

Section IV

SOME NOTIONS ON LEARNING INTERCULTURAL UNDERSTANDING

CORA DuBOIS
Harvard-Radcliffe

Introduction

The original title assigned to this paper was "Intercultural Education and International Understanding." In an attempt to understand what each of these words meant and how they could be related, certain notions emerged that have led to a more modest formulation of the topic. In order to spare the reader the time-consuming confusions through which the writer passed, it will be necessary to present a tentative and preliminary characterization of certain notions and distinctions as they will be used here.

First.—It seems essential to distinguish between intercultural and international. By cultural categories are meant the perceptions, knowledge, values, and attendant behaviors of groups of human beings. National categories, on the other hand, are complex institutional aggregates. Nations and cultures are rarely coterminous. Nations interact systematically through highly structured institutions. However, the system of interaction is of a markedly different order from the system of interaction that operates between individuals of different cultures. Cultural categories are congenial and familiar to anthropologists. They are less equipped to deal with national categories. This paper therefore addresses itself to intercultural rather than international relationships.

One of the common popular fallacies today is the confusion of these two systems. Individuals of different cultures may interact as if they were national (i.e., governmental) representatives. For example, an individual Indian may act toward an individual American as if the latter were the embodiment of military aid to Pakistan. On the other hand, many people today act as if relationships between individuals of different cultures were a direct imperative to relationships between national governments. This viewpoint is held by many advocates of governmentally sponsored programs of cross-cultural study. Cross-cultural study may be "a good thing," but to assume that it will directly and quickly affect international relations is to underestimate the complex forces controlling international relations and to confuse the systems within which peoples and governments relate to each other. The foregoing statements are not the equivalent of saying

there is no relationship between these two systems. It is quite possible that they may interlock at many points, but the salient variables of each system are probably discrete.

Second.—Learning is here considered as the process of acquiring a culture; education is the process of imparting it. Intimately related as the two are, we shall be concerned primarily with learning. It is conceived here as a process continuing throughout life but at various tempos. Individuals not only acquire the perceptions, symbols, attitudes, behavior, and values of social aggregates to which they are exposed, but also may acquire a cognitive command of some or all of the systems operative within those social aggregates.

Of considerable importance is the distinction between *affective* and *cognitive* learning. A child for example may absorb from the grandmother who rears him a conservative viewpoint toward life (Mead, 1951, *passim*). But he may also have to learn systems. If he is an individual who has been brought up abroad, or within a family of mixed cultural backgrounds, or even as a bilingual, he may from earliest childhood have acquired varying degrees of bicultural or even multicultural affective learning. If he has not had that sort of early experience in childhood, he may nevertheless learn to learn about cultural differences. An individual whose affective learning endows him with the capacity to relate to people across two or more cultural traditions does not *pari passu* command associated cognitive skills concerning the systems of cultures. Contrariwise, persons who have cognitively learned the systematic aspects of different cultures are not *pari passu* capable of relating themselves interpersonally across cultural lines.

It is suggested that cognitive learning about systems of different cultures is more likely to be applicable to competence in international relations than to competence in intercultural relations. We have all known foreign service personnel who perform their assigned tasks with competence but who never establish contacts with the people of the country in which they are posted. Similarly we have all known acute social analysts who cannot work with informants. On the other hand, we have all known people who lack systematic analytic capacities in any intercultural or international field but have a genius for establishing personal contacts wherever they are. In sum, we must distinguish between affective and cognitive learning in respect to both intercultural and international relationships. Affective learning comes before cognitive learning, although the latter may start very early in life. Both types of learning probably continue through a person's life. It does seem likely, however, that, for most Westerners at least, the weight of affective learning occurs early in the life span and that the weight of cognitive learning occurs later in the life span.

Third.—In the light of the foregoing it may be useful to establish distinctions between intuition, knowledge, and understanding.

"Intuition" is unfortunately a questionable word and one not always in the best repute. However, it is used here, *faut de mieux*, to express the substantive aspect of the affective learning process. It is the series of

affective responses, cues, and their attendant values and attitudes absorbed from the outer world by learners. "Knowledge" as used here is contrasted with "intuition" in the sense that knowledge constitutes the substantive aspect of cognitive learning. It is the more or less articulate and articulated command of a structural system. "Understanding" is used to cover the synthesis of intuition and knowledge—in the sense that both the cues and attitudes as well as the comprehension of the structural system can be brought to bear in situational contexts. This is probably what many educators would call "true learning."

Fourth.—To provide certain verbal short cuts a distinction is quite arbitrarily made here between education and educators on the one hand and between schooling and teachers on the other.

