

Cross-Cultural Competency Development Through Service-Learning and Community Engagement

Jonathan H. Westover^{a*}

^a Western Governors University, SLC, USA

* Correspondence: jon.westover@wgu.edu

Received September 23, 2025

Accepted for publication October 7, 2025

Published Early Access October 9, 2025

doi.org/10.70175/masteryjournal.2025.1.1.2

Abstract: *Cross-cultural competency has emerged as a critical capability for organizations operating in increasingly diverse and globalized contexts. This article examines how service-learning and community engagement initiatives develop cross-cultural competencies among employees, students, and organizational members. Drawing on empirical research from educational, corporate, and nonprofit sectors, the analysis explores the mechanisms through which structured community engagement builds cultural intelligence, perspective-taking abilities, and adaptive behavioral repertoires. The article presents evidence-based frameworks for designing effective service-learning programs, documents quantifiable organizational and individual outcomes, and offers practical guidance for practitioners seeking to enhance cross-cultural capabilities within their institutions. By integrating academic scholarship with real-world implementation examples, this article demonstrates that well-designed service-learning experiences can accelerate cross-cultural competency development while simultaneously addressing community needs and advancing organizational objectives.*

Keywords: Cross-cultural competency, service-learning, community engagement, cultural intelligence, experiential learning, diversity and inclusion, intercultural development, organizational learning, reciprocal partnerships, global leadership

Suggested Citation:

Westover, Jonathan H. (2025). Cross-Cultural Competency Development Through Service-Learning and Community Engagement. *Mastery: The Journal of Competency-Based Education*, 1(1).
doi.org/10.70175/masteryjournal.2025.1.1.2

The collision of demographic shifts, technological connectivity, and economic interdependence has fundamentally altered the cultural landscape in which organizations operate. Demographic projections indicate substantial increases in cultural diversity across most developed

economies, requiring organizations to build capabilities for navigating cultural complexity. Simultaneously, cross-border business activities continue expanding, requiring professionals to navigate culturally complex stakeholder ecosystems with increasing sophistication.

Despite this imperative, cross-cultural competency gaps persist across sectors. Organizations frequently struggle with cross-cultural collaboration, yet systematic development of these capabilities remains limited in many contexts (Earley & Ang, 2003). Traditional diversity training approaches often produce limited behavioral change, with meta-analytic evidence suggesting minimal long-term effectiveness for standard workshop formats (Bezrukova et al., 2016). A comprehensive review of 985 diversity training studies found that while awareness-focused training shows initial effects, behavioral changes typically decay within weeks without reinforcement through experiential learning.

Service-learning and community engagement represent promising alternatives. These pedagogical and organizational development approaches embed participants in sustained, reciprocal relationships with culturally different communities while pursuing meaningful social objectives. Unlike passive cultural exposure or classroom-based instruction, service-learning creates conditions for transformative learning through direct experience, critical reflection, and iterative practice—mechanisms that align with contemporary theories of cultural intelligence development.

This article examines how organizations can leverage service-learning to accelerate cross-cultural competency development while simultaneously advancing community welfare and institutional missions.

The Cross-Cultural Competency Development Landscape

Defining Cross-Cultural Competency in Organizational Contexts

Cross-cultural competency encompasses the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that enable effective functioning across cultural boundaries. Ang and Van Dyne's (2008) widely adopted Cultural Intelligence (CQ) framework decomposes this construct into four dimensions:

- *Metacognitive CQ*: Conscious awareness during cross-cultural interactions; planning and checking cultural assumptions
- *Cognitive CQ*: Knowledge of cultural systems, values, norms, and practices
- *Motivational CQ*: Interest and confidence in functioning effectively across cultures
- *Behavioral CQ*: Flexible repertoire of verbal and nonverbal behaviors appropriate to different cultural contexts

Meta-analytic research examining 320 independent samples ($N = 99,672$) confirms that these CQ dimensions predict cross-cultural adjustment, task performance, and decision-making quality across diverse cultural contexts (Ang et al., 2007). The framework's empirical validation across over 50 countries provides confidence in its cross-cultural applicability.

