

Developing Rubrics to Assess
the Development of Intercultural Competence
of Japanese University Students
as a Learning Outcome of Study Abroad

日本人大学生の海外研修による学修成果としての
「異文化能力」を検証するルーブリックの開発

Koji IGAWA and Miki TSUKAMOTO

井川好二・塚本美紀

Developing Rubrics to Assess the Development of Intercultural Competence of Japanese University Students as a Learning Outcome of Study Abroad

日本人大学生の海外研修による学修成果としての
「異文化能力」を検証するルーブリックの開発

Koji IGAWA and Miki TSUKAMOTO

井川 好二・塚本 美紀

It is the intention of the authors to explore theoretical and practical foundations for developing a tool suitable to assess Japanese university students' development of intercultural competence during study abroad. The study is to (1) introduce the concept of "intercultural competence" and the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence (IKC) VALUE Rubric by AAC&U, (2) review the current literature on the specific issues and needs of Japanese university students during study abroad, and (3) offer suggestions and advice the current authors received from ESL teachers and university management in the United States and the United Kingdom, who have been in contact with and have given advice to Japanese university students during their study abroad. A major part of this section includes specific suggestions and advice given by one of the researchers who compiled the IKC Rubric. Finally, (4) to conclude this study, discussions of how to assess intercultural competence of Japanese university students during study abroad are to follow, and ideas to modify the rubrics to the needs of Japanese students are also appended.

INTRODUCTION

Intercultural competence offers the chance of transcending the limitations of one's own world view. "If you want to know about water," someone once said, "don't ask a goldfish." Those who have never experienced another culture nor struggled to communicate through another language, like the goldfish, are generally unaware of the milieu in which they have always existed. (Fantini, 2000, p. 31)

Assessing learning outcomes in higher education is becoming crucially important all over the world. It is particularly significant today when university education is becoming increasingly "universalized" (Trow, 1973) and universities worldwide are competing for eligible students (Findlay, King, Smith, Geddes, & Skeldon, 2012). Study abroad is one area of student learning where assessing learning outcomes is emerging as a necessary component for the program. Williams (2005) argues;

Without concrete evidence of values and outcomes, study abroad experiences will lack the credence afforded other educational programs. More importantly, measuring outcomes of study abroad should be conducted in light of the skills that are needed for success in today's world. (p. 357)

Along with target language proficiency, intercultural competence is expected as a major outcome of study abroad. Although it has been pointed out that intercultural competence is difficult to measure because of its qualitative rather than quantitative nature. Deardorff (2011), for example, states:

Assessing intercultural competence as a learning outcome is not only possible but also necessary as postsecondary institutions seek to graduate global-ready students. ... How well prepared are our students for this global world in which we live and work? (p. 77)

It is the intention of the current authors to explore theoretical and practical foundations for developing a tool suitable to assess Japanese university students' development of intercultural competence while studying abroad.

The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) is an organization of universities and colleges in the United States of America and its current membership is 1,335.¹⁾ AAC&U has published a number of rubrics, and the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence (IKC) VALUE Rubric is one of them. It is part of their effort to make visible the outcome of intercultural education in higher education.

It could be argued that to adopt AAC&U's rubrics to assess Japanese university students' intercultural competence is more feasible and practical than to develop an original assessment tool for this specific group of learners, as these rubrics were compiled taking advantage of the scholarly knowledge of the field and practical assessment efforts of many member institutions, and have been used and tested at a large number of colleges and universities in the United States.

Still, AAC&U's VALUE Rubrics are specifically designed and conducted for university students in the United States of America. Therefore, the application of the rubrics to a group of students in a different educational context naturally needs due consideration and, possibly, modification.

Needless to say, there are other tools developed for similar purposes, mostly in the U.S. However, as Deardorff (2011) argues, by and large, other tools of intercultural competence assessment are theoretical

1) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Association_of_American_Colleges_and_Universities

in nature, “not based on actual research” (p. 68). Fantini (2009) indicates a comprehensive list of intercultural competence assessment tools. See also, for example, Blair (2017), and Spitzberg and Changnon (2009).

This study is, therefore, designed to (1) introduce the concept of “intercultural competence” and the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric developed by AAC&U, (2) review the current literature on the specific issues and needs of Japanese university students while studying abroad, and (3) provide suggestions and advice the current authors received from ESL teachers and university management people in the United States and the United Kingdom who have been in contact with and have given advice to Japanese university students during their study abroad. It is also a major part of this section to offer specific suggestions and advice given by one of the researchers who compiled AAC&U’s IKC Rubric, Dr. Darla Deardorff, who was kind enough to make individual comments on this study. Finally, (4) to conclude this study, discussions of assessing intercultural competence among Japanese university students who study abroad are included, and ideas to modify the rubrics for Japanese students are also appended.

I. Intercultural Competence: Definition & Rubric

The ‘cultural turn’ - the introduction of ‘intercultural competence’ to complement ‘communicative competence’ – has further refined the notion of what it is to be competent for communication with speakers of different languages. Teachers and learners now need to be ‘aware’ of other people’s ‘cultures’ as well as their own, and therefore, the term ‘intercultural (communicative) competence’ has emerged, along with other terms such as ‘cultural awareness’ and ‘transnational competence’. (Byram, Holmes, & Savvides, 2013, p. 251)

A. Definition of “Intercultural Competence”

Intercultural competence is a complex set of abilities necessary when communicating and interacting with people of different cultures. It is variously defined, and seemingly impossible to come to a unified definition (Deardorff, 2016a). In this rapidly globalizing age, however, intercultural competence is one of the competencies university education should foster within their students all over the world; it “offers the chance of transcending the limitations of one’s own world view” (Fantini, 2000, p. 31). In order to construct a feasible curriculum for intercultural education, a reasonable definition of intercultural competence is indispensable, more now than ever.

