University of Northern Iowa
UNI ScholarWorks

Graduate Research Papers | Student Work

1995

Communicating across cultures: Multicultural and international education

Ella A. Sweigert
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1995 Ella A. Sweigert

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp

Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Sweigert, Ella A., "Communicating across cultures: Multicultural and international education" (1995). *Graduate Research Papers*. 3383.
https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/3383

This Open Access Graduate Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Research Papers by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

Communicating across cultures: Multicultural and international education

Abstract

Not too long ago, international and intercultural relations was a topic that affected mainly the federal government, and not university campuses across the United States. Foreign student advisers and study abroad coordinators were concerned about the issue but it rarely affected the entire campus. Recently, however, university administrators frequently use terms like "valuing diversity," "multiculturalizing the curriculum," "promoting cultural pluralism," "reducing racism," or "internationalizing the campus" (Bennett & Bennett, 1994, p.145). Intercultural relations was recently listed among the top five campus-life issues by presidents in the Carnegie Foundation's study, Campus life (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990).

This open access graduate research paper is available at UNI ScholarWorks: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/3383

COMMUNICATING ACROSS CULTURES:
MULTICULTURAL AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

A Research Paper

Presented to

The Department of Educational Administration and Counseling

Univerity of Northern Iowa

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Education

---

by

Ella A. Sweigert

May, 1995

This Research Paper by: Ella A. Sweigert

Entitled: Communicating Across Cultures: Multicultural and International Education

has been approved as meeting the research paper requirement for the Degree of Master of Arts in Education.

4.13.95	Michael D. Waggoner
Date Approved	Adviser/Director of Research Paper
4.17.95	Florence Guido-DiBrito
Date Approved	Second Reader of Research Paper
4.18.95	Michael D. Waggoner
Date Received	Head, Department of Educational Administration and Counseling

Not too long ago, international and intercultural relations was a topic that affected mainly the federal government, and not university campuses across the United States. Foreign student advisers and study abroad coordinators were concerned about the issue but it rarely affected the entire campus. Recently, however, university administrators frequently use terms like "valuing diversity," "multiculturalizing the curriculum," "promoting cultural pluralism," "reducing racism," or "internationalizing the campus" (Bennett & Bennett, 1994, p.145). Intercultural relations was recently listed among the top five campus-life issues by presidents in the Carnegie Foundation's study, *Campus life* (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990).

Traditionally, cultural enrichment of campus life involved international education. International education remained the focus at institutions even after the development of ethnic studies in the seventies. In the recent past, however, "discussions of diversity have been forced by national agendas to reconsider studies of special domestic cultural groups, and to revive the debate about a multicultural versus an international perspective in the classroom and across the institution" (Noronha, 1992, p.53). According to Noronha, these two approaches are viewed separately, they are seen as different, unrelated, and sometimes adversarial. She argues that there are similarities between the two perspectives, and that they could enrich and compliment each other. These similarities include, for example, cross-cultural training, intercultural communication, cultural adjustment theories, and development theories. International education has a greater body of research in these areas, thus international educators could play a significant role in building

bridges, enriching multicultural education, and contributing to a diverse and more coherent campus community. This paper discusses the demographics of international and minority students since World War II; describes perspectives on diversity, international education, and multicultural education; examines the nature of relationship between them, and provides recommendations as to how to connect the two perspectives in order to facilitate intercultural communication in the classroom and across campus.

Demographics of International and Minority Students

There has been a continual rise in the number of both international and minority students in American higher education. Since World War II, the number of foreign students has risen from 15,000 in 1946 to 30,000 in 1951, jumped to 145,000 in 1971, and then to 311,882 in 1981 (Jenkins, 1983). During the 1993/94 academic year, there were 449,749 foreign students attending U.S. colleges and universities (Davis, 1994).

Minority student enrollment has also increased during this period, especially following the Civil Rights movement of the late 1960s. Following the example at Harvard University, predominantly white universities began actively recruiting and admitting urban minority students after establishing special admission standards, and later implementing special services to help their adjustment to the predominantly white college campuses (Ballard, 1973; Stennis-Williams, Terrell, & Haynes, 1988). The number of Black college students, for example, more than doubled from 200,000 in 1970 to 500,000 in 1970, the largest increase having occured between 1967-1971 (Ballard, 1973).