Service-learning approaches frame competency as an ongoing developmental process grounded in authentic relationship and mutual benefit, rather than positioning culture as static knowledge to acquire. Bennett's (1993) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity provides additional developmental perspective, describing progression from ethnocentric stages (denial, defense, minimization) through ethnorelative stages (acceptance, adaptation, integration). Effective service-learning experiences facilitate movement along this continuum by disrupting assumptions and creating cognitive dissonance that motivates development.

Prevalence, Drivers, and State of Practice

Service-learning has achieved substantial institutional adoption, particularly within higher education. Research indicates significant participation rates in service-learning across U.S. institutions, though implementation quality varies considerably (Eyler & Giles, 1999). Eyler and Giles's foundational research identified that meaningful community partnerships, adequate preparation, structured reflection, and cultural immersion depth differentiate transformative programs from superficial engagement.

Corporate adoption has grown over the past two decades, though systematic documentation remains limited. Organizations increasingly recognize employee volunteering and community engagement as talent development strategies, with structured programs emerging in major multinational corporations.

Three primary drivers explain this expansion:

Demographic imperatives: Organizations recognize that workforce and customer diversity requires enhanced cultural capabilities at all levels. The increasing diversity of domestic populations creates both opportunity and necessity for cross-cultural competency development.

Globalization demands: Cross-border operations necessitate employees who can navigate cultural complexity with sophistication and sensitivity. Research demonstrates that cultural intelligence predicts effectiveness in global assignments and international business contexts (Earley & Ang, 2003).

Research evidence: Growing empirical support demonstrates that experiential engagement produces stronger competency development than alternative approaches. Meta-analytic findings confirm superior outcomes for experiential compared to didactic learning methods (Conway et al., 2009).

Despite this growth, significant barriers remain. Many programs lack rigorous assessment frameworks, limiting ability to document outcomes. Resource constraints—particularly time and funding—restrict program scale and sustainability. Additionally, some initiatives inadvertently reinforce stereotypes or create dependency rather than reciprocal partnership, highlighting the importance of theoretically grounded program design.

Organizational and Individual Consequences of Cross-Cultural Competency

Organizational Performance Impacts

Cross-cultural competency development through service-learning generates measurable organizational benefits across multiple performance dimensions. Research on culturally diverse teams demonstrates that cultural intelligence moderates the relationship between diversity and team performance, with high-CQ teams extracting innovation benefits from diversity while low-CQ teams experience process losses.

Innovation outcomes represent a particularly well-documented benefit area. Meta-analytic research on multicultural work groups demonstrates that team diversity can enhance creativity and innovation when managed effectively, though effects depend critically on team processes and leadership (Stahl et al., 2010). The mechanism operates through enhanced perspective-taking, broader information networks, and reduced groupthink—capabilities that service-learning experiences explicitly develop.

Cultural intelligence among boundary-spanning personnel predicts successful international knowledge transfer and collaboration effectiveness. Research demonstrates consistent relationships between CQ and performance outcomes across diverse international contexts (Ang et al., 2007). These findings suggest that organizations investing in cross-cultural competency development may achieve enhanced global collaboration and expansion outcomes.

Talent management metrics reflect additional advantages. Research on service program participants demonstrates enhanced leadership emergence, global mindset development, and career advancement patterns, though establishing definitive causal relationships requires careful research design controlling for selection effects.

Individual Wellbeing and Stakeholder Impacts

Service-learning participation produces documented benefits for individual participants, community partners, and broader stakeholder groups. Meta-analytic research examining 62 studies found that service-learning participants demonstrate significantly higher levels of personal efficacy, identity development, and moral reasoning compared to control groups, with small to medium effect sizes (Conway et al., 2009). The meta-analysis included both randomized experiments and quasi-experimental designs, strengthening causal inference.

Cross-cultural competency development specifically enhances psychological wellbeing through several pathways. Participants report increased comfort with ambiguity, reduced intergroup anxiety, and enhanced self-efficacy in navigating cultural difference. Research demonstrates that intergroup contact under optimal conditions reduces prejudice and anxiety while building positive attitudes—effects documented across 515 studies involving over 250,000 participants (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Service-learning creates conditions conducive to such contact by establishing equal status, common goals, intergroup cooperation, and institutional support.

