A Theoretical Grounding of the Intercultural Sensitivity Model

Shizu Yamamoto

A Theoretical Grounding of the Intercultural Sensitivity Model

Shizu Yamamoto

Abstract

This paper reviews Milton Bennett's developmental model of intercultural sensitivity in terms of its grounded perspectives: phenomenology, constructivism and cognitive complexity. Based on these perspectives, the key concepts of the model, "differentiation" and "intercultural sensitivity," are defined and discussed, and stages of the model are explained.

Introduction

A model that helps teachers/trainers assess their learners' level of intercultural sensitivity is valuable to design an educational or training program. Milton Bennett (1986a, 1986b & 1993) proposed a developmental model of intercultural sensitivity, which aims to help understand the learner's experience of cultural difference and facilitate learners to achieve higher levels of intercultural sensitivity.

There are six stages in the development model, from ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism. For each stage, typical statements and behaviors expressed by the individual of that stage are described. It might be tempting to pay attention to those statements or behaviors and use them to assess the learner's sensitivity level. However, it is not the intention of the model to merely list behaviors or statements. It rather intends to explain the individual's subjective experience of cultural differences; how an individual perceives

cultural difference and attaches meanings to it. Behaviors are considered the consequence of those meanings created by the individual.

To use the model appropriately, it is important to understand the concepts on which this model is developed. In the following sections, the concepts of phenomenology, constructivism and cognitive complexity will be introduced as grounded perspectives of the model; and each stage of the model will also be discussed from these perspectives.

A Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity

There are six developmental stages in the model, under which there are subcategories. The first three stages are "ethnocentric" stages and the latter three are "ethnorelative" stages (See Table 1). Ethnocentrism is defined as "assuming that the worldview of one's own culture is central to all reality" (Bennett, 1993, p. 30). Ethnorelativism, in contrast to ethnocentrism, assumes that "cultures can only be understood relative to one another and that particular behavior can only be understood within a cultural context" (p. 46).

Table 1   A Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity

Experience of Difference

Ethnocentric Stages			Ethnorelative Stages		
Denial	Defense	Minimization	Acceptance	Adaptation	Integration
*Isolation *Separation	*Denigration *Superiority *Reversal	*Physical Universalism *Transcendent Uhiversalism	*Respect for Behavioral Difference *Respect for Value Difference	*Empathy *Pluralism	*Contextual Evaluation *Contextual Marginality

Individuals are expected to progress through the six stages as they increase in intercultural sensitivity. (See Appendix for the summary of definitions for each stage in the model).

Grounded Perspectives of the Model

As grounded perspectives of the model, phenomenology, constructivism and cognitive complexity will be discussed in the followings.

Phenomenology
Bennett's model is phenomenological as it is trying to describe people's subjective *"experience of cultural difference,"* not objective behaviors.   Phenomenology is defined by Littlejohn (1989) as follows:

> phenomenology is the study of the ways in which human beings experience the world. It looks at objects and events from the perspective of the perceiver, the individual who experiences those things.   Reality, in phenomenology, is always part of the conscious experience of the individual (p. 134).

In Bennett's model, "objects" (cultural differences) and "events" (intercultural interactions) are explained from the perspective of the perceiver (people at different sensitivity level).
Phenomenological studies reveal cultural interpretations of the world.   At the same time, they also help clarify how that interpretation is constituted in the individual's experience (Pilotta, 1983).   In the Phenomenological Approach, Pilotta (1983) states:

> The human world is defined by phenomenological thought as a nexus of experience respecting both the human and the world, not as the object which has experience.   Human behavior is

primarily the experience of meaning. Hence, it is the meaning and the experience that provide the integrative element for the study of humans ... Experience is inevitably meaningful, for indeed, the experience of meaninglessness is as well meaningful (p. 271).

Pilotta's statement, "the experience of meaninglessness is as well meaningful" is reflected in Bennett's stage of Denial. In the Denial stage, people do not attribute meanings to cultural differences. These people do not recognize differences because they have not yet developed a capacity to perceive and make sense out of differences. This experience of meaninglessness is therefore very significant in the model.