According to the figures, in 1992 there were 1,393,000 (9.6 %) African-Americans, 954,000 (6.5 %) Hispanic Americans; 697,000 (4.8 %) Asian Americans, 119,000 (0.8 %) Native Americans; and 458,000 (3.1 %) nonresident aliens (foreign students) enrolled in institutions of higher education across the United States (Carter & Wilson, 1993). Although the number of university and college students has also been on the rise since the end of World War II, by the year 2000, minority students will comprise an even larger segment of the student body up from the current 21.8% to approximatly one-third. According to the *One Third of the Nation* report, by the end of this century, students of color will compose one-third of the school population (American Council on Education and Education Commission of the States, 1988). This trend is already visible at the K-12 level and in community colleges and soon will reach institutions of higher education (Gollnick & Chinn, 1994).

It is unlikely that either the number of foreign students or ethnic minority students will decrease in the future. These two segments of the student population, instead of seeing each other as competitors for the same scarce resources, might want to consider the possibility of increasing communication and interaction. Such a unity would better serve not only the unique needs of their population but their institutions' effort of diversifying campus.

Perspectives on Diversity

There are many viewpoints on how to define diversity on college campuses. Some authors, who consider oppression and privilege associated with skin color the paramount issue in diversity, advocate the reduction of racism and prejudice

(Tatum, 1992; Brandt, 1986). Others speak in terms of "multiculturalism," referring to domestic racial and ethnic differences (Banks, 1988; Golnick & Chinn, 1994). This approach developed from the K-12 system and now has penetrated higher education as well. Proponents of the multicultural approach advocate changes in the curriculum to reflect the contributions various ethnic and cultural groups make to the culture of the United States. Other authors with similar perspective use the term "cultural pluralism" (Schmitz, 1992). By far the largest number of scholars, however, use the term "diversity" to refer to cultural differences (Bennett, 1990; Richardson & Skinner, 1991; Smith, 1989; Terrell, 1992; Woolbright, 1989).

In this paper, I use the classification of Bennett & Bennet (1994). According to Bennett & Bennett (1994), "the term 'diversity' usually carries a connotation of greater inclusivity" (p. 146). These authors also assert that "it is often construed to subsume the other approaches, with a focus on recognizing and valuing cultural differences and on recruiting and retaining students, staff, and faculty who represent non-dominant groups" (p. 146). Bennett and Bennett also use the term "diversity" to emphasize the notion of choice, without a neglect or de-emphasis of the power differences among cultures.

According to Noronha (1992), diversity "means attention paid to the social and intellectual life of an institution to support an environment that promotes sensitivity to all groups of people" (p. 54). Differences include, but are not limited to, ethnicity, race, gender, sexual orientation, country of origin, religion, and disability. This broader definition often hinders categorization and the examination

of differences and similarities. Noronha asserts that this definition is too fragmented, puts people on the opposite side from each other; and ultimately, it is ineffective in transforming curriculum and campus climate. The author of this paper believes that race, ethnicity, and country of origin go much deeper to determine a person's culture than other aspects, and the focus of this paper will include primarily these aspects of diversity.

Approaches to Achieving Diversity

Historically, institutions of higher education approached the goal of achieving greater diversity on campuses in a variety of ways. The earliest efforts included recruitment of students, staff, and faculty from underrepresented groups, assuming that a greater number of these individuals will facilitate intercultural communication and learning. This approach resulted in little improvement: the presence of culturally different populations by itself did not improve relationships (Bennett, & Bennett, 1994). Next, institutions implemented special services to serve the special needs of diverse groups: support units, diversity coordinators, interdisciplinary and culture-specific majors (for example, ethnic and women's studies were introduced in the 1980s). Despite these efforts, retention still remained a problem, especially for ethnic minority groups. According to Astin (1985), student involvement, the amount of study time and energy the learner puts into both the academic and the campus social context, influences retention. Another author, referring to Tinto's model of retention, asserts that alienation results when students do not feel integrated to the academic and social life on campus (Smith, 1991). Minority students often feel alienated on predominantly white campuses and

are involved to a minimal extent in campus life.

