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Abstract

There is an undisputed need for intercultural and world knowledge, skills and abilities, and a growing focus and interest in education abroad as a vehicle for achieving these learning outcomes. In an effort to advance the understanding of international education and explore specific aspects of short-term education abroad programs, a large and growing segment, this study focuses on how students are prepared, and the intercultural learning and engagement outcomes that result from the experience. This study used a mixed methods, pretest-posttest control group design with 3 groups of students – 2 that studied abroad and received different pre-departure orientations and 1 that remained on campus – as well as data from Hammer’s (2003) Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), student journals, trip reports and personal interviews. Qualitative data were used to illustrate the quantitative findings and more fully express the results.
Much can be drawn from the results of this study. The trend for each of the research questions was in the predicted direction. The analysis of the posttest Developmental Orientation (DO) scores and DO stages for each student group indicate that students who participated in semester-length pre-departure orientations had the highest net intercultural development gains among the three groups. The 2 study abroad groups combined achieved a larger gain than the on-campus group. While the DO gains were not statistically significant, the DO stage gains were significant between the study abroad and control groups, and between the two groups participating in the different predeparture orientations. The qualitative data seem to support the DO stage findings. Certainly, the constraints of the small size of the groups, the limitations of the design, and the only modest interpretation of the DO stages using a non-parametric test imply that the results of this study should be taken in moderation. The implications of this study are interesting and worth further investigation. They demonstrate the need to better understand education abroad, including the complexity of the individual student experience, the role of faculty and staff in fostering learning outcomes, and pre-departure preparation in developing intercultural competency in undergraduates.
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What nations don’t know can hurt them.

The stakes involved in study abroad are that simple,
that straightforward, and that important.

For their own future and that of the nation,
college graduates today must be
internationally competent.

(Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, 2005)

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

Introduction – Need for International Perspective

Today, there is increasing recognition that skills and competencies for the 21st century must include knowledge of other world regions, cultures and issues; skills in communicating across cultures, including the ability to speak languages other than English; and a sensitivity to and understanding of the values, beliefs and concerns of other cultures and peoples. U.S. students need international knowledge, intercultural communication skills, and global perspective to compete and succeed in, as well as positively contribute to, the interconnected world and global economy of today (Bannister, 2005; Bonfiglio, 1999; Groennings, 1990; Jessie, 2008; Koch, 2008; Leask, 2001; Obst, Bhandari, & Witherell, 2007). Today’s college graduates will face new personal and professional environments. They will likely hold various jobs and even careers and retire from jobs that do not presently exist. As a result, employers today are often looking for qualities and skills, rather than or in addition to knowledge or training in a single field. Communication skills are at the top of the list, along with strong work
ethic, initiative, interpersonal communication competencies, and problem-solving skills (National Association of Colleges and Employers, 2008). These skills and competencies do not develop automatically, but instead require formative experiences in order to advance.

Producing interculturally competent citizens who are capable of engaging in informed, ethical decision making in an increasingly diverse and globally interdependent world is becoming a top educational priority (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Lewin, 2009). The ability to understand diverse perspectives, act and behave in ways that are culturally appropriate for the context, and develop effective relationships across cultures are frequently cited as desired outcomes of college education (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005). International education seeks to prepare students to actively and effectively engage in the global environment of today. Education abroad or study abroad can be viewed as one of the methods many colleges and universities use to help achieve this educational goal. At the same time, there is much to understand regarding the specific educational outcomes of education abroad, particularly as it relates to intercultural development.

International education offers an opportunity to expose the uniqueness of each culture and to gain an appreciation of human variability with the hope that it will lead to mutual respect and improved human interaction (Epstein, 1998). It may also help learners to think more clearly about many of their own assumptions and values, as well as help to open their minds to alternative perspectives. Arguably, openness is necessary for leaders in our globally interdependent world in order to develop sustainable ways of living that include all people as well as the natural environment. A global leader in his own right,
Vaclav Havel (1997) argues that we are all part of a global society on this earth and have a responsibility to all cultures.

In an effort to explore the linkage between education abroad and the development of intercultural understanding, this study focuses on the most popular type of education abroad program today, short-term study abroad. This study specifically examines the relationship between predeparture preparations programs and the development of intercultural competency in U.S. undergraduate students. In other words, the potential link between specific international education programs and students’ intercultural development will be explored. A key consideration for this researcher is how students are prepared for a study abroad experience, and the learning and developmental outcomes that result.

*Internationalization of Higher Education*

In the 1990s, many scholars argued that international perspective and understanding was an undisputed goal of nearly all undergraduate degree programs in the U.S. (Bonfiglio, 1999; Groennings, 1990). In recent times, a push to increase students’ international perspectives is evidenced by additions and changes to the curriculum, study abroad/exchange programs, and international student services offered by most U.S. institutions of higher education.

