CROSS-CULTURAL TRAINING

A REVIEW

Dharm P. S. Bhawuk &
Richard W. Brislin

*P*ROGRAMS designed for preparing people for living in another culture are usually referred to as "Cross-Cultural or Intercultural Orientation Programs." It seems that the early practitioners and researchers viewed preparing people for international assignment as a process in which one needed to be oriented to the differences in social interactions between the two cultures. It is no surprise that the first book on the topic (Brislin & Pedersen, 1976) was titled *Cross-Cultural Orientation Programs*, and the tradition has been maintained over the years and people still refer to the field as Cross-Cultural Orientation (Brislin & Yoshida, 1993; Bhawuk, 1990; Paige, 1986). However, researchers and practitioners alike are realizing that we need to do more than orient people to prepare them to live abroad (e.g., we must introduce and practice culturally appropriate behaviors), and the field is being referred to as Cross-Cultural or Intercultural Training by more and more people (Brislin & Bhawuk, 1999; Landis & Bhagat, 1996; Triandis, 1995a; Deshpandey & Viswesvaran, 1992; Landis & Brislin, 1983).

Paige (1986) defined cross-cultural orientation as training programs designed to prepare people to live and carry out specific assignments as well as those that are designed to prepare people to return to their home country after completing their assignment in another culture. Brislin and Yoshida (1993) define cross-cultural training as formal efforts to prepare people for more effective interpersonal relations and for job success when they interact extensively with individuals from cultures other than their own (Brislin & Yoshida, 1993). Features of programs are that they are formal rather than the set of informal and unplanned behaviors that everyone undertakes when they live in another country, well-planned, budgeted, and staffed by experts who are knowledgeable about the wide range of issues people face when they live in other cultures. In addition, the scope of cross-cultural training has been expanded over the years to not only preparing people for re-entry but also preparing people within one's own country to deal with people who are from another culture (Bhawuk & Triandis, 1996a; Brislin & Horvath, 1997).

In this paper we review landmark studies and trace the evolution of concepts that have become a part of the vocabulary of cross-cultural training researchers and practitioners in the last fifty years. We discuss research and practice in phases of decades. Starting with the fifties and sixties when the foundation of the field was laid down, we discuss how the field saw early consolidation in the seventies and maturity in the eighties. We finally discuss the state of the art, both in terms of research and practice, in the nineties, and go on to identify major streams of research in the field. We end the paper with some speculation about where the field may be going in future.

Early Research Foundation: Research in 1950s and 1960s

Anthropologists provided some of the earliest concepts that laid the foundation of research on cross-cultural training. Oberg (1954, 1960) and Hall were the pioneers who provided the constructs of culture shock (Oberg, 1954, 1960) and space and time (Hall, 1959, 1966) that not only stimulated

practitioners but also researchers in the fifties and sixties. Psychologists were not far behind the anthropologists in this area, and those at the University of Illinois started many cross-cultural research projects that led to the development of the culture assimilators (Triandis, 1995a). In this section we review Oberg's work, Hall's work, the shift from lecture to experiential method, the research on culture assimilators, and the work of Stewart (1966) and Lee (1966).

Culture Shock

Oberg (1954) coined the term *Culture Shock* to describe the problems faced by people who go from one culture to another. He defined culture shock as "an occupational disease of people who have suddenly been transported abroad (1960, p. 177),"and suggested that it is "precipitated by the anxiety that results from losing all our familiar signs and symbols of social intercourse (1960, p. 178)." Thus, he used this term to describe the consequences, i.e., the personal problems that people face, both psychological and psychosomatic, in moving to other cultures. Culture shock is definitely not viewed as a disease anymore, and was never seriously considered one by researchers. However, it has become perhaps the most accepted construct to describe the emotional stress experienced by sojourners while they are living abroad. The symptoms of culture shock include both physical and psychological complaints. Physically, the sojourner may experience headaches, diarrhea, or insomnia, whereas psychologically, the sojourners may feel mild depression or psychosis.

Culture shock provided practitioners a legitimate reason to provide cross-cultural training because it would lead to the avoidance, if not elimination, of culture shock. Researchers also profited from this construct in that it provided a measure of the successful adaptation of sojourners when they moved from one culture to another. A measure of culture shock could also provide a criterion measure for evaluating cross-cultural training programs. In effect, culture shock probably provided the first conceptual tool to study the process of cross-cultural adjustment as well as to provide cross-cultural training to sojourners.

It should be noted that this construct provided a measure of the adaptation process, and might not have directly impacted the content of cross-cultural training programs. However, this construct might have inspired many practitioners to look for cultural items (e.g., behaviors, values, artifacts, etc.) that would shock their participants in a training session, thus allowing them to discuss cultural differences and better prepare the trainees for dealing with culture shock on arrival in a foreign culture. The Contrast-American method, which is discussed later, taps on this idea of shocking people in a training session by presenting values and behaviors that are almost the opposite of one's own (American in this particular case) cultural values. This construct also contributed to the notion of cultural distance in that the greater the cultural distance between two cultures, the more a sojourner would experience culture shock. This concept has stayed with the field of cross-cultural training ever since, and though research on the measurement of the construct has been rather scant (Mumford, 1998), a new framework has been presented by Triandis (1994) to provide much theoretical meaning to the construct, which is discussed later.

Furnham and Bochner (1986) presented a book length discussion of culture shock and its physiological and psychological effects on sojourners. They reported that culture shock might manifest in innocuous behaviors like excessive washing of hands or in extreme behaviors like fear of physical contact with others. People may become absentminded or have fits of anger. Sojourners may overreact to minor symptoms like skin irritations or become excessively homesick and drink to excess. These researchers found that sojourners, compared to locals, are twice as likely to commit suicide, highlighting the extent of psychological pressure experienced by people when living in another culture.

Triandis (1994) recently presented a theoretical framework for understanding how culture shock is experienced. According to his theory, there are many factors that lead the sojourner to experience culture shock while interacting with people in the host culture. If there is a history of conflict between the two cultures, if cultural distance between the two cultures is large, if neither the host

nor the sojourner know about each other's cultures, and if the second language competence of the sojourner or the host is weak, then they perceive each other to be very different, and their interactions lead to culture shock. On the contrary, if there is not a history of conflict, if the cultural distance is small, the sojourner knows about the host culture, and his or her second language competence is excellent, then the he or she is likely to perceive the other as similar to himself or herself, and is not likely to experience culture shock.

Other factors that add to reducing perception of difference are network overlap, equal status contact, and superordinate goals. When interaction between people who are from different cultures is rewarded, they interact more, their networks overlap more, and they make more isomorphic attributions (i.e., the sojourner makes the same judgment about the cause of a behavior as do people in the host culture, Triandis, 1975), thus leading to reduction or elimination of culture shock. Elements of this model have been tested in the context of a diverse workplace (Goto, 1995), but much cross-cultural research needs to be done to validate the framework.

Thus, research on culture shock has led to the development of sojourner adjustment as a field of research in the last two decades (see the review by Church, 1982). It should be noted that the conceptual work by Grove and Torbiorn (1985) has provided a new conceptualization of intercultural adjustment, which has further stimulated research in this area. Sojourner adjustment has also been approached from the acculturation perspective (see review by Ward, 1996), and has received much attention in the cross-cultural management literature (for a recent review, see Thomas, 1999). Indeed, culture shock has proved to be a fertile research bed.

Time and Space

Hall (1959, 1966) provided another set of conceptual tools on culture that facilitated the development of cross-cultural training as a field. Hall worked as the Director of the State Department's Point Four Training program in the 1950s. In this capacity he was responsible for training technicians and administrators going abroad to work on development projects, and he provided them the skills necessary to communicate across cultures. This responsibility provided him the opportunity to translate his ideas in practice, and he created some of the earliest cross-cultural training programs. Hall (1959) emphasized communication since he argued that most cross-cultural misunderstandings resulted from distortions in communication among people.