For community partners, well-designed service-learning programs can deliver tangible benefits while building local capacity. However, poorly designed programs can burden communities, reinforce stereotypes, and extract knowledge without reciprocal benefit—underscoring the importance of ethical partnership design.

Educational outcomes demonstrate particular strength. Meta-analytic research comparing service-learning to traditional instruction finds advantages for service-learning across academic learning, personal development, social outcomes, and career development domains (Conway et al., 2009). Effect sizes range from small to medium depending on outcome domain and program characteristics, with stronger effects associated with greater community engagement intensity and reflection quality.

Community-level impacts extend beyond immediate service recipients. Service-learning initiatives can strengthen social capital, build bridging networks across cultural groups, and enhance community capacity for collective action when designed with authentic partnership principles. Research on community outcomes remains more limited than participant outcome research, representing an important area for continued investigation.

Evidence-Based Organizational Responses

Immersive Cross-Cultural Placement Programs

The strongest evidence for cross-cultural competency development comes from programs featuring sustained immersion in culturally different communities. Research consistently demonstrates that program features including cultural mentoring, structured reflection, and experiential learning drive intercultural competency outcomes more powerfully than simple time abroad (Paige & Vande Berg, 2012).

Effective immersive programs incorporate several design elements:

Structured pre-departure preparation: Participants engage with cultural frameworks, develop learning objectives, and establish reflective practices before entering communities. Research demonstrates that cultural training enhances subsequent adjustment and learning outcomes in international contexts, with meta-analytic evidence supporting effectiveness across diverse training approaches (Littrell et al., 2006).

Meaningful work assignments: Tasks require genuine collaboration with community members to address locally identified needs rather than predetermined projects. This authenticity creates motivation and surfaces genuine cultural differences requiring navigation.

Regular guided reflection: Structured processing through journals, dialogue sessions, and mentor conversations transforms experience into learning. Kolb's (1984) experiential learning cycle provides theoretical grounding, emphasizing that reflection converts concrete experience into abstract conceptualization and active experimentation.

Reciprocal relationship structures: Partnerships position community members as co-educators and collaborators rather than service recipients, fundamentally reshaping power dynamics and learning opportunities.

Research on intensive immersive programs demonstrates cross-cultural competency advantages. Peace Corps volunteers, who serve for 27 months in international communities, show higher levels of intercultural competence and global civic engagement compared to demographically similar non-participants. These effects persist longitudinally, suggesting that intensive immersion can fundamentally reshape cultural capabilities and life trajectories (Lough, 2011).

International service-learning programs demonstrate similar patterns, though effect sizes vary with program design features. Programs incorporating intensive cultural mentoring and structured reflection produce larger competency gains than those relying primarily on immersion without these supportive structures (Paige & Vande Berg, 2012).

Structured Reflection and Guided Dialogue Processes

While immersive experience provides raw material for learning, structured reflection processes convert experience into durable competency. Reflection serves to transform concrete experiences into abstract conceptualizations that can be applied to new situations—a core principle of experiential learning theory (Kolb, 1984).

The reflection component addresses a critical limitation of experience alone. Unprocessed cross-cultural encounters may reinforce existing stereotypes or create confusion without learning. Research demonstrates that experience without reflection can produce limited or even counterproductive outcomes, whereas structured reflection enhances learning across multiple domains (Eyler & Giles, 1999).

Effective reflection practices include:

Critical incident analysis: Participants identify specific moments of cultural confusion or conflict, then systematically examine assumptions, alternative interpretations, and lessons learned. This approach develops metacognitive awareness—the foundation of cultural intelligence (Earley & Ang, 2003).

Perspective-taking exercises: Structured activities where participants articulate situations from community partners' cultural frameworks enhance cognitive complexity and empathy. Perspective-taking represents a critical component of reducing intergroup bias and building intercultural competence.

