



Phipps, A. (2010) *Training and intercultural education: the danger in good citizenship*. In: Guilherme, M., Glaser, E. and del Carmen Mendez-Garcia, M. (eds.) *The Intercultural Dynamics of Multicultural Working. Multilingual Matters, Bristol*, pp. 59-77. ISBN 9781847692863.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/42196/>

Deposited on: 20 June 2012

**Training and Intercultural Education: The danger in ‘good citizenship’**

**Prof. Alison Phipps**

Associate Dean (Postgraduate)

Director: Centre for Studies in Faith, Culture and Education

Faculty of Education

University of Glasgow,

St Andrew's Building

11 Eldon Street

Glasgow G3 6NH

[A.Phipps@educ.gla.ac.uk](mailto:A.Phipps@educ.gla.ac.uk)

## **Training and Intercultural Education: The danger in ‘good citizenship’**

**Alison Phipps, University of Glasgow**

### **Purity and Danger**

In her seminal work of anthropology Mary Douglas (1966: 3) makes the stunning claim that “The whole of the universe is harnessed to men’s [sic] attempts to force one another into good citizenship.” Perhaps even more remarkably, far from making this claim in a book on law, or ethics or even education she makes this claim in *Purity and Danger: An analysis of the concepts of pollution and taboo* (1966). Good citizenship is found at the heart of discussion of pollution and taboo.

Research which is undertaken in order to enable the development of intercultural competence for professional mobility is research which aims at producing ‘good citizenship.’ What does pollution and taboo have to do with intercultural training? Well, quite a lot, as I shall show. In the context of intercultural training for professional mobility we find Douglas’s claim centre stage albeit rendered in a different tone and style. In their preface to *Intercultural Competence for Professional Mobility* (2007) Byram and Silva maintain that:

There are major demands on someone who has to metaphorically and literally “find their way” in a new cultural environment, and they may equally become “lost” both literally and metaphorically. As a consequence, a practical interest has arisen in cross-cultural training for those who are professionally mobile, which has flourished in recent decades. Much of this is based on common-sense

and intuition but there has also been a realisation that there is a need for sound theoretical understanding. Otherwise it is possible to do more harm than good, to reinforce prejudice and overgeneralisation, for example, to advocate stereotypical response to new experience. (Byram and Silva in Glaser *et al.*, 2007: 7)

The danger, in intercultural competence for professional mobility, as stated in this preface, is doing harm, reinforcing prejudice, overgeneralising, advocating stereotypes. Training, -‘harnessing’ is Douglas’s actual word - is something which can enable ‘good citizenship’ in professional contexts of global mobility and intercultural encounter.

Because of the potential negative effects as well as the enrichment mobility can bring, people need preparation, need guidance, need time for reflection and the intellectual tools of analysis. (Byram and Silva in Glaser *et al.*, 2007: 8)

In this chapter I suggest that in this harnessing of the whole universe to good citizenship there are some questions to be asked of assumptions made in the intercultural training and education paradigms. It does not, however, seek to take this paradigm at face value and merely restate a now well worn argument that would suggest education is a long term endeavour and that training is about quick fixes to evident problems.

This is a divide which holds to itself a good deal of history and animosity and can be found in many fields of endeavour: the divide between theory and practice; between ‘those who think’ and those who ‘actually teach’, between those who ‘get their hands dirty’ and those in the ‘ivory towers’ or ‘groves of the academy’. And here we have it, pollution, dirt, disorder attached, powerfully, to the fields of endeavour of others, to

those who might have a common purpose - attempts at working towards 'good citizenship' – but who begin this endeavour by defining themselves, hastily, against others doing similar things. Instead, it is the argument of this paper, that the work of being intercultural – within training or educational contexts - requires us to reach beyond the paradigms which are sustained by intercultural discourse, to reach into dirt, mess and disorder and to re-fashion our pruning hooks.