A leading scholar in the field, Dr. Darla Deardorff, undertook a project to compile a workable

definition by utilizing a structured communication technique, the Delphi method (Deardorff, 2006), with noted researchers and has come up with the following definition, which is now generally agreed upon in the field:

Intercultural competence is, broadly speaking, about communication and behavior that is both effective and appropriate in intercultural interactions, with effectiveness referring to the degree to which the individual's goals were achieved while appropriateness refers to the manner and context in which those goals were achieved. (Deardorff, 2016a, p. 121) (Emphasis added)

A more compact and straightforward version is by J. M. Bennett (2008), which defines intercultural competence as:

...a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts. (p. 97)

J. M. Bennett (2008) also lists the three dimensions (cognitive, affective, and behavioral) of intercultural competence culled from the work of leading authors in the field (p. 97), which clearly illustrates the areas related to the competence:

Table 1. Dimensions of Intercultural Competence

#	Dimension	Competencies
1	The cognitive dimension, or <i>mindset</i>	knowledge of culture-general maps or frameworks, of specific cultures, of identity development patterns, of cultural adaptation processes, and of cultural self-awareness
2	The behavioral dimension, or <i>skillset</i>	the ability to empathize, gather appropriate information, listen, perceive accurately, adapt, build relationships, resolve problems, and manage social interactions and anxiety
3	The affective dimension, or <i>heartset</i> , of attitudes and motivation	first and foremost, curiosity, as well as initiative, nonjudgmentalness, risk taking, cognitive flexibility, open-mindedness, tolerance of ambiguity, flexibility, and resourcefulness

(Adopted from Bennett, J. M., 2008, p. 97; italics added)

It is interesting to observe that some of the competencies listed have been found in the fields of SLA (second language acquisition) and TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages); "cultural self-awareness", "appropriate information", "perceive accurately", "risk taking", and "tolerance of ambiguity" (e.g., Ellis, 1994; Richards & Schmidt, 2002).

Alternatively, Barrett, Byram, Lázár, Mompoin-Gaillard, and Philippou (2014) offer a similar definition for the Council of Europe:

Intercultural competence is therefore a combination of attitudes, knowledge, understanding and skills applied through action which enables one, either singly or together with others, to:

- understand and respect people who are perceived to have different cultural affiliations from oneself;
- respond appropriately, effectively and respectfully when interacting and communicating with such people;
- establish positive and constructive relationships with such people;
- understand oneself and one's own multiple cultural affiliations through encounters with cultural "difference". (pp.16-17) (Emphasis added)

They further explain the terms, "respect", "appropriate", and "effective" as follows:

Here, the term "respect" means that one has regard for, appreciates and values the other; the term "appropriate" means that all participants in the situation are equally satisfied that the interaction occurs within expected cultural norms; and "effective" means that all involved are able to achieve their objectives in the interaction, at least in part. (p.17)

While "appropriate" and "effective" are the features similarly mentioned in the other definitions, the term "respect" is not specifically included. Deardorff (2006) however, points out that in her search for a unified definition of "intercultural competence" the feature of "the understanding of others' world views" was the only element that received agreement from all the intercultural competence scholars and that "substantiates other literature that upholds respect for other worldviews as essential to intercultural competence" (p. 248).

The other definition of intercultural competence worth noting here is that of UNESCO (2013):

Intercultural competences refer to having adequate relevant knowledge about particular cultures, as well as general knowledge about the sorts of issues arising when members of different cultures interact, holding receptive attitudes that encourage establishing and maintaining contact with diverse others, as well as having the skills required to draw upon both knowledge and attitudes when interacting with others from different cultures. (p. 16)

Although UNESCO sees the competency in plural, "intercultural competences", and their wording is unique, the definition ultimately states the same thing, including the three dimensions J. M. Bennett (2008) summarizes.

On a similar note, Block (2007/2009) mentions the prerequisites for developing intercultural competence:

Intercultural competence is said to rely on two pre-conditions: the ability to relativize one's own culture, consisting of beliefs, value systems and behaviours (savoir être) and an acquired knowledge about cultures other than one's own. (p. 142) (Emphasis added)

It might be significant to note that Block emphasizes “the ability to relativize one's own culture”, or “cultural self-awareness” as J. M. Bennett (2008) posits, and the “acquired” nature of cultural knowledge of others’, which could constitute major components of pre-departure programs for study abroad (Bennett, J. M., 2008, p. 97).

Deardorff (2016a) summarizes the characteristics of intercultural competence as follows:

- Intercultural competence can be assessed, as illustrated by the over 100 existing assessments.
- Intercultural competence is a complex, broad, learning goal and must be broken down into more discrete, measurable, learning objectives representing specific knowledge, attitude or skill areas.
- The attainment of intercultural competence is a lifelong developmental process which means there is no point at which one becomes fully interculturally competent.
- Language fluency is a necessary component, but in itself insufficient to achieving intercultural competence.
- Intercultural competence should be intentionally addressed throughout the curriculum and through experiential learning (such as study abroad, service learning, and so on).
- Faculty need a clearer understanding of intercultural competence in order to more adequately address this in their courses (regardless of discipline) and in order to guide students in developing intercultural competence. (p. 121) (Emphasis added)

Although all the points raised are valuable in designing, conducting, and assessing educational programs for developing intercultural competence, such as study abroad, two of them stand out as salient: “The attainment of intercultural competence as a lifelong developmental process”, which means even the instructor of the program must keep on working on his/her intercultural competence, and “Language fluency is necessary, but in itself insufficient to achieve intercultural competence”, the idea being in line with M. J. Bennett (1997)’s warning of “fluent fool”; “someone who speaks a foreign language well, but doesn’t understand the social or philosophical content of that language” (p. 16).

It is natural to assume, as Jackson (2011) asserts:

In this globalized, interconnected world, intercultural competence is as vital as foreign language competence and it is simply naïve to assume that they will develop automatically and simultaneously. (p. 183)

For example, Savicki, Arrúe, and Binder (2013) investigate the learning outcomes of American university students' study abroad in Austria and Spain and state as a result that "language learning is neither a necessary nor sufficient cause for intercultural competence" (p. 54). They further maintain:

The relationship between language fluency and intercultural competence has layers of complexity. Simply plunking students into a foreign culture guarantees neither increased language learning nor increased intercultural competence. In theory, these goals of study abroad should mutually reinforce each other, yet the methods to accomplish this end remain to be uncovered. (pp. 54-55)

B. AAC&U's Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric


There are a variety of tools published to assess the development of intercultural competence. AAC&U's Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Rubric is one of the most popularly used ones. Many American universities are applying this rubric as an assessment tool, including Kansas State University, University of Massachusetts, and Texas A & M. Listing all the Value rubrics by AAC&U's, University of Massachusetts, for example, explains:

AAC&U VALUE Rubrics ²⁾

The VALUE initiative involved teams of faculty and other educational professionals from over 100 higher education institutions engaged over many months to develop 16 VALUE rubrics for the LEAP [Liberal Education and America's Promise] Essential Learning Outcomes. Drafts of each rubric were then tested by faculty with their own students' work on over 100 college campuses. For more information about the AAC&U VALUE Rubrics, visit their website.

