DE GRUYTER
OPEN

Journal of Intercultural Management

Vol. 8 | No. 4 | December 2016 | pp. 89–116

DOI 10.1515/joim-2016-0026

Heesoon Jun

Evergreen State College, USA

junh@evergreen.edu

Thinking Styles and Intercultural Competencies

Abstract: The purpose of the present study was to demonstrate specific strategies to deconstruct dichotomous, hierarchical, and linear thinking styles and to develop holistic thinking. Developing holistic thinking is the foundation of increasing intercultural competencies for students, faculty, managers, and CEOs. Holistic thinking style allows us to view the world from both Western (linear) and Eastern (non-linear) perspectives. Participants were 35 students (23 American and 12 South Korean students) in an intercultural competence course at a State College in the US. The study found that it is possible for Westerners to increase non-linearity (holistic thinking) by completing specific repetitious reflective writing on a regular basis without censoring. Limitations of the study were the small sample size (N=35) and the short duration (3 months).

Key words: intercultural competence, invisible barriers (e.g., in-group favoritism, asymmetric perception, conventional thinking styles), holistic thinking, uncensored reflective writing, multiple identities and their intersections

Introduction

As our global community expands it is essential for innovated managers, educators, and researchers to increase their intercultural competencies to best serve their students, institutions or organizations in the 21st century. The global community is interdependent, interconnected, dynamic, and complex with diverse values and beliefs which at times contradict or conflict one another. Szkudlarek, Mcnett, Romani, and Lane (2013) interviewed seven prominent leaders in cross-cultural management education from Australia, Canada, France, Turkey, and the US. They concluded traditional pedagogies do not address increasingly complex realities which require students be cross-culturally competent, view the world both from Western (linear) and Eastern (no-linear) perspectives, and think holistically. Some suggested ideas by these leaders were increasing experiential activities in the classrooms, shift from the content emphasis to the process emphasis, shift from conceptual learning to transformative learning, shift from an educator defined culturally sensitive application of management to culturally sensitive application of management defined by students (Burke & Rau, 2010).

Datar, Garvin and Cullen (2010) and Ghemawat (2011) also indicated the need for pedagogical improvement, especially in multicultural and intercultural competences of management education. Bhawuk and Brislin (2000) and Early, Ang, and Tan (2006) discussed the inability to teach intercultural competence training program as a result of educators' ingrained traditional pedagogy deliberation formats (e.g., lectures on the history and socio-economic information of the other culture). Egan and Bendick (2008) also discussed educators' inability to teach multicultural competence courses; educators in multicultural management courses who lectured on the dangers of stereotyping but their course materials were filled with stereotyping. However, these educators did not identify their inconsistencies which indicated that conceptual understanding of pedagogical improvement is

not sufficient enough to implement it. Understanding is a prerequisite for change but change requires well planned specific steps and enough time to undo ingrained habit (traditional pedagogy) and to build a new habit. The new habit becomes an ingrained habit through repetition and rehearsal which develop its own rhythm and ritual to become an ingrained habit, fluent application of the improved pedagogy (Sennett, 2012).

Fernandez (2011), President and CEO of Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business International, expressed his concern on preparedness of faculty to teach global skills development. The preparedness of faculty requires asking faculty to abandon or modify their ingrained habit of teaching to improve their pedagogies. The process of abandoning or modifying the ingrained habit is a challenging task as demonstrated by Bhawuk and Brislin (2000), Early, Ang, and Tan (2006), and Egan and Bendrick (2008). They noticed a need for improved pedagogies long before the development of globalization. Egan and Bendrick (2008) proposed improving both multicultural management and diversity course and traditional (domestic) diversity management course in order to combine both as one united cultural competence course.

For the merger to materialize multicultural management courses need to broaden the concept of culture beyond "static, homogeneous national-level cultures" (Egan and Bendick, 2008, p. 391) and traditional diversity management courses need to critically examine efficacy of their concept of diversity on cross-cultural settings and innovate strategies to implement their concept of diversity in intercultural situations. This theoretical paper requires both parties to transcend inappropriate conventional Western thinking (dichotomous, hierarchical, and linear) in order to develop the best possible courses for intercultural and multicultural competences. Learning from social psychology research findings on in-group favoritism, asymmetric perception, attribution error, inappropriate generalizations may assist educators to cooperate with each other to innovate what is best for students (Jun, 2010).

Another proposal by Mendenhall, Arnardottir, Oddou, and Burke (2013) was applying principles of cognitive-behavioral therapy to develop cross cultural competencies in management education. They pointed out some important ingredients of intercultural competence: (1) the individual needs to experience changes at the cognitive, behavioral, and affective level, (2) the process of intercultural competency is non-linear which is a foreign concept from a Western perspective, (3) examination of one's assumptions and thought patterns is a must and this requires reflective and introspective abilities of students. As suggested cognitive-behavior therapy is "an umbrella term that houses a wide variety of approaches to personal change that rely on an integration of cognitive and behavioral change techniques" (Mendenhall, 2013, p. 438). However, principles of the cognitive-behavior therapy do not include an affect component.