In the volume *Becoming Interculturally Competent through Education and Training* Fleming (Feng *et al.*, 2009) suggests that this divide may be understood as the difference between deep and surface approaches, as well as between vocational and non-vocational approaches to education in general. The differences between them he traces, following Winch (1995), back to the Enlightenment and Rousseau:

The pedagogic emphasis on discovery and the creation of a genuine desire to learn can be found in *Emile* and is also reflected in later progressive theorists. Education was thus traditionally distinguished from training both on the basis of ends (independent, thinking human beings) and means (student-centred, discovery methods). (Fleming in Feng *et al.*, 2009: 4)

Of course the divisions as presented here between training and education are constructed. The visceral language of pollution which is often used by differing parties when interpolated into discursive subject positions which require this kind of diremption, this kind of violent discursive othering, betrays questions of power and territory, money and prestige, which are masked as 'discovery' or 'engagement', as 'independent thinking' or the 'good honest hard work' where you 'roll your sleeves up

and get stuck in'. How many of us have not been party to such conversations or initiators of them ourselves? There is something more at work here in the 'harnessing of the whole universe to these attempts to force others to good citizenship' (Douglas, 1966: 3), and our vested interests in the means of so doing, than theory or method, surface or depth. Ideology is in play, shaping the values, attitudes and beliefs of trainers and educators, and the reception in training contexts.

### **Why I've come to hate training**

*It's with a considerable sense of foreboding that I turn up to the 'risk assessment training' which is 'compulsory' for all members of the senior Faculty management in the university. It's August. August used to be the time when either I took a holiday in the hills or when I could get down to some writing but now it is the time for compulsory management training. The institution has brought in a well-known and very expensive financial consultancy to run the training. Obviously, because we are being trained by 'professionals from business' it will be far better training than could be offered in-house. The experience, pedagogically, is dreadful, socially, fascinating. One sure way of ensuring solidarity of purpose among teams – cultural or intercultural – is to put them all through a gruelling ritual of pointless boredom, the point of which not one of them can see, upon whose facile nature all are agreed and whose conclusions are ideologically opposed to those held by the majority of the group. So it was, that we were trained in risk assessment. Fed a language which was not our own, nor did we have any desire to take it into ourselves. And of this in the strong knowledge that we are here to have our behaviour modified in line with powers whose desire is nothing to do with minimising any risk except to the bottom line of profit.*

According to Ulrich Beck: The production of wealth and the production of risks go hand in hand (Beck, 1986). Much training I have experienced is like this. Much of the education I experienced was not. Education has, though, at times been equally facile, and today operates, as we shall see, according to similar principles. The whole history of education demonstrates that as an endeavour it is far from immune from ideological manipulation of the powerful by those seeking to maintain their positions; a point still well captured in Paulo Freire's description:

Daf que, o que poderia parecer um diálogo destas com as massas, uma comunicação com elas, sejam meros "comunicados", meros "depósitos" de conteúdos domesticadores. (Freire, 1970:92) (Consequently, any apparent dialogue or communication between the elites and the masses is really the depositing of "communiqués," whose contents are intended to exercise a domesticating influence).

In training contexts such as those I describe – and experience tells me these are widespread – much of what passes for managerial attempts at improving 'communication' is nothing to do with 'communication' and everything to do with 'the depositing of communiqués intended to exercise a domesticating influence' (Freire, 1970: 92). In contexts such as these we may find ourselves not just culturally but also politically opposed to the prevailing view of 'good citizenship', where, in the example above, the whole universe involves our writing and holiday time as it is harnessed to force us into these dominant and uncontested models of good citizenship.

There are other examples I could bring to bear where the fear of legal measures brought as a result of 'a lack of intercultural awareness' (for which I read inappropriate comment apropos race, gender or class in interview situations) requires 'all staff serving

on recruitment or selection panels' to attempt a full day's training course on equality and diversity. The training course contains nothing in it but what Freire denounced as "banking" education, based entirely on transmission models of knowledge, which will of course be accepted entirely unproblematically by all women and men, young and old, ethnic background and cultural perspective, and in exactly the same way (or in fact, not!). When workers are managed as if they are machines, and cultures as if they are homogeneous and static then the models of training created by those imaging human beings – individually and culturally – in this way, are bound to be models which permit no deviation, no place for critique, no space for divergence or difference. There is nothing in this training course which will prevent people from behaving in racist, sexist, ageist, or classist manners.