In a recent national survey of over 1,000 individuals found that the vast majority of Americans (over 90%) believe that learning about cultures from around the world is an important part of preparing for a global society, and ensuring that future generations have the skills and knowledge needed for a more interconnected world. Similarly, 92% of the respondents indicate that knowledge of foreign languages enhances job competitiveness.
for future generations. More than three quarters of Americans (77%) value educational programs that permit students to live and study in another culture abroad. Even more (85%) value the opportunity for U.S. students to interact with international students from around the world. In short, Americans strongly believe that it is important for their children to learn other languages, study abroad, attend colleges where they can interact with international students, learn about other countries and cultures, and generally be prepared for a global age (NAFSA: Association of International Educators, 2006).

In 2002, the American Council on Education (ACE) conducted a survey to examine public attitudes about international education and whether they had changed since September 11, 2001 (Siaya, Porcelli, & Green, 2002). The study found that interest in and support for international education and language training remains very high among students, faculty and the general public. At the same time, support levels decreased when respondents were asked how likely they would be to encourage a family member to participate in study abroad. This gap is not fully understood and may include barriers to participation such as funding, curricular flexibility or fear. The gap between beliefs and action will need to be addressed if the US is to sustain and increase participation in education abroad programs.

From a higher education competitiveness point of view, more and more students are evaluating the international opportunities that institutions offer and it is becoming an important factor in the choice process (Engle & Engle, 2003). A high proportion of students want the college they attend to offer a wide range of international experiences and opportunities from internships and study abroad programs, to courses on international topics and opportunities to interact with students from other countries. A recent study of
over 1,500 high school seniors conducted by the American Council on Education (ACE), Art & Science Group, and the College Board found that college-bound high school students' interest in study abroad and other international learning experiences while in college is strong (Green, Hesel, & Bartini, 2008). The study found that 55% of college-bound students say they are certain or fairly certain they will participate in study abroad. Moreover, the study reveals that many students come to college with more internationally diverse backgrounds and experiences with 61% having traveled in another country with their families; 31% have an immediate family member who moved from another country to the United States; and 26% say the primary language spoken in their home is not English. The study suggests that institutions that do not encourage and expand international learning experiences may find themselves at an increasing disadvantage in enrolling the current generation of students and satisfying their strong desires for a truly global college education. In addition to simply offering a variety of programs, Engle and Engle (2003) believe that institutions will have to demonstrate the value of their international offerings as this becomes an increasingly important factor for students and families.

At the same time, many agree that the typical undergraduate curricula are not meeting student or industry needs when it comes to the development of international and intercultural competency. In general, there is a gap between the identified educational goals of many degree programs and the actual outcomes (Arpan & Kwok, 2002; Kwok, Arpan, & Folks, 1994; Porter & McKibben, 1988). Outcomes such as critical thinking, intercultural communication skills, emotional intelligence, and leadership ability are challenging to assess. In the increasingly complex and global interdependent environment
into which students will enter the workforce, a greater understanding of the role and impact of internationalization on learning in higher education is important.

Leadership in international education is vital as U.S. colleges and universities move forward into this new century. If the Western world is to continue playing the leadership role in the educational environment, a more comprehensive understanding of our world may be essential. Effective and moral leadership requires an understanding of the complete and complex context in which all constituents endeavor to live and thrive.

Organizations are facing an increasingly complex environment, and human resource selection and preparation for global assignments is an important and growing consideration for success (Shaffer, Gregersen, Harrison, Black, & Ferzandi, 2006).

The very nature of the undergraduate curriculum should be global in perspective. Absolutely essential to leadership outside of one’s own cultural group is an understanding of the diverse perspectives involved. The undergraduate experience should provide the opportunity to critically examine the assumptions of Western thought and practice and encourage comparative analysis with other cultures and ways of being. This would also support the development of skills and abilities called for by today’s organizations. Again, study abroad and other international experiences may help to achieve this balance and perspective. However, we need a more in-depth understanding of the types of programs that may have the greatest impact.

Tweed and Lehman (2002) assert that students would ideally be able to shift learning styles to match the cultural environment, and that such multicultural learners may have an advantage in today’s global environment. Arguably, institutions, faculty and staff could gain an advantage, as well as demonstrate leadership by developing
sensitivities and flexibility to adapt and integrate learning systems to accommodate, and even develop, diverse learning styles.