Education is both the deliberate inculcation of knowledge, attitudes, and values and the unconscious transmission of modes of perceiving the world. The most important and pervasive type of education is that which occurs in the parent-child relationship. But more precisely, education is practiced by the "formed" in relation to the "unformed" (using these words in the French sense of *formation*). This is a more accurate way of stating the meaning here attached to educator and education, since societies differ greatly in standards of social maturity as well as in the time span and duration considered appropriate for education. Furthermore, in almost all societies there are specialists who transmit their skills, frequently to fellow adults. Therefore education takes highly varied forms. The American Indian elder tells creation myths around the fire at night. Group discussion may be set up in adult education in Chicago. The young Balinese dancer may be physically molded by an experienced performer now too old to dance. The older sibling teaches his junior sibling games and duties. The Ford Foundation sponsors educational radio and television programs requiring the collaboration of many specialists. The Indian holy man has a disciple. The psychoanalyst accepts a patient.

"Teachers" will here mean the type of educator that functions in relation to schools. "Teacher" will therefore be used here in a more limited sense than "educator." Schools are conceived as institutions for the prosecution of education. Schools, as institutions, have a more limited distribution in the world than education. However, where schools occur, they generally involve a teacher and learners, a location, and regular sessions for attendance. In some societies, schools are limited to a particular age group, or to a particular social class. They vary in what is taught and the time required to complete the educational task. They may stress knowledge broadly conceived or the transmission of a limited skill; they may initiate the child into membership in the adult world through the medium of initiation ceremonies or stress the development of individual personality; they may prize "thought" whether rationally or mystically conceived.

Learners in Relation to Intercultural Understanding

It now becomes possible to suggest at least two situational categories within which individuals learn intercultural understanding. Before presenting them, one assumption and five factors should be made explicit that are here considered salient probably in all learning but especially in the learning that is conducive to intercultural understanding.

First, it is assumed that the learner must be able to differentiate between the self and the nonself with increasing accuracy in the course of his educational trajectory. This assumption underlies both categories to be discussed. The learner must neither distort the outer world (at least within the boundaries of the reality provided by his culture) nor project the self into the outer world. Genocide and world conquerors are historical realities illustrative of individual "pathologies" of this type that have found social expression. For example, Jewish persecutions rested on the belief of many individuals that the Jews were conspiring to destroy national goals. World conquerors have persuaded the naïve, the timorous, or the helpless that their projective phantasies had external validity.

On the assumption that the distinction between self and nonself is achieved with some regard for external realities, five factors salient in intercultural learning are suggested.

Factor 1.—The learner must find avenues for relating himself to the outer world. An appraisal of the rewards and penalties as well as the various roles open to the learner must be accurately perceived.

The importance of the sequence of relating the self to social reality and to values is clearly indicated in the following quotation, written within theoretical preoccupations quite different from the present one (von Gruenebaum, 1954, p. 1):

A gesture observed acquires meaning only when we know the prayer to which it belongs; and the prayer, in turn, is comprehensible when we understand the sensibilities, the religious attitudes, and the system of faith which demand it and within which it may be judged an appropriate and correct expression of the inner experience of the community and an accepted means of approach to God. The interaction between the causal and the teleological nexus in the genesis of the historical fact (as of any psychological datum) must be noted as another characteristic of methodological importance.

This consideration suggests that an overly permissive educational practice may produce confusion in learners who must adapt to complex and heterogeneous societies. Excessive permissiveness in our society may delay and possibly disorganize the learner's accurate testing of the social reality in which his future rewards and his life chances lie.

Factor 2.—Experience is salient in all learning. If the educational goal is intercultural understanding, the learner must experience intercultural differences in many contexts and in different learning situations.

Factor 3.—Supportive personal relationships facilitate all learning. They are one of the most important channels for learners to internalize motivational and valuational resources in the environment. Such relation-

ships appear to take on added salience in intercultural understanding.

Factor 4.—Timing appears to be crucial to learning. By timing is meant "when" in the life trajectory the learning occurs. The assumption is made that affective learning is the predominant process in childhood and that cognitive learning predominates as the learner matures. We have been told that toilet training prior to myelination is futile and/or damaging to the infant. The American school system has certain rules of thumb about the appropriate age when a second language should be introduced. State laws vary somewhat on the age at which mechanical judgment has developed to the point where a driving license can be issued. These are timing factors or cultural judgments on timing in respect to learning.

Factor 5.—Duration, as contrasted to timing, is the factor having to do with the length of the learning period. The United States Army, for example, deemed one year an adequate time span for Japanese students to acquire an appreciation of American democracy. Obviously in the West we are preoccupied with time to the extent where we are inclined to see it often as an independent variable. More particularly we are preoccupied with a linear time system. This may well be a culturally determined theme and not a universal category. Nevertheless I have found no way of avoiding linear time as a factor in learning. Both duration and timing in the learning process should provide interesting opportunities for comparative research that are still inadequately explored.