In the phenomenological approach, experience is the central notion and actual "lived experience" is the basic data of knowledge. Bennett treats people as the ones who experience, hence create meanings of cultural differences while the behaviors are treated as the result of those meanings. Therefore, "intercultural communication behavior is treated as manifestation of this subjective experience" (Bennett, 1986a, p. 64).

Constructivism

The concept of "construct," which is the core of constructivism, was first proposed by George Kelly (1955). Kelly states that "construct" is based on similarities of elements and sorting them into categories. Constructivism, according to Littlejohn (1989), suggests:

individuals interpret and act according to conceptual categories in the cognitive system. In other words, an event does not just present itself to the individual; rather, the person constructs experience according to the organization of the cognitive system (p. 80).

Experience of an event in the constructivist's view does not just happen. Rather, we are the ones who create meaningfulness in the event. Only then, for the first time, is the event experienced. Concerning the constructivist's view of experience, Bennett cites the words of Kelly (1963):

A person can be a witness to a tremendous parade of episodes 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. It is not what happens around him that makes a man experienced; it is the successive construing and reconstruing of what happens, as it happens, that enriches the experience of life (p. 73).

To experience an event, it first must be perceived by the individual. Otherwise, it is buried in the surrounding environment. Then, it has to be processed by the individual's conceptual category in the cognitive system to make meaning out of it. Closely related to this process, selective perception and figure/ground distinction are often discussed.

Selective perception. Selective perception is the process which deals with the vast amount of incoming message stimuli. There are countless stimuli present in the environment around us. What we hear, taste, see, smell or feel in everyday life are said to be only "a few of the countless signals arriving at our brains simultaneously and waiting to be processed - waiting to be given meanings" (Samovar, Porter & Jain, 1981, p. 110). As we cannot process all stimuli, we are unconsciously filtering it. "The decisions we make about what will arouse and hold our attention and hence receive meaning are related directly to our culture" (Samovar, Porter & Jain, 1981, p. 110).

Figure/ground distinction. In order to perceive a given stimulus, our sensory system draws lines to make a meaningful "figure" to separate it from the "ground." In the discussion of figure and ground distinction, Stewart and Bennett (1991) argue :

> Cultural differences are found almost exclusively in the subjective process of interpretation, in the way something is thought about rather than in objective perception. Thinking at this level can be seen as the construction of category boundaries that define figure/ground objects, transforming them into perceptual objects . . . In addition, category boundaries define the extent to which a figure is subcategorized (p. 26).

Stewart and Bennett describe an example of skiers' perception of snow to outline category boundaries and subcategorization. Skiers can subcategorize the snow into various types, such as light powder, medium-packed, corn, and so on, while nonskiers cannot distinct these differences and simply perceive snow. This example suggests that skiers have finer distinctions in their category of the snow, which allow them to "experience" the snow more completely compared with nonskiers. As the condition of the snow does not hold much importance to nonskiers, they do not develop distinctions for the category of snow; therefore, they do not perceive and "experience" the snow as much.

In the same way, culture influences the process of selective perception. It teaches us particular boundary constructions and guides us in what to consider a "figure." Therefore, what is a "figure" or important in one culture may be "ground" in another. In addition to culture, we learn figure/ground distinctions from our past experience and environment (Stewart & Bennett, 1991).

Cognitive complexity

In constructivist studies, cognitive complexity is seen as necessary

to meaningful communication. Cognitive complexity or "simplicity in a cognitive system" is "a function of the relative number of constructs and the degree of hierarchical construct organization" (Littlejohn, 1989, p. 80). The number of constructs which are used to organize perceptions or interpretations of events is called "cognitive differentiation" (Crockett, 1965). The degree of "hierarchic integration" of the system is defined as "the complexity of the relationships among constructs, and the degree to which clusters of constructs are related by superordinate, integrating constructs" (Crockett, 1965, p. 50). According to Crockett, people increase in cognitive differentiation and hierarchic integration, not only in development of new knowledge. Crockett states "thus, an adult being exposed to a content area that was initially foreign to him would proceed through the same stages in development as the maturing child, though the process would probably be completed more rapidly than in the child" (1965, p. 50).

