Chapter 8

Intercultural competence teacher-training models: the Italian experience

Milena Santerini
Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Italy

In order to address the challenges of cultural diversity Italian schools are facing, new initiatives are required in teacher education. This chapter surveys a number of theoretical models to identify the level of intercultural skills of practitioners and proposes a new training programme designed to increase the intercultural skills of teachers and social workers working in multicultural contexts. The experiences of teacher education initiatives at the Catholic University of Milan confirm the programme's initial assumptions: sensitivity, understanding, a critical reprocessing of personal experience and self-reflection (introspection) are all essential to improving the quality of intercultural skills training. The author argues that these assumptions are especially important in light of the increasing conflict and racism present in Italian schools today.

From the OECD online consultation : preparing the teachers

The majority of teacher respondents reported that they did not feel well prepared for diversity in their classrooms, neither by their initial teacher education nor by their professional development. How can education systems give teachers the tools they need to respond to their changing classrooms?

Introduction

In today's societies, where increasingly serious cultural conflict is becoming more and more common, the principles and methods of intercultural education in schools have undergone extensive revision. Paradigms based on *assimilation* have proven ineffectual and have done little to resolve social contradictions and conflict while those based on *absolute relativism* have affirmed the importance of cultural differences but run the risk of exempting such differences from critique and judgement, and impeding dialogue (Camilleri and Cohen Emerique, 1989; Banks, 2006). In the latter case, the undisputed need to respect and promote diversity (the aim of *openness*) has not gone hand in hand with building social cohesion and a sense of citizenship (the aim of *equality*). In fact, the glorification of diversity has had some adverse effects (Ouellet, 1991). For example, in schools the didactic activities which have highlighted ethnic differences have sometimes resulted in increasing the separation between students.

This seeming impasse in interpretations of intercultural education has been resolved by a new conceptual approach to culture. This approach is based on anthropological and philosophical contributions and has made a thorough revision of educational assumptions and methodologies possible (Geertz, 2000; Cuche, 2003). In this perspective, culture cannot be reduced to an essence because it is plural, an amalgam of many different voices. Even in individuals, culture cannot be regarded as an *unum* because individuals are themselves multicultural. Since culture is neither innate nor biologically transmitted but rather an accumulation of habits acquired from birth, it is learned through acculturation, education and – especially in adults – daily social intercourse. It is interactive, in that it is shared and transmitted within and through

the group. Cultures are not static, they are dynamic and permeable; and apart from special instances of "closure", they tend to change over time.

This conception of cultural interaction is particularly important in a country like Italy, where the issue of the integration of diverse cultures has become urgent due to the rapid increase of immigrant students. In the period following the Second World War, Italian schools have chosen an *inclusive* type of orientation. The term *inclusive* refers to the tendency over the past 50 years to promote schooling of all types of students, absorbing internal immigrants (from the south to the north) and integrating disabled students into mainstream classrooms. Italian law also allows students to attend school even if they are undocumented immigrants. This situation could change if the laws regarding immigrants become more restrictive. To avoid this, a 2007 document of the Ministry of Public Education (*La via italiana alla scuola interculturale*) specifically states that the organisation of Italian schools is founded on the Convention of Children's Rights according to the principles adopted by the European Union. This openness to diversity, however, has not always been accompanied by the appropriate teacher education to deal with diversity on all levels.

Beginning in the late 1980s, Italy began receiving immigrant students, mostly from Eastern Europe, the Maghreb region, Latin America and Asia. The heterogeneity of the immigrant population in Italy put the principles and practices of integration to the test, and the variety of languages and countries of origin presented a new challenge for teachers. There are 191 nationalities present in Italian schools, with at least 60 different languages spoken. The largest groups of immigrant students come from Romania, followed by Albania, China, Ecuador and Morocco, with most of these students concentrated in certain cities in northern Italy. In addition, the Roma population, which includes nearly 12 000 students, represents a particularly complex case for teachers and teaching due to their history.

