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ABSTRACT

This study examined the orientations to cultural difference of sojourner educators in the Foundation Program at Qatar University to determine if orientations were correlated with select demographic and experiential variables, including gender, age, time overseas, education level, formative region, ethnic minority status, job position, length of time in Qatar, intercultural marriage, default language, formal teacher training, and overseas development organization experience.

This study used a sequential mixed-method design. Perceived and Developmental Orientations were measured using the Intercultural Development Inventory© (V.3), which produced a measure of each respondent’s orientation to cultural difference. Focus group interviews were conducted to engage participants in explaining and interpreting the findings. Five focus groups of three to six participants each were conducted.

Most of the teachers were found to operate from within the transitional orientation of Minimization, although individual scores ranged from Denial to Adaptation. On average, the educators were found to overestimate their orientations by 31 points. A positive correlation between orientation and formative region was found, with participants from North America showing the highest orientation. Statistically significant differences emerged for orientations when comparing Middle East and North African (MENA) and North American formative regions.

Formative region was found to account for 4.8% of the variance in orientation and is a significant fit of the data. Focus groups participants speculated that (a) core differences regarding multiculturalism in MENA and North American cultures help explain the results, (b) aspects of the workplace culture and both the broader MENA and local Qatari culture encourage a sense of exclusion, and (c) external events further complicate cross-cultural relations. The study findings add to the literature by providing
baseline orientation data on sojourner educators in post-secondary education in the GCC region, and by confirming some of the findings of similar studies.

The study provides practitioners with suggestions for staffing and professional development. Future research should focus on the measurement of orientations in broader samples of educators, changes in orientation over time in Qatar and other cultural contexts, differences in orientation among short-term vs. long-term expatriates, the impact of employment systems and societal structures on orientations in sojourner educators, the impact of educator orientation to cultural difference on student achievement, and the design of effective cross-cultural professional development for educators.
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Definitions

Seventeen specific terms are integral to this dissertation. These terms and their definitions relevant to the present research are:

1. **Culture:** [Subconscious and changeable] learned patterns of behavior, values, assumptions, and meaning, which are shared to varying degrees of interest, importance, and awareness with members of a group that primarily inform and guide their worldview. Culture is the story of reality that individuals and groups value and accept as a guide for organizing their lives (Seelye, 1996, p. 9).

2. **Cultural Disengagement (CD):** A sense of disconnection or exclusion from one’s own cultural group. While assessed by the IDI, it is not considered to be one of the developmental orientations because it is experiential rather than developmental.

3. **Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS):** A model that envisions ICS as a spectrum of development wherein “individuals can generally progress from ethnocentrism, where they experience events in their own culture as central to reality, to ethnorelativism, where they can experience events in the context of their own and other cultures” (Hammer & Bennett, 2001, p. 13).

4. **Ethnocentric:** A stage within the DMIS that involves the perception that “one’s own culture is experienced as central to reality in some way” (Hammer & Bennett, 1998, p. 12). This is synonymous with the “Monocultural” stage on the IDC. It represents a simple orientation towards cultural difference.

5. **Ethnorelative:** A stage within the DMIS that involves the perception that “one’s own culture is experienced in the context of other cultures” (Hammer & Bennett, 1998, p. 12). This is synonymous with the “Intercultural” stage on the IDC. It represents a more complex orientation towards cultural difference.

6. **Faculty:** “The whole teaching staff of a college, university or school. Orig. and chiefly U.S.” (“Faculty,” 2012, para. 1).

7. **Formative Years:** The period of life from birth to age 18 years.

8. **Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC):** a “political and economic alliance of six Middle Eastern countries—Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates, Qatar, Bahrain, and Oman” established in May 1981 (“Gulf Cooperation Council [GCC],” 2013, para. 1). Its purpose is to “achieve unity among its members based on their common objectives and their similar political and cultural identities, which are rooted in Islamic beliefs” (para. 1).


10. **Intercultural Sensitivity (ICS):** “The ability to discriminate and experience relevant cultural differences” (Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003, p. 2). Intercultural sensitivity is the complexity of one’s perception of cultural difference. Higher sensitivity “refers to more complex perceptual
discriminations of such differences” (Bennett, 2009, p. 8). In this work orientation to cultural difference will be used as a synonym to ICS.

11. **Intercultural Development Continuum (IDC):** “A continuum that identifies orientations (denial, polarization, defense, reversal, minimization, acceptance, and adaptation) toward cultural differences that range from perspectives, which are more monocultural to more intercultural mindsets” (Hammer, 2009). The IDC was developed based on the theoretical groundwork of the DMIS.

12. **Intercultural Development Inventory© (IDI):** A paper or computer-based psychometric tool that “is a reliable measure that . . . reasonably, although not exactly, approximates the developmental model of intercultural sensitivity” (Paige, Jacobs-Cassuto, Yershova, & DeJaeghere, 2003, p. 467).

13. **Middle East and North Africa (MENA):** There is ambiguity as to what constitutes MENA. For this research it will be understood to be roughly synonymous with the greater Middle East, excluding Israel and Iran. For this research the MENA countries will be understood to be: Algeria, Bahrain, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Yemen, United Arab Emirates, Libya, Morocco, Oman, the Palestinian Territories, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Tunisia.

14. **Othering:** “Transforming a difference into otherness so as to create an in-group and an out-group” (“Other/otherness,” 2008).

15. **Orientation:** One’s attitude towards cultural difference, described based on level of complexity (Hammer, 2012a), a synonym for ICS described above.

16. **Orientation Gap (OG):** The gap between perceived orientation and developmental orientation.

17. **Sojourner Educators:** Educators who travel from country to country working in international schools, local schools and universities. Some educators make a career of such a lifestyle, and may live and work in a large number of countries during a career.
Chapter 1: Introduction

"Without mutual knowledge there can be no mutual understanding; without understanding, there can be no trust and respect; without trust, there can be no peace, only the danger of conflict. This means we have to be willing and able to familiarize ourselves with the way people of other cultures think and perceive the world around them, but without losing our own standpoint in the process." Roman Herzog, former German president.

Over the last decade, a substantial shift has taken place in the education sector in the Middle East: the burgeoning market of foreign campuses. Qatar is the home of branch campuses of six American universities (Georgetown, Virginia Commonwealth, Texas A&M, Northwestern, Carnegie Mellon, and Weil Cornell); one French university (HEC Paris); and one Canadian university (the University of Calgary). In the United Arab Emirates, there are already branch campuses of Michigan State University, New York University, Australia’s University of Wollongong, Russia’s St. Petersburg State University of Engineering and Economics University, and the United Kingdom’s Exeter University. Talks also are underway for a branch of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Moreover, the growth of foreign campuses is big business: Qatar alone spends more than $2 billion dollars annually to fully fund and support these foreign universities (Krieger, 2008). Given the effort and money that regional governments are investing in importing higher education into the region, partly to develop knowledge societies and partly for reasons of prestige, there is no reason to believe that this growth will stop anytime soon.

The spread of foreign campuses has led to many changes in higher education in the Middle East—notably a dramatic increase in the GCC of sojourner educators, defined as educators who travel from country to country working in international schools, local schools, and universities (Earley, Ang, & Tan, 2006). To function effectively, foreign educators need to master certain skills due to the close interaction with host country colleagues and students that is required by the position (Zhao, Khu,
One of these skills is intercultural sensitivity (ICS), understood in this research as “the ability to discriminate and experience relevant cultural differences” (Hammer et al., 2003, p. 2), or in other words, one’s orientation to cultural difference.

It can be understood that, in the present research, ICS is the complexity of one’s perception of cultural difference. Higher sensitivity “refers to more complex perceptual discriminations of such differences” (Bennett, 2009, p. 8). These discriminations of difference are what is meant by orientation to difference.

Other researchers have defined ICS slightly differently than how the term is used in this work. For example, Chen and Starosta (2005) state the ICS refers to respect for cultural difference, adaptability, open-mindedness, and understanding others’ needs. It can be seen though that the definition of ICS as used here is an integral sub-component of ICS definitions such as Chen and Starosta’s.

No matter how it is defined, ICS is a necessary forerunner to intercultural competence (ICC), defined in this study as "the capability to shift cultural perspective and adapt behavior to cultural commonality and difference” (Hammer, 2012a, p.116). This definition includes the idea of deep cultural self-awareness, deep understanding of the experiences of people from different cultural communities in perceptions, values, beliefs, behavior and practices, and finally, the ability to adapt—or bridge—across various cultural differences (Hammer, 2012a). It is this first sub-component of ICC—cultural self-awareness, as measured through one’s orientation to cultural difference—that will be the focus of this study.

This study does not consider the ICC of the participants, but instead narrowly focuses on their orientations towards cultural difference. However, a familiarity with the differing understandings of, and approaches to, both ICS and ICC is necessary in order to understand the context in which this research is situated. It will, therefore, be necessary to discuss ICS and ICC in some detail in later sections of this work.
Previous studies have sought to identify predictors of ICS, in both a sojourner and home environment (Ayas, 2006; Conrad, 2006; Fretheim, 2007; Helmer, 2007; Kelso, 2006; Lai, 2006; Park, 2006; Pederson, 1998; Straffon, 2001; Westrick & Yuen, 2007). Studies by Fretheim (2007) and Westrick and Yuen (2007) found higher ICS among respondents who had spent time outside of their own cultures. These findings are consistent with Allport’s (1979) Contact Hypothesis, which posits that close interaction among people of different cultures, under the four conditions of equal status, common goals, intergroup cooperation and social sanction by law or custom, leads to a greater cross-cultural understanding (Pettigrew, 1998). Thus, it might be assumed that sojourner educators may hold attitudes that are conducive to ICS and ICC due to their unique cross-cultural context.

In contrast, Furnham and Bochner (1986) and Norton, Frost, and Ariely (2007) posit a Reverse Contact Hypothesis, wherein close contact between members of different cultures may lead to a hardening of attitudes and a reinforcement of stereotypes. Stier (2011) explained, “there are people who become more prejudiced and hostile as their interaction with strangers intensifies” (para. 3). Once dissimilarity is noticed, subsequent contact is interpreted as further evidence of dissimilarity, leading to a self-sustaining process of stereotyping. These authors contend that merely participating in another culture does not increase one’s ICS.

Kelly (1963) elaborated that it is possible that “a person can be witness to a tremendous parade of episodes [while participating in another culture] and yet, if he fails to keep making something out of them . . . he gains little in the way of experience from having been around when they happened” (p. 73). In the worst-case scenario, failing to reflect on one’s intercultural interactions can reinforce stereotypes and lead to an even stronger focus on one’s own culture. Due to the rising number of sojourner
educators and the importance of ICS and ICC to these educators’ effectiveness, it is necessary to understand what factors are associated with or predict these competencies.

There has been extensive research on some populations that work or study abroad, such as “expatriates in business industries, expatriates’ spouses, government personnel, physicians, immigrants and refugees” (Lai, 2006, p. 1). This research likely is inspired by the fact that expatriate staff are expensive to recruit, and failure (defined as failing to accomplish the organization’s intended goals or leaving the assignment) can be a significant financial burden for the hiring organization (Graf, 2004).

Despite the large number of studies on expatriate staff, research on sojourning educators is relatively uncommon (DeJaeghere & Zhang, 2008; Fretheim, 2007; Helmer, 2007; Lai, 2006; Lundgren, 2007; Westrick & Yuen, 2007), particularly with regard to cultural adaptation and ICS or ICC. There is a particular scarcity of research pertaining to sojourner educators in the MENA region: only one such study (Helmer, 2007) was identified through examination of the literature for the present study. Helmer examined elementary educators’ ICS and its relation to the educators’ referral of English language learners for special education services. This study was performed on 40 elementary faculty members in an international elementary school in Egypt (see chapter 2 for a more complete discussion).

In summary, several authors have identified ICS and ICC as critical competencies (Deardorff, 2006; Zhao et al., 2005); however, it is unclear what factors contribute to ICS and ICC. Moreover, research is lacking on ICS among sojourner educators—particularly those working in the MENA countries. This gap is of concern given the growing presence of foreign campuses in the MENA region. The present study aimed to help fill this gap.
Purpose and Research Questions

This study investigated orientations to cultural difference among sojourner educators in the foundation programs at Qatar University, and examined the associations between these orientations and various demographic and intercultural background characteristics of the educators. The background and demographic variables examined in this study were selected based on a review of earlier literature of ICS and ICC within educational contexts (Fretheim, 2007; Helmer, 2007; Straffon, 2001; Westrick & Yuen, 2007). Specifically, the study re-examined some of the previously researched variables and also examined additional variables not previously examined in this context. The studied variables included educator age, gender, educational level, position (e.g., administration, supervisor, instructor), area of residence in formative years, length of residence in Qatar, length of overseas experience, intercultural marriage status, ethnic minority status, teacher training, and service in an overseas development organization such as the Peace Corps or VSO.

Three research questions guided this study:

1. To what extent does perceived ICS and measured ICS differ among educators working in the Foundation Program as measured by the IDI?

2. Is there a correlation between the educators’ demographic or intercultural background variables and the measured ICS?

3. To what extent do the quantitative results align with the observations and experiences of the sojourner educators and how do they make sense of the results?

This study used a sequential mixed methods design and was conducted in two phases. Phase 1 involved quantitative assessment of the educators’ orientations to cultural difference and utilized a correlational design to assess the correlation between educators’ demographic and intercultural background characteristics and their ICS. Phase 2 involved qualitative focus groups of educators for the purpose of confirming the survey results and gathering initial insights and explanations about the results.
Hypotheses

According to Trochim (2006), a hypothesis is a specific statement of prediction. Based on a review of the literature (Bayles, 2009; DeJaeghere & Cao, 2009; Fretheim, 2007; Helmer, 2007; Lai, 2006), 13 hypotheses were developed for this study:

Hypothesis 1. The educators’ mean perceived ICS is higher than educators’ mean measured ICS.

Hypothesis 2. Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with gender.

Hypothesis 3. Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with age.

Hypothesis 4. Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with time overseas.

Hypothesis 5. Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with education level.

Hypothesis 6. Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with formative region.

Hypothesis 7. Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with ethnic minority status.

Hypothesis 8. Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with job position.

Hypothesis 9. Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with length of time in Qatar.

Hypothesis 10. Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with intercultural marriage status.

Hypothesis 11: Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with default language.

Hypothesis 12. Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with formal teacher training.
Hypothesis 13. Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with overseas development organization experience.

Study Setting

The programme in this study is located in Qatar University, the only national public university in Qatar. The programme was established in 2004 based on its predecessor, the Foundation Unit. At the time of this study, approximately 3,200 students were enrolled. The students are enrolled in various streams of English language education. The majority of the students are in their late teens or early 20s. Student data for the autumn 2012 semester (when this research was conducted) was not available at the time of this writing. Profile data for spring 2012 show that 77% of the students were female and 23% male, while 56% were Qatari and 44% were non-Qatari (Qatar University, 2013).

At the time of this study, the program employed 106 faculty and staff (103 sojourners, 3 Qatari nationals), while one Director and two assistants administered the programme. The programme handbook states that “Two thirds (sic) of the faculty come from English speaking countries (United States, Canada, United Kingdom, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand) and one-third are non-native speakers of English” (Qatar University, 2012). A more detailed breakdown of the faculty members’ countries of origin is not available. A gender breakdown from the organization was not available; however, a manual count indicated that 47% of the faculty was female and 53% was male.

Significance

This study provides baseline data for orientation to cultural difference and its relation to various demographic factors among instructors in a foundation program at a GCC university. These data may lead to discussion within the university and organizational self-reflection. For example, this study’s results may help school
management determine whether the program’s faculty reflects the mission statement’s values, or whether staff development programs are needed to meet the program’s goals. Determining whether the educators themselves hold the values that the school wishes to inculcate in the students is important. If the faculty do not hold the values that the school wishes to foster, it is likely that they will face difficulty in achieving any internationalization goals that an institution may have. This study’s results could lead to an internal debate as to the purpose of the institution and whether internationalization is being achieved. Intercultural education (together with human rights, education for democratic citizenship, and peace education) can be seen as a critical component of a democratic and pluralistic society (IAIE & UNESCO, 1999).

A greater understanding of cultural relations will help teachers to help students. For example, greater cross-cultural sensitivity is believed to be associated with helping diverse groups of students realize their full potential. Research by DiStefano and Maznevski (2000) shows that culturally poorly managed multicultural teams underperform mono-cultural teams, but that culturally well managed multi-cultural teams greatly outperform mono-cultural teams. Based on this research, I speculate that many teachers are not culturally maximizing the performance of diverse classrooms.

As mentioned earlier, effective selection of expatriate staff is a major concern within the context of this study. Expatriate staff are expensive to recruit, and turnover before contract completion can be a significant financial burden. When talking about expatriated business personnel, Graf (2004) found that:

Using a broad definition of failure (i.e., the expatriate assignment did not accomplish the goals of the company or the expatriate broke off the assignment), global failure rates have been estimated at 16–40% (Shaffer et al., 1999), 20–40% (Solomon, 1996), 30–50% (Black, Mendenhall, & Oddou, 1991), and 50% (Allerton, 1997). (p. 667)

It has been estimated that each expatriate failure costs between $200,000 and $1.2 million (Solomon, 1996; Swaak, 1995). Although these figures were based on
expatriate turnover in a business environment and the cost of failed expatriate teachers likely is not as high, such turnover still is of concern. In addition, Bennett, Aston, and Colquhoun (2000, cited in Graf & Harland, 2005) state:

In addition to monetary costs, failed expatriate efforts can also lead to negative organizational outcomes such as delayed productivity, poor relationships with local nationals, negative perceptions of the company, difficulty for expatriate successors, and ineffective repatriation. (p. 46)

In reaction to these high failure rates and their associated costs, the business community has been researching whether culture-specific skills or culture-general skills are better predictors of expatriate employee success (e.g., Boles, 1997; Swaak, 1995). Supporters of the culture-general argument, such as Kealey and Ruben (1983), describe the “ideal” expatriate as:

an individual who is truly open to and interested in other people and their ideas, capable of building relationships of trust among people. He or she is sensitive to the feelings and thoughts of another, expresses respect and positive regard for others, and is non-judgmental. Finally, he or she tends to be self-confident, is able to take initiative, is calm in situations of frustration and of ambiguity, and is not rigid. The individual also is a technically or professionally competent person. (p. 165)

Self-reflection and an understanding of one’s own culture and worldview are musts if learners want an understanding of the process of intercultural development, rather than a mere understanding of content (Brown, Parham, & Yonker, 1996; York, 1994). The research and tool in this study can be seen as supporting Sanford’s (1966) Challenge/Support Hypothesis. This hypothesis will be familiar to any educator, and posits that without enough challenge learners are bored and do not learn effectively, but with too much challenge learners are overwhelmed and do not learn effectively. The most effective teaching and facilitation challenge a learner without overwhelming him or her.

Too often, multicultural education and professional development programs, no matter how well meaning, are not appropriately aimed at the worldview from within which the recipient is operating. Some participants may be bored, while others may be
apprehensive. By using a diagnostic tool such as the IDI, professional development can be effectively created, targeted, assessed, and professional development efficacy measured.

Cultural differences exist in the vast majority of educational institutions today, and the skillset and competencies of an effective educator include such culture related skills as cross-cultural communication, sensitivity to differing culturally informed value and beliefs, and the ability to interpret interactions from the viewpoint of the culturally different. Pierson (2010) tells us that:

To be a citizen of the twenty-first century increasingly means being a citizen of the world. Today’s global marketplace is defined by diversity, and intercultural competence is critical to navigating it successfully. No longer is it sufficient to simply be aware of other peoples and cultures. The future will belong to those who can see things from other perspectives, who can adopt the viewpoint of cultures very different from their own, thus exhibiting intercultural sensitivity (p. 19).

In the context of this study, such skills are particularly important given the highly diverse nature of the faculty and staff and the fact that none of the instructors are local nationals. The ability of these educators to reflect upon their own attitudes and worldviews in their daily interactions with students and culturally diverse colleagues, and their progression towards more complex orientations is imperative if working effectively with diverse students and colleagues is the goal.

This study also offers insights about which educators tend to have more complex orientations to cultural difference, which may help individuals and policymakers make better professional development and resource allocation decisions. The data and recommendations also can lead to programs that nurture more complex orientations among the faculty.

Such a study has never been conducted on foundation program instructors in general, or on sojourner faculty in GCC universities. Given that sojourners make up 90–100% of the instructors in Qatar, and that the demographics are very similar at other
GCC institutions, the results may lead other regional programs to examine the ICS of their faculty. In addition, some of the independent variables, such as formal teacher training, have never been examined in the literature before. This is also the first study of its type to use the IDC in an educational context.

The results of this study also provide a baseline dataset that can be used as a measure of ICS of the faculty of post-secondary institutions in the GCC region. Thus, this study provides a foundation and direction for continued research within the MENA region, and around the world.

**Organization of the Study**

This chapter has presented an introduction to the research, the research purpose and questions, study hypotheses, definition of terms, study setting, and significance. Chapter 2 examines the previous research and literature related to the concept of culture, ICC and ICS, models of ICS and ICC, ICC within higher education institutions, and the demographic variables associated with ICS.

Chapter 3 describes the research procedures used in this study, including a detailed examination of the tool used in this study. The pilot procedures, participant recruitment method, and data transformation and analysis are all explained in depth.

The findings of the study are presented in detail in chapter 4, while chapter 5 gives a summary of the findings, the conclusions drawn from these findings, and recommendations for further study.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

"Culturally heterogeneous populations do not, of and by themselves, create the necessary and sufficient conditions for positive intercultural relations or positive gains that can be attributed to intercultural contact" (Michael Paige, 1983, p.109).

This chapter provides a review of literature relevant to this study. First, the concept of culture is reviewed, as it is central to the idea of intercultural competence. Researchers in differing fields have differing definitions of culture, and it is well beyond the scope of this review to examine them all. However, the first section of this review provides a brief summary of the development, definition, and characteristics of culture.

Second, ICC and ICS are discussed, including their definitions and general approaches for developing them. Third, models of ICS and ICC are reviewed and critiqued. Particular attention is given in this section to the DMIS and the IDC.

Fourth, the discussion turns to the ICC within higher education environments, including the need for ICC and the impact of educator ICC. Finally, past research is examined to identify the demographic and experiential variables that have been associated with ICS.

Concept of Culture

To fully grasp what culture is, it is helpful to first understand what culture is not. According to Battle (2002):

Race, ethnicity and culture are not one in the same. Race is a statement about biological and anatomical attributes and functions such as skin color, facial features and hair texture. Ethnicity is about race, origin, characteristics and institutions. Culture is about the behavior, beliefs, and values of a group of people who are brought together by their commonalities. (p. 354)

Historically, culture has been portrayed very superficially, with a focus on cultural artifacts such as food, dress, language, music, and religious ceremonies. The typical “culture day” in an elementary school, with its focus on clothing and food would be an example of such a superficial portrayal. Such an approach, according to Seelye
(1993), does little to help a person function effectively in a culturally diverse environment or to truly understand others who are culturally different. Such an approach, which is unfortunately very common within schools, “runs the risk of perpetuating separateness and reinforcing negative cultural stereotypes” (Wurzel, 1988, p. 3).

This approach to culture as a list of artifacts has its origins in the 19th century, as typified by the definition of culture put forth by prominent anthropologist E. B. Tylor: “that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society” (1871/1958, p. 31). This definition exhibits both the roots of today’s common focus on artifacts, such as art and customs, but also points to the origins of more recent definitions that focus on knowledge and what Straffon (2001) calls “social heredity.” In sum then, culture is not a function of ethnicity or race, nor is it merely the sum of a collection of cultural artifacts, such as dress, music, or food. Instead, it is much more than that.

Hernandez, Isaacs, Nesman, and Burns (1998) add that culture is “omnipresent,” but essentially invisible. Hall (1998) elaborates, “Culture hides much more than it reveals and, strangely enough, what it hides, it hides most effectively from its own participants” (p. 59). Marinetti and Dunn (2002) liken culture to an onion—the outer levels are the most easily seen and understood, but as those surface layers are peeled away, the inner, hidden core that unconsciously guides cultural assumptions is revealed.

Although artifacts and material culture are indeed part of culture, most definitions of culture today consider its most important features to be those that are intangible, symbolic, and ideational (Banks, 2006). Artifacts and material objects have not been eliminated from definitions of culture; rather, the way in which people interact with them, the rules governing their use, and the way that they are interpreted are now seen to be more important. Banks and Banks (2009) stated, “It is the values, symbols,
interpretations, and perspectives that distinguish one people from another in modernized societies; it is not artifacts, materials, objects, and other tangible aspects of human societies” (p. 8).

According to Brody (2003), close to 200 definitions of culture are available in the literature. For this review, definitions that include some variation of Samovar and Porter’s (1997) six characteristics of culture will be focused on for their relevance to ICC and ICS. These six characteristics are: (a) culture is learned over time through group members’ experiences; (b) culture is transmissible from one member to another; (c) culture is dynamic and changing over time; (d) culture is selective, guiding members’ beliefs, perceptions, and actions; (e) cultural facets are interrelated; and (f) culture is ethnocentric, acting as a standard by which members measure all other cultures.

Table 1 presents four definitions that point to these characteristics. Although these definitions vary slightly, they express the common idea that culture refers to explicit and implicit, often unconscious, patterns of thinking and behaving that reflect long-term social learning of a group and which is practiced and shared by members of the group. Hofstede (1991) characterized culture as “software of the mind.” This is a helpful metaphor because it recognizes that culture is subconscious, and that people are not aware of the way it influences their perceptions, beliefs, and behavior. In a sense, culture is the operating system on which people operate; it underlies all, but we are unaware of its operation.
Table 1. Definitions of Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theorists</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hofstede</td>
<td>Patterns of “thinking, feeling and potential acting” that every person carries within him or herself, and which he terms “mental programs”. The source of these mental programs lies within the social environments in which one grew up and collected one’s life experiences. In short, culture affects who we are, how we think, how we behave and how we respond to our environment. Above all, it determines how we learn. (Hofstede, 1991, p.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kroeber and Kluckhohn</td>
<td>Patterns explicit and implicit, of and for behaviour, acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e., historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values; culture systems may, on the one hand be considered as products of actions, on the other as conditioning elements of further action. (Kroeber &amp; Kluckhohn, 1952, p. 180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seelye</td>
<td>Learned patterns of behavior, values, assumptions, and meaning, which are shared to varying degrees of interest, importance, and awareness with members of a group that primarily inform and guide their worldview. Culture is the story of reality that individuals and groups value and accept as a guide for organizing their lives. (Seelye, 1996, p. 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>“The learned and shared patterns of beliefs, behaviors, and values of groups of interacting people” (Bennett, 1998, p. 3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Bennett (1998) further clarified that two types of culture exist: “capital-C” culture and “small-c” culture. If culture is thought of as an iceberg (see Figure 1), then capital-C culture is what can be seen above the water—the food, music, clothing, language, and festivals. However, these are very superficial representations of much deeper, hidden meanings. Capital-C culture can be stereotyped, romanticized, and generalized. An understanding of capital-C culture is not enough for effective cross-cultural understanding. Bennett defined small-c culture as “the learned and shared patterns of beliefs, behaviors, and values of groups of interacting people” (p. 3). These patterns represent group values and norms, and regulate behavior and expectations within the group. Importantly, most aspects of culture (small-c culture) are hidden and outside an individual’s awareness.
As an example of the hidden effects of small-c culture, anthropologist Edward T. Hall (1983) concluded that cultures vary in their ways of perceiving and relating to time, space, and context. In terms of time, cultures tend to be monochronic (i.e., focusing on getting things done one at a time in a linear and sequential manner) or polychronic (i.e., focusing less on getting things done, but doing many things at once). Regarding space, cultures vary in their preferences for personal space and their views about ownership (e.g., believing they own their land v. believing they belong to the land). Cultures also tend to be either low-context (i.e., “Say what you mean and mean what you say”) or high-context (i.e., meaning is not in the words, but rather in the relationships, context, and history). The highly diverging approaches that emerge given these spectrums can lead to considerable discomfort. For example, a substantial amount of conflict, dissatisfaction, and lack of progress would likely result if a member of a
polychronic, high-context culture collaborates on a task with a member of a monochronic, low-context culture. Moreover, most people do not even know what sort of culture they belong to and have probably never considered how they view time, communication, personal space, or their understandings of the past and the present. Yet, it is these hidden elements of culture that affect us most. It is rarely clashes of folk music or dress that obstruct intercultural relations.

For the purposes of this study, an extension and modification of Seelye’s (1996) definition is offered:

[Culture refers to subconscious and changeable] learned patterns of behavior, values, assumptions, and meaning, which are shared to varying degrees of interest, importance, and awareness with members of a group that primarily inform and guide their worldview. Culture is the story of reality that individuals and groups value and accept as a guide for organizing their lives (p. 9).

I have modified Seelye’s original definition to incorporate elements of other definitions (Banks, 2006; Geertz, 1973; Hall, 1998; Hernandez, Isaacs, Nesman, & Burns, 1998) that emphasize that (a) people are generally unaware of their own cultural values and rarely reflect upon them, (b) culture acts at a subconscious level, and (c) cultural values and cultures themselves change over time.

Given this foundational definition of culture, it is now possible to examine ICC and orientations to cultural difference. These concepts and the models for understanding them are discussed in the next section.

**Intercultural Competence and Intercultural Sensitivity**

Many models of ICC have been proposed over the last few decades, together with well over 300 terms and concepts to reflect the different approaches to measuring ICC and ICS (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009). Researchers from fields as varied as business, economics, citizenship education, education, health, international relations, and psychology have all concerned themselves with addressing some form of ICS or
ICC (although under many different names). Bayles (2009) highlights this confusion of similar terminology across disciplines when she says:

The terms cultural sensitivity and cross-cultural sensitivity (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992), intercultural sensitivity (Bennett & Bennett, 2004; Westrick & Yuen, 2007), global competency (Olson & Kroeger, 2001), global awareness (Hanvey, 1978), intercultural competence (Davis & Cho, 2005; Bennett, 2003; DeJaeghere & Zhang, 2008; Yershova et al., 2000), cross-cultural competence (Greenholtz, 2000; Hains, Lynch, & Winton, 2000), cultural competence (Diller & Moule, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 2001), culturally proficient (Robins et al., 2006), and cultural intelligence (Earley & Ang, 2003) are often used interchangeably in the literature. (p. 22)

Although these terms seem quite similar, some of them have become value-loaded—particularly those that deal with competence (often discussed in business-oriented literature). Stone (2006) takes issue with including “competence” in any terms related to intercultural understanding and behavior because he believes it overly simplifies cultural complexity and focuses more on low-order skills training. He further argues that ICC (and similar terms) have been co-opted and redefined by some stakeholders for divergent strategic purposes. For these reasons, Stone prefers the term intercultural effectiveness, which he defines as “the ability to interact with people from different cultures so as to optimize the probability of mutually successful outcomes” (p. 338). Similarly, Bok (2006) asserts that developing skills for thinking interculturally is more important than simply having knowledge of other cultures. Despite Stone’s discomfort with the term competence, it will be used in this research, though as should be clear by now, the meaning is not limited to low-level skills. This will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

In a meta-analysis of ICC and ICS by Bradford, Allen, and Beisser (2000), it was found that most studies in the field focus on observable and easily measured behavioral or performance characteristics. Much of the literature in this field comes from the fields of business and educational exchange and seeks ways of measuring the efficiency of sojourners in new cultures. Greenholtz (2005) pointed out the risks of
focusing only on behaviors, as “a sojourner can function effectively in a foreign context while continuing to consider the other culture(s) silly, illogical, quaint, or irrelevant” (p. 10). It is also perfectly possible for a sojourner to be effective “from the point of view of accomplishing desired goals in business negotiations for example, while acting like the cultural equivalent of a bull in a china shop” (p. 10).

Thus, Hammer’s (2012a) definition of competence as "The capability to shift cultural perspective and adapt behavior to cultural commonality and difference” (p.116) succinctly sums up the importance of both mindset and skillset. In short, the interculturally competent individual has the necessary attitudes, approaches, and perspectives, as well as the appropriate behavior, to allow him or her to communicate effectively across cultures.

Ultimately, many of terms in use reflect the field of scholarship in which they were based, and clear agreement is still lacking (Deardorff, 2006). The following sections review ICS and ICC, the terms chosen for this study to reflect both mindset and skillset in effectively interacting with other cultures (Bayles, 2009).

