

# A Developmental Model of Intercultural Maturity

Patricia M. King    Marcia B. Baxter Magolda

*This article focuses on the development of intercultural maturity, which is frequently cited as a desired collegiate outcome. We position our work on intercultural maturity in the context of a holistic approach to human development using Kegan's (1994) model as a foundation and relating this outcome to other collegiate learning outcomes. We introduce a multidimensional framework that describes the development of intercultural maturity. We first explicate the three dimensions of the framework, link these to existing theory and research on student development and intercultural competence, and then illustrate the developmental levels of the framework using examples from interviews with college students.*

In times of increased global interdependence, producing interculturally competent citizens who can engage in informed, ethical decision-making when confronted with problems that involve a diversity of perspectives is becoming an urgent educational priority (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002). For example, when a group of Fortune 500 companies filed a brief in support of the University of Michigan's affirmative action policies (*Fortune 500 corporations*, 2000), they noted that students with an appreciation for diversity:

are better prepared to understand, learn from and collaborate with others from a variety of racial, ethnic and cultural backgrounds; demonstrate creative problem solving by integrating differing perspectives; exhibit the skills required for

good teamwork; and demonstrate more effective responsiveness to the needs of all types of consumers. (¶ 6)

Colleges and universities are in many ways well suited to foster the development of these skills; however, "they are what corporations find in shortest supply among entry-level candidates" (Bikson & Law, 1994, p. 26). Levine and Cureton (1998) provided evidence that appreciation for diversity is also in short supply on college campuses: In their discussion of the growing tension on U.S. campuses around multicultural issues, they noted that "multiculturalism remains the most unresolved issue on campus [in the US] today" (p. 91). Further, persistent reports of racially-motivated hate crimes on college campuses suggest that this remains an unresolved issue and that there is a strong need to find better ways to help students achieve this desired collegiate outcome.

How do people come to understand cultural differences in ways that enable them to interact effectively with others from different racial, ethnic, or social identity groups? How can institutions of higher learning better address the seemingly intractable problems associated with educating for intercultural understanding? Finding ways to answer these questions lies at the heart of national and institutional efforts to achieve diversity outcomes and at the center of research designed to better understand how students achieve this important collegiate outcome.

---

*Patricia M. King is Professor and Director of the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education at the University of Michigan. Marcia B. Baxter Magolda is Distinguished Professor of Educational Leadership at Miami University (Ohio).*

Several scholars have proposed conceptual models to describe intercultural (or multicultural) competencies (e.g., Howard-Hamilton, Richardson, & Shuford, 1998; Ottavi, Pope-Davis, & Dings, 1994; Pope & Reynolds, 1997; Pope, Reynolds, & Mueller, 2004; Pope-Davis, Reynolds, Dings, & Ottavi, 1994). These models provide useful starting points for identifying the attributes that are associated with this ability. For example, Pope and Reynolds include among their listing of multicultural skills “the ability to identify and openly discuss cultural differences and issues,” to “differentiate between individual differences, cultural differences, and universal similarities,” and “to use cultural knowledge and sensitivity to make more culturally sensitive and appropriate interventions” (p. 271). Unfortunately, theory development on multicultural competence has been limited by heavy reliance on the assessment of attitudes as a proxy for competence.

Landreman (2003) conducted a comprehensive review of the intercultural competence literature, drawing from the fields of intercultural communication, multicultural competence, and developmental psychology, and literature on critical-, stratum-, and ethnic-consciousness. In her critique of this literature, she offered the following observations:

Definitions of “competence” are theoretically and empirically inconsistent, and do not address the *application* of one’s understanding and skills to intergroup relationships or social justice issues; the heterogeneity of cultural groups, the multiplicity, complexity, and intersectionality of identity, and individuals’ relationship to institutional and societal power and their social location have been minimally considered . . . as well as the influence these factors have on the individual’s experiences, perspectives and presenting problems; absent from the

competence literature are considerations concerning students’ underlying assumptions about intergroup differences. . . .  
(p. 39)

She suggested that intercultural consciousness is a more appropriate educational goal than multicultural competence; the prefix “inter” encompasses both domestic and international contexts and implies cultures interacting. She also noted that “achieving consciousness implies an understanding of self and identity (intrapersonal), while interacting with others in a historical and socio-cultural-political context (interpersonal), leading to reflection (cognitive) that motivates action” (pp. 41-42). These observations illustrate that intercultural competence is a complex, multifaceted construct, and that educating for this outcome requires a broader, more comprehensive approach than that suggested by training for knowledge or skills alone.

Similarly, several national reports on undergraduate education have called for the achievement of outcomes that are complex, multi-faceted abilities that require a wide variety of attributes that are interdependent and mutually reinforcing; these include the Association of American Colleges and Universities’ (2002) *Greater Expectations* and the ACPA/NASPA (Keeling, 2004) report entitled *Learning Reconsidered*. Using a holistic lens to examine scholarship on intercultural or multicultural competencies allows one to identify underlying capacities that may guide (or at least affect) a learner’s ability to integrate knowledge, skills, and awareness, and to act in interculturally mature ways. We argue that the developmental ability that undergirds regarding another culture favorably is grounded in the same ability that undergirds one’s ability to regard an interpersonal difference favorably. That is, the developmental complexity that allows a learner to understand and

accept the general idea of difference from self without feeling threat to self enables a person to offer positive regard to others across many types of difference, such as race, ethnicity, social class, gender, sexual orientation, and religion. Without this foundation, students may be able to learn about cultural differences; however, this model suggests that they will find it difficult if not impossible to use this knowledge in an intercultural interaction. In other words, less complex levels of cognitive and intrapersonal (identity) development may hinder one's ability to use one's intercultural skills. Similarly, having a sense of identity driven predominantly by others' expectations may diminish one's capacity to apply cognitive and interpersonal attributes in intercultural contexts.

Many scholars of human development have argued that a more holistic approach to educational research and practice is required to help students develop the array of skills that will enable them to tackle complex contemporary problems, especially those with an intercultural dimension (Baxter Magolda, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2003; Baxter Magolda & King, 2004; M. Bennett, 1993; Bidell, Lee, Boucie, Ward, & Brass, 1994; Jones & McEwen, 2000; Kegan, 1994; King & Baxter Magolda, 1996; Knepfkamp, 2005; Mentkowski & Associates, 2000; Ortiz, 2000; Storti, 1990). Looking at intercultural maturity using a holistic perspective provides a possible explanation for the ineffectiveness of simpler, more superficial approaches to intercultural competence that rely on dispensing information and teaching desirable behavior and skills: Perhaps they are ineffective because they fail to consider one or more domains (cognitive, identity, interpersonal) of development. For example, omitting the cognitive component in conflict resolution risks being ineffective with students who see

the world in "either/or" terms and who are thus cognitively unable to analyze an intercultural conflict from the perspective of both parties involved. Similarly, omitting the interpersonal component risks being ineffective with students who decide how to act based on others' expectations rather than on the interculturally appropriate criteria that educators may have tried to teach them.

In this article, we argue that educators could be more effective in achieving diversity outcomes if they could organize their goals and programs using a conceptual framework that provides a more holistic approach to defining diversity outcome goals and how students progress toward these goals. In particular, we propose a multidimensional framework that describes how people become increasingly capable of understanding and acting in ways that are interculturally aware and appropriate; we call this capacity intercultural maturity. We first describe our proposed framework and then illustrate the developmental levels of the framework using examples from interviews with college students. We conclude with a discussion of implications for educational practice and for further research.

## **A MULTIDIMENSIONAL FRAMEWORK OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERCULTURAL MATURITY**

Our proposed model of intercultural maturity draws from several genres of research in multicultural education (see C. Bennett, 2001 for a comprehensive analysis) as it attempts to integrate three major domains of development (cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal). We draw our conceptualization of intercultural maturity primarily from the literature on college student and adult development and, in particular, from Kegan's (1994) model of lifespan development.

