

MENTORING REFUGEES:
AN INTERCULTURALLY GROUNDED TRAINING FOR VOLUNTEERS
MENTORING IN REFUGEE BEFRIENDER PROGRAMS

by

Leslie J. Rapp

A Capstone Submitted to the

MAIR Program

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

School of International Studies

Intercultural Relations

University of the Pacific
Stockton, CA

2015

MENTORING REFUGEES:
AN INTERCULTURALLY GROUNDED TRAINING FOR VOLUNTEERS
MENTORING IN REFUGEE BEFRIENDER PROGRAMS

by

Leslie J. Rapp

APPROVED BY:

Capstone Advisor: Chris Cartwright, Ed.D.

Committee Member: Amy Tolbert, Ph.D.

Committee Member: Barbara Raye, M.B.A.

Director of International Studies: William Herrin, Ph.D.

Dean of Graduate Studies: Bhaskara R. Jasti, Ph.D.

MENTORING REFUGEES:
AN INTERCULTURALLY GROUNDED TRAINING FOR VOLUNTEERS
MENTORING IN REFUGEE BEFRIENDER PROGRAMS

Copyright 2015

by

Leslie J. Rapp

DEDICATION

This capstone is dedicated to my husband, Walton Stanley. Without his steadfast love, encouragement, and support, the journey toward a master's degree would have been a lonely journey, indeed. I also dedicate this capstone to my mother, Lucille H. Rapp, who inspired in me a love of learning. Although she was unable to pursue her dream of higher education, it is by way of her legacy that I have been able to pursue mine. I know she would be cheering me on if she were here today.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are many people who have held me up, cheered me on, and supported me in ways large and small throughout this process. I am deeply grateful to each of them. I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Chris Cartwright, for challenging me to explore concepts deeply and to consider perspectives I might have overlooked. His encouragement to “keep writing” and his sense of humor kept everything in balance. I would also like to acknowledge my capstone committee members, Dr. Amy Tolbert and Barbara Raye, for their contribution of time, inspired questions, gentle critique, and encouragement throughout. Additionally, I am grateful to the panel of experts who reviewed the instructional design. This team included Dr. L. Ripley Smith, Lindsay Strand, Faith Jamnik, Joo Kim, Jennifer Bordonaro, and Gayle Lewis. I would also like to acknowledge Minnesota Council of Churches, Refugee Services, for inspiring this project; Mr. Abdillahi Mohamud for helping me with Somali translation; and my good friend Nancy Riestenberg, for introducing me to Barbara Raye two years ago. I know that working toward my master’s degree would not have been as much fun or as life changing without my MAIR cohort. I appreciated each and every one of these amazing individuals, and I learned much from their life stories during our residencies together. Most specifically, I am indebted to Sherifa Fayez, Dawnne Jones, Jenny Sowry, and Michelle Taylor-Posey. Without their support and love, I could not have made it through this process. They have a place in my heart forever.

Mentoring Refugees:
An Interculturally Grounded Training for Volunteers
Mentoring in Refugee Befriender Programs

Abstract

by Leslie J. Rapp

University of the Pacific
2015

In 2012, the United States Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP) admitted 58,238 refugees to the United States for resettlement, and close to 3% (1,738) of these refugees were resettled in Minnesota. Resettlement agencies are tasked with providing services to help refugees gain a foothold in their new communities, and volunteer (befriender) mentoring programs are often used to provide refugees personal connections with the host communities. These “befriender” programs have experienced uneven success due, in part, to a lack of intercultural training for host-national volunteers. This capstone project addressed the training gap in befriender-like programs by creating an instructional design for an 8-hour volunteer preparation training.

The capstone process included research into the literature of refugee acculturation and adaptation; volunteer motivation and retention; mentoring; intercultural competence;

and the theory, models, and frameworks behind effective intercultural training design. Data from interviews with resettlement agency professionals, volunteers, members of the refugee community, and intercultural trainers also informed the learning objectives for this instructional design. The Intercultural Effectiveness Scale (IES) was selected to provide a statistically valid assessment of the intercultural competency of training participants. The training design addressed three key areas critical for preparing befriender volunteers for an intercultural mentoring partnership: (a) cultural self-awareness, (b) intercultural communications skills, and (c) pragmatic strategies for working with refugees and agency staff. An expert panel of professionals reviewed and evaluated the instructional design and supporting materials. This training can be used as a prototype for organizations looking for culturally appropriate ways to prepare staff and volunteers to work with refugee clients.

Contents

LIST OF TABLES	10
Chapter 1: Introduction	11
Capstone Training Prototype	12
Relevance of the Capstone	16
Overview of the Capstone	17
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature	18
Refugee–Volunteer Programs	18
Theoretical Frameworks and Models	25
Intercultural Training Methods and Facilitation	32
Summary of the Literature Review	41
Chapter 3: Methods	42
Overview	42
Original Project Plan	42
Preparation Research	43
Instructional Design Development	45
Unexpected Changes	48
Interview and Evaluation Analysis Procedure	50

Chapter 4: Results	53
Themes From the Interview Data	53
Instructional Design Decisions	62
Expert Panel Feedback.....	67
Chapter 5: Conclusion.....	78
Capstone Training Contribution	78
Capstone Limitations and Considerations	80
Personal Learning	84
Next steps.....	86
References.....	88
APPENDIX A. NEEDS ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS	96
APPENDIX B. PRE-POST SESSION SELF-ASSESSMENT	98
APPENDIX C: INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN	100
APPENDIX D. EXPERT PANEL EVALUATION QUESTIONS.....	138
APPENDIX E: REVISED INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN.....	140

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Expert Panel Identification Codes.....	67
2. Results for Questions 1–6.....	68
3. Results for Questions 7–8.....	68

Chapter 1: Introduction

The United States has long prided itself on being a safe harbor for people seeking refuge, and, to its credit, the United States has welcomed more than 3 million refugees to its shores since 1975. Despite a drop in refugees after 9/11, the numbers have been on the rise since 2004 and 2008, with an influx of refugees from Somalia and Burma, respectively (Inkpen & Igielnik, 2014). In his remarks on World Refugee Day 2013, President Obama reiterated the nation's commitment to provide assistance to the world's most vulnerable citizens, recognizing the many contributions they make to the vitality, economy, and cultural life of the nation (Report to Congress, 2014).

Nine refugee relocation agencies (and their local affiliates), under the auspices of the U.S. State Department, are charged with ensuring that refugees receive appropriate levels of support to integrate successfully into their new communities. The expectations of the 1980 Refugee Act clearly state that refugees will become self-sufficient economically and proficient in the English language (Haines, 2010). Relocation agencies provide the professional staff and services to deliver on these mandated expectations. Included in these services are programs that match volunteers from the local community with new refugees. The goal of these "mentoring" programs is to help the newcomer adjust to the culture, learn new skills to independently access community services, practice English, and make a friend. Increasing access to social networks with host nationals is one of the factors that contribute to successful acculturation and adjustment (Ward, Bochner, & Furnham, 2001; Kim, 2005). In fact, a recent evaluative report on

these types of volunteer programs sponsored by the Canadian government found that “compared to other refugees, matched refugees obtain employment sooner, perform better in language acquisition, receive less government financial assistance, have more friends, and are more optimistic about their future” (Behnia, 2007, p. 3).

Although studies point to the positive effects of these mentoring programs, they also note gaps in their effectiveness (Behnia, 2007, 2012; Ward, Bochner & Furham, 2001). A significant gap cited in the research studies is the lack of volunteer training, specifically cultural sensitivity and communication training (Behnia, 2007; Immigration Consultants of Canada Regulatory Council, 2004). The overarching objective of this capstone project is to create a 3-module instructional training design addressing these critical gaps. This training can be used as a prototype for organizations looking for more culturally appropriate ways to prepare staff and volunteers to work with refugee clients.

Capstone Training Prototype

In 2012, the United States Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP) admitted 58,238 refugees to the United States for resettlement (Report to Congress, 2014). Close to 3% (1,738) of these refugees were placed in Minnesota. The Minnesota Council of Churches, Refugee Services (MCC-RS), is a resettlement agency located in Minneapolis, Minnesota. It has a volunteer program called Befriender that provides host country mentoring support to newly arrived refugees. Befriender-like programs are not unique to MCC-RS. Resettlement agencies commonly use volunteers to assist new refugees with job-seeking activities, language practice, and skills needed to access community services and resources. Most of the nine volunteer agencies with cooperative agreements with the U.S. State Department have some kind of volunteer–refugee assistance program listed on

their website, and most of them list preparation orientations as a prerequisite for volunteering (U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, n.d.).

While the MCC-RS Befriender volunteer program is the model for this instructional design, it is my intention that the activities and content included in the modules provide a well-grounded framework that will work for various organizations working with volunteers and refugee populations. I expect, however, that organizations will need to adjust aspects of the design to meet culturally specific or organizationally specific needs.

Background of the MCC-RS Befriender program. MCC-RS began its work in 1985 and has resettled more than 6,000 refugees in Minnesota. An ecumenical organization, MCC-RS's stated mission is to welcome "persecuted people from around the world into new lives of freedom, hope, and opportunity in Minnesota" (Minnesota Council of Churches Refugee Services, n.d.a). The agency provides refugees a suite of services, including immigration assistance, social service resources, employment coaching, and educational resources. While the agency maintains a staff of 19 full-time employees, part-time employees, and VISTA volunteers, it relies on the work of volunteers to assist refugees through the resettlement process.

The Befriender program provides each newly arrived refugee with a volunteer "mentor" to assist the refugee in achieving his or her resettlement goals. Befriender volunteers serve in three important capacities: (a) they provide cultural information for interacting appropriately with the host community culture, (b) they familiarize the refugee with the systems and processes of daily life in Minnesota, (e.g., shopping, using banks, reading and understanding mail and government forms, etc.), and (c) they serve as

a resource for practicing English language skills. As with any effective mentoring program, there is the potential for volunteers to learn as well, specifically, the opportunity to learn about another culture, develop a friendship, and gain a new perspective as they “experience our community through the lens of their refugee friend” (Minnesota Council of Churches Refugee Services, n.d.b).

In MCC-RS’s recently published book, *This Much I Can Tell You: Stories of Courage and Hope From Refugees in Minnesota*, a refugee from the Democratic Republic of Congo presents a poignant case for the importance of having a friend to “show you the way”:

This is one of the toughest things to achieve when you arrive here. Especially for people arriving from different countries from Africa. Everything is different, including the culture, the environment. Everything is different! You have to learn every little thing. You’re like a baby, pretty much. You’re like a baby. It’s not like you’re going to go on the street and ask everybody, ‘Can you show me how to do this?’ People are so busy! They work fast; they walk fast. Well, you feel that it’s not appropriate to stop everybody. Everything is just in a constant motion. (p. 114)

The Befriender program’s intention is to address the need for a personal connection, someone with the time and desire to slow down and lend a supportive hand during this confusing time when “everything is different.”

Volunteers. Volunteers for befriender-type programs can be sourced in several ways. Some volunteers come through established partnerships with the sponsoring agency, (e.g., church congregations) or are individually sourced from the community at large. Research has found that volunteers working with refugees tend to do so for altruistic reasons (e.g., the desire to give back to the community or help someone in need)

or for self-interest reasons (e.g., the desire to feel useful, practice language skills, or improve job/college acceptance opportunities) (Behnia, 2012).

While volunteers represent a broad spectrum of the community demographic, they typically are native born to the host country, 50 years or older, female, and college educated (Behnia, 2012). While established refugees living in the community provide informal assistance to newcomers, it has been noted that not all cultures hold a similar understanding of formal volunteerism. In some countries, volunteering is viewed as unpaid work and as such, undervalued, causing some refugees to avoid volunteering for formal befriender-type programs (Behnia, 2012). For the purposes of this capstone it will be assumed that the demographic of participants is primarily, but not necessarily 100%, U.S. born, college educated, and 50 years of age or older.

Volunteer recruitment and retention is a common challenge for resettlement agencies (Behnia, 2007, 2012.) Behnia's studies on befriending programs in four countries (Australia, England, Canada, and the United States) point to the following reasons for volunteer dissatisfaction: cultural differences, a lack of understanding of the refugee experience and its impact on resettlement, a lack of support and appreciation by the agency, and a sense that their work is not needed or helpful. Other studies find that volunteers commit more time and remain connected to organizations when they feel the work they do is not overwhelming and the relationship they have with clients is positive (Behnia, 2012). The cost in time and resources to recruit and train new volunteers can be a drain to already overworked and resource-deprived social service agencies. Ensuring that volunteers have training that appropriately supports them is a key factor to ensuring retention of a committed and effective volunteer pipeline.

Relevance of the Capstone

An interculturalist's work is centered on building bridges of understanding between people. I am drawn to this concept because it speaks to both my personal and professional philosophies. Throughout my career as an actor and, more recently, as a corporate trainer and developer of global mentoring programs, I have been immersed in the art of building understanding and creating connections between diverse individuals.

To create a memorable character—one who teaches the audience something about the human condition—the actor must live and breathe the character's world as if it were the actor's own. With an open mind, a creative imagination, and a curiosity about the inner and external workings of another human being, the actor creates a fully embodied character, igniting the imagination of the audience members to reflect not only on the character, but also on their own lives. This process is similar to what Milton Bennett (Bennett & Castiglioni, 2004) describes as embodied empathy, in which intercultural understanding takes place.

Mentoring is another way I have seen bridges built between culturally diverse people. In my decade-long career of developing global mentoring programs, I have witnessed the alchemy that occurs when mentoring partners are open to each other's perspectives, listen deeply, and solve problems with flexibility and creativity. Communication skills like these mirror the best practices of intercultural communication effectiveness.

My capstone project offers me another opportunity to embrace the tenets of intercultural communication theory and practice by creating an instructional design to prepare volunteers to work with refugees during resettlement and the early stages of

cultural adaptation. The objective of this design is not to simply provide a basic information session for volunteers, but to create a 3-module learning experience that focuses on intercultural self-awareness, mindful intercultural communication skill building, mentoring best practices, and an understanding of the adaptation process refugees face during the initial stages of resettlement. I hope this training will give refugee organizations options for improved volunteer preparation learning and will give volunteers an interculturally grounded place to begin their work as bridge-builders as they welcome new refugees to their communities.

Overview of the Capstone

This first chapter provided the capstone project's background, purpose, focus, and proposed intent. The second chapter, Review of the Literature, provides the theories and models that ground the curricula chosen for the orientation modules. I drew from the adaptation/acculturation and intercultural communication literature, adult learning theory, intercultural competence, intercultural training models and concepts, and volunteer and mentoring literature. The third chapter, Methods, includes the processes for developing the instructional design modules, including needs assessments, training plans, handouts and resources, assessments, and evaluations. The fourth chapter, Results, explains how I analyzed this curriculum based on feedback from a team of training professionals and professionals with expertise working with refugees or volunteers in the social service provider community. The final chapter, Conclusion, reviews the learning I gained through the capstone process and gives my recommendations for additional training options for volunteers.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

This literature review chapter grounds the instructional design for an intercultural orientation training of U.S. volunteers providing resettlement assistance for newly arrived refugees. The first section of the review provides general information and volunteer program research to put the training objectives and target audiences in context. The second section provides the theoretical frameworks and models that support the selection of content in the instructional design. The third section focuses on theoretically sound intercultural training methods and facilitation technique.

Refugee–Volunteer Programs

Effectiveness. Refugee resettlement agencies in the United States, Canada, Britain, and Australia have turned to mentoring-like programs to put a personal and friendly face to resettlement processes that can often seem overly institutional, impersonal, and rule bound. The objective of these volunteer programs is to provide the newcomer a one-to-one connection with someone from the host community; this connection is intended to provide comfort, emotional support, cultural information, and skill-building support during the vulnerable and challenging time of initial resettlement. Acculturation research has pointed to host-society contact as a factor leading to successful cultural adaptation (Berry, 1997; Kim, 2005; Ward et al., 2001). In fact, recent studies have found that refugees working directly with host-society contacts experience greater employment and satisfaction (Behnia, 2012) and faster language acquisition (Stewart, Anderson, Beiser, Mwakarima, Neufeld, Simich, & Spitzer, 2008).

In contrast, other studies have found that when the quality of the support programs is uneven, the impact can be detrimental to the successful adaptation of the refugee group (Ward et al., 2001). When settlement sponsors are affiliated with religious organizations, as is often the case, added complications can arise. A 1989 study of Southeast Asian refugees, for example, found that religious differences between refugees and their sponsor groups was associated with increased levels of depression (Ward et al., 2001). A recent study focusing on refugee groups resettled in Canada found that different cultural understanding of social support systems (e.g., government responsibility or holistic and interdependent) often created negative perceptions of resettlement agency programs (Stewart et al., 2008).

Still other studies have recognized that interaction with host-society members is beneficial only when the roles and expectations are clearly understood and the host-society members have cultural awareness and empathy toward the newcomer's situation (Behnia, 2007; Stewart et al., 2008). For these reasons, researchers have stressed the need for volunteer and staff training to provide individuals with increased cultural awareness and sensitivity (Behnia, 2007, 2012; Stewart et al., 2008; Ward et al., 2001).

Role of mentoring. While resettlement agencies often refer to befriender programs as a form of mentoring, it is important be clear about the definition of mentoring and how befriender-like volunteer programs align with the mentoring concepts found in the literature. Much of the academic literature on formal mentoring focuses on mentoring children and adolescents or business professionals. Mentoring is defined as having two distinct functions: psychosocial functions and career functions (Ragins & Kram, 2007). Career functions involve helping protégés learn the ropes of the job and prepare for greater responsibilities in the organization. In the case of young people, the

mentor supports the student in attaining educational goals in preparation for entering the job market. Psychosocial functions focus on trust and friendship and behaviors that help protégés better understand their self-worth and self-efficacy.

Volunteers assisting refugees assume a classic mentor role by allowing refugees to determine the goals they want to focus on during the partnership (e.g., practicing English, preparing for job interviews) and by following their lead in terms of when and how often to meet. However, the learning approach in a refugee–volunteer partnership is more directive and instructional than the guiding approach typical of a classic mentoring partnership. The accountability and measurement criteria, so critical for business mentoring, is also absent from a refugee–volunteer partnership.

There is greater alignment on the psychosocial functions. One of the main objectives of befriender programs is to develop a friendship between volunteer and refugee that can supplement the institutional and impersonal relationships refugees often have with agency professional staff. It is also intended that these relationships develop over time and continue to provide a positive social connection to the receiving community, thus increasing the refugee’s access to social capital resources (Behnia, 2007).

With these distinctions in mind, my capstone instructional design will incorporate some training components that reinforce effective psychosocial mentoring practices (e.g., collaborative goal setting, trust and rapport building). However, because of the intercultural nature of the volunteer–refugee relationship, and the unique experience of supporting a refugee during initial stages of cultural transition, mentoring concepts and techniques will be tempered to meet the needs of an intercultural partnership in a nontraditional mentoring program.

Recognizing that cultural value frameworks impact how mentoring is understood between Western volunteers and refugees coming from cultures holding a different worldview is important to the design of this training. “Cultural value orientations form the basic lenses through which we view our own actions and the actions of others” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 58). The next section provides more information about the specific value orientations that will inform the training design. I mention value orientations here only to highlight the fact that culture impacts the shared meaning of mentoring and how each party defines expectations of the other within that construct. The majority of mentoring literature comes from Western scholars and researchers. Consequently, the concepts and findings assume a distinctively Western (i.e., U.S.) perspective. More recent studies have called into question this U.S.-centric perspective, suggesting that cultural value orientations, particularly those of individualism/collectivism and power distance create different experiences and expectations of mentoring in other parts of the world (Ramaswami & Dreher, 2010; Yang et al., 2007).

Beneficiaries: the refugee. The instructional design for this capstone could easily be adapted for use in a befriender-type program in any Western resettlement agency. The prototype for this design, however, focuses on a Minnesota-based agency. It is important, then, to provide some context for the cultural groups most likely to be matched with Befriender volunteers and the cultural environment refugees experience when placed in Minnesota.

As described in chapter 1, Minnesota is a popular relocation choice for incoming refugees. A recent study found that Minnesota took in 50% more refugees than expected based on general distribution of the population (Boyle & Ali, 2009). The same study noted that, while only 2% of the U.S. population lives in Minnesota, 3% of all African

refugees choose to resettle there. The Minneapolis/St. Paul metro area currently has the highest concentration of Somali refugees in the United States. The Karen, an ethnic minority group from Burma, makes up the other major refugee group in Minnesota, with a smaller number of resettlement refugees coming from other African nations and Iraq.