**Definitions of intercultural competence and intercultural sensitivity.** Nearly 40 years ago, when expatriation was less common, Aitken (1973) wryly noted that an expatriated manager needed:

- the stamina of an Olympic runner, the mental agility of an Einstein, the conversational skill of a professor of languages, the detachment of a judge, the tact of a diplomat, and the perseverance of an Egyptian pyramid builder. [And] that’s not all. If they are going to measure up to the demands of living and working in a foreign country, they should also have a feeling for the culture; their moral judgment should not be too rigid; they should be able to merge with the local environment with chameleon-like ease; and they should show no sign of prejudice. (cited in Townsend & Cairns, 2003, p. 317)

Since then, globalization, expatriation, and the study of ICC have rapidly expanded. However, understanding of ICC has been complicated by the use of various terms to discuss it (Chui & Hong, 2005; Deardorff, 2004; Fantini, 2000; Hammer, 1994; Hunter, 2004; Sheridan, 2005, cited in Berardo, 2005). Moreover, these terms, such as
global competence, intercultural effectiveness, and ICC are common in academic literature. Despite a common focus on “the importance of knowledge, skills, attitudes and experience,” specific and agreed-upon definitions of these terms are lacking (LaRocco, 2011, p. 19). The diversity of terms and their definition are believed to have originated from the exhaustive study of them from the viewpoint of so many differing disciplines and goals. Wiseman (2001) elaborates,

ICC competence has been investigated in studies with such diverse conceptual foci as sojourner adjustment, immigrant acculturation, intergroup contact, culture shock, cross-cultural training, social change, international management, and foreign student advising (cf. Benson, 1978; Brislin, 1981; Gudykunst, Wiseman, & Hammer, 1978, Landis & Brislin, 1983; Rogers, 1983; Stening, 1979). The research in this area has been such that attempts to synthesize and report many of the findings have taken the forms of text books (Gudykunst, 1998; Lustig & Koester, 1999; Wiseman & Koester, 1993), a journal issue (Martin, 1989), chapters reporting the ‘state of the art’ (Cargile & Giles, 1996; Chen & Starosta, 1996), and even a meta-analysis of a number of studies in the area (Bradford, Allen, & Beisser, 2000). (p. 207)

For example, literature on global competence is concentrated in the fields of business, engineering, higher education, and international workforce mobility, with a particular focus on expatriated multinational corporation managers (Grandin & Hedderich, 2009; Hunter, White, & Godbey, 2006; Olson & Kroege, 2001). By using a Delphi technique with international experts in the field, Hunter, White, and Godbey (2006) developed a working definition of global competence as “having an open mind while actively seeking to understand cultural norms and expectations of others, leveraging this gained knowledge to interact, communicate and work effectively outside of one’s environment” (p. 277). Literature on global knowledge emphasizes knowledge of global or world history, politics, and geography (Hunter, White, & Godbey, 2006).

LaRocco (2011) has defined ICC as an individual’s attitudes, knowledge, and abilities that are culture general and which can be applied in cross-cultural situations. Both global competence and ICC place an emphasis on “culture general skills” (knowledge and ability that can apply to any intercultural situation)” (p. 19).
Stoof, Martens, van Merrienboer, and Bastiaens (2002) speculate that the difficulty in reaching a consensus on a definition of ICC is the search for a general definition within an objectivist paradigm that extends across all contexts and that “presumes competence can exist outside of a unique situational context” (Salisbury, 2011, p. 25). The lack of agreement on basic terminology is an ongoing issue within the field of intercultural research, has inhibited growth in the field, and shows no signs of being resolved.

Despite the wide range of definitions in the literature, Hammer (2012b) summarizes the general understanding when he says:

Building intercultural competence involves increasing cultural self-awareness; deepening understanding of the experiences, values, perceptions, and behaviors of people from diverse cultural communities; and expanding the capability to shift cultural perspective and adapt behavior to bridge across cultural differences (Hammer, 2009a, 2010, 2011). (p. 116)

Spitzberg (1997) created a partial list of traits that have been empirically cited as influencing ICC (see Table 2). The table shows the great variety of competencies that have been identified in the literature that contribute to ICC. It might be that expatriated employees can feel overwhelmed by this list and, therefore, tend to focus on technical competence in their field, rather than cultural difference. Such lists of disparate skills from such a variety of fields are of little help when trying to develop a unified theory of ICC.
Table 2. Traits that Affect Intercultural Competence

| Ability to adjust to different cultures | Cultural empathy | Personal/Family adjustment |
| Ability to deal with different social systems | Cultural interaction | Opinion leadership |
| Ability to deal with psychological stress | Demand | Rigidity (task persistence) |
| Ability to establish interpersonal relationships | Dependent anxiety | Task accomplishment |
| Ability to facilitate communication | Differentiation | Transfer of “software” |
| Ability to understand others | Empathy/efficacy | Self-actualizing search for identity |
| Adaptiveness | Familiarity in interpersonal relations | Self-confidence/Initiative |
| Agency | Frankness | Self-consciousness |
| Awareness of self and culture | General competence at job | Self-disclosure |
| Aware of implications of cultural differences | Incompetence | Self-reliant conventionality |
| Cautiousness | Intellectualizing future orientation | Social adjustment |
| Charisma | Interaction involvement | Spouse/Family communication |
| Communication apprehension | Interpersonal flexibility | Strength of personality |
| Communication competence | Interpersonal harmony | Verbal behaviours |
| Communication efficacy | Interpersonal interest | |
| Communicative functions | Interpersonally sensitive maturity | |
| Controlling responsibility | Managerial ability | |
| Conversational management behaviours | Non-ethnocentrism | |
| Cooperation | Nonverbal behaviours | |


Deardorff (2006) examined intercultural literature and used questionnaire and Delphi techniques with 23 intercultural researchers, primarily from the United States and Canada, to arrive at a consensus definition of ICC. This research was the first to “document consensus among leading intercultural experts on a definition and components of intercultural competence” (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009, p. 2). The definition with the highest approval among the researchers was from Byram (1997): “Knowledge of others; knowledge of self; skills to interpret and relate; skills to discover and/or interact; valuing others’ values, beliefs and behaviors; and relativizing one’s self. Linguistic competence plays a key role” (p. 34). The definition chosen by the researchers was broad and did not focus on low-level skills or coping techniques. From
this work, Deardorff defined ICC as “the ability to interact effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations, based on specific attitudes, intercultural knowledge, skills and reflection” (2006, p. 5). According to LaRocco (2011), “Deardorff’s work is the only study to date that brings together the insight and experience of 23 well-known interculturalists. Deardorff’s definition of intercultural competence is currently the strongest available in the field” (p. 17). Therefore, the definition used in this study is congruent with Deardorff’s (2006) definition of ICC, conceptualizing it as a combination of the domains of attitude (mindset) and action (skillset)—put simply, having “the ability to think and act in interculturally appropriate ways” (Hammer et al., 2003, p. 2).

It must be remembered that Deardorff’s work relies heavily on the input of US American and Canadian interculturalists and may not reflect the understanding of those from other backgrounds. The interculturalists were also all drawn from academia and may represent a limited perspective. The usual Delphi drawbacks of respondent bias regarding wording, as well as the pressures inherent in a forced consensus activity need to be kept in mind too. However, until more such research is done, Deardorff’s definition remains the strongest.

Many of the models and definitions of ICC identify ICS as a necessary precursor of ICC—no matter how they both may be defined (e.g., Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992; Carr-Ruffino, 2005; Dong, Day, & Collaco, 2008; Hammer & Bennett, 2001; Mahon, 2003; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004; Park, 2006; Sinicrope, Norris, & Watanabe, 2007). For example, Deardorff’s (2004, 2006, 2008) sampling of 23 thought leaders in the field of intercultural relations mentioned above found that every definition that was developed contained some element of ICS (although it appeared under many different names). Park’s (2006) research also determined that the weight of evidence (Bennett, 1993; Bennett, Bennett, & Allen, 2003) supports ICS as the core factor in improving
intercultural competence. It follows that a person can be interculturally sensitive without necessarily being interculturally competent; however, it is impossible to be truly interculturally competent without being interculturally sensitive.

Accordingly, several authors have argued that the most important skill enabling those of different cultures to live and work together is ICS (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992; Greenholtz, 2000; Landis & Bhagat, 1996). Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) identified the components of ICS as having interest in other cultures, having sensitivity to notice the differences between cultures, and being willing to modify one’s behavior to adapt to the other cultures. ICS has come to be seen as a desirable skill because employees with higher levels of ICS are believed to add more value to an organization than those mired in cultural relation difficulties (Chen & Starosta, 1997; DiStefano & Maznevski, 2000).

Yet, despite the consensus on the necessity of ICS, Davis (2009) states: “there is relatively little agreement about what it is, how it is developed, and how it can be measured” (p. 40). According to Landreman (2003), what exactly constitutes ICS and its relationship to ICC is: “theoretically and empirically inconsistent, and do not address the application of one’s understanding and skills to intergroup relationships” (p. 39).

ICS has been referred to in the literature by such names as ICC (e.g., Byram, 1997; Deardorff, 2004, 2006), *intercultural maturity* (e.g., King & Baxter Magolda, 2005), and *global competence* (e.g., Hunter et al., 2006). At this time there is no universally agreed upon definition of ICS, although Deardorff’s (2004, 2006) research on ICC has also led to a clearer understanding of ICS. The definition of ICS in this study is: “The ability to discriminate and experience relevant cultural differences” (Hammer et al., 2003, p. 2), as it helps clarify some of the confusion between ICS and ICC.

Cultural self-awareness is the core component of intercultural sensitivity. Bennett (2009) says that if individuals “do not have a mental baseline for their own
cultures(s), they will find it difficult to recognize and manage cultural difference” (p. 5). 
Cross-cultural instruction may focus on learning skills to perform in another culture, but Bennett sees such *emic*¹ knowledge as “not necessarily related to general intercultural competence, just as the knowledge of a particular foreign language is not necessarily related to a general competence in language-learning” (p. 5). It is cultural general and transferrable skills, which Bennett (2009) refers to as *etic*² that one needs “for recognizing and dealing with a wide range of cultural difference” (p. 5).

Harris, Moran & Moran (2004) have identified a scaffold of cultural general, or etic, understandings of cultural difference that can impact interactions with those from other cultural communities: (1) sense of self and space, (2) communication and language, (3) dress and appearance, (4) food and feeding habits, (5) time and time consciousness, (6) relationships, (7) values and norms, (8) beliefs and attitudes, (9) learning, and (10) work habits and practices.

It is awareness of one’s own etic approaches, as well as those of others, that develops into the sensitivity that allows for the discrimination and experience of cultural difference; this sensitivity then becomes the foundation for competence. Intercultural sensitivity, as Bennett (2009) explains:

refers to the complexity of perception of cultural difference, so that higher sensitivity refers to more complex perceptual discriminations of such differences (Bennett, 1993, 2004). The term “competence” refers to the potential for enactment of culturally sensitive feeling into appropriate and effective behavior in another cultural context (Bennett & Castiglioni, 2004). (p. 4)

As mentioned above, intercultural sensitivity, being etic, transfers across cultures. As individuals come to understand their own culturally informed perceptions they can more easily recognize where they differ with those of others. This allows for a faster path to competence in all cultures. So that for example:

---

¹ *Emic* is the understanding from within a culture, or is culturally specific.
² *Etic* is an understanding from outside a culture that is broadly generalizable and associates cultural practice with outside conditions such as geography or biology.
a student who develops intercultural sensitivity on an exchange program in France can apply that sensitivity in Korea, or Nigeria, or with different domestic ethnic groups. Of course, the student may know more about French culture than about Korean culture, so he or she will have more ways of expressing competence in France than in Korea. But since intercultural learning includes how to learn about culture, someone going to a new culture can relatively quickly acquire the knowledge that will allow them to turn sensitivity into competence there, as well. (Bennett, 2009, p. 6)

In short, once an individual has developed the etic ability or mindset, he or she then needs to develop the emic, or culturally specific skills, for each new culture he or she interacts with.

**Developing intercultural sensitivity and intercultural competence.** Although ICS may be very desirable as an enabler of the global competence necessary for today’s interconnected world, it is not at all easy to achieve, and little in historical precedence is available for its development (Bennett, 1993). In today’s global environment, it might be believed that increased contact across cultures will lead to a natural growth of intercultural understanding, but this is not necessarily the case. ICS does not necessarily grow organically from unguided cross-cultural contact (Allport, 1979; Bennett, 1993; Bochner, 1986). Bochner elaborated,

increased contact does not necessarily reduce inter-group hostility, and under some conditions actually increases friction and animosity (Bloom, 1971; Mitchell, 1968; Tajfel & Dawson, 1965). Even in culturally mixed residential settings such as International Houses, where there are explicit pressures to form cross-cultural friendships, studies in the United States, England, and Australia have shown that the various groups prefer the company of their fellow nationals (Bochner, Buker, & McLeod, 1976; Bochner, Hutnik, & Furnham, 1985; Bochner, McLeod, & Lin, 1977; Bochner & Orr, 1979; Furnham & Alibhai, 1985; Furnham & Bochner, 1982). In many cases, the foreign students had not made a single host-country friend even after a lengthy sojourn. (pp. 348–349)

Several authors emphasized the role of preparation, interaction (experience), and reflection for developing ICC (Allport, 1979; Bennett, 1993; Deardorff, 2009b). Bennett (1993) added that it is when people reflect on their experiences with other cultures, they develop a more complex and nuanced understanding of cultural difference. Kelly (1963) explained that without reflection, a person “gains little in the way of experience” and
there will be little change in worldview or perception, no matter how much cross-cultural experience he or she has (p. 73).

The role of reflection is illustrated in the concepts of single, double, and triple-loop learning (Argyris & Schon, 1978; 1996 see Figure 2). Learning is initiated when an individual encounters a problem or fails to achieve a goal. In single-loop learning, the focus is on problem solving (e.g., trying again or using a different approach) and the individual’s deep, implicit worldviews, values, and behaviors remain intact. Often, this type of approach is sufficient.

However, when someone is operating in another culture or with someone from another culture, single-loop learning may be insufficient because the individual’s foundational assumptions, beliefs, values, and behaviors may not work or be effective with the other culture. In such situations, the individual experiences failure with one or more attempts at problem solving (single-loop learning) and may then re-evaluate his or her fundamental beliefs and conceptual framework. AFS (2012) explained that double-loop learning involves “re-evaluating and reframing our goals, values, and beliefs in a more complex way of processing information and involves a more sophisticated engaging with experience . . . and looks at consequences from a wider perspective” (AFS, 2012, para. 1). In intercultural situations, the individual may evaluate not only his or her own goals and beliefs but also those of the other culture. Moreover, to achieve a successful outcome, the individual may need to adapt his or her goals, values, and conceptual frameworks to blend with the other culture. “If we do not address the governing variables, deeper beliefs, and conceptual frameworks of why this outcomes makes sense to us, and why we do what we do, we may frequently be unsuccessful” (AFS, 2012, para. 4).
Although double-loop learning is concerned mostly with the cognitive and intellectual, triple-loop learning affects “an existential level that includes the person and his/her attitudes, values, habitus etc. (italics in the original)” (Peschl, 2007, p. 138). This domain is fundamental to the person and defies easy explanation in non-philosophical language, but can be seen as the self, with self being more than “personality traits, behavioral and cognitive patterns, solely quantifiable data, etc.” (p. 138). Single-loop and double-loop learning are embedded in triple-loop learning, but where single-loop learning may lead to a change in behavior, double-loop a change in thinking, triple-loop learning leads to a change in perception, or in being.

Figure 2. Single, Double, and Triple-Loop Learning


Relationship building also has been associated with the development of ICS and ICC (Deardorff, 2009b). This suggests that one’s environment (either now or in the past) and the people with whom one interacts at work and at home influence one’s worldview and subsequent ICS and ICC. Additionally, factors such as culture and
cultural beliefs, gender, and individual traits also are believed to influence one’s reality construction, including ICS and ICC (Bennett, 1993; Proctor, 1998).

Evidence is contradictory about the role of language proficiency in ICS and ICC. Although Hunter et al. (2006) claim it plays a role, Deardorff (2006) argues it may not even be necessary for the development of ICC. Deardorff (2009b) adds that ICC means seeing the world through a different paradigm, and thinking and communicating appropriately. Thus, rather than being oriented around language, ICC is the interplay of attitude, knowledge, and behavior (Bennett & Bennett, 2004). Further, rote or unreflective behavior alone is insufficient for ICC; instead, behavior must be informed by attitude and knowledge.

Recent research with teachers in the United States suggests that ICS and ICC can be developed through professional development and guided intercultural development (DeJaeghere & Cao, 2009; DeJaeghere & Zhang, 2008). Paige, Cohen, and Shively’s (2004) research has demonstrated that through directed intercultural development and experience one’s orientation towards cultural difference can move from the simpler to the more complex. This is neither new, nor particularly an original idea, as the American Fulbright Program (established in 1946) has operated on this premise for decades. As Senator J. William Fulbright (1989) stated:

> international relations can be improved, and the danger of war significantly reduced, by producing generations of leaders, especially in the big countries, who through the experience of educational exchange, will have acquired some feeling and understanding of other peoples’ cultures—why they operate as they do, why they think as they do, why they react as they do—and of the differences among these cultures. It is possible—not very probable, but possible—that people can find in themselves, through intercultural education, the ways and means of living together in peace. (pp. 193–194)

There are number of differing hypotheses on the processes through which a person can become interculturally competent, though LaRocco (2011) reminds us that “these explanations are based more on theoretical research than investigative studies” (p. 18). It is not the purpose of this work to examine causation, though a brief
description of the five types of models, as identified by Spitzberg and Changnon (2009), some of which do make claims to causation, are presented in Table 3. This table is not by any means exhaustive, and is meant only as a brief introduction to the prominent researchers and models within each of the five types.

Within this research, a decision had to be made as to which model to use. A developmental model was chosen, as it allowed the tracking of individual progress in ICS over time. The DMIS-based IDC was chosen because of the extensive research that it has undergone, together with its corresponding measurement tool, the IDI. Many of the other models are problematic due to the limited amount of research they have undergone and the possible ethnocentric biases that they may contain. Barrett (2012) stated,

many of the models may well have ethnocentric biases due to the fact that they have been developed within Western European and North American societies and probably lack cross-cultural generalizability… most of the models…are underdetermined by the available evidence: they contain many speculative elements and, when they have been subjected to empirical examination, are typically tested in very restricted situations with limited numbers of participants drawn from only a small range of cultures or sometimes only a single culture. (p. 1)

The DMIS/IDC and the IDI are the most empirically researched ICC model and tool of any type. As is explained in more detail later in this chapter, during the development of both the model and the tool steps were taken to ensure its cross-cultural generalizability. In a thorough recent study, Hammer (2011) reported that the DMIS model has undergone three stages of testing with over 10,000 participants from widely varying cultures. Hammer concluded that the study demonstrates the cross-cultural generalizability, normal distribution, and strong content and construct validity of the DMIS model, IDC, and IDI. For these reasons, it was decided that a developmental model—specifically, the IDC and its associated tool, the IDI, were the most appropriate choices for this research. In the future, some of the other models may have an equally
strong base of empirical evidence; but for now the other models remain speculative and under-studied.

Table 3. Models of Intercultural Competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Model</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Theorist, Researcher, and Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compositional models</td>
<td>Identify components of intercultural competence without specific the relations between them. These models identify relevant attitudes, skills, knowledge, and behaviours that together are believed to make up intercultural competence.</td>
<td>Hamilton, Richardson, and Shuford (1998), Intercultural Competence Components Model; Ting-Toomey and Kurogi, (1998), Facework-Based Model of Intercultural Competence; Deardorff, (2006), Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-orientational models</td>
<td>Focus on communication during intercultural interactions and how perceptions, meanings, and understandings are constructed during these interactions.</td>
<td>Byram (1997), Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence; Byram (2003), The Concept of Intercultural Competence; Byram, Nichols, and Stevens (2001), Intercultural Competence Model (the five ‘savoirs’); Kupka (2008), Intercultural Competence Model for Strategic Human Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal path models</td>
<td>Postulate causal relationships between different components of intercultural competence.</td>
<td>Arasaratnam (2008), Model of Intercultural Communication Competence; Hammer, Wiseman, Rasmussen, and Bruschke (1998), Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Model of Intercultural Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptational models</td>
<td>Focus on how individuals adjust and adapt attitudes, behaviours, and understandings with cultural others.</td>
<td>Y.Y. Kim, (1998), Intercultural Communicative Competence Model; Navas et al. (2005) Relative Acculturation Extended Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental models</td>
<td>Describe the stages of development through which intercultural competence is acquired.</td>
<td>Bennett (1986), Developmental Model of Intercultural Competence; King and Baxter-Magolda (2005), Intercultural Maturity Model; Hammer (2012b), Intercultural Development Continuum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The next section examines the seminal developmental model, Bennett’s (1993) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) and its derivative, the Intercultural Development Continuum (IDC).

Models of Intercultural Sensitivity and Intercultural Competence

Developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. An individual is a member of any number of overlapping and constantly changing cultural groupings at any given
time. However, the DMIS focuses on orientation towards difference of culture of primary socialization (Hammer, 2003). This is not to dismiss the importance of small cultures (Holliday, 1999) but rather to acknowledge that the majority of people have a primary socialization, or big culture, as Holliday (1999) would call it, be it religious, ethnic, tribal, or possibly (but not necessarily) national, as well as a number of secondary cultural associations. This idea is illustrated in Figure 3, which shows different cultures within an educational institution.

Figure 3. Interacting Cultures in an Educational Setting


Bennett (1993) proposed a six-stage developmental model of ICS, or orientation to cultural difference, grounded in cognitive psychology and constructivism. The six stages offer a means for measuring and depicting an individual’s or group’s worldview and reaction to cultural difference.

The stages are progressive, meaning that the individual’s changing perception of reality allows for increasing accommodation of cultural difference. Bennett’s model is not predominately a description of cognition, affect, or behavior. Rather, it is a model of how the assumed underlying worldview moves from an ethnocentric to a more ethnorelative condition, thus generating greater intercultural sensitivity and the potential for more intercultural competence. Changes in knowledge, attitudes, or skills are taken as manifestations of changes in the underlying worldview (Bennett, 2004, p. 64).
A clear understanding of the model is necessary to avoid the misunderstandings of the model discussed later in this chapter.

Bennett’s development of the DMIS is groundbreaking, as previous research had focused on inventories of observable behaviors, rather than the mental schema that individuals created to understand cultural difference (Bradford, Allen, & Beisser, 2000). Rather than skills, Bennett’s conception of ICS focuses on perspective, mindset, or worldview.

Klak and Martin (2003) state that the DMIS is based on three understandings: (a) intercultural understanding is a learned behavior and is not something with which one is born, (b) both individuals and cultures are dynamic and constantly changing, and (c) with proper experience and reflection, individuals can develop a more complex and nuanced understanding of cultural difference. Bennett and Bennett (2004) described the DMIS as a “model of the development of cognitive structure”:

The underlying assumption of the model is that as one’s experience of cultural difference becomes more sophisticated, one’s competence in intercultural relations increases. Each stage is indicative of a particular worldview configuration, and certain kinds of attitudes and behavior are typically associated with each such configuration. The DMIS is not a model for changes in attitudes and behavior. (p. 152)

Bennett’s model acknowledged that cultural sensitivity is dynamic and constantly in flux, and that one’s understanding of cultural understanding is not constant, but that it is possible to get a snapshot “that is consistent for one person at one time in one particular point of development” (Rabo, 2011, p. 35).

The DMIS posits a change in the schema of dealing with cultural difference, which presumably leads to a change of attitude, and then, possibly, behavior. It is important to understand that greater understanding of other cultures does not necessarily “lead to a more favorable inclination towards the cultures in question . . . it does engender a more complex and nuanced experience of life” (Greenholtz, 2005, p. 11). It is this understanding of complexity and nuance that is one signifier of cultural
sensitivity. Hammer et al. (2003) state that “the more perceptual and conceptual
discriminations that can be brought to bear on the event [of cultural difference], the
more complex will be the construction of the event, and thus the richer will become the
experience” (p. 423).

Bennett (1993) states that the development of a more complex and sophisticated
understanding of cultural difference is not a spontaneous or natural process, and needs
to be developed or cultivated in a process that can be seen as a type of reflection, similar
to that described by Kelly (1963).

**Stages of the DMIS.** The first three stages of the DMIS continuum are seen by
Bennett (1998) as being ethnocentric, or “using one’s own set of standards and customs
to judge all people, often unconsciously” (p. 26). The final three stages are seen as
being ethnorelative, which Bennett defines as “being comfortable with many standards
and customs and having the ability to adapt behavior and judgments to a variety of
interpersonal settings” (p. 26). In Bennett’s progression, there is an increase in ICS
when a person’s understanding of different cultural worldviews becomes more complex.

The six DMIS stages as shown in Figure 4 and developed by Bennett, do not
follow a strict progression of stages; it is possible for an individual to be straddling two
stages as they grapple with more sophisticated and nuanced events. Bennett says that
one stage may not be fully resolved before the schema of the next stage start to develop.
He states that the resolution of “relevant issues activates the emergence of the next
orientation. Since issues may not be totally resolved, movement [from one stage to
another] may be incomplete and one’s experience of difference diffused across more
than one worldview” (2004, p. 74).

Additionally, while the DMIS hypothesizes a linear progression, it
acknowledges that an individual is never solely in one stage; it is possible for
individuals to regress to an earlier orientation in times of cultural stress, or if they
encounter what Hammer (2012b) refers to as “trauma.” Hammer (2012a) refers to these earlier orientations to which one moves as “trailing orientations.” For example, an individual may be mostly in the acceptance orientation, but when they encounter a particularly stressful, traumatic or confusing cultural interaction they may default back to an earlier orientation to make sense of the new information (see Figure 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIENTATION</th>
<th>VIEW</th>
<th>DOMAIN</th>
<th>STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>There is no reason to know something about foreign cultures</td>
<td>COGNITIVE</td>
<td>ETHNOCENTRIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>My own culture is superior to foreign cultures in many aspects</td>
<td>AFFECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>All human beings are similar despite some superficial differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Differences among people are not a problem, they are of interest to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>I use different standards for the evaluation of situations in foreign cultural contexts</td>
<td>BEHAVIORAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>I almost feel as comfortable in another culture as I do in my own culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity


Figure 5. Trailing Orientations

*Note. This figure illustrates trailing orientations, or orientations that are behind the developmental orientation, which in this example is Minimization. Adapted from M. R. Hammer, 20–23 April 2012, The Intercultural Development Inventory™ qualifying seminar, Zurich, Switzerland.*
**Ethnocentric stages.** By ethnocentric, it is meant that one’s culture is the standard by which all others are measured. Ethnocentrism can be seen as a simple orientation towards cultural difference. Such a worldview allows in-group and out-group identification to be made (Allport, 1979), and allows for the identification of “us” and “them.” Being limited to one worldview can be seen as negative, as a logical extension of ethnocentrism is the position that “‘our way is the right way.’ Most discussions of ethnocentrism enlarge the concept to include feelings of superiority” (Bennett, 1993; Samovar & Porter, 1997).

There are three ethnocentric stages: denial, defense, and minimization. People operating within Denial may not be aware of, or may refuse to acknowledge, the differences between cultures. These individuals are highly ethnocentric and have a simple understanding of cultural difference. This denial can manifest itself in rejection that cultural differences exist, in a belief that cultural differences are irrelevant, or in a belief in broad cultural stereotypes. Bennett believes that this stage is the “default condition of typical, monocultural primary socialization” (Hammer et al., 2003, p. 424).

Denial contains two sub-stages, which may also act to advance the development of the denial worldview; these sub-stages are isolation and separation. People in isolation might not have dealt with cultural differences because of their own geographic isolation. Despite the globalization of the world, it is still possible—particularly in largely monoethnic societies—for individuals to have no dealings with members of other cultures. Separation is when individuals or groups cut themselves off from other cultural groups, or broader society; such groups may be ethnic or religious minority groups, or members of a financial or socio-cultural elite.

Bayles (2009) speculates that:

the intentional erection of physical or social barriers to create distance from cultural differences, as can be seen in the examples of racially or ethnically segregated neighborhoods, can also create a means for maintaining some semblance of denial. Isolation and separation are sometimes interactive. The
social barriers of racial discrimination may result in the physical barriers of a ghetto, thereby creating a situation where those born into and outside of the ghetto never meet. The separation results in isolation, which breeds more separation. Consequently, people are easily ensnarled in denial. (p. 37)

Individuals within these two sub-stages believe, in Hammer and Bennett’s (1998) words, that there are “No categories or only broad categories for cultural differences” (p. 19). Bennett (1993) sees denial as a luxury enjoyed by the dominant cultural group and states that “people of oppressed groups tend not to experience the stage of denial because they receive constant reminders that they are different” (p. 37). Barnlund (1989) wonders whether globalization will lead to “neighbors capable of respecting and utilizing their differences, or clusters of strangers living in ghettos and united only in their antipathy of others” (p. 36).

The second stage is Defense. People within the defense stage recognize cultural difference, but are threatened by it—although they may be unaware that they feel threatened. People are not able to see other cultures as equal to their own, and often one’s culture is considered to be superior, and others inferior. There are three sub-stages of denial: denigration, superiority and reversal. Individuals in denigration negatively stereotype other cultural groups in order to protect their own worldview. Individuals operating from within the superiority sub-stage value their own cultural worldview and will deal with culturally threatening difference by “implicitly relegating it to a lower-status position” (Bennett, 1993, p. 37). Individuals operating from within the reversal sub-stage become negative or derogatory about their own culture, but may value the worldviews of a different culture. Bennett describes the ramifications of this reversed worldview and reminds us that it is still an ethnocentric orientation when he says:

The positive valuing of a culture not one’s own is not necessarily ethnorelative. If such positive attitudes are accompanied by denigration of one’s own culture, it is likely that more development through ethnocentric stages is necessary before work on ethnorelativism can be undertaken. (p. 40)
When people talk of long-term sojourners “going native,” this is the sub-stage that the sojourner may be viewing the world from within. This is still an ethnocentric orientation; it is just that the center of the ethnocentrism has changed from one culture to another.

The third stage is Minimization. Those operating from within this worldview devalue cultural difference. They tend to believe that we are all people and that there is a fundamental similarity between all cultures. Cultural differences are not denigrated nor denied, but rather minimized; all people are seen as being basically the same as oneself. As with defense, there are two sub-stages within minimization: physical universalism and transcendent universalism.

From within the physical universalism sub-stage, culture is seen as a product of biology that is similar among all cultures. According to this perspective, all people—regardless of culture—share the same biological needs and urges, and culture is just an offshoot product of these physical needs. It is believed that as the physical needs between humans have little variation, then the cultural differences that result from these biological needs must be minimal. However, this approach ignores the social context of how these physical similarities are dealt with.

Those operating from within transcendental universalism sub-stage have a similar belief, but also believe in the universality of philosophical or religious beliefs among all cultures. Bennett (1993) states that:

The obvious example of this view is any religion which holds that all people are creations of a particular supernatural entity or force. The statement ‘We are all God’s children,’ is indicative of this religious form of universalism, particularly where the ‘children’ include people who don’t subscribe to the same god. (p. 43)

From within transcendental universalism an individual projects his her own condition onto others, and there is still a belief that an individual’s culture is the “best” one. As Bennett stated, “I have yet to hear anyone at this stage say, ‘There’s a single universal truth in the universe, and it is not what I believe’” (1993, p. 42).
Speaking of minimization, Bennett (1993) stated, “The last attempt to preserve the centrality of one’s own worldview involves an effort to bury difference under the weight of cultural similarities” (p.41). This belief in absolutes, either physical or transcendental, can lead an individual to overlook often deep cultural differences, and while it is a move toward the ethnorelative stages, it still trivializes and diminishes cultural difference.

**Ethnorelative stages.** There are three ethnorelative stages that demonstrate increasingly more complex orientations towards cultural difference; they are acceptance, adaptation, and integration. People operating from within Acceptance recognize, respect, and may even enjoy cultural difference. An individual within this stage understands that their cultural worldview is just one of many. The term “acceptance” can be misleading, for it does not mean agreement. As Hammer et al. (2003) remind us: “Acceptance does not mean agreement—some cultural difference may be judged negatively, but the judgment is not ethnocentric in the sense of withholding equal humanity” (p. 425).

Acceptance contains two sub-stages, *respect for behavioral difference* and *respect for value difference*. Respect for behavioral difference is when individuals understand that behavior—be it spoken language, body language, interpersonal space expectations, or other—and customs differ between cultures. People in this sub-stage recognize that language is a lens through which the world is filtered, and that language can affect perception. Those operating within the respect for value difference sub-stage understand that observable behavioral difference is driven by a difference in worldviews. Bayles (2009) states that for those operating from within this sub-stage:

beliefs, values, and general patterns of assigning goodness and badness to ways of being in the world, including their own, all exist in cultural context and are respected as viable. This does not mean that people in this stage accept all behavior as appropriate in all contexts, but they do recognize the cultural context of behavior. (p. 41)
In short, the difference between the two is that those within respect for behavioral difference accept behavioral difference, while those within respect for value difference have a more nuanced understanding, and realize that the observed behavioral differences are informed by different values and perceptions.

People within the stage of Adaptation empathize with cultural differences and modify their behavior appropriately. The difference between the biblically inspired (Matthew 7:12, New Revised Standard Edition) *Golden Rule* and what Bennett (1979) has called the *Platinum Rule* becomes apparent when we consider Adaptation. The Golden Rule of “Do unto others as you would have them do unto you” is highly ethnocentric and takes the speaker’s culture as the norm; “inherent in the Rule is an assumption of similarity; that others are like ourselves and therefore want to be treated similarly” (p. 407). Such thinking, although often portrayed as well meaning and accepting, does not show a sophisticated understanding of cultural difference.

Bennett (1979) says instead, however, that we should focus on what he has dubbed the Platinum Rule, “Do unto others as they would have you do unto them” (p. 422). Bennett added, “this approach leads us to the communication strategy of empathy, whereby we imaginatively experience the world from another person’s perspective . . . Unlike the Golden Rule, empathic communication encourages interracial and intercultural sensitivity” (p. 427). This rule shows an ethnorelative orientation with a complex orientation towards cultural difference, and a willingness to modify behavior to conform to expectations based on the worldview of another culture.

Within adaptation there are two sub-stages: *empathy* and *pluralism*. Bennett describes empathy as “where one attempts to understand another by imagining how one would feel in another’s position” (Bennett, 1993, p. 53).
From within this orientation individuals may try to approximate events through the eyes of another; they are able to step outside of their own cultural worldviews (as far as this is possible) and attempt to perceive reality as they believe another would.