According to Kegan, mature individuals are better equipped to approach and respond to complex life tasks because they exemplify what he has termed “self-authorship” (p. 185). Using this way of organizing one’s life, individuals act as authors of their lives (not just the stage on which their lives are played out), balancing external influences with their individual interests and those of others around them (Baxter Magolda, 2000a). Many demands placed on adults in contemporary society “require self-authorship because they require the ability to construct our own visions, to make informed decisions in conjunction with coworkers, to act appropriately, and to take responsibility for those actions” (Baxter Magolda, 2001, p. 14). Self-authorship requires complex ways of making meaning of experience, drawing on one’s understanding in all three dimensions of development.

Kegan’s (1994) model is holistic in that it incorporates and integrates three dimensions of development. The cognitive dimension focuses on how one constructs one’s view and creates a meaning-making system based on how one understands knowledge and how it is gained. The intrapersonal dimension focuses on how one understands one’s own beliefs, values, and sense of self, and uses these to guide choices and behaviors. The interpersonal dimension focuses on how one views oneself in relationship to and with other people (their views, values, behaviors, etc.) and makes choices in social situations. Kegan argued that development in all three dimensions is required for a person to be able to use one’s skills. Those for whom development in one or more dimensions does not provide an adequate basis for coping with the complex life tasks they face often report being overwhelmed or “in over their heads.”

Our framework for discussing inter-

cultural maturity encompasses Kegan’s (1994) three dimensions of development (cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal), as well as their interconnections. Our choice of the word “maturity” in the name of this educational goal refers to the developmental capacity that undergirds the ways learners come to make meaning, that is, the way they approach, understand, and act on their concerns. Thus, demonstrating one’s intercultural skills requires several types of expertise, including complex understanding of cultural differences (cognitive dimension), capacity to accept and not feel threatened by cultural differences (intrapersonal dimension), and capacity to function interdependently with diverse others (interpersonal dimension). In other words, through this proposed model, we are building on Kegan’s contention that producing intercultural competent citizens requires helping students achieve intercultural maturity in all three dimensions.

This conceptual framework is designed to reflect two elements that are not apparent in most of the existing literature on collegiate outcomes. First, in recognition that this is a complex collegiate outcome, we define intercultural maturity as multi-dimensional and consisting of a range of attributes, including understanding (the cognitive dimension), sensitivity to others (the interpersonal dimension), and a sense of oneself that enables one to listen to and learn from others (the intrapersonal dimension). Second, acknowledging that students typically learn and become capable of more complex learning by taking a series of steps (whether gradually or quickly), the framework proposed here not only identifies the desired outcome itself, but also includes two steps that lead to the achievement of the outcome, benchmarks along a developmental continuum. For example, being aware of cultural differences

is an important first step in cultural competence; respectfully demonstrating this awareness in a conversation with a coworker or community member is a more compelling indication of the achievement of this outcome. Each of these examples shows a basic developmental progression, with the application of one's learning in changing contexts as the more stringent criterion of educational success.

The three proposed developmental levels are offered here as general descriptions of these benchmarks, not as detailed, comprehensive lists of capacities at each level. We also wish to note that the framework is the result of our attempts to integrate insights from existing theories of human development, prior research on student development and intercultural competence, and from our own experience teaching graduate students and researching college student development. The framework has not yet been subjected to empirical analysis. This framework appears in the form of a 3 × 3 matrix, linking the three domains of development (cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal) with three levels of development (initial, intermediate, and mature). Table 1 thus consists of nine cells that show how development in each domain unfolds across three developmental benchmarks, the last of which (the far right column) describes the kind of maturity that is consistent with the description of intended collegiate outcomes noted above. Next, we discuss each dimension separately, and then make some observations about their interrelationships.

### **Role of the Cognitive Dimension in Intercultural Maturity**

The first row of Table 1 describes the trajectory of the cognitive dimension and how it mediates the way people think about and understand diversity issues. For example, the assumption in the initial level that knowledge

is certain and that knowledge claims can be readily judged as right or wrong serves as a barrier to learning about or accepting differing perspectives. At this level, beliefs tend to be adopted from authorities rather than being internally constructed, so challenges to beliefs are often ignored or quickly determined to be wrong. Differing cultural perspectives that do not agree with one's view of what is true are often considered wrong rather than different. This phase has been characterized in several theories of cognitive development as dualistic thinking (Perry, 1968), received knowing (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986), absolute knowing (Baxter Magolda, 1992), pre-reflective thinking (King & Kitchener, 1994), ethnocentric reasoning (M. Bennett, 1993), and as the use of representational skills (Fischer, 1980).

In the intermediate phase of the trajectory, views about knowledge shift from seeing knowledge as certain to increasingly acknowledging the uncertainty associated with making a knowledge claim. This shift is accompanied by decreasing reliance on authority's knowledge claims and increasing reliance on personal processes for adopting knowledge claims. Increasing uncertainty yields more openness to differing perspectives, while personal processing of knowledge claims yields the notion that different people can hold different views for legitimate reasons. The intermediate phase has been characterized as multiplistic thinking (Perry, 1968), subjective and procedural knowing (Belenky et al., 1986), transitional and independent knowing (Baxter Magolda, 1992), quasi-reflective thinking (King & Kitchener, 1994), the beginning stages of ethnorelative reasoning (M. Bennett, 1993), and as the coordination of representational systems and abstract mapping (Fischer, 1980).

The mature phase of the trajectory is

TABLE 1.  
A Three-Dimensional Developmental Trajectory of Intercultural Maturity

Domain of Development and Related Theories	Initial Level of Development	Intermediate Level of Development	Mature Level of Development
<i>Cognitive</i>  (Baxter Magolda, 1992, 2001; Belenky et al., 1986; M. Bennett, 1993; Fischer, 1980; Kegan, 1994; King & Kitchener, 1994, 2004; Perry, 1968)	Assumes knowledge is certain and categorizes knowledge claims as right or wrong; is naïve about different cultural practices and values; resists challenges to one's own beliefs and views differing cultural perspectives as wrong	Evolving awareness and acceptance of uncertainty and multiple perspectives; ability to shift from accepting authority's knowledge claims to personal processes for adopting knowledge claims	Ability to consciously shift perspectives and behaviors into an alternative cultural worldview and to use multiple cultural frames
<i>Intrapersonal</i>  (Cass, 1984; Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Cross, 1991; D'Augelli, 1994; Helms, 1995; Josselson, 1987, 1996; Kegan, 1994; Marcia, 1980; Parks, 2000; Phinney, 1990; Torres, 2003)	Lack of awareness of one's own values and intersection of social (racial, class, ethnicity, sexual orientation) identity; lack of understanding of other cultures; externally defined identity yields externally defined beliefs that regulate interpretation of experiences and guide choices; difference is viewed as a threat to identity	Evolving sense of identity as distinct from external others' perceptions; tension between external and internal definitions prompts self-exploration of values, racial identity, beliefs; immersion in own culture; recognizes legitimacy of other cultures	Capacity to create an internal self that openly engages challenges to one's views and beliefs and that considers social identities (race, class, gender, etc.) in a global and national context; integrates aspects of self into one's identity
<i>Interpersonal</i>  (M. Bennett, 1993; Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Gilligan, 1982; Kegan, 1994; Kohlberg, 1984; Noddings, 1984)	Dependent relations with similar others is a primary source of identity and social affirmation; perspectives of different others are viewed as wrong; awareness of how social systems affect group norms and intergroup differences is lacking; view social problems egocentrically, no recognition of society as an organized entity	Willingness to interact with diverse others and refrain from judgment; relies on independent relations in which multiple perspectives exist (but are not coordinated); self is often overshadowed by need for others' approval. Begins to explore how social systems affect group norms and intergroup relations	Capacity to engage in meaningful, interdependent relationships with diverse others that are grounded in an understanding and appreciation for human differences; understanding of ways individual and community practices affect social systems; willing to work for the rights of others

marked by the shift to knowledge as constructed and as grounded in context. The ability to consciously shift perspectives emerges because judgments derive from personal experience, evidence from other sources, and others' experience. The ability to entertain multiple perspectives in multiple contexts leads

to the ability to use multiple cultural frames. This mature phase has been described as relativistic thinking (Perry, 1968), constructed knowing (Belenky et al., 1986), contextual knowing (Baxter Magolda, 1992), reflective thinking leading to the ability to make reflective judgments (King & Kitchener,

1994), integration, the final ethnorelative stage of M. Bennett's (1993) model, and coordination of abstract systems (Fischer, 1980; see also Fischer & Bidell, 1998; Kitchener, 2002; Kitchener & Fischer, 1990).