The major part of AAC&U's Intercultural Knowledge and Competence (IKC) Value Rubric (2009) is shown below, which seem reasonable for assessing the intercultural competence development of Japanese university students and its details are included in the Appendix:

2) <https://www.umass.edu/oapa/tools-and-services/aacu-value-rubrics>

Table 2. AAC&U's Intercultural Knowledge & Competence (IKC) VALUE Rubric³⁾


Areas of the Rubric (by AAC&U)

No.	Area	
1	Knowledge	Cultural self-awareness 文化的自己認識
2		Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks 体系的な文化的世界観
3	Skills	Empathy 感情移入, 共感
4		Verbal and nonverbal communication 言語・非言語によるコミュニケーション
5	Attitudes	Curiosity 好奇心
6		Openness 寛大さ・偏見のなさ

(Japanese Translation Added)

Along with the IKC rubric, AAC&U appends a glossary of terminologies incorporated in the rubric, including that of “intercultural competence”, which is in fact the one by J. M. Bennett (2008) cited above. Other terms are defined in Table 3.

Table 3. Glossary (AAC&U)**For clarifying terms and concepts used in the IKC VALUE Rubric**

#	Item	Definition
1	Culture	All knowledge and values shared by a group.
2	Cultural rules and biases	Boundaries within which an individual operates in order to feel a sense of belonging to a society or group, based on the values shared by that society or group.
3	Empathy	“Empathy is the imaginary participation in another person’s experience, including emotional and intellectual dimensions, by imagining his or her perspective (not by assuming the person’s position).” (J. M. Bennett, 1998)
4	Intercultural experience	The experience of an interaction with an individual or groups of people whose culture is different from your own.
5	Intercultural/cultural differences	The differences in rules, behaviors, communication and biases, based on cultural values that are different from one’s own culture.
6	Suspends judgment in valuing their interactions with culturally different others	Postpones assessment or evaluation (positive or negative) of interactions with people culturally different from one self. Disconnecting from the process of automatic judgment and taking time to reflect on possibly multiple meanings.
7	Worldview	Worldview is the cognitive and affective lens through which people construe their experiences and make sense of the world around them.

Arranged from AAC&U's Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric, <https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/intercultural-knowledge>

3) Taken from <https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/intercultural-knowledge>

Some items need comments for further understanding. First, probably, we need a little more detailed explanation of “culture”, a term that presents so much. According to the anthropologist, Geertz (1973), culture could be compared to the “webs”:

Believing, with Max Weber, that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning. It is explanation I am after, construing social expressions on their surface enigmatical. (p. 5)

Second, another point to be explicated here is the question: “Is ‘intercultural’ similar to ‘cross-cultural’”? Deardorff (2006) explains:

It is interesting to note the variety of terminology used by administrators to refer to the concept of intercultural competence, with more than six different terms cited by administrators, including cross-cultural competence, global competence, intercultural competence, and global citizenship. Though these terms are similar, there remain subtle differences in their definitions. It is apparent that consensus has not yet been reached among administrators as to what terminology is best to use. (p. 247) (Emphasis added)

In other words, since there are only subtle differences in these definitions, it might be acceptable to use them interchangeably. Alizadeh and Chavan (2016) mention another example of different definitions with subtle variations, pointing out that while health-related researchers use the term ‘cultural competence’, business-related scholars prefer to use terms such as ‘intercultural competence’, ‘intercultural communication competence’, ‘cultural intelligence’, ‘cross-cultural competence’, and ‘intercultural competency’ (p. e120), all of which could be used synonymously.

Third, the word “empathy” also needs some examination. Although the term might seem a little awkward in the “Skills” section of the rubric, which will be examined later. Following Gudykunst (1991), Pusch (2009) explains it as “Cross-cultural empathy”: “being able to participate in another person’s experience in your imagination; thinking it intellectually and feeling it emotionally” (p. 70).

Pusch explicates the term in detail:

The ability to connect emotionally with people and showing compassion for others, being able to listen actively and mindfully, and viewing situations from more than one perspective is an important set of skills that demonstrate empathy. (p. 70)

Fourth, the expression, “Suspends judgment in valuing their interactions with culturally different others”, might remind us of Nick in *The Great Gatsby* (Fitzgerald, 1926/1982) when he says:

Reserving judgments is a matter of infinite hope. I am still a little afraid of missing something if I forget that, as my father snobbishly suggested and snobbishly repeat, a sense of the fundamental decencies is parceled out unequally at birth. (p. 7)

Finally, “worldview”. M. J. Bennett (2004) mentions that “the crux of intercultural adaptation is the ability to have an alternative cultural experience”, which, by and large, matches the experience of people in a different culture. “People who can do this have an intercultural worldview” (Bennett, M. J., 2004, p. 74).

II. Issues of Japanese University Students in Study Abroad

Experiencing difference does not automatically come with learning a foreign code. The potential of the foreign language for defamiliarisation, for the discovery of alternative realities is there, but it must be actualised”. (Kramersch, 1993, p.357)

In the United States, although the number of university students participating in study abroad is growing, Derek Bok, former president of Harvard University, laments in his influential book, *Our Underachieving Colleges*, “In its current form, however, overseas education (or service work abroad) achieves far less than it might in increasing the global understanding of undergraduates” (Bok, 2006, p. 236). It might be said that the situation is not much different with Japanese university students’ study abroad programs.

A study abroad scholar, Collentine (2009), points out the paucity of quantitative research into the input and interaction students get in study abroad and questions “the assumptions that learners receive vast amounts of input and have numerous opportunities for communicative interaction” (p. 226). See, for example, Kinginger (2010) and Root and Ngampornchai (2013).

Kinginger, a leading researcher in language learning in study abroad contexts, summarizes the findings of current literature on the outcomes of study abroad:

- Study abroad holds great potential for students’ intellectual growth through integrated language and culture learning.
- However, the outcomes and qualities of student experience are highly variable.
- When students do not make dramatic gains in language ability or intercultural awareness

despite a professed desire to do so, it is because they do not become sufficiently or meaningfully engaged in the practices of their local host communities or because they lack guidance in interpreting their observations. (Kinging, 2011, p. 67) (Emphasis added)

Further, Kinginger (2011) suggests the reasons why study abroad students are not engaged in interactions with local people and communities might be:

1. students' or programs' de-emphasis on language learning in favor of other goals, such as the accumulation of symbolic capital through tourism;
2. a retreat into national superiority based on observations about gender-related or other cultural practices;
3. increasingly, the tendency to remain virtually "at home," tied to an electronic umbilical cord or an immense personal library of home-based media;
4. inadequate preparation to practice the language, to understand the nature of language learning, and to observe and reflect upon their experiences in an unbiased manner. (p. 67)

Tendencies such as "national superiority", "remaining virtually 'at home'", and "inadequate preparation" sound unsurprising and seem quite applicable to Japanese university students.

A significant number of research efforts have been made to investigate Japanese learners of English in study abroad contexts and the learning outcomes. What follows is a limited number of articles exploring these issues.