Those operating from within pluralism are able to hold two or more worldviews, and view behavior and events through these multiple lens. They do not hold this pluralism by devaluing their own culture—rather they are adept at seeing and understanding events through multiple cultural worldviews.

Integration, the third stage, is the most complex, and the rarest of all of the worldviews within the DMIS. Individuals within this stage have internalized more than one cultural worldview. LaRocco (2011) states that those within this stage “do not identify with any one culture but are in the process of creating a new intercultural or multicultural identity, reconciling the various cultures they know. Their cultural worldview is a collective construct” (p. 25).

There are two sub-stages within integration: *encapsulated marginality* and *constructive marginality*. Individuals within encapsulated marginality may feel that their sense of self is “stuck between cultures in a dysfunctional way” (Bennett & Bennett, 2004, p. 157). Persons experiencing encapsulated marginality may feel torn between cultures, and may experience identity confusion.

Those operating from within constructive marginality see their identity as being distinct from the cultures that contribute to it. Their identity may be informed by multiple cultures, and fluctuating cultural worldviews are part of their identity. They are “outside any cultural frame to judge situations and possess no absolute right norms and judgment, which may make them maladaptive” (Lai, 2006, p. 29).

**Intercultural development continuum.** With origins in the theoretical framework provided by Bennett’s (1993, 2004) DMIS, the IDC is an updated (Hammer, 2009) five-stage developmental progression of increasingly complex perceptions or
“orientations” towards diversity and cultural difference. The DMIS model has been subject to three phases of validation studies since 2003, with over 10,000 participants from many cultures, and a range of socio-economic backgrounds. The lessons learned from these studies, the primary one being that minimization is transitional orientation, have led to the development of the IDC model used in this study. Hammer (2011) stated,

some modifications to the original DMIS orientations arise as a result of the collective Phase 1, 2, post-Phase 2 testing, and the current Phase 3 validation studies of the IDI. An overall conclusion from these various efforts is that the main theoretical insights offered by the DMIS are consistently confirmed. These studies provide overall support for the DMIS as a fundamentally sound theoretical framework and simultaneously support the modifications to the DMIS framework presented in this article (p. 482).

Bennett (1993) used the terms “ethnocentrism” and “ethnorelative” when discussing the orientation stages of the DMIS. However, Hammer (2009, 2012a) has updated the terminology and uses the terms “monocultural,” “transitional,” and “intercultural” when discussing the IDC. There are two stages that are characteristic of a monocultural (or ethnocentric) mindset, one that is characteristic of a transitional mindset, and two stages that are characteristic of an intercultural/global (or ethnorelative) mindset. This view is not dissimilar to the Piagetian (Piaget, 1952) perception of development, which characterizes it as a movement through successive stages.

In this work, when the DMIS is discussed the original terminology (ethnocentric and ethnorelative) will be used, while when the IDC is discussed the updated terminology (monocultural, transitional, and intercultural) will be used. Regardless of the terminology, each stage maps to a certain score range on the IDI and identifies a progression of understanding of cultural difference from simple to more complex. The theoretical underpinnings from the earlier DMIS model can be seen in Figure 6, comparing the orientations as envisioned by the DMIS and by its successor the IDC. As
stated above, the development of the IDC used data and lessons learnt from earlier versions of the IDI to refine the DMIS model and inform the development of the IDC.

Compared to the DMIS, Hammer’s IDC uses a slightly different definition of ICC: “the capability to shift cultural perspective and adapt behavior to cultural commonality and difference” (Hammer, 20012a, p. 116), while Bennett’s DMIS (2004) definition of ICC is “the ability to think and act in interculturally appropriate ways” (p. 64).

This updated definition highlights (a) cultural self-awareness and reflection; (b) thoughtful and ongoing consideration of the experiences of those from different cultural communities, and their different “perceptions, values, beliefs, behavior and practices” (p. 3); and (c) the ability to adapt to cultural differences. This definition maintains the earlier and ongoing distinction between a mindset (understanding) and a skillset (adaptation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DMIS Theory</th>
<th>IDC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural sensitivity</td>
<td>Intercultural competence/sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range from ethnocentric to ethnorelative stages</td>
<td>Range from monocultural to intercultural mindsets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence and reversal separate stages</td>
<td>Polarization: defence and reversal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization is ethnocentric</td>
<td>Minimization is not ethnocentric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encapsulated &amp; constructive marginality both hypothesized as forms of integration</td>
<td>Cultural engagement assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration hypothesized as final stage; focus on identity- not competence</td>
<td>Integration not assessed; IDI focus on sensitivity- not identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Comparison of the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity and the Intercultural Development Continuum

As a person’s or group’s perceptions “becomes more sophisticated, one moves further along the continuum of stages” (Le Gros, 2011, para 3). It is these increasingly complex structures, and the growth of a more complex understanding of culture and
diversity, that is the goal of much cultural and diversity education. Rather than particular skills, the IDC, and the DMIS on which it is based, explicates worldview orientations in which “certain types of cognitive processing, attitudes, and behaviors are associated with each orientation rather than skill acquisition” (Rabo, 2011, p. 42).

Both the DMIS and the IDC have two broad ways of viewing the world; ethnocentric/ethnorelative (DMIS) and the monocultural/intercultural (IDC), which, despite the difference in terms, express a similar idea, a progression of understanding of cultural difference from simple to more complex. An individual operating from within an ethnocentric/monocultural mindset will interpret behavior that they do not understand through their own value system or lens. Whereas individuals operating from within an ethnorelative or intercultural/global mindset have a complex orientation towards cultural difference and understand that the view provided by their lens is not shared by all, particularly those operating from within different cultural paradigms. Le Gros (2011) gives an anecdote to demonstrate the difference in approaches:

For example, a graduate student might agree to do something that his supervisor has asked him to do knowing full well that he will not be able to get it done. If his professor has a Monocultural Mindset, he might think, "This student has been dishonest with me; he should not have said he could do the work. " With an Intercultural/Global Mindset, individuals can acknowledge that their own worldviews are not central to all paradigms. If they see behaviour they don’t understand, they will be more likely to consider alternate explanations. In the previous example, a professor with an Intercultural or Global Mindset might realize that the student did not say ‘no’ out of respect. The professor might then (a) have a conversation with the student about the importance of being direct; and/or (b) be more mindful of how he phrased questions and directions to the student. (para 2)

**Monocultural and intercultural mindsets.** Within the monocultural mindset are two orientations: denial and polarization—with polarization containing the sub-stages of defense and reversal. The intercultural mindset also has three orientations: minimization, which while an intercultural orientation with an ethnorelative worldview, is seen as a transitional stage towards the fully intercultural/global mindsets of acceptance and adaptation; from within these orientations a person will have a more
positive attitude towards cultural difference than from within denial or polarization. They will not feel threatened by cultural difference, and will recognize that there is a wide variety of ways to view the world.

The IDC also posits the existence of a state called cultural disengagement, which is a disconnection or sense of exclusion from one’s own cultural group; however, cultural disengagement is not considered to be one of the IDC orientations (Hammer, 2009). Cultural disengagement is “experiential rather than developmental. A person may experience cultural disengagement at any of the stages of the IDC” (MDB Group, 2012). A visual representation of the IDC, and the characteristics of individuals or organizations within each orientation, can be seen in Figure 7.

Figure 7. The Intercultural Development Continuum

Note. Adapted from M. R. Hammer, 20–23 April 2012, The Intercultural Development Inventory™ qualifying seminar, Zurich, Switzerland.

Monocultural IDC orientations. There are three monocultural IDC orientations: denial, polarization (defense), and polarization (reversal). Denial is seen as the default stage of being comfortable with that which is familiar and being unaware of cultural differences in those around you. People in this orientation may maintain an experiential or actual physical separation from those of different cultures. Individuals or groups with little experience of other cultures can be in denial, but so too can those who separate themselves from the host culture. It is not uncommon to hear of exchange students or expatriate employees who lead a life completely isolated—probably unconsciously—from cultures around them, and develop no understanding the cultural diversity in their
surroundings. This orientation is common among members of dominant cultures, and is less common in members of sub-cultures.

Within the Polarization (Defense) stage, differences between cultures are recognized, but an individual or a group may have a strong “us and them” mindset, and may view their own culture as superior to others. Stereotypes may be relied upon to make sense of other cultures. A danger with polarization is if it leads to a cognitive or physical separation from other cultures, then development may become stalled at this orientation.

The Polarization (Reversal) stage is less common than the defense orientation, from within this orientation other cultures are seen as better or superior than one’s own culture. A person or group may denigrate or distrust his or her own culture, or may have an unrealistically rosy view of the other culture, often based on a shallow and stereotypical understanding.

**Transitional IDC orientations.** Minimization is considered to be the first of the intercultural/global mindsets, though at a transitional stage (while in the DMIS, this orientation was seen as clearly ethnocentric). Those within this orientation are aware of cultural difference, but tend to ignore the extent and depth of these differences—which are de-emphasized (Hammer, 2012b). From within this orientation, one tends to assume that all people have similar basic wants and needs, which has the effect of diminishing perceived cultural difference. Members of the dominant culture may self-assess as being within a more intercultural orientation, and be surprised to learn that they are within the minimization orientation as measured by the IDI. They may be unaware of how behavior and expectations are adopted to the norms of the dominant culture. Hammer (2011) says of Minimization that it is:

Conceived as a transitional orientation that is more effective around recognizing and responding to cultural commonalities but is challenged when complex cultural differences need to be adapted to through deeper understanding of the values and behavior patterns of the other cultural community. (p.476)
From within this orientation, people may rely upon the Golden Rule and treat others how they themselves would like to be treated. While well intentioned, this approach assumes that all cultures would react in the same way to each situation.

A real-life example of this occurred in the researcher’s life recently when a New Zealand expatriate family’s toddler triplets were all killed in a tragic fire in a shopping mall in Qatar that took the lives of many children. The reaction of the host culture colleagues was to immediately converge on the home of the bereaved parents as a show of support and solidarity, which would be appropriate from within local culture; however, entertaining work colleagues was not what the grieving New Zealand parents expected, nor wanted, at that time. Fortunately, family friends who were well versed with both New Zealand and Qatari culture (and operating from within acceptance or adaptation as explained below) were able to intercede and arrange a compromise that was not overly burdensome to the grieving parents, yet allowed the host culture nationals to feel that they were being supportive of their colleagues.

What makes this an example of minimization though, was the expressed belief of the local staff that “everyone” wants people around when they are grieving, and that it is “natural” to visit the homes of grieving parents. This view that all peoples, regardless of culture, have the same basic needs and wants places this viewpoint within the minimization orientation. The assumption that one understands situations in the same way as those from other cultures allows for misunderstandings, because a person focused on commonalities might miss evidence of differences.

**Intercultural IDC orientations.** There are two intercultural IDC orientations: acceptance and adaptation. From within the Acceptance orientation, one’s culture is seen as one of many possible ways of understanding and experiencing the world. One is able to understand and acknowledge “behaviour which does not reflect their own value systems might be appropriate in the context of the host culture” (Le Gros, 2011, para.
2). The ideas, behavior and attitudes of those other cultures may seem to be seen as unusual, but they are not seen as less rich or meaningful than your own views (MDB Group, 2012).

From within this orientation, a person is able reflect on cross-cultural experiences, even ones that were not enjoyed, and determine if behavior that they may have initially perceived as rude or inappropriate was in fact culturally appropriate in the context. These individuals “are essential to any group that has multiple cultures in it, as they can serve as bridges and view situations from multiple perspectives” (Le Gros, 2011, para 7). Individuals operating from within acceptance can “take the perspective of another culture without losing your own perspective” (Bennett, 1993, p. 70).

From within the Adaptation orientation, people are able to switch cultural viewpoints and see the world through the lens of other cultural perspectives. In those with strongly developed adaptation they are also able to change their behaviors so that they are unremarkable when viewed by those in the target culture (Bennett, 1993). Hammer and Bennett (2001) describe one within adaptation as:

the travelers who shift easily into local behavior, although they still suffer culture shock in new cultures. They are the managers who treat employees from different cultures differently, with a natural ease that never seems to be patronizing. They are the administrators who do not balk at the idea of special programming for particular cultural groups, while they keep up the sense of unity well. (p. 44)

The similarities between the IDC and the DMIS are clear, but so too are the differences. The IDC is grounded in theory, first in Bennett’s work on the DMIS—which is itself a phenomenological model based on personal construct theory (Kelly, 1963)—and its offshoot radical constructivism (Watzlawick, 1984). From within this approach, it is understood that all knowledge is created in the heads of people as a construct through their understanding and interpretation of events around them. Glaserfeld (1995), in describing this approach, says that:
What we make of experience constitutes the only world we consciously live in. It can be sorted into many kinds, such as things, self, others, and so on. But all kinds of experience are essentially subjective, and though I may find reasons to believe that my experience may not be unlike yours, I have no way of knowing that it is the same (p.1).

The primary difference between the two tools is that the IDC model has been updated and adapted to better reflect research that shows that Minimization is a Transitional, not an Ethnocentric, orientation.

Both the DMIS and the IDC are non-judgmental and see the meaning and perception that individuals place on phenomena (Pilota, 1983) as being the priority. There is no “correct” stage of development, rather:

by not offering the “ideal” stage of development, but rather allowing learners to examine experiences and the interpretations of those experiences, they gain insights that could be used to increase their own level of sensitivity. (Matkin & Barbuto, 2012, p. 295)

Another advantage of the IDC, and the DMIS on which it is based, is that an individual gains context (Rabo, 2011) and a self-awareness of their own understanding of cultural difference. It is this self-awareness that allows for an increasingly complex understanding of ICS. Hammer (2012b) asserts that the IDC is (a) holistic in that it locates mind/action sets, not individual personality, knowledge, attitude or skill dimensions; (b) developmental rather than typological; and (c) interculturally grounded, meaning it explains how individuals or groups experience both differences and similarities.

It is this focus on development, and not skills, that sets both the DMIS and the IDC apart from most other available cross-cultural competence frameworks, of which there are many in the literature. Fantini (2006) identified 87 assessment instruments such as the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) (Kelley & Meyers, 1995), the Client Cultural Competence Inventory (Switzer, et al., 1998). The author is aware of
more recent developments, such as the under development Global Mindedness Dispositions instrument (de Oliveira Andreotti, V., Biesta, G., & Ahenakew, 2013).

**Practical applications of the Intercultural Development Inventory.** The IDI is a paper- or computer-based psychometric tool used to locate an individual’s orientation to cultural difference. The results can be mapped to the DMIS stages and IDC orientations (Paige et al., 2003). When used to determine the organizational level of ICS, IDI assessment results are triangulated with individual or focus group interviews, which are used to evaluate cross-cultural goals and incidents (Hammer, 2012b). When used with a group, these interview results can demonstrate how IDI results are actualized in the strategies they employ in their intercultural dealings. Hammer states that “these qualitative strategies help situate the individual, group, and/or organizational IDI profile results in the cultural experiences of the respondents” (p. 117).

Some of the benefits of the IDI, as identified in the literature, are that: (a) it hypothesizes a developmental model, rather than a criterion model, (b) the assessment tool provides an objective identification of an individual’s orientation, and (c) this identification of an orientation allows for the development of activities to increase an individual’s understanding of cultural complexity (Sheffield, 2007). The literature on study abroad (e.g., Engle & Engle, 2004; Pedersen, 2010; Vande Berg et al., 2009) has clearly demonstrated the value of the IDI in measuring mindset shifts and guiding cross-cultural development. This is important because the literature has also shown that immersion in another culture, or lengthy sojourns overseas, does not necessarily improve intercultural competence or sensitivity (e.g., Hammer, 2005; Pedersen, 2009; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004). Generally speaking, the literature does show (Pusch, 1994) that intercultural education can help with the movement towards more intercultural orientations, but formal and guided development toward worldview change
is not what many overseas or cross-cultural experiences provide. It is important to emphasize that programs that focus on development rather than external observables, are

appropriately aimed at the worldview, not at any particular knowledge (such as in area studies programs), any particular attitude change (such as in prejudice reduction programs) or any particular skill acquisition (such as role-plays or cultural assimilators). (Bennett, 2004, p. 68)

In the context of such development, a method of measuring any shift in orientation as a result of developmental learning is needed, and that is what the IDI provides.

The IDI allows for intercultural development and education to be effectively designed so that a student is neither intimidated nor scared, and is adequately supported with developmental training focused at their orientation level while they undertake self-examination and reflection—which may be uncomfortable. Such a pedagogical approach is in agreement with Sanford’s (1966) challenge/support hypothesis discussed in chapter 1. However, pre-arrival development and support as well as continuous ongoing diversity and cultural education for individuals or groups employed in cross-cultural environments are needed when the IDI is used. The IDI can first be used to gather baseline data. Successive measurements can assess the individual’s (and group’s) progression through pre- and post-tests to reveal the development of ICS. Paige (2004) states, “the IDI is proving to be a multipurpose instrument useful for personal development and self-awareness, audience analysis, examining topics salient to the training program, organizational assessment and development, and data-based intercultural training” (p. 99).

The importance of support for those in cross-cultural study has been extensively examined in the study abroad literature (e.g., Hammer, 2005; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004; Pedersen, 2009). One finding is that short-term “island” programs have little impact on study abroad students’ orientations, and may actually reinforce pre-existing stereotypes—or as the saying has it “Familiarity breeds contempt.” Koskinen and
Tossavainen (2004) found in their study of nursing students who spent time abroad as part of their program that a large proportion of the students concluded that nursing was similar everywhere. This view falls within the minimization orientation. Another group found that time abroad demonstrated the superiority of their own system, which reflects a view that falls within the polarization–defense orientation. Only a small group recognized the differences between their systems and the systems that they experienced overseas and found the differences interesting and stimulating; a view that falls within either acceptance or adaptation. Koskinen and Tossavainen’s study also showed that in order to make the most of their experiences while abroad, the students needed “assistance in each phase of the programme. Particularly, the students need intercultural tutoring and mentoring to venture into encounters with local people” (p. 111).

Bennett (2011) says of using the IDI to aid development:

If you want to show delta, that is, if you want to show change associated with an intervention, the IDI is the best game in town and pretty sensitive. The power of IDI is that it can attribute statistical significance to change. For instance, it shows that if people do intercultural training they’ll learn more from a cross-cultural experience than if they don’t do training. To make that statement with statistical significance is very powerful. (p. 23)

The IDI’s ability to quantify change due to cross-cultural education or experience is unique and allows educators to monitor and adapt to the needs of their students in accord with the Sanford’s (1966) challenge/support hypothesis. Using the IDI, cross-cultural educators and trainers are also able to assess and quantify the generalizable (etic) skills of intercultural sensitivity, rather than the culture specific emic skills.

**Critique of the theoretical models and tool.** It has been said (Davis, 2009; A. de Oliveira, personal communication, March 6, 2012; Le Gros, 2011; Rabo, 2011) that Bennett and Hammer’s models posit that developing ICS requires an intellectual or cognitive change, and has little to say about emotions and relationships. Critics also argue that these models are mono-dimensional and lacking in the richness that makes up
the human experience. As A. de Oliveira (personal communication, March 6, 2012) states:

Bennett’s model, although being methodologically sound, did not respond to insights from discursive theories that point to the complexity of the relationship between cognition, affect, relationality, and performance (everything seems to be based on a model where cognition defines behavior).

It is possible that the criticisms above are based on confusion or misunderstanding about the IDC and its precursor, the DMIS. Bennett (personal communication, December 3, 2012) states that such criticism may be based on confusion over the model. He says that such criticism:

seems to be based on a misunderstanding of the model. The DMIS uses constructivist perception theory to model the development of a kind of perceptual experience, not cognition, affect, or behavior. The underlying assumption is that wholistic experience is a function of how we organize our perception of reality. An early statement of this is found in the "experience corollary" of George Kelly, *Theory of Personal Constructs*, but later statements that are less easily confused with a purely cognitive approach can be found in George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Philosophy in the Flesh*, and in current neuropsych research such as Antonio Damasio, *The Feeling of What Happens*.

Davis (2009) said that as “the model conceptualizes ICS as a special form of cognitive complexity, it is reasonable to expect that advanced graduate study, when combined with other factors, would be consistent with the formation of more complex responses to cultural difference”(p. 135).

Hammer (personal communication, March 24th, 2013) states that:

Davis is not correct in characterization of the DMIS or the IDC; M. Bennett’s writings and my own (see 2011 article, etc) do NOT characterize the model as a special form of cognitive complexity—this is one erroneous author’s assertion which is NOT supported in any of the primary authors writings . . . this conceptualization of the DMIS needs to be pointed out as an unsupported assertion—not a fact.

---

3 The e-mail excerpt has been reprinted here in its exact form. Any errors appearing here are in the original communication.

4 The e-mail excerpt has been reprinted here in its exact form. Any errors appearing here are in the original communication.
It is not known how widely this misunderstanding of the model is, though Bennett (personal communication, April 16th, 2013)\(^5\) acknowledges that such misunderstanding exists when he says:

I am aware of the misunderstanding generated by interpreting DMIS with the common learning categories of Knowledge, Attitude, Skills (KAS), so in my current writing on the model I try to explicitly counter that misinterpretation. I think most of the misinterpretation arises from people basing their knowledge of the DMIS on one of the various handouts floating around on the model. Those handouts often include diagnostic shortcuts stated in KAS terms to recognize what position a person might be using in dealing with cultural difference. But noting that the manifestations of one's perceptual experience might be described in KAS terms is different than having KAS (or even worse, just cognition) be the assumed phenomenon being modeled.

Despite the possibility that some critics may have misunderstood the model, future researchers need to be aware of these criticisms and keep them in mind during any research using the DMIS or IDC. There remains the possibility that the criticisms may be proven accurate as the result of future research.

Some researchers, such as Dinges and Baldwin (1996), feel that theoretical models are abundant, but that they have “not been matched by an equally ambitious empirical research program” (p. 106). Admittedly, empirical research into ICC is challenging because of the “flexibility of working definitions of the concept” (Hajek & Giles, 2003, p. 239). Research in the future may address the criticism that the DMIS, and its offshoots, visualizes the progression of stages that a person moves through, but is silent on the process that a person goes through to move from one developmental stage to the next.

Dinges and Baldwin’s (1996) concern reported above highlight a strength of the DMIS and IDC model, which is the validation and research it has undergone. In addition to the three phases of validation research mentioned earlier in this section, Engberg (2006) has reported that there is a positive correlation between the IDI and

\(^5\) The e-mail excerpt has been reprinted here in its exact form. Any errors appearing here are in the original communication.
other standardized tests such as the Worldmindedness Scale, which assesses ethnocentric and ethnorelative attitudes, and the Intercultural Anxiety Scale, which measures participant anxiety when in contact with those of another culture. Hammer et al. (2003) have reported that both tests support the construct validity of the IDI.

Another critique of current developmental models is that they tend to ignore context in an attempt to define an overarching, context-independent model. ICC research has traditionally focused on the individual, without giving enough weight to the situation and group dynamics (Pusch, 1994). It is possible that:

Looking for an overarching model that will conceptualise ICC in a variety of settings is futile. ICC will always have a combination of both context-neutral competencies and context-specific competencies, so no set of competencies will guarantee success in all situations. (Berardo, 2005, p. 13)

Such criticism reflects that of Stoof et al. (2002), who believe that competence is influenced by people, goals, and context, that these variables cannot be separated from ICC, and that ICC should be conceptualized within a constructivist paradigm that acknowledges context and the cyclical and repetitive formation process.

Critics also argue that using psychometric tools in education (as in this study) is inappropriately reductionist (Gardner, 1983; Kornhaber & Gardner, 1993). Reductionism, to some extent, is endemic to all academic study, as research “seeks to explain a particular phenomenon in terms of more basic, general principles” (Slingerland, 2008, p. 266). Although the IDI is a psychometric tool that assesses an orientation within the theoretical model, it still leaves room for complexity, as it says nothing of causation—why individuals or groups hold the beliefs they do or why the measurements are as they are.

Developmental models are problematic to some: They can be seen as hierarchical, and they imply a linear progression in a world that rarely moves in such a predictable way. They also can be seen as implying a direction, of being teleological, perhaps even implying an ultimate destination (Stuart, 2012). Many question their value.
and usefulness. However, the biggest challenge with developmental models is the lack of a change mechanism (Stuart, 2012). This does not necessarily have to be so. The mechanism of change between, for example, Type 2 and 3 cancers might be poorly understood, but that doesn’t lessen the value of the descriptions of the characteristics of the stages. However, it is likely that developmental models will continue to be treated with suspicion. Kegan (1994) explained,

Any time a theory is normative, and suggests that something is more grown, more mature, more developed than something else, we had all better check to see if the distinction rests on arbitrary grounds that consciously or unconsciously unfairly advantage some people. (p. 229)

However, developmental models can be beneficial if used with appropriate caution; for example, understanding the average developmental stage of a group can allow for structured educational curricula, or allow for better selection of intervention techniques that align with a particular developmental stage (Stuart, 2012).

Similarly, it could be argued that using a quantitative tool for group comparisons causes ideographic difference to be ‘smoothed’, (F. Martin, personal communication, March 13th 2013) and that orientations at either extreme of the model are minimized. However, these concerns were addressed during design of the tool. Hammer (2011) asserted that,

The DO scores of the IDI are “normalized” on a scale with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. This then, based on a normal distribution, produces the following standard deviation percentages: 2.28% (Denial), 13.59% (Polarization, i.e., Defense/Reversal), 68.26% (Minimization), 13.59% (Acceptance), and 2.28% (Adaptation) . . . the "normed" cross-cultural sample for IDI v2 of 1,000 individuals reflected the normal distribution of IDI DO scores. . . . Further, a review of the current IDI v3 validation study data (this article) from 4,763 individuals provides empirical support for the normal distribution of the IDI. Specifically, the distribution of IDI DO scores within this large, international, cross-cultural sample reveals the following distribution: Denial: 2.6%; Polarization: 14%; Minimization: 67%; Acceptance: 14.9%; and Adaptation: 1.6%. . . these results clearly indicate the IDI is very sensitive to individual differences, and the IDI does not underestimate the more ethnocentric orientations. In short, the IDI is an equally robust and valid assessment for both individuals and groups. (p. 482)
Until, or unless, there is empirical evidence to support the critiques above, the IDI remains the most thoroughly examined and heavily used psychometric measure of developmental orientation to cultural difference available.

Self-report measures (such as the IDI used for this study) also have been seen as problematic. Although skills and knowledge (or the low-level artifacts of ICC) may be rather easily measured, accurately assessing attitudes and values through self-report is particularly difficult (Byram, 2003). For example, participants may consciously or subconsciously choose socially desirable answers, which can compromise the reliability and validity of the data. However, Paige et al. (2003) concluded based on their research that “there is no relationship between the way subjects answered the IDI and their level of social desirability” (p. 479). The only exception was between social desirability and minimization, which exhibited larger correlations than other dimensions. However, they concluded, even that was found to be “low and not statistically significant” (p. 479). They concluded that the IDI is “a reliable measure that has little or no social desirability bias” (p. 467). The lack of social desirability was further confirmed via the Crown Marlow Social Desirability Index that showed “no significant correlations of the IDI with social desirability (Hammer, 2009, p. 216).

Finally, there are concerns in the literature (Johnson, O’Rourke, Burris, & Owens, 2002) with how different cultures interpret and answer survey-type instruments. Johnson et al. have suggested that there is “cultural variability in survey question comprehension, memory retrieval, judgment formation, and response editing processes” (p. 55). Yamamoto (1998) also has questioned the use of the DMIS with Japanese subjects, because of believed differences in how the Japanese perceive cultural difference and beliefs that the Japanese do not follow the same progression of developmental stages as other cultures.
Yamamoto asserts that Japanese individuals perceive cultural difference as facts, while the DMIS/IDC model envisions cultural difference as abstractions. Therefore, the DMIS/IDC model is inappropriate in a Japanese context. On the surface, this fact/abstraction perception is supported by Bennett and Stewart (1991), who claim that “Americans tend to focus on functional, pragmatic applications of thinking; in contrast, the Japanese are more inclined to concrete description, while Europeans stress abstract theory” (pp.28-29).

A study by Wiseman, Hammer, and Nishida (1989) examining the relationship between ICC and culture-specific knowledge and attitudes of 800 students in Japanese and American universities found that the more ethnocentric the attitudes held by the students, the more likely they were to construe cultural difference as culture-specific, rather than culture-general. That is, they had a less complex understanding of cultural difference, which would be expected from those in the ethnocentric/monocultural orientations of the DMIS/IDC. These results are congruent with Piaget’s (1968) cognitive development theory. This theory holds that those in earlier stages of development tend to refer to concrete examples, while those in later developmental stages have more complex and abstract concepts. Rather than undermining the validity of the DMIS/IDC in the Japanese context, it seems that Yamamoto’s work actually reinforces the underlying developmental model. To date, no other studies using the IDI were found to substantiate Yamamoto’s assertions.

The assertion above by Bennett and Stewart (1991) that Europeans are more focused on “abstract theory” may perhaps be seen in Byram’s (1997) Intercultural Competence Model (the five ‘savoirs’) listed in Table 3. While Byram’s model is often cited within the literature in the European sphere, it is less common within the North American sphere. For this research, it was not chosen as theoretical model for a few reasons. First among them is Byram’s explicit statement that the model was designed to
help teachers in language classrooms understand intercultural competence (Byram, 1997), and that linguistic competence is key component of ICS.

This focus on language teachers and language classrooms is too narrow for the research in this study. Ironically, the DMIS-IDC model has been criticized (Hu & Byram, 2009; Spencer-Oatey & Franklin, 2009) for not explaining the role that language plays in the development of intercultural sensitivity. The focus in Byram’s model on linguistic competence as a key component also clashes with the findings of Vande Berg et al. (2012) and VanderHeijden (2010) that show no link between improved language skill and increased ICS.

An additional reason Byram’s model was not chosen for this study was that it has not been researched and tested as extensively as the combined DMIS-IDC model. The IDI has been subject to extensive validation studies (see discussion below), whereas no validation studies have been conducted on Byram’s model to the author’s knowledge. Finally, Byram’s model is a co-orientational model, while a developmental model such as the DMIS-IDC is better suited to gathering baseline data and monitoring progress over time, one of the goals of this research.

One recent study by Peckenpaugh (2012) combined both Byram’s five savoirs and the DMIS in an attempt to more fully explain participant attitudes and behaviours. Peckenpaugh (2012) found attitudes of ethnocentric judgment in some participant responses, despite the participants being assessed as interculturally competent according to Byram’s (1997) model. When the IDI was administered, it was found that participants who had exhibited the attitudes of ethnocentric judgment in their responses fell within the ethnocentric orientations of the DMIS, despite where they were assessed in Byram’s model.

In the future, more studies of this type that combine multiple models may be able to add depth and nuance to a very complex process and may lead to the
development of a hybrid model that combines characteristics of all of the different types of model shown in Table 5.

It has also been asserted by Greenholtz (2005) that the concepts assessed by the IDI, and by extension the DMIS and the IDC models, do not cross cultures because of translation difficulties, and that the models may therefore have validity issues. Research by Paige et al. (2003), Hammer et al. (2003) and Hammer (2009, 2011) refute this, and have confirmed the IDI’s cross-cultural and cross language validity. According to Hammer (2011), the IDI has been subject to three validation studies that total over 10,000 participants from approximately 40 countries and 15 different languages. Based on these studies and its established psychometric properties, Hammer (2009) asserted that the IDI is a cross-culturally generalizable, valid, and reliable assessment of an individual’s and group’s core orientations toward cultural differences.

Hammer (2011) further states,

the current analyses offers strong support for the cross-cultural generalizability, validity and reliability of IDI v3 measure, to include the individual sub-scales of Denial, Defense, Reversal, Minimization, Acceptance and Adaptation as well as the overall Developmental Orientation (DO) and overall Perceived Orientation (PO) scales. (p. 485)

In addition to the reliability and validity studies undertaken by Hammer (2003, 2009, 2001) and Paige et al. (2003), Endicott, Bock, and Narvaez (2003) used three assessment tools - the Multicultural Experience Questionnaire (MEQ), the Defining Issues Test (DIT) and the IDI - to examine the interplay between moral reasoning, multicultural experience, and intercultural development. The researchers found a strong positive correlation between the IDI and the MEQ and DIT.

Despite the evidence above, many researchers, depending on their ontological and epistemological stance, may continue to believe that cognitive structures such as those explicated in the DMIS-IDC models cannot be quantified. However, when used on an individual basis with the pre-administration contexting interview and the post-
administration feedback sessions, the IDI process provides both quantitative and qualitative data that can be used to locate a participant’s orientation on the DMIS-IDC scale.

During the qualification seminar for IDI administrators it is recommended that data from the interviews be prioritized over that from the IDI inventory in the case of significant difference between the inventory and the interview results. In the experience of this researcher, incongruence between the inventory and the interview results is very rare.