Current Overview of Education Abroad

Travel abroad for educational reasons has been an important part of American life for some time. During the 18th and 19th centuries, students from the US traveled to Europe to round out their education. They commonly enrolled in European universities or made a “grand tour,” traveling to broaden their outlooks and enrich their minds rather than for specific traditional instruction (H. E. Wilson, 1956; H. E. Wilson & Wilson, 1963). Travel during this time was generally limited to the economically advantaged and was personally arranged and financed. Most leading academic personalities in the first century and a half of U.S. existence were European-experienced, either through formal training or extended sojourns. During the 20th century, things started to change and students were motivated to travel because of international events. More formal organization of study abroad came after WWI, especially in some of the more exclusive women’s liberal arts colleges (Weidner, 1962) where a year abroad in Western Europe in the junior year was popular. Education abroad has moved well beyond the traditional “junior year abroad” and now includes programs of different durations, themes and focus (Obst et al., 2007).

The internationalization of higher education surged in popularity during the 1990s on many U.S. campuses (Bonfiglio, 1999; Groennings, 1990; Vestal, 1994). Today, the number of programs is still growing significantly. For example, a database of education abroad programs produced by the Institute for International Education called IIEPassport
(www.iiepassport.org) logged 2,000 programs in 1986 to over 7,500 listings for the 2007 edition (Obst et al., 2007).

Today, education abroad offerings by U.S. institutions take a variety of forms including traditional study abroad at foreign institutions, university-organized and led study abroad, and cultural immersion programs, to name only a few (Arum, 1987; Leask, 2001; Vestal, 1994). Programs often differ in terms of length, location, size, eligibility, and purpose. They also differ in the amount of intercultural interaction to which participants are exposed, the requirement of a second language, faculty and institutional participation, whether academic credit is awarded, and where participants stay, among other things. Engle and Engle (2003) advocate for a level-based classification system for study abroad that would clearly distinguish categories of program design. The system would not be based on judgmentally subjective notions of quality, but upon comparable objective criteria such as program length, language of study, required linguistic and cultural competence for admission, and so forth. A standard system in the field may guide both understanding of research currently targeting a vast array of program types, as well as student advising to achieve their personal, professional and academic goals within the same sea of options. This is certainly a challenging proposition as the field continues to grow and innovate with new program models and locations.

U.S. campuses, government agencies, corporations and other organizations increasingly work toward increasing participation in education abroad programs (Obst et al., 2007). There is an ever growing number of U.S. college students who participate in education abroad programs. According to Open Doors, for the 2006-2007 academic year, approximately 241,800 U.S. students studied abroad. While participation has grown
considerably in the past 2 decades—150% increase since 1995-1996 and 360% since 1985-1986—total participation still represents less than one percent of all students enrolled in U.S. higher education (Bhandari & Chow, 2007). Table 1 provides data on participation levels from 1957 to the latest survey data. These data do not include the variety of other education abroad experiences (e.g., immersions, internships, service) that may not be credit bearing, and for which no national survey is available.

Table 1

*Number of U.S. Study Abroad Students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decade comparisons</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-58</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>115.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>55,289</td>
<td>151.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>62,341</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>113,959</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07*</td>
<td>241,791</td>
<td>112.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual comparisons</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>129,770</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>143,590</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>154,168</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>169,920</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>174,629</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>191,321</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>205,983</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>223,534</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>241,791</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 2006-07 is the last year of data available and is just short of a full decade.
Students who study abroad still tend to study in Western Europe. Forty-five percent (45%) go to four countries—United Kingdom, Italy, Spain and France, in that order. At the same time, there is considerable growth in other regions. The data suggest that U.S. students are increasingly studying abroad in destinations that offer linguistic, cultural and professional experience in emerging global markets. There is also a gender gap in study abroad with females consistently participating at about twice the rate as males--females average 65.5% while males only 34.5% (Bhandari & Chow, 2007).

Studies of the gender gap in education abroad have not revealed consistent results and recent studies (Guerin, 2009, January 30; Salisbury, Umbach, Paulsen, & Pascarella, 2009) offer several hypotheses that might explain why woman are much more likely to go abroad than men:

— Majors that appeal to men, such as mathematics and the sciences, are less common to study abroad than are those that appeal to women, such as languages and the humanities.

— Men may be more influenced by their peers or advice from parents to stay stateside than are women due to their level of maturity and development.

— Men tend to have more athletic or financial commitments that keep them on campus than do women.

— Men have less experience in international travel and work.

— Men also may be more interested in career paths that do not typically include international travel.

— Men have fewer integrative learning experiences across the first year of undergraduate education and possibly during the last years of high school.
Short-term programs serve the largest number of Americans studying abroad, comprising more than half (55%) of all U.S. students who participate. The Open Doors survey defines short-term as any program of less than 8 weeks. This includes summer or intersession terms between traditional semesters, sometimes referred to as J-terms as they typically occur in January. Mid-length programs (one semester, one quarter or two quarters), which allow for deeper immersion into host cultures and increased opportunity for language acquisition, attract just over 40% of all study abroad students. Very few students, only 4%, spend a full academic or calendar year abroad. Fifteen years ago, that number would have been 14% (Bhandari & Chow, 2007; Chin, 2004; Chin & Bhandari, 2006; Davis, 1998, 1999, 2002; Institute of International Education, 1961). Table 2 provides an overview of the participation rates in programs by length (Bhandari & Chow, 2007).