There are undoubtedly other salient factors that should be considered in discussing adequately even two situational contexts relevant to learning intercultural understanding. However, for the moment these five factors alone are used to analyze two gross situational categories.

The bicultural learning situation.—This category is called bicultural for purposes of convenience. It might as easily be conceived as multicultural. It is also conceivable that this notion is applicable to class differences in a society where class ethos are markedly divergent. The interrelation of the five factors in bicultural learning is as follows: The learner is exposed in his early formative years (Factor 4—timing) to cultural differences and bicultural situations. Experience (Factor 2) with cultural differences is provided by the very definition of the category. Whether the learner will have warm supportive relationships (Factor 3) and how long bicultural learning will last (Factor 5) in any individual case are not stated by this crude situational categorization, but at least they can be determined *post factum*. It is in Factor 1, the relation of the self to the outer world and the attendant learning of systems of social rewards and variant roles, that the crucial situation seems to exist. In sum, the learner has had opportunity for affective learning but not necessarily for cognitive learning.

Let us take a fictitious but not improbable case. A boy is born to an American missionary family in India. The parents, absorbed in their responsibilities, turn the infant over in large part to an Indian nurse. He may have a warm supportive relationship with that nurse but much less warmth and support from his parents who are busy with mission tasks. In which world, the Indian or American, will the child ultimately seek

relationships and learn the roles open to him and the rewards or penalties entailed? Given the divergent roles of his Indian nurse and his American mother, the inconsistencies between their respective perceptions and values, how will the child learn to place his allegiances? How much confusion will he manifest on this score? The impulse and the tradition of his parents will be to send him to the United States to a "good school" near some member of the family. If the school is indeed a good one, if he makes an early enough transition, his early confusions may be resolved and the way cleared for him to attain bicultural understanding. But to achieve this solution, the affective learning of his early years must be enriched by cognitive learning in the course of his educational career.

A dramatically different illustration of bicultural learning can be suggested. An African village boy has grown up to the age of ten in a moderately acculturated village and has attended a not too "efficient" Western-type village school. He shows aptitude in Western learning. The local administrator and the parents agree to send him two hundred miles away to a boarding school. How do our salient learning factors operate in such a case? Again, cross-cultural experience will not be lacking, but what will be the effect of abrupt transition when he is already ten years old between the boarding school environment and the home village? How will these social discontinuities affect his life trajectory? Will they blur his sense of what constitutes self and nonself? Will they be conducive to regressive formations? How accurately will he be able to compare the two systems of rewards and penalties and the variant roles both in the village and in the other world that is opened to him through a rural African boarding school? And what is the likelihood of his finding in a boarding school those warm supportive personal relationships that we have assumed to be highly important to all learning but particularly to intercultural understanding? Before coming to any conclusion other than the complexity of the situation with which we are dealing, it may be desirable to present a second situational category.

The monocultural learning situation.—In this category the learner is born into a relatively homogeneous social aggregate. Whereas learning to relate the self to the outer world and to acquire a sense of the system of social rewards and variant roles (Factor 1) was suggested as crucial for the bicultural learner, for the monocultural learner let us assume that this factor, relatively speaking, is facilitated. We may also assume that time to learn these matters (Factor 5) is adequate. As in the case of the bicultural learner, the supportive relationship (Factor 3) cannot be predicted. The crucial factors will be the acquisition of cross-cultural experience (Factor 2); what constitutes the best timing for introducing various cross-cultural experiences (Factor 4); and how long a time span must be provided various individuals for cross-cultural learning to occur (Factor 5).

To capulate the argument so far made, the rough diagram following on the next page is offered.

There is no doubt that such a formulation is intolerably vague and oversimplified. Yet, inadequate as it is, it may further the development of some useful notions.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN SELF AND NONSELF IS ASSUMED

| Salient Factors | Bicultural | Monocultural |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| 1. Relation of self to society | Crucial | Facilitated |
| 2. Experience with other culture | Given | Crucial |
| 3. Supportive relationships | Must be determined | Must be determined |
| 4. Timing | Assumed at period of greatest proto-learning | Crucial to intercultural understanding |
| 5. Duration | Must be determined | Crucial to intercultural understanding |

Before pursuing such notions, let us turn to some of the very broadest forces that affect the context within which intercultural learning is proceeding in the contemporary world.