In the 2007/2008 school year, students with non-Italian citizenship numbered 574 133, representing 6.4% of the student population. This can be compared with the figures from 1998/1999 in which they made up only 1.1% of the student population. However, it is important to note that about 200 000 of these children were born in Italy and are thus second generation students. While they have grown up speaking Italian and many of their cultural habits are the same as their Italian schoolmates, under Italian law they remain foreigners. Citizenship laws in Italy, unrealistically modelled on a country of emigrants rather than immigrants, have favoured the *jus sanguinis,* the transmission of citizenship from an Italian father or mother to the children rather than the *jus soli,* or birthright citizenship, used in many other European countries as well as in North America. Although there is no distinction made in statistical data between non-citizens born in Italy and those who immigrate, there is a significant difference for the teacher. For those who immigrate, the date of

arrival in Italy is equally important. Students who arrived in Italy as recently as 2007/2008 make up only 10% of the non-citizen student population.

The phases of integration of these varied groups have been similar to many other European countries. Initially, there was a phase of *assimilation*, or insertion of the minority culture with little or no attention paid to the culture of origin, followed by a phase of *multiculturalism*, understood as the "discovery" of pluralism but also the romanticising of other cultures. Today, there is the feeling that it is necessary to reach an intercultural model to accomplish integration without giving up social cohesion.

To create the conditions for communal life in a pluralistic context, intercultural education needs to convey an idea of culture that steers clear of essentialism ("all Muslims", the "African mentality", "Asian culture") and encourages a non-simplified understanding of minority groups. Intercultural education operates in the space between the *cultural zero* and the *cultural all* (Abdallah Pretceille, 2006 and 1990). A dynamic concept of culture such as this relies on a kind of moderate relativism if it is to strike the difficult balance between respect for specificity and universal principles. In this sense, it encourages a worldview based on mutual transformation, respecting other cultures while also promoting cohesion by emphasising common goals and values (Santerini, 2003).

This theoretical and conceptual framework ought to bring about far-reaching change in all teaching methods and curricula in both formal education (schools, universities, courses) and informal education (fostering communal life and intercultural dialogue in the social sphere, conflict resolution, etc.). The reality, however, is that this dynamic vision of culture and education is frequently ignored. Unsurprisingly, the explanation for this resistance lies in the fact that education based on a static concept of culture makes curricula "easier" to teach – but not more effective (Allemann-Ghionda, Perregaux and Goumoens, 1999). In a certain sense, the "mono" approach to teaching is simpler than the "inter" approach. Italian teachers are generally accustomed to a "mono" approach, which consists of the presentation of only one point of view (for example, in subjects such as sciences, geography and history). The intercultural approach, on the other hand, requires the consideration of other points of view, the exercise of critical capacity, the analysis of sources, the distinction between differences in cultural perspectives, etc.

A prime example of this is teacher and social-worker training in Italy, the primary concern of this paper. In addition to reformulating didactic principles, methods and practices into an intercultural approach, teachers today must also deal with the consequences of a political orientation that is becoming more and more restrictive towards immigration (new laws that render it a crime to be in the country without the proper authorisation, restrictions on the possibility of residency, etc.). This situation of conflict, fed by the mass media, has

created the phenomenon of segregation of immigrant students into schools separate from those attended by native students. For example, the newspapers portray immigrant students as an "emergency" and "invasion" who will lower the quality of education for Italian citizens. Finally, especially in some cities in northern Italy, various groups of immigrants are beginning to demand cultural recognition, asking that their native language be taught in the schools or for concessions regarding special food requirements and religious holidays.

For all these reasons, it is necessary to rethink teacher training in light of new challenges. Intercultural teacher training is a fundamental means of constructing a school which is open to diversity rather than one oriented toward "segregated" education. It is important for Italian teachers to be trained to manage heterogeneity, which is to say to become sensitive to differences and to organise support and co-operation activities between students. In Italy, in-service teacher education takes place in the schools and is based on guidelines from the Ministry of Education. Initial teacher education, on the other hand, happens at university, which provides only a general training although some attention is given to intercultural and special education. Most intercultural training initiatives are organised by local government organisations or NGOs that focus primarily on the knowledge of immigrant cultures. The approach to training in Italy is generally a specialist or *segregated approach* (which promotes competence in specific fields, such as teaching the L2). The *infusion approach*, on the other hand, would update the teachers' general skills in managing heterogeneity, but it is less used.