Acculturation scholars have found that societal and individual level variables influence the individual and group's acculturation process (Berry, 1997; Ward et al., 2001). The distance between a refugee's culture of origin and the resettlement society is another factor influencing resettlement challenges, one that often creates conflicts concerning gender, parenting, and marital relationships (Boyle & Ali, 2009; Lamba & Krahn, 2003; Ward et al., 2001). Individual factors such as education level, financial resources, language proficiency, and personality characteristics impact the ease or difficulty of adapting to the new cultural environment. Pre-migration trauma, common to many refugees, can lead to physical and mental health challenges ranging from loneliness to depression and post-traumatic stress disorder (Ward et al., 2001).

While pre-migration trauma and loss are very real and create acculturation stress and mental health challenges, studies have also shown that not all refugees are impacted negatively by the preconditions of migration. In fact, for many, the support received through the resettlement process (i.e., mental health services) benefits their adjustment (Clarke & Borders, 2014). Recent research has found that, despite the disadvantages that precipitate migration, there is a range of outcomes for refugees, many of them quite positive (Lamba & Krahn, 2003; Ward et al., 2001). Other studies on refugee resettlement cited by Lamba and Krahn (2003) cautioned agencies and researchers to refrain from constructing a perception of refugees as helpless and dependent based solely on the conditions leading up to their migration:

Despite the structural barriers and normative expectations, however, most refugees do, in time resettle successfully. Some of the credit must be given to the host country and to the individuals and institutions that provide resettlement support services. However research strongly suggests that refugees themselves are resourceful and proactive in the process of resettlement and far from passive dependents in their new home. (p. 336)

It should also be noted that one of the screening criteria agencies consider when matching a refugee in a volunteer-based befriender program is the refugee's psychological health.

It is understood that this program will not require specific training modules related to the refugee's psychological or medical needs.

It is impossible to predict or generalize the specific requirements refugees need to resettle effectively. The pattern of adjustment is a controversial topic for scholars (Ward et al., 2001). One pattern cited in refugee adjustment literature suggests three phases of adjustment:

1. The first few months of resettlement are characterized by positive feelings and a focus on operational support (e.g., setting up households, securing financial aid).
2. Once these operational matters are taken care of, the focus shifts to cultural learning and gaining enough knowledge and skills to get through daily routines. This might mean beginning the process of securing employment, accessing resources, and, for some, learning English. This second phase typically lasts from 2–6 months.
3. The third phase is longer and is characterized by periods of reflection and recognition of the realities of life in a new country. This phase is depicted as lasting 6–36 months or longer (Ward et al., 2001).

While scholars admit that more specific study of refugees must be conducted before this adjustment pattern can be validated, some recent studies find that during the initial six months of resettlement, refugees want operational and emotional support and assistance with understanding the cultural norms and behaviors of their new communities (Behnia, 2012; Stewart et al., 2008). Because befriender programs typically engage the volunteer and refugee in mentoring partnerships within the first six months of resettlement, training content will focus on topics to help volunteers address the refugees' operational, emotional, and cultural needs.

Training participants: volunteers. Chapter 1 identified the demographic for this capstone training as being predominately U.S. American, college educated, and at least 50 years old. Altruism has been identified as a primary motivation for volunteers engaging in befriender programs. In Behnia's (2012) study of 60 Canadian and foreign-born volunteers, prime motivations for Canadian volunteers included social values such as equality and justice, particularly around women's rights and education; a sense of moral obligation due to volunteers' position of privilege; and religious teaching around welcoming the stranger. The desire to help refugees adjust to their new cultural environments was noted as a common motivator for foreign-born volunteers. Canadians also mentioned a desire to learn about other cultures.

Behnia's (2007, 2012) volunteer studies, including one examining befriender-type programs in 52 agencies and four countries, identified the following list of challenges volunteers face working with refugee partners:

- complexity of cultural difference,
- volunteer's lack of understanding of the refugee acculturation process,

- volunteer's feelings of helplessness to add value or make a difference in the refugee's situation,
- conflicting ideological and cultural perspectives,
- relationship trust, and
- feeling supported and valued by agency staff.

This list of challenges, and the findings from recent studies focusing on refugee resettlement and social networks, suggest that adding a more robust level of intercultural training to volunteer preparation would not only enhance the volunteer experience, but would also address some of the complaints refugees have about resettlement support and their perception of agency staff and, by extension, volunteers (Behnia, 2007, 2012; Immigration Consultants of Canada Regulatory Council, 2004; Stewart et al., 2008). The content of this capstone training will address these challenges.

Theoretical Frameworks and Models

Identity negotiation theory. Much of the adaptation literature has claimed that host-society contacts are important to the adjustment process (Berry, 1997; Kim, 2005; Ward et al., 2001). Communication with host-society members offers cultural information to help newcomers behave appropriately, achieve their operational goals, and participate successfully in the new environment. Implied in the literature is the need for host-society individuals to play a role in the adaptation process, yet the focus of the literature is directed specifically to the cognitive, affective, and behavioral adjustment strategies of the newcomer. Communication, however, does not happen in a unidirectional manner. It is a collaborative act requiring the attention of both parties to be mindful of the complexities that lead to a shared understanding.

Intercultural communication scholar Stella Ting-Toomey (1999) suggested that host members should play the helpful host role and newcomers the mindful discoverer role, and that “both people stretch their identity boundaries to integrate new ideas, expand affective horizons, and respect alternative lifestyles and practices” (p. 244). Ting-Toomey’s view suggests a need for cognitive, affective, and behavioral recognition and adjustments for host-society members as well.

The identity negotiation theory (Ting-Toomey, 1999) serves as the theoretical framework for this instructional design. At the core of this theory is the assertion that individuals in all cultures seek to be competent communicators in all situations. In one’s own culture, competency is learned through enculturation, finessed through personal experience, and reinforced by members of the cultural in-group. Social and personal identity created within one’s cultural environment, then, becomes the “explanatory mechanism” for the intercultural communication process (p. 38).

When communicating interculturally, differences in how social and personal identity is expressed and understood come into full relief. The negotiation process occurs as communicators “assert, define, modify, challenge, and/or support their own and others’ desired self-images” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 40). How well individuals negotiate the process of keeping both their own and their partner’s identity secure and respected determines the effectiveness and competence of the communication.

According to identity negotiation theory, mindful communication is the approach to use to effectively communicate in intercultural settings. This concept of mindfulness and communication competence is threaded throughout intercultural communication literature, and it forms the foundation for the curriculum and activities in this instructional design.

Intercultural competence. Intercultural competence has been studied and debated in the literature for a long time. It has been examined through multiple disciplines, including management and global leadership, education, and communication, making a universal definition difficult to determine. However, a theme arises from the scholarship that points to a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that lead to effective cultural interactions (Bennett & Bennett, 2004; Chen & Starosta, 2008; Mendenhall, Osland, Bird, Oddou, & Maznevski, 2008).

Ting-Toomey (1999) pointed to mindful communication as the operational approach to effective intercultural communication. She defined mindfulness as the “readiness to shift one’s frame of reference, the motivation to use new categories to understand cultural or ethnic difference, and the preparedness to experiment with creative avenues of decision making and problem solving” (p. 46). Mindful communicators, then, must be aware of the invisible value systems guiding their own behaviors and be generally fluent in what value systems might guide the other person. They must have the skills to listen and respond in ways that negotiate identity for both parties, leading to collaborative dialogue and problem solving.

Other scholars refer to the “mindset” of intercultural competence. This incorporates cognitive attitudes and behaviors to engage in effective communication with culturally different partners. It requires cultural self-awareness, as well as an understanding of the communication styles and values of others; the ability to use that knowledge without stereotyping or assigning negative attributions to the other person; and, finally, the ability to analyze the situation, make reasonable predictions, and adapt behavior to fit the needs of the specific interaction (Bennett & Bennett, 2004).

Literature coming from the global management field points to competencies that lead to achieving results within the contextual requirements of the cultural situation (Chen & Starosta, 2008; Mendenhall et al., 2008). Individual self-awareness and self-monitoring competencies and the motivation and curiosity to learn about other cultural perspectives are identified as key competencies of being successful in intercultural work situations.

To play the role of “helpful host” (Ting-Toomey, 1999) and be a collaborative partner, volunteers must develop their intercultural communication competencies. This training will incorporate content, experiential activities, and assessment tools to address intercultural competencies centering on cultural-self awareness, mindful communication practices, and self-management strategies.

Cultural self-awareness. The way individuals construe a sense of self is aligned with their cultural values (Ting-Toomey, 1999). However, it can be difficult for host-society individuals to grasp a sense of their own culture and how it might confuse or create conflicts for newcomers. Cultural self-awareness is a critical starting point to develop cultural communication competency (Paige, 1993; Ting-Toomey, 1999).

There are multiple cultural value patterns described in the literature (Hall, 1998; Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998). Individualism/collectivism is perhaps the most fundamental values difference (Ting-Toomey, 1999; Ward et al., 2001) and an important dimension to explore with Western volunteers, who are likely to fall strongly on the individualism side of the continuum (Hofstede et al., 2010). This individualistic view embraces a preference for independence and achievement, self-direction, direct expressions of personal needs, and the expectation that challenges and environmental roadblocks can be managed or

overcome through individual persistence. The collectivist view, preferring interdependence, reciprocity, an emphasis on status and roles within the group, and an “other-face” orientation, is more typical of parts of the world where Minnesota refugees come from (Hofstede et al., 2010).

Other dimensions that impact volunteer and refugee interactions are power distance differences, which deal with values differences along status, equality, formality/informality (Hofstede et al., 2010). Again, there is a rather large values difference between the United States and the countries represented by the refugee groups. Raising cultural self-awareness along this dimension will be critical in helping volunteers understand how U.S. cultural norms, rules, and laws may be viewed differently by refugees, particularly when it comes to gender and marital/parental roles and in dealing with government and agency professionals.

From a communication standpoint, dimensions of high/low context and sequential/synchronic time differences (Hall, 1998) will be addressed. Developing self-awareness around one’s preferences for message delivery begins the development of skills to adjust communication to avoid unintentional confusion or disrespect. Understanding the different cultural perspectives around time can directly impact how volunteers approach scheduling meetings and relationship building with their refugee partners.

Mindful communication. Developing self-awareness lessens the potential for viewing interactions through a limiting ethnocentric perspective. It creates an opening through which mindful communication practice can be developed. Mindfulness requires one to be self-reflexive, creative, and willing to approach communication in a new way (Ting-Toomey, 1999; Shaetti, Ramsey, & Watanabe, 2008). It demands a level of

consciousness that “can support us even when we don’t have the necessary knowledge for the situation we are facing” (Shaetti et al., p. 19). Mindful communicators are mentally flexible and resilient, curious, and comfortable with ambiguity, four capabilities also cited in the intercultural competency literature as most critical to effectively achieving goals in an intercultural setting (Bird, Mendenhall, Stevens, & Oddou, 2010).

Mindful communication also requires individuals to be able to shift perspective and take the cultural frame of the other person. Shifting frames increases empathy, defined by Milton Bennett (1998) as “the imaginative intellectual and emotional participation in another person’s experience” (p. 207). Empathy allows for inclusive recognition of another’s cultural reality while remaining authentic to one’s own. It enables interaction that meets the basic motivational needs of inclusion and connection, two important conditions of the identity negotiation theory (Ting-Toomey, 1999) that reduce identity vulnerability stemming from interacting in culturally unfamiliar environments.

Stress and self-management. Interacting in a culturally unfamiliar environment produces stress for most people. For refugees, transition stress or “culture shock” is part of the transitional process of acculturation. Specific stressors and coping strategies are impacted by the degree of difference between the refugee’s society of origin and society of settlement as well as individual characteristics and situational characteristics (Ward et al., 2001). While host-society individuals are not faced with the transformational shifts required of individuals going through cultural acculturation, effective hosts engage in a collaborative effort to “stretch their identity boundaries” and “integrate new ideas” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 244). It is not unlikely, then, that they experience some of the stressors associated with intercultural contact.

Integrative communication theory. In integrative communication theory (Kim, 2005), the model of stress-adaptation-growth is used to describe an adaptation process that is dialectical, cyclical, and continual. As individuals engage in culture contact, and identities and intrinsic values are challenged, there is a stress response that creates a tension between the impulse to “pull back” to what feels familiar and the impulse to “leap” into something unfamiliar. This tension or disequilibrium, according to Kim’s open systems theory, must eventually return to a stable condition. When the choice is to regain stability by leaping into the new, subtle growth occurs. No matter how much cultural information and preparation one has before interacting with a culturally different partner, there is an element of ambiguity and disequilibrium. As in Kim’s theory, one could pull back and return to a mindless communication strategy that discounts the need to see a different perspective, try a new approach, or learn a new communication ritual. Or, one could choose to stay present in mindfulness, leap into the communication “unknown” and see what learning takes place.

Anthropologist Mary Catherine Bateson (1993) described the experience of cultural learning as a form of improvisation. She noted that enculturation suggested that one learns the role first before enacting it. Her revelation was that learning actually happens in reverse. One must begin performing the role in order to learn it. Exposure to someone from another culture, she claimed, requires the ability to stay in the improvised moment. Cultural knowledge of value dimensions and the dos and don’ts of specific cultures might be a starting point, but the real experience of learning is in the stress-adaptation-growth cycle. It is a willingness to acknowledge that with unfamiliar encounters comes disequilibrium and the ambiguity of not knowing how to play the role. The leap action is similar to the improviser’s decision to jump into the action armed only

with a “sense” of what to do and a belief and confidence that, as long as he or she stays alert to the cues and open to a new perspective, the other actor will fill in the needed information and the scene will move forward toward something new.

This analogy of improvisation is key to the communication portion of this instructional design. Intercultural competence includes self-confidence and comfort with ambiguity (Bird et al., 2010). Designing experiential activities using improvisation techniques will provide learners an experience of ambiguity and cultural “not knowing” within the confines of the supportive improvisational mindset of “yes, and.”

Intercultural Training Methods and Facilitation

Intercultural training effectiveness. Intercultural training is a relatively new phenomenon that began in the 1960s and expanded greatly during the 1990s (Bhawuk & Brislin, 2000). At one time, intercultural training focused primarily on students, business professionals, and long-term sojourners as a means of preparing them to manage the transitional shock of living and working in a new culture. Less focus was placed on training host-national members to receive newcomers because the perceived need to do so was not strong and the resources to implement this type of training were too great (Ward et al., 2001). With the onset of globalization, increased global travel, and increased migration, the need to prepare receiving societies to work effectively in multicultural settings increased the need for intercultural training, particularly for those individuals working directly with newcomers, including the professionals providing services to refugees (Chen & Starosta, 2008; Ward et al., 2001).

While host-society members are not immersed in learning how to adapt to a new culture to the same degree as the newcomers, scholars agree that intercultural training should address cognitive, affective, and behavioral learning content (Bennett, 2009a;

Bhawuk & Triandis, 1996; Black & Mendenhall, 1990; Paige, 1993a). This section of the literature review will focus on the theoretical training frameworks and models that lead to effective intercultural training design.

A comprehensive review of the empirical literature of intercultural training conducted by Black & Mendenhall (1990) found that cross-cultural training generally had a positive impact on the individual's ability to develop skills to help them adjust to cross-cultural situations and increased the potential for better job performance in cross-cultural situations. Using social learning theory as the theoretical framework for their study, they concluded that training had an impact on the learner's:

- self-dimension, involving self-confidence to know how to behave appropriately in intercultural settings;
- relationship dimension, involving the skills and practice to predict outcomes enabling them to persist longer in interaction and gain more feedback to refine behavior; and
- perception dimension, involving the ability to appreciate cultural complexity, reserve judgment, and better tolerate ambiguity.

Other scholars supported the idea that training should be based on sound intercultural theory and include both intellectual and experiential methods (Bennett, 2009b; Bhawuk & Brislin, 2000; Ting-Toomey, 1999). Bennett argued that, too often, training programs fail to ground skills in theoretical rationale. Effective intercultural training must go beyond teaching people “how” to do something and focus also on “why” they are doing it, thus creating a training format to address the learner's needs (Bennett, 2009b).

Bhawuk & Triandis (1996) presented a model of cultural learning that supported the theory and experiential approach. The model included four levels of cognition and learning stages:

- The lay person – the learner has no knowledge of another culture.
- The novice – the learner has had some experience and applies what he or she remembers to the intercultural learning experience.
- The expert – the learner has knowledge and expertise in another culture and has learned cultural theories that apply to that knowledge. He or she is able to recognize patterns (based on theory) and use those patterns to problem solve.
- The advanced expert – the learner has the theory and the knowledge and has also practiced the behavior so he or she can perform the task automatically.

Other scholars noted that training host-society members to interact in multicultural settings must move beyond providing culturally specific advice to interact appropriately with particular groups. Instead, it must also include cultural self-awareness training so that “members of the dominant culture move beyond thinking their culture is uniquely central to reality” (Bennett & Bennett, 2004, p. 160).

While it is unlikely that volunteer training can result in advanced expert-stage outcomes, the instructional design for this capstone will embrace the theoretical and experiential approach to develop the foundations for an “intercultural mindset.” Bennett and Bennett (2004) described this mindset as the awareness that one is operating in a cultural context and the maintenance of attitudes of curiosity and tolerance for ambiguity, along with the skillset to analyze situations, predict outcomes, and select behaviors leading to effective and appropriate interactions with others. To that end, it is important to recognize the needs of the adult learner, to identify the training strategies unique to

intercultural learning, and to consider the risks and challenges that accompany intercultural learning.

Adult learners. The study of the adult learner has evolved over the last century and has recognized that these learners require a different pedagogical model than the ones used for educating children and adolescents (Knowles, 1987; Wlodkowski, 2008). Because training comes out of the general education movement, addressing the unique needs of the adult learner is relevant to the design of this capstone training.

Knowles (1987) made two theoretical assumptions regarding the nature of adult motivation in a learning environment. The first assumption was that adults have a self-concept of being in charge of their lives and, by extension, have a strong psychological need to be treated as capable of self-direction. The second assumption was that adults learn when they have situations in front of them that require that learning. In other words, they learn what is relevant to their real-life situations.

Wlodkowski (2008) built on Knowles's work and developed a motivational framework for culturally responsive teaching. His model integrated psychological research on human curiosity, and the need to make meaning from experience, with neuroscientific understanding of intrinsic motivation. This model provided a framework for planning learning environments and content to support the intrinsic motivation of the learner. The four motivational conditions of the model included:

- inclusion, creating an environment where learners feel respected and valued;
- attitude, creating a favorable disposition to learning that is created by demonstrating relevance and providing choice;
- meaning, creating challenging and engaging learning experiences that also include the perspectives and values of the learner; and
- competence, creating the experience of self-efficacy and the confidence that the learner has been able to learn at a level that is personally and socially acceptable. (Wlodkowski, 2008, p. 114)

Wlodkowski asserted that this model was culturally effective because it was “capable of creating a common culture that all learners in the learning situation can accept” (Wlodkowski, 2008, p.114).

Other scholars have suggested that adult learners have particular styles of learning. According to Howard Gardner, individuals have the capacity for eight intelligences (Wlodkowski, 2008). Rather than depending on one kind of intelligence, people use a range of intelligences to complete different tasks. Examples of these eight intelligences are language/verbal, logical/mathematical, spatial, and kinesthetic, among others. Attending to cognitive style in the classroom is recommended to ensure that content is presented in a manner that makes sense for the learner (Bennett, 2012).

Experiential learning theory (ELT) (Kolb, 1981) integrated research on cognitive development and cognitive style. This learning model identified differences in individualized learning styles, the learning environments that supported each style, and how experience influenced learning. The model was constructed as a cycle of four stages of experience: (a) concrete, (b) observation and reflection, (c) formation of abstract concepts and generalization, and (d) testing implication of concepts in new situations. According to Kolb, learning was an integrative process whereby learners develop new concepts by going through each of the four stages of the model.

Recent scholarship has called the ELT’s validity into question, claiming there is not enough scientific evidence to say learning style impacts learning one way or the other. In fact, some researchers have found evidence that has contradicted the ELT (Pashler, McDaniel, Rohrer, & Bjork, 2008). However, they noted it was possible that the way material is taught may vary across disciplines and that educators’ attraction to the

idea of learning styles “partly reflects their (correctly) noticing how often one student may achieve enlightenment from an approach that seems useless for another student” (Pashler et al., p. 116).