Unlike his predecessors who studied culture at two levels, overt versus covert culture (i.e., the iceberg analogy) or explicit versus implicit culture (Kluckhohn, 1949), Hall (1959) proposed that any aspect of culture could be studied at three levels, formal, informal, and technical, since humans operate at all these levels. The formal level refers to behaviors or values that everyone knows about and takes for granted. For example, formal time in the U. S. would refer to everyone knowing that meetings start on time, buses run on time, people get upset if appointments are not kept, and so forth. These aspects of time are taken for granted in the daily life. Informal time refers to rather vague or imprecise references that vary from situation to situation. Some examples of informal time would be "awhile," "in a minute," "later," and so forth (Hall, 1959, p. 64). Technical time refers to how scientists and engineers define and use time, and is likely to be unknown to a lay person. He discussed in detail how time and space could be studied at these three levels, and gave many cross-cultural examples to illustrate how space and time could be used to analyze and study culture. He argued that these three aspects are generalizable to all aspects of culture, and are present in all situations, but only one of them dominates, or is salient, at any instant in time.

The adult members teach formal aspects of a culture to the younger members. When a young member makes a mistake, he or she is promptly reminded that the behavior is inappropriate, and is asked to change the behavior. Formal aspects of a culture are characterized by right or wrong, without scope for any gray area. By contrast, members learn the informal aspects of a culture by modeling the behaviors of other adults. Therefore, informal aspects of a culture are by nature implicit, flexible, and with some variation across different people in a culture. Technical aspects of a culture are those that are transmitted either orally or in writing, from the teacher to the

student. Technical aspects of a culture, therefore, are explicit, often associated with cohort teaching (one teacher can give lessons to a large number of people at the same time), and could even be taught from a distance. The written religious texts (e.g., the Bible) would be an example of the technical aspects of a religion, and it can be easily seen how a text like the Bible was used to proselytize people who lived very far from Rome.

According to Hall (1959), formal behaviors make up the core of a culture, which is surrounded by informal behaviors that are adaptations of the formal behaviors, and the technical aspects provide the structural support for the core formal behaviors. Deep emotions are associated with the violation of the formal aspects of a culture, whereas milder affect is associated with the violation of the informal aspects of a culture. The technical aspects of culture can be discussed and explained, and are proposed to be affect free, however, the violation of technical rules are also associated with strong emotional reactions. The technical aspects of a culture are usually associated with codified rules and law because of their explicitness. When one observes cultural changes, technical changes are the ones that are most visible, and are often counter to the older formal norms, eventually becoming the basis of a new formal system. They are also the easiest to effect change from the outside, by an outsider, because of their technical and rational nature. Formal elements of a culture are the most difficult to change, and evolves slowly over the years, almost imperceptibly.

Hall (1966) created a science of human experience with social and personal space, and used the term proxemics to describe how culture influences human's use of space. He argued that people from different cultures not only speak different languages but also "inhabit different sensory worlds (p. 2)," and create different environment around themselves. He classified distance into four categories. Intimate distance refers to the situations when sight, sound, smell, etc., signal that another person is in close proximity. When one is comforting another person (love making or wrestling would be other situations), the distance between them is categorized as intimate. Personal distance refers to the "distance consistently separating the members of non-contact species (p. 119)." It is a distance (of one and one half to four feet) at which a person can lay his or her hands on the other person. In terms of relationships, a spouse can stay within the personal distance, but another person in this zone would make the person uncomfortable. Social distance refers to the situation when people do not expect to touch each other, and are far enough (four to seven feet) so that one cannot touch the other. Finally, public distance refers to a distance of twelve or more feet between people. He studied cultural differences in the use of space among the American, French, German, Japanese, and the Arab cultures. His research helped us understand cultural differences in privacy, face-to-face communication, crowding behavior, eye contact, and many other social behaviors. His studies revealed many interesting cultural differences, e.g., the Arabs use olfaction and touch more than Americans. Hall's work has greatly impacted the intercultural research and practice, especially in intercultural communication. His work greatly contributed toward the content of cross-cultural training in that cultural differences pertaining to time, space, and non-verbal communication came to be a central part of most cross-cultural training programs.

Toward Experiential Methods

Harrison and Hopkins (1967) also made significant impact on the field in the sixties. They evaluated training programs that used the lecture method to prepare people for living abroad. They found that the lecture method was, at that time, the most pervasive method or approach to cross-cultural training, and one that was used without much reservation. They recommended that the experiential method was superior to the lecture method. This led to a growth in the development of experiential exercises as well as the culture assimilator, which will be discussed at length below. They gave five reasons why the *University Model* or the lecture method in which a trainer lectures to a group of trainees about the target culture, usually its history, geography, religion, people, business, way of life, and so forth, was not effective in cross-cultural training programs.

First, the university model assumes passive rather than active learning. In lecture method, the trainees are provided information in a package, almost in a canned fashion (i.e., open the can and

the information is there for use), by the expert, whereas, in real life the onus of information collection lies on the trainee or sojourner. Second, this method traditionally involves trainees in problem solving types of activities, where well-defined problems are provided by the instructor. In real life, however, the sojourners have to identify the problem by themselves before they can attempt to address it. Third, in the class room people are encouraged to be rational and unemotional; whereas in real life the sojourners have to confront situations that are charged with emotion, and they need to develop "the emotional muscle", which is needed in intercultural interactions. Fourth, the university model usually requires participants to study material and produce an analytical report, what Trifonovitch (1977) called a "paper orientation," whereas, in intercultural interaction people need skills to interact with people, or a "people orientation." Finally, this method focuses on written more so than the verbal communication, whereas, the major mode of communication for sojourners is oral and nonverbal. Thus, Harrison and Hopkins (1967) do make a strong case against the classroom method that follows the traditional teaching approach.

Despite the criticism, there are many reasons for the university method to still be popular. This is a method to which most people have exposure, and is simple, flexible, and inexpensive. Also, trainers can use video films, slides, and other visual aids to show cultural differences. However, as mentioned earlier the article by Harrison and Hopkins (1967) provided a major stimulation to the development of the experiential method of cross-cultural training, thus contributing to methodological innovation in the field.

Culture Assimilators

The culture assimilator is the contribution of the psychologists from University of Illinois (Triandis, 1995a). It is a cross-cultural training tool that consists of a number of real-life scenarios describing puzzling cross-cultural interactions and explanation for avoiding the emerging misunderstandings. These scenarios or vignettes are called critical incidents (Flanagan, 1954). These critical incidents describe intercultural interactions between a sojourner and a host country national that depict a misunderstanding because of cultural differences between the two people. At the end of the critical incident a question is posed that asks the reader to reflect on the scenario and think about the source of misunderstanding. The question is followed by four or five alternatives that are plausible behavioral choices for a person facing such a social situation. In effect, the reader is asked to make attributions and then to compare his or her attributions with the ones provided at the end of the incident. One of these alternatives represents a view from one of the two cultures involved in the situation and a second one captures the views of the second culture. The rest of the alternatives try to capture a range of individual differences present in either of the cultures, but are usually less appropriate or desirable. Thus, one would be behaving correctly in his or her own culture if he or she selected one particular alternative, but another alternative would have to be selected for the person to behave appropriately in the second culture.

For each of the alternatives, an explanation is offered, usually on a separate page. The explanation gives the rationale why a particular behavior (alternative) is not appropriate in the given situation. Hence, the culture assimilator consists of a number of critical incidents that have three parts: An incident or a short story, four or five alternative behavioral choices or attributions, and explanations or feedback about why an alternative is to be preferred or not.

Culture assimilators are one of the earliest structured training materials, which fall in the broad category of Programmed Instruction. Trainees are given the package of training material that consists of a number of incidents, alternatives, and explanations to study at their own pace. This makes the assimilator a convenient self-learning tool. Since different people are at different levels of cultural sensitivity, this method is particularly useful as a cross-cultural training tool. When trainees use the assimilator as a programmed learning tool, they go on selecting one response at a time, until they find the correct response.