In addition to the above, another limit is the "culturalist" conception of education, which inevitably tends to teach the culture of *"the other"* by simplifying it, thereby running the risk of reinforcing stereotypes, biases and prejudices rather than countering them. On the other hand, it seems more effective to provide experiential training based on personal encounters and competence in relating to immigrant students in order to bring about more profound changes in trainees' personalities and worldviews. The expectations of this training, as well as trainees' reluctance to question their own roles and view intercultural relations critically, have been described in teacher-oriented studies on this issue (Santerini, 2002, 2008).

Although the need for multidimensional training programmes has already been voiced in several studies (*e.g.* Milhouse, 1996), most teacher and social-worker training, in Italy at least, tends even now to be intellectual rather than experiential. For example, a research project based on focus groups and in-depth interviews with 30 teachers (from 14 elementary and middle schools in Milan with high percentages of immigrants) revealed that the teachers involved all had a theoretical form of cultural training rather than an experiential one. The teachers expressed the need for training that would help them to manage a heterogeneous classroom (Santerini and Reggio, 2004).

A transversal, multidimensional approach to competence

The interpretative, inclusive approach to culture discussed in the previous section is also essential if the aim is to create real competence and not merely "knowledge" of or familiarity with cultural differences. The concept of competence is a dynamic mix of knowledge and ability indicating that mastery has been achieved in given professional or business environments. Another word for this concept is "proficiency" – high-level internalised knowledge linked to the ability to read, analyse and interpret specific, complex situations.

These process features – interactions of motivation, lived experience and uniqueness of context – make the concept of competence particularly appropriate to intercultural relations, especially where teachers are concerned. Fantini (2007) affirms that intercultural competence means the skills set needed to act effectively and appropriately in relation to linguistically and culturally diverse immigrants. The field of definition is so vast that 19 alternative terms have been coined to describe the concept (intercultural, cross-cultural or trans-cultural competence, global competence, multiculturalism, etc.).

In Italy, the concept refers mostly to the knowledge and ability of educational, social and healthcare professionals who interact with immigrants although intercultural competence increasingly seems not so much a quality or entity *per se* as an essential set of training resources for people who are aware of living in a complex world where encountering cultural difference is becoming the norm.

It should be stressed that intercultural competence training (whether delivered by or received from teachers and professionals) is, in the broadest sense, a *political* task because it is integral to our awareness of living in an interdependent world, and because it is connected to migration policy and the way states and their institutions are programmed and run. Teachers and social workers need to enhance their skills in dealing with such complexity and, in particular, their intercultural competence not only as educational professionals, but also as social actors on the cutting edge of their country's democratic development, endeavouring to promote equal rights for all citizens.

Models for the definition and evaluation of intercultural competence

In a recent survey, Sinicrope, Norris and Watanabe (2007) examined the various conceptual frameworks that have been used to define intercultural competence and the rating scales created to measure these in individuals. Some of these frameworks are discussed below in a pedagogical perspective to determine which of their aspects may be useful in developing appropriate training programmes for diversity and intercultural competence.

Ruben's model (1976), for example, lists seven dimensions of intercultural communication effectiveness. Byram (1997) affirms that intercultural competence involves five elements. The resulting model, which is appropriate both for school students and for adults, applies especially to linguistic communication.

One of the best known is the *Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity* (DMIS) (Hammer, Bennett, and Wiseman, 2003), in which Bennett conceptualises the dimensions of an individual's intercultural awareness, *i.e.* experience in the broad sense – of cultural difference. The model's underlying assumption is that when an individual's experience of cultural difference becomes more complex and sophisticated, his or her potential competence in intercultural relations increases. In this constructivist perspective, cultural difference is a key event in our experience of reality. The model was developed to identify the attitudes and viewpoints (ranging from mono-cultural to more complex mindsets) in a person's development.