Intercultural scholars and practitioners find that building intercultural competency is developmental and requires a process of learning. Learning to handle intercultural interactions requires people to cycle through learning that includes experience, reflection, conceptualization, and experimentation, and for this reason, designing training that integrates the four stages of Kolb’s model leads to effective learning (Bennett, 2012; Gregersen-Hermans & Pausch, 2012.)

Intercultural design content and methods. The following section will review the literature that addresses content and methods influencing effective intercultural training design and delivery.

There is consensus in the intercultural literature that integrated training programs using a balance of didactic and experiential methods are the preferred approach for intercultural training design (Bennett, 2009b; Fowler & Blohm, 2004; Paige, 1993b). These approaches can include both culture-specific and culture-general content. According to Gudykunst and Hammer (as cited in Paige, 1993b), training designers face a dilemma because learners tend to prefer the oft-times less effective culture-specific content because it is concrete and less threatening. However, culture-specific checklists are not helpful by themselves in preparing individuals for effective cultural interactions, because “individual cultures are diverse, fluid, and difficult to comprehend, and self-awareness and an understanding of the dynamics and influence of culture, in general terms, are equally, if not more important, than information about cultural specifics” (Paige, 1993b p. 172). Additionally, learners resist content that they perceive as

threatening. Using a blended approach of didactic/experiential and culture-general/culture-specific methods and content allows the trainer to integrate learning that is potentially transformative (Bennett, 2009b).

Intercultural training is developmental in nature (Bennett, 2009b). The developmental model of intercultural sensitivity (DMIS) (Bennett, 1993) and the challenge and support grid (Sanford, 1966) aid the instructional designer in selecting content and delivery methods that move the learner in a positive and progressive developmental direction while limiting the potential for resistance. The DMIS model reflects two approaches to cultural difference, one that avoids difference and one that seeks out difference. These two frames for approaching difference include stages that are ethnocentric and stages that are ethnorelative. According to Bennett and other scholars, knowing where the learner is on the continuum helps the designer construct activities and content that can be tailored specifically to the learner's developmental needs (Bennett, 2009b).

Intercultural topics often require that the learner reflect on areas that feel threatening or challenge deeply held beliefs. Adult learning theory, described earlier in this chapter, indicated that motivators for learning include positive attitude, inclusion, meaning, and competence. To keep the learner engaged, motivated, and working with topics that are challenging, content must have a balance between challenge and support (Sanford, 1966). Without this balance, the learner is likely to become frustrated and give up. Bennett (1993) elaborated on this idea in the challenge and support grid, suggesting that

- when the content and process challenge is high, learners leave;
- when content challenge is high and process challenge is low, learners gain knowledge;

- when content challenge is low, and process challenge is low, learners rest; and
- when content challenge is low and process content challenge is high, learners gain skills. (p. 123)

Recognizing that many learners fall on the ethnocentric side of the DMIS continuum, Bennett (2009b) recommended that training designers select less challenging content while providing high levels of support.

Similar models, such as the familiarity interactive and experiential design model (Gregersen-Hermans & Pausch, 2012), used the theoretical framework of social learning theory (Bandura, 1977), which suggested adults engage in learning when they are confident that they can do what is being asked of them. Challenge, in this model, is determined by “assessed or assumed level of intercultural competence, and familiarity with interactive and experiential learning settings” (Gregersen-Hermans & Pausch, 2012, p. 28). These scholars cautioned that experiential and interactive methodologies are not common to every culture and could be perceived as “high challenge” even when the level of competency is high. Because relevance and a sense of efficacy are strong motivators for adult learners (Wlodkowski, 2008; Knowles, 1987), it is critical to consider all of these models when selecting content and activities for the instructional design.

Resistance. Already mentioned in this review of the literature of intercultural training design are the risks of demotivating and/or creating environments that drive the learner from the training room. Paige (1993a) created a list of factors likely to raise the intensity of an intercultural experience. This capstone training is designed for individuals remaining in their home countries while working with newcomers from other countries. Several of Paige’s intensity factors, however, may have an impact on the receptivity of training participants, namely: (a) the degree of difference between the participants and

refugee culture; (b) the degree to which participants hold a negative evaluation of those differences; (c) the developmental stage of participants on the ethnocentric side of the DMIS; and (d) low language ability of refugees, leading to challenges in communication with participants.

When learners are confronted with challenging content and an environment that is perceived as unpleasant, they might express avoidance behavior (Wlodkowski, 2008). Other scholars suggested that learning is about change and change can be perceived as threatening (Preskill & Brookfield, 2009). Resistance factors such as fear of the unknown, normal rhythm of learning (i.e., doing things that do not feel comfortable or natural), and fear of looking foolish could potentially surface resistance with experiential methods. According to Bennett (2012), responding to resistance is about facilitating the learner's fear by reducing anxiety, increasing comfort, and addressing concerns.

Resistance can show up in response to methods or content (Bennett, 2012). Keeping in mind that adult learners enter the training room with a high regard for their previous knowledge and expertise, addressing a familiar topic with a new perspective may receive a resistant reaction. Bennett suggested that the trainer (and design) provide for "inoculation" to minimize the impact of resistance. Sequencing of these inoculations are typically applied at the beginning of the training, acknowledging the potential fear or risk factors that may show up in the group. Inoculation can also address the developing attitude condition of Wlodkowski's (2008) motivation model, by eliminating or minimizing negative attitudes that surround the topic and positively confronting erroneous beliefs, expectations, and assumptions.

Summary of the Literature Review

From the review of the literature, it is clear that the host-society member has a role to play in the adaptation process of refugee newcomers. They provide initial cultural information to help newcomers navigate a new community and unfamiliar systems and resources. They provide a psychosocial mentoring function to encourage and instill confidence in their partner. Working with a refugee also provides the volunteer with an opportunity for cultural learning. However, it is also clear from the literature that being able to engage in effective and appropriate intercultural interaction requires more than good intentions. It involves cultural learning, self-reflection, and a practice of mindful communication. Training programs such as the one suggested in this capstone, while not the only answer, provide a first step to ensuring that volunteers have the information, cultural self-awareness, support, and confidence to “befriend” the newcomer in a helpful and interculturally competent manner.

Chapter 3: Methods

Overview

I have worked for over a decade developing and training mentors for professional and volunteer mentoring partnerships. I view mentoring to be an experience with the potential to open perspectives, bridge differences, and transform the people on both sides of the partnership. Meeting the executive director of MCC-RS, and learning of her need to train volunteers for the intercultural experience of working with newly arrived refugees, was a perfect fit for the requirements of my capstone project. This chapter will review the processes I used to research, analyze, design, develop, and evaluate the instructional design for a training of U.S. American volunteers preparing for informal mentoring partnerships with newly arrived refugees.

Original Project Plan

MCC-RS was the original sponsoring organization for this capstone project. The design was customized for the MCC-RS volunteer program (Befriender) and was targeted to a demographic of U.S. American baby-boomer-generation participants serving refugees from Somalia, Iraq, and the Karen ethnic minority group from Burma/Myanmar. The agency's goal was to prepare volunteers to engage effectively with refugee clients and to better partner with the agency staff in assisting refugees with their resettlement goals. The original plan was to create a culturally grounded training delivered in two half-day sessions. The training needed to focus on topics of cultural awareness,

communication skills, mentoring best practices, and agency-specific program information. The agency was responsible for creating agency-specific content.

We agreed to be transparent about my role and to communicate to the staff that this project was part of a master's-level capstone project requiring their support and resource assistance. In exchange for receiving a customized training design, facilitator guide, and training handouts, the agency would be responsible for participating in needs assessment interviews, approving the final design document, recruiting the pilot volunteer group, and co-facilitating the pilot training. While the timeline for this project was ambitious, the executive director was eager to move forward with the training plan, and she was confident that deadlines could be met. The agreed-upon timeline included:

- Needs assessments conducted with agency executive director, client case manager, and volunteer coordinator completed by mid-September 2014.
- Design document approved by end of September 2014.
- Curriculum design and materials developed and approved by November 2014.
- Pilot training delivered, December 2014.
- Volunteer and refugee matches launched, January 2015.
- Posttraining evaluation received from volunteers, February 2015.

Preparation Research

My experience in training, instructional design, and mentoring was extensive; however, my knowledge of the refugee experience and the work of refugee resettlement agencies was minimal. The first step was to conduct research on the history of refugee resettlement in the United States, refugee statistics and processes, relocation agency roles

and responsibilities, and the process of adaptation as it pertained specifically to refugee populations. A review of this research was covered in chapter 2.

In addition to conducting scholarly research, it was important to gain firsthand experience with refugees and the agencies serving them. I attended workshops and orientations on refugee topics, and I conducted informal/unstructured interviews with refugees living in the Minneapolis community and the professionals serving them. The following activities provided invaluable information and insight critical to the design of the training:

- workshop on refugee healthcare sponsored by MCC-RS;
- volunteer orientation training (1 hour) by MCC-RS's volunteer coordinator;
- panel discussion with refugee clients (Somali, Iraqi, Karen);
- the book *This Much I Can Tell You*, edited by MCC-RS (16 refugee personal accounts, nine countries represented);
- unstructured interview with a consultant and humanitarian adviser for the Department of State currently monitoring resettlement agencies in the United States and Middle-Eastern countries; and
- unstructured interviews with a Somali refugee, an executive director from MORE (a refugee services agency), and a volunteer mentor working with an immigrant family from Burma/Myanmar.

Finally, I spoke with several interculturalists, including a consultant and faculty member of the Intercultural Communication Institute, a Master's of Intercultural Relations (MAIR) student working with refugees, and an English language instructor working with Karen refugees. These professionals were generous in sharing their

experiences working with refugee populations. They suggested training activities and offered feedback on many of my training ideas (e.g., using improvisation). Their feedback helped me stay mindful of bias or ethnocentrism that might cloud my thinking during the design process.

Instructional Design Development

Formal needs assessment. Following the ADDIE model (Hodell, 1997) for instructional design, I analyzed the information from the research sources listed in the previous section. I conducted interviews and formal needs assessments with several key MCC-RS staff members, including the executive director, volunteer coordinator, team coordinator (case manager), and employment coordinator. The appreciative inquiry approach (Cooperrider, 2000) kept the interview dialogue from fixating selectively on training obstacles and “fix-it” ideas. Instead, it expanded the interviewee’s curiosity and imagination about what could be done to transform the volunteer/staff/refugee experience. A copy of the interview questions used with the executive director and staff are provided in Appendix A. Notes from each interview were returned to the interviewee to fact-check and offer corrections and edits.

The analysis of the needs assessments led to the creation of the design document presented to the MCC-RS executive director and staff for approval. The design was approved, and I moved forward with the instructional design development. We agreed the pilot training would:

- focus on building cultural competency, provide volunteers with strategies and skills to interact effectively with refugees, and reinforce ways to partner effectively with agency staff;

- use the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale (IES) (Mendenhall, Stevens, Bird, Oddou, & Osland, 2012) to assess intercultural competency and support personal development;
- include two half-day training sessions during December;
- use a self-assessment before and after the training sessions to measure learning; and
- ask volunteers to complete an evaluation after working with refugees for two months to assess the effectiveness of the training and to suggest ways the training could be improved.

Design philosophy and methods. My approach to designing an interculturally grounded volunteer training was influenced by two training courses: (a) The Intercultural Context of Training, offered as a MAIR elective, and (b) Transformative Training: Design, Development, and Delivery, offered through the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication. Based on the learning from these courses, I elected to use a blended approach of didactic/experiential and culture-general/culture-specific methods (Paige, 1993b), being mindful to provide support and challenge (Sanford, 1966) to accommodate the varying developmental stages and learning styles of the group (Bennett, 2012). The design incorporated the five principles of effective intercultural design (Gregersen-Hermans & Pusch, 2012):

1. “Meet the participants where they are.
2. Clarify specific outcomes of the program.
3. Create an appropriate learning environment.
4. Evaluate and assess the program and learning outcomes.

5. Create a flawlessly organized experience” (p. 25).

The principles of adult motivation (Wlodkowski, 2008) also influenced this instructional design. Strategies for creating a motivational and engaging learning environment were used to:

- create a partnership with the adult learner,
- develop connections between participants and facilitator,
- support a climate of respect and inclusiveness,
- provide ample time to practice skills and gain competence, and
- challenge and support learning.

Assessment instruments. Pretraining assessment is an effective way to meet one of the key framing principles for effective intercultural training design—“meeting the participants where they are” (Gregersen-Hermans & Pusch, 2012, p. 25). Several assessment tools are available on the market to measure cultural competency. I chose the IES (Mendenhall et al., 2012) because it is a reliable and valid instrument that evaluates competencies for how individuals work effectively with people from different cultures.

The IES offered an online assessment that participants could take prior to the training session. A review of assessment results would provide the facilitator a sense of how much support and challenge participants might require during the training activities. I also appreciated the fact that the IES reports provided clear learning content and self-directed learning tools to assist participants in independently working toward their intercultural competency development goals.

Training assessment and evaluation. To assess the training’s effectiveness in meeting objectives, I created a pre-session and post-session self-assessment for participants

to complete on the day of the training. Examples of these two self-assessment forms are provided in Appendix B.

The self-assessments provide time for participants to reflect on their learning and identify personal goals for putting the learning into action. After the first session, participants have the opportunity to comment on the facilitation, meeting room comfort, and other training needs by completing a very brief evaluation. This feedback guides the facilitator in making adjustments to enhance learner motivation and engagement for the second training session. Examples of the self-assessments and session 1 evaluation are included in the instructional design document in Appendix C.

Unexpected Changes

Research, analysis, design, and development of the capstone training were well underway when unexpected events led to a cancellation of the MCC-RS Befriender training. Leadership changes at the top of the agency and an unexpectedly high number of refugee placements made it impossible for the agency to prioritize time to recruit volunteers, provide staff support, and secure a training location in time for the training to take place in the timeline we had established. MCC-RS remained committed to the project, but with the executive director leaving for a job with the State of Minnesota, her replacement's on-boarding responsibilities before taking maternity leave, and other pressing agency deliverables requiring staff time, it was clear that the training could not take place before June 2015. These events required me to rethink the capstone project, as I would not be able to deliver the training for the agency in time to complete the capstone for a 2015 graduation.

Project redesign. My research on refugee volunteer programs informed me that MCC-RS's Befriender program was not unique. In fact, the name "Befriender" was used in programs in other agencies in the United States, Canada, and Europe. Similar mentoring-type programs under different names were common in other resettlement agencies in Minnesota (e.g., International Institute's Family Mentor Program). I decided to redesign the training so it could be used as a template for any volunteer mentoring program serving refugee populations. The redesigned instructional design document is provided in Appendix C.

Project evaluation. Because I could not use volunteer training participants to evaluate the instructional design from personal experience, I chose to use an expert panel of professionals to review the instructional design and materials. I used Google Forms to create an online survey to gather feedback from this expert panel. Google Forms allowed an unlimited number of questions and offered various question forms, such as multiple choice, scaled, and open-text questions. The questions used in the expert panel evaluation survey are provided in Appendix D.

I used my professional network, MCC-RS's networks, and my capstone committee members to source six professionals for the expert panel. It was important to me that panel members had professional experience working with refugees and/or volunteers and experience with training delivery and/or curriculum design. My team consisted of:

- a professor of communication studies and fellow, International Academy for Intercultural Research, Bethel University;

- a communications consultant with international experience and experience sponsoring two refugee families;
- a volunteer coordinator, Minneapolis resettlement agency;
- an English language learner (ELL) instructor and board member, MORE (a refugee services agency in St. Paul, MN);
- an elementary school teacher/data and assessment coach, Bloomington Public Schools, experienced Befriender volunteer for MCC-RS; and
- an employment specialist/volunteer coordinator, St. Paul resettlement agency.

Interview and Evaluation Analysis Procedure

Semi-structured interview analysis. To design appropriate learning objectives and training activities for the volunteer training instructional design, I conducted two types of assessment interviews. Interviews with MCC-RS staff were semi-structured interviews conducted in person with the agency director and three of her staff. The director's interview included questions regarding the agency's strategic purpose for offering volunteer training. Both questionnaires asked tactical questions about desired outcomes for volunteers and staff; characteristics of program success; and challenges currently faced by refugees, volunteers, and agency staff. In addition to the questions already noted, staff interviews also included a question on training activities. Data from these interviews were scanned for training themes that would target specific refugee objectives (e.g., job seeking, trust building, and agency/volunteer/refugee partnership). Because the staff worked closely with refugees and volunteers, the semi-structured approach to these interviews allowed for best practice sharing, as well as feedback on the

improvisational approach I was considering. It also allowed for discussion of additional concerns or ideas from the staff.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, notes from the unstructured interviews were shared with each interviewee as a way of member-checking for accuracy and to guard against interpretive bias. The data collected from these interviews allowed me to compare responses and discover themes reflecting the strategic and tactical objectives a typical resettlement agency might require of a volunteer training program.

Unstructured interview analysis. My research on refugee resettlement and volunteer training programs led me to many professionals and individuals engaged in refugee support activities. These conversations focused on specific interest areas (e.g., refugee experience, training activities, and volunteer best practices). I considered these conversations unstructured interviews because they always began with a predetermined list of questions and then typically free flowed into unexpected topic areas. Notes were taken from each of these unstructured interviews; however, due to the informal nature of the conversation and the limited access I had to the professional's time, these notes were not member-checked. Data from these interviews were scanned for themes, particularly themes that could lead to learning objectives and specific training activities. I also looked for data that supported or differed from the theories and models presented in the literature review.

Panel evaluation analysis. To compare feedback on the effectiveness of the instructional design from a diverse team of professionals, I used an online evaluation tool that provided for open-ended and rated questions. I used a 5-point Likert scale to evaluate the design's effectiveness in meeting the learning objectives, balancing methods,

and providing ample time for skill practice. These design elements are requirements for effective intercultural training (Bennett, 2009b; Fowler & Blohm, 2004; Paige, 1993b). The rated results could be quantified to determine whether the instructional design met the criteria for theoretically sound intercultural training design.

Open-ended questions were included in the evaluation to capture the feedback and insights from this varied group of professionals. These questions focused on the evaluator's opinion regarding the most effective and problematic aspect of the instructional design and their suggestions for the designer. Data from these questions were scanned for themes and best practices that might dictate a need for design adjustments should this training be delivered to a volunteer group in the future.

Follow-up conversations were held with two of the six evaluators to clarify comments that were unclear. It is also important to note that the evaluation team represented professionals from the practitioner and academic arenas. Professional context and bias were considered when comparing the feedback and suggestions.

The next chapter includes the analysis of the redesigned instructional design and feedback results from the expert panel.

Chapter 4: Results

The cancelation of the MCC-RS volunteer training made the evaluative process difficult. Without the option to hear directly from volunteer participants about whether the training helped them be more prepared and effective, I turned to an expert panel to review the instructional design template and to evaluate the work based on their training expertise and/or experience working with refugees and volunteers. This chapter will present the themes that emerged from structured and unstructured interviews with resettlement agency staff, refugees, volunteers, and training professionals. I will discuss how these data influenced the instructional design template and analyze the expert panel's evaluative data.

Themes From the Interview Data

Four semi-structured interviews were conducted with resettlement agency professionals, including one director-level professional and three staff members. Unstructured interviews were conducted with a former refugee, a volunteer working with a Karen family, a professional in the intercultural communication field, and a government monitor of refugee settlement agencies. After reading through the interview notes multiple times, I saw several key themes emerge. These themes influenced the selection of learning objectives for the instructional design template.

Communication challenges. Communication challenges due to language differences are common to befriender programs in the United States and Canada (Behnia, 2007). Many refugees arrive in the United States with little to no English language

proficiency, and many volunteers speak only one language (English). At MCC-RS, 95% of the incoming refugees have little to no English language proficiency. In most befriender partnerships, volunteers must depend on nonverbal strategies (e.g., pantomime) to communicate with their partners. This mode of communication can produce anxiety for volunteers, especially for those individuals who have never interacted with non-English-language speakers without the aid of an interpreter. Five out of six interviewees noted communication as the number-one challenge for befriender volunteers, and all of the respondents suggested including nonverbal communication strategies and practice as a top priority for the training design.

Because language was a limiting factor, the volunteer interviewee noted that she tended to model behavior rather than try to tell her partner that she was doing something incorrectly. “We just did a lot of acting out . . . showing things with our bodies. I always brought a pad of paper so we could draw what we were trying to say . . . or we used books and magazines.” This interviewee also felt it was important to use books and magazines that adults could relate to rather than using children’s picture books. She felt it was more respectful of her partner to use photographs with adults in them.