There has been a considerable amount of research regarding the use of the culture assimilator as a culture training technique (Gudykunst & Hammer, 1983; Malpass & Salancik, 1977; Landis & Miller, 1973; Fiedler et al., 1971; O'Brien et al., 1971; Chemers, 1969). In one of the earliest studies from the University of Illinois, Mitchell and Foa (1969) evaluated the Thai culture assimilator and geographic-area training, which consisted of lecture and films about the target culture, in the laboratory setting and measured their impact on interpersonal relations and group task performance. A sample of 32 ROTC cadets was randomly assigned to one of the two types of training programs. Following the training program, the cadets worked on a group task with two foreign students, one Thai and another from a Far Eastern culture. The group behavior and performance of the task was observed by a Thai student observer, blind to the treatment conditions. The results showed that the assimilator-trained cadets received significantly higher ratings from the observers on the effectiveness of interpersonal relations than the geographic-area-trained cadets did. However, there was no difference between the two treatment groups on the group performance measures.

Contrast American Method

Another early innovation in cross-cultural training was the culture self-awareness method in which trainees see the demonstration of a behavior that is completely opposite to one in their own culture. Stewart (1966) used this approach to train Americans going abroad and called it the Contrast-American technique. In his programs, he used a model to demonstrate a behavior that was completely opposed to the American way of doing something. The trainees interacted with the model and the session was videotaped. Following this session, the trainer debriefed the trainees. This method is valuable in developing cultural self-awareness, and one of the strengths of the method is that it emphasizes affective goals through experiential processes. This type of training works in three steps: it helps the trainees to recognize their own cultural values, who then analyze the contrasts with other cultures, and then finally apply the insight to intercultural interaction (Bennett, 1986a). An obvious weakness of the method is that it does not necessarily help the trainees to learn anything specific about the host culture(s) in which they will be interacting. Self-Reference Criterion Method

Lee (1966) defined 'Self-Reference Criterion' as the unconscious reference to one's own cultural values in communicating with people who are from other cultures. Lee also presented a way to overcome the self-reference criterion (SRC), and he called this approach the Cultural Analysis System (Lee, 1966). The four steps of Cultural Analysis System requires first to define the business problem faced by an expatriate in terms of the cultural parameters (i.e., cultural traits, values, or norms) of Culture A (i.e., sojourner's own culture), and then to define the business problem or goal in terms of the cultural parameters of Culture B (i.e., host culture). Lee advised not to make any value judgement at this point. Next, one should isolate the SRC influence in the problem and examine it carefully to see how it complicates the situation. Finally, one redefines the problem without the SRC influence and solves for the optimum business goal situation. Since the analysis is to serve adaptation in several areas of international business activities, its use must necessarily be flexible. This method can be applied to product, institution, and individual adaptation. Lee's contribution has received much less attention in the intercultural research field, but his work did have influence on business researchers. His method is also somewhat similar to the cultural self-awareness model discussed earlier in which people recognize their own cultural values, then analyze the contrasts with other cultures, and finally apply the insight to the situation to resolve the intercultural confusion in a culturally appropriate manner.

Thus, in the fifties and sixties the foundation of cross-cultural training was laid, and some of the constructs that we take for granted were developed during this time. The research on culture assimilators and the development of simulations extended into the next decades. So did the use of constructs like culture shock, space, and time in cross-cultural training. However, the work of Stewart and Lee have not received as much attention, despite their value.

The Early Consolidation of the Field: Research in 1970s

In the seventies, the first book on the topic helped the field to crystallize, and research on culture assimilators and experiential training methods blossomed. In the sixties and seventies, a large number of cross-cultural training programs were run by the American Peace Corps and other U. S. agencies, and what was learned from these programs was presented in many technical reports, especially through the Army-supported Human Resources Research office (HumRRo; see Bennett, 1986a). However, it was the widely available seminal book by Brislin and Pedersen (1976), *Cross-Cultural Orientation Programs*, that crystallized the field as an area of research and practice. To summarize the existing literature, both published and available only in limited distribution technical reports, a number of organizing themes were developed that have proven useful in later extensive reviews (Landis & Brislin, 1983; Landis & Bhagat, 1996). These included descriptions of broad orientation models, reviews of actual programs (successes and areas to improve), potential audiences for programs, program evaluation, and practical guidelines for program development. This latter topic has been a recurrent theme in the published literature given that cross-cultural training has attracted the attention of both researchers and of practitioners who have the difficult task of communicating research findings to various audiences.

Culture Assimilators

With the publication of Fiedler, Triandis, and Mitchell's article in the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, the credibility of culture assimilators as a training tool increased. Many journal articles reported the effectiveness of this method in various contexts. For example, O'Brien et al., (1971) carried out a field study comparing a culture specific assimilator for Honduras and the geography-area training. Adolescent students (n = 265) who were going to spend three weeks in Honduras as health care and community development workers with a program called "Los Amigos de las Americas" participated in the study. Some students (n = 119) were given the culture assimilator and the remaining students received the geography-area training program. The students were asked to report on their adjustment process, before arriving in Honduras, during their stay in Honduras (on a daily basis), and after returning to the U. S. The task performance of the students was rated by the program staff and the director. Results of the study indicated that the assimilator trained students who had previous experience of visiting Honduras, and thus were motivated to read the assimilator, adjusted and performed better than the other group. Those students who were not motivated to prepare themselves for the assignment, did not read the assimilator, and did not perform as well. Since the assimilator contained task related critical incidents, the authors suggested that assimilators can also have an impact on task performance, if suitably designed to include task related situations.

Worchel and Mitchell (1972), in a field study using the U.S. military and civilian advisors in Greece, found that those who were trained using the Greek culture assimilator scored significantly higher in productivity, adjustment, enjoyment of tour of duty, and interpersonal relations than the control group that did not receive any training. Also, O'Brien and Plooji (1977) found that culture assimilators have significant impact on trainees' ability to retain and generalize cultural information in that a group of students who received culture assimilator training did significantly better than the group that received chapters from a book as reading material and the control group.

The culture assimilator has also been found to be effective in training people within a country about racial differences. As a part of a research program on "Variations in Black and White Perceptions of Social Environment" (Triandis, 1977), culture assimilators were developed to train hard-core unemployed blacks and whites. In one of the studies (Weldon, Carston, Rissman, Slobodin, & Triandis, 1975), 128 white males (paid volunteers) were randomly assigned to a treatment (assimilator training) and control group (no training). The results showed that assimilator trained people made more isomorphic attributions (i.e., their attributions were significantly more similar to those made by Blacks), supporting the effectiveness of the assimilator

training. The results also showed that the assimilator trained group perceived the behaviors of blacks as significantly more intentional or rational, the group refused to stereotype blacks, perceived less social distance between black and white workers, and were more positive in evaluating conflicts between black and white workers.

Researchers have also tried to compare assimilator training with other forms of training. Using a Black Culture Assimilator, Hulgus and Landis (1979) compared assimilator training with three other types of training (i.e., role play only, assimilator training followed by role play, and role play followed by assimilator training), and a control group. The results showed that all four trained groups did significantly better than the control group on task performance as well as anxiety scales. There was no significant difference between the four treatment groups on task performance and anxiety, but the group that went through assimilator training followed by a role play was ranked significantly higher compared to all the other groups on a behavioral task that was evaluated by two black raters. In another study, Crespo (1982) found that the groups that used a Hispanic Culture Assimilator (Albert, 1983) and the assimilator followed by role play exercises made significantly more correct attributions than the control group. The participants in this study were students enrolled in a teacher training program, and the two treatment groups also out-performed the control group on the teacher-expectation scale. However, there was no difference between the two treatment groups.