The third response to diversity emphasized on improving campus climate (Levine, 1991) and developing co-curricular activities to address the needs of the changing student population of the 1990s. Hardiman and Jackson (1992) assert that

> the most significant shift in the evolution of approaches to social diversity on campus can be described as a shift from asking who is on campus to understanding how each group views the world as a function of its experiences with social injustice and the influence of cultural orientation. (p. 21)

Student personnel administrators took active roles in programming related to diversity, recently involving faculty as partners in multiculturalizing the curriculum. The most recent changes include efforts to accomodate pedagogy to different learning and cognitive styles of diverse student populations (Schmitz, 1992). Faculty are becoming increasingly involved in designing programs to improve classroom climate (Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 1991). According to Bennett & Bennett (1994), in increasing numbers, institutions of higher education follow a systematic approach to diversity on campus. Based on the literature, these authors summarize recommendations on what can be done to effectively increase campus diversity:

- commitment and consistent leadership from the top;
- an organization-wide effort including administration, faculty, staff, and students;

- attention to all cultural constituencies;
- creation of an inclusive curriculum;
- efforts to recruit and retain underrepresented groups;
- faculty development for teaching to diverse groups;
- diversity programs in residence halls;
- intercultural communication training for administration, faculty, staff, and students;
- integration of the diversity initiative with the surrounding community; and
- preparation of students for future social responsibility in a diverse workforce. (p. 148)

International Education

The purpose of international education is to promote the transnational flow of peoples and ideas, and to provide interaction between cultures within and outside of the United States (Noronha, 1992). In the new mission of NAFSA: Association of International Educators -- in the past, NAFSA stood for "National Association of Foreign Student Advisors" but it is no longer spelled out -- professionals in the field of international education stated that "NAFSA's members share a belief that international educational exchange advances learning and scholarship, builds respect among different peoples, and encourages constructive leadership in a global community" (NAFSA Newsletter, 1994, p.5). As new international students arrive in the United States, they are provided with an orientation for the purpose of facilitating their adjustment to the new culture. During orientation, the U.S. culture is most often presented as traditional middle

class, European-American (Althen, 1988; Stewart & Bennett, 1991; Noronha, 1992). International educators and foreign students often live separate lives on campus, and their interactions with domestic culture is often limited to the majority, white, Anglo-saxon mainstream culture. Since international students most often lack a sociopolitical agenda, they try to avoid being associated with the controversial ethnic or racial issues: social issues such as segregation or disegregation, social and racial equity, and racism in society and on campus have little appeal to international students and are often ignored (Noronha, 1992).

In the past, international education has been generously funded, research grants and exchange programs are available through dozens of organizations such as the Fulbright Scholarship Fund, Agency for International Development (AID), United States Information Agency (USIA), America-Mideast Educational and Training Services (AMIDEAST), African-American Institute (AAI), Institute of International Education (IIE) and others. In addition, language studies and international studies are built into the curriculum, and most campuses also provide intensive English programs for foreign students. There is a large number of theories and a large pool of research that are focused on intercultural communication conducted by professionals in various fields such as social and political sciences, and communication theorists (Bennett, 1993; Kohls & Knight, 1994; Martin, 1994; Paige, 1993; Push, 1979; Samovar & Porter, 1991). International and cross-cultural communication methodologies have been widely excepted to all but, until recently, multicultural populations (Noronha, 1992). In general, things that are

international are viewed as "safe," not confrontational, and are more easily accepted and funded.

Multicultural Education

Although multicultural education is not a new concept, it is a relatively new name for phenomena that have existed since the 1920s when educators began writing about and training others in intercultural education and ethnic studies. The civil rights movement in the 1960s brought a renewed interest in ethnic studies, discrimination, and intergroup relations. The objectives of the current movement are to promote intergroup, especially interracial, understanding and to reduce or eliminate stereotypes (Gollnick, & Chinn, 1994). The focus of multicultural education is on issues of privilege, dominance, status and power differences, and the inter- and intragroup dynamics within the United States. Multicultural education has a political agenda: it actively challenges the current status quo, fights against racial and ethnic inequity, for equal justice, equal rights and equal access to education, representation, and other aspects of life in a democratic society (Ballard, 1973; Miller, 1990; Sweigert, 1995).