The strategy this volunteer used exemplified identity negotiation in action (Ting-Toomey, 1999). The volunteer recognized the need to communicate basically and simplistically (i.e., using picture books), yet respected and honored her partner’s role and personal identity by not treating her as childlike (i.e., using photos that pictured adults rather than children). It might be expected, if all other communication was appropriate and effective, that the volunteer’s communication partner left their meeting feeling

“understood, respected, and supported,” three outcomes of satisfactory identity negotiation (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 41).

Both the volunteer coordinator and employment coordinator acknowledged the anxiety that volunteers feel working with refugees without the support of an interpreter. Using pantomime was a source of anxiety, and both interviewees wanted the training to address this challenge. “Volunteers need to learn how to think on their feet . . . shift gears and try something new when the first thing doesn’t work. They need to think outside the box and look for ways to communicate when there is no shared language” (volunteer coordinator). Lastly, the employment coordinator noted the importance of helping refugees understand communication norms critical to interviewing for jobs in the United States, such as eye contact, appropriate speaking volume, and greeting norms.

These comments and examples highlight the transactional process of identity negotiation between cultural others (Ting-Toomey, 1999). Volunteers recognize the need to communicate differently, but in the process of doing so experience the disequilibrium that occurs when identities or values are challenged (Kim, 2005). Negotiating identity needs is the way culturally different people can reduce the stress that comes with intercultural encounters. Mindful communication is the approach required to negotiate, and it involves gaining accurate intercultural knowledge to decipher the situation and having the motivation and skills to communicate effectively (Ting-Toomey, 1999).

Knowledge can be addressed by helping volunteers recognize the role cultural values play in communication, specifically values of individualism/collectivism, high- and low-context communication, and sequential/synchronic time (Hall, 1998; Hofstede et al., 2010). This kind of information can relieve some ambiguity by giving

communicators a better idea of what to expect from their partners. The motivation to gain communication competence relates to one's willingness to learn and try new ways of adjusting communication to better respect and care for the personal and cultural identity of one's partner (Ting-Toomey, 1999). These motivational characteristics are very much aligned with the cultural competencies measured in the IES (Mendenhall et al., 2012). It is not enough, however, to cognitively understand communication differences and have the motivation to learn. To engage in interculturally effective communication, volunteers must also have the operational skills to communicate differently. This is why it is critical to provide skill practice in the volunteer training.

It is unrealistic to think that an 8-hour volunteer training will move individuals to a place of unconscious competence in communicating with their refugee partners. However, by incorporating accurate cultural information, self-awareness of cultural competence, and skill practice, it is not out of the realm of possibility to expect volunteers to gain a measure of conscious competence. In other words, they will recognize that they are not 100% skilled at effectively communicating interculturally, but they will make the commitment to integrate what they have learned and attempt to put it into effective practice (Ting-Toomey, 1999).

Knowing what to do. Volunteers attending the befriender program orientation asked a few general questions about the program, but were most curious about the activities volunteers were expected to do with the refugees. This need for practical information and tactics emerged as a theme from the interviews as well. Having confidence in one's ability to perform is a key motivator for volunteer engagement

(Behnia, 2012). The agency executive director and her staff reinforced this finding in Behnia's study through their direct and indirect comments.

From a strategic point of view, the executive director listed volunteer confidence and preparation as two of the outcomes she most wanted from the training. "I would like volunteers to enter the befriender experience with confidence rather than leaving the partnership with confidence." She added that giving volunteers the skills they need to be successful was critical to volunteer retention, and it would lead to a more sustainable program in the long term. It was interesting to note that volunteer retention was a concern for the organizations highlighted in Behnia's (2012) study of 60 refugee volunteer programs. In fact, his study noted that volunteer retention is sometimes more difficult than volunteer recruitment.

Indirect comments from agency staff also pointed to the need for practical skills. Most commonly stated was the need to help volunteers gain resiliency in figuring out what to do when things do not go as planned, having a "game plan," and having a repertoire of activities to suggest to their refugee. Some specific training suggestions included:

- language "cheat sheets";
- cultural information regarding greeting norms, gesturing, etc.;
- refugee and staff best practice sharing panel; and
- case studies illustrating typical volunteer/refugee challenges.

Adult learners need to feel confident and competent to be motivated and engaged in a learning experience (Knowles, 1987; Wlodkowski, 2008). Adults need to know how the content will help them achieve their goals (in this case, to be effective befrienders).

The skills and knowledge offered in the training must demonstrate relevance to keep adults engaged. The feedback comments demonstrate that the training content is likely to meet the relevance requirement. However, adults also need to feel they will be able to execute the learning with competence.

Intercultural training addresses unfamiliar concepts requiring learners to recognize that their cultural norms are not universal. Recognizing that familiar communication and problem-solving strategies might not resonate the same way in intercultural situations can create doubt in the learner's mind about their ability to be successful. Social learning theory (Bandura, 1977) stressed that learners' self-efficacy needs are met when they (a) believe in their ability to learn, (b) see someone similar to themselves do the task successfully, (c) get encouragement from someone they trust, and (d) are learning in an relaxed and supportive environment. Facilitators cannot predict or control the inner belief systems of each participant; however, the other factors presented in social learning theory can be attended to in the training design and facilitation. Given the challenging nature of some of the training activities, particularly the communication skill-building activities, it is paramount that enough support be provided to protect the learner's motivation, self-efficacy, and engagement (Sanford, 1966; Knowles, 1987; Wlodkowski, 2008; Bennett, 2009b, 2012).

Working with the agency. Creating a collaborative partnership with the agency staff was another key theme from the semi-structured interviews. The executive director shared that volunteers often try to advocate for their refugees and that advocacy is a positive outcome of a successful partnership. However, difficulties arise when volunteers do not understand the structure of the resettlement agency or fail to recognize the

limitations placed on the agency and staff. For instance, one interviewee noted that a volunteer might often extend his or her relationship with the refugee beyond the end of the program. Over time the refugee may lose his or her job. In an effort to assist the refugee, the volunteer comes back to the agency seeking help. Unfortunately, the volunteer does not understand that the refugee is no longer in the formal process of resettlement, and the agency cannot provide services. Volunteers and refugees get angry with the staff for abandoning the refugee in a time of need. These negative feelings filter back to the refugee community and influence the volunteer's motivation for staying connected to the agency and its mission.

Another issue arises when volunteers overstep the appropriate boundaries and get involved with issues that are more appropriately handled by staff or other trained professionals. In my conversation with the former refugee and the intercultural communications professional, this problem was framed differently. They shared that volunteerism is often a new concept for refugees. Without an understanding of the role and responsibilities of the volunteer, they assume the volunteer has the same power and ability to get things done as the agency staff member. The refugee sometimes puts undue pressure on the volunteer to do things for him or her. If the volunteer declines or fails to get what the refugee needs, the refugee becomes frustrated with the partnership and complains to the agency staff that the befriender is not doing his or her job.

Providing information to establish the roles and boundaries of the befriender volunteer was a significant theme for the agency staff. For the employment coordinator it was the need to recognize the reality of what can be done and what can be changed. For others it was helping volunteers understand the hard fact that refugees are often "resettled

into poverty” and there are limitations to what a volunteer can do to alter that fact. For the executive director there was a need to establish boundaries so volunteers learn to work more productively with the staff. “Sometimes the volunteer can get so enmeshed in the refugee’s life difficulties and their complaints about the ‘system’ that they (the volunteer) start working against the staff.” A desired outcome of the training for the executive director was for her staff to feel like they were working in partnership with the volunteers. She hoped for “a balance between getting feedback/suggestions for new ways to do things, and hearing nothing or getting nothing but complaints about the program.”

Intercultural self-awareness. Many of the studies on befriender programs cite cultural differences as a major challenge to creating effective volunteer/refugee relationships (Behnia, 2007, 2012; Immigration Consultants of Canada Regulatory Council, 2004). This theme was central to the data from both the semi-structured and informal interviews. In most cases it was identified as a desired outcome for the training with comments expressing the need to:

- gain greater intercultural proficiency,
- gain a diverse understanding of culture,
- begin the process of cultural self-awareness and how culture impacts behavior and actions,
- gain some new cross-cultural tools; and
- gain intercultural sensitivity.

The volunteer coordinator shared the most insight on the need for intercultural self-awareness. Because he worked most directly with volunteers during their

partnership with refugees, and was often in the position to coach the volunteers on how best to interpret situations, I found his comments to be the most revealing. He noted that volunteers could sometimes unknowingly communicate in an offensive manner because they did not understand how their behavior or manner was being interpreted from the refugee's perspective. The desire to help could often come across as "patronizing or judgmental." His hope for the training was to give volunteers a way to recognize and value differences in an "authentic way."

Emotional self-management. The final theme emerging from the interview data centered on resiliency and the recognition that volunteering in a befriender program creates stress for volunteers. The agency staff and director mentioned the challenge volunteers have in recognizing the enormous challenges their refugee partners face in the adjustment process. The volunteer managing his or her emotions when learning the refugee's story, dealing with the reality of poverty that refugees face in the resettlement process, and the volunteer recognizing his or her limited ability to "make things better" takes a toll on the volunteer's emotional well-being. Volunteer burnout is a common outcome of the befriender program. "We need to help volunteers get beyond the 'I feel bad' stage and find ways to take care of themselves in the process of volunteering" was a comment shared by the team coordinator.

The volunteer coordinator commented that befriender volunteers need help managing emotions when the partnership goes through changes. For example, sometimes the refugee finds support from his or her home-country community and stops meeting with the befriender without any explanation. The volunteer becomes disillusioned or resentful, assuming the partnership ended because the volunteer did something wrong or

failed to add value, or that the refugee did not appreciate the volunteer's assistance. For some volunteers, this rejection leads to resentment toward the refugee and/or the program. Volunteers need to "manage emotions, fears, disappointments, and judgments. They need to develop a personal balance so they don't get overwhelmed" (volunteer coordinator).

Seeking out social networks with co-nationals is a well-documented adaptation strategy that refugees use in the early period of resettlement (Kim, 2005; Ward et al., 2001; Lamba & Krahn, 2003). Social networks provide a web of support both emotional and operational. According to a recent study of immigrants and refugees settling in Canada, Somali refugees construed assistance as something one receives from family members and community (Stewart et al., 2008). Consistent with a cultural value of collectivism, Somali refugees were more likely to seek emotional, financial, and psychological support from co-nationals and look to formal assistance resources (volunteers) for operational support (e.g., navigating bus systems, employment help). Educating volunteers on the adaptive and cultural contexts that come into play during resettlement could shed light on potential partnership problems and lessen the emotional stress or disappointment volunteers face when the refugee steps away from the relationship or seems unresponsive or unappreciative of the volunteer's time and efforts.

Instructional Design Decisions

Using the themes from the data noted in the previous section, I developed the learning objectives for the instructional design. At the end of the training it was expected that volunteers would be able to:

- Define the difference between "large C and small c" culture.

- Describe how the cultural values of individualism/collectivism, sequential/synchronic (time), small power distance/large power distance, and direct/indirect communication may impact the volunteer/refugee experience (Hofstede et al., 2010; Hall, 1998).
- Use the Description, Interpretation, & Evaluation (DIE) exercise (Bennett & Bennett, 1991) to interpret culturally different situations.
- Identify their intercultural competency strengths and development areas.
- Describe transition stress by using the 5 R's of culture change (Berardo, 2012).
- Identify the roles and responsibilities of the volunteer.
- Use nonverbal communication techniques to communicate befriender tasks.
- Describe strategies to address common befriender/volunteer/agency problems.
- Use the results from their IES report to create a personal development plan.

The next section will review the analysis that determined the selection of training methods and assessment tools.

Intercultural awareness. The first module in the instructional design focused on raising awareness of cultural value differences, specifically comparing how U.S. values differ from values that might influence the norms and behaviors of refugee partners. Because the training participants would likely be unfamiliar with one another, it was important to provide ample time to build connection, inclusivity, and respect in order to develop a trusting environment for people to share openly. The cultural artifact icebreaker used a story-telling approach for participants to get to know one another and

for the facilitator to introduce the concept of culture. These concepts were expanded on in the subsequent activities to incorporate the learning cycle (Kolb, 1981):

- mini-lecture and theoretical background on values dimension and IES competencies (abstract conceptualization),
- table work and brainstorming on the impact of cultural values in the befriender experience (concrete experience),
- reflection work debriefing the IES (reflective observation), and
- DIE activity (active experimentation).

Assessment selection (IES). My analysis of the interview data revealed how many of the desired training outcomes aligned with the competencies measured by the IES (Mendenhall et al., 2012). The need for volunteers to be open and nonjudgmental, to manage emotions, to be resilient and cope with ambiguity, and to communicate effectively with someone culturally different lined up perfectly with the dimensions measured by the IES. I selected this instrument because it provided participants with an individualized development tool to support cultural learning during and after the training. With limited training time to address intercultural self-awareness, I wanted to offer participants a way to reflect on these concepts further. The IES report provided the content, action planning tools, and resources to support participants in this learning without the direct support of the facilitator.

Skill building. The second module focused on the volunteer experience and skill-building activities. These methods were designed to address the volunteer's need to understand the role and responsibilities of a befriender, to gain some ideas for emotional

self-management, and to learn practical tips and skills for working effectively with the refugee partner.

The refugee experience. To set the context for interacting with a newly arrived refugee, the training started with a mini-lecture on cultural transition and the experience of “culture shock” followed by the duct tape hand activity (Pollack, 2012). I chose Barado’s (2012) 5-R framework of culture change because it provided a clear and accessible approach for teaching the “whys” behind the transition process. The discussion also enabled the facilitator to share relevant stories and examples from his or her experience working with refugee clients. The duct tape hand activity moves the activity from the didactic to the experiential by giving participants a sense of what it feels like to experience change. Once again the approach moves around the Kolb (1981) learning cycle from the Abstract Conceptualization (AC) and Reflective Observation (RO) activities of lecture, theory, discussion, and reflection to Concrete Experience (CE) and Active Experimentation (AE) games and practice.

Roles/responsibilities. Given the limited time allotted for volunteer training, and the fact that information on befriender roles and responsibilities were covered in volunteer orientation, I chose to provide time for a brief review of program information and boundaries and questions. Because this design was a template, program information would be customized to reflect the specifics of each agency and program. Agency messaging on partnership could be addressed through participant questions.

Communication skill building and improvisation. Bateson (1993) equated intercultural communication to a “joint performance” between people who have different codes, rituals, and expressions of meaning and behavior (p. 119). The willingness to

“search for cues, that willingness to improvise, is not a bad starting point in human relations” (Bateson, 1993, p. 119). I chose improvisation activities as a means to give participants a sense of what it is like to engage in communication without common codes and to experience the ambiguity that comes with “not knowing.” I recognized this approach was highly challenging and would need a great deal of facilitator support to keep participants engaged in the learning. I trusted my ability to design the exercises so that participants could ease into the activities slowly to build their confidence and competence. I recognized the importance of keeping the activities upbeat and fun to manage possible resistance. I was also mindful to connect the improvisational games to practical application. The culminating activity was directly related to the typical activities a volunteer might have to communicate nonverbally to a refugee partner. The flow of the improvisation activities incorporated the motivational framework for culturally responsive teaching (Wlodkowski, 2008) by establishing inclusion, enhancing meaning, developing attitude, and engendering competence.

Because some volunteers would be tasked with assisting refugees with English language practice, I incorporated an experiential activity to raise awareness of the challenge involved with learning a new language. To address the volunteer’s need for practical application, I met with a Somali refugee to create a “cheat sheet” of useful phrases and words that might help the volunteer communicate basic messages. This handout provided a template that could be used to create additional language cheat sheets for representative languages of other refugee groups.

Practical knowledge. To provide specific practical tips and best practices, I incorporated case studies representing various “typical” challenges volunteers and

refugees face. MCC-RS' volunteer coordinator partnered with me to create the content for these case studies so that they reflected authentic situations with the potential to surface relevant working strategies and tips. This case study exercise was the culminating learning activity of the training. It provided ample time for participants to integrate the learning from both days of training and apply it to "real world" situations. The debriefing discussion offered facilitators (potentially agency staff) an opportunity to reinforce messages for collaborating appropriately with staff and other professionals.

Expert Panel Feedback

The expert panel consisted of six professionals with experience working with refugees and volunteers and/or expertise in the training and intercultural communication field. Each panel member was asked to review the instructional design document, handouts, and slides and to complete an online evaluation. For the purposes of quoting the panel's feedback without revealing the individuals' identities, I have created a code for each member. Codes are found in Table 1.

Table 1. Expert panel identification codes.

P1	elementary school teacher/data and assessment coach, Bloomington public schools; experienced Befriender volunteer for MCC-RS
P2	volunteer coordinator – Minneapolis resettlement agency
P3	professor of communication studies and fellow, International Academy for Intercultural Research, Bethel University
P4	communications consultant with international experience and experience sponsoring two refugee families
P5	English language learner instructor and board member, MORE – a refugee services agency in St. Paul, MN
P6	employment specialist and volunteer coordinator, St. Paul resettlement agency

The first set of evaluation questions focused on the extent to which the instructional design addressed (1) learning objectives, (2) cultural self-awareness, (3) volunteer roles and responsibilities, (4) insight into the refugee resettlement experience, (5) communications with ELL learners, and (6) motivation for adult learners. A Likert scale, with 1 being least effective and 5 being most effective, was used to evaluate these questions. Table 2 shows the results of these six questions.

Table 2. Results for Questions 1–6.

Question	Rating: 1	2	3	4	5
overall design with learning objectives				2	4
cultural self-awareness				2	4
roles and responsibilities			1	3	2
refugee experience of resettlement				3	3
communication with ESL learners				3	3
creation of a motivational learning environment for adult learners				3	3

Based on the feedback, it would appear the design met the learning objectives. I was not surprised that the rating for roles and responsibilities received a moderate 3 effectiveness, as this section of the training was simply a review of the information covered in the orientation training. In retrospect, it might have been better to include an open box beneath each question requiring the evaluators to provide their comments for ratings of 3 or less to analyze the data more effectively.

The second set of questions addressed (7) the balance between content learning and practice and (8) appropriateness of activity challenge. Results for questions 7 and 8 are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Results for Questions 7–8.

Question	Rating
balance between content learning and practice	100% effective balance
appropriateness of activity challenge	100% appropriate

The final question using a Likert-scale rating addressed how effectively the instructional design balanced the methods of (a) experiential, (b) didactic, (c) culture general, and (d) culture specific. Examples of each method were provided so that reviewers unfamiliar with those terms would know how to rate the design. Five of the six panelists rated the design a 4 on balance of methods, and one panelist rated it a 5.

The last three survey questions asked for open-ended feedback on (a) most effective elements of the design, (b) problematic elements of the design, and (c) suggestions for the designer. A synthesis of the panel feedback is reviewed in the next section.

Most effective design elements. There was unanimous agreement that the role-plays, activities, and case studies were the most effective, largely because they grounded the training in reality. P6 commented that these activities

integrated the class with the instructor the best (and with each other), got the group excited about the opportunity, were the most fun, and gave good examples of the reality of what it's like to be involved with a befriender mentoring program.

This panel member also said that the case studies gave the volunteer an idea of what could happen and “normalized” it. P5 saw the case studies as an “excellent opportunity for participants to discuss and apply the learning,” and P2 commented that they made the lesson “grounded and real.” P3 commented specifically about the improvisational exercises, noting that “the last game was key, having common task/activities on the cards

that they (volunteers) try to explain. That is a common question on the part of befrienders, what can/should I do with my refugee friend?”

P1 offered a comment that speaks directly to the importance of creating safety and respect in the training room (Wlodkowski, 2008). She noted that the choice to do the role-play and improvisation activities on the second day of training was effective because participants would have had enough time to get to know one another and develop a level of trust and comfort.

Knowles's (1987) theoretical assumptions for adult learning claimed that adults have a strong need for self-direction and learn best when the material is relevant to their lives. Wlodkowski's (2008) motivational framework also noted the importance of learner efficacy and the need to make meaning from experience. These learning principles guided my choice of activities, and I was encouraged to see the positive comments from the panel supporting these outcomes.

The cultural awareness elements of the training also received positive comments. P4 liked the way the training got “volunteers thinking about and understanding cultural differences. This is excellent!” She suggested including some “quick lessons that volunteers could use with others who help host the refugee so a wider host community learns some of the same lessons.” I am not completely clear about her idea for “lessons shared,” but I would not expect volunteers to be responsible right away for educating others. Reflecting on cultural self-awareness is challenging enough without expecting participants to guide others. That said, the training could provide volunteers with the cultural context to understand and reflect on their volunteer experience, thus providing more effective best practice sharing for volunteers coming after them.