In sum, studies conducted with the culture-specific assimilators have found them to be effective in many varied situations: Differing target cultures, varying lengths of training, types of measures used, types of studies conducted (field studies and laboratory research), comparisons between groups (cultural assimilator trained compared to control group, culture assimilator trained compared to another form of training, and combination training), content and context of training, and population (from teenagers to professionals abroad). Overall, the research tends to indicate that the culture assimilator is an effective training tool on the cognitive level, and it also has some positive impact on behavioral and affective criteria.

A number of assimilators are available that have been developed empirically (Vink, 1989; Tolbert, 1990), and Albert (1983) provides a list of culture assimilators that are available from different sources. One should be cautious in choosing a culture assimilator since not all the available assimilators were rigorously developed. Some cross-cultural trainers develop assimilators by writing critical incidents that are based on their personal experience, but do not go through the process of empirically testing their validity. It should also be noted that many of the culture-specific assimilators are dated. For example, the assimilators developed for Thailand, Iran, Honduras, and so forth, are more than twenty years old and may need updating.

Experiential Exercises

Experiential exercises emerged as a reaction to the traditional university model, and as a result they focus on involving the trainees a great deal. The most popular type of experiential tool is the simulation game in which trainees interact with other people following a set of guidelines provided by the trainer. Usually, trainees are divided into two groups and each represent an imaginary culture with some simple rules. Two popular simulations are BAFA BAFA (Shirts, 1973), and the Albatross (Gochenour, 1977), and many others can be found in a volume edited by Batchelder and Warner (1977). It is useful to start a training program with a simulation, but its usefulness by itself is suspect in the absence of research evidence. Ideally, the simulation should be able to produce an "Aha!" effect (Kolb, 1987), the interaction should involve trainees emotionally, and cognition should follow affect. However, many times in programs using simulations the "Aha!" effect is missing, affect is also usually low because of the artificial nature of the exercise, and though the debriefing at the end of the exercise is useful, it seems that only some very simple conclusions like "cultures are different" and "intercultural interactions are puzzling" can be drawn from the exercise. In fact, in a study that used an experimental design (Bruschke, Gartner, & Seiter, 1993), it was found that though the student participants in the group that received BAFA

BAFA simulation did become motivated about multiculturalism, they were found to have become more ethnocentric compared to the group not receiving the simulation. It is plausible that this resulted from the simulation's premature use, and could have been avoided if culture general frameworks were first introduced to trainees.

Area Simulation
Another experiential approach is the area simulation in which the target culture is simulated, usually in a natural setting. For example, Hawaii provides the natural setting for simulating life in the Pacific Islands. Trifonovitch (1977) used Hawaii for training Americans who were going to Pacific Islands to emphasize the difference between "land culture" and "sea culture," and required the trainees to support themselves by taking care of their food, water, waste disposal, entertainment, and other needs. Among other things, this training provided the opportunity to weaken habitual behaviors such as using clocks and to inculcate new behaviors like using the sun, tide, and the wind direction to think about the time of the day. The strengths of this method are that trainees learn skills that are necessary for living in the target culture on their own, with minimal guidance from the training staff, and doing is stressed over thinking or intellectualizing (Trifonovitch, 1977).

Cultural Self-Awareness Model
Kraemer's cultural self-awareness model is a training method that was developed in the seventies, and is based on the assumption that one knows one's culture so well that one really does not think about it, and one needs to be reminded about the assumptions of one's culture. The training program consists of a set of videotapes that contain 138 episodes covering 21 themes (Kraemer, 1973, 1974). Professional actors play the roles of hosts and sojourners (Americans). The trainees watch the videotape and generate themes for the episodes. Later they compare these themes with those provided by the trainer. A group discussion and a debriefing session follow to clarify any questions or doubts. This method was quite advanced for its time since it used a new technology, i.e., videotapes, and was also sophisticated theoretically since it used the principles of Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977). Bennett (1985) tested the effectiveness of this method by using a sample of exchange students, and found that the treatment group that received this training performed better than the control group. It would be interesting to examine the effectiveness of this method in comparison to other methods, and may give a boost to this method, which deserves to be used more often.

The seventies saw the early consolidation of the field through the publication of the first book on the topic (Brislin & Pedersen, 1976), the publication of many volumes of cross-cultural experiential exercises, the publication of many articles about the effectiveness of culture specific assimilators, and a steady stream of other publications in *International Journal of Intercultural Relations.*

The Maturity of the Field: Research in 1980s
The field of cross-cultural training showed signs of maturity in the eighties through the publication of theoretical books, handbooks, special issues in journals, and the development of a culture general assimilator that used a broad theoretical typology, all of which led to the integration and systematization of the field.

Theoretical Books and Handbooks
Brislin (1981) provided a theoretical foundation for intercultural interaction, which stimulated research in intercultural interaction in general, and cross-cultural training in particular. When beginning this review of what happens to people as they move across cultures, Brislin intended to have chapters based on various "audiences" or "types of experiences." Chapters were envisioned on overseas businesspeople, Peace Corps volunteers, international students, technical assistance advisors, diplomats, and so forth. But as the work proceeded, he felt that a better approach would be to suggest several broad themes that captured the range of important topics that must be

considered in extensive treatments of intercultural interactions. These included historical events in a culture, people's traits and abilities, situational forces acting upon people, the ubiquity of ingroup-outgroup distinctions and stereotypes, factors more and less under the control of administrators who organize intervention programs, changes brought about by intercultural experiences, and administrative and executive support (or lack thereof) for improved intercultural relations. In addition to organizing a wide body of relevant literature, this framework provided practical guidelines by reminding program organizers of the range of questions that might arise during a program. One piece of experience –derived wisdom for trainers is that the range of questions will be very broad and only the best-prepared trainers will deal with most questions in an efficient manner. In programs for interactions among African Americans and Anglo American in the workplace, for instance, trainers must be prepared to deal with questions about slavery (history, above). In virtually any program that is presented as cross-cultural, questions about gender may arise, such as the existence of a glass ceiling in organizations (administrative support, above).

The three volume *Handbook of Intercultural Training* (Landis & Brislin, 1983) showed the maturity of the field by integrating research in cross-cultural training in one collection. The purpose of the handbook (and its second edition, Landis and Bhagat, 1996) was to provide information useful to both practitioners and researchers about the structure, content, and evaluation of cross-cultural training programs. These is also extensive material on selection of people for overseas assignments, research and its applications, and area studies. An interesting difference between the two editions is that for the first, people who had a great deal to share (especially in area studies) were asked to contribute, but they had not necessarily had extensive cross-cultural training experience. For the second edition, the field had developed such that all the contributors were able to combine expertise in research, in-depth knowledge of relevant scholarly literature, and extensive training experience. One problematic issue in the field is undoubtedly shared by scholars and practitioners in all types of organizational and human relations training. There is not always agreement between the views of researchers and practitioners. Practitioners often feel that the contributions of researchers are dry and overly academic. Researchers feel that practitioners water down their scholarly findings and place too much importance on an exciting and attractive communication style. The two editions of the Handbook of Intercultural Training leaned toward the contributions of researchers and had academics as a major audience. This approach was at least partially offset by two volumes edited by Fowler and Mumford (1995, 1999), *Intercultural Sourcebook: Cross-Cultural Training Methods* (vols. 1 and 2). While calling upon some of the same contributors as the Handbooks, these two volumes leaned toward the concerns of practitioners while at the same time drawing from the work of active researchers. One difference, for instance, is that the two sourcebooks have far more material on trainee concerns, practical hints about introducing controversial material, "lessons learned" from extensive training experience, and so forth.

Cross-Cultural Orientation, an edited volume by Paige (1986) was the second book on the topic, and this book reported on the development in the field that took place in the decade following Brislin and Pedersen's seminal work (1976). The special issue of *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* that focused on cross-cultural training provided further stimulation to research in the field. In this special issue, Bennett (1986b) presented a developmental model that describes the various stages people go through when living in another culture. He proposed that while adapting to another culture people go through six stages, i.e., denial, defense, minimization, acceptance, adaptation, and integration. The first three stages are referred to as "ethnocentric stages," and the remaining three stages are labeled "ethnorelative stages." The model thus suggests that people go through a personal development process in which they start by using only self-reference criterion (Lee, 1966), i.e., are ethnocentric, and then develop competence to use two or more cultural reference criteria, i.e., become ethnorelative.

