. In domestic encounters with otherness, on the other hand, many dominant group members assume that non-dominant culture members are trying to assimilate to them, and sometimes non-dominant group members (particularly recent immigrants) share that goal. In those cases, there is no assumption of the integrity—i.e., wholeness, existence—of differing worldviews, and thus there is no pressure to employ adaptation of any kind. In contrast, intercultural adaptation in international situations is a foundational goal of education abroad, difficult though it may be to

achieve. In domestic multicultural contexts, the goal of diversity programs is more often simply to ameliorate abuses perpetrated in the pursuit of assimilation.

We are suggesting two responses to these substantial differences in international and domestic contexts of encountering otherness. On the international side, participants in education abroad need to be made more aware of the power/dominance issues that exist both historically and contemporarily among national societies and their cultures. On the domestic side, participants in diversity programs need to recognize that cultural differences in multicultural societies are not temporary conditions preceding group assimilation into a dominant mainstream. On the contrary, all cultures (including the dominant one) are different rivers of experience with their own integrity. The appropriate metaphor for a multicultural society (as it could be for global cultural diversity) is not one of tributary cultural streams flowing into a dominant cultural river, but one of an ecological system whose viability depends on the ongoing existence of diverse elements.

This metaphor suggests that the principles of intercultural adaptation can apply with equal effectiveness in both international and domestic culturally diverse environments. Both internationally and domestically, adaptation can counteract the ethnocentric assumption often made by dominant culture members that others want to (or should) be like them, that power can appropriately be used to achieve that end, and that if dominant cultures do not force assimilation on other cultures, then other cultures will forcibly replace them. For non-dominant cultural group members, adaptation is a strategy that allows for effective participation in a multicultural society while maintaining the integrity of their own cultural worldview. In the long run, if everyone saw themselves as involved in ecological mutual adaptation, the very idea of dominant and non-dominant cultures would become obsolete.

While it is widely agreed that education abroad would benefit from a more intentional focus on issues of equity and inclusion, there are some who argue that taking an intercultural approach to those issues would dilute a focus on social justice (e.g., Dervin, 2017). Insofar as social justice issues are defined purely in power terms, that is true. By bringing an international perspective into the conversation about social justice, contexts of group relations must be expanded beyond the histories of specific societies (Arshad, 2023); and by including an intercultural perspective, the mechanisms of group relations must extend beyond the simple exercise of power (Bennett, 2016). In support of these extensions, we argue that the focus of social justice efforts should not have been parochial in the first place; issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion are not solely the province of any one society. By understanding the

importance of DEIJ and the different forms it might take in different societies, the underlying mechanisms of social justice are clarified, not occluded. Using an international context also decenters whiteness, since DEIJ is equally relevant in societies without white dominance. And whatever form of social dominance might prevail, an intercultural approach adds the ideal of *mutual adaptation* as a reconciliation of otherwise intractable power confrontations.

What is the best approach to implementing a bridging action?

A consideration when planning implementation, and a potential criticism of combining intercultural learning with work on domestic diversity issues, is the difference between so-called transformational and developmental approaches. Intercultural learning is typically approached in a developmental way, with the rationale that some quality or condition needs to be enhanced for the outcome of the learning to be realized. The process of developmental enhancement is sequential, meaning that capacity is being built layer upon layer. In traditional pedagogical terms, capacity needs to be built with some combination of knowledge, attitude, and skills (KAS) to enable the exercise of some competence. For instance, the development of intercultural competence can be described as the sequential development of more complex perceptual organization of cultural differences (Bennett, 2017).

Developmental approaches contrast with transformational approaches that assume something like the maxim "disintegration precedes reintegration" or the idea that unlearning must occur before new learning can happen. For instance, transformational approaches generally assume that more equitable behavior cannot occur until prejudicial behavior is extinguished. In general, diversity programs that address equity, inclusion, and social justice issues use more transformational than developmental approaches. Diversity programs tend to expend a lot of effort in anti-racism and prejudice reduction, with the transformational rationale that once these inequitable behaviors have been eliminated, the alternative equitable behavior will naturally (or at least more easily) emerge. An extensive review of research into these kinds of programs has, however, shown only small effects in the size, duration, and applicability to dominant-culture participants of the programs' transformational goals (Paluk et. al., 2021).