Contemporary Conditions of Intercultural Learning

The assumption is made that no numerically significant ethnic group in the contemporary world has escaped either the direct or the indirect influence of the last four centuries of Euro-American cultural expansion. This is as true for the West as for other areas of the world, since the feedback effects on the West of its expansion have exerted great influence upon it. The intercultural contacts of those four centuries have engendered cumulative intercultural learning. In other words, intercultural contacts provide the situational context for intercultural learning. The lessons of the West have been learned, and their implications are often more vigorously pursued in the rest of the world than in the West itself. But education, as the deliberate inculcation of Western knowledge, attitudes, and values started later than the first learning contacts and has had on the whole a somewhat slower rate of acceleration.¹ The Western school system has been slowest of all, with the result that the Western system of schooling as it has been introduced into other cultures is at present, or soon will be, interpreted and restructured by local teachers who have comprehended and accepted Westernization in varying degrees.

Two propositions may now be advanced:

First, in societies undergoing rapid change there will be discrepancies between what the individual learns, what the educators inculcate, and what the schools teach. Probably even in societies that change at relatively slow rates such discrepancies are present, but the proposition here suggested is that the greater the rate of social change, the greater the discrepancies. If this proposition is true, then it follows from our earlier assumption about the rapid rate of social change in the contemporary world that we may

¹ There are exceptions of course. The proselytizing fervor that accompanied Hispanic expansion must be counted as education in the sense in which the word is used here.

expect to find individuals everywhere facing discrepancies between the knowledge, attitudes, and values they have learned, those inculcated by their educators, and those taught in their schools. All learners therefore face to some degree the situation suggested for bicultural learners.

The second proposition is that social tensions are definable in terms of the gap between values and practice, or, if one speaks in terms of individual psychology, between aspirations and resources. Presumably all learning and much social change is attributable to such tension gaps. As social analysts or practitioners we must try to formulate means for determining under what conditions and at what intensity gaps prove intolerable to individuals and have deleterious repercussions on social groups, institutions, or commonly held value systems.

These are certainly not novel ideas. Studies of the social and psychological implications of urbanization point in this direction. Riesman (1950) has given us a provocative statement of discrepancies between values and practices and between inconsistent values in the American scene. Rundblad's (1951) study of Forestville in Sweden reveals the deleterious individual and social results of the gap between aspiration and resources. The contemporary problem of caste in India is another case in point. The sociological concepts of anomie and the marginal man point in the same direction. Individual cases like Kenyatta in Africa and the recent Puerto Rican attempts at assassination are straws in the same wind.

The argument just advanced runs as follows: Euro-American expansion produced intercultural contacts; these in turn triggered intercultural learning in both donor and recipient groups; intercultural learning has accelerated rates of social change; in periods of rapid social change discrepancies will arise between learning, education, and schooling; these discrepancies create individual as well as social tensions that can result in, as well as be the result of, social dysphoria.

The essential problem is to understand the processes of intercultural learning in the individual so that education can be used to diminish the deleterious personal and social tensions such learning may engender. Intercultural understanding is presumed to be a contributing element in reducing social tensions.

Given what has been suggested about learners in relation to intercultural understanding and about contemporary conditions of intercultural learning, the roles of educators and more specifically of teachers can be tentatively explored.

A Valuational Topography of the Functions of Educators and Teachers

In order to provide a preliminary topographic orientation one might suggest that educators function at one extreme of a continuum as transmitters of cultural traditions and values. The teacher of a Koran school and the traditional Chinese teacher of the classics are both examples of this type. But so also are parents who duplicate their own upbringing

in their children. At the other extreme educators may function as innovators and experimenters. Teachers who are concerned with widening horizons of knowledge and the teaching of intercultural understanding and who wish to share these interests with their students belong to this category. But wittingly or unwittingly so also may parents whose educational practice is based as nearly as possible on the latest psychological theories of child development, or who because of their own confusions abandon the child to pick up his own values and standards wherever he may.

Within this general topography persons of essentially traditional and conservative outlook will argue that the role of the educator should always be that of transmitter of traditions. Somewhat less tradition-bound individuals might argue that the teacher should be the transmitter of tradition during periods of rapid social change, that only in this way can brakes be put upon social changes that outstrip the capacity of individuals to cope with them. Such individuals might be willing to see the educator function as an innovator and experimenter during periods of relative social stability. On the other hand, persons might also argue that during a period of rapid social change, if the tension gap is not to reach individually intolerable and socially disruptive proportions, the function of educators must necessarily be that of innovators. This is precisely the situation, such persons would argue, in which education must be experimental to keep abreast of the times and to search out devices that will help human beings to deal with social tensions. Such persons might also argue that this type of education also mitigates against social stagnation in periods of relative social stability. Crudely presented as it is, the following table serves to illustrate the different value positions just presented:

| Value Judgment | Role of Education During Periods of : | |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|
| | Rapid Social Change | Slow Social Change |
| 1 | Transmitter | Transmitter |
| 2 | Transmitter | Innovator |
| 3 | Innovator | Innovator |

It is now necessary to elaborate this oversimplification. Patently in no era or area have all educators belonged exclusively to one or another type. But the important point is that schools have stressed one or another educational philosophy. There are, for example, in the United States today schools that are concerned with traditional learning and others that are frankly innovative and interested in educational experimentation. The Western type of schooling introduced into other cultures is always innovative (but not necessarily experimental) from the viewpoint of those societies.