Peer dialogue groups: Small cohorts meeting regularly to process experiences create social support while exposing participants to multiple interpretations of shared events. Intergroup dialogue approaches bring together participants from different cultural backgrounds for sustained, facilitated conversations that build understanding and reduce prejudice (Gurin et al., 2013).

Mentor-guided debriefing: Experienced facilitators help participants identify patterns, challenge assumptions, and extract transferable principles from specific experiences. Cultural mentoring

significantly enhances intercultural learning outcomes in study abroad and international service contexts (Paige & Vande Berg, 2012).

Empirical studies demonstrate that reflection quality predicts learning outcomes. Eyler and Giles (1999) found that programs incorporating regular, structured reflection sessions produced significantly stronger outcomes across academic learning, personal development, and intercultural competence domains compared to programs with minimal reflection components.

Community-University Partnership Models

Academic institutions have developed partnership infrastructure that balances student learning with community benefit—expertise transferable to corporate and nonprofit contexts. The key differentiator involves shifting from transactional service provision to sustained, mutually beneficial collaboration.

Research on effective community-campus partnerships identifies several critical principles:

Community-driven agenda setting: Partners identify needs and priorities rather than organizations imposing predetermined projects. This approach ensures relevance while creating authentic cultural learning opportunities.

Asset-based orientation: Partnerships recognize and build upon community strengths rather than focusing exclusively on deficits, fundamentally altering power dynamics and learning opportunities. This contrasts with deficit-oriented approaches that can reinforce stereotypes and power imbalances.

Multi-directional knowledge exchange: Community members are positioned as educators with valuable expertise, creating space for cultural learning that unidirectional "service" models preclude.

Long-term relationship commitment: Sustained partnerships enable deeper cultural understanding and trust that short-term projects cannot achieve. Research documents that partnership maturity predicts both student learning quality and community benefit magnitude.

Research examining community-university partnerships documents evolution from initial transactional relationships toward transformational partnerships characterized by shared governance, mutual benefit, and sustained trust. This developmental trajectory suggests that organizations should view partnership building as long-term capability development rather than discrete projects (Bringle & Hatcher, 2002).

The Carnegie Foundation's Community Engagement Classification has catalyzed systematic improvement in partnership quality across hundreds of institutions, creating a framework for assessing and enhancing community engagement infrastructure, quality, and outcomes.

Intercultural Peer Learning Communities

Peer learning approaches leverage diversity within organizations to build cross-cultural competency through structured interaction. Rather than positioning cultural competency as expertise acquired through training, these models create conditions for mutual learning across difference.

Research on intergroup contact theory provides theoretical grounding. Meta-analytic research examining 515 studies (N = 250,555) demonstrates that contact reduces prejudice and builds positive intergroup attitudes, with larger effects when Allport's (1954) optimal conditions exist: equal status, common goals, intergroup cooperation, and institutional support (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Effect sizes prove robust across diverse cultural contexts, age groups, and contact types.

Effective peer learning designs incorporate:

Intentional composition: Groups balance demographic diversity with common purpose, ensuring multiple cultural perspectives while maintaining sufficient shared ground for collaboration.

Facilitated dialogue protocols: Structured conversations guide participants through sharing cultural backgrounds, examining assumptions, and exploring difference productively. Intergroup dialogue represents a structured form of intergroup contact that has demonstrated effectiveness in building intercultural competence and reducing prejudice (Gurin et al., 2013).

Collaborative projects: Shared work with meaningful stakes creates interdependence that motivates engagement across difference. Cooperative interdependence transforms potential diversity challenges into collaborative opportunities.

Safe space norms: Explicit agreements around confidentiality, non-judgment, and constructive feedback enable risk-taking necessary for genuine learning.

The University of Michigan's Intergroup Relations Program, operating for over three decades, creates facilitated dialogues bringing together students from different racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds. Rigorous quasi-experimental research documented that participants showed significant gains in perspective-taking, reduced intergroup anxiety, and increased commitment to diversity compared to control groups, with effects persisting through four-year follow-ups (Gurin et al., 2013). The program's replication at over 100 institutions creates confidence in cross-context applicability.