The culture of the United States is viewed by multiculturalists as representing multiple traditions and contributions to the overall culture, and tensions are acknowledged to exist among various cultural groups. According to Noronha (1992), the most vocal group fighting against injustice and discrimination is African-Americans who are represented in the largest numbers among minorities. She also argues that, until recently, racial conflicts have been interpreted as Black/White issues. The field of multicultural education also has a growing number

of educational, developmental, and psychological theories (Cross, 1978; Helms, 1980; Helms, 1990). While international educators seek adjustment and enrichment of the culture of the United States in a peaceful way, advocates of multicultural education might be seen as militant in their pursuit of their agenda.

Relationship Between International and Multicultural Perspectives

June Noronha (1992) summarized how international education and multicultural education are seen by faculty and staff in academe. According to her comparison, international education is influenced more by global and national politics, economic changes, government relations, and funding. It can be internalized more by structured learning than direct experience: facts and concepts can be taught and learned. Multicultural education, on the other hand, is often thought of as subject to pressure from on and off-campus groups of special interests, with an agenda that is separate (for example, ethnic studies, women's studies taught by ethnic and women faculty), problematic, and more accessible by direct experience instead of structured learning. In describing the nature of interaction between multicultural and international education, Noronha (1992) writes that

> internationalists (predominantly European-American) have not been engaged or included in the discussions with multiculturalists (predominantly Americans of color), and faculty, staff, and students in the two areas do not often work or plan together. Each area assumes a specific mastery over cultural learning and is often suspicious and critical of one another's approach, analysis, and theoretical knowledge. (p. 56)

She goes on to say that "multiculturalists tend to perceive internationalists as elitists and interested in esoteric agendas; they are perceived in turn as professional victims, exclusionary, and theoretically soft" (p. 56). Faculty and staff have not yet found a way of working together on a basis of inclusiveness, based on the similarities of the two perspectives, to shape institution's effort to achieving greater diversity.

There are significant differences between international and minority students that might help explain the current lack of interest and interaction between the individuals belonging to these groups. International students tend to be older than the average U.S. student, they come from families with higher socioeconomic status in their home countries, and attend college full time (Noronha, 1992). They are more likely to pursue graduate studies (44.7%), select traditional fields in science, business, humanities, and education, and the majority (65 %) receive their funding primarily from personal and family sources. Seventy-three percent receive funding mainly from outside of the U.S. (Davis, 1994). Minority students, especially African-Americans and Hispanic Americans, are less persistent in college than other minority groups, and only a small percentage actually complete their degrees (Carter & Wilson, 1991).

Minority students, in general, come from socioeconomically disadvantated families, they rely heavily on institutional, state, and federal financial assistance, are more likely to attend part-time, and only a very small percentage go on to do graduate work (Nettles, 1991). In addition, ethnic minority students often believe that foreign students receive unfair privileges, and are unaware of domestic political

and cultural issues while international students, especially those of color, do not want to be identified as such, especially when it comes to participating in discussions about domestic equity/inequity (Noronha, 1992). The campus community, similarly to the the society as a whole, views all of these various groups as different from the mainstream white, Anglo-saxon student population. There is little wonder that these perspectives lead to misunderstandings and do very little to serve the institutions' desire to advance learning and development.

Although there are many factors distancing ethnic minority groups and international students, they also have some values in common. Some of these commonalities are: the advocacy of culture learning, consideration of mentors as facilitative of the process, promotion of experiential and structured learning, and the appreciation of, both subjective and objective, cultural differences (Bennett & Bennett, 1994). Many professionals in both fields are also committed to social justice, shared privilege, and greater inclusivity (Bennett & Bennett, 1994). If institutions are to be developed into truly diverse communities, these shared sentiments and common values may provide incentives to share, to cooperate, and to bridge gaps.