A different approach, this time from an education expert rather than a psychologist, comes from Banks (2006). The aim of his six-step model is to outline ideal-types that can help educators to identify how people experience their ethnic identities and to help develop them. The six steps are:

- captivity (internalisation of negative racial/ethnic stereotypes and beliefs)

- encapsulation (characterised by separatism)

- clarification (development of a healthy sense of one's own identity)

- bi-ethnicity (participation in cultures other than one's own)

- multiculturalism (interaction and involvement with several cultures)

- globalism (positive identification with the global dimension)

Deardorff's multidimensional model (2004) reappears in *Intercultural Competence – The Key Competence in the 21st Century* (2007), which is based on the American researcher's intercultural competence models. In her original Delphi study, Deardorff interviewed 23 American intercultural experts regarding key elements and appropriate methods of intercultural evaluation so as to draw up a checklist of definitions of *intercultural competence*. Deardorff then reduced the components of intercultural competence (as indicated by the experts) to four dimensions:

- *attitude* (openness, respect, curiosity, tolerance of ambiguity)

- *knowledge and skills* (cultural awareness, knowledge of one's own and other cultures, observation, ability to evaluate)

- *internal outcomes* (adaptability, flexibility, empathy, the ability to see things from another's point of view

- *external outcomes* (situation-appropriate behaviours and communication)

In the models we have examined, the most useful analyses of intercultural competence for the purposes of this study – *i.e.* models that actually *increase* competence, rather than merely define and describe it – are those that adopt a dynamic, multidimensional approach (Deardorff, 2007). This is because they enable us to consider not only the development of competence over time, but also the extent to which its elements influence each other.

Models of this type are concerned with how an individual attains the highest possible level of self-awareness (Bennett, 1986). Most importantly, they invite reflection on how intercultural competence is *constructed* (*e.g.* through encountering and relating to the "other") rather than merely how it is described. To the extent that competence is a question not only of *knowing* but also of *being* and *doing*, the ability to increase competence depends not so much on describing its content as on being able to experience and reflect on the interaction with people from other cultures that activates the necessary comprehension skills and abilities.

Box 8.1. Enhancing intercultural awareness: training model

1. **INTERCULTURAL KNOWLEDGE**

   a. Acquisition of a theoretical framework encompassing major intercultural issues and concepts (universal *vs.* relative, etc).

      i. Discussion of major ethical issues.

      ii. The ability to understand and describe the evolutionary, subjective, historical and dynamic aspects of cultures.

      iii. Interpreting cultural difference in ways that take into account individual subjectivity, rather than in terms of static, unyielding worldviews.

      iv. The ability to make informed ethical choices (*e.g.* universalistic *vs.* relativistic) when comparing cultures.

   b. Increased knowledge.

      i. Of the life sciences (anthropological, psychosocial and pedagogical aspects of integration, assimilation, inter-group relations, theories of prejudice, concepts of ethnic difference, race/racism).

      ii. Of geo-historical and socio-political issues (globalisation, geo-political information, migration and ethnic difference, migrants' countries of origin, the composition of multicultural societies).

      iii. Of language and linguistics (differences of idiom, verbal and non-verbal communication, sociolinguistic issues).

Box 8.1. **Enhancing intercultural awareness: training model** *(continued)*

2. INTERCULTURAL UNDERSTANDING

   a. Development of cultural sensitivity.

     i. The ability to acknowledge (accept) people who are different.

     ii. The acquisition of interpretative ability (relating to others as unique individuals, perceiving differences as variants of a shared humanity).

     iii. Encouraging de-centring/other-centredness (overcoming self-centredness so as to be able to adopt the other's point of view).

     iv. Empathy (an intentional process through which a profound relationship with the other is achieved by accepting his/her uniqueness while maintaining a sense of one's own personal autonomy and identity).

     v. Trust (a moral resource that makes sharing and co-operation possible).

     vi. Flexibility and emotional resilience (the ability to tolerate ambiguity and react to it in a constructive and appropriate way).

   b. Encouragement of self-reflection.

     i. Modifying and reconstructing one's previous attitudes and views.

     ii. Understanding how one's own thinking may be biased.

     iii. Questioning stereotypes and prejudices.

     iv. Developing a critical and dialectic approach.