Milton Bennett's (1993) model specifically explicates the role of cognitive complexity in the development of intercultural competence, focusing on the ways individuals come to understand cultural differences. This model is grounded in constructivism (how individuals make meaning of experience) and, in particular, how individuals interpret their experiences with diverse others in intercultural situations. It also delineates six major markers that indicate increasing sophistication in complexity of understanding intercultural issues, from ethnocentric (three stages) to ethnorelative (three stages) perspectives. The two forms of adaptation (the second ethnorelative stage) illustrate this link particularly well. The first form is "cognitive frame-shifting," or taking a cultural perspective different from one's own; the second form is "behavioral code-shifting," in which the individual can act from another frame of reference. Both require the cognitive complexity to hold at least two cultural perspectives in mind at the same time.

Since there is cognitive complexity in the presence of diverse worldviews, accepting ambiguity and understanding the basis of differing worldviews require complex thinking skills. Perry (1968), Baxter Magolda (1992, 2001), Fischer (1980), and King and Kitchener (1994, 2004) all posit that earlier, more simplistic levels of cognitive development involve concrete thinking and a belief in absolute knowledge, whereas later, more complex levels reflect an ability to consider knowledge grounded in context, deriving judgments from personal experiences, evidence from other sources, and from the perspectives

of others. This raises the distinct possibility that complexity in thinking is a prerequisite for mature understanding of culturally different worldviews (M. Bennett, 1993; King & Shuford, 1996). Intercultural perspective taking, another cognitive task, also has application as students are able to develop the ability to consider both cognitive and affective elements that affect culturally different students (Kappler, 1998; Steglitz, 1993). Evidence of the role of cognitive complexity in the development of intercultural maturity is provided in a study of U.S. students who had studied abroad: Moore and Ortiz (1999) found that interculturally competent students were critical thinkers who suspended judgment until the evidence was in and who included a diverse range of knowledge in what they considered as evidence. Taken together, these findings suggest that there are strong reasons to include and to continue to explore the role of cognitive development in various aspects of intercultural maturity.

### **Role of the Intrapersonal Dimension in Intercultural Maturity**

The second row in Table 1 traces ways in which the intrapersonal dimension mediates how people think about and come to understand diversity issues. As noted above, this dimension focuses on how people view themselves; this is variously referred to as identity development, ego development, developing a sense of identity, or self-development. This broad category includes a range of identity-related topics, from ways people use their values and beliefs to make life choices and decisions to how they view and interpret their social identities based on factors such as race, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, and religious affiliation. Each of these factors has been reported to affect the ways students act in intercultural situations, examples of which

are offered below.

Fortunately, there is a wealth of literature on identity development to inform this dimension. In the last two decades, there has been a virtual explosion of literature on identity development. This includes theory and research on general models (e.g., Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Josselson 1987, 1996; Kegan, 1994; Marcia, 1966, 1980) as well as models addressing particular dimensions of identity development, such as racial/ethnic identity (e.g., Cross, 1991; Helms, 1995; Parks, 2000; Phinney, 1990; Thompson & Carter, 1997; Torres, 2003; Torres & Baxter Magolda, 2004; Wijeyesinghe & Jackson, 2001) and sexual orientation (e.g., Cass, 1984; D'Augelli, 1994; Evans & D'Augelli, 1996). In these models, individuals at more complex stages of development have considered and integrated these dimensions into a sense of self that is maintained through interactions with diverse others and through participation in majority-defined and -dominated society. While these models tend to focus on culturally distinct differences, they also contain some noteworthy similarities, especially when examined from a holistic, developmental perspective. For example, these theories tend to describe movement from lack of awareness of one's particular identity, through a period of confusion and exploration, to a complex, internally defined perspective on how one's race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation are integrated into one's view of oneself and the world. In addition, these theories indicate that intercultural competence requires an internally defined sense of self to avoid feeling threatened by difference (Kegan, 1994). In other words, several overarching theoretical perspectives are apparent, perspectives that in some ways subsume or overlap with theories addressing particular dimensions of identity development.

As outlined in Table 1, perspectives on

diversity issues at the initial level are characterized in ways that tap a variety of aspects of identity; these include a general lack of awareness about one's own social identity. Among racial/ethnic identity development models, this is reflected in Cross's (1991) Preencounter and Encounter stages; Helm's (1995) Contact and Disintegration statuses; and Phinney's (1990) Diffusion-Foreclosure stage; it is also consistent with Josselson's (1987, 1996) foreclosures/guardians. This level is also characterized as being defined by others' expectations; endorsing cultural beliefs, values, or practices in an unreflective or unconsidered way; and being threatened by different cultural values or by others of different social identity groups. Having an externally defined identity yields externally defined beliefs that regulate interpretation of experiences and guide choices. Thus the "resistance" multicultural educators experience from some students may result not only from their reliance on simplistic cognitive categories that do not accommodate multiple cultural perspectives, but also from a sense of self that is largely defined by others, as described in Kegan's (1994) third order. At this level of intercultural maturity, an individual's sense of self might be defined in a restrictive sense by one's primary social identity group, whether or not the values of that group are internally endorsed.

The tension between an externally derived sense of self (e.g., reliance upon affirmation by others or peer group acceptance) and an internally derived self-definition is heightened at the intermediate benchmark of intercultural maturity. This level is characterized by an intentional self-exploration that allows for the simultaneous examination of one's experiences in one's own cultural contexts and an examination of that culture in broader social contexts. For example, it allows for a more visible expression of one's own cultural values

and is reflected in Cross's (1991) Immersion/Emersion stage, Helm's (1995) Reintegration and Pseudo-Independence statuses, Phinney's (1990) Diffusion-Foreclosure stage, and in the ability to take a more candid look at the nature of one's own privilege (McIntosh, 1989).

By contrast, a mature level of intrapersonal development as applied to diversity issues is characterized by a sense of self in which various aspects of one's identity are integrated in ways that provide a culturally-sensitive and well-considered basis for making decisions about intercultural interactions. In the theoretical models noted above, this level of development is reflected in Cross's (1991) Internalization and Internalization-Commitment stages, Helms's (1995) Immersion-Emersion and Autonomy statuses, and Phinney's (1990) Identity Achievement stage. Individuals are still open (indeed, eager) to have their views and perspectives questioned, but are not threatened by this process. This mature level resonates with Kegan's (1994) fourth order meaning making, with achievement of Chickering and Reisser's (1993) identity vector, and with Josselson's (1987, 1996) pathmaker.

Ortiz (1997) noted that in campus communities where culture is expressed, opportunities for learning are enhanced when students successfully integrate their ethnicity into their identity. For example, Howard-Hamilton (2000) showed how a student's level of racial identity development could affect his or her response to and performance on class assignments that call for analysis of issues that involve racial dynamics. Broido (2000) found that students who became social justice allies during college had developed self-confidence, defined as "comfort with one's identity and internal loci or worth and approval" (p. 12), and weren't threatened by being aligned with underrepresented or non-dominant groups.

These examples illustrate the central role of identity development in achieving intercultural maturity.