Crockett's description of cognitive development parallels Bennett's sequence of the model. At the initial level of intercultural sensitivity, Bennett (1993) states "intercultural sensitivity can be understood as a kind of cognitive complexity, where greater sensitivity is represented in the creation and increasing differentiation of cultural categories" (p. 25). Bennett's model begins with no recognition of cultural difference and proceeds with the perception of an increased number of, and more subtle, differences. Crockett explains that the cognitive development proceeds from global, diffuse, loosely organized systems to increased differentiation and hierarchic integration with the individual's growing conscious awareness of subtle differences. However, he says that such development does not occur automatically. The interaction between "an existing mode of cognitive organization with respect to some domain of events" and "the individual's actual experience with events in that domain" is the key element to development. Crockett (1965) further maintains:

To the extent that a person seldom or never encounter events in some domain, his cognitive system with respect to those events may remain global, undifferentiated, and loosely organized ... The increased differentiation and articulation of constructs with respect to such domains reflects the individual's growing awareness of subtle differences in the aspects of these events and, at the same time, helps him identify and respond differentially to such subtle differences (p. 54).

In the initial stage of Bennett's model, cultural difference is not experienced because people at this stage have no, or only wide, categories for cultural differences. As people are more sophisticated in their categorization of perceived cultural differences, their intercultural sensitivity increases. In the Ethnorelative stages, categories are further developed and people are able to distinguish more subtle cultural differences, such as cultural values. At the more advanced stages, people are not only able to distinguish subtle differences, they can internalize another person's set of differentiations, as in the case of "empathy" in Adaptation. Furthermore, people are able to evaluate situation from one or more chosen cultural perspectives, which are different patterns of differentiation. At this level, people are aware of their process of differentiating cultural differences. Each stage of the model will be further discussed from the concept of cognitive complexity in the later sections.

Key Concepts of the Model

With the conceptual framework to understand the model described above, key concepts of the intercultural sensitivity model will be explained next.

Differentiation

Bennett (1993) maintains that "developmental or personal-growth models ideally are based upon key organizing concepts" (p. 22). The key concept which organizes the developmental stages in the intercultural sensitivity model is "differentiation." Differentiation is taken in two senses in the model: 1) "people differentiate phenomena in a variety of ways"; and 2) "cultures differ fundamentally from one another in the way they maintain patterns of differentiation, or worldviews" (p. 22). These are the basic premises of ethnorelativism.

Differentiation, here, is discussed in terms of cognitive processing. The assumption in the first statement, "people differentiate phenomena in a variety of ways," is that people make figure/ground distinctions or selectively perceive the environment based on their own cognitive categories. Consequently, out of phenomena, people differentiate only what is meaningful to them in the way which makes sense to them. Culture and past experience play an important role in this process. Therefore, people differentiate phenomena and attach meanings to it in a variety of ways according to their culture and past experience.

To consider the second statement, "cultures differ fundamentally from one another in the way they maintain patterns of differentiation, or worldview," it is necessary to examine "culture" from the constructivist's view.

A culture can be characterized with customs, values, beliefs, behaviors, or social systems expressed or used by a group of people. However, it is also culture which guides people to think or behave in certain ways. This both-ways process is often explained in transaction. Culture teaches us through socialization how to differentiate and create meanings out of the environment. As a result, people in the same culture construct reality with certain tendencies, hence think or behave accordingly to those tendencies, which again, become characteristic to that culture. We do not

"have" culture or culture does not "have" certain characteristics, but we are actively participating in the creation of our culture and culture is orienting us through socialization how we organize that process.

Therefore, culture is a manifestation of people's values and social behaviors, while it also guides people to value or behave in specific ways. Patterns of differentiation or worldview which are shared by people of one culture is maintained in this ongoing cycle and cultures are fundamentally different from each other in the way they sustain this continuous process.

To state it simply, we are creating our own reality and people of a different culture are living in a different reality from ours. Bennett (1993) says that "the idea of culture itself refers to patterns of differentiation" and that "these patterns form the constructs that provide us with interpretations of phenomena" (p. 25). Acceptance of this notion is essential to Ethnorelative stages in the model.

Intercultural Sensitivity

Definition of intercultural sensitivity by Bennett should be understood from the constructivist's view. Bennett (1993) asserts that "specifically, we are interested in the way people construe cultural difference and in the varying kinds of experience that accompany different constructions" and he continues to say "this experience is termed 'intercultural sensitivity'" (p. 24).