Research on multicultural teams in organizational contexts demonstrates similar principles. When teams establish norms supporting open discussion of cultural differences and build psychological safety, cultural diversity can enhance creativity and problem-solving. Conversely, diverse teams without these supportive structures often experience process losses and conflict (Stahl et al., 2010).

Culturally Adaptive Leadership Development

Service-learning experiences create natural laboratories for developing culturally adaptive leadership capabilities—the capacity to diagnose cultural contexts and adjust leadership approaches accordingly. This competency proves critical as leaders increasingly work across cultural boundaries.

The GLOBE (Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness) research project, examining leadership across 62 cultures, documented substantial cultural variation in effective leadership behaviors (House et al., 2004). Participative leadership highly valued in Nordic cultures may be viewed as weak in hierarchical cultures; direct communication appreciated in low-context cultures may be perceived as rude in high-context settings. Adaptive leaders diagnose cultural expectations and flexibly adjust their approach.

Service-learning develops this adaptability through:

Leadership role rotation: Participants take turns leading in culturally unfamiliar contexts, receiving feedback on cultural appropriateness and effectiveness. Developmental experiences involving challenge, assessment, and support accelerate leadership capability building.

Mentorship by cultural insiders: Community partners coach participants on culturally effective approaches, making implicit norms explicit. Cultural mentoring proves especially effective for developing behavioral and metacognitive dimensions of cultural intelligence.

Failure analysis: Structured examination of cultural missteps creates learning opportunities and reduces anxiety about imperfection. Learning from experience requires reflecting on both successes and failures in supportive environments.

Progressive challenge: Graduated responsibility allows skill building from simpler to more complex cultural navigation tasks, aligning with developmental theory emphasizing appropriate challenge levels.

Research on international service programs documents leadership development outcomes, including enhanced leadership self-efficacy and adaptive leadership capabilities. Program features including cultural immersion, leadership responsibility, and structured reflection predict outcome magnitude.

Building Long-Term Cross-Cultural Capability

Institutional Infrastructure for Sustained Engagement

Short-term service-learning initiatives generate individual competency gains but may produce limited organizational transformation. Building durable cross-cultural capability requires institutional infrastructure embedding community engagement within core operations rather than treating it as peripheral activity.

Research on organizational learning demonstrates that isolated individual development rarely translates to organizational capability without supporting structures, incentives, and knowledge management systems (Crossan et al., 1999). The framework describes how individual intuition becomes institutionalized through interpretation, integration, and organizational processes. Effective institutional infrastructure includes:

Dedicated coordination capacity: Staff or units managing community partnerships, supporting program quality, and facilitating knowledge transfer ensure consistency and continuous improvement. Infrastructure enables sustained implementation beyond individual champion efforts.

Integration with talent development systems: When service-learning participation connects explicitly to performance evaluation, promotion criteria, and career development, organizational signals prioritize cross-cultural competency. Research demonstrates that alignment between espoused values and reward systems predicts actual behavioral priorities (Kerr, 1975). Kerr's classic article "On the Folly of Rewarding A, While Hoping for B" demonstrates that organizations often inadvertently reward behaviors contrary to stated objectives.

Knowledge capture and sharing mechanisms: Systematic documentation and dissemination of cultural insights gleaned through community engagement convert individual learning into organizational knowledge. Knowledge management research emphasizes that tacit knowledge requires deliberate processes for articulation and transfer (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). The knowledge-creating company framework describes how organizations convert individual tacit knowledge into explicit organizational knowledge through socialization, externalization, combination, and internalization processes.

Resource allocation aligned with stated priorities: Budgets, time allocation, and recognition systems that support engagement demonstrate institutional commitment beyond rhetoric. Research on organizational culture change emphasizes resource allocation as critical signal of authentic priority (Schein, 2010). Schein's organizational culture framework emphasizes that artifacts, espoused values, and basic underlying assumptions must align for authentic cultural change.

Institutional policy changes can enable individual faculty and staff to invest in community engagement without career penalty. Structural changes create conditions for individual behavior change at scale, demonstrating how institutional infrastructure translates into enhanced organizational capability.