3. INTERCULTURAL SKILLS

   a. Enhancement of relational skills.

     i. Developing the ability to communicate.

     ii. Developing the ability to handle emotional conflict and moral divergence, and to mediate and negotiate democratically.

     iii. Developing awareness of communication signals.

     iv. Developing the ability to handle stress and culture shock.

     v. Developing willingness to engage in new activities and experiences, and to interact with people in new situations.

Box 8.1. **Enhancing intercultural awareness: training model** *(continued)*

b. Construction of methodological tools that can add an intercultural perspective to working and professional activities.

   i. Developing the competences needed to gather ethnographic data on pupils, their families and their socio-cultural environment, and then to interpret and apply it in strategy building.

   ii. Developing the competences needed to review school subjects and informal system content in an intercultural perspective.

   iii. Acquiring the knowledge and skills needed to handle direct contact with people from other cultures.

Structuring the training

Having surveyed academic models of competence and the components of intercultural training, the following section outlines a training programme designed to enhance the intercultural awareness of social workers and teachers professionally involved in ethnic diversity. This training model incorporates the dynamic, multidimensional features appropriate to training in a complex field, and is based on the three classic dimensions of intercultural training – *knowing, being* and *doing*.

The training model above has a number of specific features:

* The concept of culture is dynamic and subjective (it is people who enter into contact with each other, not cultures). This means that competence rests on an anthropological interpretation of reality rather than on knowledge of preordained notions.

* Personality and self-reflection are crucial because they make affectivity the basis of cultural relations. In this sense, training must act on the personalities of teachers and social workers, who in turn must "mediate" or facilitate understanding between people from different cultures. For example, various studies have shown the tendency of some teachers to have stereotypes regarding immigrants. A critical analysis of his or her own stereotypes may help him or her to mediate problems between Italian families and immigrant families.

* The various elements are mutually influential. For example, interest in and respect for the other determine the ability to communicate which, once learned, can create empathy. Revisiting one's stereotypes and prejudices creates openness, and openness is, in turn, a necessary condition for self-reflection.

- Training is not limited to promoting the ability for tolerance and mere acceptance, which would mean leaving people in separate spaces that never intersect. To achieve training objectives and overcome prejudice and cultural misunderstandings, it is not enough to know about the other culture: a third space of trust and mutual transformation needs to be constructed, in which people are prepared to adapt to each other (Marandon, 2001, 2003).

- Intercultural competence has an ethical-political dimension because it fosters a global, non-nationalistic concept of citizenship based on interdependence and peaceful understanding between peoples.

These elements constitute a working basis that can be adapted to the varying needs of teachers and the contexts in which they find themselves. The self-reflective nature of the approach suggests a personalised form of training, as trainees can decide how they want to communicate their experiences and theoretical insights. This individual work can be the basis upon which the trainer develops additional skills in the trainees. To be effective, programmes of this type need active methodologies – discussion, case study, simulation, role-playing, problem-solving, exploration of cultural dilemmas and culture shock – that can personalise learning, and tools that encourage self-reflection (*e.g.* logs, self-assessment, narrative writing, literary criticism, portfolios). These activities should be done in a group setting with other teachers.

The connection between theoretical knowledge and practice is fundamental to this training curriculum, and takes the form of frequent or less frequent (depending on need) alternations of work experience, traineeship/teaching practice, extramural activities, and periods spent abroad or living in minority communities. It is also essential that trainees are expected to report on the competence they have acquired by producing a teaching or educational project.