It has become the domain of communication professionals who define it in terms of problem-solving, participation, and collaboration around predetermined tasks, the outcome of which can be subjected to quality assessment and quality improvement. (Kramsch, 2006: 250)

And as a way of forcing others into good citizenship, the definition of 'good' is defined most precisely, under such technicist models of training and education.

Technical devices [...] follow a principle, and it is the principle of optimal performance: maximizing output (the information or modifications obtained) and minimizing input (the energy expended in the process). Technology is therefore a game pertaining not to



the true, the just, or the beautiful, etc., but to efficiency: a technical "move" is "good" when it does better and / or expends less energy than another (Lyotard, 1984: 44).

### **Why Intercultural Education is also a bit of a problem**

In 'A Critical Perspective on Teaching Intercultural Competence in a Management Department' (Feng *et al.*, 2009) Gavin Jack offers a searchingly honest retrospective assessment of his own attempt to bring intercultural and critical education approaches into mainstream management degree courses.

For me, this course was always about more than academic achievement. It was an attempt to get management students to think beyond the confines of management discourse, and in particular the dimensionalising impulse that characterises work in CCMM [cross-cultural management and marketing]. It was an attempt to make culture intertwine with politics and ethics, as much as, probably even more than, capital accumulation. It was an attempt to bring different stories and different voices into the milieu of a management classroom in a British university. That the outcomes of the course in terms of students' cognitive and affective learning were highly differentiated is testament to the fact that teaching is never an unequivocal success. Perhaps teaching for any kind of learning (critical intercultural or otherwise) is always, perhaps necessarily, ambiguous and imperfect. (Jack, 2009: 110-11 )

What Jack describes, through careful discussion of transcripts and evaluations, is a course which fails to raise critical intercultural awareness among all his students, where

the outcomes were in some instances diametrically opposed to those he had intended, and where those who did meet the intended learning outcomes, demonstrating welcome degrees of criticality, were doing so without their own intercultural privilege being brought into question as a subject position.

Perhaps the problem here is that the course is harnessed by an educational discourse of intended learning outcomes (ILOS), which, however resistant or engaged the praxis of the lecturer, will always mean that the instant product, not the process is the ultimate arbiter. It will mean that the 'good citizenship' aimed at through the framework thus imposed is one at odds with that of the resistant, critical lecturer.

There is also a wider problem with expecting any organised educational or training framework to remove the danger of intercultural encounter, to provide the smooth and pure experience desired by students, academics, managers, and staff. Intercultural encounter is a volatile, tricky and messy process which, like the learning of other languages to which it is inherently allied, changes the bedrock of the self and of self-understanding. In such a context there is no room for an immediately 'satisfying' critical outcome, other than a performance of critical transformation in stated understandings about difference and culture and 'the way things are always going to be'.

To my mind, the students most highly resistant to this course seemed to adopt a cosmopolitan attitude to cross-cultural learning. By cosmopolitan I do not mean that these students were open to different ways of being with the Other; instead, I think they resisted these possibilities through the deployment of triumphalist

capitalist discourse. By cosmopolitan what I have in mind is a negative sense of cosmopolitanism expressed, for instance, in the work [of] Žižek (1997) for whom cosmopolitanism is capital's latest cynical way of incorporating and thus appropriating (ethnic) differences into the structural organisation of production and consumption. (Jack, 2009: 111)

Intercultural training and intercultural education sit uncomfortably with these kinds of conclusions and this is no bad thing. Trainers and educators are both now judged by their outcomes, by the satisfaction expressed in the evaluations, by the 'usefulness' of the courses or workshops in fulfilling a specific set of customer or client based expectations. These expectations are 1) therapeutic – they expect to 'feel good' about what they experience and to have fun 2) they are consumerist – offered as part of a menu of choice as part of staff development of degree course options c) they are technocratic – aiming at solving problems which they were part of creating in the first place and they are also d) imperialist (to modify slightly Brueggemann's taxonomy (Brueggemann, 2007)) in that they aim to ensure the health of wealth, and the health of symbolic capital, as attained through education.