Reciprocal Assessment and Continuous Improvement Systems

Traditional program assessment often measures only participant outcomes, neglecting community partner perspectives and reciprocal benefit. Comprehensive assessment frameworks examine multiple stakeholder experiences and employ data for continuous improvement rather than mere accountability.

Assessment approaches should emphasize:

Community partner input on program quality: Structured mechanisms for partners to evaluate student preparation, project relevance, and relationship quality inform program refinement. Community partner feedback identifies improvement opportunities invisible to institutional perspectives.

Reciprocal benefit documentation: Assessment tracks value created for communities alongside participant learning, ensuring authentic partnership. Frameworks for assessing community outcomes include capacity building, resource access, and social capital development.

Longitudinal outcome measurement: Follow-up assessment examining sustained competency gains and career impacts provides richer understanding than immediate post-program surveys. Research demonstrates that some service-learning outcomes—particularly values development and career trajectories—emerge years after program participation.

Disaggregated analysis: Examining outcomes across participant demographics surfaces differential impacts and equity considerations. Service-learning experiences may benefit participants differently based on prior cultural experience, socioeconomic background, and demographic characteristics.

Multi-stakeholder assessment approaches enable evidence-based program improvement. Programs employing systematic assessment with feedback loops achieve better outcomes than those relying on anecdotal evidence.

Scaling Through Networked Learning Communities

Individual organizations face resource constraints limiting service-learning program scale. Networked approaches where multiple organizations collaborate create efficiency while expanding reach and impact. These networks enable shared learning, resource pooling, and collective advocacy for community priorities.

Network structures range from informal knowledge-sharing communities to formal consortia with coordinated programming. Research on multi-organizational networks identifies several success factors (Provan & Kenis, 2008):

Shared governance structures: Formal mechanisms ensuring member voice and collective decision-making build commitment and sustainability. Network governance research identifies three primary models—shared governance, lead organization, and network administrative organization—each appropriate for different network contexts and objectives.

Boundary-spanning coordination: Network facilitators or coordinating organizations manage logistics, enable communication, and maintain momentum. Boundary-spanning roles prove critical for network effectiveness by connecting otherwise disconnected organizational units.

Aligned yet differentiated contributions: Members contribute distinct capabilities while working toward shared objectives, creating complementary value. Network theory emphasizes leveraging member diversity rather than seeking homogeneity.

Knowledge management infrastructure: Platforms and practices for capturing and disseminating learning across network members accelerate collective capability development. Research on communities of practice emphasizes that knowledge sharing requires both technological infrastructure and social practices supporting exchange (Wenger, 1998). Wenger's framework describes communities of practice as groups sharing concern or passion for something they do and learning how to do it better through regular interaction.

Campus Compact, a national coalition of over 1,000 colleges and universities committed to community engagement, exemplifies network benefits. Member institutions share curricula, assessment tools, partnership relationships, and lessons learned through annual conferences, publications, and online platforms. Research on member institutions documents that network participation enhances service-learning quality and institutional capacity (Bringle & Hatcher, 2002).

Research on networks more broadly demonstrates that participation can accelerate capability development by providing access to proven practices while avoiding duplicative resource investment. For service-learning and cross-cultural competency development, networks offer particular value given the specialized expertise required for high-quality implementation.

Conclusion

Cross-cultural competency has transitioned from optional enhancement to organizational imperative as demographic diversity, globalization, and stakeholder complexity intensify. Traditional training approaches produce limited behavioral change, creating demand for more effective development strategies. Service-learning and community engagement offer evidence-based alternatives that accelerate competency development while simultaneously advancing community welfare.

The research evidence demonstrates several key principles for effective practice. First, sustained immersion in culturally different communities generates stronger outcomes than brief exposure or classroom-based instruction. Meta-analytic research confirms experiential learning advantages across multiple outcome domains (Conway et al., 2009). Second, structured reflection processes prove essential for converting experience into learning—theory and research emphasize that experience alone, without reflection, produces limited learning (Kolb, 1984; Eyler & Giles, 1999). Third, reciprocal partnerships where community members serve as co-educators fundamentally enhance both learning quality and ethical practice. Fourth, institutional infrastructure embedding community engagement within core systems enables sustained capability building beyond individual program participation (Crossan et al., 1999).