Quite apart from value judgments on what should or should not be the role of educators in relatively stable and in rapidly changing societies, one possible hypothesis suggests itself. Since no teacher exists in a social vacuum, interaction between the social milieu and the teacher both as an individual and in his social role is inescapable. It might therefore be

hypothesized that in periods of relative social stability the major tendency will be for teachers to function as transmitters of tradition, whereas in periods of relatively rapid social change the major tendency will be for them to espouse innovation and/or experimentation. As a subhypothesis it might be suggested that schools will lag behind an educational trend in either direction, on the assumption that organized institutions respond more slowly to changing situations than do individuals.

In connection with this notion it is possible that much of the philosophy of innovation, experimentation, and permissiveness current in certain sectors of American education today reflects the unsureness of teachers, parents, and other educators concerning the relevance and viability of traditional methods and values of training the young for the world in which they will have to live. This bewilderment may be one factor in the reported inclination of parents to place responsibility for bringing up children increasingly on the schools and other institutions external to the home.

Intercultural Understanding as the Goal of the Learner-Educator Relationship

It is probably a safe guess that the vast majority of the people in the world today lack the motives and the opportunity to establish linkages across cultural or class groups, and that many never extend their direct learning beyond what is provided by primary face-to-face groupings, although they are rarely able to escape the indirect effects of the intercultural contacts and learning that characterize the modern world. This contrast between direct and indirect learning may account in part for the psychic satisfaction claimed for life in small communities or tribal groups, whether we are thinking of an American small town or the Pueblo Indians. The psychic strain of life in large social aggregates, whether nations or metropolitan centers, may reflect the same gap between direct and indirect learning.

It can be suggested that there are certain crucial points for learners in the process of relating the self to steadily expanding horizons required by contemporary life. One point is when the learner must make the transition from face-to-face (or potentially face-to-face) groups like the school or the village to secondary groups like the nation, the United Nations, or the Standard Oil Company. The other point is when cross-cultural persons or systems must be related to the self. The affiliational problems for the learner are then:

1. In-group
 - a) Primary relationship
 - b) Secondary relationship
2. Out-group
 - a) Primary relationship
 - b) Secondary relationship

The bicultural learner is presumably equipped by early life experiences with resources in primary relationships of both in-group and out-group (1a and 2a). The monocultural learner is presumably equipped by early life experiences only with resources in primary relationships of the in-group (1a). But on the other hand the monocultural learner is presumably better equipped than the bicultural learner to achieve secondary relationships in the in-group (1b).

It is now possible to return to the earlier notions presented in an earlier section, "Learners in Relation to Intercultural Understanding," to see if we can relate them to the question of educators and teachers.

In the monocultural learning situation it was suggested that the three learning factors crucial to intercultural understanding were experience, timing, and duration. The crucial questions, then, are when and for how long should learners be provided cross-cultural experiences, and what types of experience can realistically be provided within the framework of a monocultural educational and schooling system. Let us begin with the transition from in-group primary relationships (1a) to in-group secondary relationships (1b).

It can be suggested that for monocultural learners an important predisposer to experience is the existence of a symbol charged with plus values. I do not feel competent to develop this point in any detail, but I would like to suggest that symbols must be of a sort that facilitate the relation of the self to the value and to its internalization. For example, the double-headed eagle, the crown, the swastika, and the jade Buddha seem less obvious channels to self-relatedness than the Great White Father, Mother India, or the Queen. Lincoln and Washington may be better symbols of national life than the flag. There is, however, much to be said for badges of identification, such as a flag, so long as the learner is assisted in distinguishing the badge from the symbol and the symbol from reality, and so long as the symbol remains in the realm of human experience. The dilemma here appears to be twofold. Human symbols facilitate identification, but if they are not clearly and cognitively recognized as symbols, there is the risk that these human symbols may become repositories for projections of unresolved interpersonal relationships with all of the distortions such projections can induce both in the individual's intrapsychic economy and in his social and political judgments. The other dilemma is that the symbolic figure must be charged with the desired value. Thus in India, Brahman girls for a month each year between the ages of about seven and thirteen are expected to fast, meditate, and pray on the legendary life of goddesses like Sita in order that they may lead lives of comparable virtue. A human yet frankly symbolic figure with appropriate value charge is provided in an experiential context. The desired value as such is deliberately taught and presumably internalized. One wonders whether equivalent symbols and rituals could be provided that would carry the value of intercultural understanding.