Intercultural Development Inventory

Bennett's (1986b) model is useful for trainers in that training program can be tailored to the needs of trainees. For example, people who are already in the acceptance stage are likely to profit

from an immersion type of training program and not from a simulation exercise used for sensitizing people to cultural differences. Similarly, people who are in the denial stage are likely to profit from a simulation exercise rather than a program that requires total immersion in another culture. Hammer (1999) reports on the psychometric development of the self-administered Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) that is derived from Bennett's model, and recommends the scale, which measures what stage of development people are in, for situations where the assessment of intercultural sensitivity is critical. The popularity of the model is reflected in various symposia organized on the model at intercultural conferences, and research on the model appears to be promising.

Culture General Assimilator

The development of the culture general assimilator (Brislin, Cushner, Cherrie, & Yong, 1986) was a significant contribution to the field in that it directed research in cross-cultural training away from the less theoretical realm of culture specific assimilators (Brislin & Bhawuk, 1999). Brislin and Pedersen (1976) stated that culture-general training refers "to such topics as self-awareness and sensitivity training that allow one to learn about himself or herself as preparation for interaction in any culture (p. 6)." The culture-general assimilator, unlike Kraemer's (1973) self-awareness model that fits the description of culture general training quite well, is not a tool to increase self-awareness, in the strictest sense. However, it still is a culture general training tool. It covers eighteen themes that have appeared in the literature as important concepts in the context of living abroad. These themes are organized around three broad headings: People's Intense Feelings, Knowledge Areas, and Bases of Cultural Differences (Brislin et al., 1986).

Sojourners strongly feel about many things during their sojourn, and some of these feelings are caused by *Anxiety* (due to unfamiliar circumstances in a new culture), *Disconfirmed Expectancies* (behaviors of hosts that are different from those expected by the sojourner), lack of emotional support from the hosts leading to a clear sense of lack of *Belonging*, *Ambiguity* in interactions with the hosts, and confrontation with one's *Prejudice and Ethnocentrism*. These five themes appear to be causally related to people's intense feelings during their stay abroad.

Eight of the other themes that Brislin et al. (1986) classified as Knowledge Areas are concepts that are crucial in understanding cultural differences. These are: *Work*, *Time and Space*, *Language*, *Roles*, *Importance of the Group and the Importance of the Individual*, *Rituals and Superstition*, *Hierarchies* (class and status), and *Values*. The culture-general assimilator prepares sojourners for differences across cultures in work attitudes and values, use of time and personal space, roles of men and women, importance of group harmony and individual achievement, local rituals and superstitions, the role of class and status in societies, and personal and social values.

The remaining five constructs refer to psychological processes of *categorization* (e.g., who is a friend or a good mother), *differentiation* (i.e., making appropriate distinction, such as various skills to overcome red tape or to identify obligations related to various relationships), the *ingroup-outgroup distinction* (e.g., as it relates to individualism and collectivism), *attribution* (e.g., the skill of making isomorphic attribution), and *learning style* (e.g., the best way to learn is not the same for people in different cultures).

The culture-general assimilator consists of 100 critical incidents that cover all the above themes. The validation sample consisted of people who had lived in many countries and had held many positions while working in another culture over the years. The 60 experts who participated in the validation of the assimilator responded to a seven-point Likert-type of scale about their agreement or disagreement with each of the four or five alternative responses to the critical incidents. Only the incidents whose responses were clearly preferred by the expert sample were included in the assimilator. Also, if more than one of the members of the validation sample criticized a critical incident then the incident was dropped.

In a number of studies, researchers have found support for the effectiveness of the culture-general assimilator (Broaddus, 1986; Bonner, 1987; McIlveen-Yarbro, 1988; Cushner, 1989; see Landis & Bhagat, 1996 for a review). Cushner (1989) examined if the culture-general assimilator helped sojourners in their adjustment overseas. Secondary school exchange students (n = 50) from 14 countries who were spending a year in New Zealand were divided into experimental and control groups. The experimental group was given 18 critical incidents from the culture-general assimilator. The control group was given another type of cross-cultural training. The results showed that the group that received the assimilator training was better able to explain culturally related causes of cross-cultural misunderstandings, perceived that it had a better control over the environment, demonstrated better application of concepts of cross-cultural interaction to a self-generated critical incident, and was more apt to take the initiative to address intercultural problems than the control group. However, the two groups could not be differentiated on the cross-cultural sensitivity inventory. Therefore, there is sufficient evidence to support the effectiveness of the culture-general assimilator developed by Brislin et al. (1986), and a second edition is currently available (Cushner & Brislin, 1996).

The State of Art: Research in 1990s
In the 1990s, researchers have focused on evaluating cross-cultural training programs using methods like meta-analysis, building theoretically meaningful models and training materials, and developing criterion measures that can be used in the evaluation of various training programs.

Cross-Cultural Training Evaluation
Researchers have paid some attention to evaluation of cross-cultural training programs. Black and Mendenhall (1990) reviewed 29 studies that had evaluated the effectiveness of various training programs. They concluded that because of cross-cultural training provided to participants, there was positive feelings about the training they received, improvement in their interpersonal relationships, changes in their perception of host nationals, reduction in culture shock experienced by them, and improvement in their performance on the job. Thus, cross-cultural training programs were found to be generally effective.

These findings were further supported in a meta-analsysis of 21 studies in which the effect of cross-cultural training was examined on five variables of interest: self development of trainees, perception of trainees, relationship with host nationals, adjustment during sojourn, and performance on the job (Deshpande & Viswesvaran, 1992). The researchers concluded that the effect of cross-cultural training on these variables was positive.

In general, field studies have showed positive effect of cross-cultural training on most of the above mentioned variables, but not the laboratory studies (Triandis, 1995a). However, in a recent laboratory study comparing three types of culture assimilators with a control group, Bhawuk (1998) found that a theory-based Individualism and Collectivism Assimilator (ICA) had significant effects on a number of criterion measures such as Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory, Category Width, attribution making, and satisfaction with training compared to a culture-specific assimilator for Japan, a culture-general assimilator (Brislin et al., 1986), and a control group. Thus, research on studying the impact of cross-cultural training seems to continue to attract researchers.

Behavior Modification Training
One of the recent developments is the attention given to behavior modification training. In a review article, Black and Mendenhall (1990) proposed that behavior modification training may be more effective than other types of training programs. Behavior modification is based on the Social Learning Theory (SLT) proposed by Bandura (1977). It has four central elements: Attention, Retention, Reproduction, and Incentive. According to SLT, people need to observe a behavior before learning it (i.e., they need to pay attention to the target behavior). Attention is a function

of status, attractiveness, similarity, and availability of past reinforcement for focusing on the model demonstrating the target behavior. Retention refers to how people remember behaviors, and the theory proposes that behaviors are remembered either as imaginal cognitive maps or as verbally encoded units. Retention is a function of practice or repetition. Reproduction refers to the demonstration of the learned behavior by the learner, and the theory posits that people translate remembered symbols into action by checking the results against memory. Incentives refer to external (valence of outcomes) and internal (satisfaction, self-efficacy) motivators that help people to observe, retain, and reproduce learned behaviors. The essence of SLT is that learning is affected by both observation and experience, and that people anticipate actions and their associated consequences (Bandura, 1977).

Behavior modification training is necessary for habitual behaviors that people are not usually aware of, especially behaviors that are acceptable, even desirable, in one's own culture but which may be offensive in another culture. For example, in Latin American cultures, people give an *abrazo* or an embrace to friends which is not an acceptable behavior in the United States; or in Greece when people show an open palm, called *moutza,* they are showing utmost contempt, and not simply waving or saying hello (Triandis, 1994). A *moutza* needs to be avoided, whereas, an *abrazo* needs to be acquired. There are many examples of such behaviors, and the only way to learn them is through behavior modeling, by observing a model do the behavior and then practicing the behavior many times. Despite its theoretical rigor and practical significance, this method has not been used much in cross-cultural training programs because it is expensive, requiring a trainer who constantly works on one behavior at a time.