### **Role of the Interpersonal Dimension in Intercultural Maturity**

The third dimension of intercultural maturity involves the ability to interact effectively and interdependently with diverse others. In particular, this draws on the mature capacity to construct and engage in relationships with others in ways that show respect for and understanding of the other's perspectives and experiences, but that are also true to one's own beliefs and values. Developmental theories informing the social dimension of intercultural maturity tend to show change from an egocentric, individualistic perspective ("I act in ways that serve me"), to a perspective that acknowledges that different social groups have different values, sensitivities, and experiences ("to each her own"), to a perspective that reflects an appreciation for ways in which social systems affect relations between and among culturally different groups. Because members of underrepresented groups have not been treated fairly at a societal level, this is a key concern underlying intergroup relations in the US.

Several theories have described development in this domain. Chickering and Reisser (1993) described the development of mature interpersonal relationships among college students, focusing on how students come to appreciate differences across intercultural and interpersonal boundaries. Kohlberg (1984) developed a theory of moral development based on principles of distributive justice, and other scholars focused on an ethic of care as the ethical imperative (Brabeck, 1989; Gilligan, 1982; Martin, 1985; Noddings, 1984); more recently, Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, and Thoma (1999a, 1999b) proposed using schema theory

to explain changes in moral judgment.

The last row of Table 1 outlines key developmental features as individuals develop mature capacity in social contexts, including intercultural contexts. At the initial level, social relations are grounded in one's primary social identity or affinity group, often using egocentric standards to judge cultural differences ("that's not how my family celebrates that holiday") or to judge social policy issues ("what's in it for me?"). Perspectives and values held by others may be tolerated, but are judged as ignorant or wrong. There is little acknowledgement of or reference to abstract concepts such as social ideals of community or to the goals of organized society. This kind of understanding of one's relationships with others is also apparent in the ethnocentric stages of M. Bennett's (1993) model, the Personal Interests schema (similar to pre-conventional reasoning) of Kohlberg's theory (Rest et al., 1999a), and with Level I of Gilligan's (1982) model, which is characterized by an egocentric, survival orientation where self-interest motivates moral reasoning.

By contrast, there is a much greater capacity to explore the nature and sources of intergroup differences at the intermediate level and to interact effectively with others who are seen as different. Individuals tend to be less judgmental, acknowledging the legitimacy of multiple perspectives. Associated with this broadening perspective that allows for a wider range of views and experiences is a broader understanding of social systems; at this level, students show an early awareness of these systems as social/cultural constructions that include not only social expectations that are codified in law, but also social conventions and community rules governing behavior. This kind of reasoning is consistent with the early ethnorelative stages of M. Bennett's (1993) model and with the Maintaining Norms

schema (similar to conventional reasoning) as applied to Kohlberg's (1984) theory, reflecting a more inclusive view of roles, rules, and duties as having society-wide implications. It may also be seen in Level II of Gilligan's (1982) model, where connection with others is highlighted, even to the point of forfeiting one's own view to seek others' acceptance and thus avoid hurting them. However, this openness to new perspectives is mitigated by the continued use of others' approval as a standard for one's decisions about what to believe and how to act, as described in Kegan's (1994) third order reasoning and Gilligan's Level II.

The mature level of the interpersonal dimension is characterized by heightened awareness and capacity to engage in intercultural interactions that are interdependent, respectful, informed by cultural understanding, and mutually negotiated. Instead of experiencing such interactions as compromising or diminishing one's own cultural values and experiences, or as threatening one's own sense of self, they are experienced as enhancing one's identity and role as a member of society. This type of understanding is reflected in M. Bennett's (1993) stage of Integration, in which an individual can integrate disparate aspects of one's identity as one moves between cultural perspectives. It is also consistent with Kohlberg's (1984) description of Postconventional reasoning, where moral criteria (such as respect for human rights) have primacy over social conventions (such as roles or contracts) in making moral decisions. At this level, individuals acknowledge that there are many possible social arrangements, so members' duties and rights should derive from the moral purpose of the arrangement, not from its existence per se. It is also consistent with Gilligan's (1982) Level III reasoning, in which a woman's own needs

are added to the mix of those that should be taken into account in resolving a moral conflict. The ways of making meaning of intercultural experiences at this level of development appear to enable individuals to comfortably and more effectively act as advocates or social justice allies across a range of social issues, from civil rights to causes related to specific social identities.

Several studies on moral development have addressed the development of intercultural maturity in the college years. Based on their comprehensive literature review of moral judgment development among college students, King and Mayhew (2002, 2004) reported that students who relied on moral principles to reason about moral dilemmas held more positive attitudes toward diversity issues (e.g., Derryberry & Thoma, 2000) and had a higher level of intercultural sensitivity (Endicott, Bock & Narvaez, 2003). They also found that moral reasoning level was a strong predictor of acting in prosocial ways in that those whose moral reasoning relied on moral principles were more likely to engage in prosocial behaviors. They explained these findings by suggesting that the shift from norm-based to principled reasoning reflects students' ability to examine the fairness of social systems; it also reflects the understanding that social systems are cultural constructions and can be changed. These findings illustrate the connections between moral development and intercultural maturity.

### **Interrelationships among the Three Dimensions**

Links across the three dimensions of development are evident through findings from several studies. For example, having an internal sense of self supports the cognitive ability to acknowledge that people hold multiple perspectives on many issues, including

intercultural issues (Baxter Magolda, 2000b; Ortiz, 2000), and for defensible reasons (King & Shuford, 1996). In a study that directly examined this relationship, Guthrie (1996) found that almost half of the variance in college students' level of tolerance for diversity was explained by their level of cognitive complexity in reflective judgment. Similarly, Kitchener and Fischer (1990) argued that the ability to understand abstract concepts (e.g., White privilege) emerges with the ability to engage in abstract mapping; this ability coincides with Stage 4 of quasi-reflective thinking in the Reflective Judgment Model, where knowledge is first understood as an abstraction (King & Kitchener, 1994). In other words, the capacity to examine one's identity through the lens of privilege requires at least an intermediate level of cognitive development. Endicott et al. (2003) reported a similar link to the cognitive dimension. They examined patterns of correlations between moral judgment and intercultural sensitivity and suggested that the obtained shared variance could be explained by the fact that both postconventional and ethnorelative thinking are "rooted in cognitive flexibility, or the ability to understand, consider, and weigh multiple frameworks, or schemas. In flexible moral thinking one is considering frameworks of moral principles and in flexible intercultural thinking one is considering cultural frameworks" (p. 16). Further evidence that these dimensions are related was recently reported by Torres and Baxter Magolda (2004); they found that among a sample of Latino college students, increased cognitive complexity reduced stereotype vulnerability and enabled more complex constructions of ethnic identity.

As can be seen by looking at Table 1, juxtaposing domains of development with varying levels of development illuminates both similarities and differences among the rows

and columns. While each row focuses on a different dimension of development, each column reveals similarities in approaches to meaning making within developmental level. At the early phases of development, learners tend to accept authorities' views (cognitive dimension), define themselves through others' views and expectations (intrapersonal dimension), and act in relationships to acquire approval (interpersonal dimension). In the context of racial, ethnic, or sexual orientation identity development, these characteristics are consistent with the lack of awareness of one's particular identity that stems from accepting external (often dominant) perspectives. Dissonance in various aspects of identity development often stems from marginalization by others, which can call into question the validity of external authority. As learners struggle through the confusion that comes with realizing that all knowledge is not certain and that they must consider establishing their own views (cognitive dimension), they also come to question their reliance on others for self-definition (intrapersonal) and on others' approval in relationships (interpersonal). The particulars of race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation are intertwined in this confusion and exploration. The need to explore these issues for oneself and move away from uncritically accepting authorities' views is consistent with the exploration phases of these layers of identity. In later, more complex phases of development where self-authorship on all three dimensions is achieved, it is possible to construct an internally defined perspective on how one's race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation is integrated into one's view of oneself.