P3 commented that the “mix of self-discovery and culture learning were great.”

He went on to suggest volunteers often have a relatively high level of unexamined cultural identity that might benefit from a deeper debrief:

You might probe into a Meta analysis of the artifact people chose to focus on, and what they, in turn, featured about themselves. What values are highlighted? How do they construct their sense of self? Is it grounded in autonomy or interdependence with family and community? What they may see (eventually) is that the refugees with whom they will be working largely ground their identities in family and community. (P3, Question 10)

This comment raised an interesting option for the cultural awareness module. A deeper dialogue in the opening exercise could offer a more fluid transition from the opening icebreaker to the cultural values discussion. Before making a change like this, however, I would need to consider the timing required for this level of dialogue as well as the risk involved in asking participants to go deeper into identity conversations. This level of debrief would require a high level of intercultural competence on the part of the trainer that might not be realistic to expect from agency facilitators.

P6 made another interesting suggestion regarding the “iceberg” model of culture:

With respect to the shared levels of culture, Chao and Moon’s (2005) cultural mosaic theory suggest that identities are comprised of tiles reflecting nationality, ethnicity, professional sector, employment organization, local community, co-cultures, etc. The question during interaction is which tiles will be salient. This approach does not see identity as static or monolithic, but rather adaptive, and multifaceted.

I read the article on cultural mosaic by Chao & Moon (2005). This metaphor of a mosaic might make the concepts of culture and its influence on individuals’ behaviors more relevant to volunteer audience members, particularly those members who struggle to “see” their cultural identity through a national lens. The mosaic considers three

categories: (a) demographic (e.g., age, ethnicity, gender); (b) geographic (e.g., urban/rural, regional/country); and (c) associative (e.g., family, religion, profession) (Chao & Moon, 2005).

The mosaic model could be nicely paired with the activity called four circles of diversity/what do they bring (Stringer & Cassidy, 2003) to shape the content on cultural value differences. This approach might also address one of the concerns expressed in the next section, that the training was too “academic theory-heavy.”

While few panelists commented specifically on the IES in this question, P2 thought it was an “effective tool for educating and assessing one’s strengths and weaknesses.” He also appreciated the IES’s potential for demonstrating the “benefits of intercultural proficiency.” P3 raised the concern that the training might not provide enough support in “debriefing the IES along-side the self-assessment.” I appreciate this concern and recognize there is not optimal time in the training day to do a deep debrief of the IES. However, because of the self-guided report that accompanies this tool, I felt comfortable with the activity as written. Because the IES is presented on the first day of training, participants would be able to bring questions forward on the second day and receive some additional guidance from the facilitator. Once again, this comment made me recognize the critical importance of having a facilitator with a background in intercultural training. This consideration is detailed later in the chapter.

Problematic design elements. Three themes were identified as potential training problems, and they all involved time. The first problem focused the amount of training material covered in the 8-hour time frame. P3 commented that the “training scheme was a nice balance of cognitive and behavioral components,” but he cautioned that I might

discover that “day 2 contained too much material and a difficult mix of befriending components, ELL activities, and IES goal setting.” He suggested doing away with the ELL activities or offering them in a separate session. I agree with P3’s feedback and would consider eliminating the ELL section in favor of a more relaxed pacing for the intercultural self-awareness activities and the communication role-plays, improvisation, and case studies.

P4 suggested breaking up the activities in day 1 and day 2 to create more variety. She felt that having all of the befriender activities on day 2 might be less engaging for volunteers. I do not agree with this idea, and I feel strongly that cultural self-awareness/cultural values fits with the IES and should be done as one module. To introduce befriender tactical activities when volunteers are engaged in the self-reflective and sometimes challenging work of developing cultural self-awareness would be confusing and would disrupt the flow of the design.

The second problem area around time was practical in nature. The question centered on volunteer commitment. P4 questioned whether volunteers would agree to attend two half-days of training. P6 also said that 8 hours of training was “too much to expect of volunteers who have busy lives, jobs, school, etc.” She also implied that many of her agency’s volunteers have traveled outside the United States and have exposure to cultural difference. She thought that two hours would be the maximum amount of time her agency could expect volunteers to commit to training.

While I do not necessarily agree that the simple fact of traveling abroad negates the need for intercultural training, I appreciate the practical problem facing resettlement

agencies requiring training time from volunteers. This is a real problem and one that could limit the potential for this training to be offered through resettlement agencies.

Devoting the time and resources that cultural training requires in order to move beyond surface orientation is a challenge faced by many organizations, not just resettlement organizations. J.M. Bennett and M.J. Bennett (2004) cautioned organizations against a shortsighted approach to intercultural training that focuses narrowly on specific skills or cultural checklists but fails to ground skills in a theoretical rationale.

Additionally, it is not unlikely that volunteers from the mainstream culture, particularly those with little to no experience working with refugees, might come to the befriender experience with tightly held beliefs and inaccurate assumptions about refugees, the countries they come from, their pre-settlement situations and their perceived deficiencies. Intercultural training has the potential to circumvent potential befriender problems and thus save the agency time (e.g., staff time dealing with conflict resolution) and increase volunteer retention. If, as Behnia's (2007, 2012) research bears out, cultural training is needed to significantly improve volunteer befriender program outcomes, then a commitment to the investment of training time is a problem worth solving. Convincing overworked and underfunded resettlement agencies to embrace the benefit of making such an investment is the challenge I face in taking this training design to market.

One idea that attracted the MCC-RS executive director during our initial conversations was to provide volunteers with "mini-sessions" throughout their volunteer experience. In this way, the agency could provide ongoing value to the volunteers in exchange for their time. She thought volunteers might enjoy the opportunity to network

and share best practices with other volunteers, and the mini-sessions would give agency staff more opportunities to partner with the volunteer pool, to forge relationships, and to gain feedback for program improvements. Perhaps offering smaller “mini-sessions” would be a more palpable way to offer intercultural training without watering down content to fit into a two-hour format.

The third problem area was facilitator qualification. P4 connected the effectiveness of the training to the expertise of the facilitator delivering it. P5 wondered whether resettlement agencies would have enough people with the skills to “deliver a high quality program like this.” These are important considerations, because “intercultural training is an inherently transformative form of education, for learners and trainers alike” (Paige & Martin, 1996, p.45). Some ethical considerations in selecting an appropriate facilitator include choosing a trainer who:

- has relevant conceptual/theoretical foundations for intercultural training (e.g., a background in intercultural communication);
- possesses the skills and comfort with the topic areas covered by this volunteer training design;
- is openly self-reflective and critical regarding their own skills, levels of self-awareness, and training biases; and
- is skilled at facilitating difficult conversations associated with cultural learning activities. (Paige, 1993b, p. 178)

To be responsible and ethical in offering this training to volunteers, agencies need to ensure that the facilitator is trained in intercultural communication and education and not expect an inexperienced volunteer or staff member to take on a project of this nature. While the improvisational activities in this training design could be taught in a “train-the-trainer” session, and the befriender roles/responsibilities and case studies would benefit from the expertise of an experienced agency staff member, the cultural self-awareness

and IES module would require the expertise of a trainer with academic credentials in intercultural communication.

Suggestions for the designer. This question did not surface general themes, but provided some creative ideas and helpful reminders.

P1 and P3 reminded me to ensure that participants get enough support to relieve anxiety that accompanies the process of preparing to work with a refugee. P1 also cautioned that some participants might resist participating in the improvisation activities and the facilitator would need to know how to accommodate those individuals. I agree that trainers would require some coaching on how to set up and facilitate these activities; however, my experience using improvisation with a wide range of participants in corporate and educational settings makes me confident that resisters will be the exception rather than the norm. One of the attributes of an effective intercultural trainer is a sense of humor (Paige, 1993b). Keeping the atmosphere fun and supportive goes a long way in mitigating resistance to improvisational exercises.

P1 also suggested I include some information (perhaps a handout) on culturally appropriate body language. I appreciated this suggestion, particularly in light of the fact that so many of the communication activities employ hand and body gestures. Nonverbal communication is particularly nuanced in intercultural encounters. The training content on high/low context will provide culture-general guidance to heighten awareness that shared meaning is impacted as much by what is not said out loud as it is by the words spoken. The opportunity for misunderstanding as a result of gestures, touch, and proximity is great. In this case, including culture-specific information can provide some protections against the most obvious blunders. Bateson (1993) and Ting-Toomey (1999)

however, reminded us that intercultural communication is complex. It is more than likely that mistakes will be made and misunderstanding will occur. Engaging in mindful practices and tapping into the competencies of flexibility, inquisitiveness, and a sense of humor may prove ultimately more helpful than a checklist of do and don't behaviors.

P1 also made the important note that many refugees speak multiple languages, so the use of "ESL" in the training design and handouts should be avoided. If I continue to include this activity I would change the terminology to "English Language Learner (ELL)."

Lastly, two panel experts, P5 and P6, found the training too heavy in academics and theory. I disagree with this assessment and choose to embrace the theoretically grounded framework that is supported by decades of intercultural scholarship. It is critical that learners understand what to do but, more importantly, to understand the reasons a particular behavior is effective.

In the next, and final, chapter, I will reflect on the capstone project, the insights and learning it has provided to me, and my thoughts on next steps for this instructional design.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

Mentoring has been described as a two-way learning experience that has the potential to be transformative. New learning, insight, and personal growth occur when the knowledge, experience, and perspective of the mentor meet the needs, experience, and perspective of the protégé. My deep belief in the power of mentoring drew me to the befriender approach for supporting newly arrived refugees. I recognized these programs as opportunities to support and provide benefit for the process of resettlement but also, and perhaps more importantly, to impact cultural understanding between host-community members and refugees.

Bateson (1993) suggested that

... when you expose yourself to the culture of another human community, you are exposing yourself to a masterpiece, to a work of art, to the invention of a form of humanness that has been made over a long period of time. This then allows the thinking of ways to connect, to share, in spite of disparate codes. (p. 119)

This chapter will review my reflection on why I believe this capstone instructional design has merit and my ideas for its future implementation. I will also share the personal learning I have gained through the capstone process.

Capstone Training Contribution

Refugee resettlement agencies provide newcomers with a range of services, including food and housing, employment, healthcare, and sponsorship. Befriender mentoring programs are often created to provide personal and customized assistance for

refugees lacking familial or conational community support. Befriender volunteers, in turn, gravitate to this kind of offering because it provides them opportunities to use their talents and skills, contribute in a relational way, and align their philanthropic activities to their values (Behnia, 2012). Gaps in program quality, however, have created uneven results in these programs, which, in turn, can lead to dissatisfaction and underuse of befriender-like programs by refugee clients, and volunteers alike (Behnia, 2007, 2012; Ward et al., 2001).

In his study of befriender programs in four countries, Behnia (2012) identified several key factors that led to the attraction and retention of volunteer mentors. Included in this list of factors were:

- “cross-cultural communication workshops and training;
- raising volunteers’ knowledge of culture, cultural biases and stereotypes, and their effects on relationships with newcomers; and
- training on how to deal with cultural and linguistic differences” (p. 20).

Unlike many of the orientations currently offered to befriender volunteers, this training design intentionally focused on the key factors that Behnia (2012) identified as important to befriender program success and volunteer satisfaction. It incorporated the theoretical frameworks foundational to intercultural communication and training, such as identity negotiation theory (Ting-Toomey, 1999) and the motivational framework for culturally responsive teaching (Wlodkowski, 2008). It also followed theory and methods critical to creating a culturally responsive learning environment (Bennett, 2012; Gregersen-Hermans & Pausch, 2012; Paige, 1993a). Additionally, providing case studies of common befriender situations and the strategies to address them attended to the

relevance of the learning content that is key to learner motivation (Wlodkowski, 2008; Pausch, 1994).

Befriender programs in the United States and elsewhere have had limited study regarding their effectiveness. Behnia's studies (2007, 2012) and the evaluation report presented to the Immigration Consultants of Canada Regulatory Council (2004) attempted to surface some of the missing links to program effectiveness. Providing intercultural training and preparation for volunteers was consistent across the studies and report. Additionally, theoretical studies centered on adaptation, and research studies focused on social networks for refugees, recognizing the importance of effective cultural interaction between host-country individuals and refugees (Ward et al., 2001; Lamba & Krahn, 2003; Kim, 2005; Stewart et al., 2008). For this reason, I contend that the instructional design presented in this capstone contributes to the mission of refugee resettlement organizations by providing a resource to improve their volunteer training and, ultimately, the success of their befriender programs and volunteer retention efforts.

Capstone Limitations and Considerations

To offer this training design to resettlement agencies, two areas must be addressed: (a) facilitator expertise and (b) length of training. These considerations were thematic in the feedback received from the expert panel and presented in chapter 4 of this paper. It is clear to me that these issues, unaddressed, potentially limit the feasibility for resettlement or other refugee service agencies to use this design.

Facilitator expertise. From a product perspective, the instructional design provides a template that can be customized to fit the specifics of any befriender program. Step-by-step instructions provide agency facilitators with setup and delivery instructions

for each activity, and a set of handouts provide self-assessments and evaluations to support the learning curriculum. Despite the turnkey instructional design, however, it is imperative to the success of this training that facilitators have formal education in intercultural communication or intercultural training/education. Topics addressing cultural values, identity, and bias and stereotypes have the potential to elicit confusion, resistance, or conflict in the training group (Gudykunst & Hammer, as cited in Paige, 1993). Facilitators must be competent and comfortable guiding this dialogue in ways that protect the participants' emotional safety while creating an environment that has potential for deep learning (Bennett, 2012). Familiarity with the intercultural training techniques of support/challenge (Sanford, 1966) and the elements of learner motivation (Wlodkowski, 2001) are critical to the effective facilitation of this training.

I recognize that the instructional design, as written, did not clarify the need for facilitator qualifications, and this omission would need to be rectified by adding content to the introductory materials before releasing the design to a potential agency. The stipulation for interculturally trained facilitators might prove difficult for agencies that rely on staff members to deliver volunteer training. It is not a guarantee that volunteer coordinators, typically in charge of volunteer programs and training, have the required intercultural background and education to facilitate all aspects of this instructional design.

Some options to combat this obstacle include a revised training (i.e., train-the-trainer) for interculturalists working in other capacities in the refugee services community or for agency volunteers who might have appropriate intercultural backgrounds but lack experience facilitating training. For some individuals, this option might be appealing, because it would give them a new or expanded opportunity to work with refugee

resettlement agencies. Learning how to facilitate an interactive and experiential training session might also give agency professionals ideas to transform other training that might lack a balance of didactic/experiential methods.

Another option might include incorporating this training into my current communication and training practice. Co-facilitating alongside a refugee services staff member was the original plan for this design. It offered an effective blend of intercultural expertise and refugee experience and program-specific knowledge. The challenge to this option would be ensuring that the costs inherent in hiring the facilitator from outside could be absorbed by the agency budget.

Length of training. Research conducted on befriender-like programs, and on volunteer motivation and retention point to a need, (and a request by volunteers) for more intercultural training (Behnia, 2007, 2012). However, several of the expert panel professionals expressed a concern about the feasibility of requiring volunteers to commit to 8 hours of training. Recruiting volunteers is difficult, and it was stated that adding a requirement for a full day of training was too much to ask of people who volunteer their time. Another potential problem briefly discussed during initial conversations with MCC-RS was scheduling. Breaking the training into two days seemed to make the training less exhausting for volunteers, but finding dates that ensured participants could attend both training days posed a challenge.

I am not convinced that volunteers, especially those who recognize the complexity of intercultural relationships and/or have less confidence in their personal skills working with refugees, would refuse free training to prepare them for the befriender experience. My professional experience working in corporate mentoring has proved to

me that even very senior executives who have informally mentored people throughout their careers and who have extremely busy calendars can make time for mentor training. Additionally, these mentors consistently return for subsequent training because they claim it sharpens their skills and they enjoy learning from other mentors. I believe something similar might be true for befriender volunteers.

However, the challenge remains in how to convince a resource-strapped agency that has always trained volunteers in a quick 1-hour orientation, that a longer and more culturally grounded training would be beneficial. One option might be to offer a volunteer training series over the course of the befriender experience. The first offering might look similar to the orientation with some additional content on the refugee experience. Perhaps including a panel of refugees and staff to share their experiences and stories would fit well for this type of session. Once volunteers have had a chance to meet the refugee and experience some of the challenges, they might be motivated to attend sessions that target nonverbal communication and ELL strategies, as well as case studies addressing befriender/refugee/agency situations. I do stand firm on the importance of cultural self-awareness and recommend offering this module before the befriender match.

As the saying goes, “you can lead a horse to water, but you cannot make him drink it.” It may be so with volunteers and intercultural training. It would be interesting, however, to conduct a pilot of this training for an interested group of volunteers and to compare the perceptions of befriender experience between volunteers with training and volunteers without training. If the results point to greater satisfaction and lead to repeat befriender volunteerism, as Behnia’s (2012) study suggests, then perhaps agencies would be willing to shift their paradigm on volunteer training requirements. This research is not

the scope of this capstone but might make for an interesting research project for another MAIR student.

I revised the instructional design to address the limitations noted in the previous paragraphs, and to offer a flexible approach to volunteer training without sacrificing the intercultural awareness component so critical for successful communication in intercultural settings. The revised design document is found in Appendix E.

Personal Learning

As part of my elective on intercultural coaching, I participated in the certification training for the global competency inventory (GCI) (Mendenhall et al., 2012). My report showed that my tolerance of ambiguity, one of the competencies in perception management, was in the high range. The definition of this dimension is “The extent to which you are able to manage ambiguity as it relates to new and complex situations where there are not necessarily clear answers about what is going on or how things should be done” (Mendenhall et al., 2012, p. 7). According to this definition, being surrounded by the new and unfamiliar is something I can handle and perhaps get energy from as well. This has certainly been my experience throughout the capstone process.

Before engaging with MCC-RS, I had limited knowledge and experience with refugees or the agencies serving them. I had never volunteered for a refugee resettlement agency, nor did I have a background in social work or medicine, two fields that work directly with refugee clients. Perhaps it was due to my comfort with ambiguity—or maybe it was an overabundance of confidence—that I was able to enter into this project.

I would like to say I sailed through the process with ease, but that was not the case. Throughout the process I encountered self-doubt and frustration. More than once I

thought for certain I had made a poor decision to assume I could add value in this arena. I struggled with the level of communication from the agency, and I often felt like I was working in a vacuum. With emails and phone calls not returned and timelines falling behind, I questioned whether this project would ever come to fruition.

During my MAIR studies I learned a process called personal leadership (PL) (Schaetti et al., 2008). While I pride myself on my innate ability to deal with ambiguity and manage disappointments and setbacks, I turned to the PL process countless times throughout the capstone process. Mindfulness of my physical self, my emotions, and, most importantly, my judgments, helped me refrain from acting on faulty assumptions and literally saved me from abandoning this Capstone altogether.

The cancellation of the training with MCC-RS was a great disappointment. I understood the reasons behind the decision to cancel and even agreed with the wisdom of postponing the offering. However, not experiencing the facilitation firsthand created a hole in my learning experience. While I have an intellectual and academic sense that the design is effective, I have less confidence that it works from a practitioner's standpoint. Without experiencing the flow in real time and testing out which parts of the training make an impact on trainees and which parts need rework, I lack a sense of closure to this process. That said, the feedback I received from the expert panel, as well as from my capstone committee, has provided me with some ideas for revisions and improvements I am eager to incorporate if and when I get the chance to deliver the training.

If I were to recreate the capstone project, I would do several things differently. I would ask more questions of the agency, and I would do a better job of assessing timing needs. I am used to working in a corporate culture that thrives on project planning and

24-hour turnaround to meeting requests. My assumption that agency culture mirrored corporate culture created some frustration that could have been minimized had I taken time to negotiate shared understanding of our working relationship. It might also have been wise to develop relationships with others in the agency community. I might have been able to engage people with a keen interest in the project to work on my behalf to keep the training a priority. For example, I might have met with board members or volunteers. I relied too heavily on the executive director, who was distracted by other agency priorities and her potential plans to leave the agency for a position at the state level.

Another missing part of the process was a connection with the refugee community. I would have liked more input from the recipients of the Befriender program. Although I recognized the need to include feedback from refugee clients, the interview MCC-RS promised me never happened. In retrospect, I realize I could have done more to ensure that these important voices were part of the process, but without a community liaison it was challenging to gain access to refugee clients.