Table 2

Duration of Study Abroad by Institutional Type, 2006/07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution type</th>
<th>Short-term</th>
<th>Mid-length</th>
<th>Long-term</th>
<th>Total students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>141,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>54,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>36,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>241,791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In a recent survey of institutions, 53.7% indicated that the primary growth area for education abroad at their institution would be “short-term programs sponsored by my institution” (Gutierrez, Auerbach, & Bhandari, 2009).

Much of the debate on duration of study abroad is centered around the value of short-term programs in relation to other, longer-term programs. Short-term programs do not provide the same opportunity for immersion (intimate contact with host culture) and language learning. At the same time, short-term programs address some of the challenges to access for students (e.g., fit with academic program, cost, schedules) and have played an important role in increasing the popularity of and participation rates of study abroad, offering international study opportunities to students who might otherwise have been unable to participate in longer programs. Students studying abroad for a shorter period of time may also have the same expectations as students on long-term programs (Pitts, 2007, May). Given that much of the growth and overall participation in study abroad is in the short-term arena, it is critical to understand the best way for institutions to maximize the learning potential from these experiences (Chieffo & Griffiths, 2009).

The Institute of International Education (IIE) conducted another recent study that focused on the host country capacity for increasing U.S. study abroad (Gutierrez, Bhandari, & Obst, 2008). Foreign institutions that participated in the research project indicated that the greatest capacity to receive more international students, including those from the US, is in the longer-term programs that last at least a semester to a full academic year. Some countries have national-level internationalization policies to attract full-degree international students or those enrolled in longer-term programs and have developed offerings accordingly. This prioritization goes counter to the trend toward
short-term programs and presents a tension between this trend and worldwide capacity. The IIE report argues that more research is needed on existing constraints and how model programs and initiatives can be expanded into larger, more comprehensive approaches (Obst et al., 2007).

In this environment of increasing international participation and interest, a study by the Center for International Initiatives at the American Council on Education finds a mixed picture of progress and decline (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008). Green and her colleagues collected data from more than 2,500 U.S. colleges and universities in 2001 and 2006. These surveys represent the only comprehensive source of data on internationalization of U.S. higher education institutions (Koch, 2008). The limited data regarding internationalization of U.S. higher education is itself additional evidence of the need for more research and measureable outcomes.

At the most basic levels, there were some strong indicators of increasing internationalization. There was a major jump in the number of institutions offering study abroad opportunities from 65% in 2001 to 91% in 2006. Fifty-eight percent (58%) supported faculty-led study abroad programs, up 8% from 2001. There were also increases in the offerings of international internships, service opportunities, and field study from 2001 (Green, Luu et al., 2008). Table 3 provides an overview of participation rates for the 2 years of data collected.
Table 3

*Education Abroad Program Offerings at U.S. Institutions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program type</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools offering education abroad</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-led programs</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field study</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N > 2,500 colleges and universities*

While advances have been achieved, the data also suggest that U.S. institutions are making slow and uneven progress toward comprehensive internationalization. For example, offerings in education abroad have increased dramatically, yet participation rates remain relatively low. Even though the vast majority of schools report offering education abroad programs, over 25% of the schools still report no students studying abroad, and nearly half (46%) indicated less than 5% of the graduates had done so. This would suggest that even though the majority of schools offer programs, it does not necessarily result in higher participation rates.

There is also evidence of rather limited commitment to internationalization based on both institutional policy and practice. The most recent report indicates that only 39% of universities make a specific reference to international or global education in their mission statements, and just 34% list it among their top five strategic priorities (though up from 28% in the 2001 survey). Less than 25% had a separate plan that addresses internationalization across the institution (Green, Luu et al., 2008).

In another study of the membership of The Forum on Education Abroad (The Forum), 58% reported international education was included in the mission statements of
their institutions, this was up 4% from a similar survey in 2006 (Whalen, 2008). The difference in these findings and those of Green et al. may be attributed to the institutions participating in the later survey. The Forum is a professional organization whose exclusive purpose is to serve the field of education abroad, and its membership includes more than 350 institutions that together account for approximately 90% of U.S. students studying abroad (Whalen, 2009). In spite of serving the majority of participating students, the Forum surprisingly found that most member schools (63%) do not set specific targets for increasing education abroad enrollments (Whalen, 2008). It is also telling that the survey did not ask about targets beyond participation rates such as levels of international knowledge or intercultural sensitivity. Of course, while strategic plans and mission statements do not guarantee effort or results toward a particular goal, the articulations of these specifics would appear critical to broad and deep internationalization.