Other researchers have also reported findings that illustrate interrelationships across domains of development. One prominent example was offered by Parks Daloz, Keen, Keen, and Daloz Parks (1996) in a study of

100 individuals who had committed themselves to the public good. They reported the following:

In sum, many of our interviewees are able to coordinate several cultural perspectives at once, including their own. Thus, they can appreciate what they find worthwhile and are open to what they may not easily grasp in another culture, yet they are forthright in their abhorrence of brutality regardless of where it is found. At the same time, they are conscious of their own cultural frame from which they are rendering their judgment. In effect, their appreciation for cultural difference does not invalidate their sense of a moral compass. On the contrary, their experiences appear to strengthen it by taking them across the boundaries of and beyond the blind spots of their own tribal perspectives. (p. 119)

## STUDENT REFLECTIONS ACROSS LEVELS OF INTERCULTURAL MATURITY

In the prior section, we presented a conceptual framework for the development of intercultural maturity. Here, we offer examples from interviews with White and Latino students that informed the identification of these developmental themes and that illustrate these themes. These excerpts are drawn from studies conducted by Baxter Magolda (1992, 2001) and Torres (2003).

### Initial Perspectives on Intercultural Maturity

Lauren, a White participant in Baxter Magolda's (1992) longitudinal study, relied on external authority to define herself during college. Her stance on differences was apparent in this story:

One thing that living off campus showed

me the most is that it's really hard sometimes to live with your friends and be good friends with them at the same time. I lived with my best friend last year, and that might have been a mistake because we fought over trivial matters. But it turned into bigger things. This year, we are in the same house but on different floors. We haven't had a fight yet. It's important to learn that they're your friends; however, you can't eat, breathe, and live twenty-four hours a day with them. (Baxter Magolda, pp. 313-314)

Lauren and her best friend fought about their differences when they lived in the same room, leading Lauren to suspect it might have been a mistake to live together. Lauren's revelation the second year that it was easier to get along with friends when living on different floors or not being together so much suggests that maintaining relationships requires avoiding difference. From the vantage point of external self-definition, others' approval is crucial to maintaining relational bonds; thus difference threatens relationships. Elements of her meaning-making process that support this as a threat include viewing difference as wrong, needing affirmation from dependent relationships with similar others, and lacking awareness of one's own values and social identity. This perspective no doubt contributed to Lauren's focus on building friendships with those who were like her during college. This stance does not reflect the ability to deal effectively with difference, a key aspect of intercultural maturity.

Elizabeth, a participant in Torres's (2003) longitudinal study of Latino students' identity development, offers another example of the initial phase of the trajectory. Despite having grown up in a bicultural family (her father is Latino and her mother is Anglo), she accepted the values and attitudes of the majority culture and identified her cultural orientation as

Anglo. Torres reported that Elizabeth initially found the diversity in the college environment created an internal conflict:

I have felt that I have been more segregated [in college] because when I was in high school, there weren't many Hispanics, and so like I [being Cuban] . . . would be neat, like "Yes, I am Cuban, and this is how we do things."

And here there are so many Hispanics, but most of them have grown up with both Hispanic parents, or in a Hispanic neighborhood, or in a Hispanic country, and so they are like very, very cultural, and I am like half and half, so sometimes I feel like a . . . an outsider in the Hispanic group, but then like I don't want to be, because that is my culture, but I don't speak fluent Spanish anymore, and they [other Latino students] do things different than I would. (Torres, p. 538)

Torres interpreted Elizabeth's perspective as one of unexamined ethnic identity because of the lack of focus on her Latino culture in her earlier environment. Elizabeth's comments suggest that she relies on external others at college for her self-definition, and her lack of similarity to her peers in terms of parental heritage and speaking Spanish limits her ability to connect with them. She feels segregated because she perceives herself as different from her Hispanic peers.

### **Intermediate Perspectives on Intercultural Maturity**

Both Lauren and Elizabeth shifted to the intermediate phase of the trajectory over time. Lauren reported a very different perspective on interacting with others after college. She worked in various business contexts during her early twenties. During this time she struggled to shift from relying on her parents for direction to making her own choices. By her

mid-twenties she reported changes in her relations with others:

I also matured in my relationships because people my age were not plentiful, so I did make some new friends that were older. And, also, different types of friends. In high school and college, everybody I hung around with was like me. You should give everybody an opportunity to be your friend regardless of where they work or where they went to school or if they didn't go to school or if their economic background was different than yours. And I can honestly say that I didn't give the other people a chance [before]. And I don't know why. But coming here opened some doors. You just really realize that everybody's different and everybody's unique in their own way. That doesn't mean that they're less because they don't have a college degree, for example. And I'll tell you, too, I think I'm more appreciative right now because from what I see there are so many other sides and walks of life. Everybody's situation isn't like the situation that I have. So maybe a little bit more open, I guess. (Baxter Magolda, 2001, p. 288)

Lauren's experience with people different from herself in age and economic background helped her understand multiple realities. Her shift from external to internal self-definition allowed her to be open to these new realities, leading her to construct relationships with people she avoided in college. Her own evolving sense of her identity in her twenties allowed her to move beyond dependent relationships with similar others to explore differences in a new way. Because she was able to associate with similar peers during college, this challenge did not present itself until after college.

In contrast, Elizabeth's internal conflict prompted her to begin exploring her ethnic identity early in college. At her second-year

interview she identified her cultural orientation as bicultural and described to Torres (2003) why she planned to study abroad for a year. She reported that being in a class in which many of the students were Hispanic had an influence on her plans:

So, in that class, I just really felt whiter than white, like more American than ever, and they would stay afterwards with the professor and speak Spanish and . . . oh, I just hurt. I really want to be able to do that and that's like a really big deal why I am studying [abroad] the entire year, because my Spanish is horrendous and . . . I want to be fluent by the time I get back. I want to be able to read in Spanish, write in Spanish and be good at it. And it's been really hard because the Hispanic kids don't look at me as very Hispanic. But the white kids or the American kids, . . . [with] their racism issue, they'll look at me and they'll hear me sing a Spanish song or listen to Spanish music or, you know, things like that, or I want to eat Spanish food and they look at me like, "Oh, God, she is so Spanish" you know, and I'm not. It's just because it is so different to them. So, I don't know, it's hard. . . . My quest or journey to learn Spanish is a really big deal but also the education I get and the different classes in Latin America . . . they all kind of deal with like the same things, like, cultural identity and that's why I am really, really interested in anthropology. But that's like a really big deal, how people see themselves, how people identify because it really has an effect on your whole outlook on life. (Torres, p. 542)

Subtle changes are evident in Elizabeth's second year story. She drew distinctions between how other students see her and how she identifies herself. Although she still desires the approval and acceptance of her Hispanic peers, she identifies herself separately from their perceptions of her. Her awareness of the

importance of how people identify themselves suggests her increasing awareness of multiple perspectives. She has concrete plans to explore her cultural identity further and to develop the language that is central to it.

### **Mature Perspectives on Intercultural Maturity**

Carlos, also a participant in Torres's (2003) study, grew up in an environment in which he was the majority. Torres regarded this as an important factor in Carlos's comfort with his ethnicity upon entering college and his having achieved a complex understanding of his ethnic identity during his second year. He shared the result of seeking out a diverse group of friends during his second year at college:

I definitely found my place. I know a lot more Hispanic students. That's great—I can speak Spanish with them a lot and love that. Also I've learned to live with like the fact that I am different culturally, myself. I've learned to integrate myself and I've culturalized [adapted]. . . . The way I found it is not by trying to change others, but just by trying to understand and making them understand more about me. The Mexican culture within the Hispanic culture is different and I talk about it in conversation, but I also learned not to focus on the fact that my skin may be a different color or my name might be a lot different than others, but rather that all our blood is red. In a way I have become blind to it, but not completely blind to it . . . In a way I accept it more and I think that through me accepting it like that, I think others accept. (Torres, p. 543)

Carlos describes himself as having become blind to difference, but in a qualified way. He sought out diversity within the Hispanic culture and focused on trying to understand different cultural orientations. He talked about

his own cultural orientation in conversation with diverse peers to get them to understand him. In accepting his own cultural orientation and how it differs from that of others, he encourages others to accept difference. His understanding of cultural difference goes deeper than skin color or names. He is able to shift perspectives and use multiple cultural frames to understand his friends, can engage in meaningful relationships with diverse others without seeking their approval, and has an internal identity that allows him to stay true to himself and his culture, while openly engaging with others to discuss diverse views.