The Role of International Educators

Since international educators have a reputation on campuses of being leaders in the field of intercultural communication, they might be called upon by institutions to provide their perspectives on issues of domestic diversity. Therefore, international educators have an obligation to gain insight and skills in domestic diversity issues that requires in-service training. Following the initiatives from

faculty and administrators to "internationalize," "multiculturalize," and "diversify" the campus and the curriculum (Bennett & Bennett, 1994; Houston, 1991; Mark, 1994), international educators can likely serve as expert resource persons and should have a significant voice in the discussion. Some of the challenges are already present and new ones will come. For example, an increasing number of students of color, gays, lesbians, older students, and students with disabilities want to go abroad. Bennett & Bennett (1994) cite incidents from the recent past that illustrate regretable practices. For example, an exchange organization refused to accept an obese student because of being heavier than the cultural norm in the hosting country, a prospective female exchange student was rejected by an overseas medical school, and an overseas family refused to host a student of color. All of the above examples represent clear issues of illegal discrimination in the United States, but not in other countries. In addition to these problems, international educators also need to realize that the issues of diversity come up in the developmental stage when minority students, at least those of traditional age, are working on establishing their identity.

Familiarity with various psychological and identity development models developed during the past two decades helps international educators better understand and address these problems. These theories and models include, for example African-American identity (Cross, 1978; Helms, 1987), ethnic identity in general (Smith, 1991), and white identity (Helms, 1984, 1990). Awareness of one's own ethnocentricity (Bennett & Bennett, 1993) and of the consciousness of the oppressed is extremely important and may help international educators

understand vital issues of diversity. Pre-departure training programs for study abroad or orientation for new foreign sojourners should not avoid the component of domestic diversity.

Foreign student advisors also have an obligation to prepare nonwhite foreign students, who often do not feel comfortable being seen as minority students and are likely to be reluctant to participate in debates of diversity, how to deal with prejudice and discrimination present on college campuses and in American society. Domestic minority groups should also be educated that they should not automatically assume that a foreign student is comfortable and willing to speak about, for example, Hispanic issues or apartheid, and should not view them as elitists and oppressors. International educators must assume leadership in active and open discussions of these concerns so that all involved can learn and develop from the experience.

Current Efforts to Bridge Domestic and International Diversity

Through uniting their forces, professionals in international offices that serve the needs of foreign students and scholars and staff at multicultural centers, and multicultural or minority offices have a great potential to shape the discussions about how to diversify college campuses and facilitate cross-cultural communication. At present, they are too busy to satisfying the needs of the population they serve. They are asked to do more with less as institutions struggle with the consequences of decreasing state and federal support for the enterprise of higher education, and they are often "competitors for the same slice of the pie" (LaPidus, 1991, p. 5).

As a beginning step to bridging domestic and international diversity, NAFSA: Association of Internaitonal Educators recently reviewed its practices and devoted efforts to examine its stands on diversity. In 1990, NAFSA's president, Martin Limbird, appointed a Task Force on Cultural Diversity to explore issues of diversity in terms of NAFSA membership, leadership, central office staff, and the field of educational exchange. This initiative was in response to the NAFSA Board's initiative to call for increased minority participation in the association, its personnel and hiring practices, and multicultural and international affairs on campus (Kennedy, 1994; Smithee, 1991). The report was presented and well received at the NAFSA National Conference in 1992.

In addition to the establishment of the Task Force, an informal telephone survey of professionals at 20 universities was also conducted (Smithee, 1991). Despite the unscientific methodology, the survey provided valuable first information about the sentiments and the relationships between internationalism and multiculturalism on college campuses. The subjects, mainly foreign student advisors, shared a goal of having better relationships among people with different cultures based on the overlapping areas between minority/multicultural affairs and international offices on campuses. Three questions were addressed in the survey: how institutions' currently respond to diversity and multicultural issues, how international office's respond to the same phenomenon, and how feasible it is to integrate the functions of the international and multicultural divisions. According to the analysis of the anwers, institutions were responding to diversity in a variety of ways: the institutional review, the administrative solution, educational evaluation

and change, and programmatic efforts. Some institutions set up task forces and commissions to review institutional policies, hire affirmatively, and are concerned with minority admission and retention, and improving campus life for minorities. Others establish centers to coordinate diversity or multicultural affairs focusing on domestic ethnic groups. Again, other institutions revise the curriculum to reflect values and perspectives of minorities. Finally, the rest of the campuses engage in programmatic efforts to design, develop, implement, and evaluate programs to educate and provide interaction between faculty, staff, and students.