What additional educational experiences may be suggested to carry the monocultural learner outward in a widening sphere of self-relatedness

with out-groups, whether primary or secondary (2a and 2b), in such a way that cultural differences can be encountered without threat?

If there is any value in the abstract argument here proposed, the answer would seem to lie in providing quite young monocultural learners with cross-cultural primary face-to-face contacts (2a) in an atmosphere of positive valuation. Teachers, family friends, nurses, and playmates from different class, cultural, and racial backgrounds will presumably afford the best channel for establishing out-group primary relationships. The disappearance of segregation in our schools may be a step in this direction. The unfortunately minuscule teacher-exchange program is another step in such a direction. Undoubtedly far more could be done in this direction by American schools than now is. It seems wise to introduce cultural behavior and values that diverge considerably from those of the monocultural learner, not in terms that stress traditional differences but rather in terms of common problems (Johnson, 1951, p. 86).

Quite apart from face-to-face experiences, the monocultural learner can be introduced quite early to cognitive learning materials that should go far in facilitating both primary and secondary out-group relationships (2a and 2b) throughout life. Chief among these is the study of foreign languages. Differing styles for perceiving and construing the world can be unthreateningly conveyed by the teaching of foreign languages. The almost complete ignorance in this country of languages that are outside the Indo-European stock is startling in a nation with world leadership responsibilities. The drop in even the customary French, Spanish, and German language teaching in the American schools should be a source of grave concern on many scores. Language training is an excellent and unthreatening channel to understanding of the arbitrary quality of symbols and of differing cultural modes of perception. It is probably one of the best educational devices for leading monocultural learners toward intercultural understanding. As a medium serving these purposes it is unfortunately seriously handicapped by the methods and the timing now employed in language teaching (Carroll, 1953, Chap. 6).

In line also with providing monocultural learners cross-cultural experience, educators and school systems can encourage study tours across cultural boundaries. American study abroad as compared with tourism is not only limited but is directed largely to countries where cultural differences are minimal, as in the United Kingdom or France. The experience of travel and study for American learners in Latin-American countries is all too little encouraged by our school system. However, it is important to insist on the importance of competent guidance and interpretation in connection with foreign study and travel (Taba, 1953, *passim*; Kahn, 1954, pp. 459-64). Cross-cultural experience without education is of minimal benefit. It may actually impede intercultural understanding. Experience must be mediated by competent and knowledgeable teaching. This was amply demonstrated by the behavior of most American army personnel overseas, who were ill-prepared to establish contacts with people of other cultures and even less prepared to develop intercultural understanding.

However, it need scarcely be stressed again that a school system can operate only within a social context. The American school system and all educational activities, whether television or psychotherapy, inevitably reflect the American system of social rewards and penalties. Until clear rewards are available for international understanding and the skills that are attendant upon it (e.g., the command of other languages or personal poise when faced with contradictory values and conditions associated with overseas travel and living experience), the school system and educators cannot be expected to alter social attitudes quickly and solely with the tools at their disposal.

We have so far dealt essentially with experience that might be provided the monocultural learner to develop his capacity for intercultural understanding.

By implication both timing and time have at least been touched upon. Both affective and cognitive learning for encouraging both primary and secondary relationships may be introduced early in the educational trajectory. Thus language could easily be introduced in the primary grades, whereas guided study tours would not be feasible before the secondary school. There is much need for precise and practical educational research into the problems of timing and duration in providing learners viable experiences that will lead to intercultural understanding. I would assume that learning opportunities in this area must be many-faceted, reinforcing, and continuing.

Let us now turn to the bicultural learner. If the earlier suggestions have validity, the bicultural learner has greater resources than the monocultural learner in that he has established at least two primary group relationships early in life. The crucial area for the bicultural learner will lie in discovering how to relate the self to at least two secondary groups without being forced to reject one or the other. What has been suggested earlier about symbols applies in the case of the bicultural learner with added emphasis. That symbols should be as culture-free as any symbol can be suggests itself further at this point.

Whereas the educator's problem with the monocultural learner is to stage in cross-cultural experience, his problem with the bicultural learner is to help his pupil discover the differing systems of rewards and the variant roles provided by secondary group relationships in different cultures, and to help him reach a viable adjustment in the face of choice. Here the role of the educator-teacher as a warm supportive figure seems to emerge with even more saliency than in the case of the monocultural learner. Educators and teachers must in their persons provide support to the bicultural learner that the monocultural learner derives from a social milieu whose system of rewards and roles are relatively apparent to him. The bicultural learner must be assisted to select social roles that promise rewards commensurate with his capacities as a learner. Variant social roles and their attendant rewards will need to be stressed in the education of the bicultural learner. But at the same time, in the achievement of these social roles and rewards, he must not have to suppress or reject the alternative cultural resources

acquired through his bicultural experience. Probably one of the greatest barriers to the development of intercultural understanding among the foreign-born or second-generation students in the United States has been the rigorous insistence in American schools, until recently, on the exclusive quality of American values. When these were reinforced by the relatively accessible rewards and variant roles offered by American society, the "alienation" of our foreign-born from their own cultural origin and their rejection of it was assured. We appear to have built national solidarity at the expense of intercultural understanding.