An example of a transformational approach to education abroad would be that of giving participants a strongly disorienting dose of culture shock, with the idea that their ethnocentrism will be shaken loose and more ethnorelative or interculturally

sensitive behavior will emerge. While one can find some anecdotal reports of such transformations -- "the scales falling from the eyes" of students on education abroad programs, there is no evidence in international education literature of such transformations occurring commonly.

Transformational approaches have largely been abandoned by education abroad in favor of developmental approaches to intercultural learning. As illustrated in Case Study (1), most contemporary programs incorporate a combination of pre-departure and on-site facilitation with re-entry interventions that are designed to introduce and support a developmental sequence of intercultural learning activities. This model of training and guided experience has been extensively researched, and findings overwhelmingly support the proposition that it is successful in helping participants become more interculturally competent or sensitive or conscious (Vande Berg et al., 2012). If this developmental approach were used more commonly in domestic diversity programs, the measurable results might be that participants became less bigoted and more empathic, and there probably would be a cumulative effect of multiple exposures to guided experience, as there is in education abroad.

A criticism of using developmental approaches to DEIJ issues is that they are "incremental," a disadvantage when it is held that the basic principles of human rights are diluted by accepting results guided by what is possible rather than exclusively by what is right. We are taking the position that developmental is not incremental; it is just sequential. Most learning involves the accretion of layers of capacity, in the same way that reading skills build on knowledge of vocabulary and syntax, mathematical skills are based on a progression from arithmetic to calculus, and farming skills are based on generations of experience with seeds, ground conditions, and weather. Developmental models such as those of race and ethnic development (e.g., Cross & Fhagen-Smith, 1996) or the development of intercultural sensitivity or maturity (Bennett, 2017; King & Baxter Magolda, 2005) also assume that certain precursor conditions must be experienced or resolved before subsequent conditions of maturity can be realized. Diversity programs would probably benefit from more fully incorporating this developmental perspective common in intercultural learning programs.

What are the next steps in implementing the action?

First, offices of International Education or Education Abroad or Area Studies need to coordinate programming and resources with the variety offices and programs on campuses designed to support Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and/or Social Justice

and Safety to support the appropriate inclusion of DEIJ issues into education abroad preparation (including international student cultural orientation) and to support the use of more developmental intercultural learning approaches to DEIJ issues. The case studies we present are illustrative of ways that this might be done (and cautions about doing it).

Second, regardless of the state of official coordination between education abroad and DEIJ programming, professionals working in these fields can foster collaboration. This may occur through informal sharing of personnel in training initiatives, joint attendance at conferences and workshops, and encouragement of cross-disciplinary, cross-functional planning.

Third, existing resources that incorporate a combination of intercultural learning and DEIJ learning (such as the Intercultural Communication Workshop) need to be collected and made available in a single publicized location. A curator institution and person need to be identified for this purpose. The Forum on Education Abroad views this as an important contribution it can make to advance this work and will endeavor to provide a centralized point of access to relevant publications and resources.

Fourth, members of the think tank and others may want to write spin-off articles picking up on topics mentioned but not developed in this white paper. The criterion for such papers should be that they accept the basic premise of positive cooperation between intercultural learning and DEIJ laid out in the white paper. Of course, other scholars and practitioners might also want to write papers arguing against the consolidation suggested here. In those cases, the articles would be considered critical reflections rather than spin-offs.

Fifth, we should all be prepared to answer the question, "what are our programs really about?" As we all basically agreed in the think tank session, they are about "adaptation to the future." That future is, in the words of Carlo Rovelli, "approaching us as a cloud of possibilities, determined by the choices we make now". We see our job as educators to prepare our program participants with knowledge and experience that will help them make choices – choices that have as their goal the creation of equitable and socially just multicultural societies in an interconnected world. To that end we are suggesting a bridging of education abroad and DEIJ intentions to foster a broader intercultural learning approach to becoming viable creators and citizens of that future.

Case Studies

The following brief case studies are illustrative of some ways to implement the bridging of intercultural learning and DEIJ efforts. These are provided humbly and with caution, as all efforts to integrate must recognize local conditions, be mutually beneficial, and be respectful of the expertise of all professionals engaging in this important work.