In the simplest terms, intercultural sensitivity is a person's subjective experience of cultural differences. It does not refer to any skills which may be accomplished in ethnorelative stages. Skills, such as empathy, are manifestations of certain stages (in this case, Adaptation). Rather, intercultural sensitivity concerns how people make distinctions in an event or phenomena and perceive it as cultural difference (or not perceive any cultural difference, or perceive it as similarity); and what meanings they attach to it in order to make it meaningful to them. Therefore, the more a person can make

significant cultural distinctions, the more s/he is interculturally sensitive, as stated "greater sensitivity is represented in the creation and increasing differentiation of cultural categories" (Bennett, 1993, p. 25).   Furthermore, people in Ethnorelative stages can make significant cultural distinctions and construct meanings according to the context of another culture.

It is important to note here that the term, "intercultural sensitivity" itself, does not represent ethnorelative view or positive feeling toward another culture. It rather refers to people's ability to *sense* the difference. For example, people in the Defense stage may have negative feelings for cultural differences. However, their intercultural sensitivity is considered more sophisticated than people in the Denial stage who do not even recognize those differences.

Stages of the Model

Stages of the intercultural sensitivity model will be discussed in terms of the theories and concepts described in the earlier sections. See the Appendix for a summary of the original definitions of each stage.

Denial

In the Denial stage, people do not recognize cultural difference due to physical isolation or separation. At this initial level of intercultural sensitivity, people have no categories or only broad categories for different cultures. From the position of relatively pure isolation, cultural difference is not noticed, hence, not experienced at all because people at this level do not have categories to perceive differences. When cultural difference is confronted under such conditions, "it is probably overlooked through processes of selective perception" (Bennett, 1993, p. 31). Thus, cultural difference is not construed as a "figure" in these people's constructed reality.

Bennett describes the example of Americans saying Tokyo is

"just like home" for there are lots of cars, big buildings, and McDonald's. These people could perceive only that which is familiar to them, that for which they have already established categories. However, those differences for which they have not yet developed cognitive categories eluded their attention. Therefore, these people, though they visited Japan, experienced only a "U.S. experience" in a Japanese environment. As they didn't know how to interpret the Japanese environment in a Japanese way, they merely experienced the Japanese surroundings in an U.S. way.

People of "the partial isolation of parochialism" have only overly broad categories for cultural differentiation. As these people have only poorly differentiated categories for different cultures, cultural differences are sorted into very broad categories when perceived. Therefore, they may ask "stupid questions" based on their "benign stereotypes," which are manifestations of their broad categories, though usually well-intended. Asking people from Africa about wild animals or asking people from Chicago about the Mafia are some of the examples listed by Bennett.

When Denial takes the form of Separation, people create distance from cultural difference. Although Separation "necessitates the temporary acknowledgment of some kind of difference" (Bennett, 1993, p. 33), those differences perceived do not hold any significance for people at this level. There is a category to make some distinctions of cultural difference, but they intentionally attach no meanings to them and bury them in the environment. Differences are literally denied. When people perceive others as "mere objects in the environment" (Bennett, 1993, p. 33), they do not give the same status to those people that they do to inclusive others. The danger of subhumanization of others is pointed out. Controlling homeless people in the U.S. and violent reactions in some European countries to guest workers are given as examples.

Defense

In this stage, cultural differences are recognized. When people have more categories, they are able to differentiate cultural others, enabling them to define a "figure" as opposed to mere "ground." Unlike the Denial stage, people are able to experience cultural differences, which then becomes threatening to their own world view. People create defensive strategies to counter threatening cultural differences. The Defense stage represents "denigration of difference," "feeling of superiority to other cultures" and "reversal" — denigration of one's own cultural frame of reference.

At this level, one's world view is polarized by building a barrier between "we" and "they." Because of this dualistic "we-they" (in-group and out-group) view, one's own culture becomes absolutely good/right and the other's becomes absolutely bad/wrong. Therefore, people in the Defense stage cannot talk about cultural difference without referring to absolute goodness or badness. When something about the other culture is mentioned, and the comment is positive or even neutral, these people can get angry. Because of their system of categorization, a positive comment about the other culture inevitably means the same thing as being told that their culture is bad. Any cultural difference is perceived as either good or bad. Thus, being given more information about the other culture may simply strengthen their good/bad distinction.