Next steps.

At our last meeting at MCC-RS, the new executive director was clear that moving forward with the volunteer training was still a desire of the agency. The plan was to revisit the idea in June 2015. With the instructional design created, evaluated, and revised based on the capstone process, I feel I am in a good place to present the design and some of my other ideas for training offerings to MCC-RS. I also plan to volunteer as a Befriender and hope to be matched with a refugee this year. The experience of

befriending will likely shed greater light on training needs, but, more importantly, it will provide continued learning about what it means to be an interculturalist.

I began this chapter with a quote from Catherine Bateson (1993) that suggested exposure to another culture allows one to “connect and to share in spite of disparate codes” (p. 119). Bateson refers to the context of cultural difference as the “canon of human experience” (p. 118). I cannot help but recognize that it was a desire to better understand that canon that led me to the study of intercultural relations, and it is the potential for shared connection that continues to ignite my passion for this work.

References

- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. New York, NY: General Learning Press.
- Bateson, M. C. (1993). Joint performance across cultures: Improvisation in a Persian garden. *Text and Performance Quarterly*, 13(2), 113–121.
- Behnia, B. (2007). An explanatory study of befriending programs with refugees: The perspective of volunteer organizations. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 5(3), 1–19. doi: 10.1300/J500v05n03_01
- Behnia, B. (2012). Volunteering with newcomers: The perspectives of Canadian and foreign-born volunteers. *Canadian Journal of Nonprofit & Social Economy Research*, 2, 6–23.
- Bennett, J.M. (1993). Cultural marginality: Identity issues in intercultural training. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 109-135). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Bennett, J. M. (2009a). Cultivating intercultural competence: A process perspective. In D. K. Deardorff (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 1–13). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bennett, J. M. (2009b). Transformative training: Designing programs for culture learning. In M. A. Moodian (Ed.), *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Exploring the cross-cultural dynamics within organizations* (pp. 95–110). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Bennett, J. M. (2012). The developing art of intercultural facilitation. In K. Berardo & D. K. Deardorff (Eds.), *Building cultural competence: Innovative activities and models* (pp. 13–22). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 21–72). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Bennett, M. J. (1998). Overcoming the golden rule: Sympathy and empathy. In M. J. Bennett (Ed.), *Basic concepts of intercultural communication* (pp. 191–214). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Bennett, M. J., & Castiglioni, I. (2004). Embodied ethnocentrism and the feeling of culture: A key to training for intercultural competence. In D. Landis, J. M. Bennett, & M. J. Bennett (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (3rd ed.) (pp. 249–264). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bennett, J.M., & Bennett, M.M. (1991). Description, interpretation, & evaluation [class handout]. Portland, OR: Intercultural Institute.
- Bennett, J. M., & Bennett, M. J. (2004). Developing intercultural sensitivity: An integrative approach to global domestic diversity. In D. Landis, J. M. Bennett, & M. J. Bennett (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (3rd ed.) (pp. 147–165). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Berardo, K. (2012). Framework: The 5R's of culture change. In K. Berardo & D. K. Deardorff (Eds.), *Building cultural competence: Innovative activities and models* (pp. 193-199). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied psychology*, 46(1), 5–34.
- Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Brislin, R. W. (2000). Cross-cultural training: A review. *Delhi Business Review*, 1(1), 1–20. Retrieved from http://dbr.shtr.org/v_1n1/dbr1n1b.pdf
- Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Triandis, H. C. (1996). The role of culture theory in the study of culture and intercultural training. In D. Landis & R. S. Bhagat (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (2nd ed.) (pp. 17–34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bird, A., Mendenhall, M., Stevens, M. J., & Oddou, G. (2010). Defining the content domain of intercultural competence for global leaders. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(8), 810–828.
- Black, J. S., & Mendenhall, M. (1990). Cross-cultural training effectiveness: A review and a theoretical framework for future research. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(1), 113–136.
- Boyle, E. H., & Ali, A. (2009). Culture, structure, and the relationship experience in Somali immigrant family transformation, *International Migration*, 48(1) 47–79. doi10.1111/j.1468-2435.2009.00512
- Chao, G. T., & Moon, H. (2005). The cultural mosaic: A metatheory for understanding the complexity of culture. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1128–1140.
- Chen, G-M, & Starosta, W. J. (2008). Intercultural communication competence: A synthesis. In M. K. Asante, Y. Miike, & J. Yin (Eds.), *The global intercultural communication reader* (pp. 215–238). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Clarke L. K., & Borders, L. D. (2014). "You got to apply seriousness": A phenomenological inquiry of Liberian refugees' coping. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 92*(3), 294–303. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6676.2014.00157.x
- Cooperrider, D. L. (2000). Positive image, positive action: The affirmative basis of organizing. In D. L. Cooperrider and Associates (Eds.), *Appreciative inquiry: Rethinking human organization toward a positive theory of change* (pp. 29–53). Champaign, IL: Stipes.
- Fowler, S. M., & Blohm, J. M. (2004). An analysis of methods for intercultural training. In D. Landis, J. M. Bennett, M. J. Bennett (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (3rd ed.) (pp. 37–84). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gregersen-Hermans, J., & Pausch, M. D. (2012). How to design and assess an intercultural learning experience. In K. Barardo & D. K. Deardoff (Eds.), *Building cultural competence: Innovative activities and models* (pp. 13–22). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Haines, D. W. (2010). *Safe havens? A history of refugees in America*. Sterling: VA, Kumarian Press.
- Hall, E. T. (1998). The power of hidden differences. In M. J. Bennett (Ed.), *Basic concepts of intercultural communication* (pp. 53–68). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Hodell, C. (1997). Basics of instructional systems development. *Info-line*, ASTD. Retrieved from <https://www.hctportal.hct.ac.ae/common/general/Development.pdf>

- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations software of the mind: Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Immigration Consultants of Canada Regulatory Council. (2004). *Evaluation of host program: Ottawa* (Ref. No. E9-2013). Retrieved from <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/pdf/research-stats/e9-2013-icrc-eng.pdf>
- Inkpen, C. & Igielnik, R. (2014). Where refugees to the US come from. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org>
- Kim, Y. Y. (2005). Adapting to a new culture: An integrative communication theory. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 375–400). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Knowles, M. S. (1987). Adult learning. In R. L. Craig (Ed.), *Training and development handbook: A guide to human resource development* (3rd ed.) (pp. 168–179). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Kolb, D. A. (1981). Learning styles and disciplinary differences. In A. W. Chickering & Associates, *The modern American college* (pp. 232–255). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lamba, N. K., & Krahn, H. (2003). Social capital and refugee resettlement: The social network of refugees in Canada. *Journal of Migration & Integration*, 4(3), 335–360.
- Mendenhall, M. E., Stevens, M. J., Bird, A., Oddou, G. R., & Osland, J. (2012). Specification of the content domain of the intercultural effectiveness scale. *The*

Kozai Monograph Series, 1(3), 1–26. Retrieved from

<http://www.intercultural.org/documents/IESTechReport.pdf>.

Mendenhall, M. E., Osland, J. S., Bird, A., Oddou, G. R., & Maznevski, M. L. (2008).

Global leadership: Research, practice, & development. New York, NY:

Routledge.

Minnesota Council of Churches Refugee Services. (2011). *This much I can tell you:*

Stories of courage and hope from refugees in Minnesota. Minneapolis,

MN:Minnesota Council of Churches.

Minnesota Council of Churches Refugee Services. (n.d.a). Mission and Vision.

Retrieved from: <http://www.mnchurches.org/refugeeservices/about-us/mission-and-vision>

Minnesota Council of Churches Refugee Services. (n.d.b) *Refugee Befriender* [handout].

Minneapolis, MN:Minnesota Council of Churches.

Paige, R. M. (1993a). On the nature of intercultural experiences and intercultural

education. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp.

1–20). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Paige, R. M. (1993b). Trainer competencies for international and intercultural programs.

In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 169–199).

Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Paige, R. M. & Martin, J.N. (1996). Ethic in intercultural training. In D. Landis &

Bhagat, R.S. (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (2nd ed.) (pp. 35-60).

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Pausch, M. D. (1994). Cross-cultural training. In G. Althen (Ed.), *Learning across cultures* (pp. 129–146). Washington, D.C.: NAFSA.
- Pashler, H., McDaniel, M., Rohrer, D., & Bjork, R. (2008). Learning styles: Concepts and evidence. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* 9(3), 106–119.
- Pollack, S. (2012). Duct tape hands. In K. Berardo & D. K. Deardorff (Eds.), *Building cultural competence: Innovative activities and models* (pp. 208-210). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Preskill, S. & Brookfield, S.D. (2009). *Learning as a way of leading: Lessons from the struggle for social justice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-bass.
- Ragins, B. R. & Kram, K. E. (2007). The roots and meaning of mentoring. In B. R. Ragins & K. E. Kram (Eds.), *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 3–17). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ramaswami, A. & Dreher, G. F. (2010). Dynamics of mentoring relationships in India: A qualitative, exploratory study. *Human Resource Management*, 49(3), pp. 501–530. doi: 10.1002/hrm.20363
- Report to Congress. (2014). *Proposed refugee admissions*. Retrieved from <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/219137.pdf>
- Sanford, N. (1966). *Self and society: Social change and individual development*. New York: Atherton.
- Schaetti, B. F., Ramsey, S. J., Watanabe, G. C. (2008). *Personal leadership: A methodology of two principles and six practices*. Seattle, WA: FlyingKite.
- Stewart, M., Anderson, J., Beiser, M., Mwakarima, E., Neufeld, A., Simich, L., & Spitzer, D. (2008). Multicultural meanings of social support among immigrants

and refugees. *International Migration*, 46(3), 123–159. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2435.2008.00464

Stringer, D. M. & Cassiday, P. A. (2003). *52 Activities for exploring values differences*.

Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1999). *Communicating across cultures*. New York, NY: Guilford.

Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1998). *Riding the waves of culture:*

Understanding cultural diversity in global business (2nd ed.). New York, NY:

McGraw-Hill.

U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. (n.d.). What Is the Administration for

Children & Families? Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov>

Ward, C., Bochner, S., & Furnham, A. (2001). *The psychology of culture shock* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Wlodkowski, R. J. (2008). *Enhancing adult motivation to learn: A comprehensive guide for teaching all adults* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Yang, L-Q., Xu, X., Allen, T. D., Shi, K., Zhang, X. & Lou, Z. (2011). Mentoring in

China: Enhanced understanding and association with occupational stress. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 26, 485–499. doi 10.1007/s10869-010-9202-5

APPENDIX A. NEEDS ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

Executive Director Interview Questions

1. Say more about what you envision for the baby boomer engagement idea. What do you hope this group can offer to the program and agency?
2. If you and I were having this conversation 18 months from now – what would your “perfect” volunteer program be like?
3. How would you know the program was working well?
4. Who do you imagine would be served by this program?
5. What would be a great outcome for those being served (volunteers and refugees) that is different from what they receive now?
6. What would you need to see or receive to let you know that the program/training/outcomes were working perfectly?
7. What barriers exist or might show up that could limit the success of this program?
8. What has prevented this program from happening without my intervention?

Staff Interview Questions

1. If you and I were having this conversation a year from now – what would be the “perfect” Befrienders program for you?
2. How would you know the program was working?

3. If you had a “perfect: Befrienders program what challenges or “headaches” would it alleviate for you? For the agency? For the refugees you work with?
4. When you talk to volunteers and refugee clients, what do they say they want most from the Befriender program?
5. How could the Befriender program training complement what you already provide?
6. What are some anecdotal examples of Befriender/Refugee’s having a really successful partnership? What activities work well? What techniques do you hear about that you would recommend we include in the training?

APPENDIX B. PRE-POST SESSION SELF-ASSESSMENT

Instructions: Please circle the number that reflects how you would rate yourself today on the following statements.

1. I am clear about my role and responsibilities as a volunteer in this program.

1 2 3 4 5

Unclear

Absolutely Clear

2. I am aware of the resources the agency has to support me in this program.

1 2 3 4 5

Unaware

Completely Aware

3. I am clear about my cultural values and how they impact my behavior.

1 2 3 4 5

Unclear

Absolutely Clear

4. I am comfortable interacting with people from other cultures.

1 2 3 4 5

Uncomfortable

Extremely Comfortable

5. I know how to shift my frame of reference in intercultural interactions.

1 2 3 4 5

Unaware

Completely Aware

6. I am experienced working with ESL learners.

1 2 3 4 5

No Experience

Highly Experienced

7. I am confident about working with a refugee.

1 2 3 4 5

Not Confident

Highly Confident

APPENDIX C: INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN

Introduction:

This instructional design provides 8-hours of training for volunteers participating in “befriender-type” mentoring programs sponsored by refugee resettlement agencies. These programs exist to provide newly arrived refugees with a volunteer partner from the host-community who will work one-on-one with the newcomer to provide assistance with cultural learning, tasks for daily living, English language practice, job search activities, and to share friendship. It is presumed that prior to attending this training session, volunteers have attended an orientation to gain general information about refugee resettlement and specific information about the responsibilities of participating in the agency’s program.

The purpose of this training is to prepare the volunteer for the befriender experience so that they enter the program with an increased sense of cultural self-awareness, confidence, and enthusiasm. In addition, this training will clarify the boundaries of the volunteer role, provide general information on transition stress (Culture Shock) relating to resettlement, and provide strategies for partnering effectively with agency staff. It is assumed that refugees selected to be matched with a volunteer will benefit from this type of relationship, and do not need more intensive support (i.e. mental health services) that a volunteer would be unable to provide.

The training design works best if delivered in two half-day sessions. It is recommended that there be at least one-day but not more than three weeks between session 1 and session 2. Timing for each activity is approximate due to the experiential nature of the training. Prior to attending the training session, volunteers will take the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale (IES) online assessment. The IES measures three factors of intercultural competency:

- How individuals learn about other cultures and the accuracy of that learning.
- How individuals develop and maintain relationships with people from other cultures.
- How individuals manage the challenges/stress involved with interacting with cultural differences.

The IES reports will be shared with participants during Session 1 and will be used to construct a personal development plan during Session 2. A sample IES report accompanies this instructional design to provide Evaluators additional information about the instrument.

Volunteer Training Learning Outcomes

At the end of the training, participants will be able to:

- define the difference between “large C and small c” culture;
- describe how the cultural values of individualism/collectivism, sequential/synchronic (time), small power distance/large power distance, and direct/indirect communication may impact the volunteer/refugee experience (Hofstede et al., 2010; Hall, 1998);
- use the D.I.E. strategy to interpret culturally different situations;
- identify their intercultural competency strengths and development areas;
- describe transition stress (5 R’s of culture change);
- identify the roles and responsibilities of the volunteer;
- use non-verbal communication techniques to communicate befriender tasks;
- describe strategies to address common befriender/volunteer/agency problems; and
- use the results from their IES report to create a personal development plan.

Module 1: Building Cultural Competency

Session Time	8:00 – 12:00 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions/Values ice breaker • Exploring cultural values/shifting frames • <i>Break</i> • Understanding the IES report
Learning Objectives	At the end of this module, participants will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • define the difference between “large C and small c” culture; • describe how the cultural values of individualism/collectivism, sequential/synchronic (time), small power distance/large power distance, and direct/indirect communication may impact the volunteer/refugee experience (Hofstede et al., 2010; Hall, 1998); • use the D.I.E. strategy to interpret culturally different situations; and • identify their intercultural competency strengths and development areas
Preparation	Prior to session participants will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • complete the IES online assessment; and • bring an object that tells something about their cultural background. This object will be used in the introduction icebreaker. Each participant will receive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • folder with session handouts; • name plate; and • short self-assessment (completed prior to start of session).
Materials	Easel and markers PowerPoint Slides and Projector – [PPT #1 pre-set]

Activity 1.1: Introduction and Values Ice Breaker TIME: 30 min.**Purpose: Build trust and rapport, and establish collaborative learning environment.**

1. Welcome the participants to the training and acknowledge them for volunteering their time to the program.
2. Review agenda and purpose for the first module.
3. Share ground rules for the session and ask for other suggestions. [Flipchart list]
 - a. Length of session day, including breaks;
 - b. Self-care (refreshment refills, bathroom location, etc.);
 - c. Participation – comments, ideas, stories welcome/share the floor;
 - d. Confidentiality and safe space – respect your colleagues; and
 - e. Other??
4. Introduce the Values Ice Breaker – Cultural Artifact*
 - a. Ask participants to take out the Cultural Object they were instructed to bring to the session. (If individuals have forgotten their object, suggest that they use something they have with them (e.g., a pen, watch, coffee cup, car keys, an item of clothing, etc.)
 - b. Instruct participants to introduce themselves by sharing their name, occupation (optional), and a brief story or explanation for why they selected the object, what it means to them, and how it reflects their culture/cultural background.
 - c. The Facilitator should introduce her/himself first as a way of demonstrating the instruction and providing a timing example.
 - d. Debrief the exercise for key learning or insights reinforcing the following points:
 - How challenging/easy was it for you to identify your cultural object? (It can be hard for some of us to “see” our culture.)
 - Cultural objects are only a “piece” of the whole of cultural identity. It is important to seek out more information so you understand the complexity and context of an individual’s background.
 - There is diversity in every group (even in groups that appear to be the same).
 - Understanding our lens for viewing the world is critically important before we try to understand others.

*Cultural Artifact created by D.K. Deardorff, in Building Cultural Competence (2012)

Activity 1.2: Discussion: What is culture?**TIME: 30 min.****Purpose: Introduce a framework for discussing cultural values, build a positive attitude toward the topic, and assess participant's knowledge/experience with topic.**

1. Brief description of culture “Large C” and culture “Small c” (refer to definitions on [PPT 3]).
2. Engage participants in a discussion about the elements of culture.
 - a. Cultural artifacts;
 - b. Language and verbal symbols/nonverbal symbols;
 - c. Cultural norms, values, beliefs, traditions; and
 - d. Universal human needs
3. Reflection: Ask participants to think of a strongly held personal value. Share their value and how they learned that value with a table partner.
4. Debrief:
 - a. Ask for a few volunteers to share their value.
 - b. Make note of values that are similar, but hold different meanings.
 - c. Key points:
 - i. To understand culture we must match the “under the water line” values accurately with respective norms, meanings, and symbols.
 - ii. Values, norms and behaviors drive our thinking, acting, and reacting behaviors.
 - iii. Internal values are implicitly learned, unconscious and hard to change.
 - iv. External values are explicitly learned, conscious and easily changed.
 - v. Commonalities are most often found at the universal level (safety, control, connection, security, dignity, etc.).

Activity 1.4: Mini-lecture– Cultural Values Framework TIME: 50 min.**Purpose: Provide the theoretical basis for the cultural values dimensions**

1. Briefly describe the scholarship behind the dimensions to be discussed.
 - a. Edward T. Hall, American anthropologist and cross-cultural researcher
 - i. Introduced hi-low context and significance of non-verbal communication and meaning across cultures; and
 - ii. Introduced the concept of sequential/synchronic time.
 - b. Geert Hofstede, Dutch social scientist known for his work in cultural values dimensions and organizations
 - i. IBM study; and
 - ii. Five dimensions: Power distance, individualism/collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, task orientation/people orientation, and short-term/long-term orientation.

2. Lead a brief discussion about the difference between stereotypes and generalization and make the following key points: [PPT #5]
 - Values are not right or wrong, just different;
 - Understanding underlying values increases the ability to understand others; and
 - Cultural values are about patterns found in different cultures, and that they are not universally held by every person within the culture.
3. Review and discuss four dimensions listed in step 4.
4. Provide examples of how values show up in behavior. (If there are participants in the room who are familiar with this work, ask them to assist in the discussion.)
5. Direct participants to the worksheet in their folder and ask them to put an “X” on the continuum representing where they would place themselves on the continuum. Show slides with country cultures noted on the dimension continuum. [PPT #6-10]
 - a. Individualism – Collectivism (identity)
 - b. Direct (low context) – Indirect (high context) (communication)
 - c. Large power distance – Small power distance (status)
 - d. Sequential – Synchronic (time)
6. Group Debrief Activity [PPT #11]
 - a. Assign each table one of the values dimensions.
 - b. Ask participants to brainstorm how values differences between US culture and refugee’s culture might show up.
 - c. Refer participants to worksheet starter questions and ask them to record their ideas.
 - d. Suggested starter questions:
 - i. How might individualism (common value for US) challenge a refugee from a collectivist country as they adapt to life in Minnesota?
 - ii. What misunderstandings might arise from direct and indirect communication styles (e.g., at a job interview)?
 - iii. How might status differences show up in your relationship (e.g., gender differences, family roles, familiarity/touching)?
 - iv. How might different understanding of time impact your meetings?
 - e. Debrief 1-2 examples from each table. Facilitator adds specific examples from past volunteer/refugee partnerships and/or staff interactions.
7. Close by reinforcing Key Message –We see the world through our own cultural lens. When we try to understand others, it is challenging to see the world through their lens. First step: understand our own lens (which is often unconscious). Cultural self-awareness is critical, and a primary cultural competence.