Case Study (1)

Two study abroad programs leverage preparation, pedagogy, and practices to expose students to the core values driving DEI initiatives in U.S. higher education. These programs are designed to introduce the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) and its concept of worldviews as part of the preparation and early learning of all participants. Pedagogy and practice are designed to then integrate DEI concepts via the DMIS framework to anchor one of the programs' goals: to attain global awareness through knowledge and understanding of other cultures.

One of the programs begins in the U.S. when all students are introduced to DMIS in one of their classes. DMIS concepts are tied into subsequent lectures and discussions and are revisited as students engage in experiential learning activities such as a Civil Rights Bike Tour. For the program that does not begin in the U.S., worldview and similar concepts are referenced in orientation, and then introduced formally early in the program abroad.

Abroad, the learning outcomes for one course central to the programs include:
- Develop critical thinking skills and apply them to concepts and debates around identity, globalization, and notions of globalism and global citizenship.
- Understand and analyze socio-cultural and political developments and current societal debates in France and Europe and be capable of considering these phenomena in cross-cultural, cross-regional and cross-national contexts.

Program site visits and active learning are designed to help participants:
- Learn about minorities in different countries.
- Explore how other societies have dealt with contested parts of their historical experience.
- Understand how the world sees us.
- Learn about the expatriate/exile experience of black Americans.

Facilitated site visits in one or both programs include: History of Immigration Museum (Paris), Africa Museum (Brussels), Holocaust Memorial and Jewish Museum (Berlin), homestays, presentation on the Roma (Bucharest), and Black Paris Tours.

An example of how site visits address the points above is well illustrated in one group's time in Paris. First, the concept of identity was activated on multiple levels facilitating critical thinking and historical reflection about how the meaning of identity and alterity are shaped by cultural contexts. In the spirit of mindful travel, the visit to Paris was organized around the theme of "French identity through three prisms": (1) The 'Official and the Revered'-- with site visits to the French Assemblée Nationale (the French parliament with an overview of how the political system functions in France) and the Panthéon (France's 'secular temple' to individuals considered to have contributed to the greatness, where students were exposed to the life of legendary Josephine Baker, who had been inducted the previous year, becoming the first African American woman and first US citizen and naturalized French citizen to be 'pantheonized'). (2) 'Entrepreneurial France' included a visit to the world's largest incubator start-up campus; and (3) the third prism of identity – 'multicultural and post-colonial France' featuring a visit to the History of Immigration Museum and the Black Paris Tour. The Black Paris Tour was preceded by a two hour-long deep dive into African influences in the development of Paris through the evolution of the French American relationship highlighting the transatlantic slave trade, the role of the US and France in Haiti, and the heroic figure Toussaint l'Overture. In a day-long walking tour of Paris, students spent the better part of the day visiting sites, monuments and venues representing key periods of history allowing examination of the ways in which race, race relations and the quest for equality and human dignity played out in various neighborhoods in Paris. Experiencing the process of exploring the past and present through different cultural lenses and national perspectives enhances the capacity of participants to become more empathetic, open-minded learners.

This case study illustrates how two programs emphasize the value of intercultural learning as a tool to develop capacities useful within participants' own society as well as internationally by including learning outcomes that foster the development of intercultural sensitivity and ethnorelative perspective for navigating difference, and by employing practices that encompass historical and current domestic and international issues.

Case Study (2)

An international office has been working towards centering justice in all that they do. At the core of this work is exploring the intersection between intercultural and global learning and diversity, equity and inclusion, work that has often been siloed. Using Kathryn Sorrell's Intercultural Praxis model (Sorrells, 2021) as a framework to underpin their efforts, they are simultaneously reflecting on their own positionality and critically examining and shifting their practice and policy, teaching and learning efforts and the professional development and training of staff and faculty on campus and abroad. This case study will focus specifically on the training and professional development they have been doing with their global team to commit to equity and justice in their education abroad programs. This development has asked staff and faculty abroad to be a bridge for students and their new local contexts – asking both faculty and staff to shift their perspectives and to facilitate the growth and learning of students. Faculty and staff have developed new programming and curriculum to bridge new contexts, histories, and perspectives with the goal of helping students critically interrogate what is similar and what is different across cultures within a DEI framework.