Christina was a White participant in Casa de la Solidaridad, a Jesuit-based study abroad program where students work with the poor in El Salvador (Yonkers-Talz, 2004). She developed a mature intercultural perspective by living in a rural village in El Salvador and through her relationships with people in the Salvadoran community. She described how it changed her:

It has turned my world upside down and has made me more aware of things in the world. Spending time in the communities in Tepecoyo [praxis site] and really talking to the people and hearing what they have to say about political issues, their beliefs, and their spirituality. It opens your eyes, seeing how other people live, and the atmosphere and the setting, but also the Casa students have been a key aspect of my learning, because I looked at them and what they say, and they have a lot of views and have so many wonderful things to share. I'd get so much more out of what they had to say than out of any class. . . . The classes helped solidify it all. (Yonkers-Talz, p. 173)

Having sustained relationships with Salvadorans helped Christina understand multiple cultural frames. She used these frames to challenge her views of herself, as evidenced in

these comments:

I feel like I have been inwardly trying to figure out what this experience means to me and how I'm going to take that back, and how that is going to shape what I do in the future. So I feel right now I am more inwardly focused on myself and on my own development of ideas and thoughts and stuff and political thoughts and things along those lines. . . . Sometimes I wonder why I am so grateful for this experience. Now I can never ever again be the same person I was. Sometimes I think it would be so much easier if I didn't know that people live like this and could go on living in my happy little world, thinking everything is perfect, doing the service project and not questioning things. . . . It has affected what I'm going to do. It affected every action that I take. I'm forever dedicated to these people that I have met here. I am dedicated to them and their struggle for justice. In a way I am pushed to figure out why people are living so awfully in the United States. There is still so much poverty in the United States. . . . I thought I would go into nursing and be a missionary but now I feel drawn towards education—to learn about the realities of the world, to do education. . . . I am more aware of how my little decisions affect the greater population, and how things in the U.S. affect smaller countries like El Salvador. My train of thought is changed, asking questions that I would never have bothered to ask before. When we don't know a lot of this stuff [poverty], you don't think about it. You just think about if there are people living like this here, how are people living in the rest of the world and what is the way to deal with that? (Yonkers-Talz, pp. 173-174)

Christina's reflections illustrate her recognition of the need to define her beliefs internally and to define her role in the larger world. She

understands how her actions and community practices affect larger social systems and is willing to work to improve the lives of those whose experience differs from her own.

### Summary

In this section, we have presented verbatim examples of student reflections that illustrate the three levels of development of intercultural maturity described in Table 1. These examples illustrate the ways students reflect on their diversity experiences in ways that show development in their meaning-making over time, and how seemingly separate strands of development (cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal) are interrelated as students develop intercultural maturity.

### EDUCATIONAL APPLICATIONS AND FUTURE INQUIRY

The changes in students' intercultural skills being called for today require not just knowing more facts or having more awareness, but a genuine maturity, an individual transformation that enables students to apply their knowledge and skills in a variety of contexts. That is, educators are being asked to produce graduates who see the world, themselves, and their own agency in more sophisticated and enabling ways, and who can appropriately draw upon that understanding as the need arises. To achieve this goal, we argue that promoting intercultural maturity will be more effective if it is approached in a manner that takes into account related aspects of development (that is, defined not only as knowledge or as a set of social skills) and that acknowledges that this type of maturity doesn't emerge fully formed, but unfolds with time and experience. We now turn to ways educators can apply this integrated, developmental model to promote intercultural maturity.

Existing frameworks for educational practice illustrate how this developmental, integrated model can be used to guide practice. For example, Ortiz and Rhoads's (2000) framework for multicultural education outlines a series of five steps that are part of an individual's journey toward intercultural maturity. The first step, understanding culture, acknowledges the dynamics of the initial level of development of intercultural maturity and introduces students to new ways of thinking in a low-risk approach. Many students (especially majority White students) report being afraid to discuss diversity issues, either not feeling comfortable with the language of the topic, or afraid that their comments will be misunderstood and labeled racist; both discourage motivation for cultural learning. Ortiz and Rhoads's framework explicitly starts at a lower threshold of risk to encourage the conversation at a place that challenges but does not overwhelm students at the initial level of maturity. The increasingly complex steps engage students in moving toward the intermediate level of intercultural maturity as they learn about other cultures (step two) and deconstruct White culture (step three). The most complex fourth and fifth steps of recognizing the legitimacy of other cultures and developing a multicultural outlook guide students into the mature level of intercultural maturity. The goals and activities for each step engage students in exploring and gradually reformulating how they see the world (cognitive), how they see themselves (intrapersonal), and how they relate to others (interpersonal).

Hornak and Ortiz (2004) demonstrated the utility of this framework to design a multicultural education class for business students at a community college. They chronicled the challenges that students faced when addressing diversity content and found that the Ortiz and Rhoads (2000) framework

provided ways for the course instructor to both challenge and support students' efforts to develop a self-authored multicultural perspective. Fernandez (2002) adapted the Ortiz and Rhoads framework to examine the development of intercultural competence. She explored how students' experiences with culture shock could be used to enhance self-authorship. For each of five developmental steps, she noted specific self-authorship goals, cognitive dissonance caused by culture shock, and the role of the guide in providing support for students trying to make meaning of their experiences. Thus this framework provides a rich illustration of the potential of a developmental, integrated model of intercultural maturity in multiple settings.

A second framework for educational practice in multicultural education is used in intergroup dialogue programs on college campuses (Schoem & Hurtado, 2001); these offer another example of how to implement a developmental, integrated model. Designed to promote student interaction and understanding among students from different social backgrounds, these dialogues are structured to explore students' own experiences and assumptions as the basis for enabling them to understand more fully the idea of socially constructed group distinctions and how these are played out in intergroup interactions in the US. The four-stage design of this approach takes into account the trajectory of initial to mature levels of development. The program opens by establishing the foundations for dialogue, including introductions and guidelines (e.g., no personal attacks, respect confidentiality). This welcomes students whose initial level of development may lead them to be fearful of this exchange. At the second stage, the purpose is to develop a shared vocabulary around issues of social identities and social stratification, and then to introduce

and explore concepts such as prejudice, in/out group dynamics, discrimination, and privilege, and how each affects intergroup relationships. Not until the third stage does the dialogue focus on “hot topics,” difficult or controversial issues such as separation/self-segregation on campus, or racism on campus. Guiding students gradually in exploring their assumptions and worldviews, hearing from others, and formulating more complex perspectives helps students move forward on each developmental dimension. The last stage is designed to prepare students for post-dialogue experiences, especially for action planning and alliance building. The effects of participation in these dialogues are impressive (see Hurtado, 2001, and Stephan and Stephan, 2001, for details of these studies):

[D]ialogue participation is linked with positive effects on cognitive outcomes such as knowledge about other groups and discrimination in society, stereotype and prejudice reduction, the development of complex thinking, social awareness of self and others in systems of inequality, and increased understanding about the causes of conflict between social groups. Dialogue participation is also found to reduce anxiety about intergroup contact, and to enhance skills related to communication across differences, conflict exploration, comfort dealing with diversity, and perspective taking. Finally, participation in intergroup dialogues, as a participant or a student facilitator, seems to promote more active involvement in social justice work. (Zúñiga, 2003, p. 18)

These outcomes reflect growth on all three developmental dimensions.

Yonkers-Talz (2004) offers another example of matching educational practice to the continuum of initial to mature intercultural maturity and to all three developmental dimensions. He used Baxter Magolda's (2004)

Learning Partnerships Model (LPM) to conceptualize the Casa de la Solidaridad, an opportunity for U.S. college students to live, study, and work in poor communities in El Salvador. One of the goals of the Casa program is for students “to learn to analyze information from a variety of cultural perspectives and use it to make wise decisions for themselves but also for the common good” (Yonkers-Talz, p. 151). This goal encompasses the cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal dimensions, respectively. The Casa's classroom pedagogy, living/learning community, experiential components, and emphasis on reflection validate students' ability to craft complex perspectives and situate learning in their experience to engage them at their varying levels of intercultural maturity. All these components also engage students in sustained reflection and in mutual construction of meaning with each other, students from the University of Central America, staff, faculty, and local Salvadorans. Thus participants are engaged in exploring increasingly complex perspectives, experiences, and notions of themselves and others. Yonkers-Talz shares narratives from Casa participants that reveal meaningful progress toward intercultural maturity.