The fundamental assumption of cognitive-behavioral therapy is cognitive restructuring alone changes our thinking and changing our thinking changes our behavior (Corey, 2005; Dattilio, 2001; Dobson & Block, 1988). According to cognitive-behavioral perspective we can come to a conclusion that our assumption is irrational through logical examination. This then leads to a change in our behavior. For example, one of my clients said, "everybody hates me." I asked, "Everyone? Will you name them for me?" The client named 5 and she paused. I asked, "Is five everyone?" The client laughed. She noticed "everyone" was not "five". She was no longer in despair after identifying her cognitive distortion. Her behavior changed. Cognition, affect, and behavior are interconnected from a whole person perspective. However, cognitive-behavioral therapy focuses on specific thoughts and/or assumptions and specific behavior. Mendenhall et al. state, "Thus in order to develop any type of cross-cultural competency, it is necessary that individuals experience change at the cognitive, affective, and behavioral levels" (Mendenhall, 2014, p. 437). I agree with the statement but it does not represent a cognitive-behavioral therapeutic perspective.

Posadas (2014) proposed a new management theory, converlogical (conversational/dialogical) management, which is the fusion of management by objectives and the theory of communicative action to better serve global challenges. According to Posadas one of the weaknesses of management by objective was it reinforced the traditional organizational culture in its top down communication model which emphasized control rather than creativity (Litoiu, 2010). Posadas infused the theory of communicative action with the management by objective to make one effective management theory that values all employees and making dialectical decisions through dialogical conversations among all parties in an organization. Posadas' assumption was that it would foster interdependence between and among employees which would lead to trust. The converlogical theory covers several suggested ideas by seven prominent leaders in the cross-cultural management education (Szkudlarek, et al., 2013). However, empirical evidence is needed prior to developing a pedagogy based on the theory.

Empirically based studies were conducted by Mor, Morris, and Joh (2013) conducted to investigate the effectiveness of the metacognitive strategies on intercultural and multicultural competencies. Participants for five studies were American MBA male students with mean age 27. They were assigned to multinational learning group of 5–6 students (2 American, 1 European, and 2 from other cultures like Asia, Africa, Middle East, or South America) upon arrival. Participants spent the first year working in teams and they were evaluated by 305 international students from 45 nationalities starting 2 months after arrival. They were asked to report by online survey on a regular basis about their experiences in multicultural environment and their cultural metacognition was assessed by using a 6-item scale on (1) cultural awareness, (2) adjustment during intercultural interactions, and (3) planning before intercultural interactions.

One of the five studies was finding out the effects of cultural perspective taking, which was one of the metacognitive strategies, on intercultural collaboration and cooperation. For the study Mo et al. used Ang's and Van

Dyne's (2008) definition of cultural metacognition that was "an individual's level of conscious cultural awareness and executive processing during cross-cultural interactions" (Ang and Van Dyne, 2008, p. 454). They used cultural perspective taking definition by Lee, Adir, and Seo [2011]: It was "how another person's cultural background may affect their response to a situation" (Lee, Adir and Seo, 2011, p. 455). Their hypothesis was cultural perspective taking would promote intercultural collaboration and cooperation. Total 107 American adults (81,3 % Caucasian, 7,5% Asian, 6,5% African American, 3,7% Hispanic, 9% Native American, and 51% female, 28,1% college students, 70,1% working) were recruited via Mechanical Turk for a study on problem solving. Participants were randomly assigned to experimental and control group. Participants were asked to read a mixed motive conflict scenario and asked to read the prompt about their role and objectives. Participants in the experimental group were asked to think about their counterpart's culture before making their decision. The results indicated a cultural perspective taking increased intercultural and multicultural competences: It promoted cooperation ($P < .05$) and increased relational orientation toward the other. This study is important because it not only provided empirical evidence for the effectiveness of the cultural perspective taking on improving intercultural competence but also verified some essentials in the literature for pedagogical improvement. Some essential pedagogical improvements incorporated were working in teams with culturally different students for a whole year, being evaluated by them on a regular basis, and focusing on the process. These pedagogical changes led to experiential and transformative learning. The study needs to be replicated with managers as participants.