Trainees' thoughts on intercultural competence

The training programme outlined above was tested as a component of the M.A. in Intercultural Training in the Faculty of Education (Facoltà di Scienze della Formazione) at the Catholic University of Milan in the academic year 2007/2008. To test some of the programme's hypotheses, the 28 participants were asked to fill in a short questionnaire of six open questions. The participants, who came from varying backgrounds (teachers, social workers, university students, professionals), had already completed Module I of the M.A., consisting of courses and workshops on intercultural education and anthropological and communication models of particular relevance to migration issues. The aim of our questionnaire was to explore some of the *autobiographical aspects* of the participants' experience, *i.e.* their knowledge and beliefs concerning the intercultural sphere when they filled in the questionnaire, and

the experiences (professional, cultural, daily life, etc.) that had helped shape their opinions. The *training aspects* of the questionnaire were designed to elicit the definitions and aims of intercultural competence resulting from the participants' experience of the course. The perceptions of students intending to become teachers in intercultural contexts are especially useful because they suggest practical ways of improving competence (Mushi, 2004).

In their descriptions of the knowledge and beliefs they thought they possessed (as a result of training or otherwise), all the participants discovered, in their various ways, that the dynamic process of intercultural relations was fundamental to any kind of meaningful intercultural relationship. Half of them (14) stressed the social dimension because they saw intercultural relations as a pervasive feature of both daily life and society as a whole. In their view, the social dimension is an aspect not only of ethnic relations in the narrow sense, but also of the ability to relate to other people in general through dialogue and mutual respect. Intercultural activity is, then, a *way* of encountering and coping with the range of thought-processes typical of complex societies.

Five students laid even more emphasis on the idea of inter-relationship and the notion that mutual transformation and influence leads people not only to compare themselves with others, but also to question who they are in their search for shared values.

Finally, nine students related their heightened awareness of the social dimension to the conceptual content of the course itself (essentialism, the subjectivity of culture, universalism *versus* relativism, etc).

The participants also had to indicate, in the "training" section of the questionnaire, their definition of intercultural competence. In terms of the three dimensions of the training model (*knowing, being, doing*), there was a marked preference for intercultural sensitivity and understanding (being). Twenty of the 28 students stressed that self-reflection was a fundamental part of competence: the ability to risk, to be self-critical, to re-examine their beliefs, to be able to see things from another's point of view and so on. Of these 20 students, five expressed this idea in an explicitly "relativistic" way (with non-judgemental openness, unconditional acceptance, etc.), while another seven stressed the *transformative* power of intercultural competence (achieving competence entails changing all one's partners, creating mutual understanding, searching for shared values and the things that bring people together).

By contrast, only four participants chose knowing (knowledge) as their main definition of competence (*"understanding of theoretical intercultural concepts", "knowledge of socio-political and life sciences"*). Another four opted for the third dimension (doing), the ability to communicate, relate and negotiate (*"the ability to listen and communicate effectively"*).

Conclusions and next steps

This chapter has reviewed a number of theoretical models to identify the salient dimensions of intercultural competence. A brief survey of participants in an M.A. course in Intercultural Training confirmed the programme's initial assumptions, in particular the dynamic, transformative nature of intercultural competence training in which sensitivity, understanding, critical reprocessing of personal experience and self-reflection (introspection) are of key importance.

The conclusions suggest a new training programme designed to increase the intercultural competence of teachers and social workers involved in intercultural contexts, especially in situations of conflict and racism that appear to be present in Italian society today. It is necessary to continue the research in order to understand the impact of this training on participants, and in particular, teachers' intercultural competences should be evaluated according to the three aforementioned levels (intercultural knowledge, understanding and skills). Future steps of this research will include evaluating intercultural competences of a group of teachers before and after the training through the use of a questionnaire and other methodology.