Researchers should continue to be aware of the concerns among some with the IDI, particularly when used for group assessment, and should consider that despite the research, concerns with “smoothing” of data when used with groups persist. For example, Bennett (2009) expresses concern that the IDI:

... sacrifices ideographic data in favor of the nomothetic data necessary for group comparisons. What this means is that the instrument is not very sensitive to individual differences; it tends to overestimate the ‘normative’ condition—Minimization—and underestimate the extent of more ethnocentric or more ethnorelative positions ... Consequently, the IDI should be used cautiously and only with other measures, such as the qualitative data reported in descriptive studies, to discover the overall intercultural sensitivity of groups. (p. 8)

However, Hammer (2011) is critical of Bennett’s opinion, stating that Bennett provides no evidence to support his assertion. Hammer states:

It is puzzling why Dr. Bennett would make such an unsubstantiated claim insofar as he is well aware that the "normed" cross-cultural sample for IDI v2 of 1,000 individuals reflected the normal distribution of IDI DO scores. ... Further, a review of the current IDI v3 validation study data (this article) from 4,763 individuals provides empirical support for the normal distribution of the IDI. Specifically, the distribution of IDI DO scores within this large, international, cross-cultural sample reveals the following distribution: Denial: 2.6%; Polarization: 14%; Minimization: 67%; Acceptance: 14.9%; and Adaptation: 1.6%. ... These results clearly indicate the IDI is very sensitive to individual differences, and the IDI does not underestimate the more ethnocentric orientations. In short, the IDI is an equally robust and valid assessment for both individuals and groups. (p. 482)
In this research, Bennett’s concerns with group administration were addressed through the use of focus groups to gather qualitative data. Any future researcher considering the use of the IDI on groups should bear in mind the concerns with group administration and smoothing, despite the lack of evidence to support such concerns.

In sum then, the IDI is an instrument that is based on the theoretical models provided by the DMIS and IDC, and has undergone extensive validity, reliability, and social desirability study, and has had its construct validity confirmed through its positive correlation with two similar scales. Although concerns have been expressed about both the tool and the models, they are unsubstantiated by empirical study, I am not aware of any other tool or model that has undergone anything approaching a comparable amount of research. Given this, the IDC and IDI are the most appropriate choices for a study of this type.

That being said, the IDI is a proprietary instrument controlled by a private corporation as a revenue-generating tool. As such, access to the tool is strictly controlled, and only after a relatively expensive and lengthy training period. While this can be seen as maintaining quality, it does put the tool out of reach for many researchers.

**Intercultural Competence within Higher Education**

Several studies have examined the need for, and impact of, ICC within higher education. Before examining the findings of these studies, it is important to understand the role and impact of culture within education and elsewhere.

**Impact of culture on higher education.** Ting-Toomey (1999) identified five basic functions of culture:

1. Identity construction. “Culture provides indoctrination in the values, beliefs, and expectations that guide the worldview and behavior of both teachers and students” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 12). This has been described as being the primary role of culture. Within a school environment, this can be a cause of conflict, because a teacher and a student may have brought different norms and expectations to the classroom.
2. Group inclusion. “It is human nature to feel a need to belong to an identifiable group, and identifying with a cultural group can meet this need” (p. 13).

3. Intergroup boundary regulation. *Intergroup boundary regulation* refers to “the positive and negative evaluative attitudes members develop regarding in-group and out-group interactions” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 13). This function can be seen as the underlying source of monocultural and ethnocentric mindsets. That is, when an individual’s evaluations of another culture are negative, the individual is said to be ethnocentric. This ethnocentric worldview is common, with most individuals viewing their own culture as the best, and the model on which other cultures should be based (McIntyre, 1995). Most people are not aware of the way their culturally informed worldview or their cultural underpinnings informs their beliefs, perceptions, and actions (Gudykunst & Kim, 1997). Ethnocentric views by teachers can be detrimental for the teacher–student relationship. Paige et al. (2003) believes that teachers may exhibit an unconscious message of ethnocentricity and intolerance.

4. Ecological adaption. *Ecological adaption* refers to the interplay between the social and physical environment and culture, wherein the culture changes to adapt to the environment. This occurs when the attitudes, beliefs, values, and behaviors of the culture no longer “work” within the larger environment. Adaptation can cause stress for a culture’s members (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 14) because cultural expectations and ways of being are very difficult to change (Russell, 1997; Senge, 1990; tatto, 1996).

5. Cultural communication. “Communication plays a central role in perpetuating culture” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 14). Anthropologist Edward T. Hall succinctly summarized, "culture is communication and communication is culture" (1959, p. 186). It is through communication that new cultural members are socialized to observe the “acceptable” pattern of behaviors. Moreover, communicative behaviors are interpreted through a cultural lens. It follows that communication styles may vary widely from culture to culture and cross-cultural communication may be fraught with conflict. Thus, when teachers and students do not share a culture (or even when fellow teachers do not share a culture), misunderstanding and conflict may be inevitable.

These functions of culture result in deeply ingrained and culturally influenced expectations that consciously and subconsciously guide how students interact with teachers and how teachers interact with students (Senge, 1990; Tatto, 1996). Several studies have shown that American pre-service teachers’ communication and interaction, as well as their decision making, is deeply influenced by their cultural beliefs (Domínguez, 2003; Emmanuel, 2002; Lockhart, 2002; Park, 2006; Ross, 2002). Other studies have found that teachers’ life experiences—especially their previous experiences with teaching—produce preconceived notions and self-conceptions (Entwistle, Skinner,
Entwistle, & Orr, 2000; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Northfield & Gunstone, 1997; Russell, 1997). Hoppe added that these cultural patterns are rather intractable because “culture is internalized patterns of thinking and behaving that are believed to be ‘natural’—simply the way things are” (1998, p. 340). It follows that when teachers and students from different cultures come together within one institution, unproductive conflicts can result. For example, cultures have divergent attitudes about noise, respectfulness, independence, and discipline in the classroom (Thorpe, 1997).

Moreover, students may display perfectly culturally appropriate behavior that simply irritates teachers from different cultures (Chamberlain, 2005; Neal, McCray, Webb-Johnson, & Bridges, 2001). For example, it is not uncommon for male students in GCC classrooms to raise their hands in class and snap their fingers to get the attention of a teacher. While unremarkable in the context of the local culture, such behavior is seen as arrogant and condescending by Western expatriate teachers. Only rarely do teachers systematically and continuously consider a culturally or linguistically different student’s socialization, and how that influences learning style, classroom behavior, and social interactions (Fradd, 1997; Smith-Davis, 2004). Therefore, it is not uncommon for Western instructors to respond with a strong rebuke to the baffled student. This can serve as the beginning of an escalating series of cultural communication misunderstandings between the two.

Cultural differences in the classroom also can lead teachers to make erroneous conclusions about their students. Helmer (2007) found that lack of ICS among expatriate teachers in Egypt was a strong predictor of students being labeled deficient and being unnecessarily referred for special needs accommodation. Warren (2002) conducted a study that showed 75% of teachers hold stereotypical views of some cultures, and do not consider cultural background when considering student achievement. Many teachers feel that a lack of student success is purely due to a lack of
effort, and that students just need to work harder in order to be successful. Kusuma-Powell (2000) noted that sojourner educators often view local students as lazy and lacking motivation, or, as in the context of this research, as having so many maids and nannies that they have learned helplessness. Neal et al. (2003) conducted research where middle-school teachers viewed clips of the walking style of African-American males and then were assessed on their perceptions. Results showed that the teachers viewed those males with a more exaggerated African-American walking style, which included a deliberate swagger, to be lower in intelligence and more aggressive, without any other evidence to support this perception. Similarly, it has been my experience that, within the context of this study, the walking style of the male Gulf Arab students is sometimes interpreted by Western expatriate staff as lazy, uncaring, and insolent.

These cultural differences and erroneous conclusions can impact the hidden curriculum within higher education. Because culture influences what is valued, how assessments are conducted, and what behaviors are expected (Apple, 1982), teachers and students who share a culture also tend to share and socially reinforce a common set of values and expectations. Apple posited that those students who share the dominant culture of the institution enjoy a privileged status, as they are best positioned to adapt to the school’s expected patterns of perception, behavior, and language. Accordingly, students operating according to a different culture may feel discomfort and may have difficulty effectively operating within the dominant culture of the institution. Corson (1999) went further to argue that only those students who share the institutional culture actually receive and understand the knowledge and training delivered in that institution. This leaves students who are not versed in the cultural expectations of the school at a disadvantage. Chamberlain (2005) and Neal, McCray, and Webb-Johnson (2001) added that the end result is ineffective instruction for all but those students who share the culture.
Bayles (2009) summarized that culture plays an important role in the classroom and emphasized “the need for educators to be able to think and act in culturally appropriate ways in order to effectively engage students from diverse cultural backgrounds and to foster the culturally appropriate knowledge and skills demanded by today’s global society” (p. 64). However, studies conducted on in-service and pre-service teachers in the United States suggest that teachers largely hold simple orientations to cultural difference (Bayles, 2009; Dominguez, 2003; Garmon, 2004; Lockhart, 2002; Ross, 2002; Song, 2005). Bennett (1993) reminds us:

Intercultural sensitivity is not natural. It is not part of our primate past, nor has it characterized most of human history. Cross-cultural contact usually has been accompanied by bloodshed, oppression, or genocide. The continuation of this pattern in today’s world of unimagined interdependence is not just immoral or unprofitable—it is self-destructive. Yet in seeking a different way, we inherit no model from history to guide us. (p. 21)

Research in California has reported that in-service teachers are intimidated by and unprepared for culturally diverse classrooms (Farr, Sexton, Puckett, Pereira-Leon, & Weissman, 2005). Melnick and Zeichner (1998) elaborated that teachers generally lack an understanding of diversity. They say that “teacher candidates, for the most part, come to teacher education with limited direct interracial and intercultural experience, with erroneous assumptions about diverse youngsters, and limited expectations for the success of all learners” (p. 89). The research above does not deal specifically with sojourner educators, but it is likely that if in-service teachers feel unprepared for culturally diverse classrooms in their own country, then sojourners in an entirely new cultural milieu will feel at least equally unprepared. The MDB Group (2012) further estimated that although approximately 90% of any population views itself as being interculturally competent or aware, in reality, only roughly 13% actually have such awareness. Cheng (1996) further asserted that teachers do not value what is outside of their cultural expectations. There is no reason to believe that in-service teachers are any different.
Life history research in the United States by Mahon (2003) of a small sample of six teachers selected from a much larger sample who had taken the IDI found, [a] tendency among participants . . . to concentrate on the similarities of their students...If the difference seems glaring or a serious departure from the norm, he or she will be attended to (holidays discovered, parents spoken to, diet or other needs covered). Racial or ethnic differences not accompanied by linguistic differences between the teacher and the student may also not provoke any adaptation to culture...It is difficult to fault teachers for believing that seeing only the mind and heart of a child is best practice. They firmly may attest that they do not see color, and attest even more firmly that this is the best thing for the child. They cling tightly to the value of humanity, and the fact that everyone has the same needs and desires. (p. 348)

**Need for intercultural sensitivity among educators.** On a global scale, although it has always been important to understand and relate to our neighbor, it is more important today than at any time in the past due to the deeply interconnected way of life nations have developed within the last several decades. Martin and Nakayama (2000) have referred to this as the *peace imperative*.

The push for peace and globalization has cascaded down to our institutions. Thus, together with human rights, education for democratic citizenship, and peace education, intercultural education can be seen as a critical component of a democratic and pluralistic society. Given that schools are expected to succeed with diverse learners, teaching and acquiring intercultural competence should be a major concern in schools and universities (Leeman & Ledoux, 2003). As universities and schools become more diverse, the importance of ICS has become more apparent (Caruna & Spurling, 2007). Many schools and post-secondary institutions around the world now include internationalizing or “globalization” in their mission statement and incorporate it into their business strategy (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008; Knight, 2004; Siaya & Hayward, 2003). Many schools and universities also have prioritized producing “global citizens” (de Witt, 2002).

Seventy years ago, Vickery and Cole (1943) already were expounding the idea that education is not just about the syllabus, but that it was also a tool that they called
cultural democracy. Bayles (2009) elaborated that cultural democracy involves acknowledging and valuing the existence, diversity, and richness of multiple cultures and viewpoints.

He further argued that educators must cultivate this cultural democracy in the classroom and within their students so that students may “interact effectively with people from various cultures” (Bayles, 2009, p. 3). In short, Bayles argued that educators must develop ICS/ICC. This may be particularly true for sojourner educators, who are often expected to leave their home cultures and adapt to the one prevalent at school, often in a very different cultural milieu, and often with little or no formal assistance. Diller and Moule (2005) defined ICS in educators as the ability to successfully teach students who come from cultures other than your own. It entails developing certain personal and interpersonal awareness and sensitivities, learning specific bodies of cultures, and mastering a set of skills, that taken together, underlie effective cross-cultural teaching. (p. 2)

One manifestation of ICS/ICC in the classroom is allowing cultural considerations to inform the planning and teaching process. Ziguras (1999) elaborated that teachers should design their content and delivery methods for particular cultural groups based on what is understood of their needs. Tailoring instruction for the different needs of different groups is a common pedagogical tool and traditionally has been done based on achievement testing, special needs, and emotional-behavioral needs. This begs the question of why content has not been customized based on cultural preferences. Research by Cole and Scribner (1974) showed that "Perception, memory, and thinking all develop as a part of the general socialization of a child and are inseparably bound up with the patterns of activity, communication and social relations in which it enters” (p. 9). This suggests that people learn and understand differently based on their cultural differences. It follows that students who are operating outside their home cultures may experience a sense of confusion or dissonance that in turn affects their achievement.
Therefore, teachers should account for cultural differences when planning materials and conducting lessons (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992; Stone, 2006).

Culturally responsive educators are not just educators who do not let an Arab student see the soles of their shoes, or who know that it is not deceitful for a Japanese student to not make eye contact. Culturally responsive educators are those who reflect on their own culture, consider how it guides their behavior, and anticipate how their culturally informed communication and conflict styles may lead to conflict with their students. Culturally responsive educators monitor and adapt as appropriate to accommodate student needs and culturally informed communicative and learning style preferences (Hammer, 2005).

**Impacts of culturally sensitive teaching.** Several correlational studies have shown a relationship between culturally responsive teaching and student achievement (Jodry, 2001; Kelleher, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Lundgren, 2007, cited in Bayles, 2009). Research by Goodear (2001) also found that “students who learn in an environment where multiple and diverse perspectives are fostered and appreciated become better critical thinkers, communicators, problem-solvers and team players” (p. 13). This is not to say that such outcomes will be easy or automatic. However, few studies have used an experimental design to link interculturally aware teaching with greater student achievement and more research is needed in this area. Klump and McNeir (2005), ascribe this lack of research to the complexity and difficulty of conducting random experiments in educational systems, rather than to the validity of culturally sensitive and responsive practice. Due to the lack of experimental literature, Bayles (2009) concluded that the literature does not show that educators with higher ICS orientations more effectively promote student achievement.

However, research by McLoughlin and Oliver (1999) has shown that when teachers use culturally inappropriate pedagogical techniques and values that do not
match students’ worldviews, the students often “. . . question knowledge . . . question the merit in participation, or worse, feel disenfranchised” (Backroad Connections, 2002, p. 3). In some milieus—for example, education among indigenous learners in Australia—a “lack of culturally appropriate learning is considered to be a major cause of unsuccessful completions. Inadequate teacher and provider sensitivity to cultural differences, lack of teacher relations with students and their communities as well as language difficulties all contribute” (p. 5).

**Impacts of cross-cultural exchange.** The literature on study abroad students (Hammer, 2005; Salisbury, 2011) shows that while not all study abroad automatically leads to increased ICS recent research⁶ on study abroad programs for post-secondary students has shown that properly conducted programs can lead to a marked increase in ICS. However, that does not mean that all programs are effective.

Interestingly, it has been found that the effects of long-term study abroad in high school can last decades. In research with a control group (Hansel & Chen, 2008), it was found that even 20 years after a long-term high school international immersion program the research group demonstrated markedly higher ICS than a control group that did not participate in the study abroad program.

In general, the research has shown that students in programs that follow an experiential-constructivist approach such as those shown in Figure 8 develop more complex and sophisticated orientations than do students enrolled in programs using other approaches (Vande berg et al., 2012). These gains, as measured by the IDI, can be substantial, with gains of more than 15 points possible. Table 4 shows the change in IDI pre- and post-test scores from different types of programs in a sample of study abroad programs in the United States.

---

⁶ For anyone interested in gaining more in-depth understanding of the research behind and the practicalities of study abroad, the Webinar *Student Learning Abroad: What Our Students are Learning, What They’re Not, and What We Can Do About It* (2012), presented by M. Vande Berg, R. M. Paige, and K. H. Lou is an excellent summary of recent research and best practices.
Figure 8. Experiential-Constructivism Approaches to Study Abroad

Note. “Student Learning Abroad: What our Students are Learning, What They’re Not, and What We Can Do About It” [Webinar] (p. 4), by M. Vande Berg, R. M. Paige, and K. H. Lou (Presenters), May 3, 2012. In NAFSA Webinars and Faculty Conversations. Retrieved from http://www.nafsa.org/attend_events/webinars/student_learning_abroad__what_our_students_are_learning,_what_they’re_not,_and_what_we_can_do_about_it/

Table 4. Intercultural Development: Pre and Post Intercultural Development Inventory Gains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Post IDI Gains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No study abroad</td>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown Consortium Study</td>
<td>Unfacilitated</td>
<td>+ 1.30 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown Consortium Study</td>
<td>Facilitated with cultural mentoring onsite</td>
<td>+ 5.00 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota, Twin Cities (Maximizing Study Abroad)</td>
<td>Online course with limited cultural mentoring</td>
<td>+ 4.50 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette-Bellarmine</td>
<td>Online course (with intercultural facilitation by instructor)</td>
<td>+ 8.20 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIEE: Seminar on Living and Learning Abroad</td>
<td>Comprehensive onsite intercultural instruction</td>
<td>+ 9.00 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM Duluth (Psychology Dept.)</td>
<td>Comprehensive onsite intercultural instruction (1 year)</td>
<td>+ 12.00 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Center of Provence: Comprehensive</td>
<td>Onsite intercultural facilitation (Coursework, cultural mentoring, structured cultural immersion)</td>
<td>+ 12.50 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the Pacific School for International Studies</td>
<td>Bookend with three-credit pre-departure and re-entry courses, What’s Up with Culture online support, Semester long study abroad, Intercultural embedded in the Global Studies curriculum</td>
<td>+ 17.50 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that the program with the greatest change in IDI scores had pre- and post-departure activities that, together with onsite activities, were designed to engage the students in constant reflection and meaning-making. These findings on the efficacy of different types of study abroad are consistent with those of the Georgetown Consortium Project (Vande Berg et al., 2009; Vande Berg et al., 2012) as shown in Table 5.

**Table 5. Impact of Program Type on Student Learning Abroad**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration of experience abroad</td>
<td>Small impact on intercultural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homestays</td>
<td>No significant gains in intercultural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct enrollment in host university courses</td>
<td>No significant gains in intercultural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfacilitated “experiential” activities</td>
<td>No significant gains in intercultural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximizing contact with host nationals</td>
<td>No significant gains in intercultural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving foreign language proficiency</td>
<td>No significant gains in intercultural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-departure cultural orientation</td>
<td>Small impact on language skills only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homestays—when students engage with host</td>
<td>Significant gains in intercultural development—highest overall impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural mentoring onsite</td>
<td>Significant gains in intercultural development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Adapted from “Student Learning Abroad: What our Students are Learning, What They’re Not, and What We Can Do About It” [Webinar] (p. 7), by M. Vande Berg, R. M. Paige, and K. H. Lou (Presenters), May 3, 2012. In NAFSA Webinars and Faculty Conversations. Retrieved from http://www.nafsa.org/attend_events/webinars/student_learning_abroad__what_our_students_are_learning__what_they’re_not__and_what_we_can_do_about_it/*

It is clear that merely studying abroad or participating in homestays has little impact on ICS. However, study abroad when paired with pre, post, and ongoing reflective and meaning-making activities guided by a competent facilitator can have a significant impact on ICS.

While these studies have dealt with American university students in study abroad, it is possible that both sojourner educators and domestic educators would benefit from some type of experiential-constructivist cultural sensitivity program that incorporates ongoing reflective and meaning-making activities guided by an interculturally competent facilitator.
Demographic Variables Associated with Intercultural Sensitivity

Earlier studies have tried, with mixed success, to identify predictors of ICS (Ayas, 2006; Conrad, 2006; Fretheim, 2007; Helmer, 2007; Helms, 2003; Kelso, 2006; Lai, 2006; Park, 2006; Pederson, 1998; Straffon, 2001; Westrick & Yuen, 2007), but only a few have examined the ICS of teachers (Bayles, 2009; Fretheim, 2007; Helmer, 2007; Lai, 2006; Lundgren, 2007; Westrick & Yuen, 2007). Further, only one study (Helmer, 2007) was found to address expatriate educators, as in the present study.

Past literature has suggested that several variables influence intercultural success, including personality characteristics, family situation, and technical skills. However, any discovered association between various demographic factors and more complex orientations to cultural difference cannot definitely be said to be causal due to the nature of these studies. Based on his review of the literature, Ronen (1989) identified five categories of factors that were correlated with intercultural success: (a) job factors, (b) relational dimensions, (c) motivational state, (d) family situation, and (e) language skills. Table 6 shows Ronen’s categories, and some of the aspects associated with each.

Zlobina, Basabe, Paez, and Furnham (2006) found, in their study of socio-cultural adaptation of immigrants to Spain, that certain demographic or experiential variables, such as education, were significant predictors of adaptation. While this study examined socio-cultural adaptation and not specifically orientation to cultural difference, it is clear that a complex orientation, and in particular an ethnorelative worldview, is an implicit part of successful socio-cultural adaptation among immigrants, based on Zlobina et al.’s definition of socio-cultural adaptation. It is possible that similar factors also influence long-term sojourner educators.
Table 6. Ronen’s Five Categories of Cross-Cultural Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Factors</th>
<th>Relational Dimensions</th>
<th>Motivational State</th>
<th>Family Situation</th>
<th>Language Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical skills</td>
<td>Tolerance for ambiguity</td>
<td>Belief in mission</td>
<td>Willingness of spouse to live abroad</td>
<td>Host country language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity with host country and</td>
<td>Behavioral flexibility</td>
<td>Congruence with career path</td>
<td>Adaptive and supportive spouse</td>
<td>Non-verbal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>headquarter operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial skills</td>
<td>Non-judgmentalism</td>
<td>Interest in overseas experience</td>
<td>Stable marriage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative competence</td>
<td>Cultural empathy and low ethnocentrism</td>
<td>Interest in specific host country culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>Willingness to acquire new behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Previous studies with varied populations have demonstrated that multicultural experience can contribute to increased ICS (Klak & Martin, 2003; Straffon, 2003; Endicott, Bock, & Narvaez, 2003).

Studies with doctors (Altshuler, Sussman, & Kachur, 2003), high school students (Straffon, 2001, 2003) and nurses (Greatrex-White, 2008) have shown increased ICS as a result of cross-cultural experiences. Bennett (1993) postulated that ICS is largely the result of experience. It can be hypothesized that location during the formative years, educational level, gender, ethnic background, career and cross-cultural traumatic experience could affect the development of ICS.

Research by Davis (2009) found a correlation between support for gay marriage and ICS. Davis hypothesized that supporters of gay marriage see it as more of a cultural than a religious or moral issue.

Other researchers have looked at some of these variables (Bayles, 2009; Helmer, 2007; Helms, 2003; Lai, 2006; Kelso, 2006; Rabo, 2011); however, a gap in the literature remains, as these variables have never been examined among post-secondary
expatriate faculty in the MENA region, nor among those teaching developmental education, nor with faculty members with such diverse national and experiential backgrounds.

Variables such as gender, age, and education in relation to ICS have been examined in earlier studies in an educational context (Fretheim, 2007; Helmer, 2007; Westrick & Yuen, 2007); however, the results have been contradictory. Some researchers (Fretheim, 2007; Straffon, 2001; Westrick & Yuen, 2007) found a positive correlation between time spent abroad and increased ICS; while others, such as Helmer (2007), found that ICS actually decreased with increased time spent outside of one’s own culture.

**Age and intercultural sensitivity.** The literature shows that age is not consistently correlated with ICS and that results vary across studies. Hammer sensitivity. They found no significant differences in IDI orientations based on age. Several studies (Kelso, 2006; Lai, 2006; Paige et al., 2003) also found no significant correlation between age and ICS results. However, Straffon (2001) found that there was inverse relationship between age and ICS. In his study, older high school students were likely to be less culturally sensitive than younger students.

In contrast, Fretheim (2007) and Westrick and Yuen (2007) found a positive correlation between ICS and age, particularly for older participants. This is perhaps not so much a function of age as of experience. According to Bennett (1993), experience is a necessary part of ICS and the development of a complex orientation. It could be presumed that in this study those who were older had more experience with cross-cultural relations, and consequently had the opportunity to develop more complex orientations to cultural difference.

Helmer (2007) found that participants over the age of 50 years had IDI scores that were significantly less interculturally sensitive than those under 50, but she was
unable to say if that was a function of age, or whether it was due to less cross-cultural experience. She speculated that their upbringing might have been at a time when the world was less diverse, so that despite their age, they actually had less experience with cultural diversity than those younger than them. In contrast, research by Mahon (2006) found just the opposite—that teachers over 50 had more complex orientations, and that they fall more within the acceptance/adaptation orientations, and less within the monocultural orientations. Mahon, therefore, conjectured just the opposite, that increased age allowed for more intercultural experiences and the opportunity to develop a more complex schema regarding cultural difference. This is an area in need of more research across populations with little, and a lot, of cross-cultural experience.

**Gender and intercultural sensitivity.** Studies that examine gender and ICS have been contradictory, and it seems likely that the gender expectations of the sojourner’s culture play a large role. For example, in a study not using the IDI, Zlobina et al. (2006) found that gender was not of significance to the socio-cultural adaptation of immigrants to Spain—except among those from North Africa, with North African women displaying greater difficulties in adapting. It is possible that populations from countries with a less marked gender-role differentiation than North Africa suffer less difficulty with cultural adaptation.

Bayles (2009) found there to be no significant difference by gender of measured levels of ICS, which is congruent with earlier findings (Hammer et al., 2003; Paige et al., 2003; Westrick & Yuen, 2007; Yuen, 2010) that there is no correlation between gender and ICS. Helmer (2007) did find that female teachers had slightly higher ICS scores, but the results needed to be treated with caution as there were very few male participants in the study.

**Area of residence during formative years.** In general, previous research has shown no significant correlation between complexity of orientation and area of
residence during formative years, with two intriguing exceptions. Straffon (2001, 2003) found that “The level of ICS was higher in European and North American Students than it was in Asian students, with Australasian students being intermediate” (Straffon, 2001, p. 98). Although Straffon studied students rather than teachers, the results are still intriguing. It could be hypothesized that students from multicultural and borderless Europe, and highly diverse North America, have had more experience of cultural diversity, and have been able to develop a more complex view of cultural difference, compared to students from relatively culturally homogenous Asian countries, although more research is needed to confirm this.

Helmer (2007), in her study of the faculty of an elementary school in Egypt, found that North American teachers had a higher mean ICS score than did the “other” teacher category. Unfortunately, the “other” category included world regions such as Australia, Western Europe, the Middle East, and the Asia Pacific, and it is not possible to disaggregate the results. Additionally, the sample size for “other” was very small. Still, these results raise interesting questions about the region during formative years and ICS, and the results of this variable within this study are reported in chapter 4.

**Cross-cultural experience.** Cross-cultural interactions are hypothesized (Paige et al., 2003) as being necessary to the development of a more complex understanding of cultural difference, though the research results are contradictory. Lai (2006) found no significant correlation between the amount of time that expatriate teachers had lived in Taiwan and the complexity of their orientations, while Mahon (2006) found that intercultural contact, in the form of travel, was correlated with reduced ethnocentric attitudes, and still others have found that beyond a certain limit (Helmer, 2007) ethnocentrism can increase. In Lai (2006), only the amount of time living in Taiwan was measured, not the amount or quality of cross-cultural contact; so it is possible that
despite many years in Taiwan, the expatriate teachers actually had very little in the way of cross-cultural contact.

Bayles (2009) found that teachers who had lived in multicultural settings for more than 10 years had significantly more complex attitudes towards cultural difference than did teachers with no experience in multicultural settings. Fretheim (2007) found that there was “only a weak and non-significant correlation (0.39) between years living abroad and IDI score” (p. 118), while Helmer (2007) found that ICS leveled off and decreased after more than 10 years of living abroad. She states that “it seems that while initially increased, time out of one’s home country improves levels of intercultural sensitivity, it levels off or even decreases with increased time out of one’s home country” (p. 131).

Zlobina et al. (2006), Li and Gasser (2005), and Black and Gregerson (1991) also found that relationships with host nationals, as long as they were supportive, were positively correlated with adaptation. However, Ward and Kennedy (1992) found just the opposite with both Malaysian and New Zealand expatriates located in Singapore. They found that the greater the interaction with the host culture, the higher the stress, and consequently the socio-cultural adaptation of the sojourners was reduced. Church (1982) found similar results. Ward and Kennedy hypothesized that the quality of the contact is, therefore, more important than the mere fact of contact. While these studies did not use the IDI, they do raise interesting questions about the nature of cross-cultural contact on ICS.

Some studies (Endicott et al., 2003; Klak & Martin, 2003; Straffon, 2001) have shown that multicultural experience contributes to the development of a more complex orientation, but the studies that show this have never dealt with sojourner educators, and more research is needed. It is possible, for example, that the often confrontational relationship between sojourner educators and host national students and their parents, in
In the context of this proposed study, actually contributes to decreased ICS as demonstrated in Church’s (1982) and Ward and Kennedy’s (1992) non-IDI studies. Much more research is needed in this area, particularly with a focus on the nature and quality of cross-cultural contact.

In this study, the variables of age, gender, nationality, educational level, position, area of residence during formative years, length of residence in Qatar, length of previous overseas experience, intercultural marriage, language spoken, service in overseas development organizations such as the Peace Corps or VSO, and formal teacher development are examined for a correlation with more complex orientations. While some of these variables have been examined in the literature before, formal teacher development and service in overseas development organizations have not been examined, and as mentioned earlier, the population and the context is unique, and has never before been addressed in the literature.

**Chapter Summary**

This chapter provided a brief overview of the concepts of culture, intercultural competence, and ICS, or orientation to cultural difference. The theoretical underpinning of this research in the DMIS and its derivative, the IDC, were examined. A brief critical examination of the theoretical models and tool was undertaken, and the importance of ICS to educators and educational organizations was stressed. Finally, previous research on variables affecting ICS was reviewed, highlighting the contradictory nature of earlier research. Throughout, the general lack of research in this field in the MENA region, and in particular in post-secondary developmental education, was highlighted.
Chapter 3: Methods

“The questions which one asks oneself begin, at least, to illuminate the world, and become one’s key to the experience of others.” - James Baldwin, Novelist

This exploratory study investigated educators’ orientation towards cultural difference in relation to their demographic and experiential background. This chapter describes the methods used in the study, including the theoretical framework guiding the research, the two phases in which the study was conducted, the ethical considerations that were observed during the course of this study, and delimitations and limitations of the research.

The tone of the following chapters may differ from previous chapters through the use of the pronouns such as I and me. This is a deliberate stylistic choice that reflects my personal involvement in the data collection and analysis.

Theoretical Framework

This study used a mixed-methods sequential explanatory design. Mixed-method research perhaps is best understood by considering the two other dominant research methodologies (quantitative and qualitative) and the relationship among the three.

In brief, quantitative methodologies view the nature of reality as being characterized by a single and objective truth (Creswell, 2003). Therefore, quantitative studies tend to study behavior under controlled conditions and seek to isolate causal effects. The collected data are then analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical calculations for the purpose of testing study hypotheses and describing, explaining, and predicting variables and their correlations.

Qualitative methodologies hold that multiple and subjective realities exist and that human behavior is dynamic, situational, social, and personal (Creswell, 2003). These approaches “are interpretive and this has led to an emphasis on meaning, seeing the person, experience and knowledge as multiple, relational and not bounded by
reason” (Ryan, 2006, p. 16). According to these methods, reality is not a fixed or ossified concept; it is a constantly changing concept of the individuals involved in the research. Thus, behaviors are studied in their natural environments in an effort to explore, discover, and construct knowledge. Rather than a measurement of variables, the aim is to understand the “whole” in terms of its patterns, features, and themes. The result is the development of a “complex, holistic picture” of the phenomenon (Creswell, 1998, p. 15).

Mixed method approaches assume that human behavior is complex and cannot be measured by any one method. Moreover, mixed-method approaches recognize the existence and importance of the natural or physical world as well as the social and psychological worlds comprised of language, culture, institutions, and subjective thoughts. Mixed-method methodologies assume that the disparate views offered by quantitative and qualitative approaches are complementary rather than contrasting. Thus, mixed-method research utilizes those quantitative and qualitative approaches that make sense for the particular study purpose (Creswell, 2003; MacKenzie & Knipe, 2006). In doing so, mixed-methods approaches aim to enhance the accuracy of the study data by providing a more complete picture of the phenomena afforded by blending methodologies. Mixed-methods studies also offer the benefit of avoiding the biases intrinsic to single-method approaches because the blending of various methods serve to compensate for the strengths and weaknesses associated with any particular method they use.

For these reasons, mixed-methods research is located within the pragmatic paradigm (Datta, 1994). For example, Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) state that they endorse pragmatism because “in many situations, researchers can put together insights and procedures from both approaches to produce a superior product (i.e., often mixed methods research provides a more workable solution and produces a superior product)”
(p. 17). N. Ivankova (personal communication, 13 November 2011) added, “Pragmatism is considered a philosophical foundation for mixed-methods research because it takes into account the research problem and the best method(s) to approach it.”

Thus, while qualitative and quantitative purists argue that “the mixing of such dichotomous positions is untenable” (Armitage, 2007, p. 8) and “accommodation between paradigms is impossible [because they lead] . . . to vastly diverse, disparate, and totally antithetical ends” (Guba, 1990, p. 81), pragmatists believe that the philosophical distance between quantitative and qualitative researchers can be bridged (Greenberg & Folger, 1988; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998).