Another empirically based study by Ljubica, Dulcic, and Aust (2016) attempted to create a pedagogically complex model by linking individual and organizational cultural competences as a step to multicultural competence. The authors used the integrated cultural competence model to assess multicultural organization development which was achieved through

interaction between individual and organization cultural competence and organizational progress towards multicultural adaptation. The study was done in the Republic of Croatia with 146 expatriate managers. The survey was conducted between May and September of 2014 and the questionnaires were written in English to minimize language bias. The results demonstrated a positive correlation between managerial individual cultural competence and organizational cultural competence. The organizational multicultural competence was reflected in how organization supported individual competencies in its organizational policies, procedures, and implementations. The results also confirmed the importance of analyzing from a complex model: relations between individual cultural competence, organizational cultural competence, and intercultural experience outside of work along with the manager's individual cultural competence enhanced the manager's ability to contribute to organizational cultural competence.

The common theme of the studies reviewed is that there is a need to improve existing pedagogies (from simple to complex) to increase intercultural and multicultural competencies of students in order for them to successfully cope with challenges of rapidly changing global community. Most attempts to provide more complex pedagogical models were theories which lacked empirical evidence. Most models which provided empirical evidence did not critically examine barriers for successful implementation of their findings. For example, most researchers agree that the process of cross-cultural competence development is non-linear (Lloyd & Hartel, 2010; Pless, Maak, & Stahl, 2011; Szkudlarek, Mcnett, Romani, & Lane, 2013) but failed to provide specific strategies to transition from the linear processing (Western) to non-linear (non-Western) processing.

As stated in the above review of the literature the fundamental barriers to implementation of non-traditional pedagogies are Western linearity, "us vs. them" (dichotomous), and hierarchical mentality. It is extremely challenging to transcend these barriers because they have been embedded in American psyche through socialization (Singer & Kimbles, 2004). Chil-

dren as young as 5 years old show they not only have learned to be loyal to their in-groups but also have learned to dislike other children who do not conform to the norms of their in-groups (Abrams, Rutland, & Cameron 2004; Nesdale & Brown, 2004; Heiphetz, Spelke, & Banaji, 2013). In other words, behavioral indication of in-group favoritism is intergroup discrimination. Meta-analysis on in-groups and out-groups indicates that people have a tendency to favor in-groups (Robbins & Krueger, 2005; Bruckmuller & Abele, 2010; Hegarty & Bruckmuller, 2013). Attribution error, social projection, and asymmetric perception are examples of in-group favoritism. Attribution error theory postulates "positive behaviors as the internal traits of the in-group and negative behaviors as the internal traits of the outgroup" (Jun, 2010, p. 45) while social projection theory postulates that an individual assumes his/her/zir "perception (sample size one, $N=1$) is the representation of many ($N=1=\text{many}$)" or all (Jun, 2010, p. 45). Asymmetric perception is a tendency to praise oneself higher than others and to perceive other's biases without being unable to perceive the same biases within self (Pronin, Gilovich, & Ross, 2004). Pronin et al. reviewed the literature on differential perceptions of self vs. others from 1949 to 2004 (for 55 years). All reviewed studies indicated participants rated they were more objective and less biased than others.

Other barriers to intercultural competencies are implicit values and beliefs individuals learned through systemic privilege and oppression which result in internalized privilege and oppression. Both dominant and non-dominant groups perpetuate the appropriate social norms and standards without conscious awareness since conditioning starts before individuals are able to apply their own critical reasons skills. When dominant groups perpetuate their own standards and norms, it is often due to their internalized privilege as a result of belonging to privileged groups. When nondominant groups perpetuate the dominant group's norms and standards, it is because they have been socialized to value the dominant group's norms and standards over their nondominant group norms and standards. Fur-

thermore, privilege and oppression are perceived differently by an individual. Privilege is often invisible to privilege holders who are unaware of the fact that the dominant group's norms are socially constructed for their benefit while those norms discriminate against non-privilege holders. Oppression is very visible to those who are oppressed. "Oppression refers to systematic constraints on groups and is structural... We cannot eliminate this structural oppression by getting rid of the rules or making some new laws, because oppressions are systematically reproduced in major economic, political, and cultural institutions (Young, 2000, pp. 36–37).

Jackson, Barth, Powell, and Lochman's (2006) research depicted the impact of internalized privilege and oppression on children. They found that children of color rated White children higher as leaders even when there were fewer White children in class compared to Black children. Black children were not rated as leaders even when there were more Black children in a class unless their teacher was also Black. White children exerted their power just by being White even when there were fewer in number. The Black children's behavior was an example of internalized oppression while White children's behavior was an example of internalized privilege. Repetitious exposures to systemic privilege and oppression throughout development lead to two dramatically different internalized beliefs about self, one of an agent and the other of a victim. These are learned implicitly and understanding complex relationship between them in relation to multiple identities (race, sex, class, sexual orientation, disability/impairment, religious affiliation, age, region, language, etc.) and their intersections require holistic thinking and appropriate dichotomous, hierarchical, and linear thinking.