It is easy to see how such training comes about. Senior managers sit around worrying about the possibility of their organisation being sued for breach of 'purity' in the guise of the new 'good citizenship' tests – i.e. prejudice against people – and therefore, fundamentally, worrying about 'danger' to their financial health. The question "How can we prevent this?" comes up and this is answered in the default way all questions relating to quick, cheap solutions to what are believed to be 'skills shortages' are answered, "with a training course on intercultural mobility", "with a training course on

recruitment and selection” , “with a training course on risk assessment!”. So staff training or development (a euphemism for training, forcing) divisions are tasked with the job of ensuring all “staff are trained”. The model is based entirely on a deficit model where danger is imminent. “No one in this room knows anything about this subject; all are going to cost us lots of money if we don’t train them. If we train them then it’s not our responsibility if they do anything for which we are sued, because we trained them, so we are not going to be culpable corporately. It therefore doesn’t matter at all how bad the training is.”

And so it is that all staff are trained. The whole universe is harnessed. ‘Purity’ is achieved, under the terms of the implicit framework. Belief in otherness and difference is reinforced and in this context stereotypes provide the necessary base material for the critical approaches of courses. But the result is not people who are any more able to deal with the mess and struggle of dialogue, human trust, subtlety of context-based understanding, a disposition which is enabled, through careful sensory perception to be attuned to a new habitat, a new place, a different context. The result is often a reinforcing of a simplistic belief that ‘stereotypes are wrong’ (I happen to believe they can actually be subtle and important aspects of our dialogue, vital points in the way we approach one another, and certainly in no way damaging unless used violently when they are revealing, rather than concealing of structural and historical injustice).

But it is equally easy to see how the critical educational courses come into being, too. Through critical engagement with literature in cultural studies, anthropology, sociology, politics, literature and language experiences which were part of an academic education form the basis for the countering and questioning of the status quo. Added to this is a

different purpose; not necessarily (though I would contest this) the pursuit of capital or avoidance of legal redress but a pursuit of Kantian purity in the form of learning for learning's sake; learning to participate in the field of academic endeavour and to compete for its (increasingly dubious and expensive) prizes. Mary Evans puts this even more crudely: "Increasingly, students are being asked to pay for the costs of the regulations of higher education rather than education itself" (Evans, 2004: x). The former – training – is part of the wealth protection enterprises of global capitalism; the latter – education - requires release from material necessity to pursue its reflections on the world (Bourdieu, 2000).

Hence, the struggle, the critical challenge. The quick fix solution to the hard work of intercultural dialogue and what Guilherme [this volume] has called 'intercultural responsibility' does not lie in a model of education for intercultural competence any more than it lies in a training model. This isn't because those designing the models are intentionally subversive or just bad trainers or educators, but because coercive frameworks/models of training or education may produce outward signs of success (very differently defined as 'damage limitation financially (training), or damage limitation socially (education)), but do not transform people. Arguments which suggest this is to do with 'deep or surface learning' are not sufficient for the levels of complexity in play and are simply re-enacting the pollution hierarchies described earlier, ignoring the place of ideology and politics in the learning process.

How transformation happens is not understood by philosophers, poets, artists, educators, anthropologists nor even psychologists. That it happens is widely acknowledged. I too have seen students transforming themselves and their

understandings in intercultural classrooms where I have been teaching. I have watched adults change their lives and leave behind addictive or destructive behaviours through holidays with holistic or healing purpose. I have marvelled as young people have come together and enlivened the words of a drama script with exciting performance after six weeks of intensive rehearsal and training for the stage. I can point to a whole palette of models, methods and training/educational approaches which have been applied in these contexts but I cannot say for certain that this model will always work in this context every time. In fact, I fear I can only say with any certainty that it will depend on the relationships and quality of dialogue and trust which is present in any given situation. This is not to say that there are not essentials or universals of behaviour – I fundamentally believe that there are – but it is to say that no moment in time, no training or class is ever repeatable. It is always live and like any live performance, never to be repeated, and always infinitely diverse. We can only access the fundamental danger of these universals through one-off local happenings. That the big questions are still unanswered after millennia of thought is intellectually and emotionally exciting. That the big questions: such as how might we learn to live together so as to prosper one another? Such as ‘how do we communicate?’, such as ‘what is learning?’ are still intact is perhaps fundamentally the whole point and be it in the quick fix intercultural training context or the long term intercultural education discovery modes the elusive, tantalising nature of these questions will mean we have to continually try to do other, to do again, to do differently, to work and walk on through.