Harrison (1992) examined the effectiveness of different types of training programs by comparing groups that received culture assimilator training (i.e., Japanese Culture Assimilator), behavioral modeling training, a combined training (i.e., behavioral modeling and culture assimilator), and no training (i.e., control group). He found that people who received the combined training scored significantly higher on a measure of learning than those who were given other types of training or no training. This group performed better on the role-play task compared to the control group only, but not to the other two groups. This study provides further evidence for the impact of assimilators on behavioral tasks.

Development of Theory-Based Assimilators

Another recent development deals with the role of culture theory in cross-cultural training (Bhawuk, 1998; Bhawuk & Triandis, 1996b), and the development of a theory-based culture assimilator, which is based on the concepts of individualism and collectivism (Bhawuk, 1995, 1996). Bhawuk and Triandis (1996b) proposed that culture theory could be effectively used in cross-cultural training. Bhawuk (1998) further refined this model by integrating the literature on cognition and stages of learning, and presented a model of stages of intercultural expertise development. He defined a lay person as one who has no knowledge of another culture, a novice as a person with extended intercultural experience, which is acquired through overseas experience or an intercultural training program, an expert as a novice who has acquired knowledge of culture theories that are relevant to a large number of behaviors so that they can organize cognitions about cultural differences more meaningfully around a theory, and advanced experts as experts who have had the necessary practice to perform relevant tasks proficiently, almost automatically. He postulated that experts are different from novices in that they use theory to organize knowledge as well as to retrieve information to solve problems, and that a theory-based training would lead a lay person to become an expert, whereas, a culture-specific, a culture general and a behavior modification training would lead a lay person to become a novice. The model also postulates that to become an advanced expert one would have to go through additional behavior modification training, or live abroad for cross-cultural experience.

To test the model, Bhawuk (1995) developed a theory-based culture assimilator using the four defining attributes and the vertical and horizontal typology of individualism and collectivism

(Triandis, 1995b; Bhawuk, 1999). He argued that a theory-based assimilator using fewer categories is likely to avoid the cognitive load experienced during a cross-cultural interaction, and carried out a multimethod evaluation of cross-cultural training tools to test this. In this study (Bhawuk, 1998), he found that, trainees who received the theory-based Individualism and Collectivism Assimilator (ICA), compared to a culture-specific assimilator for Japan, a culture-general assimilator (Brislin et al., 1986), and a control group, were found to be significantly more interculturally sensitivity, had larger category width, made better attribution on given difficult critical incidents, and were more satisfied with the training package. The findings of this study show promise for using over-arching theories like individualism and collectivism in cross-cultural training, and it can be expected that many such theories will be used in future for developing theory-based training tools.

There is also some evidence that some researchers are developing exercises for cross-cultural training that are grounded in theory, and two volumes of such exercises have appeared recently (Brislin & Yoshida, 1993; Cushner & Brislin, 1997). Development of many training videos has moved the field away from the paper medium to other media (Copeland & Griggs, 1985). There is also a move toward the development of multimedia based culture assimilators (Bhawuk, Lim, Copeland, & Yoshida, 1999), which may change the way cross-cultural training has been. Institutional developments include Summer Workshop for Intercultural Coursework Development at Colleges and Universities at the University of Hawaii and the Intercultural Summer Institute at Portland. The creation of the International Academy of Intercultural Research is also likely to shape the research in this field.

Alternative Criterion Measures

The search for appropriate criterion measures to evaluate cross-cultural training programs continues. The most acceptable framework for evaluation of training programs includes reaction, learning, behavior, and performance related criteria (Kirkpatrick, 1987). A number of tests have evolved in the past, and more theory-based measurement instruments are likely to emerge in future. Some of the promising paper-pencil-tests include intercultural sensitivity inventory, category width, reaction measures, and learning measures (Bhawuk, 1998). Behavioral measures are also being tested (Harrison, 1992; Bhawuk, 1998). Some of these tools are discussed below.

Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI)

Intercultural sensitivity is a concept that is frequently viewed as important in both theoretical analyses of people's adjustment to other cultures and in applied programs to prepare people to live and work effectively in cultures other than their own. Attempts to measure this concept have not always been successful, and one reason is that researchers and practitioners have not specified exactly what aspects of the other culture people should be sensitive to during their sojourn.

Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) developed a scale to measure intercultural sensitivity by examining (a) people's understanding of the different ways they can behave, depending upon whether they are interacting in an individualistic or a collectivist culture, (b) their open-mindedness concerning the differences they encounter in other cultures, and (c) their flexibility concerning behaving in unfamiliar ways that are called upon by the norms of other cultures. The Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory is a 46-item scale that was developed and tested among participants at the East-West Center in Hawaii and among graduate students in an MBA program who were contemplating careers in international business. The instrument was found to have adequate reliability and validity.

Category Width

Categorization is an organizing process through which the human mind creates a cluster of similar things, to reduce the complexity of the environment and to reduce the necessity of constant learning. For example, the human mind can discriminate about 7,500,000 different colors, but most English speakers find it functional to categorize the color spectrum into a

dozen or so frequently cited color categories (Triandis, 1972). Some people categorize different things minutely while others categorize things broadly. "Category width" is a term used to describe the amount of discrepancy tolerable among category members (i.e., how similar things have to be, to be called by the same name?) (Detweiler, 1978). According to this definition, a narrow categorizer would put highly similar things in a category, whereas a broad categorizer would put more discrepant things in the same category. Also, narrow categorizers, compared to broad categorizers, make different attributions concerning foreigners and non-foreigners (Detweiler, 1975), adjust less well to different cultures (Detweiler, 1978), and are more ethnocentric (Rokeach, 1951).

Detweiler (1980) validated his instrument by using a sample of Peace Corps volunteers. He found that volunteers who had a broad category width score were able to successfully complete their tasks overseas when compared to those who had a narrow category width score, who often returned without completing their assignments.

Reaction Measures

Bhawuk used six items, adapted from Harrison (1992), to measure generic reaction to tap participants' opinions about the training. These included: "I knew everything that was a part of the training," "The training was a waste of time," "I think the program was much too short," "I enjoyed the training program very much" "I would tell my friends to avoid such a training program," and "I enjoyed learning at my own pace." These items measure the opinion of the participants about training program. In addition, Bhawuk (1998) used 8 items identified as important goals of cross-cultural training programs in the literature (Underhill, 1990) to measure the relevancy of the material in preparing people for cross-cultural interactions. These included items like "I learned from the training program to effectively solve serious problems with people who are culturally different from me" and "The training program helped me to understand the difference between the values of the host culture and those of North American culture." Underhill (1990) found that stakeholders agreed upon nine objectives as the most important ones for cross-cultural training programs and of these nine, eight were included, with minor adaptations, to examine the participants satisfaction with the training programs in achieving these objectives. These items also measure reaction since they ask for participants' self-report about the effectiveness of the training, and are relevant because of their specific focus on cross-cultural interactions. These items could be used as a measure of the relevancy of the material used in training programs. Brethower and Rummler (1979) suggested that negative reactions may result from poor design, unrealistic expectations from the training, and inclusion of irrelevant material in the training programs. By including the reaction measures discussed here would allow the researcher to examine if the training material given to various treatment and control groups caused negative reactions among the participants.