T. Tanaka and Ellis (2003) examined changes in Japanese university students' beliefs about language learning and in their English language competency in a 15-week study abroad program. The results include "statistically significant changes in the students' beliefs relating to analytic language learning, experiential language learning and self-efficacy/confidence". (p. 63)

Many EFL (English as a Foreign Language) teachers in Japan, like in other "Expanding Circle" (Kachru, 1991) countries, experienced study abroad before starting to teach. Igawa (2014) investigated the impact of overseas experience on Japanese EFL teachers and their professionalism, and concluded:

The teachers' overseas experience and the confidence thereof have a long lasting impact on their career and help them establish and maintain themselves as a role model for their students. (p. 368)

This “role model” naturally includes language proficiency and intercultural competence.

K. Tanaka (2007) qualitatively investigated how 29 Japanese students communicated with English-speaking people outside the classroom during a 12-week study abroad program in New Zealand. Tanaka states:

Overall, a homestay did not provide as many opportunities to speak English as the students had expected. The problem stemmed from both the students and their hosts. (p. 45)

Similar situations are observed by Kinginger (2015a), who reports a case of two American high school students studying Chinese in homestay situations in China; one of them has only a limited proficiency and the other is more advanced. The students received a different language socialization process.

Also, researching Japanese students in an intercultural context, Kinginger (2015b) states:

Much depends not only upon the ways in which learners are received by their host communities, but also upon the personal desires and dispositions students themselves bring to their experiences. (p. 52)

As for major findings, K. Tanaka (2007) lists (1) learners’ initial target language (L2) proficiency, and (2) native speakers’ adjustment to learners’ level of L2 proficiency, as “a crucial factor in determining the quality and quantity of contact with the L2 in natural settings outside the classroom” (p. 36).

An important affective trait to promote communication and intercultural learning could be “willingness to communicate” on both sides. Willingness to communicate (WTC) is a concept developed in first language research and popularly used in second language research as well. It could be defined as: “the tendency of an individual to initiate communication when free to do so” (Yashima, 2002, p. 55).

Ujitani (2017) studied an 11-day service learning program held in a rural village north-east of Hanoi, Vietnam, involving 12 Japanese university students and six Vietnamese volunteers. The project intended to “improve Japanese students’ intercultural attitudes, knowledge, and skills that support effective and appropriate interactions with host nationals” (p. 275).

As an outcome of the project, Ujitani summarizes the following as suggestions for improvement:

1. Align real-life tasks with students' capabilities
2. Assess reciprocal benefits
3. Use observable behavioural assessment
4. Longitudinal design (p. 278)

As to (3), acknowledging the importance of assessing participants' "willingness to communicate", Ujitani mentions that it is necessary to use some "quantitative tool" together with the self-report, which is often used in this type of research:

In order to measure willingness to communicate in particular, it would be helpful to include behavioural assessment, such as frequency of participation at reflection meetings, frequency of interactions with local students or the use of communication strategies as evidence of curiosity towards the host nationals. (p. 278) (Emphasis added)

As to (4), Ujitani argues the significance of the idea that "intercultural competence is a lifelong developmental process" and proposes a longer perspective, saying, "It is important to assess their changes a year or more after the programme" (p. 278).

Motivated by the idea that a goal of second language learning is "to facilitate better communication and understanding between individuals who come from different cultural backgrounds and speak different languages" (p. 120), Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, and Shimizu (2004) investigated the significance of "self-confidence" in second language communication and undertook two investigations involving Japanese EFL students, the second of which examined 60 students participating in study abroad in the United States.

Again, "willingness to communicate" is the key feature. Yashima et al. (2004), following MacIntyre, Dörnyei, Clément, and Noels (1998), emphasize:

... communicative goals using the conceptual model of willingness to communicate (WTC), in which L2 proficiency is not regarded as the goal of learning an L2 per se but is seen as a means to achieve interpersonal/intercultural goals. (p. 120) (Emphasis added)

Since communication is the prime goal, this argument sounds similar to Deardorff's (2016a) claim that "language fluency is a necessary component, but in itself insufficient to achieving intercultural competence." As a conclusion, Yashima et al. (2004) mention:

To have self confidence in communication in an L2 is crucial for a person to be willing to communicate in that L2. In addition, students who have a greater interest in international affairs, occupations, and activities seem to be more willing to communicate in the L2 and voluntarily engage in communication more frequently. Furthermore, those who are internationally oriented seem to be motivated to study the L2. The higher level of motivation links to self-confidence, possibly through learning behavior and its resultant competence. (pp. 141-142) (Emphasis added)

While “self-confidence” is a personality trait necessary for “willingness to communicate”, other features to promote WTC are a “greater interest in international affairs, occupations, and activities” and becoming “internationally oriented,” and they seem to be in line with one of the prerequisites to develop intercultural competence. As pointed out earlier, Block (2007/2009) stresses the importance of “an acquired knowledge about cultures other than one's own” and this constitutes the “worldview” in AAC&U's IKC VALUE Rubric.

Finally, it is worth listing the implications for language study abroad that Kinginger (2015b) gleaned from a review of literature related to Japanese EFL students:

Table 4. Practical Implications for Language Study Abroad (Kinger, 2015b, pp. 63-64)

#	Item	Implication
1	Program Choice & Design	... program choice and design should include careful consideration of the ways in which students are likely to be received by the institutions they frequent and the families whose homes they visit. In the case of well-intentioned host families, there is a potential need to provide some information about language learning processes and how to foster these during everyday communication.
2	Local Meaning of Host Country Practices	... to the extent possible, students should be informed about the local meaning of host country practices they are liable to encounter, such as norms for classroom interaction and associated values. If this information cannot be provided prior to a sojourn abroad, ideally students will have access to mentoring and guidance to help them to maintain an analytical rather than a judgmental stance as they explore these practices.
3	Exposure to Non-Pedagogical Social Interactive Practices	... since from the point of view of language learning, the principle advantage of study abroad is exposure to non-pedagogical social interactive practices, students should develop awareness that these practices are an important component of language ability. Some practice in non-pedagogical communication prior to study, for example through the use of tele-collaborative pedagogies, may ease the transition to informal communication while abroad.
4	Relationship between English as a Lingua Franca & Related Constructs	...educators should be aware of the relationship between English as a Lingua Franca and related constructs, such as “international posture” (Yashima & Zenuk-Nishide, 2008) orienting students toward openness toward linguistic and cultural difference.

Regarding (1) Program Choice & Design, it is interesting to note that Kinginger (2015b) suggests host families should have access to “some information about language learning processes”, which might be conducive to students’ second language development, as K. Tanaka (2007) mentioned that “native speakers’ adjustment to learners’ level of L2 proficiency” is of significance.