A notable benefit of mixed-methods studies is triangulation, meaning that the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data allows for diverse perspectives and multiple views and analyses of the data to emerge. This is important, as quantitative data often needs to be supplemented with qualitative data, and vice-versa (Ulmer & Wilson, 2003). Relying solely on either quantitative or qualitative data is insufficient, as neither type of data gives a sufficiently full picture. When used in combination, as in this study, quantitative and qualitative methods can complement each other and facilitate deeper and more complete analysis in a process known as triangulation. (Green, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). These aspects can lead to increased validity (Erzberger & Prein, 1997). Cohen and Manion (2000) elaborated, “Triangulation is an attempt to map out, or explain more fully, the richness and complexity of human behavior by studying it from more than one standpoint” (p. 254). When a researcher desires triangulation, the specific methods must be carefully chosen so that they complement each other by filling in each other’s gaps or ameliorating each other’s weaknesses.
Despite its strengths, mixed-methods research does have limitations. The limitations of mixed-method designs include the length of time needed to conduct it, difficulties in selecting participants for the qualitative phase, and the resources and knowledge needed to collect and analyze both types of data (Creswell, 2003).

Although mixed-methods research involves the collection and analysis of both qualitative and quantitative research, the specific timing, sequencing, and procedures involved in these activities can vary widely. For example, these steps may be conducted simultaneously (collecting both types of data at the same time) or sequentially (collecting and analyzing one type of data before collecting and analyzing the other type of data). In their review of literature across disciplines, Tashakkori and Teddlie (2002) found almost 40 specific mixed-methods designs.

This study utilized a sequential explanatory design, which involves, first, collecting and analyzing quantitative data and, second, collecting and analyzing qualitative data (Creswell, Plano Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2003). In this two-phase design, the quantitative data serve to measure the variables and their relationships, thus, providing a general sense of the issue. Terenzini and Upcraft (1996) stated that “quantitative studies [or phases, in the case of this study] give us a very firm foundation for describing and analyzing what ‘is’ and offer some insights into ‘why’ it is the way it is” (p. 85). Creswell (2003) added that quantitative methods may be most appropriate when the goal is to determine variables that influence an outcome or, as in this proposed study, when discussing outcome predictors. In such a design, the quantitative results are weighted heavier than the qualitative results.

In the second phase of sequential explanatory designs, the qualitative data help to “explain, or elaborate on, the quantitative results obtained in the first phase . . . by exploring participants’ views in more depth” (Ivankova, Creswell, & Stick, 2006, p. 5). This is particularly true of the follow-up explanations model used in this study, which is
used when “a researcher needs qualitative data to explain or expand quantitative results” (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007, p. 72). This design can be especially useful when unexpected results arise from the quantitative phase (Morse, 1991).

In summary, this study utilized a non-experimental exploratory approach using a mixed-methods sequential explanatory design with the IDI providing the quantitative data and the semi-structured focus group interviews providing the qualitative data. The next section describes the procedures related to each phase of the study.

**Phase 1: Measurement of Intercultural Sensitivity using the Intercultural Development Inventory**

Phase 1 involved administering the IDI to produce an initial empirical exploration of “what is out there” in terms of the educators’ ICS and the relationships between ICS and various demographic variables. These data provided a measurement of participants’ ICS for further discussion in the follow-up focus groups.

This phase utilized a non-experimental, correlational design, meaning there was no treatment or manipulation, nor was there a control group. This phase also can be considered inferential, where the researcher used a sample of data to make conclusions or inferences about the differences between groups. Inferences are appropriate “when it is reasonable to assume that the data in hand are representative for the question being considered about a larger group” (Utts & Heckard, 2005, p. 59).

Correlational designs may be used for predictive or selective research, because they "specify how variables are related and do not specify that one caused the other”(Elmes, Kantowitz, & Roediger, 2005, p. 17). The inability of correlational designs to infer causality is one of the design’s inherent weaknesses. It is impossible to say that one variable causes another, and it is certainly possible that there is no causal relationship of any sort, or that one or more other variables is actually responsible for the relationship between two variables (Cozby, 2008). Therefore, the correlation
between demographic or experiential variables and ICS cannot be definitively said to be causal.

**Participants.** The data for this phase were collected from the faculty and staff of the Foundation Program at Qatar University, the national university in Qatar. This phase was conducted during September 2012 and all 106 employees of the Foundation Program at that time were invited to participate. Responses were received from 94 employees for a response rate of 88.6% and power of 94%. This sample was purposefully selected for its convenience, as it is my place of employment.

Participant demographics are reported in Table 7. The faculty reported being from 27 different countries, with more than half coming from the U.S. (29.8%), the United Kingdom (12.8%), and Canada (9.6%). Males represented 58.5% of the population and females were 41.5%. The largest group in the study was from North America and 67% of the whole population reported having more than 10 years abroad as sojourner educators. All participants were considered fluent enough in English to teach pre-university level courses in English, with most having earned Master’s degrees in institutions where English was the language of instruction.
Table 7. Survey Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Demographics</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male: 58.5%</td>
<td>22–30 years: 7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female: 41.5%</td>
<td>31–40 years: 36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41–50 years: 30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51–60 years: 22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61 and over: 3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formative Language and Region</th>
<th>Default Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formative Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America: 29.8%</td>
<td>English: 58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA: 26.6%</td>
<td>Arabic: 23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe: 13.8%</td>
<td>Malayam: 2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa: 6.4%</td>
<td>Farsi: 2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific: 6.4%</td>
<td>Hindi: 1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe: 6.4%</td>
<td>Urdu: 1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia: 2.1%</td>
<td>Other: 11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America: 1.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: 7.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Has teacher certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not complete secondary school: 1.1%</td>
<td>Yes: 63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor: 3.2%</td>
<td>No: 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. or equivalent: 85.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate: 10.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-Cultural Exposure</th>
<th>Cross-cultural marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic minority status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: 18.3%</td>
<td>Yes: 20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No: 81.7%</td>
<td>No: 79.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overseas Experience</th>
<th>Length of time in Qatar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time spent overseas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 3 months: 1.1%</td>
<td>Less than 3 months: 7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 years: 2.1%</td>
<td>1–2 years: 8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–5 years: 8.5%</td>
<td>3–5 years: 32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 years: 21.3%</td>
<td>6–10 Years: 28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years: 67.0%</td>
<td>Over 10 years: 23.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overseas development organization experience</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes: 14.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No: 85.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MENA = Middle East and North Africa

Measurement. The IDI (Hammer et al., 2003) was used to assess participants’ worldviews (see Appendix B). The IDI is a 50-question inventory. Participants are asked to rate their level of agreement with a series of statements about their relationship with and evaluation of cultural difference using a five-point Likert scale ranging from

---

7 The IDI shown in the appendix is the paper version and not the computerized version, though the questions are the same. The IDI is proprietary and I am not able to reproduce the full instrument.
strongly disagree to strongly agree. The resulting scores indicate a participant’s orientation toward denial, polarization (with defense and reversal on separate scales), minimization (which is seen as a transitional orientation), and acceptance and adaptation on two measures.

The first score is Perceived Orientation (PO), meaning where one perceives oneself to be on the IDC continuum (see Figure 9). The second score is Developmental Orientation (DO), meaning one’s primary orientation toward cultural differences and commonalities along the IDC continuum (see Figure 9). The DO is the perspective one is most likely to use in situations where cultural differences and commonalities arise. PO and DO scores align with the five stages on the IDC continuum (i.e., denial, polarization [defence and reversal], minimization, acceptance, and adaptation). Scores range from 55 (denial) to 145 (adaptation), with a standard deviation of 15. The midpoint (100) is within the minimization orientation—an ethnocentric orientation on the DMIS, and a developmental orientation on the IDC.
The IDI produces two additional measures: Orientation Gap (OG) is calculated as the difference between PO and DO. As rule, most individuals and organizations overestimate their location on the continuum and are surprised at the gap between their perceptions and the IDI assessment. The OG often provides a good starting point for a conversation about attitudes towards cultural difference. In Figure 10, for example, PO
is 120.79 (acceptance), whereas DO is 89.78 (minimization), meaning OG is 31.01. Anything greater than 7.0 is considered to be a significant gap.

![Orientation Gap](image)

**Figure 10. Orientation Gap**

*Note. Orientation gap is calculated as the difference between perceived and developmental orientation. Adapted from M. R. Hammer, 20–23 April 2012, *The Intercultural Development Inventory*™ qualifying seminar, Zurich, Switzerland.*

The final score provided by the IDI is Cultural Disengagement, which measures the sense of disconnection or detachment the participant has from his or her primary cultural group and indicates aspects of how people relate to their own culture group and other cultures. Cultural Disengagement is not a dimension of intercultural sensitivity along the continuum.

Three versions of the IDI have been created. The IDI v.1 (Hammer, 1999) was created based on a culturally diverse sample of 312 respondents. The 60-item measure was organized into 6 scales of 10 items each. The scales exhibited the following reliabilities: Denial (á = .87), Defense (á = .91), Minimization (á = .87), Acceptance (á = .80), Cognitive Adaptation (á = .85), and Behavioral Adaptation (á = .80). The IDI v.1 produced individual scale scores but did not place these scores along the continuum of intercultural development.

The 50-item IDI v.2 was created based on 122 items administered to 591 respondents. This version was inspired by Paige et al.’s (1999)factor analytic research of the IDI v.1 and focused on creating additional measures, as indicated in the DMIS theory, for reversal and integration.
The current IDI v.3 was created based on administration of the IDI v.2 to a sample of 4,763 individuals from 11 distinct cross-cultural sample groups, including participants from for-profit, non-profit, and international organizations as well as from secondary and higher education institutions. All participants completed the IDI in their native language, except where the organization’s primary language was English. Hammer (2009) concluded based on his research that the instrument is both generalizable across cultural groups and applicable across specific cultural communities. Moreover, he pointed out that the inter-correlations among its seven scales support the developmental continuum and the relationships among the core orientations.

This study will use the IDI because the research described in chapter 2 has shown it to be a reliable and valid instrument (Hammer, 2011; Hammer et al., 2003; Paige et al., 2003) that efficiently measures participant orientation towards cultural difference. The IDI has been subjected to factor analysis, social desirability analysis, and validity and reliability analysis by Paige et al. (2003). Hammer (2011) found it to be a reliable measure of the DMIS and IDC, while Hammer et al. (2003) and Paige et al. (2003) confirmed its lack of social desirability. Hammer et al. stated, “the short form (10-item) Marlowe–Crown social desirability scale (Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972) was included in the questionnaire completed by the 591 respondents in the sample. Correlations between social desirability and all five IDI scales revealed no significant differences, meaning IDI scale scores did not appear to be influenced by any general tendency for respondents to provide socially desirable responses” (p. 19). Paige et al. (2003) concluded based on their psychometric analysis of the IDI that “the IDI is a reliable measure that . . . reasonably, though not exactly, approximates the developmental model of intercultural sensitivity” (p. 467). Paige et al. were also able to confirm the construct validity of the IDI. The IDI has been translated into
approximately 14 languages and is cultural general, meaning that it is valid and reliable, no matter the cultural background of a participant (Fantini, 2009).

In summary, the IDI has been specifically designed to measure IDC worldview orientations, which draws upon the DMIS and reflects the results of years of research across many cultures. The theoretical framework and tool for this study have been widely used and accepted in a variety of settings—although its use is much more common in the American sphere than the European one—including education and medicine (DeJaeghere & Zhang, 2008; Mahon, 2006). Use of the IDI has been recommended specifically for pre-service teachers (Bhawuk & Brislin, 2000; Van Hook, 2000).

The IDI shares some of the strengths and weaknesses of surveys in general; but, the weaknesses of surveys were reduced in this study with the use of qualitative research in the form of focus groups that supplement the IDI results. Inflexibility and a lack of depth can be of concern with surveys, particularly if a researcher fails to take into account possible answers. However, the IDI has been used for a number of years and the 50 questions on the survey undergo constant analyses and revision. Therefore, I believe this weakness to be minimal with the IDI. Researchers can face the risk of trying to cover too broad a range of materials in surveys (Kelley, Clark, Brown, & Sitzia, 2003); however, the IDI has been carefully designed with questions that focus on eliciting the respondents’ orientations towards cultural difference.

**Administration.** The IDI can be administered as an online or pencil-and-paper survey. The online version was chosen for this research for ease of administration and data collection. All 106 study candidates received an email that invited them to participate in the study (see Appendix C). The invitation outlined the purpose of the study and the nature and risks of participation and provided a link to participate. The
A survey was open for a period of 10 days and was expected to take each participant roughly 40 minutes to complete.

The email addresses of the 106 employees were taken from program staff list. All employees, regardless of job description, were invited to participate. A reminder email was sent approximately 7 days into the survey. The survey software was a proprietary online version of the IDI provided by IDI, LLC, which exports the results in Excel format.

**Analysis.** Descriptive statistics were calculated for PO, DO, OG, and Cultural Disengagement for the whole population. PO and DO scores were interpreted using the DMIS dimensions:

1. Mean scores less than 70 are considered to reflect the monocultural stage of Denial (not being aware of, or refusing to acknowledge differences between cultures).

2. Mean scores ranging from 70 to 85 indicate the monocultural stage of Polarization (Defense, where one is threatened by cultural difference, or Reversal, where one is ashamed of one’s own culture).

3. Mean scores ranging from 85 to 115 are considered to reflect the transitional stage of Minimization, a normative stage in which one believes one’s own cultural worldview to be one of “universal absolutes.” People in this stage tend to minimize important cultural differences.

4. Mean scores ranging from 115 to 130 reflect the intercultural stage of Acceptance (one’s own culture is one of many complex cultures).

5. Mean scores ranging from 130 to 145 reflect the intercultural stage of Adaptation (one’s own culture is one of many complex cultures and adaptation to another culture is possible).

OG scores greater than 7.00 reflect substantial overestimation of ICS. Cultural Disengagement indicates the degree of disconnection or detachment the participant is experiencing relative to his or her own cultural group. Scores of less than 4.00 indicate the participant may be “unresolved,” meaning he or she is experiencing to some degree a lack of involvement in core aspects of being a member of a cultural community.
Testing for Hypothesis 1 was completed using the results of a paired t-test to determine whether there was a significant difference between PO and DO.

Descriptive statistics also were calculated for each demographic grouping. Testing for Hypothesis 2 was conducted using a series of four steps. First, ANOVA and t-test statistics were performed to determine whether any significant differences emerged based on the independent demographic variables. Significant differences were found for the mean DO based on default language, formative region, and length of time in Qatar. Subsequent ANOVA and post-hoc comparisons were performed to determine the specific differences. Second, Bonferroni post-hoc tests were run to look for significant differences. Third, the direction and degree of relationships between the independent demographic variables and the dependent IDI scores were tested using Spearman’s Rank Correlation Analyses.

Fourth, the normality of the data within the demographic grouping was assessed using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov(K-S) test for each of the significant relationships identified by the Spearman’s Rank Correlation Analyses. This was necessary to finally determine the variables for which stepwise multiple regressions could be performed.

Phase 2: Exploration of the Intercultural Development Inventory Results Using Focus Groups

Phase 2 of the present study consisted of follow-up structured focus groups with selected participants. The primary purpose of this phase was to gather rich detail to triangulate and either confirm or refute the quantitative data. Additionally, a secondary aim was to gain some insight into participants’ attitudes towards the “why” of orientations towards cultural difference, and their relationship to demographic and experiential variables that may allow deeper insight into the experiences and perceptions of the participants.
Johnson and Christensen (2007) explained that focus groups and interview procedures are helpful for measuring attitudes and gaining in-depth information about the topics under investigation and about the quantitative data gathered to date. Additionally, group and individual interview approaches provide information about participants’ internal meanings and ways of thinking—these insights generally are not possible to gain through quantitative questionnaires. Well-constructed and tested interview protocols typically have moderately high measurement validity and relatively high response rates often are attainable. As a result, interview approaches (whether one-on-one or in groups) are useful for exploring phenomena as well as for confirming previous gathered findings.

Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge the weaknesses of focus group approaches, such as the time required to both conduct them and to transcribe and analyze the volumes of data gathered (Johnson & Christensen, 2007), though it might be argued that this is not such much a weakness as a drawback, and that length of time is only a consideration if the outcome does not justify the time spent (F. Martin, personal communication, April 13, 2013).

Additionally, several sources of biases may occur, including reactive effects, wherein participants provide only socially desirable answers, or researcher bias, wherein untrained interviewers may distort data due to their personal biases or poor interviewing skills. Moreover, participants may not recall, recognize, and share information relevant to the interview. Concerns about anonymity and confidentiality may further dissuade participants from providing their insights and feedback.

Morgan (1997) points out that the researcher’s role in focus groups can be of concern. He says that “the fact that the researcher creates and directs the groups makes them distinctly less naturalistic” (p. 14) and that there is concern that the moderator may, “in the name of maintaining the interview’s focus . . . influence the group’s
interactions (p. 14), and that there will always be “residual uncertainty about the accuracy of what the participants say” (p. 14).

According to Umaña-Taylor & Bámaca (2004) the choice of language and expressions by both the moderator—in this case, the researcher—and the participants impact focus group discussions. It is possible that the language of the script in this research, specifically the use of the word “versus” in the questions and on the title of the handouts used to show the results of the quantitative phase unconsciously set the tone for the focus group and led to a polarized and othering discourse.

The researcher’s influence on data is an issue in most qualitative research, not just focus groups, and the researcher must be concerned with minimizing conscious and unconscious influence on the participants. The moderator’s influence on the data is a concern in all qualitative research, and “there is no hard evidence that the focus group moderator’s impact on the data is any greater than the researcher’s impact in participant observation or individual interviewing” (Moran, 1997, pp. 14–15).

**Trustworthiness.** In qualitative research, the researcher needs to understand that he or she is not a neutral observer and that subjectivity is inherent in the process. This is not to say that subjectivity is a flaw in qualitative research, as long as the researcher is aware of it and takes steps to ensure trustworthiness. Ethnographers Angrosino and Mays de Perez (2000) say,

> The ethnographer may need to realize that what he or she observes is conditioned by who he or she is, and that different ethnographers—equally well trained and well versed in theory and method but of different gender, race or age—might well stimulate a very different set of interactions, and hence a different set of observations leading to a different set of conclusions. (p. 689)

Within qualitative research, trustworthiness is the way in which research is judged as adequate. Trustworthiness can be thought of as “the ways we work to meet the criteria of validity, credibility and believability of our research—as assessed by the academy, our communities, and our participants” (Gubrium & Koro-Ljungberg, 2005, p.

*Transferability*, in contrast to generalization (as desired in quantitative research), involves the readers making connections between the study findings and their own contexts and experiences. Transferability is sought after rather than generalizability because, in qualitative research, context defines and limits the data (Richards, 2003). Transferability can be seen as the richness of both the description and interpretation. The interpretation in particular must be “methodical and rigorous, but also demands sensitivity” (Richards, 2006, p. 22). A researcher must be aware of his or her strengths and weaknesses as an analyst, just as he or she must be aware of his or her role in data collection (Richards, 2006).

*Dependability* can be understood as the documentation of the steps in the research, showing the decision tree followed, perhaps in the form of a research notebook. This can include an audit trail so that data collection techniques and decisions can be replicated (Richards, 2003).

*Credibility* refers to the adequacy of the data, such as evaluating whether it was gathered in a number of different ways from multiple participants. Credibility can be increased through (a) prolonged engagement with the setting and the data, (b) persistent observations, (c) triangulation, (d) referential adequacy, (e) peer debriefing, and (f) member checks. The two most common methods of confirming credibility are triangulation and member checks. In this study, member checks were performed by sharing chapter drafts with focus group participants and triangulation was achieved through both methodological triangulation and convergence of multiple data sources—in this case, the multiple focus group results (Denzin, 1978; Richards, 2003). Peer debriefing, a form of analytic triangulation, was employed with colleagues uninvolved in the study to probe the researcher’s interpretation and analysis of the data.
Although not part of the trustworthiness process detailed above, the pilot research also can be seen as being analogous to peer debriefing and aids in trustworthiness. In this study, an initial set of research questions were generated and then revised with peers. This revised set of research questions were then shared with an experienced researcher for further feedback and revision.

The entire research process, from letters of invitation, quantitative tool administration, focus group administration, and analysis and interpretation was piloted on three colleagues before the full-scale research began. Despite this, small issues with word choice, graph labeling, and clarity of instructions were revealed during the full-scale research, although no issues with the research questions and the general direction of the research were highlighted.

Baker (1994) advised that pilot studies should involve 10-20% of the participants in the full study. The pilot study for this research did not draw upon that large of a sample. It is possible that if a larger sample had been utilized in the pilot that the othering tone that sometimes developed during the full-scale research may have been detected earlier. If possible, in the future it would be preferable to do a series of ever expanding pilots until the final pilot process has approximately 20% of the participants of the final study.

**Participants.** Focus group participants were selected using an intensity sampling strategy, which means focusing “on cases that are rich in information because they are unusual or special in some way. Unusual or special cases may be particularly troublesome or especially enlightening, such as outstanding successes or notable failures” (Patton, 1990, p. 171). This form of sampling “manifests sufficient intensity to illuminate the nature of success or failure, but not at the extreme” (p. 172). Based on the quantitative results, five types of sojourner educators were focused on during this phase: (a) sojourner educators with less than 3 years experience, (b) sojourner educators with 3
to 5 years of experience, (c) sojourner educators with more than 10 years of experience, (d) sojourner educators who were raised in a Western country, and (e) sojourner educators who were raised in a MENA country.

Based on the results of the quantitative phase, I determined that it would be helpful to interview participants in groups based on homogeneity, in this case homogeneity of experience based on time in Qatar and formative region. Morgan (1997) states, “The group composition should ensure that the participants could easily discuss this topic in normal, everyday conversation. Participants must feel free to talk to each other, and wide gaps in social background or lifestyle can defeat this” (p. 36). The homogeneity of the focus groups in this study allows for greater free-flow of conversation, but also facilitates analyses of differences between groups. Groups of high homogeneity participants “spend less time explaining themselves to each other and more time discussing the issues at hand” (Morgan & Scannell, 1998).

The following groups were developed: faculty resident in Qatar for less than 1 year, faculty in Qatar 3 to 5 years, faculty in Qatar 10 or more years who had spent their formative years in Western countries, regardless of length of stay in Qatar. I attempted to organize a corresponding focus group of faculty who had spent their formative years in MENA countries; however, only one such faculty member agreed to participate. In the end, he joined one of the Western focus groups. The total number of focus group participants was 23 (14 men, 9 women). A total of eight home countries were represented within the groups.

Table 8 presents the demographics of the focus group participants. The participants were largely from North America (65.2%), spoke English as their default language (78.3%), held a master’s degree (100%) and a teacher’s certification (63%). Additionally, they were largely neither of minority ethnic status (95.7%) nor in a cross-cultural marriage (87%).
Table 8. Focus Group Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Demographics</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male: 60.9%</td>
<td>22–30 years: 8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female: 39.1%</td>
<td>31–40 years: 39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41–50 years: 34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51–60 years: 17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61 and over: 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22–30 years: 8.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–40 years: 39.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–50 years: 34.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51–60 years: 17.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 and over: 0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formative Language and Region</th>
<th>Default Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formative Region</td>
<td>Default Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America: 65.2%</td>
<td>English: 78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA: 0.0%</td>
<td>Arabic: 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe: 13.0%</td>
<td>Malayam: 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa: 4.3%</td>
<td>Farsi: 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific: 0.0%</td>
<td>Hindi: 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe: 8.7%</td>
<td>Urdu: 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia: 4.3%</td>
<td>Other: 26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America: 0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: 0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Has teacher certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Has teacher certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not complete secondary school: 0.0%</td>
<td>Yes: 63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor: 0.0%</td>
<td>No: 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. or equivalent: 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate: 0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-Cultural Exposure</th>
<th>Cross-cultural marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic minority status</td>
<td>Cross-cultural marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: 4.3%</td>
<td>Yes: 13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No: 95.7%</td>
<td>No: 87.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overseas Experience</th>
<th>Length of time in Qatar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time spent overseas</td>
<td>Length of time in Qatar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Less than 3 months: 17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1–2 years: 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas development</td>
<td>3–5 years: 26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization experience</td>
<td>6–10 Years: 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Over 10 years: 21.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 23; MENA = Middle East and North Africa

Comparing this composition to the overall population (see Table 9) reveals that participation based on gender and educational attainment was roughly proportionate to the overall population. However, participation of native English speakers was disproportionate (78.3% of focus group participants vs. 55.7% of the population) and native Arabic speakers were underrepresented (<1% in the focus group and 19.8% in the population). This distribution was not intentional; despite the efforts to recruit a balanced sample, native Arabic speaker participation was low.
Table 9. Educator Population Demographics

### Basic Demographics

**Gender**
- Male: 57.5%
- Female: 42.5%

### Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Default Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not complete secondary school: 0.9%</td>
<td>English: 55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor: 2.8%</td>
<td>Arabic: 19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. or equivalent: 86.8%</td>
<td>Malayam: 1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate: 9.4%</td>
<td>Farsi: 1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hindi: 3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urdu: 3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other: 13.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Demographic data regarding age, formative region, teacher certification, ethnic minority status, cross-cultural marriage, time spent overseas, overseas development organization experience, and length of time in Qatar were unavailable.

Focus group participants were sought from the 94 people who completed the IDI. All prospective participants received an invitation to participate (see Appendix D), which outlined the purpose of the groups and the nature of participation. Interested candidates were asked to contact me, with a total of 31 faculty members expressing a willingness to participate. Those who agreed to participate were formed into focus groups of four to eight participants based on their availability. Ultimately, a total of 23 people attended five different focus groups over a period of 2 weeks.

**Interview script.** An interview script was created after the completion of Phase 1 of this study for the purpose of gaining insights and explanations about the results. Four basic questions were posed to the participants:

1. How do you explain or make sense of these results?
2. Do these results align with your own observations?
3. What do you think the implications of these findings are?
4. What recommendations would you give based on these findings and what we have discussed?
The full interview script (including prompts and probing questions) is presented in Appendix E. These questions were asked following a presentation of the quantitative results.

**Focus group administration.** The interviews were conducted in the Teacher Resource Centre (TRC), a library and lounge area for faculty. This was chosen for its comfortable atmosphere and accessibility to participants. According to Madriz (2003), conducting focus groups in a familiar and comfortable place reduces researcher power and lessens the “the possibilities of ‘Otherization’ of the research participants” (p. 374). Each focus group lasted 1 to 2 hours, depending on the number of participants. No time limit was set; instead, the conversation was continued until the topic was exhausted.

At the beginning of the focus group, each participant received handouts that displayed graphs showing PO and DO of the demographic groups of interest, as well as a brief explanation of the different orientations and the IDC model. A laptop projector was used to project the handout material on the wall. A digital recorder was prepared for recording the focus group.

I facilitated the discussion using the script in Appendix E. The resulting data were captured using a digital audio recorder, as it was unobtrusive, reliable, and allowed me to focus on the participants rather than on taking notes.

After each focus group interview, a transcript was created using Dragon Naturally Speaking, which I then reviewed and corrected as needed. I also typed out a summary document of the high points from the focus group interview immediately after each interview.

**Analysis.** I followed four steps based on Miles and Huberman’s (1994) stages of qualitative analysis to identify themes in the texts generated from the focus groups. These steps were:

1. I read each transcript several times to gain an overall impression for the nature of the data and the possible themes that were implicit within and
across the stories. I made notes to record my impressions and developing understanding.

2. I then created a “start list” of codes that seemed to reflect the data. Then, I reviewed each transcript again, taking care to code each meaning unit as needed (see sample in Appendix F). Following this initial round of coding, I organized the data by code.

3. I then reviewed the data and grouped similar codes together, labeling these groups with macro codes. I again organized the data by macro code. This process of coding, reorganizing the data, and coding again continued until the analysis was complete. Steps 1, 2, and 3 here are roughly analogous to Miles and Huberman’s process of data reduction.

4. Quotes and codes were entered into a table, along with columns for easy review (see sample in Appendix G). This step is analogous to data display in Miles and Huberman’s process. Concurrent with this process, I identified themes in the text and looked for any negative cases, which is similar to Miles and Huberman’s stage of conclusion drawing and verification.

5. As a final step, I submitted the chapter drafts to the focus group participants as a member check in order to increase trustworthiness.

Ethical Considerations

The ethical concerns of conducting the research were addressed. The unique requirements of meeting the British Educational Research Association’s ethical standards for research conducted overseas were also satisfied (BERA, 1992). Particular attention was paid to voluntary informed consent, which needed to be accommodating of both local and British requirements. Additionally, the training I attended to administer the IDI covered issues of information security, confidentiality, and ethics grounded in the Code of Standards and Ethics for Survey Research published by the Council of American Survey Research Organizations (CASRO, 2008). A comparison of the standards of this American institution with the requirements of both Britain and Qatar showed them to be compatible.

According to Ramcharan (2010), researchers have an obligation to ensure the overall well being of participants, be that well-being physical, emotional, or social. Although the physical and emotional risks for the participants were low, social risks can be seen as being of legitimate concern. While the moderator (the researcher) in this
study could guarantee confidentiality, it was not possible to guarantee that other participants would keep the focus group conversation confidential (Willis et al., 2009). This can be problematic in institutional settings (Liamputtong, 2011), such as in this research. In some cases, participants’ reputations and, in extreme cases, their employment could possibly be at risk if sensitive focus group conversation is shared.

In practice, anonymity of the participants was of importance. There were no names associated with the IDI results, and it would not be possible for an outside observer to identify individuals from the computer-generated data. Focus group quotes also were anonymous, and any transcript passages that contained speech that allowed a participant to be identified through idiomatic quirks or unique use of language were not used.

By far, the greatest ethical concern with this work is the lack of participation of the MENA formative region staff and the “speaking for them” by other participants. The participants in the focus group were expressing their understanding of the mindset and experiences of other faculty members who were not able to reply or to correct any misperceptions. In short, an entire group did not have a “right of reply” (F. Martin, personal communication, March 13, 2013) in this study. It is possible that focus group participants were interpreting the experiences of their colleagues in an othering, stereotyping manner. This concern is discussed in more detail in chapter 4.

Appendices H and I present the documentation related to the ethical approval for this study.

**Delimitations and Limitations**

Delimitations or delimiters are characteristics that define the scope or boundaries of the research through exclusionary and inclusionary decisions made by the researcher. These may include objectives, and questions, variables, and the problem and research approach themselves (Arkansas State University, n.d.).
The primary delimitation of this study is its narrow focus on orientations to cultural difference. Furthermore, no attempt was made to identify mechanisms of change between orientations.

Another delimitation of this study is that it included only faculty members of the Foundation Program Department of English and did not include faculty in the math or computer departments of the program. This choice was made primarily for logistical and language reasons as the staff in those departments and I do not share a common language.

The convenience and intensity sampling methods used in this study represent a delimiter that may be seen as a threat to external validity, when compared to random sampling that could have included the Math and Computer Departments. The population was chosen as I had linguistically and logistically more convenient access to that group of participants. Therefore, this sample may be seen as one of convenience. Some, such as Glesne (1999), have rather derisively called this sort of research “backyard research,” and are dismissive of it as it is only a single case study. Although statistically such research is frowned upon, a great deal of educational research is based on convenience sampling. The truth is that in such environments, the researcher does not have control over most variables. However, this research is the first of its kind in the MENA area and is only meant to provide baseline data on which other future research can then be based. Given the human resource and financial limitations faced by many researchers, particularly those who are not employed in academia, “backyard research” is better than none at all.

Limitations are influences or events beyond the researcher’s control that place restrictions on methodology, data collection, interpretation, generalizability, and conclusions drawn from the research (Arkansas State University, n.d.).
A limitation of this study is that only those faculty who were present on the days that the tool was administered, and who agreed to participate, were included. The method of inviting faculty to participate in this study (email) may have led to a lower participation rate than face-to-face invitations. Although this was not desirable, it was unavoidable due to last minute construction and computer lab closures.

The faculty members in this study chose to teach in this program out of all the other possible employers worldwide and, therefore, represent a unique population of educators. Due to the small sample size and the uniqueness of the employment situation and cultural milieu, the worldwide generalizability of this study is limited. However, given the similar and unique demography of foundation programs in Gulf Cooperation Council countries, the findings may be applicable to similar institutions and programs.

The text-dense nature of the consent form used in this study is another limitation. Research by Singer (1978, 2004) has shown that “. . . the informed consent statements typically employed in social as well as biomedical research are poorly understood by respondents and subjects, thus violating the principle of autonomy of beneficence” (2004, p. 5). Therefore, the ways in which traditional consent forms are considered to be inadequate were researched with the goal of improving the ones used in this study. In the end, a very traditional written consent form was used to meet ethics requirements. However, I believe that the very text heavy nature of the form decreased participation, particularly among those whose first language was not English.

Singer (2004) further states that research shows that requests for written consent reduced the participation of respondents who were previously willing to participate in the research by approximately 13%. Other colleagues who recently completed doctoral level work also highlighted this as a particular issue in this cultural milieu, stating that participants who had indicated willingness to participate in research changed their minds when it came time to sign the consent documents.
Another limitation was that the chosen sampling method also allowed for a high-degree of self-selection, which might mean that a disproportionate number of participants had a higher interest in ICS than the general population that the respondents represented. Similarly, despite assurances that the IDI is not subject to social desirability biases (Hammer, 2009; Paige et al., 2003), as a psychometric instrument, it is a concern that must always be considered. Moreover, participation of English vis-à-vis Arabic speakers in the focus groups was disproportionate when compared to the overall population of educators in the programme.