The survey data also shed light on related areas such as specific degree requirements. For example, only 23% of all institutions required foreign language for admission, an increase of only 2% from 2001. There was a decrease in a foreign language requirement for study from 2001 to 2006, down from 53% to 45%. Also, fewer institutions required a course with an international or global focus within their general education or common curriculum requirement—again down from 41% in 2001 to 37% in 2006. Of the institutions with a global course requirement, only half have a non-Western focus or theme, down from 62% in 2001 (Green, Luu et al., 2008).

In 2004, Congress formed the Lincoln Commission to evaluate the possibility of dramatically increasing the number of Americans studying abroad. The report notes how providing more students with international experience is critical to America’s
competitiveness and national security, and argued for aggressive goals of sending one million students abroad each year (Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, 2005). The Commission recommended:

— Providing more access to study abroad through scholarships
— Increasing participation in quality study abroad programs
— Encouraging diversity in student participation in study abroad
— Diversifying locations of study abroad, particularly in developing countries

In The Forum survey, while few set specific targets, 75% of member colleges and universities reported that they are actively trying to send a greater number of students abroad (Whalen, 2008).

Some countries or regions have developed infrastructure to support education abroad (e.g., European Union with ERASMUS). The US does not have a national-level program to promote education abroad. The Lincoln Commission argued that national leadership and support is essential to increase participation, and it challenged campuses to plan for the resources and structures to prepare and send students overseas. The report also urged that “the most demanding quality control be a second defining characteristic of the study abroad experiences” (2005, p. xi). This charges schools to not only develop capacity, but also to ensure learning outcomes. In other words, the push to increase participation rates should not be at the expense of quality learning experiences.

An increasingly popular concept in internationalization is the idea of curriculum integration. This refers to the growing effort by universities across the US to integrate education abroad into the undergraduate curriculum. At the campus level, this often means collaboration between the international programs office and academic units.
Integration refers to the ways that education abroad becomes part of the curricular program. In other words, education abroad should be more than an embellishment to the traditional curricula. Rather, it should be designed to support international education goals, such as facilitating international and intercultural engagement and understanding. In 2005, The Forum published a broad, introductory survey of curriculum integration practices (Woodruff, Gladding, Knutson, & Stallman, 2005). One of the goals of this professional organization is the promotion of coherent views and effective implementation of curriculum design for education abroad. A preliminary survey was conducted to identify the most common methods of integration. Members of The Forum were then asked to identify the use of the following methods in the baseline survey:

- requiring education abroad to complete a degree,
- accepting education abroad credits toward degree requirements (general education, major or minor),
- faculty or staff including education abroad options when advising students on degree requirements,
- including education abroad information in materials about a particular major or minor (printed and Web),
- courses that include/require an education abroad experience,
- education abroad is considered in curriculum committees, creation of new academic programs, and academic program reviews, and
- students going abroad are required to take a credit bearing predeparture or reentry course.
The most popular methods of integration currently used by The Forum member institutions are counting credits toward degree requirements with 91% reporting usually or always following this practice. Conversely, over 75% of schools report never or rarely requiring education abroad credits to complete a degree, and nearly 90% never or rarely requiring students going abroad to take a for-credit predeparture or reentry course. About half the schools usually or always consider education abroad in curriculum committees, or in the creation or review of academic programs. Advising for education abroad is usually or always included in reviewing degree requirements by 39% of institutions, while 45% report sometimes including it in advising (Woodruff et al., 2005). This study demonstrates that education abroad is still rather limited in terms of a truly integrated approach to curriculum design or comprehensive internationalization.

Overall, international education and education abroad in particular, presents a mixed picture. On one hand, it seems clear that there is agreement on the needs for developing international and global perspectives and skills, and the role that international education can play in it. At the same time, there is much work to be done in both institutionalizing and integrating this into higher education today. Groenning’s (1990) statement on the internationalization of higher education still rings true today:

Like the scientific revolution, internationalization is leading to a ubiquitous, pervasive and permanent redirection of the intellectual framework. Yet, like the early scientific revolution, it is a disorderly development, lacking clear definition, boundaries, and agreement. It is a many-splendored chaos with momentum, and it is cross-disciplinary. (p. 29)
Vestal describes international education in the US as a “giant mosaic” representing all of the institutions, programs, and individuals who contribute to the total picture. The pieces appear to have been set in the wall at random. There is little or no relationship between the tiles. Many stand in isolation—sometimes exceptional, but most just lonely and disconnected (1994).