Organizations implementing service-learning initiatives should prioritize several design elements based on empirical evidence: adequate preparation before community engagement, meaningful work assignments addressing locally identified needs, regular guided reflection with skilled facilitators, and long-term partnership commitments enabling deep relationship development. Assessment frameworks should examine multiple stakeholder outcomes, incorporate community partner perspectives, and support continuous improvement rather than mere accountability.

The documented benefits—enhanced intercultural competence (Ang et al., 2007), improved outcomes in diverse teams when cultural intelligence is high (Stahl et al., 2010), reduced prejudice through optimal intergroup contact (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), and individual wellbeing gains (Conway et al., 2009)—demonstrate that service-learning represents strategic investment rather than peripheral social responsibility activity. As organizations navigate increasingly complex cultural landscapes, the capacity to learn through authentic community engagement may distinguish thriving institutions from those struggling to adapt.

Ultimately, cross-cultural competency development through service-learning embodies a paradox central to intercultural effectiveness: genuine cultural capability emerges not from mastering others' cultures but from sustained practice in recognizing one's own cultural conditioning, embracing productive discomfort, and building relationships across difference. Cultural intelligence theory

emphasizes metacognitive awareness—consciousness of one's own cultural assumptions—as foundational to effective cross-cultural functioning (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008). Service-learning creates conditions for this transformative learning while addressing community needs—an integration that benefits all stakeholders when implemented with attention to partnership quality, reflection depth, and reciprocal benefit.

References

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Addison-Wesley.
- Ang, S., & Van Dyne, L. (2008). Conceptualization of cultural intelligence: Definition, distinctiveness, and nomological network. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and applications* (pp. 3–15). M.E. Sharpe.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K. Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 3(3), 335–371.
- Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 21–71). Intercultural Press.
- Bezrukova, K., Spell, C. S., Perry, J. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2016). A meta-analytical integration of over 40 years of research on diversity training evaluation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 142(11), 1227–1274.
- Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2002). Campus-community partnerships: The terms of engagement. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58(3), 503–516.
- Conway, J. M., Amel, E. L., & Gerwien, D. P. (2009). Teaching and learning in the social context: A meta-analysis of service learning's effects on academic, personal, social, and citizenship outcomes. *Teaching of Psychology*, 36(4), 233–245.
- Crossan, M. M., Lane, H. W., & White, R. E. (1999). An organizational learning framework: From intuition to institution. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 522–537.
- Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford University Press.
- Eyler, J., & Giles, D. E. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* Jossey-Bass.
- Gurin, P., Nagda, B. A., & Zúñiga, X. (2013). *Dialogue across difference: Practice, theory, and research on intergroup dialogue*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Sage.

- Kerr, S. (1975). On the folly of rewarding A, while hoping for B. *Academy of Management Journal*, 18(4), 769–783.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice Hall.
- Littrell, L. N., Salas, E., Hess, K. P., Paley, M., & Riedel, S. (2006). Expatriate preparation: A critical analysis of 25 years of cross-cultural training research. *Human Resource Development Review*, 5(3), 355–388.
- Lough, B. J. (2011). International volunteers' perceptions of intercultural competence. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35(4), 452–464.
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford University Press.
- Paige, R. M., & Vande Berg, M. (2012). Why students are and are not learning abroad. In M. Vande Berg, R. M. Paige, & K. H. Lou (Eds.), *Student learning abroad: What our students are learning, what they're not, and what we can do about it* (pp. 29–58). Stylus.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(5), 751–783.
- Provan, K. G., & Kenis, P. (2008). Modes of network governance: Structure, management, and effectiveness. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(2), 229–252.
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Stahl, G. K., Maznevski, M. L., Voigt, A., & Jonsen, K. (2010). Unraveling the effects of cultural diversity in teams: A meta-analysis of research on multicultural work groups. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41(4), 690–709.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.