Similarly, the instrument in this study relies on self-reported data. It is possible that participants might have had imperfect recall of certain intercultural events. The IDI scores are based on what participants say that they think or believe, but there is no way to confirm that is actually how participants conduct themselves in real-world intercultural situations.

Another limitation was the inability to identify who did not return a survey, the reasons they declined to return a survey, and how their opting out of the sample affects the representativeness of the data.

There is concern that some respondents may have felt compelled to participate in the research, which can be seen as another limitation. Although faculty are not required to participate in these sorts of studies, they are strongly encouraged to do so. This could have led to a situation where some faculty may have participated in this study, despite their discomfort, in order to comply with perceived managerial priorities. To minimize this possibility, data was collected early in the school year; if the data had been collected late in the year, then there may have been faculty members who procrastinated in their study participation, and consequently felt that they had no choice but to participate in something that they were uncomfortable with.
An additional limitation is that participants may have misinterpreted the questions and answer choices. This is a concern (Peterson, 2000), as misinterpretations about the tool did come to light during informal conversation after the survey was administered. These included UK respondents marking their region of origin as “Other,” rather than “Europe,” as they did not consider the UK to be part of Europe, and respondents from Arab African countries taking umbrage that their countries were included in the category “Africa.” It seems that some respondents were answering what were meant to be geographical questions from a cultural perspective.

Chapter Summary

This chapter described the mixed-methods sequential explanatory design used in this study. The theoretical framework guiding the research, the two phases in which the study was conducted, the ethical considerations that were observed during the course of this study, and delimitations and limitations of the research were described. The next chapter reports the results.
Chapter 4: Findings

“Hammer’s Law: People want numbers; they listen to stories.” Mitch Hammer, Ph.D.

This study evaluated the orientation to cultural difference of the faculty and staff of the Foundation Program at Qatar University and examined the relationship between those scores and the participants’ demographic and experiential factors. This chapter reports the findings. First, the quantitative results for Research Questions 1 and 2 are presented. This section includes descriptive statistics as well as the results of various inferential tests. Second, themes that emerged from the focus groups in answer to Research Question 3 are presented to provide further insights and speculation about the quantitative findings. The chapter concludes with a summary of findings.

Research Question 1 and Hypotheses

Three research questions were defined for this study and several hypotheses were identified for each question. Statistical analysis was conducted on the data to assess and answer Research Questions 1 and 2. Research Question 1 was: To what extent does perceived ICS and measured ICS differ among educators working in the Foundation Program as measured by the IDI? Perceived ICS was indicated through the PO score on the IDI. Measured ICS was indicated through the DO score on the IDI. One hypothesis was defined that corresponded to this research question:

Hypothesis 1: The educators’ perceived ICS is higher than educators’ measured ICS.

Alternate Hypothesis: The educators’ perceived ICS is not higher than educators’ measured ICS.

Descriptive statistics were calculated for the four variables. PO and DO scores are interpreted as follows:

1. Mean scores less than 70 are considered to reflect the monocultural stage of Denial (not being aware of, or refusing to acknowledge differences between cultures).
2. Mean scores ranging from 70 to 85 indicate the monocultural stage of Polarization (Defense, where one is threatened by cultural difference, or Reversal, where one is ashamed of one’s own culture).

3. Mean scores ranging from 85 to 115 are considered to reflect the transitional stage of Minimization, a normative stage in which one believes one’s own cultural worldview to be one of “universal absolutes.” People in this stage tend to minimize important cultural differences.

4. Mean scores ranging from 115 to 130 reflect the intercultural stage of Acceptance (one’s own culture is one of many complex cultures).

5. Mean scores ranging from 130 to 145 reflect the intercultural stage of Adaptation (one’s own culture is one of many complex cultures and adaptation to another culture is possible).

OG scores reflect the differences between perceived orientation and developmental orientation. Scores exceeding 7.00 reflect substantial overestimation of ICS. Cultural disengagement indicates the degree of disconnection or detachment the participant is experiencing relative to his or her own cultural group. Cultural disengagement scores of less than 4.00 indicate the participant may be “unresolved,” meaning he or she is experiencing to some degree a lack of involvement in core aspects of being a member of a cultural community.

Table 10 presents the minimum and maximum scores, the mean, and the standard deviation for these variables for the whole group. The PO scores vary from 95.08 to 136.51 (M = 120.79, SD = 7.31). Average PO (120.79) indicates Minimization, with individual participants ranging from Minimization (minimum = 95.08) to Adaptation (maximum = 136.51).

DO scores ranged from 36.40 to 126.70 (M = 89.78, SD = 18.76). Average DO (89.78) indicated early Minimization, with individual participants ranging from Denial (minimum = 36.40) to Acceptance (maximum = 126.70).

OG scores ranged from 7.62 to 63.81 (M = 31.00, SD = 11.77). These results suggest that most participants substantially overestimate their PO and DO. Cultural disengagement ranged from 2.0 to 5.0 (M = 4.21, SD = .86). The average cultural
disengagement (4.21) suggests that the participants were resolved and rather engaged with their own cultures, although individual participants ranged from unresolved (2.00) to resolved (5.00).

Table 10. Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Orientation</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95.08</td>
<td>136.51</td>
<td>120.79</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Orientation</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>36.40</td>
<td>126.70</td>
<td>89.78</td>
<td>18.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Gap</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>63.81</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>11.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Disengagement</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the paired t-test for PO and DO reveal that the difference between the scores was statistically significant: $t(93) = 25.54$, $p < .01$, $r = .94$. Therefore, the alternate hypothesis can be rejected. These results are displayed in Table 11.

Table 11. Comparison of Perceived and Developmental Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Std. Error Mean</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>28.59</td>
<td>33.41</td>
<td>25.54</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 2 and Hypotheses

Research Question 2 asked: Is there a relationship between the educators’ demographic or experiential background variables and the measured ICS? Measured ICS was indicated by DO on the IDI. Twelve hypotheses were defined for this question:

Hypothesis 2: Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with gender.
Alternate Hypothesis 2: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with gender.

Hypothesis 3: Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with age.
Alternate Hypothesis 3: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with age.

Hypothesis 4: Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with time overseas.
Alternate Hypothesis 4: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with time overseas.
Hypothesis 5: Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with education level.
Alternate Hypothesis 5: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with education level.

Hypothesis 6: Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with formative region.
Alternate Hypothesis 6: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with formative region.

Hypothesis 7: Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with ethnic minority status.
Alternate Hypothesis 7: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with ethnic minority status.

Hypothesis 8: Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with job position.
Alternate Hypothesis 8: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with job position.

Hypothesis 9: Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with length of time in Qatar.
Alternate Hypothesis 9: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with length of time in Qatar.

Hypothesis 10: Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with intercultural marriage.
Alternate Hypothesis 10: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with intercultural marriage.

Hypothesis 11: Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with default language.
Alternate Hypothesis 11: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with default language.

Hypothesis 12: Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with formal teacher training.
Alternate Hypothesis 12: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with formal teacher training.

Hypothesis 13: Educators’ measured ICS significantly correlates with overseas development organization experience.
Alternate Hypothesis 13: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with overseas development organization experience.

Mean DO was calculated for each demographic subgroup. ANOVA or t-test statistics were performed as appropriate to determine whether any significant differences emerged based on the independent demographic variables. No significant differences were found for gender, age, time overseas, education, ethnic minority status,
job position, intercultural marriage, teacher certification or overseas development organization service. The following alternate hypotheses could not be rejected:

Alternate Hypothesis 2: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with gender.
Alternate Hypothesis 3: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with age.
Alternate Hypothesis 4: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with time overseas.
Alternate Hypothesis 5: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with education level.
Alternate Hypothesis 7: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with ethnic minority status.
Alternate Hypothesis 8: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with job position.
Alternate Hypothesis 10: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with intercultural marriage.
Alternate Hypothesis 12: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with formal teacher training.
Alternate Hypothesis 13: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with overseas development organization experience.

However, significant differences were found for the mean DO based on default language, formative region, and length of time in Qatar. Differences based on default language were not tested further, however, because subsequent ANOVA and t-test calculations revealed that DO scores were not significantly based on default language within each formative region (see Table 12). Therefore, the following alternate hypothesis could not be rejected:

Alternate Hypothesis 11: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with default language.
Table 12. Comparison of Means for Development Orientation within Formative Region by Default Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formative Region</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>F(1,26) = .946, p &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>F(3,21) = .942, p &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F(2,3) = 6.126, p &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Comparison could not be performed due to sample size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F(2,3) = 2.668, p &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>F(1,4) = .629, p &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>t(4) = .793, p &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>F(2,3) = 2.668, p &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MENA = Middle East and North Africa

The results of the tests pertaining to formative region and length of time in Qatar are discussed in the following sections.

**Formative region.** Significant differences emerged for the mean scores based on formative region. Perceived orientation was highest for those whose formative region was North America (M = 126.56, SD = 5.06, F(8,85) = 5.84, p < .01).

Developmental orientation was highest for the same group (M = 104.39, SD = 13.84, F(8,85) = 5.76, p < .01). Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 13 and ANOVA results are presented in Table 14.

Table 13. Descriptive Statistics for Developmental Orientation by Formative Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formative Region</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>StdError</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>104.39</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>99.02 to 109.75</td>
<td>73.89</td>
<td>126.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84.72</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>84.72 to 84.72</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>76.79</td>
<td>18.96</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>68.97 to 84.62</td>
<td>36.40</td>
<td>111.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78.37</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>62.96 to 93.77</td>
<td>63.87</td>
<td>98.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85.18</td>
<td>25.56</td>
<td>18.08</td>
<td>71.49 to 98.84</td>
<td>67.10</td>
<td>103.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>94.85</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>87.27 to 102.42</td>
<td>86.30</td>
<td>105.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>85.87</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>76.32 to 95.42</td>
<td>63.61</td>
<td>111.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>88.43</td>
<td>17.17</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>70.41 to 106.45</td>
<td>59.76</td>
<td>108.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>81.99 to 105.50</td>
<td>79.22</td>
<td>108.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>89.79</td>
<td>18.76</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>85.95 to 93.63</td>
<td>36.40</td>
<td>126.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MENA = Middle East and North Africa

Table 14. Analysis of Variance for Developmental Orientation by Formative Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>11514.14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1439.27</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>21227.81</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>249.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32741.95</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15 presents the results of the Bonferroni post-hoc analysis for developmental orientation based on formative region. The results reveal three significant differences, all indicating that participants whose formative region was North America had higher DO than those raised in the MENA region (mean difference = 27.59; 95% CI = 13.57, 41.62; p < .01), Africa (mean difference = 26.02; 95% CI = 3.09, 48.95; p < .05), and Western Europe (mean difference = 18.51; 95% CI = 1.41, 35.62; p < .05). No other significant differences emerged.

Table 15. Bonferroni Post-hoc Analysis Developmental Orientation Based on Formative Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Formative Region</th>
<th>(J) Formative Region</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>41.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.02</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>48.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.21</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-18.10</td>
<td>56.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-13.39</td>
<td>32.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.51</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>35.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.96</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-6.97</td>
<td>38.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-10.90</td>
<td>32.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>-27.59</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-41.62</td>
<td>-13.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-24.75</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>-8.38</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-45.84</td>
<td>29.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>-18.05</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-41.23</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>-9.08</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-26.51</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>-11.64</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-34.81</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>-16.95</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-38.75</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>-26.02</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-48.95</td>
<td>-3.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-21.60</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>-6.81</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-48.43</td>
<td>34.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>-16.48</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-45.91</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>-7.51</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-32.66</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>-10.07</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-39.49</td>
<td>19.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>-15.38</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-43.74</td>
<td>12.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>-19.21</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-56.52</td>
<td>18.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-29.07</td>
<td>45.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-34.81</td>
<td>48.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>-9.67</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-51.29</td>
<td>31.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-39.41</td>
<td>38.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.26</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-44.87</td>
<td>38.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>-8.57</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-49.44</td>
<td>32.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I) Formative Region</td>
<td>(J) Formative Region</td>
<td>Mean Difference (I-J)</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval</td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>-9.54</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-32.47</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.05</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-5.12</td>
<td>41.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.48</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-12.95</td>
<td>45.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-31.95</td>
<td>51.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-16.18</td>
<td>34.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-23.01</td>
<td>35.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-27.26</td>
<td>29.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>-18.51</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-35.62</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-8.35</td>
<td>26.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-17.65</td>
<td>32.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-38.02</td>
<td>39.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>-8.98</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-34.13</td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.56</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-27.72</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>-7.87</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-31.77</td>
<td>16.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>-15.96</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-38.89</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-11.54</td>
<td>34.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-19.36</td>
<td>39.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-38.36</td>
<td>44.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>-6.42</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-35.85</td>
<td>23.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-22.60</td>
<td>27.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>-5.32</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-33.67</td>
<td>23.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>-10.64</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-32.18</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-4.84</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-12.98</td>
<td>43.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-32.30</td>
<td>49.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-29.46</td>
<td>27.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-16.02</td>
<td>31.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-23.04</td>
<td>33.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Only one participant indicated a formative region of South America. This participant was excluded from the post-hoc analysis; MENA = Middle East and North Africa.

**Length of time in Qatar.** Significant differences also emerged for the mean scores based on length of time in Qatar. DO was highest for those in Qatar 3-5 years (M = 97.98, SD = 15.85, F(4, 88) = 2.57, p < .05). Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 16 and ANOVA results are presented in Table 17.

**Table 16. Descriptive Statistics for Developmental Orientation by Time in Qatar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 months</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>89.22</td>
<td>22.44</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>68.46</td>
<td>109.98</td>
<td>42.24</td>
<td>108.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89.06</td>
<td>21.59</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>107.11</td>
<td>59.08</td>
<td>122.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–5 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>97.98</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>92.06</td>
<td>103.90</td>
<td>72.42</td>
<td>126.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 Years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83.25</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>75.94</td>
<td>90.56</td>
<td>36.40</td>
<td>111.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>86.22</td>
<td>18.78</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>77.90</td>
<td>94.55</td>
<td>50.63</td>
<td>119.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>89.65</td>
<td>18.82</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>85.78</td>
<td>93.53</td>
<td>36.40</td>
<td>126.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17. Analysis of Variance for Developmental Orientation by Time in Qatar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3409.26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>852.32</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>29173.20</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>331.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32582.46</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 presents the results of the Bonferroni post-hoc analysis for developmental orientation based on time in Qatar. The results reveal one significant difference, indicating that participants who have been in Qatar 3–5 years have higher DO than participants who have been in Qatar 6–10 years (mean difference = 14.73; 95% CI = 0.68, 28.78;p< .05). No other significant differences emerged.

Table 18. Bonferroni Post-hoc Analysis Developmental Orientation Based on Time in Qatar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Time in Qatar</th>
<th>(J) Time in Qatar</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 months 1–2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-26.97</td>
<td>27.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–5 years</td>
<td>-8.76</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-30.77</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 Years</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-16.35</td>
<td>28.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-19.75</td>
<td>25.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 years Less than 3 months</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-27.30</td>
<td>26.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–5 years</td>
<td>-8.92</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-29.79</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 Years</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-15.39</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-18.82</td>
<td>24.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–5 years Less than 3 months</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-13.25</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 years</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-11.94</td>
<td>29.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 Years</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>28.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-2.96</td>
<td>26.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 Years Less than 3 months</td>
<td>-5.97</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-28.30</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 years</td>
<td>-5.81</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-27.00</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–5 years</td>
<td>-14.73</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-28.78</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>-2.98</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-18.16</td>
<td>12.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years Less than 3 months</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-25.75</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 years</td>
<td>-2.83</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-24.48</td>
<td>18.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–5 years</td>
<td>-11.76</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-26.47</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 Years</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-12.21</td>
<td>18.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The direction and degree of relationship between the formative region and length of time in Qatar (the independent demographic variables) and DO were tested using Spearman’s Rank Correlation Analyses (see Table 19). A significant negative
relationship was exhibited for formative region and developmental orientation ($r = - .292$, $p < .01$).

Table 19. Spearman Correlations between Developmental Orientation and Selected Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental Orientation</th>
<th>Formative Region</th>
<th>How Long Qatar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>-.292**</td>
<td>-.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the $p < .05$ level; **significant at the $p < .01$ level

The correlation results suggest that, despite the significant differences in DO based on length of time in Qatar, the following hypothesis could not be rejected:

Alternate Hypothesis 9. Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with length of time in Qatar.

A stepwise multiple regression was performed to determine whether formative region can predict DO. In stepwise multiple regression, the statistical contribution that an independent variable makes to explaining the variance in the dependent variable determines how they are entered. Stepwise multiple regression is used to predict the dependent variable using the smallest set of parameters. However, before a stepwise multiple regression could be performed, it was necessary to determine whether the data were normally distributed for DO and demographic groups. The K-S test was used to do so. Based on the K-S test, the results show that the distributions of the scores overall are normal for DO (see Table 20).

Table 20. Test for Normal Distribution of Developmental Orientation Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Orientation</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, it was necessary to confirm that the data for each variable were distributed normally within the demographic groupings that would be examined using the stepwise regression. The first K-S test was performed for formative region. The DO

---

8 In stepwise multiple regression, the statistical contribution that a variable makes to explaining the variance in the dependent variable determines how they are entered. Stepwise multiple regression is used to predict the dependent variable using the smallest set of parameters.
data were normally distributed within the formative region groups (see Table 21). Thus, the multiple regression could be performed.

Table 21. Test for Normal Distribution of Developmental Orientation Scores Based on Formative Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formative Region</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.200*</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.200*</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.200*</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.200*</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.200*</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MENA = Middle East and North Africa; the data were constant when FormativeRegion = South America. These data were omitted.

Regression results for DO are presented in Table 22, using the demographic variable of formative region. These results show that formative region accounts for 4.8% of the variance in DO and is a significant fit of the data (F(1,92) = 5.667, p < .05).

Table 22. Stepwise Regression Results for Developmental Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>Changed df</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.241*</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>18.30962</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>5.667</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Formative Region

The results discussed above suggest that the following hypothesis could be rejected:

Alternate Hypothesis 6: Educators’ measured ICS does not significantly correlate with formative region.

Research Question 3 and Focus Group Results

Research Question 3 asked: To what extent do the quantitative results align with the observations and experiences of sojourner educators and how do they make sense of the results?

Five focus groups were held with a self-selected sample of the survey participants (n = 22) for the purpose of discussing and interpreting the results. The focus groups consisted of three to six participants each and were conducted between 12
December 2012 and 1 January 2013. Each focus group consisted of a mixture of men and women (see Table 23).

**Table 23. Focus Group Dates and Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Home Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/12/12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>Canada, United Kingdom, United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17/12/12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–5 years</td>
<td>Brazil, Canada, United Kingdom, United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23/12/12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>Egypt, Nigeria, Turkey,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13/12/12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Over 5 years</td>
<td>Australia, United Kingdom, United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>01/01/13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Over 5 years</td>
<td>Canada, Russia, United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The focus groups were presented with and then interviewed about three sets of data: (a) PO and DO results, (b) impact of formative region on ICS, and (c) impact of length of time in Qatar on ICS. For each set of data, the participants were asked whether the results aligned with their own experience, how they make sense of the data, what the implications of the results are, and what they recommend based on the results. The following sections present the findings from the focus groups. Reactions to the findings are presented first, followed by the recommendations they offered.

**General reactions.** Members from Groups 2 and 3 voiced surprise that the DO scores were as low as they were (in the Minimization stage on the IDC). These members expected the educators’ orientations to be in the Acceptance stage. One participant from Group 3 stated, “Well, I would say slightly [these results are] surprising because I didn’t expect anyone to score this low on the DO scale. Considering our age and being in an international setting, yeah, I find that surprising.” It is important to note that these participants had the least tenure (3–5 years in Group 2 and less than 1 year in Group 3).

However, members of the other three focus groups believed that the results were not surprising. One member of Group 1 said, “If a person stayed in Denial or Polarization they would tend to leave the region itself . . . or be very unhappy.”
Members from all five focus groups agreed that there was a correlation between formative region and orientation towards cultural difference. One member of Group 2 shared, “I’m not surprised, from what I’ve heard and seen.” Yet another member of Group 4 elaborated on another aspect of his experience:

Coming from a country with a history of racism, I don’t notice racism here, but I notice, what I call, “passportism” you are judged, your value, is based on your passport” . . . You’re not treated the same. You’re treated differently based on the passport you hold. For me, that’s where I think that’s where a lot of that comes from.

Members from four of the five focus groups also agreed that there was a correlation between length of time in Qatar and orientation. Nevertheless, members of Group 2 cautioned that the results observed in this study within the Qatari context may not be representative of other countries. One member explained, “You might consider this to be an extreme culture, and if you went to Dubai, the results might be a little different again.” A visual representation of these themes and sub-themes may be seen in Figure 11.
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**Figure 11. Focus Group Themes**

PO = Perceived Orientation, DO = Developmental Orientation, ICS = intercultural sensitivity
**Participant explanations.** Participants were asked to interpret and make sense of the data regarding the findings related to the impact of formative region and length of time in Qatar on orientation. The following sections report the themes that emerged.

**Developmental Orientation and Perceived Orientation results.** Analysis of the focus group data revealed less agreement with the DO and PO results than with the results for Formative Region or Time in Qatar, with two themes emerging: either (a) surprise at the results and an expectation of more complex orientations or (b) agreement with the results.

Members of two of the five focus groups expressed surprise that most of the faculty were in Minimization and expected that the faculty would be in a more complex orientation given the nature of their jobs. Participants in the other three focus groups felt that it wasn’t surprising that most teachers were in Minimization. A participant in Group 1 shared,

> I think that the Minimization stage is the only stage that you need at a very basic level to function. Without that, you wouldn’t be able to function here at all. You’d be in turmoil; you’d be in too much conflict. Minimization I’d say is just the basic level of doing the day-to-day things and getting on with it.

Another participant speculated,

> some of the people stay . . . have stayed, not because of the culture but because they enjoy maybe the lifestyle, and so they haven’t necessarily become more self-reflective, or grown, or understood the culture, they’ve just found a method to survive here and just continue on.”

It is perhaps not surprising that most educators fell within the Minimization orientation when the life history research of Mahon (2003) examined in chapter two found similar results.

**Impact of formative region.** Analysis of the focus group data revealed three themes regarding participants’ explanations of the impact of formative region on orientations: (a) core differences regarding multiculturalism in MENA and North American cultures, (b) aspects of local Qatari culture are felt by participants to
encourage a sense of separation and difference, and (e) external events are further complicating cross-cultural relations.

As mentioned in chapter 3, these perceptions should be treated with caution as, in many cases, they are participants’ understandings of the experience of others, and not directly self-reported by the individuals in question. Furthermore, it is possible to interpret some of the focus group responses as an othering discourse. Within research, othering is seen as:

perpetuating prejudice, discrimination, and injustice either through deliberate or ignorant means. Othering is most obvious where researchers, their paradigms and processes, and their reports have objectified or exotified a person, group, or community. Othering . . . usually portrays a particular case or set of cases in an essentialized or overly simplistic manner. . . . Othering is always accompanied with essentialist assumptions about the other that are typically unexamined from a critical analytical standpoint (MacQuarrie, 2010, p. 636).

This research is not positioned from within a postcolonial paradigm; however, awareness of the possibility of an othering discourse within the focus groups is of value.

Finally, there is the possibility that the participants in the focus group exhibited either conformity, which is withholding, not saying in the group what they might say in private, or its opposite, polarization exhibiting more extreme views in a group setting than they would in private (Sussman, et al., 1991). Regardless, the data below is presented as typical of the themes that emerged during the groups.

Members of all five focus groups stressed that core differences regarding multiculturalism in MENA and North American cultures help explain the results. The members of all groups pointed out that North Americans generally grow up in multicultural societies where diversity and equality are legislated and culturally encouraged. A participant in Group 1 shared, “The West has a recent history of human rights, equality, women’s rights, civil rights, etc.” A member of Group 2 explained,

Culturally speaking, if you have been brought up in the West, it’s not okay to be a racist, to discriminate on sex, things like that. And that’s not the case here. Not just in the Gulf region, but all across the Arab world.
A member from Group 3 pointed out,

People from North America, they went to schools with people from different countries in the world. So I think that they are more culturally sensitive, while here, they see ex-pats are people who are coming to work for us, so they have a different perception of others.

A participant in Group 4 similarly expressed,

America has had a very strong cross-cultural, multicultural, ah, focus for the last, well, since I entered junior high, and cross-cultural and multicultural are big, big buzzwords. . . . When I was uni[versity] training that was huge, you must be cross-cultural; you must represent other cultures, that was the big touchstone.

Another member of Group 4 agreed,

I’ve been taught my whole life that we are all the same. You know, Declaration of Independence, unalienable rights, has been rammed down our throat, you know, we are all God’s children and entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and it has been rammed down all through school.

A participant in Group 5 shared,

In North America I think that there is more of a recognition of protecting minorities and encouraging diversity. If there is a legislation and government that is promoting diversity and inclusion, then people may tend to be more inclusive you know, and not have that us and them, less of a barrier there, but if it’s left to people, then the natural tendency might be to group together and avoid others.

The participants emphasized that from their perspective multiculturalism was not encouraged in MENA societies. On the contrary, participants in all five groups voiced the view that some MENA societal characteristics actually encourage a simple orientation towards cultural difference — particularly an “us” and “them” mentality, as discussed in Groups 1 and 2.

One participant in Group 1 shared, “It was an ‘us and them’ . . . It was rife absolutely. It was horrendous. It was so obvious that no one even talked about it. That was it.” A participant in Group 2 similarly stated, “any pre-existing us and them sort of attitude is supported here, because this is the environment we have: it is ‘us and them.’”

A participant in Group 3 of Arabic ancestry shared his unsuccessful attempt to mingle with his MENA colleagues:
I noticed this, that the Arabs in the department don’t mix up a lot with other people, even with myself. Sometimes I try and go and say hello and mix with many people. But I have found, you know, that they are, ah, they stay away. They want to be in the shade.

One Group 4 participant compared his experience working in Qatar with working in other countries and noted the differences he experienced in adapting to the local culture: “If I’m living in Korea, if I’m living in Japan, I’m forced to adapt. But here I am encouraged to stay amongst my people.”

Moreover, in Group 5, an Arabic speaking North American participant married into a MENA family observed that many subcultures exist within MENA communities, and that each subculture is cohesive and rather closed, and that mingling across these subcultures is rare:

They are quite distinct and specific, I mean, you know, Syria and Kuwait and North Africa and Sudan, they are very specific culture. I mean, yes, they may share a religion and a language, . . . but they have their own [group], umm, and they’re tight.

This participant further speculated why these communities may be so tightly knit:

I think for survival in this area, there was, you know, being in a family, being in a group, because they protected you, your group, your identity. This is how you survived and how you were protected, so there would have to be a stronger “us and them” mentality.

The second common theme that emerged in the focus group data was that aspects of Qatari culture seem to encourage “us and them” thinking. Participants in four of the five focus groups discussed the social hierarchy of Qatari society, and speculated that this has led to anger and an ingrained sense of inferiority among some.

In Group 1, participants discussed how Qatari society is organized in a hierarchy, with people at different levels of government transfer payments, pay scales, and statuses based on tribe. They explained that this is seen by Qataris as natural, and is the norm in society. However, they also believed that this hierarchical system, and upbringing and education in Qatar, leads to a feeling of inferiority and persecution in
some non-Qatari MENA staff, as well as “anger and touchiness at times.” One participant elaborated,

I don’t know if they would admit it openly, but certainly in private conversations they have this terrible sense [of inferiority]. . . . And it must come from their educational background and political beliefs; I’m not sure, but this terrible feeling of inferiority.

Participants in Group 2 spoke a great deal about how people are viewed and treated very differently based on one’s home country. The recent decision to raise the salary of all Qatari university employees by 60%, but not that of the non-Qatari employees was repeatedly highlighted as an example of how one’s worth is judged on nationality, not contribution. One participant shared, “One person [I know] . . . he’s from an Arab [sic] speaking country, was quite upset that you’re judged by where you’re from, and not by who you are.” Another participant had a similar experience of discrimination:

Different faculty are treated according to their class. . . . I was upset that it took, it took me 5 weeks to get a driving license. Yet one of my co-workers got it within a week based on status. . . . That perceived difference in treatment is aggravating. Why isn’t it consistent for everyone? Why is it different based on where you’re from?

In contrast, another participant has experienced preferential treatment based on his Westerner status:

I knew quickly after arriving here that my position was number two. [First are] Qatari male and Qatari female. Then you’re going White male, and then the other Arabs fell after me, which I found quite surprising that I was placed higher than a Palestinian or someone from Algeria, or something like that. It was quite shocking for me that that would be the case.

Another participant readily agreed:

Yes, I have heard non-Gulf Arabs complaining of being treated poorly by Qatari, [sic] and being treated unfairly. . . . I remember one [case from] when I first arrived. The university had just started allowing non-Qatari Arabs to collect educational expenses for their children, whereas before their kids had to go to public schools and the Western kids got to go to private schools. That was one specific event, but there are others.
The discussion in Group 4 focused on the divisions within Qatari society and that people from different subcultures are viewed and treated differently. In particular, as mentioned by Group 2, the participants in Group 4 noted that non-Qatari MENA residents are treated and paid poorly compared to the local subjects. One Group 4 participant remarked,

There is a great deal of infighting among the different Arab groups, but I mean specifically everybody else versus the Gulf, like, the ex-pat Arabs who live in the Gulf feel to a very great extent that they are looked at as second class by the local Arabs.

Another participant elaborated,

For the non-Qatari Arabs, . . . having this idea that you share a language, you share a religion, but the laws here and the way in which labour works here, the labour practices, it’s very polarizing. You’re doing the same job as someone else, but they get paid a hell of a lot more because of the passport they hold. . . . No wonder there is this idea of division.

The participants in Group 4 also speculated about the historical reasons for the preferential treatment. Another Arabic speaking North American participant who married into an Arab family posited that the differences center on class, the types of jobs that people hold, and a regional history of poverty:

[Western faculty] don’t have like, labourer jobs, whereas a lot of folks from the Arab world do, from Jordan, from Egypt, from these different places, ah, and so the perception of the locals towards them is often derogatory, just because of the socio-economic stratification thing, so a lot of the Arab people who live here feel that they sort of have to fight against that perception and they often feel discriminated against by the locals. The money here is so recent, many of their countries used to subsidize the Gulf a lot, when it was poor and Bedouin, like Egypt and Lebanon used to send money here, within the living memories of a lot of the folks, so they feel very resentful that they are treated as second class.

Another participant speculated that governmental practices of privilege explain the strained attitudes:

Maybe it’s the history, the Arab countries have an ongoing history of those who are privileged by the government, where you have favoured and unfavoured, so maybe that has something to do with it, there is a sense of us and them.
In Group 5, participants discussed the social structures within MENA society and reasoned that these structures prescribe clear roles and places for members, thus, encouraging people to stay within their circle:

It’s very clear; I mean here it’s very obvious. It’s very clearly delineated, it helps people understand where they belong, and in North America there is less of a distinction. It is just another way of categorizing and grouping people, you have the families and the tribes, and you also have the social grouping, and it really does put you in a very specific spot in society.

Four of the five groups also discussed their beliefs that Islamic religious views as understood in some areas of the region further reinforce an “us and them” perception and inhibit the growth of sophisticated orientations towards cultural difference. In Group 1, one participant likened this to his own upbringing in Catholicism:

It’s partly tied to religion. . . . I went to private Catholic school and was taught that all of my Protestant friends were going to go to hell. This is the same: they’re taught that there’s them and everyone else. That they have the right way of life and that everyone else is lesser—that [others] have the wrong way. They’re all going to hell and that makes it okay to lie to the Kafir.

A participant in Group 2 affirmed, “I think it [religion] creates an ‘us and them,’ in their particular point of view.” A member of Group 5 agreed, “They [religious scholars] do promote some isolationism.” A participant in Group 4 elaborated on his own experience with religion and what he has learned of some local views toward non-Muslims:

The Christian churches have mostly stopped with the “Yeah, you’re going to go to hell because you’re not Christian sort of stuff.” But Islam, as it’s taught here, definitely doesn’t have that. You know, non-Muslims, atheists—my God—we are worse than anything else. The top tier of “going to hell” is Christians and Jews, and then next level down would be the polytheists—the Hindus and the Buddhists. The boys that I tutor believe that I, as a non-Muslim, will be going to hell. So there are elements of this religion that reinforce cultural difference. You know, God’s favoured language, or the language of God, is Arabic.

Participants in two focus groups also discussed that external events such as the spread of Western universities and the 2022 World Cup to be held in Qatar are leaving

9Kafir is a derogatory term in Arabic for non-Muslims, often translated as “infidel” or “unbeliever”.
Qataris and long-term GCC and MENA residents feeling threatened as the environment, both within and outside the workplace, becomes increasingly Westernized, or what they perceive as Westernized. A member of Group 1 shared:

In the past, it was an Arab-run department. In the last 7 or 8 years, it has become more and more Western-oriented, so, I’m wondering if they’re also feeling a little more, judged, attacked, or pressured to fit in if they want to survive. I know that a lot of my colleagues have said in the past, “Oh, they’ll get rid of us because [we’re] from here, of from this country or that country.” They feel they are being pressured to adapt to our work environment that we are setting up.