**Rationale for the Current Research**

There is general recognition that international and intercultural skills and understanding are important in today’s environment, and that higher education has a role to play. At the same time, identifying how and when to address these learning outcomes, as well as how and when to assess them is a major challenge. Internationalization, in general, and education abroad, more specifically, are often considered important resources to address the global skills challenge. Full integration of education abroad into the overall 4-year undergraduate educational process is a key topic in international education.

There has also been an important shift in mobility patterns of American college students who study abroad. Participation rates are growing and the majority of them are engaging in short-term programs. The popularity of these programs shows no sign of diminishing and is likely to continue growing in the future (Chieffo & Griffiths, 2009). Colleges and universities will need to understand the role that short-term programs can play to meet the educational needs of the future.

From a scholarship point of view, education abroad, including its pedagogy and curriculum development, is still a relatively new field. Albeit growing, relatively few questions have been asked in this realm, and fewer still have been advanced by research.
contributions, both quantitative and qualitative (Chieffo & Griffiths, 2009). Much of the research targets the subjective student experience, while little focus is on objective research using theory-based valid and reliable instruments. It seems clear that educators are trying new ideas and interest in the area is growing. Professionals in the field now speak more frequently about language acquisition, intercultural competence, learning outcomes and assessment methods, rather than a simple appraisal using numbers of participant students. This is an important shift in focus on quality over quantity (Engle & Engle, 2003). Now there should be a focus toward a more formal qualitative and quantitative research approach to heighten understanding of specific program models and their outcomes. McLeod and Wainwright (2009) argue that “although it may be easy to believe that experiencing other cultures in all their richness will have a positive effect on these areas of a student’s life, the kind of face validity that we currently have is a poor substitute for reliable and valid research evidence to substantiate this assumption” (p. 67).

If the goal of higher education is not only the development of career or professional skills, but also intellectual and moral capacities, exposure to different cultures, experiences, and ways of thinking may be essential. It is important to understand the role higher education plays in our increasingly global society by examining the theories and underlying assumptions of its policies and practices. In particular, it is critical to understand the internationalization of institutions of higher education in the US and their role in providing learning opportunities to students that link theory and practice for a deeper understanding of the world. Rationale for international expansion typically focuses on economic or career/professional goals that prepare students for the global
workplace, while little emphasis is placed on the developmental aspects of international education (Gmelch, 1997). Perhaps such grounding is needlessly thin.

A better understanding of how international education transforms students’ understanding of the world might even have a reciprocal effect. Understanding the effects could itself deepen the justification for internationalization and more urgently demand that educators develop comprehensive strategic approaches to the internationalization process that integrates curricular changes, faculty development, extracurricular programming, partnerships, and community outreach efforts. The strategic approach should include the balance between theory and practice, coupled with the development of effective international pedagogy and extracurricular programming that meet the needs of today’s increasingly diverse student population.

Shealy (2005) argues that the need to understand the role of beliefs and values is one of the most important lessons from the last century—and the beginning of this one—to realize a more peaceful and sustainable 21st century.

Values and beliefs should be understood across the entire range of human functioning, from the private and public justifications we harbor for the perpetration of violence against others, to the way we treat and regard societies, cultures, and religions different from our own, to our attitude and subsequent actions vis-à-vis the protection and sustenance of planet earth. That human beings (and the governing systems created by them) make statements about their beliefs and values to legitimize, explain, or otherwise justify behavior—mundane and extraordinary—can hardly be contested. (p. 88)
As the field of international education matures, and if internationalization is to become integral to the mission of U.S. institutions, it becomes more important to determine specific outcomes of various types of international opportunities. Scholars (Engle & Engle, 2003; Vande Berg, 2003) are advancing that we need to commit ourselves to identifying and documenting the educational outcomes of students while they are abroad, rather than focus on simple measures of participation rates. Vande Berg (2003) is concerned that

In our zeal to increase access to study abroad, we’ve lost our focus as educators, and have become all too willing to measure success through the very crudest of metrics: the number of students enrolling in programs abroad. It’s time for us to move away from this over-preoccupation with the numbers, and to shift our primary focus from the on-campus marketing, promotion and recruitment of students to the design, delivery and evaluation of quality educational experiences abroad. (p. 24)

Given the increasing focus and growth of international education programs, it is particularly important to identify specific outcomes of distinct programs in order to determine how each program an institution offers will impact undergraduate students and ultimately achieve institutional internationalization and learning goals. In an effort to advance the understanding of international education and explore specific and important aspects of short-term education abroad programs, a key segment of international education, this study focuses on how students are prepared, and the learning and developmental outcomes that result from the experience, particularly in the area of intercultural competency.
Statement of the Problem: Developing Intercultural Competency

College and universities, as well as students and their families, recognize the importance of understanding and engaging in the world. Education abroad is a popular vehicle to foster this and short-term programs are increasingly popular. At the same time, specific learning outcomes are recognized as essential, but rarely established or assessed.