The research will be accompanied by a specific assessment, consisting of the collection of continuous monitoring data of teachers' training to identify the impact of intercultural training. The evaluation will be designed to reveal the evolution and critical aspects of the various dimensions of intercultural competence – intercultural knowledge, understanding and skills. These elements will be gathered from a group of teachers who attend a post-graduate intercultural training course who are simultaneously actively teaching in schools. The characteristics of the participants will be observed throughout the training course to shed light on the learning process and weak points relative to skills mastered or acquired. A final round of data collection will be performed at the end of the training regarding the skills developed.

We will employ methodological tools that encourage the ability of teachers to reflect on their training and professional experience. The data on skills developed will be analysed by the participants along with intercultural training experts, through a dialogue that develops awareness and critical capacity. The tools to be utilised are suitable for research and individual evaluation (personal themes, diaries, case analyses, interviews) as well as for group evaluation: brainstorming and the "scale of required priorities" (Bezzi, Palumbo, 1997), focus groups, and case analyses carried out within the group. The data gathered will be used to form evaluation judgments to be discussed and shared with teachers. These judgments will be formulated using specific criteria and relevant indicators which will be identified with the teachers in the establishment phase of the intercultural training assessment.

References

Abdallah Pretceille, M. (1990), *Vers une Pédagogie Interculturelle*, Publications de la Sorbonne, Paris.

Abdallah Pretceille, M. (2006), "Interculturalism as a Paradigm for Thinking about Diversity", *Intercultural Education*, Vol. 5, pp. 475-483.

Allemann-Ghionda, C., Perregaux, C., de Goumoens, C. (1999), *Curriculum pour une Formation des Enseignant(e)s à la Pluralité Culturelle et Linguistique*, Programme national de recherche 33 (Centre suisse de coordination pour la recherche en éducation – CSRE), Genève.

Banks, J.A. (2006), *Cultural Diversity and Education. Foundations, Curriculum, and Teaching* (5th edition), Allyn and Bacon, Boston.

Bennett, M.J. (1986), "A Developmental Approach to Training to Intercultural Sensitivity", *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol. 2, pp. 179-186.

Bennett, M.J. (1993), "Toward Ethno-relativism: A Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity", in R.M. Paige (ed.), *Education for Intercultural Experience*, Intercultural Press, Yarmouth, pp. 21-71.

Bennett, M.J. (2002), *Principi di Comunicazione Interculturale*, Franco Angeli, Milano.

Bezzi, C., and Palumbo, M. (1997) (eds.), *Valutazione: Materiali di Lavoro*, Arnaud – Gramma, Perugia.

Bhawuk, D.P.S., and Brislin, R. (1992), "The Measurement of Intercultural Sensitivity Using the Concept of Individualism and Collectivism", *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol. 16, pp. 413-436.

Byram, M. (1997), *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon.

Camilleri, C., Cohen Emerique. M. (eds.) (1989), *Choc de Cultures. Concepts et Enjeux Pratiques de l'Interculturel*, L'Harmattan, Paris.

Clanet, C. (2000/1), "L'Interculturel et la Formation des Maitres: Institution et Subjectivation", in Dasen, P.R. and C. Perregaux (eds.), *Pourquoi des approches interculturelles en sciences de l'éducation? Raisons Educatives*, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 223-242.

Cuche, D. (2003), *La Notion de Culture dans les Sciences Sociales,* La Découverte, Paris.

Cui, Geng., and S. A. van den Berg (1991), "Testing the Construct Validity of Intercultural Effectiveness", *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol. 15, pp. 227-241.

Deardoff, D.K. (2004), "The Identification and Assessment of Intercultural Competence as a Student Outcome of Internalization at Institutions of Higher Education in the United States", Ph.D Thesis, North Carolina State University.

Deardoff, D.K. (2006), Identification and Assessment of Intercultural Competence as a Student Outcome of Internationalization, *Journal of Studies in International Education* Vol. 10, pp. 241-266.

Fantini, A.E. (2007), *Exploring and Assessing Intercultural Competence,* Center for Social Development Research Report, Washington, DC., *www.sit.edu/ publications/docs/feil_research_report.pdf 2006.*

Geertz, C. (2000), *Available Light: Anthropological Reflections on Philosophical Topics,* Princeton University Press, Princeton, NY.