Intercultural competencies require both types of thinking, conventional Western styles (e.g., linear) and holistic non-Western (e.g., nonlinear) style. As cited above the process of intercultural and multicultural competences is non-linear. It also often includes non-dichotomous and non-hierarchical thinking. Conventional Western thinking is hierarchical, dichotomous, and linear and is deeply ingrained in dominant US culture through socialization

(Jun, 2010). This creates an invisible barrier for a paradigm shift in thinking. American Psychological Association (APA) guidelines for multicultural competencies state psychologists commit to cultural awareness and knowledge of self and others (APA, 2008, p. 9). However, various research findings indicate that some psychologists do not follow the APA guidelines of multicultural competencies. It might have been due to unconscious biases (e.g., conventional thinking styles, ethnocentrism, social projections, inappropriate generalization, etc.) which are ingrained through socialization and are invisible to psychologists. One of the educators interviewed by Szkudlarek, et al. (2013) says,

One of the basic premises of the Yin and Yang approach is that elements of everything are embodied in any one particular culture....The salience of given a given dimension depends upon the circumstances. Viewed in this context, it is possible to embody both the yes and they into one system. Similarly, it is possible for nonlinear and linear thinking to coexist (Szkudlarek et al., 2013, p. 483) ,

The other educator says, "You try to talk about holistic thinking with Western students, and they have a lot of trouble with it" (Szkudlarek et al., 2013, p. 483). Understanding intercultural competencies require us to be non-linear. We need to examine whether our thinking style is able to process non-linearly. Faculty preparedness for intercultural and multicultural competence must start from paradigm shifts in thinking (from conventional to holistic) and learning (from conceptual to transformative). The first step to paradigm shift in thinking is accessing our own thinking styles. In order to access our own thinking styles we need to collect data on our thinking style. We need to record our intrapersonal communication (inner dialogue) for at least 7 to 10 days without judgment. Tallying recorded data on the basis of four thinking styles (dichotomous, hierarchical, linear, and holistic) give us access to our own thinking style (Jun, 2010, pp. 27–44). Knowing our thinking styles is necessary but not sufficient to produce changes in our thinking styles. We need to develop specific strategies to change or

modify our thinking styles to learn a nonlinear thinking style. Then we need to practice diligently. Sennett (2012) describes in detail the process of developing skills. The first stage is ingraining a habit by repetition and "The rhythm of building up skill can take a long time to produce results....about 10 000 hours are required to develop mastery....this works out roughly four hours a day of practice for five or six years... Just putting in hours will not ensure that you become" transformed (Sennett, 2012, p. 201).

The purpose of the present study was to demonstrate that it is possible for Westerns to increase non-linearity (holistic thinking) by completing specific repetitious reflective writing without censoring on a regular basis. The first hypothesis of the study was repetitive practice of uncensored reflective and expressive writing on one's identities and their intersections increases self-knowledge. The second hypothesis was self-knowledge increases intercultural competencies. The third hypothesis was uncensored reflective and expressive writing on multiple identities and their intersections increases (a) paradigm shift in thinking (from conventional to holistic) and (b) paradigm shift in learning (from conceptual to transformative) which are essential for intercultural competencies.

Methods

This 9 week longitudinal study was conducted in spring of 2016 at a West Coast State college in the US. Participants were 35 undergraduate students in intercultural competence course [23 American students (9 female and 14 male) and 12 Korean students (9 female and 3 male)]. The definition for intercultural study was understanding and desire to learn about the other culture by Odag, Wallin, and Kedziot (2016). It was measured by each student's self-report. All participants assessed their thinking styles, systemic privilege/oppression and internalized privilege/oppression, their multiple identities and their intersections in their description of identity construc-

tion ("who am I?") in the 1st week (before learning) and in the 9th week (after learning) of the quarter. Their initial assessments (before learning) were collected immediately after completion the assessments. They were put into a large manila envelope, stapled, and kept by the professor until week 9 of the quarter. All participants were required to complete written uncensored reflective and expressive writing (assignments) prior to class to learn the origin of their values and beliefs on a particular topic (e.g., racism, classism) throughout the quarter. These assignments were answering specific questions written in first person from each chapter of their textbook, *Social Justice, Multicultural Counseling, and Practice: Beyond a conventional approach* by Jun (see Appendix A for sample questions). All Korean students who arrived from Korea 3 days before the quarter had an option of writing in their preferred language since most of them struggled with writing in English. Throughout the quarter, with the participant present the professor checked to see that the assignment was complete without reading the content. This was an attempt to provide a safe environment for students to write without censoring. They were encouraged to be honest with themselves. They participated in the Journal workshop which emphasized a way to access information in a person's unconscious by writing without censoring and that thinking about writing is different from actually writing (Progoff, 1992). Participants submitted assignments at least once a week and sometimes twice a week. The uncensored writing started on the first week and ended on the 9th week. The professor taught each corresponding chapter after students' completion of their uncensored written assignments. At the end of the quarter the participants were asked to describe their identity construction again; they were asked to describe "who am I?" Their initial description of "who am I?" was returned to them when they completed their final description. A description comparison form was given to each participant was asked to fill out the form and to submit it to the faculty anonymously (see Appendix B). Anonymity was designed to avoid social desirability and allow participants to respond without censoring.