The idea of informing students of (2) Local Meaning of Host Country Practices is essentially in tune with what Block (2007/2009) had to say: “an acquired knowledge about cultures other than one’s own” (p. 142). And this is naturally the major component of the “Worldview” of the rubric, which, as Deardorff (2016a) recommends, has to be “intentionally addressed”.

Participating in local interactions is an important key to the success of study abroad programs, so it is quite natural for Kinginger to push (3) “Exposure to Non-Pedagogical Social Interactive Practices”. It might also be productive to initiate pre-departure intercultural exchanges via telecommunication technology.

“Openness” is another feature of the rubric listed here. The concept of “English as a lingua franca (ELF)” is now well established, and as Kinginger mentions, students should be aware of and open to variations of ELF (4). According to Seidlhofer (2005):

In recent years, the term ‘English as a lingua franca’ (ELF) has emerged as a way of referring to communication in English between speakers with different first languages. ... Although this does not preclude the participation of English native speakers in ELF interaction, what is distinctive about ELF is that, in most cases, it is “a ‘contact language’ between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common (national) culture, and for whom English is the chosen foreign language of communication” (Firth, 1996, p. 240). (p. 339)

Naturally, the English that students encounter during study abroad might be variations of ELF. The students should be guided so that they do not shun interactions in ELF.

III. Suggestions and Advice: Faculty and Management of Study Abroad Host Institutions, and the Leading Intercultural Competence Researcher, Dr. Deardorff

... a closer look is required at those assessment efforts which, although growing in popularity, are not always designed well, executed effectively, or leveraged to maximum effect. (Deardorff, 2016b, p. 89)

The current authors implemented a small-scale survey on Japanese university students’ intercultural

competence using AAC&U's Values Rubric in 2016 (Igawa & Tsukamoto, 2017). We found that the rubric was very helpful for assessing Japanese students' intercultural competence. However, we also noticed that it might need some modification for Japanese students because the rubric was made in order to assess American university students' intercultural competence. Japanese students have their own characteristics, which might be different from American university students' in some areas.

We received suggestions and advice from the faculty and management of study abroad host institutions; ESL (English as a Second Language) instructors and university management in the United States and the United Kingdom, who have been in contact with Japanese university students on their study abroad programs, which include a community college in Utah, a private university in California, the United States, and a public university in Hampshire, the United Kingdom.

The following is the summary of their comments:

- (1) Japanese students speak less in class, but there are exceptions.

An ESL instructor at a community college in the United States, who has been teaching English to students from a variety of countries, told us it would be dangerous to be caught up in a stereotype, but that there is a tendency for each group of students who have similar cultural backgrounds to have similar characteristics. He mentioned that Japanese students generally tend to speak less in the class, but that one student who found the courage to speak out in front of the class came to get more opportunities to speak English, and immensely improved her verbal communication skills.

It is often mentioned by ELT (English Language Teaching) practitioners inside and outside Japan that Japanese students are not active in speaking, and that leads to a typical example of Asian students' "reticence" (Tsui, 1996), which sometimes has induced accusations of "overgeneralization" (e.g., Cheng, 2000).

This example the ESL instructor mentioned might probably have to do with the case of "willingness to communicate (WTC)" promoted by their self-confidence, as Yashima et al. (2004) explained.

- (2) Japanese students need exposure to non-pedagogical social interactive practices (Kinger, 2015b).

A management staff member at a university in the United Kingdom introduced us to a similar episode. He said that most of the Japanese students refuse offers to join events or club activities, but he found one of the Japanese students always accepted other students' or teachers' invitations and she remarkably

improved her English competence. He also found that she used to have difficulty joining in with others but that she tried to say “Yes” to any invitation offered to her.

He mentioned that she received more opportunities to interact with other people who spoke English through joining events or club activities with her teachers or classmates, and it improved her verbal and non-verbal communication skills. With these episodes it might be said that “courage” could be an indicator for assessing Japanese university students’ intercultural competence.

This anecdote seems exactly what Kinginger explicates when she emphasizes the importance of “non-pedagogical social interactive practices” (2015b) and explains why some students “do not make dramatic gains in language ability or intercultural awareness” (2011) ; they need to positively participate in non-pedagogical social interactive practices in and around the host insitutions.

However, Kinginger (2015b), specifically reviewing literature on Japanese students’ study abroad experience, mentions:

Japanese learners may struggle for access to engagement in local communities. ...While some students are very much attached to notions of English as access to specifically Western values and worldviews, others imagine themselves belonging to international, translingual communities where English functions as a lingua mundi, and native speaker values or norms do not apply. (p. 52)

This dichotomy of Japanese students studying abroad, belonging to which “imagined communities” (Anderson, 2006), needs to be addressed in future research. It is beyond the scope of this paper to delve into the concept of “imagined communities” and its significance for Japanese university students’ study abroad. It would suffice to mention some of the research efforts from this perspective: e.g., Sasaki (2011), Song (2012) and Trentman (2013).

At an annual conference of the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) in 2018, Dr. Darla Deardorff gave us suggestions and advice so that we could make a rubric for assessing intercultural competence of Japanese university students.

What follows is the gist of her input:

(3) Rubrics are context-dependent.

Deardorff mentioned that the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Value Rubric was just an

example and that rubrics should be made depending on the context. Further, she explained that the purpose and items of assessing should be clarified before making rubrics. She also mentioned that some research showed examples of modifying AAC&U's Value Rubric depending on their context, which we need to take into consideration.

In fact, when Deardorff (2006) studied a variety of definitions of "intercultural competence" she made it clear that a tool to assess intercultural competence is context-dependent and that it is the purpose of the assessment that determines the tool(s), not the other way round. Deardorff (2016a) says: "The starting point should not be to select a measurement tool. Rather, it should be to clarify what specifically is to be assessed by" (p. 120). When modifications are necessary according to the context, we modify the rubric to the situation.

(4) Courage or WTC

Deardorff mentioned that in some African countries, they use "courage" in their rubric to measure intercultural competence.

Actually, Deardorff (2016a) explains:

Many of the existing definitions are from *Western perspectives*. So one must ask the question "Intercultural competence according to whom and to what degree?" Perspectives from Asian viewpoints, for example, may focus more on a relational definition of intercultural competence. (p. 121) (Emphasis added)

Even from the United States, a different perspective is presented. Paine, Jankowski, and Sandage (2016) examined "humility" as a predictor of intercultural competence and show a positive result.

However, Deardorff expressed that we might need to be aware of some complication in translation when we mentioned that we had some hesitation in using "empathy" in the rubric. We certainly must check to see if the translation of the word into Japanese is appropriate and the possibility of using the concept "WTC (willingness to communicate)", which might be closer to that of "Courage".