The establishment of Western schools, especially boarding schools, and curricula in non-Western societies is likely to constitute an extreme type of cultural discontinuity and may do much to force "either-or" choices on their learners. The native learner is presented with discrepant persons and discrepant values but not with resources for integrating both systems into an expanding concept of the self. The knowledge offered him by teachers is likely to be inadequate to the learning process and need for intercultural understanding. The learner often has no recourse except to select one or the other cultural alternative. His own pattern may close off avenues to international understanding, but the alternative educational pattern gives him no foundation in personal security. By the same token this suggests that the village or community school taught by competent indigenous teachers will provide more accessible channels to the widened identifications than will the boarding school. The ineffectuality of the boarding school program adopted by the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs in facilitating intercultural understanding among American Indians may rest on such considerations. On the other hand, this is the problem created by those non-Western students who select the Western alternative without adequately based learning patterns. The insistence of certain West Africans on a British classical education, whose relevance to their life trajectories is hard to establish, is an example of the repercussions of such discontinuities in learning that may face the bicultural learner when his resources of affective learning and his bicultural primary relationships receive exclusive rather than inclusive treatment in the course of schooling. His efforts to relate the self to secondary groups will be commensurately impaired. Whatever value judgment may be passed on this situation, we must face the probability that discontinuities in the schooling of bicultural learners are conducive to the creation of social marginality.

One final and perhaps gratuitous comment should be added. If we are considering study abroad—whether for the bicultural or monocultural learner—we are presumably concerned with a relatively advanced stage in the learner's educational trajectory. It would appear from recent studies in cross-cultural education that the same salient factors we have selected for younger learners are still operative. The educators and teachers of foreign students can help to introduce ameliorative factors that will enhance the likelihood of the learner emerging not only with a cross-cultural education but with intercultural understanding. These ameliorative factors phrased in terms of foreign students in the United States include: estab-

lishing early in the sojourn a warm supportive interpersonal relationship; safeguards against diminished self-esteem derived from attitudes bearing on race and accorded status in the host country (i.e., reduction of social penalties); provisions for schooling that will interlock with past cognitive resources; opportunities to achieve self-related goals (i.e., social rewards); and sufficient time for these processes to occur.

It should be noted that the importance of the time element in adjusting to new cultures is emerging with increasing clarity. Research on foreign students in the United States indicates that stages in learning to adjust to this country can be postulated. For example, "adjustment" seems most satisfactory in the early so-called spectator stage before the individual is genuinely engaged in the demands of a new culture. Later, if the sojourn has lasted more than a year, a deeper but again reasonably satisfactory sense of adjustment is reported. The crucial period for young adults appears to be somewhere between three months and eighteen months (Social Science Research Council, 1953; Lysgaard, 1954). The relevance of these preliminary findings for international understanding seems clear.

So far the learner-educator relationship has been discussed largely in terms of interpersonal relationships, but the social role of the educator in the larger social matrix still requires exploration. If earlier suggestions are valid, intercultural learning is a given in the contemporary world, and in a period of rapid social change discrepancies between learning, education, and schooling are probably inevitable. Educators are faced with the dilemma of choosing whether to become cultural transmitters or experimental innovators. How do such roles affect the learner-educator relationships?

The potentiality for intercultural learning in the contemporary world is, of course, an asset to the expressed value implied in intercultural understanding. The educator who wishes to assist the learners toward that goal has unprecedented opportunities offered by the increasing movement of peoples across cultural and national boundaries, the development of communication systems, new social science insights, and the growth of relevant teaching materials. The issue is to marshal these resources for the learner. "Facts" are understood only to the degree in which their context is comprehended (von Gruenebaum, 1954, p. 1). National and cultural values need not be slighted in the process. The problem is one of placing in-group and out-group cultures in comparative but nonvaluational perspectives. The role of the educator in fostering intercultural understanding is neither that of cultural transmitter nor that of experimental innovator but rather that of cultural translator. The skilled educator will appreciate the gaps on the one hand between learning, education, and schooling, and on the other hand between cultural systems. Differences can be objectively considered. Training should stress that value judgments are relevant only to values and that they are not automatically attached to any subject or system simply because they are different from the familiar or congenial. Teachers and educators have a large responsibility for cultivating rational thinking, objective analysis, and a sharp sense of relevance. The re-emphasis in the

last century on man's irrationality has served as a useful corrective to the eighteenth century's overvaluation of reason as arbiter of human affairs. Today, with our unparalleled (though avowedly meager) insights into individual and social dynamics, it is as appropriate to reappraise and to cultivate the human individual's capacity for rational and objective thought and to direct such capacity to valuational choice, as it is to assume that valuational choices reflect early and nonrational conditioning.