The form had three parts and participants were asked to read the week 1 description of who they were to complete the form for the week 1 before they read the week 9 description and complete for the week 9 for both part A and B. Part A was putting check marks on the concepts or ideas of their identities (e.g., race, gender, class, sexual orientation, disability/impairment, age, religious affiliation, region, language, etc.), intercultural competence, and writing without censoring. Part B was listing intersecting identities, belonging to privileged or oppressed groups, and awareness of belonging to privilege or to oppressed groups. Part C was response to two questions. This took place in the classroom in week 9 to make sure that everyone completed the form at the same time and everyone had the chance to ask for clarification on the form. The completed comparison forms were collected for data analysis at the end of their course completion and the results were shown during the last day of class in week 10.

Results and Conclusion

Graphs 1 through 3 show the effects that repetitive practice of uncensored reflective and expressive writing on their self- knowledge. All 3 Graphs [Graph 1 = all participants (Koreans and Americans), Graph 2=Koreans, and Graph 3= Americans] are comparisons between the 1st week and the 9th week. In each graph, Y axis is the percentage of change and X axis is categories of multiple identities, their intersections, awareness of oppressed/privileged group memberships, thinking styles, and intercultural competence. All three graphs show a substantial increase in awareness of their multiple identities, holistic thinking, and intercultural competence while a substantial decrease in dichotomous, hierarchical, and linear thinking. The first hypothesis of the study was repetitive practice of uncensored reflective and expressive writing on one's identities and their intersections increases self- knowledge. The first hypothesis was confirmed. Graph 1

shows that every identity category (e.g., race, gender, etc.), its intersections, and awareness of group memberships in relation to oppression and privilege increased from week 1 to week 9.

Graph 1. Changes in Self-Knowledge for All (Korean and American) Students

Source: own study.

For each category, Y axis is the percentage of change before (week 1) and after (week 9) completing the course and X axis is categories of multiple identities (race, gender, class, sexual orientation, disability/impairment, age, language, religion, regions), their intersections, awareness of belonging to oppressed/privileged groups, thinking styles (dichotomous, hierarchical, linear, and holistic), and intercultural competence.

The second hypothesis was self-knowledge increases intercultural competencies. The second hypothesis was also confirmed. Graph 1 shows the percentage of change in intercultural competence increased from 11% (1st week) to 100% (9th week).

Graph 2 was analysis of only Korean participants. It showed that Korean students' initial percentages for identities related to language and region were higher (39% and 33% respectively) than that of week 9 (5% and 25% respectively). It is important to notice the impact of intercultural contexts on shifting identities and its consequences on sense of self and intercultural competence, although the differences did not show up in all student analysis (See graph 1). Korean students had not experienced extreme difficulty due to the lack of English proficiency in week 1 of the quarter. A substantial decrease in the percentage (5%) in week 9 represented extreme challenges with academic work in English. In terms of identity relating to region a few Korean students reported they experienced racial discrimination outside of the campus. They did not equate this to racial identity but equated it to region. The graph showed that Korean students did not respond to "belonging to privileged group" in week 1 because of the difficulty of comprehending the concept.

Graph 2. Changes in Self-Knowledge for Korean Students from Week 1 to Week 9

Source: own study.

For each category, Y axis is the percentage of change before (week 1) and after (week 9) completing the course and X axis is categories of multiple identities (race, gender, class, sexual orientation, disability/impairment, age, language, religion, regions), their intersections, awareness of belonging to oppressed/privileged groups, thinking styles (dichotomous, hierarchical, linear, and holistic), and intercultural competence.

Graph 3 shows analysis of only American participants. Graph 3 shows that every identity category (e.g., race, gender, etc.), its intersections, and awareness of group memberships in relation to oppression and privilege increased from week 1 to week 9.

Graph 3. Changes in Self-Knowledge for American Students from Week 1 to Week 9

Source: own study.

For each category, Y axis is the percentage of change before (week 1) and after (week 9) completing the course and X axis is categories of multiple identities (race, gender, class, sexual orientation, disability/impairment, age, language, religion, regions), their intersections, awareness of belonging to oppressed/privileged groups, thinking styles (dichotomous, hierarchical, linear, and holistic), and intercultural competence.