The successful implementation of strategies designed to promote intercultural maturity is enhanced when educators themselves have a sophisticated understanding and a high level of capacity in regard to intercultural issues. For example, Landreman, Rasmussen, King, and Jiang (2004) examined how multicultural educators applied their own critical consciousness to their efforts on behalf of intercultural education.

Despite the success of these educational practices, focused research would strengthen our understanding of how to best promote the important goal of intercultural maturity.

Further study of educational practices aimed at promoting intercultural maturity might address these questions: (a) What educational practices promote the developmental complexity that undergirds intercultural maturity? (b) What educational practices promote growth toward self-authorship in all three dimensions simultaneously to support intercultural maturity? (c) What kinds of educational practices promote intercultural maturity by helping learners apply insights gained or lessons learned in one domain to another domain? (d) What kinds of experiences enhance, hinder, and/or mediate the development of intercultural maturity?

Inquiry to address theoretical and assessment issues arising from the developmental, integrated perspective is also warranted. Rich questions related to theoretical issues include: (a) How do various dimensions of students' development (e.g., cognitive complexity, racial identity status, sense of ownership of one's opinions) contribute to their capacity to become interculturally competent? (b) How does development in one domain relate to development in the other two domains? (c) How does intercultural maturity unfold over time, and what are the steps in this developmental process? (d) Does race, ethnicity, or cultural heritage mediate growth toward intercultural maturity? (e) How do the dimensions of development intertwine in the growth of self-authorship that is directed toward intercultural maturity? (f) In students' journeys toward intercultural maturity, what levels of cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal complexity are required to achieve intercultural maturity?

Many assessment questions are also suggested by this model. Key questions include: (a) How can the three domains of development be measured in ways that capture the qualities of each domain and that, when

combined, reflect a holistic approach to development? (b) What aspects of intercultural competence should be assessed in a measure of intercultural maturity? (c) What kinds of research designs are needed to document the development of intercultural maturity from an integrated perspective? Progress in answering these and other assessment questions would assist researchers and educators alike in understanding the development of intercultural maturity.

## CONCLUSION

In this article we have introduced an integrated model of development that we think has great potential for better understanding the nature of intercultural maturity, how students develop the capacity to achieve collegiate outcomes around diversity issues, and why efforts to promote the achievement of a variety of diversity outcomes have met with mixed success. This model lays a foundation for developing an integrated model of the development of intercultural maturity, one that is multidimensional rather than one-dimensional. We have tried to show how an integrative model provides a more comprehensive, and therefore more powerful, conceptual tool for understanding and promoting development than do models that focus predominantly or exclusively on one domain. Further, we have tried to describe how the development of intercultural maturity unfolds gradually and in a manner that reflects an individual's maturity in each of the three dimensions.

We encourage other scholars to extend and test the model we have proposed here, using strategies that enable the assessment of intercultural maturity both within and across developmental domains, and to explore whether the use of an integrated model yields more effective educational interventions.

Research on this topic presents not only conceptual but methodological challenges; nevertheless, national and international events that reflect intercultural tensions suggest an urgency to this agenda.

The need to address intercultural issues personally and with more than one's intellect is not a new insight; in fact, Aldous Huxley captured it eloquently in 1947:

Proverbs are always platitudes until you have experienced the truth of them. The newly arrested thief knows that honesty is the best policy with an intensity of conviction which the rest of us can never experience. And to realize that it takes all sorts to make a world one must have seen a certain number of the sorts with one's own eyes. There is all the difference in the world between believing academically,

with the intellect, and believing personally, intimately, with the whole living self. (*Jesting Pilate*, p. 207; quoted by Storti, 1990, p. 53)

Believing with the intellect or relying on cognitive attributes may be a good first step in the development of intercultural maturity. We propose this integrated framework and identify educational programs that exemplify its major components as steps toward the end of helping students to gain the maturity to believe personally and "with the whole living self."

---

*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Patricia M. King, 2117 School of Education Building, 610 E. University Avenue, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259; patking@umich.edu*

## REFERENCES

- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2002). *Greater expectations: A new vision of learning as a nation goes to college*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (1992). *Knowing and reasoning in college: Gender-related patterns in student intellectual development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (1997). Facilitating meaningful dialogues about race. *About Campus*, 2(5), 14-18.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (1999). *Creating contexts for learning and self-authorship: Constructive-developmental pedagogy*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2000a). Interpersonal maturity: Integrating agency and communion. *Journal of College Student Development*, 41(2), 141-156.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2000b). Teaching to promote holistic learning and development. In Baxter Magolda, M. B. (Ed.), *Teaching to promote intellectual and personal maturity: Incorporating students' worldviews and identities into the learning process*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 82, 88-98. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2001). *Making their own way: Narratives for transforming higher education to promote self-development*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2003). Identity and learning: Student affairs' role in transforming higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(1), 231-247.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2004). Self-authorship as the common goal of 21st century education. In M. B. Baxter Magolda & P. M. King (Eds.), *Learning partnerships: Theory and models of practice to educate for self-authorship* (pp. 1-35). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B., & King, P. M., (Eds.). (2004). *Learning partnerships: Theory and models of practice to educate for self-authorship*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Belenky, M., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N., & Tarule, J. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bennett, C. (2001). Genres of research in multicultural education. *Review of Educational Research*, 71(2), 171-217.
- Bennett, M. (1993). Towards ethno-relativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 21-71). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Bidell, T. R., Lee, E. M., Boucie, N., Ward, C., & Brass, D. (1994). Developing conceptions of racism among young white adults in the context of cultural diversity coursework. *Journal of Adult Development*, 1(3), 185-200.
- Bikson, T. K & Law, S. A. (1994). *Global preparedness and human resources: College and corporate perspectives*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Brabeck, M. (Ed.) (1989). *Who cares? Theory, research, and educational implications of the ethic of care*. New York: Praeger.
- Broido, E. M. (2000). The development of social justice allies during college: A phenomenological investigation. *Journal of College Student Development*, 41 (1), 3-18.
- Cass, V. C. (1984). Homosexual identity formation: Testing a theoretical model. *Journal of Sex Research*, 20, 143-167.
- Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cross, W. E. J. (1991). *Shades of Black: Diversity in African-American identities*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- D'Augelli, A. R. (1994). Identity development and sexual orientation: Toward a model of lesbian, gay, and bisexual development. In E. J. Trickett, R.J. Watts, & D. Birman (Eds.), *Human diversity: Perspectives on people in context* (pp. 312-333). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Derryberry, P., & Thoma, S. (2000). The friendship effect: Its role in the development of moral thinking in students. *About Campus*, 5(2), 13-18.
- Endicott, L., Bock, T., & Narvaez, D. (2003). Moral reasoning, intercultural development, and multicultural experiences: Relations and cognitive underpinnings. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27, 403-419.
- Evans, N. J., & D'Augelli, A. R. (1996). Lesbians, gay men, and bisexual people in college. In R. C. Savin-Williams & K. M. Cohen (Eds.), *The lives of lesbians, gays, and bisexuals: Children to adults* (pp. 201-226). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.
- Fernandez, E. (2002). Framing incidents of culture shock: A growth process for intercultural maturity. Unpublished paper, University of Michigan. Available from the author, Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education, 2117 Education Building, 610 East University Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 49109.
- Fischer, K. W. (1980). A theory of cognitive development: The control and construction of hierarchies of skills. *Psychological Review*, 87(6), 477-531.
- Fischer, K. W., & Bidell, T. R. (1998). Dynamic development of psychological structures in action and thought. In W. Damon (Ed.) and R. Lerner (Series Editor), *Handbook of child psychology, Vol. 5, Theoretical models of human development* (pp. 467-561). New York: Wiley.
- Fortune 500 corporations file brief in support of diversity in higher education. (2000, October 16). [On-line press release]. Retrieved March 1, 2004, from: <http://www.umich.edu/~urell/admissions/releases/fortune.html>
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on student outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(3), 330-366.
- Guthrie, V. L. (1996). *The relationship of levels of intellectual development and levels of tolerance for diversity among college students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, KY.
- Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helms's White and people of color racial identity models. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 188-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hornak, A. M., & Ortiz, A. M. (2004). Creating a context to promote diversity education and self-authorship among community college students. In M. B. Baxter Magolda & P. M. King (Eds.), *Learning partnerships: Theory and models of practice to educate for self-authorship* (pp. 91-123). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Howard-Hamilton, M. F. (2000). Creating a culturally responsive learning environment for African American students. In M. B. Baxter Magolda (Ed.), *Teaching to promote intellectual and personal maturity: Incorporating students' worldviews and identities into the learning process. New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 82, 45-53. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Howard-Hamilton, M. F., Richardson, S., & Shuford, B. C. (1998). Promoting multicultural education: A holistic approach. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 18(1), 5-17.
- Hurtado, S. (2001). Research and evaluation on intergroup dialogues. In D. Schoem & S. Hurtado (Eds.), *Intergroup dialogue: Deliberative democracy in school, college, community and workplace* (pp. 22-36). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Jones, S. R., & McEwen, M. K. (2000). A conceptual model of multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 41(4) 405-414.
- Josselson, R. (1987). *Finding herself: Pathways to identity development in women*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Josselson, R. (1996). *Revising herself: The story of women's identity from college to midlife*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kappler, B. J. (1998). *Refining intercultural perspective-taking*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
- Keeling, R. P. (Ed.). (2004). *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience*. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators and American College Personnel Association.
- Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- King, P. M., & Baxter Magolda, M. B. (1996). A developmental perspective on learning. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37(2), 163-173.
- King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (1994). *Developing reflective judgment: Understanding and promoting intellectual growth and critical thinking in adolescents and adults*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (2004). Reflective judgment: Theory and research on the development of epistemic assumptions through adulthood. *Educational Psychologist*, 39(1), 5-18.
- King, P. M., & Mayhew, M. J. (2002). Moral judgement development in higher education: Insights from the Defining Issues Test. *Journal of Moral Education*, 33(3), 247-270.
- King, P. M., & Mayhew, M. J. (2004). Theory and research on development of moral reasoning among college students. In J. C. Smart (Ed.) *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, Vol. XIX* (pp. 375-440). New York: Springer.
- King, P. M., & Shuford, B. C. (1996). A multicultural view is a more cognitively complex view. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(2), 153-164.
- Kitchener, K. S. (2002). Skills, tasks, and definitions: Discrepancies in the understanding and data on the development of folk epistemology. *New Ideas in Psychology*, 20, 309-328.
- Kitchener, K. S., & Fischer, K. W. (1990). A skill approach to the development of reflective thinking. In D. Kuhn (Ed.), *Contributions to human development: Developmental perspectives on teaching and learning*, 21 (pp. 48-62). Basel, Switzerland: Karger.