Summary and Conclusion

Intercultural understanding results from the ability to bring both intuition (affective learning) and knowledge (cognitive learning) to bear on cross-cultural situations. For a learner to achieve intercultural understanding certain sufficient conditions must exist: Intercultural understanding must have positive value attached to it; rewards should be perceivable for such learning; cultural differences must have been experienced; the experiences must be self-related; the sequences between the self and the learned must be left unresolved. In the monocultural learner the crucial problems are when and for how long to stage in cross-cultural experiences. In the bicultural learner the crucial problem is how to establish the coherent linkages between the self and secondary groupings of two or more cultures. Educators' and teachers' roles in respect to learners are threefold: first, to encourage an expanding system of self-relatedness; second, to supply the affective learning resources essential to intuition; and third, to provide the cognitive-rational materials necessary for systematic knowledge.

Remove supportive personal elements, skip too widely and too early in the learner's life experience over the sequence of expanding self-relatedness, cut too short the time allowed to absorb new ways and objectively appraise new values, fail to provide the opportunities for experiential learning or fail to establish it as a habit of learning, distort or fail to supply systematic cross-cultural knowledge, and the learner is unlikely to achieve international understanding.

For educators and teachers to perform their necessary role in this process, they must themselves possess intercultural understanding, but also they must conceive their function to be neither solely that of cultural transmitters nor solely that of innovators. Rather, their function is to translate cultural realities to individual learners whose capacities and incapacities for intercultural understanding will vary greatly not only between learners but also at various periods in the learner's life.

If we grant that we are somewhat less than perfect educators living in a somewhat less than perfect world, there is cause for considerable optimism that there are even a certain number of people capable of intercultural understanding. It behooves us to recognize that the number of people capable of practicing intercultural understanding today is a numerically small group and that this group does not necessarily embrace all people who make international relations their business. The opinion might even

be hazarded that the elite of the so-called underdeveloped countries contains a greater proportion of people who possess intercultural understanding than do more stable and "advanced" Western European nations. The former have usually had to learn languages basically different from their own; they have often had extended foreign study experiences; their educational regimen has often been intercultural in form and content; they have frequently grown up in families where consistent image ideals, traditions, and values laid the ground for a firm internal security system; last, they live in nations whose aspirations are not conducive to complacency, whose international power responsibility breeds fewer anxieties than our own, and whose very national aspirations tend to develop rewards for individuals with intercultural understanding.

If persons possessing intercultural understanding do not seem to be produced automatically by our present system of mass education in the United States, it may be desirable for educators and teachers to recognize that special training for this goal is as necessary as special training for any other leadership specialty. Not only must educators and teachers themselves be trained (or at least selected) for such functions, but they should be concerned with identifying the aptitudes and resources of individual learners for intercultural understanding. The education of the masses is a force as irreversible as interdependence in the contemporary world. But we cannot expect mass education automatically to achieve intercultural understanding.

If, and when, we understand more precisely the nature of the process, its broader extension into a mass education system may be more feasible than it now appears to be.

References

- Carroll, John B. 1953. *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gruenebaum, G. E. von (ed.). 1954. "Studies in Islamic Cultural History," *American Anthropologist*. Comparative Studies of Cultures and Civilizations, No. 2 (American Anthropological Association), LVI, No. 2, Part 2, Memoir 76.
- Johnson, Charles A. 1951. *Education and Cultural Crisis*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Kahn, Lothar. 1954. "Teachers' Guided Tours Abroad: A Frank Assessment," *Clearing House*, Vol. 28, No. 8, pp. 459-64.
- Lysgaard, Sverre. 1954. "Adjustment in a Foreign Society: Norwegian Fulbright Grantees Visiting the United States" (preliminary draft of a paper delivered at the XIV International Congress of Psychology, Montreal, June 7-21, 1954).
- Mead, Margaret. 1951. *The School in American Culture*. Inglis Lecture of 1950. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Riesman, David. 1950. *The Lonely Crowd: A Study in Changing American Character*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Rundblad, Bengt G. 1951. "Forestville: A Study of Rural Social Change," Uppsala: Sociologiska Institutionen (mimeographed).
- Social Science Research Council: Committee on Cross-Cultural Education. 1953. "Report on the Ithaca Conference: August 8-16" (mimeographed).
- Taba, Hilda. 1953. *Cultural Attitudes and International Understanding: An Evaluation of an International Study Tour*. New York: Institute of International Education, Research Program, Occasional Papers, No. 5.