Graph 4 shows comparisons between week 1 and week 9 on thinking styles, intercultural competence, and reflective writing without censoring. The third hypothesis of the study was uncensored reflective and expressive writing on thinking styles and multiple identities and their intersections increases (a) paradigm shift in thinking (from conventional to holistic) and (b) paradigm shift in learning (from conceptual to transformative). Graph 4 shows that hypothesis 3 (a) was confirmed. It shows a substantial decrease in conventional thinking (hierarchical and dichotomous) and an increase in holistic thinking for both American and Korean participants as they increased writing without censoring. This results shows complex pedagogies can be developed on the basis of holistic thinking which examines issues from a multidimensional and multilayered perspective. One of

the reasons for traditional pedagogies' inability to address an increasingly complex reality is they are based on conventional thinking styles (dichotomous, hierarchical, and linear) which simplify complex reality.

The author chose not to distribute the questionnaire on paradigm shift in learning (transformative learning) at the end of the quarter due to unexpected emotional reactions of both Korean and American students around the upcoming departure of Korean students. The Korean students had to leave the US on the third day of final's week and both Korean and American students were not ready to end their relationship.

Graph 4. Shift in thinking (from conventional to holistic) & Intercultural competence

Source: own study.

For each category, Y axis is the percentage change and X axis is categories of thinking styles (dichotomous, hierarchical, linear, and holistic), intercultural competence, and reflective writing without censoring by the groups (1= all students in week1; 2=American students in week1; 3=Korean students in week1; 4=all students in week 9; 5=American students in week 9; 6=Korean students in week 9).

Chi-square analyses (see tables 1-3) indicated statistical significance for increase in holistic thinking ($p < .00001$), reflective writing without censoring ($p < .00001$), and intercultural competence ($p < .00001$) from week 1 to week 9.

Table 1. Comparisons of all students' holistic thinking between week 1 and week 9

All	Holistic thinking, yes	Holistic thinking, no	Marginal Row Totals
Week 1	8 (18) [5.56]	27 (17) [5.88]	35
Week9	28 (18) [5.56]	7 (17) [5.88]	35
Marginal Column Totals	36	34	70 (Grand Total)

Source: own study.

The chi-square statistic is 22.8758. The p-value is .000002. This result is significant at $p < .00001$.

Table 2. Comparisons of all students' reflective writing without censoring between week 1 and week 9

All	Reflective writing w/o censoring(yes)	Reflective writing w/o censoring(no)	Marginal Row Totals
Week 1	3 (17.5) [12.01]	32 (17.5) [12.01]	35
Week 9	32 (17.5) [12.01]	3 (17.5) [12.01]	35
Marginal Column Totals	35	35	70 (Grand Total)

Source: own study.

The chi-square statistic is 48.0571. The p-value is .00001. This result is significant at $p < .00001$.

Table 3. Comparisons of all students' intercultural competence between week 1 and week 9

All	Intercultural competence (yes)	Intercultural competence(no)	Marginal Row Totals
Week 1	4 (19.5) [12.32]	31 (15.5) [15.5]	35
Week 9	35 (19.5) [12.32]	0 (15.5) [15.5]	35
Marginal Column Totals	39	31	70 (Grand Total)

Source: own study.

The chi-square statistic is 55.641. The p -value is 00001. The result is significant at $p < .00001$.

The present study demonstrated specific strategies to deconstruct dichotomous, hierarchical, and linear thinking styles and to develop holistic thinking. Developing holistic thinking is the foundation of increasing intercultural competencies for all (e.g., students, faculty, managers, and CEOs). It provides us to view the world from both linearity (Western) and non-linearity (Eastern). The strengths of the study were (a) participants were in the same course, intercultural competence and (b) engaged in experiential learning activities on a weekly basis (e.g., writing without censoring, in-depth course content processing, community based learning projects, creative projects as small groups who were partnered for a whole quarter). (c) Students defined themselves through self-reflection based essays that asked the question, "who am I?". (d) they assessed their own changes in their multiple identities, thinking styles, their relationship to systemic privilege and oppression and internalized privilege and oppression, and intercultural competencies by comparing the 1st (before) and the 9th (after) week descriptions at the end of the quarter. Some participants reported that comparing the two descriptions was transformative because they actually witnessed their growth in self-knowledge and self-awareness in the process.

One of the limitations was a sample size being too small ($N=35$) and the duration (3 months) being too short. Future studies need to include a larger

sample with a longer duration to examine the effectiveness of uncensored writing on increasing holistic thinking which is essential for intercultural competencies. Future studies should also include learning intercultural competencies through transformative learning. Conceptual understanding of intercultural competencies is necessary but not sufficient. "Due to deep-rooted emotional attachment to in-group favoritism, deconstructing inappropriate hierarchical, dichotomous, and linear thinking must focus on understanding the affective transformative process as well as the rational transformative process" [Jun H., 2010, p. 264]. We may communicate our implicit attitude on intercultural competences. Affective transformative learning involves experiencing a deep structural change in our feelings and actions and is essential for us to transcend our implicit biases.