**Paolo Freire: Críticos seremos, verdadeira, se vivermos a plenitude da práxis  
(We will only truly be critical, if we live out the fullness of praxis.)**

This is where the genius of Guilherme's conceptualization of the ICOPROMO project proposal rests. Here we have an open weave of dialogue, critique and activism between academics, educators and trainers all aware that 'there is more to this' than coercion or prescription or even intended learning outcomes:

Intercultural mobility in the workplace, as we define it and if we are to consider its ontological, epistemological, methodological and civic dimensions, certainly depends on individual vision and commitment, on work group dynamics as well as on organisational structure and culture. However, it is also shaped by a national legal and political framework that is multicultural and stimulates the individual to act as an intercultural citizen and is inspired by counter-hegemonic globalisation which "is animated by a redistributive ethos in its broadest sense, involving redistribution of material, social, political, cultural and symbolic resources" (Santos, 2005<sup>a</sup>: 29).

(Glaser *et al.*, 2007: 46)

Intercultural mobility means that questions of purity and danger are now writ large across the global educational context, not just confined to relatively stable communities. Under the conditions of intercultural mobility good citizenship is of necessity critical citizenship (Guilherme, 2002). Now as in previous ages the biggest issue facing us, interculturality, is how we share our bread, to paraphrase George Macleod. Both are present in the discourses we bring to bear in the contexts of intercultural training and intercultural education. It is easier to remain within the discursive space of what Freire terms either 'verbalism' – where we critique others or 'activism' – where we launch new, ill considered projects and programmes. If we wish to walk on through, to stick

with the tough, enduring questions, to be more than people with a gut reaction against stereotypes but to be open to more than predetermined scripts of therapeutic, technocratic, consumer militarism (Brueggemann, 2007), then critique and action need to be worked out as what Freire terms 'praxis'. For this to occur the intercultural dialogue, intercultural responsibility, and a sixth savoir, to add to Byram's five (Byram, 1997), is necessary – that of knowing to change oneself, savoir se transformer (Phipps, 2006). This sounds rather easy, but, like Byram's other savoirs, it is a competence which is processual, difficult and messy. It requires learned and practiced degrees of self awareness, and self reflexivity, yes, but also melded with these self-critical aptitudes it requires that practical and perceptual changes be made, over and over again, to the ways in which we behave, one to another. Such transformational work is always locally oriented, often first and foremost domestic, it occurs in the places where we encounter pollution, dirt, and disorder most viscerally. It happens when suddenly we are out of routine and in another environment, when what is temperate is hot and sticky, when our patterns of sleep and digestion are disturbed, when our bodies move and bring and make mess, when the ways of inhabiting the world and our well practiced, comfortable values, attitudes and beliefs (about when to go to bed, what to drink, where the rubbish goes) are thrown into disarray. For there to be harmony – social and bodily –there will need to be changes and we will need to learn to discern what these might be.

### **Who is served by transformation?**

I'd like to venture, in conclusion, that intercultural training and intercultural education, at their best, offer a praxis in discernment. When discernment, rather than solution is at the core the questions, open ended and not unproblematic, begin by considering what interests are being served by these divisions of purity and danger, gender, race and class



and their rather stark polarities. Discernment requires the self to be the subject *and* object of the learning: Who is served when I – and I do this – am dismissive of intercultural training approaches? What kinds of investments do I have in intercultural education and what do I gain from these?