The role of international services in adding a specifically international perspective to the institutions' efforts were seen by respondents as depending on the culture, size, mission, and demographic characteristic of the student population. Responding foreign student advisors saw organizational and functional differences that separate the goals of international and multicultural offices. The focus of international education on the transnational exchange of ideas and peoples and multiculturalists' focus on ethnic differences might limit the role of international offices in campus-wide diversity efforts. For example, both of the offices are required to see if institutions comply with federal regulations, but these regulations have little in common. Minority-related regulations are seen to focus on providing access to education, services, and funds. Regulations pertaining to foreign students, on the other hand, focus on limitations of entering the country and specifying benefits within those limitations (for example, length and conditions of stay, restricted access to the workplace, and the presense of the family, etc.).

Respondents also indicated the potential risk of exposing yet another group

to prejudice in putting the two populations together, and the possibility of hightened emotions about the allocation of resources. If the two areas were put together, the new unit might be viewed on campus as an administrative office and could be identified with one group while the other might feel deprived. In addition, many international offices see themselves as unequipped to effect institutional change. Many respondents cautioned about combining the two areas claiming the unclarity of who is responsible for failures or successes, the different characteristics of the two populations, the lack of success and low participation in the past in joint programming efforts, and the lack of sophisticated skills and the ability to stand pressure from both sides that is needed in order to make a joint unit function effectively. Despite the discouraging responses, suggestions were made toward NAFSA to encourage the debate, to revise its policies and stand on diversity, to learn more about issues of domestic diversity, and to model the behavior of respecting differences among peoples (Smithee, 1991).

The NAFSA Board of Directors discussed both the 1992 report of the Task Force and the results of the survey, and assigned the Task Force to further fine-tune the association's strategic directions and to define diversity in a broader sense, since the report discussed race and ethnicity, but did not address other aspects of diversity, such as gender, religion, national background, sexual orientation, and disability (Kennedy, 1994). In October 1994, the NAFSA Board discussed the second report of the Task Force (chaired by June Noronha from the College of Saint Catherine, Saint Paul, Minnesota), and made recommendations in the following areas:

- Expand access to leadership [at every level of the association];
- Promote climate that fosters inclusion;
- Collect and analyze demographic data [using membership renewals and other forms];
- Promote involvement of multicultural members in workshops, conferences, programming, planning, and leadership;
- Provide "diversity training" to members and leaders [...] through workshops and at the national conference; and
- Continue to question our cultural assumptions. (Kennedy, 1994, p.3)

NAFSA followed its own guidelines at the 46th Annual National Conference at Miami Beach (May 31-June 3, 1994) when it included a wide array of themes on promoting diversity and building connections between multicultural and international education. All sessions featured topics related to diversity and were publicized in the NAFSA Newsletter prior to the conference (Thewlis, 1994). Sample topics discussed in NAFSA's Admission Section (ADSEC) included, for example, the educational systems of Latin-America, the Carribean, document analysis from Norway, Bulgaria, China, Myanmar, and Nepal. Administrators and Teachers in English as a Second Language (ATESL) addressed the multicultural/international connections and some concerns of bilingual education. The Council of Advisers to Foreign Students and Scholars (CAFSS) examined, for example, the increasing anti-immigrant sentiment and their ramifications on campus, comparative cross-cultural counseling paradigms, and the issues of Central- and Eastern European sojourners in America. Community Section

(COMSEC) professionals and volunteers working with the community discussed how to involve international students in off-campus multicultural activities and how to recruit volunteers to diversify organizations. U.S. Students Abroad (SECUSSA) section suggested techniques on how to include underrepresented groups in study abroad programs, how to develop cooperation with minority study offices, how to advise students seeking ethnic identity, and discussed special concerns of gay and lesbian students going abroad. The document named "Diverse," containing NAFSA's stand on diversity, along with its policies and activities, is now available on the Inter-L to interested professionals from the Inter-L Archives (Kennedy, 1994).