The main contribution of the study was demonstrating specific strategies to deconstructing dichotomous, hierarchical, and linear thinking styles and how to develop holistic thinking. Developing holistic thinking is the foundation of increasing intercultural competencies for students, faculty, managers, and CEOs. The other contribution was demonstrating that uncensored reflective and expressive writing on a regular basis to answer specific questions around our beliefs and values give access to our ingrained values and beliefs.

The process of acknowledging our ingrained values and beliefs without judgment leads to self-understanding and self-acceptance as we are. Many students who engaged in regular practice of reflective and expressive writing without censoring since 2009 reported accepting themselves allowed them to be more accepting of others. In turn, it increased their intercultural competencies. If educators, leaders, managers, employees, students, politicians, CEOs, and researchers incorporate this model to increase their own and their organizations' or institutions' intercultural competencies, it is possible to resolve inter and intra-cultural, organizational, institutional, political issues and conflicts with respect, trust, and cooperation.

References

Abrams, D., Rutland, A. & Cameron, L. (2004) The development of subjective group dynamics: Children's judgments of normative and deviant in-group and out-group individuals. *Child Development*, vol. 74, pp. 1840–1856.

American Psychological Association (2008) Report of the APA task force on the implementation of multicultural guidelines [Online], Available: <http://www.apa.org/pi/> [25 June 2016].

Ang, S. and Van Dyne, L. (2008) *Conceptualization of cultural intelligence: Definition, distinctiveness, and nomological network*, in: S. Ang and L. Van Dyne (eds.), *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and application*. New York, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Bhawuk, D. & Brislin, R. (2000) Cross-cultural training: A review. *Applied Psychology*, vol.49, pp. 162–191.

Bianchi, M., Machunsky, M., Steffens, M.C. & Mummendey, A. (2009) Like me or like us: Is ingroup projection just social projection?. *Experimental Psychology*, vol. 56, pp. 198–205.

Burke, L.A. & Rau, B. (2010) The research-teaching gap in management. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, vol. 9, pp. 132–143.

Corey, G. (2005) *Theory and practice of counseling & psychotherapy*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole-Thomson Learning.

Datar, S.M., Garvin, D.A. & Cullen, P.G. (2010) *Rethinking the MBA: Business education at a crossroads*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Dattilio, F. M. (2001) Cognitive-behavior therapy: Contemporary myths and misconceptions. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 3–18.

Dobson, K. & Block, L. (1988) *Historical and philosophical bases of the cognitive-behavioral therapies*, in: K.S. Dobson (ed.), *Handbook of cognitive-behavioral therapies*. New York: Guilford Press.

Early, P.C., & Ang, S. & Tan, J.S. (2006) *CQ: Developing cultural intelligence at work*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Egan, M.L. & Bendick, M. (2008) Combining multicultural management and diversity into one course on cultural competence. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 387–393.

Fernandez, J. (2011, April/May) Globalization: Time to step up. *eNewsline: AACSB International* [Electronic], vol. 10, no. 2, Available: <http://www.aacsb.edu/publications/enews/archives/2011/vol10-issues2-UpFeont>, [25 June 2016]

Ghemawat, P. (2011) *Responses to forces of change: A focus on curricular content* [in:] *Globalization of management education. Changing international structures, adaptive strategies, and the impact on institutions report of the AACSB-IGME Task Force*. Tampa, FL: AACSB International-The Association to Advance of Collegiate Schools of Business.

Hegarty, P. & Bruckmuller, S. (2013) Asymmetric explanations of group differences: experimental evidence of Foucault's disciplinary power. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, pp. 176–186.

Heiphetz, L.S., Spelke, E.S. & Banaji, M.R. (2013) Patterns of implicit and explicit attitudes in children and adults: Tests in the domain of religion. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, vol. 142, no. 3, pp. 864–879.

Jackson, M., Barth, J.M., Powell, N. & Lochman, J.E., (2006) Classroom contextual effects of race on children's peer nominations. *Child Development*, vol. 77, pp. 1325–1337.

Jun, H. (2010) *Social justice, multicultural counseling, and practice: Beyond a conventional approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lee, S., Adir, W.L. & Seo, S.J. (2011) Cultural perspective taking in cross-cultural negotiation. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, pp. 1–17.

Litoiu, N. (2010) Career counseling at Romanian universities level: Management by whose objectives?. *Gas University of Ploiesti Bulletin, Education Sci*, vol. 62, no. (2), 170.

Ljubica, J., Dulcic, Z., & Aust, I. (2016) Linking individual and organizational cultural competences: One step closer to multicultural organization. *Management*, vol. 21, pp. 51–82.