Since spring 2020, the international office has been actively promoting cross collaboration, exchange, and education on DEI themes among its staff members abroad. Self-reflections from staff and faculty demonstrate a commitment to making real change toward inclusion, equity and justice happen and the impact of new curriculum and programming on the student experience. One director noted the evolution of her own thinking and its impact on orientation, programming, and interactions with local communities. Exploring how DEI fits within the framework of students' intercultural experience as opposed to trying to shoehorn a US-based/influenced "JEDI" approach that students should take when analyzing or living through certain situations has, she reports, helped students better understand the realities of what may occur during their program depending on the region in Spain where they are studying and also appreciate how culture constantly shifts and moves, including around identity and marginalization. Another director who teaches a course on food insecurity specifically states that the professional development work around DEI issues he was part of with colleagues during the pandemic years significantly helped him develop a new sense of and approach to international education. He claims that his personal approach to teaching Italian Studies has evolved to include progressively more and more opportunities for students to reflect on their identity and positionality as North American students who navigate a different culture and speak a different language. Social justice, equity and equality,

race and ethnicity etc. have become important lenses through which students can learn about Italian culture and progress linguistically while abroad.

Case Study (3)

An ongoing initiative in an academic college in collaboration with a network on race and inclusion in international education exemplifies the benefit of an intentional and purposeful connection between research and practice towards embedding inclusivity in study abroad and internationalization policy and initiatives.

Demonstrating the importance of leadership investment on the policy side, the current exercise is promoted by a member of the university leadership with a remit for internationalization strategy development on campus and abroad, working closely with the international office. On the research side, the collaboration uses an empirical-informed framework for international students' rationale for study abroad within four dimensions–educational experiential aspirational and economic (Fakunle, 2021)—as a driver for action to promote inclusive internationalization, taking cognizance of the human dimension.

In a departure from the common research focus on economic and educational aspects of study abroad, the framing question for the exercise is: to what extent are the experiential and aspirational goals of students, as intended recipients of education abroad initiatives, included in existing policy and initiatives? This is premised on a recognition that, while study abroad offers opportunities for intercultural encounters with diverse people, the institution has a key role in establishing policies and actions that explicitly intersect principles regarding equality, diversity and inclusion with internationalization policy and strategy. Since the encounter with cultural and ethnic diversity is a major aspect of study abroad, the aim of the current work is to operationalize internationalization initiatives to promote an inclusive environment that recognizes and values diversity as strength and that provides an experiential learning opportunity for all.

Initial findings have identified activities with a diversity and inclusive ethos across the university. The students' study abroad rationale framework thus provides a mechanism for assessing, capturing, and sharing good practice. Considering criticism that internationalization activities are 'very general and thus offer little practical guidance' (EACEA, 2020, p. 124), the framework provides a useful tool to operationalize internationalization activities. This case study underscores the value of collaboration between study abroad practitioners, administrators, researchers, and

university leadership to inform holistic and inclusive policy and actions that will impact all dimensions of students' experiences on the campus and abroad.

Case Study (4)

One university has a staff position shared between the international office and the diversity office. It is jointly funded by both offices. The person in the role liaises between leadership in these units, ensuring that non-traditional and/or underrepresented students have access to education abroad programs. Their target audience expands beyond students of color, ranging from students from Appalachia to women in STEM and including students who identify as African as well as those identifying as African American or Black. A major part of the role is to communicate that education abroad is accessible for these students and should not be viewed by students, their families, or faculty as exceptional or extra-curricular. One successful approach has been to share with students how education abroad can positively impact their future, as well as stressing how it will benefit them in the present. Financial support is available from the diversity office to defray the cost of student travel, and it is strategically targeted to less-represented, high-promise students through the distribution of "planning" scholarships. Both are specifically for diversity office scholars who are planning to travel on an approved international office program during their undergraduate career. Applicants do not need to have identified a program to be awarded; they can use the funds at any point up to their final semester of senior year when a program has been selected.