A participant in Group 4 shared his observations in the wake of the World Cup announcement:

From what I’ve seen in the local culture, the Qataris are feeling more and more under threat, under attack from us outsiders coming in. . . . The [Qatari] middle-class didn’t invite us in. The upper-class invited us in, and it’s the middle-class who is now fighting back. The upper-class, like the top crust Qataris, are still the ones who want the World Cup, who still want the Olympics, all of this other connecting with the world. And middle-class Qataris are saying, "No, we want you all to go home." When the World Cup was announced, I had a group of women saying, "No, we don’t want a million foreigners coming here during the World Cup."

**Impact of length of time in Qatar.** Analysis of the focus group responses regarding the impact of length of time in Qatar led to three themes. First, the participants explained that working outside one’s home country may have nothing to do with more complex orientations towards cultural difference, or even any sort of interest in other cultures. A Group 1 participant explained that long-term tenure in a country may simply reflect the person’s ability to survive there:

I would say that it could be that some of the people stay not because of the culture but because they enjoy, maybe, the lifestyle, and so they haven’t necessarily become more self-reflective or grown or understood the culture. They’ve just found a method to survive here and just continue one with what they’ve done all along.

Moreover, a participant of Group 4 commented that people may stay simply because they have nowhere else to go: “There is that dynamic of the stuck thing, where people don’t really want to be here anymore, but they’re kind of complacent, or realize that they can’t go anywhere else.” This sentiment had also been heard by a member of
Group 2. He shared, “They see us [Westerners and] they say, ‘You know, you’re lucky, you can leave. I can’t go back to Syria,’ or ‘I don’t want to go back to Palestine.’”

Another participant in Group 2 commented that at some point, people lose interest in acculturation and adapting to and exploring the society around them:

I joke about reaching the point of apathy; you just become apathetic about the culture around you, and just don’t really care anymore. . . . I think that we develop to a point, that we acculturate to a point and we say "Okay, that’s as far as I’m going." And at that point, you become very apathetic and you just live your daily life without concern or consideration of the fact that you’re in a different culture and so on and so forth.

A participant in Group 3 similarly commented that the interest in the host culture wanes after a certain point:

The guys who have been here a long time. . . . You know, they have a cultural firewall, they don’t care anymore. . . . You know, that’s it. They just have this block, like, "I’ve heard enough. I’ve seen enough. I’ve been there, done that."

A second common theme voiced by participants in all five groups was that as people age and acquire more personal and professional responsibilities, their ICS decreases. A member of Group 1 explained,

As you get older, you tend to, you don’t like it, but you tend to go back to that period of stability time (sic) when most judgments were formed…it becomes a sort of self-protection. The effort involved [in exploring and relating to other cultures], perhaps when we were younger, which would have been exciting and new and so on and so forth, I don’t think people have the energy for it.

A member of Group 4 commented that "aging and life stage impacts on perceptions. If you have kids or not, etc., affects it too." A participant in Group 5 further speculated, “As we age, the majority of people get set in their ways, they become more rigid, they become less accepting of other ideas, more grumpy, more everything.”

The final explanation discussed in four of the five groups regarding why time in Qatar may influence ICS is that stress as well as repeated negative experiences in the host society decrease ICS. In Group 1, participants explained that negative experiences and trauma experienced in the host society can result in situations where “you let the stereotypes take over your attitude, which you shouldn’t at all.” One participant shared,
"People I know who have been over here for 20 years, trauma has played a big part [in adopting stereotypes]."

Similarly, a participant in Group 2 shared, “I’ve heard people comment that ‘I wasn’t a racist before I came here, but I am now.’” Another participant in this group elaborated on her experience of losing her empathy:

It is as if I have reached a certain point . . . that is due to the fact that there has been a cumulative amount of experiences that I have had [here]. . . . There are [only] so many times you can bang your head against that wall. But the experiences that I have had that have led me to be less willing to climb into another person’s shoes and sort of attempt to resolve conflict have not necessarily been good experiences. They have been difficult experiences. . . . From a Western perspective, from a North American perspective, there might be the idea that there might be more flexibility, more adaptability with the other people with whom you are working, that they would have that same type [of adaptability] because we work internationally, regardless of whether we are Arab or non-Arab, we, maybe just I assume that they would have a more sophisticated concept. . . . And when you reach that point [of conflict]. . . . And one might have that awareness that the other person isn’t willing to do that, so why should you? . . . [So] at times, I’m no longer willing to go to that place and sit in that spot embody it from that position, cause I’m burned out, and I’m tired of doing it now.

Participants in Group 4 noted that the attitudes of both Qatari subjects and expatriates have soured toward each other:

“To a certain extent, I see that the environment out in the Qatari culture has gotten more negative and that is so kind of an outside influence where they’re being more negative about us and we’re being more negative about them as a result.

Another participant in this group reasoned, “It could be that the Westerners are moving towards something that the [non-Gulf] Arabs already know: the ‘us and them’ mindset.”

A participant in this group also noted that his stress level tends to be associated with his ICS—as his stress elevates, his ICS tends to decrease:

What I’ve realized is that my stress level in everything augments or magnifies my stress level in everything. So, my experience interacting with the community is everything to do with whether things are going well with my kid or if things are going well here. I found myself that my overall stress level, at home, at work, translated out to the community, where I really had a hard time having any kind of positive reaction towards the cross-cultural experiences that I had.
In Group 5, participants discussed that repeatedly being excluded over time by the host culture prompted them to become increasingly become insular:

The longer people are here, the more isolated they become, or at least more aware of their isolation from the local culture. I’ve been here for 5 years now, but I can’t say that I have any Qatari friends. It is very difficult to get to know them as people. You can only be separated from a group by them not allowing you in for so long before you say "To hell with them” and be negative and just not try anymore. I think that when that happens you just stop trying to understand.

**Recommendations.** After reviewing and discussing the findings, participants were asked to offer recommendations to help improve ICS throughout the faculty community. Analysis of the focus group data revealed four themes: program-level buy-in and effort is needed, candidate screening during the hiring phase should be improved, better professional development is needed for new and seasoned faculty, and activities should be planned to improve cross-cultural faculty communication and collaboration.

Participants across three of the groups emphasized that program-level buy-in and deliberate cross-cultural team building were lacking. One Group 3 participant commented, “I never felt like there was, like, an effort to, like, put all people from different cultures together and integrate them.” A participant in Group 5 similarly stated,

I don’t think that the program has a vested interest in this, you know, they do the 1 hour intercultural training for the new staff, then they’re interested in you going in the classroom and doing the curriculum and getting the assessments done, and they don’t perceive this as having too much of an effect on your professional behaviour, your work related affairs.

A member of Group 1 emphasized, “Work needs to be done for it to be an enduring . . . or an understanding relationship.”

The suggestion was offered in three focus groups that the candidate screening needs to improve to ensure that newly recruited teachers have cross-cultural experience and ICS. Participants in Group 1 emphasized that a certain level of ICS is needed to function as a sojourner educator. One participant commented, "If a person stayed in
Denial or Polarization they would tend to leave the region itself . . . or be very unhappy.” Another member of this group shared,

I think that the Minimization stage is the only stage that you need at a very basic level to function. Without that you wouldn’t be able to function here at all. You’d be in turmoil; you’d be in too much conflict. Minimization I’d say is just the basic level of doing the day-to-day things and getting on with it.

A participant in Group 5 believed that the hiring process should focus more on candidates’ past intercultural experiences:

We look at experience teaching abroad, we look at experience teaching Arabic [sic] students, so we do consider that a plus, you know, we have hired faculty straight from the States and they come in with very little intercultural experiences [sic]and we think it is more of a struggle than for those who have been around.

The second suggestion, offered by participants in three groups, commented that better professional development and acculturation activities are needed--both initially and on an ongoing basis. A participant in Group 2 shared, "I had trouble adapting, which surprised me, because I’d lived all over the world, and I expected adaptation to be a little bit easier and to have less culture shock.” Participants in this group agreed that more thorough intercultural development for newcomers and more written guidance were needed to help new faculty acclimatize. A similar sentiment was offered in Group 3. One participant in this group pointed out, however, that the need was to adapt to the cultures of one’s colleagues within the university--not necessarily to the Qatari culture:

Raising intercultural awareness is one thing that the program could do . . . [about] the subcultures present in the university, so when we understand ourselves better, we can see how we can seek balance. As teachers here, we need to adapt not to the host culture, but to the work culture, the culture of our colleagues, not the culture of Qatars.

Participants in Group 5 pointed out that the faculty who have been on staff for longer periods of time need ongoing "refresher" development:

In terms of training we can easily forget those people, 10,15 years, and think oh, they’re fine, they know the culture so well, there are no issues, they’ve become intercultural, they’ve integrated, but maybe they haven’t. Perhaps targeting those people who have been there, and do a refresher [training].
The third recommendation, offered by participants in all five groups, was to create a cohesive workplace climate through various events and activities. In Group 1, participants discussed the need to engage in cross-cultural conversations as a means for deepening their mutual understanding. One participant explained,

We need to meet more as staff, because we don’t have a chance to get to know each other. You know, our only contact is when there is an issue, or when we get together and focus, and you have to put all of those issues aside and deal only with the issue at hand. And sometimes it’s very difficult because you have no understanding of each other’s culture.

In Group 2, participants voiced that faculty from all cultures need to be brought together through activities that "develop a sense of unity." They emphasized that although the focus of cultural development activities is on Westerners, other sojourner educators also need to be included. One participant explained,

The concern, whether it is addressed well or not, is usually with getting the Westerners acclimated [sic] and able to work in this system. That’s the main concern. The non-Gulf Arabs are sort of assumed to be just fine. But more effort needs to be placed so that we can all come closer to a level playing field as co-workers.

Participants in Group 3 advised that the activities include ample discussion, learning about and practicing cross-cultural communication, and learning from the experience of faculty who have been there longer. Moreover, these participants emphasized that the activities include extracurricular and other social outings. One participant elaborated,

If we have more extra-curricular activities for staff. We only talk about work here, you know. There is nothing else to talk about. So, how about if we have something . . . we have a club . . . [and] try to find similarities between people, build bridges, make friends.

Similarly, participants in Groups 4 and 5 stressed that activities were needed to develop more cohesion and bring people together outside of work.

Conclusion

This chapter reported the quantitative and qualitative findings of the study. Participants’ ICS as measured by the IDI were reported and an analysis of the influence
of demographic factors on these were examined using statistical tests and focus group interviews.

Most of the teachers were found to operate from within the transitional orientation Minimization, although there is a broad range of orientations from Denial to Adaptation. On average, the educators were found to overestimate their ICS by 31 points.

A positive correlation between DO and formative region to the age of 18, with participants from North America showing the highest ICS was found. Statistically significant differences emerged for DO when comparing MENA and non-MENA formative regions. Formative region was found to account for 4.8% of the variance in DO and is a significant fit of the data \( F(1,92) = 5.667, p < .05 \). Through focus groups, participants speculated that core differences regarding multiculturalism in the examined MENA and North American cultures helped explain the results, with aspects of the examined MENA cultures inhibiting the development of complex orientations towards difference, and aspects of North American cultures encouraging them. External events were believed to further complicate cross-cultural relations.

Statistically significant differences also emerged for mean DO based on length of time in Qatar. Those educators who had resided there 3–5 years had the highest ICS and this was significantly different than the ICS of educators who had resided in Qatar 6–10 years. However, a statistically significant relationship between length of time in Qatar and DO was not found. Regarding the difference in means, participants in focus groups explained that working outside one’s home country for extended periods of time may have nothing to do with ICS or interest in another culture. They also speculated that as people age and acquire more personal and professional responsibilities their ICS decreases, and that ICS also diminishes as stress and negative cross-cultural experiences accumulate over time. It is important to note, however, that the quantitative results did
not suggest a relationship between age and ICS. The next chapter provides a summary, discussion, and recommendations based on these findings.
Chapter 5: Summary, Discussion, and Recommendations

"It is not the worldly distance traveled that is important to the intellectual transformation of the student and teacher towards a broader world view, but rather the degree to which the individual steps out of a culture-bound process of thinking, learning and viewing the world" (Sylvester, 1998, p.186).

This mixed-methods study investigated ICS among sojourner educators in the foundation programs at Qatar University and examined the relationships between ICS and various demographic and intercultural background characteristics of the educators. Two research questions were defined:

1. To what extent does perceived ICS and measured ICS differ among educators working in the Foundation Program as measured by the IDI?
2. Is there a relationship between the educators’ demographic or intercultural background variables and the measured ICS?
3. To what extent do the quantitative results align with the observations and experiences of sojourner educators and how do they make sense of the results?

This chapter provides a summary of the findings and discusses the implications of these findings. Contributions of this study to theory, recommendations for professional practice, and suggestions for future research are then outlined.

Summary of Findings

**Perceived vis-à-vis measured intercultural sensitivity.** The participants’ mean PO was 120.79, which placed them well into Acceptance (respecting and adapting to behavioral and value differences within the cultural context). In contrast, their mean DO was 89.78, which is in early Minimization (devaluing cultural difference and believing that all people are basically the same as oneself), although individual DO varied from 36.40 (Denial) to 136.51 (Acceptance).

These results suggest that, on average, participants believed they had more complex orientations than they actually had, according to the IDI. Moreover, their overestimation of their
ICS was substantial: Whereas Hammer (2009) stated that an OG (difference between PO and DO) greater than 7 points is significant, participants in this study produced a mean OG of 31 points (SD = 11.77). This is not uncommon. MDB Group (2012) reported that approximately 87% of any population exhibits PO-DO gaps of 7.0 or more, meaning it is rather common to greatly overestimated one’s ICS. Nevertheless, the size of the participants’ gap appeared to be surprising to at least some participants. The focus group participants shared that they perceived themselves to have more complex orientations given their choice to work abroad in a highly culturally diverse environment. They explained that they had assumed a complex orientation to be a prerequisite for the job.

Although common, it is concerning that sojourner educators are in a Minimization stage. Within the Minimization orientation, individuals acknowledge cultural difference, but they emphasize commonalities, trivialize cultural difference (Bray, 2006), and tend to view their own ways and views as being the best and most accurate (Bennett, 1993). They may focus so much on cultural commonality that they may not be able to recognize cultural perspectives that impact intercultural relations. It is even more concerning that the faculty substantially overestimate their ICS. By definition, sojourner educators travel from country to country working in international schools, local schools, and universities (Earley, Ang, & Tan, 2006). If they believe themselves to be operating with regard for and understanding of other cultures, yet interpret others’ actions through their own culturally informed understanding of behaviour, unproductive conflict, misunderstanding, and other adverse outcomes are inevitable. This gap (and the misunderstandings that result) may at least partly explain the negative intercultural experiences the focus group participants described having in Qatar. It follows that overestimation of ICS—particularly when one’s DO is in Minimization may be associated with several adverse outcomes.
for the faculty member, the faculty community, students, and the university at large. However, specific outcomes of overestimating one’s ICS remain to be determined, leading to some suggestions for future research (discussed later in this chapter). Recommendations for faculty selection and development also are warranted based on these findings. These recommendations also are described later in this chapter.

**Relationships between demographic variables and intercultural sensitivity.** Twelve variables were hypothesized to be associated with ICS: gender, age, time overseas, education level, formative region, ethnic minority status, job position, length of time in Qatar, intercultural marriage, default language, formal teacher training, and overseas development organization experience. Comparisons of the mean revealed significant differences only when analyzing the data for three variables: formative region, length of time in Qatar, and default language. When controlling for formative region, DO was not found to significantly vary based on default language. Furthermore, correlational analysis did not reveal a significant relationship between length of time in Qatar and DO.

Correlational analysis revealed a significant relationship between formative region and DO. Regression analysis revealed that formative region accounts for 4.8% of the variance in DO and is a significant fit of the data ($F(1,92) = 5.667$, $p < .05$). Thus, only one of the examined variables (formative region) was found to have a significant correlation with DO. Focus group results confirmed and further explained this relationship. Additional insights also were gained from the focus groups about the possible relationship between length of time in Qatar and DO.

Many of these results depart from past literature on the proposed relationships between demographic variables and ICS, and help to fill the gap in the literature. Before more fully
discussing the impact of formative region and time in Qatar on DO, it is of benefit to briefly examine those variables that were not found to have a significant association with ICS.

**Variables lacking a significant association.** No significant differences in DO were found based on gender, age, time overseas, education level, ethnic minority status, job position, intercultural marriage, default language, formal teacher training, or overseas development organization experience. The following sections discuss these findings.

**Gender.** The results of this study were consistent with several past studies (Bayles, 2009; Hammer, 1999; Hammer et al., 2003; Paige et al., 2003; Westrick & Yuen, 2007; Yuen, 2010) that found that gender was not correlated with ICS. In contrast, Altshuler et al.’s (2003) study of physicians and Hansel and Chen’s (2008) study of high school international immersion program students suggested that women score higher on the IDI. It is possible that other characteristics of these latter study participants might be responsible for the results.

**Age.** The present study’s results were consistent with the findings of several earlier studies (Hammer et al., 2003; Kelso, 2006; Lai, 2006; Paige et al., 2003) that age and ICS are not consistently correlated. In contrast, a correlation between these variables was found by Straffon (2001) in his study of high school students in an international school and by Westrick and Yuen (2007) in their study of secondary teachers in Hong Kong schools. It is possible that factors such as sample size or other characteristics in these latter studies influenced these results.

**Time overseas.** Length of time living overseas was not correlated with ICS, which may be surprising as it is often assumed that those who choose to live abroad must have higher ICS. Mahon (2006) found that intercultural contact in the form of overseas travel was correlated with reduced ethnocentric attitudes, though Lai (2006) found no correlation between time living abroad and the ICS of sojourner teachers. It must remembered that these studies, and this one,
just measure time abroad, there is no attempt to assess the depth of cross-cultural interaction, or the amount of reflection on these interactions.

*Education level.* In this study, educational level was not associated with ICS, which is congruent with the findings of Hammer et al. (2003) and Bayles (2009), although these findings depart from the findings of other studies (Davis, 2009; Fretheim, 2007; Helmer, 2007; Kelso, 2006) that showed higher educational achievement to be positively correlated with ICS levels.

However, the present study’s sample was quite homogeneous in terms of educational attainment, as 4 participants had bachelor’s degrees, 88 had master’s degrees, and 6 had doctoral-level degrees. The lack of variation might have precluded the discovery of any statistical difference. Another possible explanation is that the benefits of educational attainment for ICS might be shown when comparing participants with secondary school degrees to participants with bachelor’s degrees. Thereafter, the impact of educational attainment may be negligible.

*Ethnic minority status.* No literature was found as part of this study that examined ethnic minority status and its relationship to ICS. However, the experience of being a minority has been associated with awareness of the differences between one’s own cultural beliefs, values, and behaviors and that of the dominant culture. Therefore, it was reasonable to conclude that individuals who identify with an ethnic minority status may have heightened ICS, as they may be more aware of cultural differences. However, the present study’s findings did not indicate any relationship between ethnic minority status and ICS. It is important to keep in mind, however, that only 17 of the 94 survey respondents identified with this status. Studies with a more balanced representation of minorities might produce different results.
Job position. This study found no correlation between job position and ICS, in conflict with Fretheim (2007), who found that administrators’ mean DO scores were nearly 10 points higher than teachers’ DO scores and that the variability in administrators’ scores was less than the variability of teachers’ scores. In the present study, administrators and teachers had the same mean DO (89.7). It should be noted, however, that only 4 (4.3%) of the 94 survey respondents self-identified as administrators (in Fretheim’s study, 8.9% self-identified as administrators). Moreover, in Fretheim’s (2007) study, the administrators had higher educational attainment than the teachers. It is possible that in Fretheim’s study, educational attainment or the combination of educational attainment and job position best predicted the results. Fretheim did not perform this level of analysis.

Intercultural marriage. Although literature was not found that examined the impact of cross-cultural marriage on ICS, it was expected that cross-cultural marriage would be positively correlated with ICS because individuals in these types of marriages likely would have experience recognizing, identifying, and reconciling cultural differences with their partners. However, this assumption was not supported by the results of this study.

Default language. Past research was not found that examined the impact of default language on ICS; however, it was assumed that individuals whose default language was different than the language of the institution would have more complex orientations due to the experience of learning another language (and, presumably, learning about that culture). Although the initial statistical analysis showed differences in DO based on default language, subsequent analysis revealed that the differences originated in formative region.

Formal teacher training. Formal teacher training has not been examined in the literature with regard to its influence on ICS. However, it was hypothesized to have an impact, as teacher
training, at its best, involves building awareness of one’s own and others’ cultures, including their beliefs, values, and ways of being (Bayles, 2009). This hypothesis was not supported by the present study’s findings. However, the study did not gather any data about the nature of the teachers’ training and whether it included a focus on intercultural awareness. This remains a direction for continued research.

Overseas development organization experience. Participation in the Peace Corps or VSO involves substantial immersion in another culture—often one that is dramatically different from one’s own. Therefore, it was hypothesized that having such experience would be associated with more complex orientations, consistent with Paige et al.’s (2003) assertions about the impact of cross-cultural interactions. It was important to examine this aspect, as past literature has been contradictory, with Lai (2006) and Fretheim (2007) finding no significant correlation between intercultural contact and ICS, others (e.g., Bayles, 2009; Black & Gregerson, 1991; Li & Gasser, 2005; Mahon, 2006; Zlobina et al., 2006) finding a positive correlation, and still others finding a negative correlation (Church, 1982; Ward & Kennedy, 1992). This study did not find a relationship between overseas development organization experience and ICS. This finding is consistent with those of Fahim (2002), who found that full intercultural immersion experiences are not necessary for the development of ICS, provided an individual has enough cross-cultural experiences from which to construe meaning. However, it must be noted that only 14 of the present study’s 94 survey participants had this experience and no information was gathered about the length or nature of their experience.

Variables exhibiting a striking association. Differences emerged when comparing DO based on length of time in Qatar and formative region, with those for formative region being notable. The following sections discuss these findings in detail.
**Length of time in Qatar.** Length of time in Qatar was examined based on past literature that examined the impact of cross-cultural experience on ICS. Helmer (2007) found based on her study of 40 elementary faculty members in an international elementary school in Egypt that although the sojourner educators’ ICS levels initially increased, it actually leveled off or decreased the longer the individual was away from his or her home country, congruent with the results of this research, but not in agreement with the findings of Bayles (2009), who found that sojourner educators with more time in the host country had higher ICS.

In this study, the results showed that the educators who had spent 3 to 5 years in Qatar had the highest DO (97.98), which is substantially higher than those who had been in Qatar for 6 to 10 years (M = 83.25) and those who had been in Qatar for over 10 years (M = 86.22).

Although the correlational analysis did not reveal a significant relationship between time in Qatar and ICS, participants in the focus groups speculated that as people age and acquire more personal and professional responsibilities, their ICS decreases. However, this explanation may lack validity, given that the quantitative data did not reveal an association between age and ICS. The participants also speculated that ICS diminishes as stress and negative cross-cultural experiences accumulate over time. Similarly, Bennett (1992) and Hammer (2012b) hypothesized that individuals can move to a less complex orientation in times of cultural stress or trauma. Finally, they also pointed out that having a long tenure in Qatar (or any other country) may have little to do with high ICS or interest in another culture. These results are consistent with Ward and Kennedy (1992), who found that the greater the interaction with the host culture, the higher the stress, and the lower the sojourners’ socio-cultural adaptation. Ward and Kennedy hypothesized that quality of the contact is more important than the mere fact of contact. This study’s results appear to support those contentions.
**Formative region.** Past research generally has shown no significant correlation between formative region and ICS, although Straffon’s (2001, 2003) studies of students from various regions found that European and North American students had higher ICS than Australasian and Asian students. Helmer (2007) similarly found in her study that North American teachers had a higher mean ICS score than did the “other” teacher category, which included Australia, Western Europe, the Middle East, and the Asia Pacific. The present study’s findings showed that North American educators had the highest DO. Stepwise regression suggested that formative region accounts for 4.8% of the variance in DO and is a significant fit of the data (F(1,92) = 5.667, p < .05). Participants in the focus groups believed that a focus on multiculturalism in North American culture and, conversely, encouragement of group identities in many MENA cultures help explain the results. They further speculated that the perceived increasing Westernization in some parts of the region, and within the workplace of this study, further encourage a defensive identification with the group and hinders the development of a more complex orientation towards cultural difference.

In summary, according to the study findings, only one demographic variable, formative region, was found to correlate with and be predictive of complexity of orientation towards cultural difference. Similarly, Straffon’s (2001) study found that students from countries such as the United States, Canada, and many European countries showed higher ICS as measured by the DO on the IDI compared to students from countries such as Japan and Malaysia.

Based on the focus group participants’ responses, it could be that when a sojourner educator moves to or works within a culture that is perceived as excluding him or her, the sojourner’s ICS may decrease over time, especially when his or her experiences are marked by
exclusion, stress, and negative experiences, what Bennett (1993) and Hammer (2012b) termed 
*traumas*.

An understanding that could be applied to the results for length of time in Qatar is that sojourners internalize the orientation toward cultural difference to which they are daily exposed. Thus, what may underlie the findings for formative region may be the complexity of orientation to cultural difference exhibited by peers and thought leaders and the society at large. That is, this study’s findings suggest that when an individual grows up within a culture that promotes acceptance of cultural difference, and displays the corresponding complex orientations, then those norms are internalized. Accordingly, different norms aligning with a simpler orientation are internalized when an individual grows up within a culture focused on excluding such difference. As this study did not focus on causation, more research is needed to confirm these assertions.

**Discussion**

The findings of this research highlight the complexity of ICS and ICC research and, in particular, how political, social, and historical and local influences can manifest themselves in the study.

The sensitivity of this topic to many of the non-Western participants surprised me. The quantitative phase of this research generated much “water cooler” conversation with and between colleagues on this and other culture-related topics, which I see as an unexpected, yet beneficial, side effect of this research. Nevertheless, in the end, the office politics of this research may have proven to be a weakness.
It became clear that being from a Western country seemed to cause any research or conversation on culture to be regarded with suspicion and caution by some, but not, as may have been expected, due to lingering hostility due to the legacy of European actions in the region.

Based on conversation with colleagues, I speculate, but cannot prove, that this has more to do with changes in the workplace that are seen as “Westernizing” both the university and the department, and my perceived role in these reforms, than an overarching political legacy. I had not expected this reticence, as I have worked and socialized with many of the participants for years and have had many frank exchanges of views with a number of participants on sensitive topics.

In conversation, more than one colleague expressed a belief that the results would be used against them and that it was just another tool to “Westernize” the workplace and force them out, as alluded to by the comment from the Group 1 member in chapter 4. I believe that if I had been a different ethnicity or nationality, I would have been able to get a much deeper set of data from a wider set of participants.

However, other colleagues discounted the idea of fear of a changing workplace having an impact on participation. They believed that non-participation by members of the MENA formative region was the product of simple logistics. They pointed out the logistical difficulties of working on a gender-segregated campus with three teaching shifts. They said that non-participation was simply a result of timing and location and that people should avoid reading too much into the MENA formative region non-participation. Regardless, future researchers should be aware of their own role in their research environment, and how it may impact the research.

The finding that most participants’ PO is in Acceptance, while their DO is in Minimization is not surprising, given that most people overestimate their ICS. What is
concerning is by how much participants overestimate (an average of 31 points). This result was surprising to both the participants and the researcher.

This result seemed to cause participants discomfort, as evidenced by the respondent who said, “Well, I would say [these results are] slightly surprising because I didn’t expect anyone to score this low on the DO scale. Considering our age and being in an international setting, yeah, I find that surprising.” The finding that most teachers are in Minimization should perhaps not be too surprising; it can be seen as a very comfortable orientation in which to be: that is, it doesn’t require grappling with the more complex realities of cultural difference. From within Minimization,

you’re excessively respectful of other cultures and see yourself as well-meaning and kind. You seek to avoid stereotypes by viewing and judging others as individuals. Today, we call this being “politically correct.” However, in many cases, you aren’t aware that you might be a member of a dominant culture with institutional privileges. (Schmidt, 2009, p. 3)

It is perhaps in the nature of teaching that the characteristics Schmidt mentions are important to develop. Indeed, there are few teachers who would not want to be seen as a well-meaning and kind person who recognizes each student as an individual. However, within the context of ICS, such an approach may blind the teacher to the deeper and more nuanced realities of intercultural interaction. It is possible that this is not only an issue with educators, but also with other helping professions. Beagan (2003) found that, in a study of doctors and medical students, it was believed that patients’ beliefs should be part of their training; however, they were uninterested in examining their own beliefs and attitudes. It was found that to be professional was equated with being “color-blind, gender-blind, and class-blind” (p. 607)—notably, an approach that indicates a Minimization orientation.

It is also possible that a high PO could be seen as an impediment to the development of ICS. If a faculty member already believes that his or her PO is within an intercultural orientation,
then he or she may be reluctant to undertake ICS development, as he or she may detect little need for further development.

The finding that a difference in ICS is associated with formative region mirrors the findings of Straffon (2003), although his study focused on students, not educators. Straffon found that students who had originated in East Asian countries had lower ICS levels than those originating in North American and European countries. These findings are similarly reflected in this study, wherein North Americans were found to have the highest ICS levels. The strongest result of this study is to be reminded that there are what Avruch (1998) called:

the six inadequate ideas which oversimplify and “fail to reflect the “thickness” or complexity of (culture). The six conceptual inadequacies are: to assume that culture is homogeneous; to reify culture as if it were a “thing” that could act independently of human agents; to ignore intercultural variation by assuming that it is uniformly distributed among members of a group; to assume that an individual possesses only one culture; to identify culture superficially with custom or etiquette; and to assume that culture is timeless. (pp. 12-16)

**Contribution to theory.** Although in many ways, the specifics of this study are limited in transferability, the more general results, particularly the support they provide to existing hypotheses, are transferable to a wider range of contexts. Primary among the general results is reinforcement of the constructivist approach that reality is created and construed in a manner that is informed by experience, and that ICS development requires a bottom-up approach of reflection—often, guided reflection—and that short workshops or seminars focused on building easily observed skills are insufficient.

One of the assumptions of the IDC and its precursor the DMIS is that knowledge is constructed by individuals. It follows that prior lived experience influences how one construes events and constructs meaning and, further, that where one spent his or her formative years has a major impact on how events are construed. The statistical significance of the study results confirmed these assumptions that reality is constructed and, in particular, that formative region
impacts the nature of this construction. This can be seen as supporting Vygotsky’s (1962, 1978) social constructivism, where individuals learn, or are enculturated, during social interactions.

The finding that most teachers are within the Minimization orientation is similar to the findings of Bayles (2009), Fretheim (2007), Helms (2003), Helmer (2007), and Westrick and Yuen (2007). As mentioned earlier, those in Minimization may have familiarity with different cultures and be of differing cultural patterns; yet, they continue to apply universal values in their practice. This is problematic, because, as Bennett (1993) says, “these assumed universal characteristics are almost always derived from the native culture of the person making the assertion” (p. 42). Moreover, this practice directly contradicts Canagarajah (2002), who asserted that teachers should base their pedagogical practices on cultural understanding of learning in the community or context in which they are teaching. In lieu of such understanding, the teacher assumes that the students are fundamentally similar to himself or herself, which may prevent the teacher from fully understanding or respecting their students' experiences. Villegas and Lucas (2002) say that this leads to an unintentional setting of “unacknowledged norms” that can place students at a disadvantage.

**Contribution to practice.** Tiedt and Tiedt (1990) summarized research and best practices regarding educational techniques that increase ICS and lead to multicultural education. These are:

1. The learner must be actively engaged in constructing his or her own meaning.
2. Cultural literacy occurs over a period of years and must be acquired in and within a context that enables students to integrate knowledge with understanding.
3. All students come to school with prior knowledge. We need to recognize this and help the student become aware of how the new knowledge is related to what is already known.
4. Teacher attitudes and expectations of how students will do influence their performance.
This research dealt with educators, but the principles above would apply to any ICS development plan that is put in place for the faculty, particularly point three. It is a mistake to assume that all faculty members have the same prior knowledge or experiences, and that they are starting from the same complexity of understanding of ICS. The principles above are congruent with the constructivist assumptions of the IDC and DMIS.

Tiedt and Tiedt (1990) also say that “the teacher models appreciation for diversity by building on students’ prior knowledge and making clear expectations that are realistic for each student's abilities” (p. 32). If we change “teacher” to “administrative personnel” and “students” to “faculty members,” it can be seen that this approach would apply to faculty development activities as well, particularly the focus on being realistic about student or faculty member abilities. It would be inappropriate to expect a faculty member in Denial to move to Acceptance after 1 hour of ICS development; however, by knowing the IDI orientation developmental activities can be more accurately created that are non-threatening to those in the more monocultural orientations yet allow for progression to the more multicultural orientations.

Will and Enloe (1990) researched the atmosphere of the international school and found that the cultural setting, or what they called ethos, was important in explaining how these schools function. They said that,

The best international schools provide a rich setting for the study of socialization as it takes place in a multicultural or cross-cultural environment. In our research we have found it to be a setting characterized by tolerance, empathy, and mutual respect and, moreover, there is a committed effort to actualize such values. Displays of intolerance, discrimination, or chauvinism are social taboos in these schools where cosmopolitan values are usually formed quickly and run deep. (p. 176)

Although the context in this school was not an international school per se, the values above are encouraged in most institutions, including the one in this study. The ethos above rarely develops spontaneously; it must be valued and developed by all stakeholders, particularly by
those in leadership positions. Steps must be taken so that the exploration of cultural issues can take place in a non-threatening and non-judgmental environment where it is clear that the development of a more intercultural mindset is the goal. However, formal development opportunities alone may not be enough. When speaking of international school students, Hayden and Thompson (2000) said that their research “…hinted that the formation of world-minded attitudes may not primarily be a direct function of the formal curricular structure” (p. 53). If this is the case, then formal training of faculty may not be adequate, and the atmosphere that the administration sets through mission statements, policies and, most importantly, through example, may be more influential than formal ICS developmental activities.