- Knefelkamp, L. L. (2005, January). *Educational encounters in the intersection: Student intellectual, intercultural, and identity development*. Presentation made at the Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges and Universities, Washington, DC.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *Essays on moral development: Vol. II. The psychology of moral development*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Landreman, L. (2003, November). *A multidimensional model of intercultural consciousness: A reconceptualization of multicultural competence*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Portland, OR.
- Landreman, L., Rasmussen, C., King, P. M., & Jiang, C. (2004, November). *Exploring the development of multicultural educators' critical consciousness: A phenomenological study*. Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Kansas City, KS.
- Levine, A., & Cureton, J. S. (1998). *When hope and fear collide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Marcia, J. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3, 551-558.
- Marcia, J. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (pp. 159-187). New York: Wiley.
- Martin, J. (1985). *Reclaiming a conversation*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- McIntosh, P. (1989, July-August). White privilege; Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Peace and Freedom*, 10-12.
- Mentkowski, M. and Associates (2000). *Learning that lasts: Integrating learning, development, and performance in college and beyond*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Moore, K. A., & Ortiz, A. M. (1999). *The intercultural competence project: Site visit and focus group report*. A Report to the Institute on the International Education of Students. East Lansing: Michigan State University.
- Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ortiz, A. M. (1997). *Defining oneself in a multicultural world: Ethnic identity in college students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California Los Angeles.
- Ortiz, A. M. (2000). Expressing cultural identity in the learning community: Opportunities and challenges. In M. B. Baxter Magolda (Ed.), *Teaching to promote intellectual and personal maturity: Incorporating students' worldviews and identities into the learning process*. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 82, 67-79. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ortiz, A. M., & Rhoads, R. A. (2000). Deconstructing whiteness as part of a multicultural educational framework: From theory to practice. *Journal of College Student Development*, 41(1) 81-93.
- Ottavi, T., Pope-Davis, D., & Dings, J. (1994). Relationship between White racial identity attitudes and self-reported multicultural counseling competencies. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 41(2), 149-154.
- Parks, S. D. (2000). *Big questions, worthy dreams: Mentoring young adults in their search for meaning, purpose, and faith*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Parks Daloz, L., Keen, C. H., Keen, J. P., & Daloz Parks, S. (1996). *Common fire: Lives of commitment in a complex world*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Perry, W. G. (1968). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme*. New York: Rinehart and Winston.
- Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(3), 499-514.
- Pope, R. L., & Reynolds, A. L. (1997). Student affairs core competencies: Integrating multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. *Journal of College Student Development*, 38, 266-277.
- Pope, R. L., & Reynolds, A. L., & Mueller, J. (2004). *Multicultural competence in student affairs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pope-Davis, D. B., Reynolds, A. L., Dings, J. G., & Ottavi, T. M. (1994). Multicultural competencies of doctoral interns at university counseling centers: An exploratory investigation. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 25, 466-470.
- Rest, J. R., Narvaez, D., Bebeau, M., & Thoma, S. J. (1999a). *Postconventional moral thinking: A neo-Kohlbergian approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rest, J. R., Narvaez, D., Bebeau, M., & Thoma, S. J. (1999b). A Neo-Kohlbergian approach: The DIT and schema theory. *Educational Psychology Review*, 11, 291-324.
- Schoem, D., & Hurtado, S. (2001). *Intergroup dialogue: Deliberative democracy in school, college, community, and workplace*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Stephan, W., & Stephan, C. W. (2001). *Improving intergroup relations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Storti, C. (1990). *The art of crossing cultures*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Steglitz, I. (1993). *Intercultural perspective-taking: The impact of study abroad*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
- Thompson, C. E., & Carter, R. T. (1997). An overview and elaboration of Helms's racial identity development theory. In C. E. Thompson & R. T. Carter (Eds.), *Racial identity theory: Applications to individual, group, and organizational interventions* (pp. 15-32). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Torres, V. (2003). Factors influencing ethnic identity development of Latino college students in the first two years of college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(4), 532-547.
- Torres, V., & Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2004). Reconstructing Latino identity: The influence of cognitive development on the ethnic identity process of Latino students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45(3), 333-347.
- Wijeyesinghe, C. L., & Jackson, B. W. III. (2001). *New perspectives on racial identity development: A theoretical and practical anthology*. New York: New York University Press.
- Yonkers-Talz, K. (2004). A learning partnership: U.S. college students and the poor in El Salvador. In M. B. Baxter Magolda & P. M. King (Eds.), *Learning partnerships: Theory and models of practice to educate for self-authorship* (pp. 151-184). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Zúñiga, X. (2003). Bridging differences through intergroup dialogue. *About Campus*, 7(6), 8-16.