Defense represents greater intercultural sensitivity than Denial. Though negatively evaluated, cultural differences are at least discriminated from the environment by increased differentiation and experienced, though not recognized.

In Reversal, other cultures are perceived by the category of absolute goodness within a polarized world view. Everything about the other culture becomes good and one's own culture becomes bad. Although people in Reversal perceive some cultural differences with a positive attitude, those differences are very superficial and often stereotypical images of the other culture, because their knowledge of

the other culture is limited and their categories are not sophisticated.

Minimization

In the Minimization stage, people trivialize cultural differences and assume that all people are basically the same. Perception of cultural differences is more sophisticated. People recognize cultural differences such as different clothes, foods or customs. However, those differences are trivialized with a belief of a much more powerful similarity, which is presumed to be shared by all human beings. The importance of "shared universality," such as in abstract principles, laws, religions, biology, or survival needs are emphasized. People in this stage tend to think "deep down we are all the same, whether you know it or not."

Bennett explains (1993), "In constructivist terms, one finds superordinate constructs that place previously polarized elements onto one side of a larger construct" (p. 41). In cognitive terms, the newly-recognized categories are subsumed by an existing superordinate category, such as "we are all children of God" or "we are all human."

At this stage, the category to perceive cultural differences are more differentiated. However, perceived cultural differences are sorted into the larger category, which is already existing in one's world view. As people assume that this larger category is universal, they attempt to understand the difference based on that category. As a result, the difference is considered just a variation or a sample of what they already know. Therefore, it is assumed that "despite differences, all people share some basic characteristics, such as individual motivation for achievement" (p. 42).

Ethnocentrism of people in the Minimization stage appears in ethical issues. It is hard for them to believe that people can be ethically sound in different ways from their own. When they ask "how ethical can anyone be if s/he is not doing things in this way,"

they are talking about their way. These people tend to assume that "other people just don't know this way yet," "once they know it, they will want to do it," or that "they are not trying hard enough."

Acceptance

In the Acceptance stage, more subtle differences such as nonverbal behaviors, communication style and cultural values are acknowledged and respected. Unlike Minimization, where people attempt to protect their worldview by putting cultural differences into their already existing superordinate category, people at the Acceptance stage can allow another worldview to exist in their worldview. People accept the idea that each culture has its own way to organize the experience of reality and that the other culture's way may be different from their own but is workable. Bennett thinks that one can recognize that people of different cultures are *not* living the "mistaken" experience of his/her reality, but are having an "actual" experience of *their* reality, which is constructed based on their own worldview.

In the cognitive category, a new worldview is developed in one's own, therefore, more than two worldviews exist. The new worldview is not as well differentiated as the original one, but is considerably better differentiated and can get better differentiated as one learns more about the other culture.

At this level, people may not know differences in detail (exactly what are different in what way), but they approach another culture with an assumption that how people in that culture see the world, the reality they live in, is different from their own. To respect the difference, it is not necessary to like or admire it. Rather, people may understand the difference as the consequence of the other culture's organization of reality, which is equally important, but may not be "right" from their own cultural point of view.

Adaptation

In the Adaptation stage, one can shift one's own frame of reference (Empathy). Also, one can understand that cultures are not only different, but such difference must always be understood totally within the context of the relevant culture, using two or more internalized cultural frames of reference (Pluralisim).

The difference between Acceptance and Adaptation is that, in Acceptance, people acknowledge and accept the existence of different worldviews, but their behaviors are operating from their own, whereas, in Adaptation people are capable of operating from another culture's worldview. To communicate with people of a different culture, gaining another culture's worldview is not enough, but one has to be able to shift the cultural frame of reference back and forth between another culture's and one's own worldviews. Taking another culture's perspective, one's behavior emerges from that culture's worldview rather than one's own. In doing so, Bennett believes that it is not that "I think I have to do this or that," but it is that "it feels right to do it that way," which is the other culture's way rather than "my way" in this particular situation.