Another example of creative collaboration is a partnership between the diversity office, the international office, and the college of arts and sciences that offers a course co-led by the history department and the diversity office. The course is described as, "exploring the ways in which the experience of modern colonialism helped to shape the cultures of two countries: France, which had the world's second-largest overseas empire between 1830 and 1962, and Morocco, which was colonized by France between 1912 and 1956". During two weeks in France and one week in Morocco, students focus on how these two countries, one largely Catholic and the other largely Muslim but each with significant religious, ethnic, and racial minorities, have approached the challenges of practicing inclusivity and respecting diversity in the past and today. The course is successful because the faculty leaders are willing to include DEI topics and are comfortable with relevant, sometimes challenging, conversations. It benefits from a significant degree of faculty mentorship through the history department and a student cohort that is a blend of both diversity office and scholars from the college of arts and sciences, who may not be from less represented

student groups. The resulting discussion of identity and privilege through the comparative lenses of US and Francophone racial politics is a critical part of the learning experience for the entire group.

Case Study (5)

Recognizing the complementarity and overlap of their goals, an international office and diversity office share a robust partnership. The partnership began as a collegial effort to support each other's missions, which were seen as complementary. The partnership has evolved over the last 3 years to recognize the tremendous overlap between these missions, and to take a wider lens that sees the work of both offices as part and parcel of the same mission: to help humans navigate difference in ways that make positive meaning of that difference, that promote belonging, and that improve the human condition.

This partnership evolved as participants from both offices worked together, as the staff participated in each other's programs, and the units offered collaborative programming. Some pivotal programs are:

1. Inclusive leaders program: This program aims to build a community of leaders whose impact transforms the culture towards inclusive excellence and does so with a broad approach that aims to broaden perspective and focus on self- work as necessary to effect change in our community. As a pilot project, international office staff completed the program as a cohort and allowed non-managers to participate. After the first cohort, previous participants and the cohort attended a follow-up workshop to support moving from learning to practice, and to support the application of this practice in international education. International office staff continue to participate in this program (offered annually), and in subsequent offerings for this growing community of Culture Champions.

2. Facilitated reading group – A diversity office leader served as facilitator for international office staff to engage in a reading group using *The Racial Healing Handbook* by Dr. Anneliese Singh (2019).

3. Implicit bias workshops offered to international office staff.

4. A pilot program in 2022 using the Intercultural Development Inventory to assess staff intercultural competence and train staff and faculty to facilitate forward-leaning conversations and actions directed toward growth and belonging.

5. International office staff participate in the planning of the annual Diversity Symposium, and the inclusion of international diversity issues in the content of the symposium.

Working together has allowed staff in both offices to learn about the methods and tools of both professional areas, to develop some common vocabulary, and to incorporate the concepts into each unit's work, programs, and service models.

References

Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. New York: Addison- Wesley.

American Council on Education. (2022). *Intersections of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion and Internationalization: A Framing Guide*. https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/DEI-IZN-Framing-Guide.pdf

Amir, Y. (1969). Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. *Psychological Bulletin, 1969, 71,* 319–343.

Arshad, R. (2023, January 13) Is there a tipping point before we pivot collectively and decisively for racial justice? *Race.Ed.* https://www.race.ed.ac.uk/is-there-a-tipping-point-before-we-pivot-collectively-and-decisively-for-racial-justice/

Baudrillard, J & Guillaume, M. (2008). *Radical alterity.* Semiotext(e)

Bennett, M. (2013a). *Basic concepts of intercultural communication: Paradigms, principles, & practices.* Intercultural Press.

Bennett, M. (2013b). Stereotypes/generalizations. In C. Cortes (Ed.) *Multicultural America: A multimedia encyclopedia.* Sage.

Bennett, M. (2016). The value of cultural diversity: rhetoric and reality. *SpringerPlus 5*, 897. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40064-016-2456-2

Bennett, M. (2017). Developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In Y. Kim (Ed), *The International Encyclopedia of Intercultural Communication*. Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118783665.ieicc0182

Bennett, M. J. (2012, February 15). Turning cross-cultural contact into intercultural learning. *Proceedings of the Universidad 2012 8th International Congress on Higher Education*. Havana, Cuba: The University for Sustainable Development. www.idrinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Turning-cross-cultural-contact.pdf

Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Anchor.