Summary and Recommendations

The task of bridging the gap between the now separately functioning multicultural education and international education, and the imperatives of increasing intergroup communication between domestic minority students and foreign students can begin on the basis of intercultural communication (Bennett & Bennett, 1994). This theoretical orientation was developed in the 1980s, and, until recently, it was applied mostly in multicultural counseling (Sue & Sue, 1990). When institutions try to build diverse communities based on inclusivity of different groups of peoples, the intercultural approach can provide insight on how to deal with both international populations and domestic diversity at the same time. Interculturalism emphasizes the subjective side of cultures, beliefs, assumptions, values, behavioral and cognitive patterns, and the notion of understanding these differences as facilitative of cultural adaptation and cultural learning. The broader

definition of subjective culture allows us to include both international and multicultural students under the term "diverse populations." Diversity includes, in addition to these two groups, other subcultures such as those of gender, sexual orientation, religion, and vocation. Limited contact with people from other cultures leads to stereotyping and sweeping generalizations, and that, in turn, may result in confusion and limited communication. When conflict arises, instead of harsher terms, it may be more appropriate and less offensive to use the term "cultural misunderstanding." Cultural learning and intercultural communication can be applied to increase understanding between one cultural group and another. It is important that individuals from different cultures maintain communication and discuss cultural differences, especially about controversial issues.

Intercultural communication offers an alternative to the melting pot perspective that assumes assimilation, and that alternative is the concept of cultural adaptation (Bennett & Bennett, 1994). The optimal result of cultural adaptation is not a monocultural and ethnocentric perspective, but rather a bicultural or multicultural perspective that includes appreciation of cultures different from one's own. Intercultural communication also endorses a "theory into practice into theory" approach (Bennett & Bennett, 1994, p. 158). This methodology may include domestic diversity as an aspect of sojourning. Professionals in both areas need to be aware of the different developmental theories and models, and communicate them to the rest of the campus community.

International educators need to adopt concepts of intercultural sensitivity, culture shock, differences in cognitive, communication, and learning styles into

their repertoire of knowledge and skills, and, with minor extentions, apply them to domestic diversity. The concepts of privilege, power, and oppression are relevant to discussions on diversity, and international educators need to be aware of the white privilege phenomenon. Instead of increasing the power struggle between the dominant and the non-dominant cultures, international and multicultural educators need to learn how to mediate conflicts when it occurs between individuals and groups. International educators can play an important role on campus in how to improve communication and understanding between foreign students and multicultural students, and thus contribute to institutional efforts to diversify campus climate while building community.

References

Althen, G. (1988). American ways: A guide for foreigners. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

American Council on Education and Education Commission of the States. (1988). One-third of a nation. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Astin, A. W. (1985). Achieving educational excellence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ballard, A. B. (1973). Power to the people: Racial strife on the campuses, 1965-71. In A. B. Ballard (Ed.), The education of black folk: The Afro-American struggle for knowledge in white America (pp. 60-80). New York: Harper & Row.

Banks, J. A. (1988). Multiethnic education: Theory and practice (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bennett, C. I. (1990). Comprehensive multicultural education: Theory and practice (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bennett, M. J. (1993). Toward ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), Education for the intercultural experience (pp. 21-71). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Bennett, J. M., & Bennett, M. J. (1994). Multiculturalism and international education: Domestic and international differences. In G. Althen (Ed.), Learning across cultures (pp. 145-172). Washington, D.C.: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

Brandt, G. L. (1986). The realization of anti-racist teaching. London: Falmer Press.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1990). Campus life: In search of community. Lawrenceville, NJ: Princton University Press.

Carter, D. J., & Wilson, R. (1991). Ninth annual status report on minorities in higher education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Carter, D. J., & Wilson, R. (1993). Minorities in higher education. Annual. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, Office of Minorities in Higher Education.

Cross, W. E., Jr. (1978). The Thomas and Cross model of psychological nigrescence: A review. Journal of Black Psychology, 5 (1), 13-31.

Davis, T. M. (Ed.). (1994). Open doors 1993/94: Report on international education exchange. New York: Institution of International Education.

Gollnick, D.M., & Chinn, P. C. (1994). Multicultural education in a pluralistic society (4th ed.). New York: MacMillan.

Hardiman, R, & Jackson, B. W. (1992). Racial identity development: Understanding racial dynamics in college classrooms and on campus. In R. J. Menges, & M. D. Svinicki (Eds.), Promoting diversity in college classrooms: Innovative responses for curriculum,faculty, and institutions (pp. 53-59). New Directions for Teaching and Learning No. 52. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Helms, J. E. (1984). Toward a theoretical explanation of the effects of race on counseling: A black and white model. Counseling Psychologist, 12 (4), 153-165.