Research by Ayas (2006) found that medical students and doctors sent on international exchanges felt that reflective discourse and activities before, during, and after their cross-cultural experience would have been helpful in putting the experience into perspective and to make meaning from it and that, without such discourse, it was easy to stereotype other cultures. Similarly, in this study, the focus group participants highlighted that ongoing ICS development was needed and that 1-hour of training provided to new faculty (and it is training, versus development or education) is not adequate for developing ICS.

Typically, administrators interested in ICS development would develop a seminar or a workshop to address ICS concerns. However, these workshops often devolve into little more than training seminars with checklists of behaviours. Kai et al. (1999) found in a medical context that such seminars actually may increase stereotyping through an unsophisticated and non-reflexive focus on cultural difference. Any ongoing education and development will need to be ongoing, reflexive, and targeted for the recipients. Management may set the tone and encourage development, but development is by its nature reflective and individual.
The othering discourse observed at times in the focus groups was complex and not binary (e.g., Westerners othering Arabs or vice versa). Groups had different perspectives on other groups; for example, the perception of relatively short-serving teachers included and excluded certain understandings of both their own attitudes and behaviours, as well as the perspectives of the longer serving teachers. A complex mix of national, ethnic, religious, age, and experiential variables informed these exclusions and inclusions and are difficult to generalize.

Some of the focus group discourse could be read as perceiving the other not as a complex and nuanced individual, but as a member of a monolithic, homogenous community where all have the same characteristics. It is possible that within the context of this research, such an othering approach is a way of staking out one’s identity in a context in which traditional identifiers of identity are gone. For example, the North American participants may have been accentuating their perceptions of their heritage of multiculturalism and plurality, and overemphasizing their perceptions of the MENA participants as a way of constructing identity. It is not likely that this was a conscious decision, but it is a possibility that needs to be considered.

Perhaps in a context like the one examined in this study (where everyone is an outsider), participants focused on their differences from the other as an attempt to construct identity in an environment where their role and identity were no longer clear. It is not possible to know in more detail because of the structure of this study; however, it is intriguing to consider whether the participants focused on difference in an alien environment as a sort of identity self-preservation and whether results in participants’ home countries would have been similar. Holliday (1999) states that “Otherisation can be defined as the process whereby the ‘foreign’ is reduced to a simplistic, easily digestible, exotic or degrading stereotype. The ‘foreign’ thus becomes a degraded or exotic ‘them’ or safely categorized ‘other’” (p. 245). It could be speculated that in
In the context of this study, the focus group members’ identity was adrift, and a way to re-establish that identity was by safely categorizing the ‘not me’.

People are members of a varying number of different groups at the same time. Membership in a particular group becomes a “…salient part of an individual’s own self-concept when he or she attributes value and emotional significance to that membership” (COE, 2009, p. 13). At this time, the person is said to subjectively identify with that membership. These identities are multiple and actively constructed, helping individuals position themselves relative to other people. For example,

the connotations which a white, male, middle-class Christian living in Versailles associates with being French will be very different from those which a female, working-class Muslim of North African heritage living in Clichy-sous-Bois associates with being French. (COE, 2009, p. 14)

That is, being Christian might be of no particular importance when the individual is in France, whereas the importance of being Muslim in France is noteworthy. Moreover, the importance of these different subjective identities varies from context to context. In this example, if the man noted above moved to Saudi Arabia, his identity as a Christian might gain more centrality to his identity.

In the present study, the strong identification with formative region might be particularly important to the focus group participants because they were living and working in a foreign environment. This might lead participants who had never considered the make-up of their own society to suddenly give it primacy when resident in a society that is organized in a very different way, which could be seen as leading to an othering mindset, as in the case of the participant who said:

In North America, I think that there is more of a recognition of protecting minorities and encouraging diversity. If there is a legislation and government that is promoting diversity and inclusion, then people may tend to be more inclusive you know, and not have that “us
and them," less of a barrier there, but if it’s left to people, then the natural tendency might be to group together and avoid others.

It is hasty to say that the mindset was definitely othering based on the present study data available. An underlying assumption of the IDC model is that, after experience with a different cultural group, people may engage in a process of reflection and self-examination and reappraise themselves, their in-group, and their role in and relation to that in-group. It is certainly possible that the discourse presented in this research that can be seen as othering is really the result of reappraisal and reflection and is a result of building identity by reflecting on oneself and one’s in-group rather than focusing on the differences of an out-group. Thus, further research in the field, particularly in ‘home’ and ‘non-home’ contexts is needed.

However, some focus group responses also highlighted a concern with what can be seen as ‘small cultures’ (see image 3); and for some these were of more salience than ‘big cultures.’

As one focus group participant said,

Raising intercultural awareness is one thing that the program could do . . . [about] the subcultures present in the university, so when we understand ourselves better, we can see how we can seek balance. As teachers here, we need to adapt not to the host culture, but to the work culture, the culture of our colleagues, not the culture of Qatari.

Although this respondent focused on intergroup relations and conflict within the workplace, other respondents highlighted inter-tribal distinctions (p. 126), inter-Arab distinctions (p. 127), or distinctions based on nationality, job status (p. 128), or religious choice (p. 129). It is at this interface between the various small cultures that most of the othering seems to arise, not at the meeting of the larger national or ethnic cultures.

Palfreyman (2005) has said “Othering is pervasive and multidimensional, and fulfills social functions” (p. 228). In this study, the “us and them” mindset displayed in the MENA formative region quantitative results, as well as the more localized othering revealed in focus
group results, might serve the social function of increasing coherence when identity feels as if it is adrift.

**Strengths and Limitations of the Study**

**Strengths.** The first strength of this study is that it has provided answers to original research questions in a context and environment that has never before been researched. Although the data are far from complete, they do provide baseline data on which future research can call. The data offer a statistical snapshot of the faculty, as well as in-depth feedback from a subset.

The data have highlighted and reinforced the findings of Mahon (2003) that teachers minimize cultural difference, while reinforcing and expanding upon the findings of Straffon (2001, 2003) and Helmer (2007) that demonstrated differences in ICS based on formative region. However, it must be remembered that no causality claim has been made. This is a fascinating result upon which further research can be based, and which may be prove particularly beneficial to international schools and demographically similar educational programs in the GCC region.

The use of a mixed-methods design also represents a strength of the study, as it allowed the quantitative data to be explored more fully, and for data triangulation via information rich in-depth data. This triangulation was most marked for the variable Formative Region with focus group participants uniformly agreeing that the quantitative results were congruent with their experience.

**Weaknesses.** The findings of this study should be interpreted with care and should be applied to populations in other contexts only in a general sense. The findings may not generalize outside of university developmental education programs in the Gulf Cooperation Council area.

This study has been limited in a number of areas, the greatest of which was the lack of participation by MENA formative region participants in the focus groups. It became clear as this
research progressed that some in this group saw it as controversial. This perception may have negatively affected participation rates.

Only one researcher participated in this research; therefore, not all practices for ensuring the trustworthiness of the qualitative data could be followed. It would have been beneficial to engage in inter-coder agreement and code-recode exercises with other focus group administrators. This would have increased the likelihood that themes were properly extracted and interpreted from the data. The present study’s findings should be reviewed keeping in mind the biases involved with having a single researcher encoding and interpreting the data.

Any future researcher in this field in this region would be advised to consider his or her relationship to the participants; the regional, national and office politics; and the sensitivity of this topic and use it to inform his or her choices of personnel to administer the tool and conduct the focus groups with the goal of getting broader participation than in this study.

Related to this weakness is the possibility of a polarized, othering discourse from the focus group participants, as mentioned in chapter 4, and the unrepresented faculty members not having the “right of reply” as mentioned in chapter 3. Although the quotes used in this work are representative of the content and tone of the focus groups, it is possible that moderator conduct, focus group organization, or focus group member selection led to a polarized and stereotyped discourse, and that the views expressed were more extreme than might otherwise be the case.

A final weakness is that I did not know the orientation of individual focus group participants; therefore, it was not possible to parse participant response based on orientation. It is possible, although unlikely, that all of the participants were in an ethnocentric/monocultural orientation and were interpreting events around them through that lens. Given that the IDC is based on a developmental model of increasing intercultural sensitivity, it would be interesting to
compare focus group responses of participants reflecting ethnocentric/monocultural, transitional, and ethnorelative/intercultural orientations. This would require that participants not remain anonymous and would introduce other considerations into the research. Although such a study would be interesting, the promised participant anonymity of this study would have made such an analysis impossible.

**Recommendations**

Two recommendations are advised based on the findings of this study: implement professional development to promote more complex and sophisticated orientations towards cultural difference among educators, and improve appreciation of the importance of ICS among administrators. These recommendations are described in the sections below.

**Implement professional development practices to develop educator intercultural sensitivity.** Based on the findings that the participants, on average, fall into the Minimization stage, it follows that most of them have relatively simple orientations towards cultural difference. It is likely that the educators in this study are not fully prepared for the diversity they encounter in relations with colleagues and students. Consequently, they may not be as effective as they could be as educators.

Moreover, the results of this and other studies show that most individuals overestimate their ICS. Bennett (2003) explained that people need guided reflection and instruction to understand their own culturally informed worldview and begin to understand the perspective of others. “Building on cultural self-awareness, the learners can examine the contrast between their own cultures and other cultures with which they will be working” (p. 163). Thus, the educators in this study need ample cross-cultural experiences and, more importantly, guided reflection on these experiences if they are to increase their ICS.
Bayles (2009) has emphasized the importance of ICS for educators. ICS is possibly even more critical for sojourner educators who routinely need to effectively relate to a diverse educator and student population. Therefore, it is important to develop sojourner educators who have more complex orientations. However, the present study findings have suggested that the usual characteristics that are used to indicate ICS (e.g., time overseas, cross-cultural experience) are not actually correlated with more complex orientations. Therefore, the assumption that a teacher with many years of experience abroad or in different cross-cultural environments has a more complex orientation towards cultural difference than a teacher without such experience is not supported by this study.

Other measures are needed to help administrators develop more complex orientations among their staff, and themselves. One such measure is to use the IDI, which could be used as a pre-test and post-test to assess the effectiveness of any professional development programs, similar to the way it is used in study abroad as discussed in chapter 2. Bennett (2003) has stated that if leaders understand “the underlying cognitive orientation toward cultural difference, predictions about behavior and attitudes can be made and education can be tailored to facilitate development into the next stage…” (p.163).

It is possible that educators overly focus on their previous international experience and the impact that it had on their ICS development. It follows that they may need assistance in understanding their own cultural viewpoint. One suggestion would be an intermittent reflexive exercise, perhaps in the form of a journaling exercise, in which the faculty reflect on their thoughts, experiences and development. There are a number of very good commercial packages available that could be adapted to the local situation.
Improve appreciation of the importance of intercultural sensitivity among administrators. Additionally, it is unclear whether the administrators in this study prioritize the development of an institution where complex and sophisticated orientations towards cultural difference are valued, encouraged, and developed, either formally or informally. Participants across three of the groups emphasized that program-level buy-in and deliberate cross-cultural team building were lacking. The findings that the employees overall are in the low end of Minimization, while some individuals at the extremes are in Denial, should offer policy makers sufficient cause to emphasize cross-cultural and diversity development as a regular part of staff professional development.

It is critical that both educators and administrators shift to more complex orientations. This could be done by delivering periodic intercultural development based on the models discussed in chapter 2 to both established faculty and newcomers.

In addition to formal development, it would be helpful to organize a range of activities to promote cross-cultural discussions, socializing, and collaboration. This could occur through lectures and presentations, social events, or professional learning communities that could engage faculty in actively supporting and working together toward a common goal (DuFour, Eaker, &DuFour, 2005). Through such activities it could be shown to the program community as a whole that more sophisticated understandings of cultural difference are a valued part of the program ethos.

Suggestions for Future Research

More studies using the IDI in the MENA region in similar post-secondary contexts with extremely diverse student and faculty populations are needed. Cultural issues are a constant source of worry for new hires, and a source of friction between the majority sojourner teaching
staff and the local population. If future studies confirm that educators as a group tend to be in the low end of Minimization, with an equally wide range from Denial to Adaptation, perhaps appropriate cultural professional development for faculty and staff would be given the priority it deserves.

Studies that focus on the changes orientation over time in Qatar and other cultural contexts would be particularly beneficial. The present study’s results showed that DO was highest among those who had worked in Qatar for 3 to 5 years, with lower DO among those who had been in the country longer. The focus group participants speculated that age (and increasing responsibilities) as well as negative intercultural experiences over time explained this effect. Given that the quantitative data did not find a correlation between ICS and age, it follows that negative or traumatic experiences in the host country may explain diminishing ICS among sojourner educators. Similarly, Hammer (2012b) hypothesized that individuals can move to an earlier orientation in times of cultural stress or trauma.

The role and impact of negative intercultural experiences needs to be examined further through additional research. This could be accomplished through phenomenological study that deeply examines the lived experience of sojourner educators. A longitudinal mixed methods study conducted over a period of 5 to 10 years would be tremendously helpful for examining the changes in ICS over time.

The sojourner teaching profession also would benefit from studies to examine whether the differences in ICS between short-term and long-term expatriates is particular to Qatar and the GCC, or whether it is common among sojourner teachers everywhere. If it is common everywhere then studies that examine any such change would be beneficial. This could deepen
the body of literature surrounding Allport’s (1979) contact hypothesis that posits that the nature of cross-cultural contact impacts perceptions.

Allport’s (1979) contact hypothesis also posits that in order for cross-cultural relationship building to be successful, there must be equality among the participants. Therefore, it would be beneficial to know if employment systems and societal structures are associated with declining ICS among sojourner teachers over time. For example, in Qatar, sojourner educators and other expatriates are governed according to a kefala system. This means that the foreign workers are “sponsored” by their employers, who have wide-ranging authority over the minutiae of their lives and who retain their passports and identification and can decide whether they can open a bank account, rent or buy a car, get a driving license, get a phone, change jobs, where they live, or even whether they can leave the country on holiday. It would be interesting to examine ICS over time among sojourner educators working within these restrictive systems and compare the results with those from less restrictive systems.

It would be beneficial to examine sojourner educators’ self-image and identity construction in both their home environments and in foreign environments. Do sojourners construct an identity based on an othering approach of what they are ‘not’ when compared to other groups?

Finally, two related points would benefit from future research: Does being an interculturally sensitive educator have a positive impact on student achievement, and what constitutes effective cross-cultural professional development for educators? The assumption in the literature and, indeed, throughout this research has been that a more complex orientation

---

10 Late in the preparation of this work, I found a Ph.D. dissertation written for Georgetown University entitled “Seeing security: Societal securitization in Qatar” (2012) by Jennifer Heeg. Heeg writes extensively on the “politics of exclusion” in Qatar and its status as an “ethnocracy” in which jobs, salary, housing, and status are based on ethnicity and tribal affiliation. This dissertation would be a useful primer for anyone interested in learning more about the systems within Qatar and a number of other GCC countries.
towards cultural difference is a desirable trait to cultivate in educators. However, it is not known whether students do indeed benefit academically from having interculturally sensitive educators. Do students of such teachers develop different cultural perceptions than other students? Do teachers with more complex orientations have improved communication with diverse students and their community? The widely held assumption is yes; but there is little in the research literature to support this belief.

Similarly, there is very little research on what constitutes effective cross-cultural professional development for educators. There is an extensive body of research on cross-cultural effectiveness in study abroad programs as seen in chapter 2, and effective best practices are beginning to be understood. However, little such literature exists with regard to professional development for teachers. Do effective practices from other domains such as study abroad transfer to the teaching profession? Given the current state of knowledge, it is not possible to answer that question.

**Conclusion**

There is no such thing as neutral education. The hidden curriculum, defined here as “values, attitudes and principles which are implicitly conveyed to students” (Pearson, 2013, para. 1) affects students and staff alike. The insidiousness of the hidden curriculum is that it exerts social control—at first, only within the school. However, this hidden curriculum ultimately exerts influence on society at large as well. He adds, “The aim of the hidden curriculum is to create conformity, obedience and coercion into belief that social inequalities are just and correct” (para. 1). Additionally, hidden curricula are, by nature, thoroughly and inherently cultural. A conscious and constant effort must be made to make the curriculum, both the formal and the hidden, inclusive and representative of all (Sylvester, 1998). To understand this, educators (as
well as researchers) need to be aware of their own largely unconscious and unexamined cultural worldview and how it informs and guides their expectations and choices. The first step in this process of introspection can be the use of the IDI to provide statistically valid results to which educators can refer as they undertake cross-cultural development and grow in their understanding of the complexity and subtlety of intercultural relations.

Given the results of this study, it is clear that the faculty studied are not fully prepared for the diversity that they encounter in the workplace. It is also clear that faculty from different formative regions hold different attitudes and perceptions, and that any cross-cultural development would have to take these differences into account. If the recommendations for practice and research are pursued, substantial strides may be made with regard to enhancing sojourner educators’ orientation towards cultural difference and understanding the impact of this competency for the educators, students, educational institutions, and the community at large.
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Appendix B: Sample of the Intercultural Development Inventory

The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI™) is a valid, reliable instrument measuring people's basic orientations toward cultural difference. Thank you for your valuable assistance.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Your honest responses to the IDI are crucial to its effectiveness. If your name or identification is asked for, your individual responses will be kept in strict confidence by the IDI administrator.

RESPONDING TO ITEMS
There are no right or wrong answers, nor "good" or "bad" responses. Respond to each statement based on your first, initial reaction. BE SURE to respond to each and every item. Ignoring some statements will mean that your total responses will not reflect your own personal viewpoint, and your completed survey cannot be properly analyzed.

The items in the IDI are drawn from actual statements made by people from many cultures throughout the world. The wording and content of the items reflect a range of viewpoints toward cultural differences. It is important that you respond to each item based on your agreement or disagreement with the overall content of each item. You should not respond based on whether you believe a certain type of statement should or should not be made or whether you like or dislike the way a statement is worded.

Some of the items in the IDI express a viewpoint that you might not feel comfortable expressing to others. When responding to these types of statements in the IDI, you should think about the degree to which you agree or disagree with the overall content, or meaning of each statement as if you "overheard" someone make that statement.

DEFINING "CULTURE"
Each of us has a worldview that is related to participation in one or more culture groups. These groups are typically defined by national and/or ethnic boundaries, but they may also represent other affiliations. In the IDI, terms such as "our culture" or "my culture" refer to the culture group(s) to which you feel you "belong" the most. The terms "other cultures," "people from different cultures," or "different cultures" refer to groups to which you do not feel you belong.

Try to think about the other culture groups with which you are familiar. Please avoid considering cultures that you know only from media. Respond to each item in the IDI in terms of the specific culture groups with which you have had the most contact or experience.
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This study is conducted by: Ian McKay, Ed.D candidate at Exeter University, Graduate School of Education.

The purpose of this study is to assess attitudes to cultural difference of faculty and staff in developmental education at this institution, and to explore relationships between levels of intercultural sensitivity and various demographic/background variables.

If you agree to participate in this study, you will anonymously complete the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) and a demographic survey online. Completing the IDI will take approximately 15 minutes.

It is unlikely that you will experience any risks or discomfort from participating in this study. While it is possible that reflecting on intercultural relations could be unpleasant, it is more likely that reflection may lead you to better understand your own perceptions. The primary benefit to participating in this study is that your program or university may gain some insights about intercultural sensitivity that may enhance teaching, administration, and collegial relations.

The data from the IDI will remain confidential. Individual respondents can not be identified. It is not possible to disaggregate individually identifiable information from the IDI. Research records will be stored securely and only the primary investigator will have access to the records.

Participation in this study is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any point.

If you have questions, you are encouraged to contact the researcher at mailto:irm205@exeter.ac.uk. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher, you are encouraged to contact the research supervisor, Dr. Andrew Richards, at mailto:Richards.andrew@exeter.ac.uk.
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Dear XXXX,

I thank you for having taken the time to participate in my study by completing the Intercultural Development Inventory in September; I value the contribution that you have made.

The research model that I am using is a mixed-methods one via which I seek a comprehensive depiction attitudes to cultural difference among the faculty of the Foundation Program. In this study, the quantitative instrument (the IDI) comes first, and then questions are developed from its results for the qualitative portion of the research.

As the next step in this study, I am holding focus groups. In this case, the group will be determined by the length of time in Qatar. I would like to ask you to join in this focus group.

You will be asked a series of questions with the intent of getting you to discuss specific situations or events in your time living in Qatar. I am looking for vivid and comprehensive recollection and reflection on what these events were like for you. I am interested in your thoughts, feelings, and perceptions, and your feedback on implications for program development.

I value your participation, and thank you for your commitment of time, energy, and effort so far. The results of this study will be valuable, and your insights and opinions will contribute to its depth and thoroughness. When the study is complete I will of course share my findings with you.

Thank you for considering this request. Please let me know if you agree to participate. If you do, I will contact you to schedule the focus group in the near future.

Yours,
Appendix E: Focus Group Agenda and Interview Questions

Descriptive and non-significant results
- PO v. DO
- Non-significant results

Formative Region, including Arab v. non-Arab groups and Arab v. Western groups
1. Do these results align with your own observations?
   Prompts (if needed):
   a. What is consistent? Can you give me an example?
   b. What is not consistent? Can you give me an example?
2. How do you explain or make sense of these results?
   Prompts (if needed):
   a. Why do you think these differences show up? Can you give me an example?
   b. Do you think there might be any extraneous reasons that might explain the difference (i.e., limitations of the research)
3. What do you think the implications of these findings are?
   Prompts (if needed):
   a. For faculty?
   b. For the universities?
   c. For the students?
4. What recommendations would you give based on these findings and what we have discussed?
   Prompts (if needed):
   a. Recommendations to faculty?
   b. Recommendations to the universities?

Length of Time in Qatar
1. Do these results align with your own observations?
   Prompts (if needed):
   a. What is consistent? Can you give me an example?
   b. What is not consistent? Can you give me an example?
2. How do you explain or make sense of these results?
   Prompts (if needed):
   a. Why do you think these differences show up? Can you give me an example?
   b. Do you think there might be any extraneous reasons that might explain the difference (i.e., limitations of the research)
3. What do you think the implications of these findings are?
   Prompts (if needed):
   a. For faculty?
   b. For the universities?
   c. For the students?
4. What recommendations would you give based on these findings and what we have discussed?
   Prompts (if needed):
   a. Recommendations to faculty?
b. Recommendations to the universities?
Appendix F: Focus Group Transcript Example

Female: So it could be...there could be a little bit of awareness that there are differences in culture. It’s not just...

Male A: For these people here?

Male B: Yeah, it’s not just being in a country, it’s more.

Male A: Yeah, yeah.

Male B: And therefore they are used to the country, but they have that background awareness. They haven’t accumulated these bad experiences with the environment here.

Male A: Okay so there is a sweet spot, they’ve developed the skill set or the mindset, but they haven’t yet accumulated the negative experiences too?
Male B: I wouldn't necessarily like to say negative experiences. I keep... I joke about reaching a point of apathy, you just become apathetic about the culture around you, and just don't really care anymore, I think that we develop to a point, that we acculturate to a point and we say, "Okay, that's as far as I'm going." And at that point, you become very apathetic and you just live your daily life without concern or consideration of the fact that you're in a different culture and so on and so forth and you just become less sensitive.

Female: And you don't think your apathy is born out of disappointment or disillusionment at being excluded or kept at a distance, or something like that?

Male B: I think we develop to a point, we acculturate to a point and we have certain... there's probably you could generalize which is most of the population that we hit, you know, we say, okay, this is as far as ongoing, and at that point we become very apathetic and you just live your daily life without really concerned or consideration of the
fact that you're in a different culture, so on and so forth, you just forget about it and you become less sensitive to adaptation, acceptance, bridging across differences, and stuff like that.

**Male A:** So how much of that do you think is accumulated experiences and how much of it is a result of aging? I know I reacted lot differently when I was 22.

**Male B:** I that that it is intrinsically linked to age and as you get older... and more experience you have the older you get.
**Appendix G: Coding Example**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>17/12/12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>4m, 2F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative regions</td>
<td>US, UK, Canada, Brazil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"I think that diversity is very embraced in North America, more so than even Europe I think".

"A lot of it comes down to how you’re treated, isn’t it? I get the impression that the...those [Arabs] who are not actually Qatari, or even Gulf state, and the way that they’re treated is quite, they’re treated as inferior, compared to a Westerner...So, the way you’re treated creates a reaction".

"One person...he’s from an Arab (sic) speaking country, was quite upset that you’re judged by where you’re from here, and not by who you are".

"Yes, I have heard non-Gulf Arabs complaining of being treated poorly by Qatari, and being treated unfairly, especially in term of, I remember one...when I first arrived, the university had just started allowing non-Qatari Arabs to collect educational expenses for their children, whereas before their kids had to go to public schools and the Western kids got to go to private schools, that was one specific event, but there are others, yes."
"I knew quickly after arriving here that my position was number two, Qatari male and Qatari female, then you're going white male, and then the other Arabs fell after me, which I found quite surprising...That I knew that I was placed higher than a Palestinian or someone from Algeria, or something like that. It was quite shocking for me that that would be the case"- 

"Different faculty are treated according to their class...I was upset that it took, it took me five weeks to get a driving license, yet one of my co-workers got it within a week based on status, certain countries, so that perceived difference in treatment is aggravating. Why isn't it consistent for everyone, why is it different based on where you're from?"- 

"If you don't have a policy that is equitable or equal or fair, that's going to drive that sort of thing, it's going to further that sort of thinking". 

"They see us, they say, "You know, you're lucky, you can leave. I can't go back to Syria, or I don't want to go back to Palestine. 'stuff like that."- 

"There are some instances where Western [managerial] culture does impact. Like merit based systems might be incongruous with the attitudes of the region"- 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative exp with discrim</th>
<th>Local society org and values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative exp with discrim</td>
<td>Local society org and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics/Unrest</td>
<td>External events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work tensions</td>
<td>External events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"I would think that there would be some effect, that if within the culture there is not a push to integrate people, or to make them feel an integral part of the society, that they're just there to work, that that would be reflected in the university...I believe that there would have to be some kind of effect."

"I think it was mainly pre-existing, and that the local environment somewhat supports that, obviously."

"Their position on the Intercultural Development Continuum is set at a relatively early age and that of course they are still within the Arab environment...any pre-existing us and them sort of attitude is supported here, because this is the environment we have, it is us and them."

"Culturally speaking, if you have been brought up in the West it's not okay, to be a racist, to discriminate on sex, things like that; and that's not the case here...not just in the Gulf region, but all across the Arab world."

"I think it [religion] creates an us and them, in their particular point of view."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative exp with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discrim in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local society org and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative exp with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discrim in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local society org and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA Diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME Diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional value difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>re: diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CONSENT FORM

Assessing the Intercultural Sensitivity of Instructors in Middle Eastern University's Developmental Education Programs

You are invited to participate in a research study of the intercultural sensitivity of Foundation Program instructors. You were selected as a possible participant because you teach in a developmental education program. I ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in this study.

This study is conducted by: Ian McKay, EdD. candidate at Exeter University, Graduate School of Education.

The purpose of this study is to assess the levels of intercultural sensitivity of teachers in developmental education at this institution and to explore relationships between levels of intercultural sensitivity and various demographic/background variables.

If you agree to participate in this study, you will anonymously complete the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) and a demographic survey online. Completing the IDI will take approximately 20 minutes.

It is unlikely that you will experience any risks or discomfort from participating in this study. While it is possible that reflecting on intercultural relations could be unpleasant, it is more likely that reflection may lead you to better understand your own perceptions. The primary benefit to participating in this study is that your program or university may gain some insights about intercultural sensitivity that may enhance teaching, administration, and collegial relations.

The data from the IDI will remain confidential. It is not possible to disaggregate individually identifiable information from the IDI. Research records will be stored securely and only the primary investigator will have access to the records.

Participation in this study is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any point.

You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you are encouraged to contact the researcher at irm205@exeter.ac.uk. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher, you are encouraged to contact Dr. Fran Martin, supervisor, at fran.martin@exeter.ac.uk.

This survey complies with the research code of ethics of Exeter University available at...
Certificate of ethical research approval
Dissertation/Thesis

Your student no: 590058560

Title of your project: Tentatively - Factors Influencing the Intercultural Sensitivity of Instructors in a Developmental Education Programs in a Middle Eastern University: A Quantitative Non-Experimental Design

Brief description of your research project: I propose to administer the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), to faculty volunteers in developmental education programs at Qatar University and then look for correlations between the IDI stage and demographic factors such as age, gender, time spent overseas, educational level, position in program, cross-cultural marriage, and area of residence during formative years. It is possible that participant participation may lead to reflection on their own perceptions. The primary benefit to participating institution in this study is that the university may gain some insights about intercultural sensitivity that may inform teaching, administration, and collegial relations.

Give details of the participants in this research (giving ages of any children and/or young people involved): Participants would be volunteers who are staff of the Foundation Program at Qatar University. They would range in age from approximately 24 to 65. This proposed study would be conducted by: Ian McKay, EdD. candidate at Exeter University, Graduate School of Education. The investigator is also a staff member in one of the developmental programs to be studied.

Give details (with special reference to any children or those with special needs) regarding the ethical issues of:

- **Informed consent:** I propose to use the attached GSE consent form as a guide. The Foundation Program as already given approval for the research

- **Anonymity and confidentiality**

  The IDI as I propose to use it would be completely anonymous with no personally identifiable information available to the researcher. Individual replies could not be disaggregated.

Give details of the methods to be used for data collection and analysis and how you would ensure they do not cause any harm, detriment or unreasonable stress:

The IDI is a 60 question online instrument that uses likert scale responses to place a participant within one of the six stages of Bennet’s (1993) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS). The instrument and the replies will be anonymous. The instrument can either be taken by participants on their own computers on their own time if I email them the link, or it could be done as a
group in a computer lab at a convenient time at the Foundation Program. The computers in the lab at
the Foundation Program are individual booths, so those at neighbouring computers could not see a
participant’s replies. I do not foresee any harm or detriment as a result of this online survey. It is
possible that some participants will re-examine their attitudes to cross-cultural relations and gain new
understandings about themselves, but the stress from self-reflection can not be considered a risk. Data
analysis would consist of statistical manipulation of the IDI results that is unlikely to cause harm to
any participants.

Give details of any other ethical issues which may arise from this project (e.g. secure storage
of videos/recorded interviews/photos/completed questionnaires or special arrangements
made for participants with special needs etc.):

The initial data of this survey will be stored on computers in the United States until it is downloaded
for manipulation in Excel. So there are concerns about data security under American laws, but given
the nature of the questions, and that the surveys are not personally identifiable, I don’t believe that
there is a large concern. The data will be stored at industry standard norms, but as with any electronic
data there is always a risk of disclosure.

Research by Singer (1978 & 2004) has shown “…that the informed consent statements typically
employed in social as well as biomedical research are poorly understood by respondents and subjects,
thus violating the principle of autonomy of beneficence” (2004, p. 5). Therefore, I will have to
research how traditional consent forms are inadequate and see how the one I propose to use can be
improved.

I am concerned that some respondents may feel compelled to participate in the research if I do not
time the data collection correctly. While the faculty is not required to participate in these sorts of
studies, they are strongly encouraged, this could lead to a situation where some faculty may participate
in studies that they are not comfortable with, in order to comply with perceived managerial priorities. I
believe that collecting any data early in the school year can minimize this possibility. If the data is
collected late in the year, then there may be faculty members who have procrastinated in their study
participation and consequently feel that they have no choice, but to participate in something that they
are uncomfortable with; therefore, collecting the data early in the school year will be necessary.

Give details of any exceptional factors, which may raise ethical issues (e.g. potential political
or ideological conflicts which may pose danger or harm to participants):

There is the possibility that if the results show that the faculty of the Foundation Program is highly
skewed toward the ethnocentric side of the DMIS that the Program and Qatar University could
perceive it as a loss of face. Equally however, such a loss of face could be a motivating factor that
leads towards self-examination and change. I do not see either outcome as a realistic possibility and
believe that the results of the research will be ignored by the university. Regardless, a loss of face is
unlikely to lead to harm or danger in this situation.

This form should now be printed out, signed by you on the first page and sent to your supervisor
to sign. Your supervisor will forward this document to the School’s Research Support Office for the
Chair of the School’s Ethics Committee to countersign. A unique approval reference will be added
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Appendix I: Foundation Program Letters of Approval

Ian McKay
Graduate School of Education
The University of Exeter
Mail Room, The Old Library
Prince of Wales Road
Exeter, Devon
EX4 4SB
United Kingdom
10 June 2012

Dear Ian,

I have received your request to administer the Intercultural Development Inventory to select faculty and staff as part of your research.

I have no objection to this research, or to your request to use a computer lab to administer the survey.
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[Signature]

Robert Kennedy - Head
Department of English
Foundation Program
Qatar University
P.O. Box 2713
Doha, Qatar
Tel: (+974) 4403-5333 (office)
(+974) 6528-0950 (mobile)
GMT/UTC +3
email: kennedy@qu.edu.qa
Ian McKay
Graduate School of Education
University of Exeter
Prince of Wales Road
Exeter, Devon
EX4 4SB
UK

13 June 2012

Dear Ian

Further to your request to administer the Intercultural Development Inventory to select faculty and staff as part of your doctoral research, I have no objection to you using our laboratory facilities when they are available to conduct this questionnaire.
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