The field must also ensure quality and a growing understanding of learning outcomes of the experience. Research in study abroad, however, often involves student satisfaction or perceptions. Many studies focus on one study abroad program. Few studies attempt to measure specific outcomes or compare the outcomes among program types. Likewise, few schools require a predeparture or reentry course to prepare students for an education abroad experience (Chieffo & Griffiths, 2009; Woodruff et al., 2005).

In particular, what factors involved in international educational experiences promote the development of intercultural competency? Given their popularity, what can be done to maximize the intercultural learning outcomes of short-term education abroad programs? Does predeparture preparation facilitate the learning process and prime the development of a more complex intercultural worldview? Ultimately, answers to these questions may provide policy guidance and direction to institutions of higher education as they continue to develop internationalization strategies.

Ultimately, a better understanding of the learning outcomes that result from education abroad will help determine the types of curricular integration and changes that will maximize an institution’s ability to meet its established goals related to students’ ability to be cognizant and effective in the global environment. It will also better able institutions to assess learning achievements in global and intercultural competence.
Research Questions

This research proposal addresses the need to understand the role of international programming in the undergraduate curriculum by evaluating specific summer study abroad programs. It will look more specifically at the integration of a course-based for-credit predeparture orientation. Both qualitative and quantitative methods will be used to address the following questions:

1. Do students who have participated in short-term summer study abroad (SSA) programs have more developed intercultural competency than students who do not participate in any summer abroad program?
2. Do students who participate in a semester-long credit-bearing predeparture orientation course develop more intercultural competency than those who receive a more traditional 2-day orientation?
3. Is there a difference in the ongoing intercultural engagement of students who participate in SSA programs and those who do not?
4. Is there a difference in the ongoing intercultural engagement of students who participate in the semester-long versus 2-day orientation upon return to the US?

In other words, if students are more prepared for their overseas experience, does that impact their intercultural development, and/or ongoing interest and exploration of intercultural experience in the US? Can preparation and success overseas foster lifelong intercultural exploration?

Summary

International education may provide critical opportunities to achieve learning outcomes for undergraduate students that are established by higher education institutions
of all types. However, it is important to understand the specific outcomes that result from individual programs. Contact with another culture does not necessarily lead to intercultural competence (Pettigrew, 1998; Stephan & Stephan, 2001, 2003).

“Intercultural learning needs reflection of individual and collective social experiences with people from other cultures rather than the mere contact as such” (Otten, 2003, p.15). Exploring how to leverage the potential that summer international programs can have on intercultural development is a starting point.

International experiences may facilitate student transformation by bringing to consciousness taken-for-granted assumptions of knowing, and expanding and revising established ways of thinking, interacting, and learning. Experience is a demanding motivator that guides individual awareness and attitude development in the process of personal growth. Education abroad has the potential to lead to the integration of meaningful and cognitive cultural learning to a greater extent than traditional coursework experiences by directly involving the learner. The ability to make balanced, critical judgments can result from the transformative experience of being confronted with the need to reflect upon, defend and justify the ways of one’s culture and society. The result might be the development of more worldminded, culturally sensitive learners and ultimately leaders.
CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

International education as a field is still relatively young. Research in study abroad often involved student satisfaction or perceptions. Many studies focus on only one study abroad program and few attempt to measure specific outcomes or compare the outcomes among program types. An overview of relevant past studies is included with this review. Moreover, relevant intercultural, epistemological, and moral/ethical frameworks are also presented.

In 2006 and 2008, The Forum polled its members on a variety of issues related to the field. The survey asked respondents to report their most critical education abroad concerns. There is a high degree of consistency between the 2006 and 2008 responses. The priorities for both years are as follows:

1. Academic quality
2. Curriculum integration
3. Program costs and rising costs (tied for #2 in 2008)
4. Adequate preparation of students (tied for #2 in 2008)
5. Parent involvement
6. Need for better funding
7. Disparity between student expectations and the reality of the experience
8. Increasing participation in short-term programs
9. Helping students maximize their experience
10. The commodification of study abroad

This research seeks to understand the linkage between on-campus curriculum via a credit-bearing predeparture orientation course and education abroad experience, and how it might maximize intercultural learning outcomes of a short-term study abroad program. This directly informs priorities # 1, 2, 4, 8 and 9 of faculty and staff who are working in this area.