The difference between Empathy and Pluralism is that shifting one's cultural frame of reference for communication is intentional and temporary in the form of Empathy, while it is more unintentional and tied to multiple permanent frames of reference in Pluralism (Bennett, 1993). In Pluralism, two or more fairly complete cultural frames of reference are internalized into one's self, so cultural differences become part of one's normal self. One does not only identify himself/herself with his/her original worldview, but also with the second or even more worldviews. On the other hand, in the Empathy form, "a different worldview is still 'outside' the self, before and after the act of empathy" (Bennett, 1993, p. 56).

Integration

In the Integration stage, people are able to evaluate situation

from one or more chosen cultural perspectives, which are different patterns of differentiation (Contextual Evaluation) and one's identity is culturally marginal (Constructive Marginality). "The experience of one's self as a constant creator of one's own reality" (Bennett, 1993, p. 64) is also possible, therefore, people are conscious of the process of their differentiating cultural differences.

An integrated person, Bennett says, "understands that his or her identity emerges from the act of defining identity itself. This self-reflective loop shows identity to be one act of constructing reality" (p. 60). In Acceptance, people can see themselves operating in a world view (self-reflection). In Adaptation, people are able to operate *upon* their worldview (self-relfectiveness), which is to intentionally shift categories. However, what enables them to do so is the worldview itself. In the Adaptation stage, one's self is seen as "existing within a collection of various cultural and personal frames of reference" (p. 59). Being conscious of this transactional process, in Integration, people can define themselves as the creator of their construct. They no longer see themselves existing in the combination of two worldviews, but they can "function in relationship to cultures while staying outside the constraints of any particular one" (p. 60). This experience of "one's self as a constant creator of one's own reality" (p. 64) is named Constructive Marginality. These people's view of identity is different from that of people in Adaptation, where one's self is considered to exist *within* two or more sets of frame of reference.

Bennett says that development of intercultural sensitivity is ultimately the development of consciousness. As we experience cultural differences in more sophisticated ways, we eventually retain the ability to see ourselves as having a system for experiencing difference, or operating in our worldview (self-reflection). Only then we can operate upon our worldview (self-reflectiveness) and finally see ourselves as the creator of our own worldview.

Conclusion

Bennett's developmental sensitivity of intercultural sensitivity was reviewed in terms of phenomenology, constructivism and cognitive complexity. Also, two key concepts from the model, "differentiation" and "intercultural sensitivity" were defined and discussed. To use this model appropriately, it should be understood from these perspectives. Using this model for teaching or training, therefore, behaviors should always be understood as a manifestation of the cognitive process.

The danger of applying a western model to Japanese is often a topic of discussion (Tai, 1986). Also, problems of applying Bennett's model of intercultural sensitivity to Japanese is pointed out (Kelly, 1994). Therefore, studies need to be conducted to examine the applicability of the model to the Japanese, and modification must be made if necessary.

For example, according to research employed by this author (1994), Japanese do not express the Minimization in the same way as Westerners. Minimization for the Westerners takes place at the abstract level, using principles such as law, religion, or biology, whereas Japanese express Minimization (unconsciously stressing commonalty) at a more concrete, interpersonal level.

Behaviors or statements which associate each stage and the categories used to organize the experience of cultural difference might be different for Japanese. Further investigation is necessary. However, this model still has a lot to offer. If used appropriately in the Japanese context, it can certainly be beneficial to both trainers/ teachers and learners.

REFERENCES

Bennett, M. J. (1986a). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental

model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Cross-cultural orientation: New conceptualizations and applications* (pp. 27–70). Lanham, MD: University Press.

Bennett, M. J. (1986b). A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10, 170–198.

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

Crockett, W. H. (1965). Cognitive complexity and impression formation. In B. A. Maher (Ed.), *Progress in experimental personality research* (vol. 2, pp. 47–90). New York: Academic Press.

Kelly, B. (1994). Foundations of a new developmental model for intercultural sensitivity training. *Sanno College, Jiyugaoka Bulletin*, 27.

Kelly, G. (1955). *The psychology of personal constructs*. New York: North.

Kelly, G. (1963). *A theory of personality*. New York: Norton.

Littlejohn, S. W. (1989). Theories of human communication (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Pilotta, J. J. (1983). The phenomenological approach. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Intercultural communication theory* (pp. 271–282).