Furthermore, and perhaps more importantly, discernment praxis needs the question to be asked: who is served by understanding these things better? Who is served by democratic and critical paradigms if these merely get soaked up by the dominantly powerful to serve their own needs. Famously Freirean techniques and educational models have been found to be extremely successful in the training of people for work with the FBI/CIA. The hunger of capitalism, happily taking on equality and diversity, cultural difference, social class, environmental care into consumption hoovers up everything to serve its voracious appetite for anything new. We see this in Jack's reflections:

The cultural difference they came to class to learn about is the cultural difference of an imagined cosmopolitanism, of world cities, airport lounges, exotic foods and comfortable communicative possibility. It seemed to me that courses in CCMM cross-cultural management and marketing like mine that did not provide this 'shopping-cart' for knowledge, its embodiment and future performance was at best suspect, at worst wasted. (Jack, 2009: 112)

But perhaps, just perhaps, there is a way through – the walking on through way, the continual discernment way, – which does not need us to reach such despairing conclusions, though as an educator in this field I know well the delights of watching

students learn how to transform themselves through their thinking and engagements and the disappointments of those who use their experiences to aims with which I fundamentally disagree. As an educator I know that this has to be the deal. If I move from a position where I will not brook such disappointment then I am no longer educating. If I believe that this is 'at worst, wasted' then I am back with dirt, disorder, purity and danger.

[...] ideas about separating, purifying, demarcating and punishing transgressions [such as bad or potentially damaging intercultural behaviour] have as their main function to impose system on an inherently untidy experience. It is only by exaggerating the difference between within and without, about and below, male and female, with and against, that a semblance of order is created [we are all trained now, phew!]. (Douglas 1966: 4)

Santos, in a suggestively entitled article, reaches back into the disappointments, the failed critical dreams, into the longevity of education, training and action and rails 'against the waste of experience' (Santos, 2004). Such an approach offers a way of countering the imperialist purities in the intercultural present not by creating ever better models or ways of training, educating or understanding, but with dialogic, interhuman, ways of discerning and being intercultural. If we follow Douglas in her argument we learn that dirt is simply 'matter out of place'. What we define as dirt, or difference or disorder tells us a great deal about the cosmologies we inhabit, and the universes we harness to force others into 'good citizenship'.

*In my home is a destitute young man from North Africa. He is with us because he is denied a place to stay by the state and it is illegal for him to earn any money. He doesn't wish to disturb us, moving around the house with respect, quietly. He cooks for himself in our kitchen in the late evenings. One night, I wake to the smell of burning. I doze a while and then am woken again, rudely, by a loud explosion in the kitchen below. I run downstairs to find that the eggs he was boiling have boiled dry and exploded leaving charred remains all over the walls, floor, ceiling. Everywhere there is matter out of place and it's 3am, and our house guest has just woken up terrified by what he's inadvertently done and we are beginning to clean up the mess.*

This was a real intercultural encounter; you will have had many similar ones yourself. It was messy, dangerous and my instant reactions were not particularly those of a 'good citizen'. They rarely are at 3 am. I have some strong principles, creedally shaped and for which I am determinedly accountable, in my life, when it comes to shaping my life, with as much discernment as I am capable of, as a 'good citizen'. I believe, for example, that the use or threatened use of weapons of mass destruction is morally indefensible. This means I campaign against their existence. I believe, for example, that this beautiful world of ours contains enough for our need, but not for our greed. This means I continually try and adapt my life to live simply and it means that intercultural education has to be about more than the boundaries of the classroom if I am to ever discern ways of living which might have any degree of intercultural integrity. Yet in this experience and in the heart of a small attempt at good citizenship, according to my own ethical, creedal principles; mess, and a strong desire to vomit, such is my disgust at the smell.

## **CODA: Grafting**

At the close of the twentieth century Robert Young wrote a profound critical account of intercultural communication (Young, 1996). He was concerned in this work to find ways of articulating the profound violence and disintegration he saw as emanating from the end of the imperial and colonial ages and the possibilities for hope for the future. His sense of good citizenship, like Douglas's work, is palpably aware of the difficulties human beings have always faced when trying to live together peaceably. Importantly his 'wager on hope' insists that there is no technology and no externally designed model which can offer the means to intercultural communication. Action, he sees as creative and as carried out by participants in any give situation. His conclusion is one written for professionals and mandating critical action and reflecting on our general capacity for intercultural critique:

Specific professionals are not at the margin of society, they are at the centre. They are the people who make postmodern society work. [ ...] the task of critical professionals is to make that centre a multicultural, democratic centre. (Young, 1996: 212).