Break [PPT #12]

TIME: 15 min.

Activity 1.5: Value Judgment/Assumptions***TIME: 50 min.**

Purpose: Develop self-awareness of personal and cultural assumptions. Appreciate the importance of shifting frames (looking through another lens) when encountering difference. Develop a strategy to interpret culturally unfamiliar situations.

1. Welcome group back and check in to see if there are any questions from the previous work.
2. Start the next activity with very little instruction. Select an object that is ambiguous (e.g., machinery pieces, kitchen gadgets).
3. Round 1
 - a. Pass the object around the room, ask: “tell me something about this.”
 - b. On flip chart newsprint, enter the comments under three (untitled) columns indicating descriptive words (observed through senses- “it is hard, it is clear,”) analysis words (explains what is seen – “it might be used to peel something,”) and evaluation words (personal opinions – “it’s kind of weird”, “it’s pretty”).
 - c. DEBREIF
 - i. Define Describe, Analysis, Evaluation
 - ii. Label the flip chart so participants can see how the comments fit those definitions
4. Round 2
 - a. Give each table group a photograph depicting a human interaction (e.g., photo of two men with machine guns sitting on a jeep, a child with bloated belly eating a cracker, a woman with a head covering standing outside a school with big smile on her face, etc.)
 - b. Direct participants to the worksheet in their folders.
 - c. Instruct them as a group to decide on one description of what they see in the photograph and write it on the worksheet, decide on two possible analysis statements based on the description, and for each analysis, two evaluations (1 positive and 1 negative).
 - d. Debrief:
 - Each table shares 1 description, 2 analysis statements, 4 evaluations
 - Ask what was most challenging about this activity
 - Ask if anyone has experienced acting on an assumption that turned out to be erroneous. (Facilitator should have an example if none arise from the group.)

Key Points:

 - It is hard to keep evaluation from being our “knee-jerk” reaction or approach to something unfamiliar.

- Creating a new frame of reference can challenge our worldview – it can be discomfoting.
- The processes we use to describe, analyze, and evaluate are culture dependent and can be limiting when it comes to understanding other cultures.
- We often project what is inside us onto what we observe outside us.
- Judgments often reveal more about the person making the judgment than about the image that evokes the judgment.
- Describing before going into analysis and evaluation, remaining authentically curious, and suspending judgment is what is termed “Frame Shifting.” It is a prerequisite for effective intercultural communication.

* This activity is adapted from the D.I.E. activity, by J.M. Bennett, www.interculturalinstitute.org, and the D.A.E. activity by K-A Nam, Building Cultural Competence (2012).

Mini Break

TIME: 5 min.

Activity 1.6: Understanding the IES

TIME: 50 min.

Purpose: Build awareness of intercultural competencies.

1. Ask group to answer the question: What is intercultural competence?
2. Provide a brief overview of intercultural competence scholarship (e.g., history of study, disciplines providing scholarship, importance for multi-cultural environments, etc.)
3. Share commonly held definition: [PPT #13]
 - a. Cultural competence is a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts. (Bennett, 2009).
 - b. Remind the group that we were focused earlier on comparing cultures. Focus was on the gaps. Now we are going to look what we do to manage the gaps.
4. Introduce the IES and provide some information on the background of the tool, its creators, scholarship, and the validity of the instrument.
 - a. Direct participants to the handout scoring worksheet. Tell them we will be reviewing the dimensions of the IES. After each dimension is explained, they should mark where they “think” they rated on the score sheet.
 - b. Provide a brief description of the 6 dimensions and allow a few moments for self-rating. [PPT #14-20]

- c. Pass out individual reports. NOTE: The report handed out to the group contains selected pages. When they return home, the full report with activities, profiles, and additional information will be in their email.
 - d. Direct participants to the reflection worksheet in their handouts.
 - e. Allow 15 minutes for reflection. [PPT #21]
 - f. Debrief (Note that participants can choose to keep their results private):
 - i. What surprises, aha's, take-aways did you have?
 - ii. Did you find discrepancies between your self-rating and the IES report? Why do you think that is?
 - iii. What questions do they have after reflecting on the results?
 - g. **Key Points**
 - Demonstrate the interconnectedness of the dimensions. [PPT 22]
 - Clarify how the scoring works (relative to others who have taken the IES).
 - Remind them that the data came from them. [PPT #23]
 - Human beings are unique - assessments do not represent you 100%.
 - The point of this assessment is not to put you in a box, but to provide a starting place for a dialogue about your strengths and show you possible areas or patterns of behavior that might be blind spots.
5. Recommend that participants read through the entire report when they go home, paying particular attention to pp. 12-17. Ask them to bring their report to the next session.

Activity 1.7: Closing out the day.

TIME: 10 min.

Purpose: Self-assessment, evaluation, and preparation for next session.

1. Acknowledge the group for their participation, comments, insight, and ask for final comments and questions.
2. Provide a brief outline for the next session: We have focused, today, on YOU. Next time we will be shifting frames a bit to focus attention on the refugee/volunteer experience, the skills and resources to work together effectively.
3. Direct them to the two evaluations in the handout folder. Give them a few minutes to complete. [PPT #24]
 - a. Self-evaluation
 - b. Session evaluation

Module 2: The Volunteer Experience: Strategies, Skill-building, and Resources

Session Time	8:00 – 12:00 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome back/getting settled • The Refugee experience – transition stress • The Volunteer experience – roles and responsibilities • Communicating with ESL learners • Developing strategies for effective partnering • Personal development plans
Learning Objectives	At the end of this module, participants will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • describe transition stress (5 R's of culture change); • identify the roles and responsibilities of the volunteer; • use non-verbal communication techniques to communicate befriender tasks; • describe strategies to address common befriender/volunteer/agency problems; and • use the results from their IES report to create a personal development plan.
Preparation	Prior to session participants will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • review the IES report they received in email; • bring a copy of the Personal Development Plan worksheet; and • bring their folder back to the session. Each participant will receive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • session handouts; and • name plate <p>NOTE: Facilitator should bring extra copies of Personal Development Plan worksheets.</p>

Activity 2.1: Welcome and Getting Settled **TIME: 10 min.****Purpose: Debrief learning from last session, address evaluation comments.**

1. Welcome the group back. Ask for volunteers to share insights, “ah ha’s” or questions that have come up between last session and today.
2. Review comments from evaluations.
3. Review agenda [PPT # 2]

Activity 2.2: Mini-lecture - Cultural Transition **TIME: 20 min.****Purpose: Introduce a framework for understanding cultural transition and transition stress.**

1. Define cultural transition and acknowledge that this training will cover only the tip of the iceberg on this topic. [PPT #3]
 - a. Debrief **Key Points**:
 - Change is external event/Transition is internal response to the event;
 - Transition stress is a normal, healthy psychological reaction to the stress of living in another culture;
 - Transition stress commonly referred to as Culture Shock; and
 - Transition process is different for each person.
2. Briefly review 5-R Framework of Culture Change *
 - a. Model to manage cultural transition.
 - b. Provides a framework to understand the “whys” behind transition shock.
 - c. Describe the 5 R’s. [PPT #4]
 - Routines – Shifts in how we do “normal” things = feeling not “normal,” tired, physical reactions;
 - Reactions – Unexpected reactions to our “normal” behavior = confusion, uncertainty, loss of confidence, critical of new ways;
 - Roles – Status/employment/familiar role changes – sadness/loss, defensiveness, resistance, excitement; and
 - Relationships – Interpersonal challenges = family tension, sense of loss/worry for those left behind, excitement in making new contacts.
 - Reflections of self – Inner changes, identity/values/learning = flipping between being critical and accepting of new culture, grappling with deeper questions of identity (scary, unsettling)
 - d. **Key Points**:
 - Changes (5 R) result in multiple responses
 - Being mindful of 5R’s and their impact on your refugee partner helps to understand behaviors
 - We address this topic because change/transition is the refugee experience – it is helpful context for volunteers to understand the “what” and “why” of cultural transition/stress and the many ways it can be expressed in behavior, emotions, physical reaction

- NOTE: Facilitators can also provide examples of the 5R's that they have noticed working with agency clients.
- End with slides of quotes from refugees. Ask participants to listen for the 5 R's in these words. "This Much I Can Tell You." – Refugee's words about cultural transition. [PPT 5-6]
- Reminders:
 - Recognize strengths and capabilities that come with refugee experience: courage, resiliency, problem solving, ability to navigate complicated systems
 - Recommend resources to increase understanding [PPT 7]

*5R Model created by Kate Barardo, Building Cultural Competence, (2012).

Activity 2.3: Duct Tape Hands

TIME: 20 min.

Purpose: Gain awareness of their personal level of adaptability for change.

1. Start the Duct Tape Hands* activity with very little instruction. Pre-set 2 pieces of duct tape on back of chairs.
 - a. Round one: ask participants to do an activity (untie-tie shoes, unbutton/button sweater, enter a telephone number in their phone contacts)
 - i. Ask participants what it felt like to do this activity
 - ii. Flip chart answers (typical responses: it's easy, no problem)
 - b. Round two: instruct participants to tape fingers together and repeat the activity.
 - i. Record comments you hear on flip chart
 - c. Round three: instruct participants to tape thumb to palm and repeat activity
2. Debrief Activity
 - a. How did you handle the challenges of round 2?
 - b. Did your reactions surprise you?
 - c. What are some similarities between this exercise and making the transition to a new culture?
3. **Key Points**
 - Change requires a willingness to try something new – new strategies
 - New behaviors can be stressful – stress can be felt physically and emotionally
 - New behavior can impact our sense of competency and control

*Duct Tape Hands activity created by Stephanie Pollack, Building Cultural Competence, (2012).

Activity 2.4: Interactive Discussion -Volunteer Role TIME: 15 min.
Purpose: Clarify role, responsibilities, and boundaries of effective partnering.

1. Ask participants to think of a time when they were an outsider and received hospitality from someone, (e.g., starting a new job, moving to new state, country, etc.) What did that person do to make you feel welcome?
2. Debrief by asking for volunteers to share behaviors from their table discussion. Flip chart responses and reinforce characteristics of effective mentoring.
 - Showed me the “ropes”
 - Introduced me to others
 - Gave me information
 - Encouraged me to try new things
 - Showed interest in getting to know me
 - Was fun to be around
 - Gave me confidence
 - Was generous with their time
3. Show slide of Characteristics of Effective “Befriender” volunteer [PPT #9]
 - a. Align characteristics with IES competencies
 - b. Ask if there are any behaviors that might be “off-limits” or outside the guardrails of appropriate volunteer behavior– review the boundary guidelines [PPT #9 animation]
4. Direct participants to the Responsibility Handout in their folder (This is a review of information shared during orientation and should be specific to the agency program covering meeting expectation, timing, accountability, agency contact, etc.

Mini Break

TIME: 10 min.

Activity 2.5: Introduction to Communication**TIME: 5 min.**

1. Ask participants who have had experience working with ESL learners or who have traveled to a place where they did not speak the language. How did you communicate? How did it feel to not have words to communicate? Typically people will mention using signs/miming actions, feeling limited in getting ideas across, lots of misunderstandings, feels uncomfortable/silly, takes longer to get what you need, etc.
2. Remind participants that many of the refugees in the program will have limited or no English language ability. The next part of the training will focus on strategies and skills to effectively communicate without words.
3. Share slide [PPT #10]– with Improvisation quote from anthropologist Mary Catherine Bateson. Introduce the improvisation/communication section.
4. Reassure the participants that:
 - There is no right or wrong way to improvise – it is an art that includes rather than excludes – it is a “yes, and” philosophy;
 - No one will be asked to do anything they are unwilling to do – safe space;
 - This isn’t SNL – you don’t need to be funny; and
 - Think of this as a laboratory of exploration not a performance.

Activity 2.6: Improvisation Activities**TIME: 60 min.**

Purpose: Build non-verbal awareness/observation awareness; develop strategies for communicating without words, experience ambiguity.

1. Invite participants to open space in the room.
2. Warm-up - Introduce and demonstrate Mirror Games (NOTE: all games should be done as a group to eliminate “performance” stress or embarrassment. Number of games can be adjusted depending time and/or comfort of group.)
 - a. Game 1. In pairs – person 1 mirrors abstract movement of person 2 (Switch so both individuals can lead)
 - b. Game 2. In pairs – person 1 mirrors specific activity (e.g. brushing teeth), of person 2 (Switch so both individuals can lead)
 - c. Facilitator provides verbal encouragement as group works
 - d. Debrief
 - How did it feel to lead/follow?
 - What strategies did you use to mirror?
3. Introduce and demonstrate Gibberish Games
 - a. Facilitator demonstrates how to speak in Gibberish

- b. Game 1 - In pairs – have a brief “conversation” using gibberish (participants can use numbers if coming up with gibberish words is too challenging)
 - c. Game 2 “The Interpreter” In pairs Person 1 begins an activity (e.g. explaining how to portage with a canoe) and uses Gibberish to explain what they are doing. Person 2 takes on the role of “interpreter” and reports what is happening in English. GOAL for Person 1 is to make sure the interpreter is communicating accurately.
 - d. Debrief
 - What did you notice about yourself (physically, emotionally, behaviorally)?
 - What did you notice about your partner?
 - What did you do as a team that helped create understanding?
 - How does this experience prepare you for communicating with a refugee?
 - e. Key Points
 - When words aren’t an option – body cues/expression and keen observation is critical.
 - It’s helpful to keep a sense of humor (this is an Intercultural Communication Competence.)
 - Gibberish offers a sense of how English may sound to refugee.
 - Mistakes and misunderstanding is just part of the process.
 - Keep trying – if the first thing you do doesn’t work – try a different approach.
4. Introduce Murder Mystery Game (NOTE: Skip this game if time is an issue.)
 - a. Ask half the group to leave the room.
 - b. Ask the remaining group to name:
 - A location, for example: A swimming pool
 - A famous person
 - A murder weapon (that isn’t a weapon) for example: An apple
 - c. Bring group 1 back in the room.
 - d. Explain that their partner will use gibberish and pantomime to communicate the facts of a murder mystery. They must guess what famous person was murdered, where the act took place, and what was used to do the deed. Person 2 will give a “thumbs up” every time they guess correctly.
 - e. Debrief:
 - What did it feel like to be on each end of this game?
 - What emotions/physical sensations came up?
 - What strategies worked best for each of you?

- How does this activity link to working with a refugee who speaks no English?

f. Key Points

- When the action or object you are trying to “explain” is not part of the other person’s “context” (e.g., apples aren’t weapons) the task of finding common symbols/shared meaning is challenging. This might happen when you are trying to mime how to do an activity that has no cultural equivalent in refugee’s experience.
- Lack of shared meaning can create stress for both parties. Don’t be afraid to “take a break.”

5. Task Game

- Explain that we will now play a game that is related to some of the tasks they will be asked to do with refugees.
- In pairs – give person 1 a Task Card (activities on the card might be: how to ride the bus, checking out at the grocery store, using a Laundromat washing machine, using the library, etc.) and instruct them to teach person 2 what is on the card. They can (but do not have to) use Gibberish, but they may not use English.
- Place a variety of “props” around the room and let people know they can use anything in the room that will help them communicate (props could be bus maps, library cards, laundry soap/cup, etc.).
- Debrief:**
 - What worked?
 - Did it help to have props?
 - What other items in the room helped you communicate?
 - For those of you who are not fans of Improvisation – what was it like to step out of your comfort zone? Reinforce the message from earlier in the session re: stress fatigue, frustration, and critical responses. Reinforce cultural competencies of openness, flexibility, and personal self-management.

Break [PPT. #

TIME: 15 min.

Activity 2.7: Walk-in-their-shoes Activity***TIME: 15 min.****Purpose: Appreciate the effort that “new” second language learners and speakers exert while communicating in their non-primary language.**

1. Mention that some volunteers may be matched with a partner who wants to work on language skills. This refugee may have basic English language education.
2. Explain Activity (do not over explain)
 - Find a partner and decide who will go first.
 - Facilitator gives the following instruction: “Now tell your partner about the town you grew up in.” BEGIN
 - Facilitator quickly interrupts, “Oh, wait! As you share this information, insert a COLOR every seventh word, using a different color each time.” GO!
 - After two minutes ask partners to switch.
3. Debrief:
 - How did it feel to be speaker? What did you do?
 - How did it feel to be listener? What did you do?
 - How effective were you?
 - What did you learn?
 - How can you use this awareness as you interact with a refugee learning a new language?

*Walk in Their Shoes activity adapted from an activity by Scott Horton, Delta Concepts Consulting and Training Atlanta, GA in 52 Activities for Improving Cross-cultural Communication, 2009.

Activity 2.8: Trying on a New Language**TIME: 10 min.****Purpose: Practical language practice.**

NOTE: While this activity uses a Somali Words and Phrases handout for practice, facilitators can substitute other language handouts reflecting their agency client populations.

1. Direct participants to the Somali Words and Phrases handout in their folder.
2. Ask them to pair up and try a few words.
3. Remind participants of the benefits of learning a little of their refugee’s language
 - Demonstrates interest and respect;
 - Builds connection;
 - May facilitate understanding as you explain tasks; and
 - Allows your partner to help you learn!

Activity 2.9 Putting it all Together**TIME: 40 min.**

1. Graffiti Carousel Activity* – Refugee Scenarios
 - a. Place flip chart paper on the wall in three areas around the room. Tape a scenario on the wall next to the flip chart paper.
 - b. Ask participants to count off by threes and direct each numbered group to stand by a piece of flip chart paper.
2. Instructions
 - a. Tell group that they will work in teams.
 - b. Decide on a team member who will report for the group.
 - c. Pass out scenarios for each team.
 - d. Give them 15 minutes to analyze and come up with strategies to manage the situation. Remind them to consider the work of the two sessions in their analysis.
 - e. Instruct them to write their ideas/strategies on the flip chart.
3. Debrief:
 - a. Instruct each group to choose someone to report out to the plenary;
 - b. Ask for additional suggestions from other groups;
 - c. Reinforce agency messaging and ways volunteers can partner with them to handle challenging issues; and
 - d. Acknowledge participants for their ability to pull all of our work together into a practical application.

*Adapted from Carousel Graffiti Exercise, created by Ray Wlodkowski & Margery Ginsberg.

Activity 2.10 Personal Planning Reflection**TIME: 15 min.****Purpose: Develop a plan to develop Intercultural Competence**

1. Acknowledge the group for their participation and hard work and recognize the amount of ground that has been covered over the two training days. As they think about preparing for an intercultural experience, what areas would they like to focus on?
2. Instruct the group to take out their IES Personal Development Plan Document. [PPT #11]
3. Review pages 13, 15, and 17. Take about 10 minutes of reflection time to complete a Personal Development plan.
4. Paired debrief (5 min.).
 - a. Share one of your action steps
 - b. Ask for ideas/feedback/help with accountability

Activity 2.11 Close**TIME: 5 min.**

1. Thank the group for participation. [PPT #12]
2. Wish them good luck in the program.
3. Remind them to complete session evaluation before leaving.

References:

- Barardo, K. & Deardorff, D.K. (2012). *Building cultural competence: Innovative activities and models*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Bennett, J.M. (2009). Cultivating intercultural competence: A process perspective. In D.K. Deardorff (Ed.) (pp. 1-21). *The SAGE Handbook of intercultural competence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bennett, M.J. (1998). Intercultural communication: A current perspective. In M.J. Bennett (Ed.) *Basic concepts of intercultural communication* (pp. 1-34), Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Bird, A., Mendenhall, M, Stevens, M.J., & Oddou, G., (2010). Defining the content domain of intercultural competence for global leaders. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(8), 810-828.
- Hall, E.T., (1998). The power of hidden differences. In M.J. Bennett (Ed.) *Basic concepts of intercultural communication* (pp. 53-68). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G.J., Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Stringer, D.M. & Cassiday, P.A., (2009). *52 Activities for improving cross-cultural communication*. Boston, MA: Intercultural Press.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1999). *Communicating across cultures*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Activity 1.4 – Cultural Values Framework

Instructions:

Place an X on the continuum representing your cultural value orientation.