Glaser, E., M. Guilherme, M. Méndez Garcia and T. Mughan (2007), *ICOPROMO – Compétence Interculturelle pour le Développement de la Mobilité Professionnelle,* Editions du Conseil de l'Europe, Strasbourg.

Hammer, M.R., M.J. Bennett and R. Wiseman (2003), "Measuring Intercultural Sensitivity; the Intercultural Development Inventory", *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* Vol. 27, pp. 421-443.

Hannerz, U. (2001), *La Diversità Culturale,* Il mulino, Bologna.

Hofstede, G. (1980), *Culture's Consequence: International Differences in Work Related Values,* Sage Publications, Beverly Hills.

Kelley, C. and J. Meyers (1992), *The Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory,* National Computer Systems, Minneapolis.

Lázár, I., M. Huber-Kriegler, D. Lussier, G.S. Matei and C. Peck (eds.) (2007), *Developing and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence – A Guide for Language Teachers and Teacher Educators,* Conseil de l'Europe / Centre européen pour les langues vivantes, Strasbourg / Graz.

Olson, C.L. and K.R. Kroeger (2001), "Global Competency and Intercultural Sensitivity", *Journal of Studies in International Education*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 116-137.

Marandon, G. (2001), *L'Empathie et la Rencontre Interculturelle*, L'Harmattan, Paris.

Marandon, G (2003), "Au-delà de l'Empathie, Cultiver la Confiance: Clés pour la Rencontre Interculturelle", *Revista CIDOB d'Afers Internacionals*, Vol. 61, No. 6, pp. 259-282.

Milhouse, V.H. (1996), "Intercultural Communication Education and Training Goals, Content, and Methods", *Intercultural Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol. 20, pp. 69-95.

Mushi, S. (2004), "Multicultural Competencies in Teaching : A Typology of Classroom Activities", *Intercultural Education*, Vol. 15, 179-194.

Ouellet, F. (1991), *L'Education Interculturelle. Essai sur le Contenu de la Formation des Maitres*, L'Harmattan, Paris.

Ouellet, F. (2002), *Les Défis du Pluralisme en Education. Essais sur la Formation Interculturelle*. Les Presses de l'Université Laval – L'Harmattan, St. Nicolas (Quebec), Paris.

Ruben, B.D. (1976), "Assessing Communication Competence for Intercultural Communication Adaptation", *Group and Organization Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 334-354.

Santerini, M. (2002), "La Formation des Enseignants à l'Interculturel : Modèles et Pratiques", *Carrefour de l'éducation*, Vol. 14, pp. 97-104.

Santerini, M. (2003), *Intercultura*, La Scuola, Brescia.

Santerini, M. and P. Reggio (2004), "La Scuola dell'altro. Intercultura e Formazione degli Insegnanti", in V.Cesareo (ed.), *L'altro. Identità, Dialogo e Conflitto nella Società Plurale*, Vita e Pensiero, Milano, pp. 261-302.

Santerini, M. (2008), "School Mix e Distribuzione degli Alunni Immigrati nelle Scuole Italiane", *Mondi Migranti*, Vol. 3, pp. 235-249.

Sercu, L. (2004), "Assessing Intercultural Competence: A Framework for Systematic Test Development in Foreign Language Education and Beyond", *Intercultural Education*, Vol.15, No. 1, pp. 73-89.

Sinicrope, C., J. Norris and Y. Watanabe (2007), *Understanding and Assessing Intercultural Competence: A Summary of Theory, Research, and Practice*, Technical Report for the Foreign Language Program Evaluation Project 2007, *http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/evaluation/publications.htm*.

Sleeter, C.E. (2001), "Preparing Teachers for Culturally Diverse Schools. Research and the Overwhelming Presence of Whiteness", *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 52, 94-106.

Vinsonneau, G. (2002), *L'identité culturelle*, Armand Colin, Paris.