Castiglioni, I. & Bennett, M (2018). Building capacity for intercultural citizenship, *Open Journal of Sociology, 6*(3), 229-241. https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2018.63016

Cross, W. E., Jr., & Fhagen-Smith, P. (1996). Nigrescence and ego identity development: Accounting for differential Black identity patterns. In P. B. Pedersen, J. G. Draguns, W. J. Lonner, & J. E. Trimble (Eds.), *Counseling across cultures* (pp. 108–123). Sage Publications.

Dervin, F. (2017). *Critical interculturality.* Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Education, Audiovisual & Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). (2020). *The European Higher Education Area in 2020: Bologna Process Implementation Report*. EACEA. https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/sites/default/files/ehea_bologna_2020.pdf

Fakunle, O. (2021). Developing a framework for international students' rationales for studying abroad, beyond economic factors (2021). *Policy Futures in Education*, 19(6), 671-690. https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210320965066

Fakunle, O., Kalinga, C., & Lewis, V. (2022). Internationalization and Decolonization in UK Higher Education: Are We There Yet? *International Higher Education*, (110), 25–27. https://ejournals.bc.edu/index.php/ihe/article/view/14993

Foucault, M. (2003). *Society must be defended: Lectures at the Collège de France*, 5. Picador.

Goldstein, S., B. (2022). *Intercultural Learning through Study Abroad.* Cambridge University Press.

Goznik, N. & Hamir, H. (2022). *A house where all belong: Redesigning education abroad for inclusive excellence.* Forum on Education Abroad

Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad 36(1)   Bennett et al.

Hall, E.T. (1977). *Beyond culture.* Anchor.

Husserl, E. (1982). Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy (translation by F. Kersten). Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

King, P. & Baxter Magolda, M. (2005). A developmental model of intercultural maturity. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*(6), 571-592. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2005.0060

Lorenz, D. (2013). Dream Weaving as Praxis: Turning Culturally Inclusive Education and Anti-Racist Education into a Decolonial Pedagogy. *In Education*, 19(2), 30-56.

Melaku, T., Beeman, A., Smith, D. & Johnson, W. (2020, November-December). Be a better ally. *Harvard Business Review.* https://hbr.org/2020/11/be-a-better-ally

Ogden, A. (2007). The view from the veranda: Understanding today's colonial student. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 15*(1), 35–56. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v15i1.215

Paluk, A., Porat, R., Clark, C., & Green, D. (2021). Prejudice reduction: Progress and challenges. *Annual Review of Psychology. 72*(1), 533-560. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-071620-030619

Sartre, J-P. (1984). *Being and Nothingness*. Trans. Hazel E. Barnes. New York: Washington Square Press.

Singh, A. A. (2019). *The racial healing handbook*. New Harbinger Publications.

Sorrells, K. (2021). *Intercultural Communication: Globalization and Social Justice* (3rd ed.). Sage

Sweeney, K. (2013). Inclusive excellence and underrepresentation of students of color in study abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 23, 1-21. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v23i1.326

Tarozzi, M. & Torres, C. (2016). *Global citizenship education and the crises of multiculturalism: Comparative perspectives*. Bloomsbury Publishing

Vande Berg, M., Paige, M., & Lou, K. H. (Eds.) (2012). *Students learning abroad: What our students are learning, what they're not, and what we can do about it*. Stylus

Author Biography

Milton Bennett is the executive director of the Intercultural Development Research Institute (Oregon, USA and Milan, Italy).

Keshia Abraham is the principal of Abraham Consulting Agency (Miami, FL, USA).

Omolabake Fakunle is Chancellor's Fellow and Director, Equality, Diversity, The University of Edinburgh, Moray House School of Education and Sport (Scotland, UK).

Julie Ficarra is Associate Professor of the Practice at the Department of Global Development at Cornell University (Syracuse, NY, USA).

Amy Henry is Executive Director of International Education at Georgia Institute of Technology (Atlanta, GA, USA)

Marissa Lombardi is Executive Director of Training, Programs and Services at The Forum on Education Abroad (Carlisle, PA, USA).

Quinton Redcliffe is Director, Diversion and Inclusion at CIEE on International Educational Exchange (Cape Town, South Africa).

Melissa Torres is President and CEO of The Forum on Education Abroad (Carlisle, PA, USA).

Barry Van Driel is President of the International Association for Intercultural Education (The Hague, Netherlands)