Learning Measures

Bhawuk (1998) used nine difficult critical incidents to measure their skills in making correct attributions in intercultural interactions, and found them to be useful as a measure of learning. Some of the critical incidents were selected from Brislin et al. (1986), which have been used in the past as criterion measures (Broaddus, 1986; McIlveen-Yarbro, 1988; Cushner, 1989), and others from Bhawuk (1995). Bhawuk (1998) also asked participants to recall five concepts that they had learned from the training program. The purpose of this measure was to see if there was a significant difference in recalling information learned through different assimilators. This method did not distinguish treatment from control groups, but it may be useful in other situations, e.g., when comparing a culture assimilator to a behavioral training program.

Behavioral Measures

Harrison (1992) developed a cross-cultural interaction task as a measure of behavioral change. In this task, participants are required to interact in the capacity of a manager with a Japanese

worker, who was a confederate. The interaction is analyzed by using the five-item criteria recommended by Harrison (1992). These items measure the extent to which a participant would show personal concern, reduce conflict, maintain harmony, emphasize group consensus, and solicit employee input. By examining the audio or video taped interactions, two or more judges can rate each of the participants' conversation with the confederate on a five-point Likert scale for each of the five criteria of personal concern, reducing conflict, and so forth. It is recommended that the judges discussed their ratings, and to achieve a consensus rating for each of the interactions. This procedure of obtaining a consensual rating for an interaction task has been recommended by Latham and Saari (1979) since it avoids the mechanical calculation of the average of the independent ratings.

Emerging Research Streams and Future Research Directions

Considering the recent interest in the development of an instrument to measure culture shock (Mumford, 1998), and the recent theoretical conceptualization of this concept (Triandis, 1994), it is clear that this construct is still actively researched. It is plausible that many measurements of this construct will emerge in future, which could be used as criterion measures to evaluate the effectiveness of cross-cultural training programs. Further refinement of theory and instruments may also lead to a better understanding of the process of intercultural adjustment. For example, one reason for culture shock is that sojourners break norms and receive negative reactions from hosts, but do not know exactly why. Future research on this construct may help us better understand the dynamics of such interactions, and how they lead to culture shock. Therefore, culture shock seems like a promising area of research related to cross-cultural training.

The development of the field of cross-cultural training over the past fifty years shows an encouraging sign of evolution of more theoretically meaningful training methods and tools. It can be expected that more theory-based training methods and material are likely to be developed in the future. More theory-based culture assimilators like the Individualism and Collectivism Assimilator, theory-based exercises and simulations (Brislin & Yoshida, 1994; Cushner & Brislin, 1997), and behavior modeling type of programs (Harrison, 1992) based on social learning theory are likely to emerge. Culture assimilators are also likely to remain the most popular method as this tool has evolved from culture specific to culture general to culture theory-based format (Bhawuk, 1999, 1996), and many computer-based and multimedia assimilators (Bhawuk et al., 1999) are likely to emerge in future. Also, Thomas and colleagues in Germany have developed a program of research, which provides a cognitive perspective to cross-cultural training. They argue that for every culture there are some core or central cultural standards (Thomas, 1998) that provide a particular orientation to behavior for the people of that culture. They have developed many culture assimilators using this notion of culture standards for German managers going to China, Indonesia, and so forth, and this program of research is likely to have an impact on research in this area.

It is likely that many more criterion measures would be developed in future to meet the demands of evaluating cross-cultural training programs offered in various media. For example, the development of multimedia-based training programs would require the development of criterion measures in that media, which can help evaluate the effectiveness of such tools. Computer-based negotiation tasks or other such activities may need to be developed and validated to enable the evaluation of training programs that are designed to prepare people for intercultural negotiations. Many behavioral measures are also likely to be developed to measure the impact of cross-cultural training on intercultural interactions.

Experiential methods have persisted for fifty years, and we are likely to see the development of more innovative experiential exercises in the future. Practitioners are likely to encounter more sophisticated participants who have some exposure to cross-cultural issues through coursework at universities or through orientation programs conducted by international student offices in student dormitories. People are likely to have participated in popular simulations like *BAFA*

BAFA, Barnga, Albatross, etc., or might have traveled abroad making such simulations irrelevant, since the purpose of simulations is to sensitize participants to consequences of cultural differences experienced while living abroad. Thus, there will be an increased demand for newer and more sophisticated training tools, challenging both research and practice, and the experiential exercises are likely to become more complex, and would probably use more than one medium (e.g., audio, visual, discourse, models, and so forth). Survey of the past fifty years of the field of cross-cultural training shows that there is much enthusiasm among researchers and practitioners in this field, which is reflected, among other things, in the recent creation of the International Academy of Intercultural Research. Therefore, this field is likely to blossom many fold in the future global village, where intercultural skills will become a prime necessity.

References

Albert, R. D. (1983). *The intercultural sensitizer or culture assimilator: A cognitive approach. In D. Landis & R. W. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of intercultural training: Issues in training methodology (Vol. 2, pp. 186-217). New York: Pergamon.*

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.*

Bennett, J. M. (1985). *Intercultural communication training in cultural self-awareness for study abroad. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.*

Bennett, J. M. (1986a). *Modes of cross-cultural training: Conceptualizing cross-cultural training as education. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10, 117-134.*

Bennett, M. J. (1986b). *A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10, 179-196.*

Bhawuk, D. P. S. (1999). *Evolution of culture assimilators: Toward theory-based assimilators. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of Academy of Management, Chicago, August 6-11, 1999.*

Bhawuk, D. P. S. (1998). *The role of culture theory in cross-cultural training: A multimethod study of culture-specific, culture-general, and culture theory-based assimilators. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 29 (5), 630-655.*

Bhawuk, D. P. S. (1996). *Development of a culture theory-based assimilator: Applications of individualism and collectivism in cross-cultural training. Best Paper Proceedings (pp. 147-150) Academy of Management Annual Meeting, Cincinnati.*

Bhawuk, D. P. S. (1995). *The role of culture theory in cross-cultural training: A comparative evaluation of culture-specific, culture-general, and theory-based assimilators. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.*

Bhawuk, D. P. S. (1990). *Cross-cultural orientation programs. In R. W. Brislin (Ed.), Applied cross-cultural psychology (pp. 326-346). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.*

Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Brislin, R. W. (1992). *The measurement of intercultural sensitivity using the concepts of individualism and collectivism. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 16, 413-436.*

Bhawuk, D. P. S., Copeland, J., Yoshida, W., & Lim, K. (1999). *The development of a multimedia culture assimilator: Issues facing adaptation from text to multimedia. Manuscript under preparation.*

Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Triandis, H. C. (1996a). *Diversity in work place: Emerging corporate strategies. In G. R. Ferris & M. R. Buckley (Eds.), Human resource management: Perspectives, context, functions, and outcomes (Third edition) (PP. 84-96). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.*

Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Triandis, H. C. (1996b). *The role of culture theory in the study of culture and intercultural training. In D. Landis & R. Bhagat (Eds.), Handbook of intercultural training (pp. 17-34). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.*

Black, J. S., & Mendenhall, M. (1990). *Cross-cultural training effectiveness: A review and theoretical framework for future research. American Management Review, 15, 113-136.*

Bonner, G. (1987). *A theoretical analysis and development of the intercultural sensitizer as a tool for teacher education from a multicultural education perspective. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston.*

Brethower, K., & Rummler, G. (1979). Evaluating training. *Training and Development Journal*, *33*, 14-22.

Brislin, R. W. (1981). *Cross-cultural encounters: Face to face interaction*. New York: Pergamon.

Brislin, R. W., & Bhawuk, D. P. S. (1999). Cross-cultural training: Research and innovations. In J. Adamopoulos and Y. Kashima (Eds.) *Social psychology and cultural context* (pp. 205-216). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Brislin, R. W., Cushner, K., Cherrie, C., & Yong, M. (1986). *Intercultural interactions: A practical guide*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Brislin, R. W., & Horvath, A.-M. (1997). Multicultural training and education. In M. Segal, J. W. Berry, & P. Dasen, (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 3). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Brislin, R. W., & Pedersen, P. (1976). *Cross-cultural orientation programs*. New York: Gardner.