It might be worthwhile to quote the following from J. M. Bennett (1998) comparing "empathy" and "sympathy":

Empathy may be defined as "the use of imagination to intellectually and emotionally participate in an alien experience." Often people discuss empathy in terms of "putting yourself

in the other person's shoes." But such a simple shift in position without an equal shift in personal perspective merely elicits a sympathetic response. From such a view, we know how we would feel in the situation, but not how the other person feels. To achieve an empathic response, we must not only step into the other person's shoes, but we must imaginatively participate in the other's worldview. We must not only shift our position but also our perspective on the event. (p. 221) (Emphasis added)

We might have to further study the differences between "empathy" and "sympathy" in our understanding of intercultural competence.

(5) Different Ideas from Faculty and Management

As for the design of implementation, Dr. Deardorff said to us that peer assessment was highly recommended. From the discussions at the 2018 AIEA conference, along with some research findings, we also found that faculty and administrators sometimes have different perspectives on assessment of students' intercultural competence. It is crucial to get information and ideas on assessing students' intercultural competence from faculty and administrators and to clarify the purpose and items of assessing in order to make an appropriate rubric for assessing Japanese university students' intercultural competence.

Deardorff (2006) certainly mentioned the differences in the definition of intercultural competence, and we will check into the possibility of using "peer assessment", which is, in fact, already in our research design, by collecting input from host institution faculty and management.

Certainly, "peer assessment" is well known in education. In the European Union document for developing intercultural competence through education, Barrett et al. (2014) mention the term as follows:

Assessment in general is often associated with tests, but there are many additional kinds of instrument to use in assessment – for example, portfolios and learner-diaries – and assessment can be carried out by teachers, or by learners themselves and their peers, in self- assessment or peer-assessment. (p. 19)

For further details, see Griffith, Wolfeld, Armon, Rios, and Liu (2016).

As a preliminary step to including more peer assessment in our future study, the current authors asked a colleague to give us professional comments on (1) assessing Japanese university students'

development of intercultural competence and (2) one of the skills in AAC&U's IKC Rubric, "empathy".

The colleague is a native speaker of English and has been teaching at a university in southern Japan for more than 20 years, planning and directing international programs for the Japanese and international students. What follows is a summary of his comments:

- (1) He sometimes finds a big gap between students' language competence and intercultural competence. Yet, intercultural competence is difficult to evaluate. Therefore, it is certainly a good idea to develop a tool for assessment.
- (2) According to his experience of teaching British students studying abroad in Japan, there are some different tendencies between British and Japanese students. He sees the needs for a new rubric to assess intercultural competence of Japanese university students; different intercultural competence rubrics for students from different cultural backgrounds.
- (3) As for the word "empathy" on the rubric of AAC&U, he mentions that empathy is an important competence but that it could be categorized not in "skills", but in "attitudes" or "traits", which are not included in the rubric of AAC&U. He thinks empathy is more of a "shared feeling" rather than a skill.

Working with peers definitely affords us nonpareil perspectives, which in itself is an intercultural experience for the authors.

IV. Conclusion

In this rapidly globalizing world of the 21st century, with its world-wide network of electronic communication and international flights transporting goods and people, competencies to work together with peoples of different cultures are essential. One of the important responsibilities of higher education is, therefore, to foster intercultural competence within students through a variety of programs, including study abroad, and assessing those learning outcomes is now requisite.

Intercultural competence can be defined, following J. M. Bennett (2008) as:

... a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts (p. 97).

Intercultural Competence can be assessed, though it is difficult because:

1. it has different kinds of dimensions,
2. it can be influenced by the context, and
3. the attainment of intercultural competence is a lifelong development process.

In order for Japanese university students to attain intercultural competence through study abroad programs, they need to:

1. participate in local interactions,
2. have target language proficiency, which in itself is insufficient, and
3. have support from native-level speakers who can adjust their language to the learners' level.

In order to develop a rubric to assess the development of intercultural competence of Japanese university students, the following steps should be taken: (1) modifying AAC&U's VALUE Rubric, (2) assessing their intercultural competence with the modified rubric, (3) examining the appropriateness of the modified rubric, and (4) making necessary adjustments.

Gleaned from this research, our tentative conclusions for modifying the original AAC&U's VALUE Rubric are as follows:

1. Although the current authors have some hesitation in using "Empathy" as one of the items of "Skills", we would keep this as is and see how it works with Japanese university students.
2. We would use "Willingness to Communicate (WTC)" as one of the items in "Skills" or "Attitudes" to see its impact on the rubric and the entire assessment process.
3. At this stage, it is difficult to decide which category, "Skills" or "Attitudes", WTC belongs to (further study is necessary).
4. "Courage" is an important aspect to assess Japanese students' intercultural competence, but it could be included in "Willingness to Communicate."
5. The dichotomy in the "Worldview" showing "the imagined self" of Japanese students while studying abroad (Kinging 2015b) should be taken into consideration when the current researchers go on to the stage of implementing the modified rubric.

*本研究は、日本私立学校振興・共済事業団「平成29年度 大学間連携等による共同研究」として、西南女学院大学との共同研究「異文化理解・対応力ルーブリック開発のための研究」の一環である。

あとがき

共著の分担

Koji Igawa (井川好二)

Introduction

Chapter I. Intercultural Competence: Definition & Rubric

Chapter II. Issues of Japanese University Students in Study Abroad

Miki Tsukamoto (塚本美紀)

Chapter III. Suggestions and Advice: Faculty and Management of Study Abroad Host Institutions,
and the Leading Intercultural Competence Researcher, Dr. Deardorff

Conclusion

REFERENCES

- Alizadeh, S., & Chavan, M. (2016). Cultural competence dimensions and outcomes: A systematic review of the literature. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, 24(6), e117-e130.
- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London & New York: Verso Books.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2009). *Intercultural knowledge and competence VALUE rubric*. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/intercultural-knowledge>
- Barrett, M., Byram, M., Lázár, I., Mompoin-Gaillard, P., & Philippou, S. (2014). *Developing intercultural competence through education*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Available online from: http://hub.coe.int/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=9396761c-aea8-43f3-86a6-c105b45ef756&groupId=10227
- Bennett, J. M. (1998). Transition shock: Putting culture shock in perspective. In M.J. Bennett (Ed.), *Basic concepts of intercultural communication* (pp. 215-224). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Bennett, J. M. (2008). Transformative training: Designing programs for culture learning. In M. A. Moodian (Ed.), *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Understanding and utilizing cultural diversity to build successful organizations* (pp. 95-110). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bennett, M. J. (1997). How not to be a fluent fool: Understanding the cultural dimension of language. *New ways in teaching culture*, 16-21.
- Bennett, M. J. (2004). Becoming interculturally competent. In J. Wurzel (Ed.), *Toward multiculturalism: A reader in multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 62-77). Newton, MA: Intercultural Resource Corporation.
- Blair, S.G. (2017). Mapping Intercultural Competence: Aligning goals, outcomes, evidence, rubrics, and assessment. In D.K. Deardorff & L.A. Arasaratnam-Smith (Eds.), *Intercultural competence in higher education: International approaches, assessment and application* (pp. 110-123). London & New York: Routledge.
- Block, D. (2007/2009). *Second language identities*. London: Bloomsbury.