Helms, J. E. (Ed.). (1990). Black and white racial identity: Theory, research and practice. New York: Greenwood Press.

Houston, R. (1991). 111 ways to internationalize the campus. NAFSA Newsletter, 43 (2), 16.

Jenkins, H. M., & Associates. (1983). Educating students from other nations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (1991). Cooperative learning: Increasing college faculty instructional productivity. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 4. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Kennedy, S. (1994). Board endorses diversity report. NAFSA Newsletter, 46 (2), 3, 12.

Kohls, L. R., & Knight, J. M. (1994). Developing intercultural awareness: A cross-cultural training handbook (2nd ed.). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Levine, A. & Associates. (1989). Shaping higher education's future: Demographic realities and opportunities, 1990-2000. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mark, N. (1994). Promoting culture learning on campus: Internationalizing student life at Michigan State University. In G. Althen (Ed.), Learning across cultures (pp. 173-183). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Martin, J. N. (1994). Intercultural communication: A unifying concept for international education. In G. Althen (Ed.), Learning across cultures (pp. 9-29). Washington, D.C.: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

Miller, R. I. (1990). Minority access and success. In R. I. Miller (Ed.), Major American higher education issues and challenges in the 1990s (pp. 43-61). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Nettles, M. T. (1991). Racial similarities and differences in the predicators of college student achievement. In W. R. Allen, E. G. Epps, & N. Z. Haniff (Eds.), American students in predominantly white and in historically black public universities (pp. 75-91). Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.

Noronha, J. (1992). International and multicultural education: Unrelated adversaries or successful partners? In R. J. Menges, & M.D. Svinicki (Eds.), Promoting diversity in college classroom: Innovative responses for curriculum, faculty, and institutions (pp. 53-59). New Directions for Teaching and Learning No. 52. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Paige, R. M. (1993). On the nature of intercultural experiences and intercultural education. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), Education for the intercultural experience (pp. 1-19). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Push, M. D. (Ed.). (1979). Multicultural education: A cross-cultural training approach. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Richardson, R. C., & Fisk Skinner, E. (1991). Achieving quality and diversity: Universities in a multicultural society. New York: Macmillan.

Samovar, L. A., & Porter, R. E. (Eds.). (1991). Intercultural communication: A reader (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Schmitz, B. (1992). Curriculum and cultural pluralism: A guide for campus planners. Washington, D.C.:Association of American Colleges.

Smith, D. G. (1989). The challenge of diversity: Involvement or alienation in the academy? ASHE-ERIC Report. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Smith, E. J. (1991). Ethnic identity development: Toward the development of a theory within the context of majority/minority status. Journal of Counseling and Development, 70 (1), 181-188.

Smithee, M. (1991). Internationalism, diversity, and multiculturalism: Are they compatible? NAFSA Newsletter, 42 (6), 1, 8-10.

Stennis-Williams, S., Terrell, M. C. & Haynes, A. W. (1988). The emergent role of multicultural centers on predominantly white campuses. In M. C. Terrell, & D. J. Wright (Eds.). From survival to success: Promoting minority student retention (pp. 73-98). Washington, D.C.: NASPA.

Stewart, E. C., & Bennett, M. J. (1991). American cultural patterns: A cross-cultural perspective (rev. ed.). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Sue, D. W. & Sue, D. (1990). Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Sweigert, E. A. (1995, February). The development and role of multicultural centers at predominantly white colleges and universities. Paper presented at the Iowa Graduate Student Conference, Iowa City, Iowa.

Tatum, B. D. (1990). Talking about race, learning about racism: The application of raxial identity development theory in the classroom. Harvard Educational Review, 62 (1), 1-24.

Terrell, M. C. (1992). Diversity, disunity, and campus community. Washington, D.C.:NASPA.

Thewlis, S. (1994). The agendas for Miami Beach: Sections to focus on diversity. NAFSA Newsletter, 45 (3), 37, 40.

Woolbright, C. (Ed.) (1990). Valuing diversity on campus: A multicultural approach. Bloomington, IL: Association of College Unions International.