Samovar L. A., Porter R. E., & Jain N. C. (1981). *Understanding Intercultural Communication*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

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

Tai, E. (1986). *Modification of the Western approach to intercultural communication for the Japanese context*. Unpublished master's thesis, Portland State University, Portland, OR.

Yamamoto, S. (1994). *A qualitative study of Japanese students' intercultural experiences in the U.S. in relation to the developmental model of*

intercultural sensitivity. Unpublished master's thesis, Portland State University, Portland, OR.

APPENDIX

A Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity

This summary of definition is taken from material prepared by Milton Bennett (Intercultural Communication Institute, 8835 SW Canyon Lane, Suite 238, Portland, Oregon 97225, U.S.A.). These definitions are based on his work: "Towards a Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity" in M. Paige (Ed.) *Education for the Intercultural Experience.* Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural press, 1993.

DENIAL

The inability to construe cultural difference. Indicated by benign stereotyping (well-meant but ignorant or naive observations) and superficial statements of tolerance. May sometimes be accompanied by attribution of deficiency in intelligence or personality to culturally deviant behavior. Tendency to dehumanize outsiders.

Isolation: Isolation in homogeneous groups fails to generate either the opportunity or the motivation to construct relevant categories for noticing and interpreting cultural difference.

Separation: Intentional separation from cultural difference protects world view from change by creating the conditions of isolation. Some awareness of cultural difference may yield undifferentiated broad categories, such as "foreigner" or "Asian" or "Black."

DEFENSE

Recognition of cultural difference coupled with negative evaluation of most variations from native culture - the greater the difference, the more negative the evaluation. Characterized by dualistic us/them thinking and frequently accompanied by overt negative stereotyping. Evolutionary view of cultural development

with native culture at the acme. A tendency towards social/ cultural proselytizing of "underdeveloped" cultures.

Denigration: Cognitive categories for constructing cultural difference are isolated by evaluating them negatively, thus protecting world view from change. (E.g., "I know Americans have a different culture, but everything about it proves what barbarians they are.")

Superiority: Existing cultural world view is protected by exaggerating its positive aspects compared to all other cultures. Any neutral or positive statement about another culture may be interpreted as an attack.

Reversal: Tendency to see another culture as superior while maligning one's own. Dualistic thinking is identical; only the poles are reversed.

MINIMIZATION

Recognition and acceptance of superficial cultural differences such as eating customs, etc., while holding that all human beings are essentially the same. Emphasis on the similarity of people and commonalty of basic values. Tendency to define the basis of commonalty in ethnocentric terms (i.e., since everyone is essentially like us, "just be yourself").

Physical Universalism: Emphasis on commonalty of human beings in terms of physiological similarity. (e.g., "After all, we're all human!").

Transcendent Universalism: Emphasis on commonalty of human beings as subordinate to a particular supernatural being, religion, or social philosophy. (e.g., "We are all children of God, whether we know it or not.")

ACCEPTANCE

Recognition and appreciation of cultural differences in behavior and values. Acceptance of cultural differences as viable alternative solutions to the organization of human existence. Cultural

relativity. The beginning of ability to interpret phenomena within context. Categories of difference are consciously elaborated.

Behavioral Relativism: All behavior exists in cultural context. Ability to analyze complex interaction in culture-contrast terms.

Value Relativism: Beliefs, values, and other general patterns of assigning "goodness" and "badness" to ways of being in the world all exist in cultural context.

ADAPTATION

The development of communication skills that enable intercultural communication. Effective use of empathy, or frame of reference shifting, to understand and be understood across cultural boundaries.

Empathy: Ability to consciously shift perspective into alternative cultural world view elements and act in culturally appropriate ways in those areas.

Pluralism: Internalization of more than one complete world view. Behavior shifts completely into different frames without much conscious effort.

INTEGRATION

The internalization of bicultural frames of reference. Maintaining a definition of identity that is "marginal" to any particular culture. Seeing one's self as "in process."

Contextual Evaluation: Ability to use multiple cultural frames of reference in evaluating phenomena. Similar to "contextual relativism" in Perry's terms.

Constructive Marginality: Acceptance of an identity that is not primarily based in any one culture. Ability to facilitate constructive contact between cultures - for one's self and for others. Participation to some extent in a "marginal reference group," where other marginals rather than cultural compatriots are perceived as similar.