Young's mandate, like the vision of the ICOPROMO project, is one which attempts to place intercultural professionals those entrusted with the critical and creative stewardship of democratic institutions, in a dialectic of hope and critique. Like the ICOPROMO team he attempts to show that power and professionalism come with responsibility to question, reflect, consider and also to demonstrate, *in situ*, what intercultural hope might be imagined to be, and how it might be enacted.

This will always require hard work, and periods of rest for reflection – times of doing the work and times out of routine, in training sessions or classrooms as professionals, when a different kind of work can be done. The results will rarely be perfect or anything other than ambiguous. Professionals will want to try new things out, change the structures or patterns, find other ways of relating, will be discerning and critical, accepting and considerate, at their best.

At the level of culture, as well as at the level of the individual, Young suggests that it is possible and desirable for all cultures to change, but not to change by blending with one another or being submerged by a single culture:

Each culture must change to the extent necessary for it to recognize differences, to acknowledge the *prima facie* validity of other cultures, to incorporate some degree of tolerance of cultural diversity, and to discover some common ground in the new intercultural space thus created, ground upon which a conversation about intercultural understanding and cooperation can be built. (Young, 1996: 3)

‘Common ground and discernment’: back to dirt, culture as cultivation, raking over the living with the dead to make good earth for growing. Throughout this chapter I have wrestled with notions and experiences of training and of education. Both words, for me as a gardener, have strong roots through their etymology, with gardening. Training is what I do in my garden. Carefully, usually in the spring when the runner beans have actually survived the last danger of late frost and the merciless onslaught of slugs; when the green stems are strong with rising sap and growth is flourishing, then and only then is it time to ‘train’ the runners up the bean poles. Nurseries are places where young

plants are raised, as with young children and this links back to the notion of education as nurture and not, as often erroneously stated, as leadership.

But here, neither concept satisfied. In their place I'm settling on the metaphor of 'grafting'. Grafting, in colloquial English means work, hard work, embodied work – not some kind of mental abstraction, but engaged with the messiness of life and its patterns at a given time and place. 'Grafting' has a further sense, however, for it is how new apple trees are created on old root stock, how a purple and white lilac might come to live together as the same tree. Grafting is what comes when we don't waste intercultural experience, and when we take into ourselves what we would otherwise cast as different, dangerous, unconscionable.

## References

Beck, U. (1986) *Risikogesellschaft. Auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Bourdieu, P. (2000) *Pascalian Meditations*. Cambridge: Polity.

Brueggemann, W. (2007) *Mandate to Difference: An Invitation to the Contemporary Church*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

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

Douglas, M. (1966) *Purity and Danger: An analysis of the concepts of pollution and taboo*. London and New York: Routledge.

Evans, M. (2004) *Killing Thinking: The Death of the University*. London: Continuum.

Feng, A., Byram, M. and Fleming, M. (eds) (2009) *Becoming Interculturally Competent through Education and Training*. Bristol, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Freire, P. (1970) *Pedagogia do Oprimido, São Paulo, Paz e Terra*

Guilherme, M. (2002) *Critical Citizens for an Intercultural World*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Glaser, E., Guilherme M., Méndez García, M. and Mughan, T. (2007) *ICOPROMO – Intercultural competence for professional mobility*. Graz and Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Jack, G. (2009) A Critical Perspective on Teaching Intercultural Competence in a Management Department. in: A. Feng, M. Byram and M. Fleming (eds), *Becoming Interculturally Competent through Education and Training* (pp. 95-114). Bristol, Buffalo, Toronto.: Multilingual Matters,

Kramersch, C. (2006) 'From Communicative Competence to Symbolic Competence in Modern Language Journal 90 (pp, 249-252)

Phipps, A. 2006, Whose Chances? People, Place and Praxis in Languages for Intercultural Communication. In: A. Hahn & F. Klippel (eds) *Sprachen schaffen Chancen* (pp. 27-43) München: Oldenbourg.

Santos, B. d. S. (2004) A Critique of Lazy Reason: Against the Waste of Experience. In: I. M. Wallerstein (ed) *The Modern World-System in the Longue Durée* (pp. 157-97), Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Young, R. (1996) *Intercultural Communication: Pragmatics, Genealogy, Deconstruction* Clevedon: Multilingual-Matters.