Lloyd, S. & Hartel, C.E. J. (2010) Intercultural competencies for culturally diverse work teams. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 25, pp. 845–875.

Mendenhall, M.E., Arnardottir, A.A., Oddou, G.R. & Burke, L.A. (2013) Developing cross-cultural competencies in management education via cognitive-behavior therapy. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 436–451.

Mor, S., Morris, M. & Joh, J. (2013) Identifying and training adaptive cross-cultural management skills: The crucial role of cultural metacognition. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, vol. 12, no. 3, 453–475.

Pless, N.N., Maak, T. & Stahl, G. (2011) Developing responsible global leaders through international service-learning programs: The Ulysses experience. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, vol. 10, pp. 237–260.

Odag, O., Wallin, H.R., & Kedziot, K.K. (2016) Definition of intercultural competence according to undergraduate students at an international university in Germany. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 20 (2), 118–139.

Posadas, M.C. (2014) Converlogical management theory: Towards the development of the communicative competence of an organization. *DLSU Business & Economics Review*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 45–59.

Progoff, I. (1992) *At a journal workshop: Writing to access the power of the unconscious and evoke creative ability*, New York: Tarcher/Putnam.

Pronin, E., Gilovich, T. & Ross, L. (2004) Theoretical note: Objectivity in the eye of the beholder: Divergent perceptions of bias in self versus others. *Psychological Review*, vol. 111, no. 3,

pp. 781–799.

Robbins, J.M., & Krueger J.I. (2005) Social projection of ingroups and outgroups: A review and meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 32–47.

Sennett, R. (2012) *Together: The rituals, pleasures and politics of cooperation*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Singer, T., & Kimbles, S. L. (eds.) (2004) *The cultural complex*. New York: Brunner-Routledge.

Szkudlarek, B., Mcnett, J., Romani, L. & Lane, H. (2013) The past, present, and future of cross-cultural management education: The educators' perspective. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 477–493.

Young, I.M. (2000) *Five faces of oppression*, in: M. Adams, W.J. Blumenfeld, C. Castaneda, H.W. Hackman, M.L. Peters, and X. Zuniga (ed.) *Readings for diversity and social justice*, New York: Routledge.

Appendix A

Concrete Strategies

Inappropriate Dichotomous Thinking and Intrapersonal Communication

The purpose of these activities is to gain conscious awareness of how you think and how your thinking style affects your interpersonal communication. It is important that you do not judge, censor, or minimize your inner dialogue (intrapersonal communication).

Reflection-based Learning Activities

Record your inner dialogue (intrapersonal communication) on a daily basis for at least a week or 10 days and then do the following.

- 1) Examine whether you used an inappropriate dichotomous thinking style and what happened as a result.
- 2) If you used an inappropriate dichotomous thinking style, do you recall the first time you were exposed to it?
- 3) Did your parents, siblings, and/or school teachers inappropriate dichotomous thinking while you were growing up? How did this shape your intrapersonal communication?
- 4) Close your eyes for 5 min while breathing in and out slowly and evenly. Reflect on your answers to the previous questions. Open your eyes and write down your relationship to the inappropriate dichotomous thinking style.
- 5) Think of one incident where you were frustrated with a client, boss, or friend. What were your assumptions? What did you expect? Was your frustration related to inappropriate dichotomous thinking? If so, explain.
- 6) Estimate the percentage of inappropriate dichotomous thinking in your inner dialogue each day. [Jun, 2010, p. 34]

Appendix B

Examination of Identity Descriptions

1. Check one which represents you most accurately.
- 1) __Korean student ___American student
 - 2) __Female __Male __Trans
 - 3) __First year __sophomore __Junior __senior
2. (a) Read "Who am I?" you wrote at the beginning of the quarter (week 1) and check words or concepts you used to describe yourself for part A, list as instructed for part B, and describe for part C.
- (b) After completion of (a), read your second description of "Who am I?" you wrote on Monday (at the end of the quarter) and follow the same instructions as (a) for week 9.

Concepts or Ideas	Beginning of the Quarter (week 1)	End of the Quarter (week 9)
Multiple Identities	Check	
race		
gender		
class		
sexual Orientation		
disability/Impairment		
age		
language		
religious Affiliation		
region		
Thinking styles		
dichotomous style		
hierarchical style		
linear style		
holistic style		
Intercultural competence		

Reflective writing w/o censoring		
Multiple Identities and their intersections	List intersecting identities	List intersection identities
Belong to privileged group	List # of groups	List # of groups
Belong to oppressed group	List # of groups	List # of groups
Aware of belonging to privilege group	List group name(s)	List group name(s)
Aware of belonging to oppressed group	List group name(s)	List group name(s)

C. Essays

3. State similarities and differences between your first and last descriptions.
4. Describe your learning from comparing your identity descriptions.