- Bok, D. (2006). *Our underachieving colleges: A candid look at how much students learn and why they should be learning more*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Byram, M., Holmes, P., & Savvides, N. (2013). Intercultural communicative competence in foreign language education: Questions of theory, practice and research. *The Language Learning Journal*, 41(3), 251-253.
- Cheng, X. (2000). Asian students' reticence revisited. *System*, 28(3), 435-446.
- Collentine, J. (2009). Study abroad research: Findings, implications, and future directions. In M. H. Long & C. J. Doughty (Eds.), *The handbook of language teaching* (pp. 218-233). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(3), 241-266.
- Deardorff, D. K. (2011). Assessing intercultural competence. *New Directions for Institutional Research 2011*(149), 65-79.
- Deardorff, D. K. (2016a). How to assess intercultural competence. In Z. Him (Ed.), *Research methods in intercultural communication: A practical guide* (pp. 120-134). Chichester, UK: Wiley Blackwell.
- Deardorff, D. K. (2016b). Outcomes assessment in international education: Changing the paradigm. In E. Jones, R. Coelen, J. Beelen, & H. De Wit (Eds.), *Global and local internationalization* (pp. 83-89). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fantini, A. E. (2000). A central concern: Developing intercultural competence. *SIT Occasional Paper Series*, 1, 25-42.
- Fantini, A. E. (2009). Assessing intercultural competence. In D. K. Deardorff (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 456-476). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Findlay, A. M., King, R., Smith, F. M., Geddes, A., & Skeldon, R. (2012). World class? An investigation of globalisation, difference and international student mobility. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 37(1), 118-131.
- Fitzgerald, F. S. (1926/1982). *The Great Gatsby*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretations of cultures: Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books.
- Griffith, R. L., Wolfeld, L., Armon, B. K., Rios, J., & Liu, O. L. (2016). Assessing intercultural competence in higher education: Existing research and future directions. *ETS Research Report Series*, 2016(2), 1-44.
- Igawa, K. (2014). The impact of overseas experiences on Japanese EFL teachers. *Shitennoji University Bulletin*, 58, 353-375.
- Igawa, K., & Tsukamoto, M. (2017). *Developing intercultural competence of Japanese students through study abroad*. Paper presented at CamTESOL 2017, Phnom Penh, Cambodia, February 18-19, 2017.
- Jackson, J. (2011). Host language proficiency, intercultural sensitivity, and study abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 21, 167-188.
- Kachru, B.B. (1991). World Englishes and applied linguistics. In M.L. Tickoo (Ed.), *Languages & standards: Issues, attitudes, case studies*. (FL 019 461). ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 347 805. Originally, Kachru, B. B. (1990). World Englishes and applied linguistics. *World Englishes*, 9, 3-20.
- Kinginger, C. (2010). American students abroad: Negotiation of difference? *Language Teaching*, 43(2), 216-227.
- Kinginger, C. (2011). Enhancing language learning in study abroad. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics (2011)*, 31, 58-73.
- Kinginger, C. (2015a). Language socialization in the homestay: American high school students in China. In R. Mitchell, N. Tracy-Ventura, & K. McManus (Eds.), *Social interaction, identity, and language learning during*

- residence abroad: Eurosla Monographs Series, 4* (pp. 53-74). Amsterdam: The European Second Language Association.
- Kinginger, C. (2015b). Japanese students learning English abroad in an era of globalization. *JACET International Convention Selected Papers, 3*, 52-66.
- Kramsch, C. (1993). Language study as border study: Experiencing difference. *European Journal of Education, 28* (3), 349-358.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Dörnyei, Z., Clément, R., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal, 82*(4), 545-562.
- Paine, D.R., Jankowski, P.J., & Sandage, S.J. (2016). Humility as a predictor of intercultural competence: Mediator effects for differentiation-of-self. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families, 24* (1), 15-22.
- Pusch, M.D. (2009). The interculturally competent global leader. In D. K. Deardorff. (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 66-84). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Richards, J.C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching & applied linguistics* (3rd ed.). Harlow, UK: Pearson Education.
- Root, E., & Ngampornchai, A. (2013). "I came back as a new human being" Student descriptions of intercultural competence acquired through education abroad experiences. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 17* (5), 513-532.
- Sasaki, M. (2011). Effects of varying lengths of study-abroad experiences on Japanese EFL students' L2 writing ability and motivation: A longitudinal study. *TESOL Quarterly, 45*(1), 81-105
- Savicki, V., Arrúe, C., & Binder, F. (2013). Language fluency and study abroad adaptation. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 22*, 37-57.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal, 59*(4), 339-341.
- Song, J. (2012). Imagined communities and language socialization practices in transnational space: A case study of two Korean "study abroad" families in the United States. *Modern Language Journal, 96*(4), 507-524.
- Spitzberg, B., & Changnon, G. (2009). Conceptualizing intercultural competence. In D. K. Deardorff. (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 2-52). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tanaka, K. (2007). Japanese students' contact with English outside the classroom during study abroad. *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics, 13*(1), 36-54.
- Tanaka, T., & Ellis, R. (2003). Study-abroad, language proficiency, and learner beliefs about language learning. *JALT Journal, 25*(1), 63-85.
- Trentman, E. (2013). Imagined communities and language learning during study abroad: Arabic learners in Egypt. *Foreign Language Annals, 46*(4), 545-564.
- Trow, M. (1973). *Problems in the transition from elite to mass higher education*. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Berkeley, CA: McGraw-Hill.
- Tsui, A. B. M. (1996). Reticence and anxiety in second language learning. In K.M. Bailey, & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom* (pp. 145-167). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ujitani, E. (2017). A collaborative volunteer project in Vietnam. In D. K. Deardorff, & L. A. Arasaratnam-Smith (Eds.), *Intercultural competence in higher education: International approaches, assessment and application*. (pp.275-279). London & New York: Routledge.
- UNESCO. (2013). *Intercultural competences*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese EFL context. *Modern Language*

Journal, 86(1), 54–66.

Yashima, T., & Zenuk-Nishide, L. (2008). The impact of learning contexts on proficiency, attitudes, and L2 communication: Creating an imagined international community. *System*, 36(4), 566-585.