Individualism

Collectivism

Direct (low-context)

Indirect (high context)

Small Power Distance

Large Power Distance

Sequential Time

Synchronic Time

Activity 1.4 – Cultural Values Framework – Discussion Worksheet

1. Individualism/Collectivism

Instructions:

- Discuss how this cultural value dimension could impact your interaction with your refugee partner.
- How might individualism (common value for US) challenge a refugee from a collectivist culture as they adapt to life in Minnesota?
- Be prepared to share a few of your insights with the group.

2. Indirect (low context)/Direct (high context)

Instructions:

- Discuss how this cultural value dimension could impact your interaction with your refugee partner.
- What misunderstandings might arise from direct and indirect communication styles (e.g., at a job interview)
- Be prepared to share a few of your insights with the group.

Activity 1.4 – Cultural Values Framework –Discussion Worksheet**3. Large/Small Power Distance (status)****Instructions:**

- Discuss how this cultural value dimension could impact your interaction with your refugee partner.
- How might status differences show up in your relationship (e.g., gender differences, family roles, familiarity/touching?)?
- Be prepared to share a few of your insights with the group.

4. Sequential/Synchronic (time)**Instructions:**

- Discuss how this cultural value dimension could impact your interaction with your refugee partner.
- How might a different understanding of time/task impact require adjustments in planning and carrying out your meetings?
- Be prepared to share a few of your insights with the group.

Activity 1.6: Understanding the IES – Self-Assessment**Instructions:**

As you listen to the dimensions described, put an X in the box you think represents your competency.

	Low		Moderate		High	
	1	2	3	4	5	6
A. Continuous Learning						
Self-awareness						
Exploration						
B. Interpersonal Engagement						
Global Mind-set						
Relationship Interest						
C. Hardiness						
Positive Regard						
Emotional Resilience						

Activity 1.6: Understanding the IES – Reflection Worksheet**Instructions:**

Reflect on the results of your IES Report. The questions below may spur your thinking about how to use this information to develop your intercultural competencies.

What were your initial reactions to the IES results? (Surprises, reinforcement of what you already know, concerns, questions, etc.)

How did the IES results align with the self-assessment you created earlier in the session? If your results were not close, why?

How do these competencies impact the work that you do currently? The work you might do with your refugee partner?

Are there specific competencies you would like to develop? Leverage?

Self-Assessment (complete one for each session)

Based on what was covered in today's session:

What were my key learning or insights today?

As a result of this learning what will I:

Start doing:

Stop doing:

Continue doing:

Session Evaluation – Complete for first session only.

What did I like best about today's session?

What would I like more or less of next time?

What could the facilitator do to make the session more effective?

Comments about training room, materials, refreshments?

Activity 2.8: Building the Relationship

Meeting your refugee partner for the first time without an interpreter can be exciting and a little stressful for both of you. Your partner is faced with the task of learning a new language on top of adjusting to a new culture and environment. Learning to say a few words of welcome in Somali will help break the ice, and the phrases below may come in handy when you start working on activities together. Have fun learning Somali as you help your refugee partner learn English.

Words and Phrases of General Greeting		
English	Somali	Phonetic Transcription Underlined syllables are accented
Hello	Haye	High <u>ye</u> (<u>ye</u> = short “i” sound as in “it”)
How are you	Mafiicantahay	Ma fee <u>an</u> ta high (“a” is an open “a” sound as in heart)
I am fine. We are fine.	Waan fiicanahay	Wan fee <u>ana</u> high (“a” is an open “a” sound as in heart an the “c” is silent)
It is nice to meet you.	Kulan Fiican	Cool an <u>fee</u> an (“c” in “Fiican” is silent, double ii sounds like long “e” and is elongated)
Welcome to MN (Minneapolis)	Kusoo dhowow (MN/Minneapolis)	Coo sow d’ <u>woe</u> MN, Minneapolis (link the d and woe)

Instructional Design
Volunteer Training

Please	Fadlan	<u>Fad</u> lan (“a” as in heart)
Goodbye	Nabad gelyo	Nah bahd <u>gel</u> yo (“a” as in heart and “g” as in gag)
What is your name?	Magacaa	Ma ga <u>ah</u> (“a” as in heart and last “aa” is elongated)

My name is [...]	Magacaygu waa	Maga <u>eye</u> goo waah (the “c” is silent, “aa” is like father)
See you tomorrow	Beri baan is arki	Beri bahn is arki (“r” is a rolled sound, “I” as in wit)
Good	Fiican	<u>Fee</u> an (“c” is silent)

Words and Phrases – For Explaining Activities and Tasks

Let me show you	Aan ku tuso	Ahn coo <u>too</u> so (“aa” as in father)
Now you try	Iminka isku day	I <u>mink</u> a is <u>coo</u> die (“I” as in wit)
That’s right	Waa sax	Wah <u>sah</u> (the “x” is silent)
Try it again	Isku day markale	Is coo die <u>mak</u> alay

Instructional Design
Volunteer Training

Can I help	Ma ku caawiyaa	Mah coo ahh <u>wee</u> ya (elongate the ahh, sound)
Sit here	Halkan fadhiso	Howl can fad <u>ee</u> so (“a” in halkan sounds like hot)
Go there	Halkaa aad	Howl <u>ca</u> <u>ahd</u> (Elongate the ah sound)
Here	Halkan	<u>Howl</u> can
Show me	I tus	I <u>Toos</u> (“T” as in wit)

Scenario 1

Instructions:

1. **Read the scenario**
2. **Analyze together:**
 - Analyze the situation.
 - What cultural values might be at play for the refugee? For you?
 - What are some “within the guardrail” strategies volunteers might use to deal with this situation?
 - What self-management strategies would help you deal with this?
 - How can you partner with agency?
3. **Write your ideas on the flip chart.**

Scenario

As a parent, you have come to believe that toys play an important role in child psychology and development. The refugee family you have been matched with has 3 small children. You are delighted because the group sponsoring this family has acquired many wonderful toys for the children. It seems to you like the toys will help lighten the stress the family has while working towards sustainability because it is one less thing they need to find money for.

You arrive at your meeting with a box full of toys, but notice that the family’s father appears upset and doesn’t want to accept the toys.

Debrief (Facilitator copy).

- Family’s father tells the volunteer coordinator that he views having too many shiny toys as being too materialistic and worldly.
- Messages agency would like volunteers to consider:
 - Remember it’s not about your values.
 - It is important to give the family time to adjust before overwhelming them with “gifts.”
 - Remain curious – how do children play in their country – what toys do they enjoy? What games do they play?
 - Role of parents/children may be different in this culture than in the US.
- What are some reactions we would not want?
 - Insist on educating family about the value of toys.

Scenario 2

Instructions:

1. **Read the scenario**
2. **Analyze together:**
 - Analyze the situation.
 - What cultural values might be at play for the refugee? For you?
 - What are some “within the guardrail” strategies volunteers might use to deal with this situation?
 - What self-management strategies would help you deal with this?
 - How can you partner with agency?
3. **Write your ideas on the flip chart.**

Scenario

1. You have just been matched with a refugee family, and you are excited about finally utilizing your time for something that is purposeful and meaningful. You can't wait to see how you might be able to assist a family achieve sustainability. When you meet the family in their new home, you find that the rooms are small, the floors are dirty and many things are falling apart. The family is a single mom who has been in Minneapolis for a month, and she is on the verge of tears because life in America is proving to be much too difficult. The mom goes on to explain that it is too difficult to raise her two children and continue to look for a job. She complains that agency staff is being too harsh on her and asks if you could advocate on her behalf for some reprieve.

Debrief (Facilitator copy).

- Messages agency would like volunteers to consider:
 - This could be a first encounter with poverty and struggles that are below yours (and the refugee's) expectations of life.
 - Encouragement and empathy are helpful.
 - Understand that the agency is pushing a form of tough-love because the situation is tough and sustainability is a real battle.
 - Share concerning issues about the apartment conditions with staff.
 - Suggest that the case-manager is the person who can address these issues.
- Unhelpful messages/reactions:
 - Empowering a victim-mentality.
 - Encouraging quitting.
 - Commiserating about the injustice of the system and harshness of agency.
 - Offering money and other forms of empowering, short-term assistance.

Scenario 3

Instructions:

1. **Read the scenario**
2. **Analyze together:**
 - Analyze the situation.
 - What cultural values might be at play for the refugee? For you?
 - What are some “within the guardrail” strategies volunteers might use to deal with this situation?
 - What self-management strategies would help you deal with this?
 - How can you partner with agency?
3. **Write your ideas on the flip chart.**

Scenario

You have gone through the volunteer application and processes, and attend training. You’ve finally been matched with a refugee client. On the morning of your appointment, you show up at 8am, but the client does not answer the door. You have a suspicion that they are inside and keeping quiet until you go away. You leave. What are some of the emotions you might experience, and what are some actions you might take?

Debrief (Facilitator copy).

- Messages agency would like volunteers to consider:
 - Refugee is making a big adjustment to time.
 - You cannot force the person to meet with you.
 - You could call out the client’s name or try to see if a neighbor can assist.
 - Call for help from volunteer coordinator/case manager.
 - Sometimes, this happens. Just do the best you can and leave. Let the case manager know that it happened. The case manager can contact the client and reiterate the importance of schedules and time in America with a translator. You can try again possibly the next day.
- Unhelpful messages/reactions:
 - Pounding on the door.
 - Blaming the refugee.
 - Blaming the agency.
 - Demanding a new match before trying to connect again.

LIST OF TRAINING SLIDES

SLIDE NUMBER	CONTENT DAY 1
1	Welcome slide (Optional - facilitator name/photo)
2	Agenda – brief description of key activities
3	Definition of culture (Bennett & Hofstede)
4	Iceberg model of culture
5	Stereotype vs. Generalization (Stringer)
6	Individualism/Collectivism
7	Individualism/Collectivism country examples
8	Power Distance country examples
9	Sequential/Synchronic country examples
10	High/Low Context country examples
11	Instructions for group activity on dimensions
12	Break slide
13	Cultural competency definition (Bennett)
14	IES Factor/Dimensions
15	Self-awareness description
16	Exploration description
17	Global Mindset description
18	Relationship Interest description

LIST OF TRAINING SLIDES CONTINUED

19	Positive Regard description
20	Emotional Resilience description
21	Activity instructions – Reflection on IES
22	IES Dimensions and how they work together
23	IES reminders
24	Instructions for Evaluation
SLIDE NUMBER	CONTENT DAY 2
1	Welcome
2	Agenda – brief description of key activities
3	Definitions of change and transition
4	5R's of culture
5	Quotes from book <i>This Much I Cat Tell You</i>
6	Quotes from book <i>This Much I Cat Tell You</i>
7	Resources for additional information on the refugee experience
8	Volunteer Characteristics/Boundaries
9	Quote from Catherine Bateson
10	Break
11	Personal Development Plan (IES)
12	Evaluation and Closing

APPENDIX D. EXPERT PANEL EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Rated questions: 1(least), 5(most)

- How effectively did the overall design align with the learning objectives?
- To what extent does this design effectively address cultural self-awareness?
- To what extent does this design effectively address volunteer's role and responsibilities?
- To what extent does this design give volunteers insight into the refugee experience of resettlement?
- To what extent does this design provide effective ideas for communication with ESL learners?
- To what extent does this design provide for a motivational learning environment for adult learners?
- To what extent does this design effectively integrate methods? (Experiential – e.g., role plays, Didactic, e.g., lecture, culture general, e.g., values dimension, culture specific, e.g., Somali words/phrases.

Multiple-choice questions:

- Rate the amount of time this design allows for skill practice.
 - a. Not enough time.
 - b. Too much time.
 - c. Effective balance between practice and content learning.

- To what extent do the activities in the design address different challenge levels?
 - a. Too many low challenge activities.
 - b. Too many high challenge activities.
 - c. Appropriate blend for diverse group of learners.

Open text questions:

- What were the most effective aspects of the design? Why?
- What were the most problematic aspects of the design? Why?
- What suggestions do you have for the designer?

APPENDIX E: REVISED INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN

Introduction

This training provides refugee resettlement agencies with 9-hours of volunteer training for individuals participating in befriender-type mentoring programs. Befriender programs match newly arrived refugees with a host community volunteer partner to work one-on-one over a period of 6 months to 1 year. Volunteers provide refugee partners assistance with cultural understanding, tasks for daily living, English language practice, and job search activities. Additionally, they offer a personal connection to newcomers as they adjust to their new community. As in all mentoring programs, the learning and benefit goes both ways. Volunteers learn much from the resilience, courage, and determination of their refugee partner, and from exposure to a different culture.

For some volunteers, working interculturally may be a new experience. For some, travels abroad and other intercultural life experiences have drawn them to the befriender volunteer program; however, they may know little about refugees and their unique situation. Providing training to prepare volunteers to engage their refugee partner in interculturally competent ways is critical to the success of the mentoring relationship.

This training design offers agencies a pragmatic, and interculturally grounded offering to ensure that volunteers enter the experience with

- cultural self-awareness;
- confidence in their ability to communicate without English as a common language
- knowledge about transitional stress and its potential impact on their refugee partner;
- strategies to address common challenges faced by befriender participants; and
- a set of resources to support them throughout the befriender experience.

It is assumed that refugees selected to be matched with a volunteer will benefit from this type of relationship, and do not need more intensive support (i.e. mental health services) than a volunteer would be unable to provide.

Design Modules and Recommended Scheduling

The instructional design contains three learning modules delivered in 2-4 hour sessions over several months. This approach provides “just in time” learning on topics relevant to volunteers in preparation for, and during their volunteer experience.

Building cultural competency (Module 1) is recommended to take place after the general orientation and prior to matching volunteers to refugee partners. Working with the refugee: Skill practice and resources (Module 2) is recommended to take place prior to the first meeting with the refugee partner. Practical strategies and best practice sharing (Module 3) is recommended to take place after the first month of partnership or after two meetings have been completed.

Facilitation

Engaging in intercultural training content can be a transformative experience for individuals. Ensuring a safe environment to share ideas, to discuss personal cultural values, and to engage in respectful exploration of differences requires a facilitator who is trained in intercultural communication, education or training. It is recommended that agencies use facilitators with the appropriate education and skills to ensure that these learning sessions are effectively delivered.

Module 3 includes content that is agency specific. Unless the facilitator is also an agency staff member, it is recommended that Module 3 be co-facilitated by someone knowledgeable about agency policies and processes.

Additional Information

Prior to attending Module 1, volunteers are encouraged to take the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale (IES) online assessment. Results from the IES are provided during Module 1 and IES reports are provided to each participant after the training session.

The IES measures three factors of intercultural competency:

- How individuals learn about other cultures and the accuracy of that learning.
- How individuals develop and maintain relationships with people from other cultures.
- How individuals manage the challenges/stress involved with interacting with cultural differences.

Instructional Design Overview

Module 1: Building Cultural Competency – 4 hours

At the end of this module, participants will be able to:

- define the difference between “large C and small c” culture;
- describe how the cultural value dimensions of individualism/collectivism, sequential/synchronic (time), small power distance/large power distance, and direct/indirect communication may impact the volunteer/refugee experience (Hofstede et al., 2010; Hall, 1998);
- use the D.I.E. strategy to interpret culturally different situations; and
- identify their intercultural competency strengths and development areas.

Activity	Purpose
Welcome and Agenda	Establish the learning partnership with participants, and set a context for the befriender program. Review learning outcomes, and training session ground rules.
Values Ice Breaker – Cultural Artifact* <small>*Cultural Artifact created by D.K. Deardorff, in Building Cultural Competence (2012)</small>	Build trust and rapport with participants, and establish a foundation for cultural values content.
Group Discussion – What is Culture	Interactive conversation with participants to introduce a framework for discussing cultural values (mosaic, “large C/small c,”), to build a positive attitude toward the topic, and to assess participants’ knowledge and experience with the topic.
Human Values Continuum* individual reflection and group debrief <small>*Human Values Continuum created by D.K. Deardorff, in</small>	Activity to introduce cultural values dimensions of individualism/collectivism, high and low context, power distance, and sequential/synchronic time. Clarify stereotype vs. generalization, and prepare

Building Cultural Competence (2012)	participants for applying value dimensions to befriender interactions.
Cultural values and the befriender experience – Group brainstorm activity to identify how cultural values might show up during interactions with refugee partners	Expand self-awareness of cultural value differences, and apply learning to befriender situations.
BREAK	
Cultural judgments/assumptions activity* * This activity is adapted from the D.I.E. activity, by J.M. Bennett, www.interculturalinstitute.org , and the D.A.E. activity by K-A Nam, Building Cultural Competence (2012).	Develop self-awareness of personal and cultural assumptions. Appreciate the importance of shifting frames (looking through another lens) when encountering difference. Develop a strategy to interpret culturally unfamiliar situations.
Understanding the IES	Build awareness of intercultural competencies. Review definitions, and reflect on personal results. Reflect on competency development needs.
Closing	Field questions, reflect on learning, provide information on next module, and evaluate the training.

Module 2: Working with the Refugee: Skill Practice and Resources – 3 hours

At the end of this module, participants will be able to:

- describe transition stress (5 R's of culture change);
- identify strategies they use to manage personal stressors;
- use non-verbal communication techniques to communicate befriender tasks; and
- use culture-specific and appropriate body language/non-verbal expressions

Activity	Notes
Welcome and Agenda	Debrief agenda and learning objectives, respond to evaluation feedback from previous session, and debrief learning “ahas” from previous session.
<p>What’s Left Behind Activity*</p> <p>*Adapted from an icebreaker shared by Tatyana Fertekeyster</p>	Sets the tone for a discussion on the refugee experience and transition stress.
<p>Mini-lecture on Cultural Transition and (5-R’s*)</p> <p>*5R Model created by Kate Barardo, Building Cultural Competence, (2012).</p>	Introduce a framework for understanding cultural transition and transition stress.
Duct Tape Hands Activity* - and reflection on personal stress coping strategies	Gain awareness of personal level of adaptability for change. Reflect on stress self-management strategies (an intercultural competency).
BREAK	
<p>Improvisation Activities: Communicating without a common language.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mirror games • Murder mystery game (gibberish optional) 	Build non-verbal awareness and observation awareness; develop strategies for communicating without words, experience ambiguity and apply stress coping strategies (intercultural competencies).
Culture-specific Communication Resources	Provides culture-specific information about appropriate nonverbal and body language norms for refugee groups represented in partnerships. (Handout)
Activity: Applying non-verbal communication to befriender tasks.	Integrates communication and cultural awareness to befriender tasks, and allows

	time to practices skills. Builds confidence and competence to work with befriender partners without interpreter.
Closing	Field questions, reflect on learning, provide information on next module, and evaluate the training.

Module 3: Practical Strategies and Best Practice Sharing – 2 hours (less if panel is not used)

At the end of this module, participants will be able to:

- describe the boundaries of a befriender volunteer;
- name the resources provided to volunteers by agency; and
- identify strategies and best practices to address common befriender challenges and effectively mentor in the befriender partnership.

Activity	Notes
Welcome and Agenda	Debrief agenda and learning objectives, and respond to evaluation feedback from previous session.
What’s Working Activity (paired conversation/group debrief)	Reflect on the partnership experience as well as personal learning (e.g. cultural “ahas”, best practices for communicating with refugee partner, etc.) An appreciative inquiry worksheet of question starters is provided for this activity. Provides a foundation for volunteer networking and best practice sharing.
Mini-lecture - Befriender Boundaries	Reviews roles/responsibilities and agency expectations. Aligns “real-world” experience with program boundaries. Provides a framework for the scenario activity.

<p>Graffiti Carousel Activity* – Refugee Scenarios</p> <p>*Adapted from Carousel Graffiti Exercise, created by Ray Wlodkowski & Margery Ginsberg.</p>	<p>Provides strategies to work effectively with agency staff, refugees, and other volunteers. Reinforces cultural learning from previous training, as well as IES competencies. Gives participants an opportunity to demonstrate competence in handling cultural relationships and challenges.</p>
<p>Panel – Best Practice Sharing*</p> <p>*Optional activity.</p>	<p>Panel consists of agency staff, refugees, and former befriender volunteers. Provides participants with additional ideas for creating and maintaining a successful partnership.</p>
<p>Closing Activity</p> <p>*VisualsSpeak® Cards are recommended for this activity.</p>	<p>Participants select a visual that represents something they are taking away from this training series. Participants share their story as a closing activity.</p>