Brislin, R. W., & Yoshida, T. (1994). *Intercultural communication training: An introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Brislin, R. W., & Yoshida, T. (Eds.) (1994). *Improving intercultural interactions: Models for cross-cultural training programs*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Broaddus, D. L. (1986). *Use of the culture-general assimilator in intercultural training*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The School of Graduate Studies, Indiana State University.

Bruschke, J. C., Gartner, C., & Seiter, J. S. (1993). Student ethnocentrism, dogmatism, and motivation: A study of BAFA BAFA. *Simulation and Gaming*, *21(1)*, 9-20.

Chemers, M. M. (1969). Cross-cultural training as a means of improving situational favorableness. *Human Relations*, *22*, 531-546.

Church, A. T. (1982). Sojourner adjustment. *Psychological Bulletin*, *91* (3).

Copeland, L, & Griggs, L. (1985). *Going international*. New York: Random House.

Crespo, O. (1982). *Effects of cross-cultural training on attributions and attitudes of students in a teacher-training program*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois.

Cushner, K. (1989). Assessing the impact of a culture-general assimilator. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *13*, 125-146.

Cushner, K., & Brislin, R. W. (1996). *Intercultural interactions: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cushner, K., & Brislin, R. W. (Eds.) (1997). *Improving intercultural interactions: Models for cross-cultural training programs*, (Volume 2). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Deshpandey, S. P., & Viswesvaran, C. (1992). Is cross-cultural training of expatriate managers effective: A meta analysis. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *16*, 295-310.

Detweiler, R. (1978). Culture, category width, and attributions: A model building approach to the reasons for cultural effects. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *9*, 259-284.

Detweiler, R. (1980). Intercultural interaction and the categorization process: A conceptual analysis and behavioral outcome. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *4*, 275-295.

Fiedler, F. E., Mitchell, T. R., & Triandis, H.C. (1971). The culture assimilator: An approach to cross-cultural training. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *55*, 95-102.

Fowler, S., & Mumford, M. (eds.), (1995). *Intercultural sourcebook: Cross-cultural training methods, vol. 1*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Fowler, S., & Mumford, M. (eds.), (1999). *Intercultural sourcebook: Cross-cultural training methods, vol. 2*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press

Furnham, A., & Bochner, S. (1986). *Culture shock: Psychological reactions to unfamiliar environments*. London: Methuen.

Grove, C., & Torbiorn, I. (1985). A new conceptualization of intercultural adjustment and the goals of training. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *9*, 205-233.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Hammer, M. R. (1983). Basic training design: Approaches to intercultural training. In D.

Landis & R. W. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of intercultural training: Issues in theory and design (Vol. 1, pp. 118-154). Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.

Gudykunst, W. B., Hammer, M. R., & Wiseman, R. (1977). An analysis of an integrated approach to cross-cultural training. International Journal of Intercultural relations, 1, 99-109.

Guthrie, G. M. (1967). Cultural preparation for the Philippines. In R. B. Textor (Ed.) Cultural frontiers of the Peace Corps (pp. 35-47). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hall, E. T. (1959). The silent language. New York, NY: Doubleday and Company.

Hall, E. T. (1966). The hidden dimension. New York, NY: Doubleday and Company.

Hammer, M. R. (1999). A measure of intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. In S. Fowler, & M. Mumford (eds.), Intercultural sourcebook: Cross-cultural training methods, Vol. 2. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.

Harrison, J. K. (1992). Individual and combined effects of behavior modeling and the culture assimilator in cross-cultural management training. Journal of Applied Psychology, 77, 952-962.

Hugh-Weiner, G. (1986). The "learning how to learn" approach to cross-cultural orientation. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10, 485-505.

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1987). Evaluation. In R. L. Craig (Ed.), Training and development handbook (2nd ed.) (pp. 301-319). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kraemer, A. (1973).   Development of a cultural self-awareness approach to instruction in intercultural communication (Technical Report No. 73-17). Arlington, VA: HumRRO.

Kraemer, A. (1974). Workshop in intercultural communication: A handbook for instructors (Technical Report No. 74-13). Arlington, VA: HumRRO.

Kluckhohn, C. (1949). Mirror for man. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Landis, D., & Bhagat, R. (Eds.) (1996).   Handbook of intercultural training. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Landis, D., & Brislin, R. W. (Eds.) (1983). Handbook of intercultural training: Vol. 1-3. New York: Pergamon.

Landis, D., & Miller, A. (1973). The army culture assimilator: Interaction with black soldiers. Philadelphia: Center for Social Development.

Lee, James A. (1966). Cultural Analysis in Overseas Operations, Harvard Business Review, May-June, (pp. 106-114).

Malpass, R. S., & Salancik, G. R. (1977). Linear and branching formats in culture assimilator training. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1, 76-87.

McIlveen-Yarbro, C. L. (1988). An assessment of the ability of the culture-general assimilator to create sensitivity to multiculturalism in an educational setting. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston.

Mitchell, T. R., & Foa, U. G. (1969). Diffusion of the effect of cultural training of the leader in the structure of heterocultural task groups. Australian Journal of Psychology, 21, 31-43.

Mumford, D. B. (1998). The measurement of culture shock. Social Psychiatry and Psychiatrical Epidemiology, 33, 149-154.

Oberg, K. (1954). Culture shock. The Bobbs-MerrillReprint Series, Np. A-329.

Oberg, K. (1960). Culture shock: Adjustment to new cultural environments. Practical Anthropology, 7, 177-182.

O'Brien, G. E., & Fiedler, F. E., & Hewett, T. (1970). The effects of programmed culture training upon the performance of volunteer medical teams in Central America. Human Relations, 24, 209-231.

O'Brien, G. E., & Plooji, D. (1977). Comparison of programmed and prose culture training upon attitudes and knowledge. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62, 499-505.

Paige, R. M. (1986). Cross-cultural orientation: New conceptualizations and applications. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Stewart, E. (1966). The simulation of cultural differences. Journal of Communication, 16, 291-304.

Tolbert, A. S. S. (1990). Venezuelan culture assimilator: Incidents designed for training U. S. professionals conducting business in Venezuela. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Thomas, A. (1998). Scientific and practical aspects of cross-cultural cooperation and management in the context of European integration. Studia Psychologica, 40, 1-2, 69-78.

Thomas, D. C. (1999). The expatriate experience: A critical review and synthesis. Advances in International Comparative Management, 12, 237-273.

Triandis, H. C. (1972). The analysis of subjective culture. New York: Wiley.

Triandis, H. C. (1975). Culture training, cognitive complexity, and interpersonal attitudes. In R. W. Brislin, S. Bochner, & W. Lonner (Eds.), Cross-cultural perspectives on learning (pp. 39-77). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Triandis, H. C. (1977). Theoretical framework for evaluation of cross-cultural training effectiveness. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1, 19-45.

Triandis, H. C. (1994). Culture and social behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Triandis, H. C. (1995a). Culture specific assimilators. In S. Fowler, & M. Mumford (eds.), Intercultural sourcebook, Vol. 1. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.

Triandis, H. C. (1995b). Individualism and collectivism. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Trifonovitch, G. (1977). On cross-cultural orientation techniques. In R. W. Brislin (Ed.), Culture learning: Concepts, applications, and research (pp. 213-222). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Underhill, F. (1990). An application of social learning theory using stakeholder evaluations to assess a cross-cultural training programs for business people. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington.

Vink, C. D. (1989). Development of an intercultural sensitizer training program for Americans going to China. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University.

Ward, C. (1996). Acculturation. In D. Landis & R. Bhagat (Eds.), Handbook of intercultural training (pp. 124-147). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Weldon, D. E., Carlston, D. E., Rissman, A. K., Slobodin, L., & Triandis, H. C. (1975). A laboratory test of effects of culture assimilator training. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 300-310.

Worchel, S., & Mitchell, T. R. (1972). An evaluation of the effectiveness of the culture assimilator in Thailand and Greece. Journal of Applied Psychology, 56, 472-479.