Yashima, T., Zenuk-Nishide, L., & Shimizu, K. (2004). The influence of attitudes and affect on willingness to communicate and second language communication. *Language Learning*, 54(1), 119–152.

Williams, T. R. (2005). Exploring the impact of study abroad on students' intercultural communication skills: Adaptability and sensitivity. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9(4), 356-371.

APPENDIX

INTERCULTURAL KNOWLEDGE AND COMPETENCE VALUE RUBRIC



for more information, please contact valuel@aacu.org

The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

Intercultural Knowledge and Competence is "a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts." (Bennett, J. M. 2008. Transformative training: Designing programs for culture learning. In *Contemporary leadership and utilizing cultural diversity to build successful organizations*, ed. M. A. Moodian, 95-110. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.)

Framing Language

The call to integrate intercultural knowledge and competence into the heart of education is an imperative born of seeing ourselves as members of a world community, knowing that we share the future with others. Beyond mere exposure to culturally different others, the campus community requires the capacity to: meaningfully engage those others, place social justice in historical and political context, and put culture at the core of transformative learning. The intercultural knowledge and competence rubric suggests a systematic way to measure our capacity to identify our own cultural patterns, compare and contrast them with others, and adapt empathetically and flexibly to unfamiliar ways of being.

The levels of this rubric are informed in part by M. Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (Bennett, M.J. 1993. Towards ethnocentrism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In *Education for the intercultural experience*, ed. R. M. Paige, 22-71. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press). In addition, the criteria in this rubric are informed in part by D.K. Deardorff's intercultural framework which is the first research-based consensus model of intercultural competence (Deardorff, D.K. 2006. The identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 10(3): 241-266). It is also important to understand that intercultural knowledge and competence is more complex than what is reflected in this rubric. This rubric identifies six of the key components of intercultural knowledge and competence, but there are other components as identified in the Deardorff model and in other research.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- Culture: All knowledge and values shared by a group.
- Cultural rules and biases: Boundaries within which an individual operates in order to feel a sense of belonging to a society or group, based on the values shared by that society or group.
- Empathy: "Empathy is the imaginary participation in another person's experience, including emotional and intellectual dimensions, by imagining his or her perspective (not by assuming the person's position)". Bennett, J. 1998. Transition shock: Putting culture shock in perspective. In *Basic concepts of intercultural communication*, ed. M. Bennett, 215-224. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Intercultural experience: The experience of an interaction with an individual or groups of people whose culture is different from your own.
- Intercultural/cultural differences: The differences in rules, behaviors, communication and biases, based on cultural values that are different from one's own culture.
- Suspends judgment in valuing their interactions with culturally different others: Postpones assessment or evaluation (positive or negative) of interactions with people culturally different from one self.
- Disconnecting from the process of automatic judgment and taking time to reflect on possibly multiple meanings.
- Worldview: Worldview is the cognitive and affective lens through which people construe their experiences and make sense of the world around them.

INTERCULTURAL KNOWLEDGE AND COMPETENCE VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact rubric@aca.org.



Definition

Intercultural Knowledge and Competence is "a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts." (Bennett, J. M. 2008. Transformative training: Designing programs for culture learning. In *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Understanding and utilizing cultural diversity to build successful organizations*, ed. M. A. Moodin, 95-110. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.)

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmarks (all one) level performance.

	Capstone 4	3	Milestones 2	Benchmark 1
Knowledge <i>Cultural self-awareness</i>	Articulates insights into own cultural rules and biases (e.g. seeking complexity, aware of how her/his experiences have shaped these rules, and how to recognize and respond to cultural biases, resulting in a shift in self-description)	Recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases (e.g. not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)	Identifies own cultural rules and biases (e.g. with a strong preference for those rules shared with own cultural group and seeks the same in others)	Shows minimal awareness of own cultural rules and biases (even those shared with own cultural group(s)) (e.g. uncomfortable with identifying possible cultural differences with others.)
Knowledge <i>Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks</i>	Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates partial understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates surface understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.
Skills <i>Empathy</i>	Interprets intercultural experience from the perspectives of own and more than one worldview and demonstrates ability to act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another cultural group.	Recognizes intellectual and emotional dimensions of more than one worldview and sometimes uses more than one worldview in interactions.	Identifies components of other cultural perspectives but responds in all situations with own worldview.	Views the experience of others but does so through own cultural worldview.
Skills <i>Verbal and nonverbal communication</i>	Articulates a complex understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication (e.g., demonstrates understanding of the degree to which people use physical contact while communicating in different cultures or use direct/indirect and explicit/implicit meanings) and is able to skillfully negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.	Recognizes and participates in cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication and begins to negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.	Identifies some cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication and is aware that misunderstandings can occur based on those differences but is still unable to negotiate a shared understanding.	Has a minimal level of understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication; is unable to negotiate a shared understanding.
Attitudes <i>Curiosity</i>	Asks complex questions about other cultures, seeks out and articulates answers to these questions that reflect multiple cultural perspectives.	Asks deeper questions about other cultures and seeks out answers to these questions.	Asks simple or surface questions about other cultures.	States minimal interest in learning more about other cultures.
Attitudes <i>Openness</i>	Initiates and develops interactions with culturally different others. Suspend judgment in valuing her/his interactions with culturally different others.	Begins to initiate and develop interactions with culturally different others. Begins to suspend judgment in valuing her/his interactions with culturally different others.	Expresses openness to most, if not all, interactions with culturally different others. Has difficulty suspending any judgment in her/his interactions with culturally different others, and is aware of own judgment and expresses a willingness to change.	Receptive to interacting with culturally different others. Has difficulty suspending any judgment in her/his interactions with culturally different others, but is unaware of own judgment.

日本人大学生の海外研修による学修成果としての 「異文化能力」を検証するルーブリックの開発

井川 好二・塚本 美紀

本稿は、日本人大学生が海外研修によって身につけた「異文化能力 (Intercultural Competence)」を検証するためのルーブリック開発に向けた理論的・実践的な基盤の探求を目的としている。内容は以下の通り：(1) 「異文化能力 (Intercultural Competence)」の概念および全米大学協会による「異文化知識と能力ルーブリック」(IKC Rubric) の紹介、(2) 文献研究による海外留学中の日本人大学生の現状と課題、(3) 日本の大学生に現地でアドバイスを与えた経験を持つESLの教師や大学関係者からの提言、および IKC Rubricを編集した研究者による本研究に対する具体的な助言。および (4) これまでの検討に基づいて、海外留学における日本人大学生の異文化能力評価用としてIKC Rubricの改定案を添付する。