*International Experience and Education Abroad*

In one of the earliest studies, Leonard (1959) looked at the experiences of students from New York who studied abroad the summer and fall of 1957. He found that the students had a general liberalizing of attitudes, a change of views of foreign culture with greater understanding and less prejudice, greater knowledge of geography, improved language skills, gain in self-confidence and general knowledge of world affairs. Other studies have confirmed these findings. Carlson and Widaman (1988) polled 450 students who went abroad for a year and 800 students who did not. They found that the study abroad experience was a significant factor in development of positive attitudes toward other countries, and that it led to greater concern for international problems, greater interest in cross-cultural activities and better understanding of cultural differences and similarities. They also found that study abroad students were more positive, yet had more critical attitudes toward their own country (the US in this case) than non-study abroad respondents. This reflects the development of greater self and cultural awareness. It also reflects the notion of *Reversal*, a stage in the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) where there is a tendancy to view one’s own culture more critically than others (J. M. Bennett & Bennett, 2004; M. J. Bennett, 1993, 2004; Hammer, 2009c).
More recently, Williams (2005) conducted research to explore the impact of study abroad on students’ intercultural communication skills. In a pre-/posttest design, students who studied abroad for a semester and those who did not took the Cross-cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) and the Intercultural Sensitivity Index (ISI). The results confirmed that students who studied abroad exhibited a greater change in intercultural communication skills than the students who did not (CCAI: $r = .41, r^2 = .17, df = 1, F = 10.02, p = .003$; ISI: $r = .63, r^2 = .39, df = 1, F = 31.19, p = .001$). She also found that exposure to various cultures was the greatest predictor of advanced intercultural communication skills ($r = .54, r^2 = .29, df = 1, F = 19.24, p = .001$). The study design and small group size were limitations, and the ISI showed moderate reliability (.56 pretest and .67 posttest).

Dennis-McCauley (1990) found that study abroad students claimed they were able to achieve a higher degree of learning than at home. They viewed the experience as one of the most valuable cross-cultural learning experiences, transformative in terms of views of world, culture, country, career, travel, self-understanding, self-confidence and beliefs. Kauffmann (1983) determined that participation in study abroad resulted in a personality change. The study abroad experience had the most impact on three dimensions: a gain in reflective thought, increased interest in welfare of others, and increase in self-confidence and well being. He also found changes persisted after one year.

Another study attempted to link education abroad with moral development. Garvey (1992) used both quantitative and qualitative data to examine the relationship between participation in education abroad and moral development. The Defining Issues Test (DIT) was used in a pre/posttest design with students participating in the Semester at
Sea program. The quantitative data of the DIT did not find a statistically significant change in moral development, but qualitative data from student journals indicated a change might have taken place.

Most research, to date, regarding study abroad focuses on participants during predeparture and/or immediately upon return. International experience may take time to process and the full impact may not be known immediately upon return from the experience. Whalen (2003) embarked on a study to measure outcomes of the study abroad experience and to describe the characteristics of learning from study abroad alumni over 3 decades. The purpose of the study was to document what alumni remembered about study abroad, how they remembered it, and assessed the long-term effect of study abroad learning. When asked to recall “memorable events” from their college experience, data showed that study abroad alumni think more about specific events from their abroad experience and reflect more on those events than non-participants do about specific events from their campus experience. Study abroad alumni also report that the memorable events they identified as their study abroad experience continue to make a difference in their lives to a much higher degree than the memorable events of non-participants. He found that study abroad alumni are more likely to report that they continue to learn from reflecting upon and remembering their experience more than campus-based students do.

Paige, Stallman and Josić (2008) are extending the study of study abroad alumni by Whalen and embarking on a large study of over 6,000 former study abroad participants from 22 U.S. colleges, universities and education abroad program providers spanning over 50 years. The emphasis of this study is on the ways in which returnees
become globally engaged during their lives and the degree to which their contributions can be attributed to having studied abroad. These researchers conceptualize global engagement as:

— civic commitments in domestic and international arenas;
— knowledge production of print, artistic, on-line, and digital media;
— philanthropy in terms of volunteer time and monetary donations;
— social entrepreneurship, or organizations whose purpose and/or profits are to benefit the community, and
— the practice of voluntary simplicity in one’s lifestyle.

The preliminary data indicate that a majority of respondents felt that their education abroad experience influenced to a large degree or to some degree their involvement in civic engagement (both domestic and international), voluntary simplicity, knowledge production, social entrepreneurship, educational decisions (advanced degree), and occupation/career choice (Paige et al., 2008). There was a positive and statistically significant relationship between overseas program duration and three of the six global engagement factors: philanthropic donations, political civic engagement (domestic), political civic engagement (international). However, 1% or less of the variance was explained by duration; therefore duration with respect to global engagement matter little according to this research. This study provides strong empirical evidence that undergraduate students who study abroad during their college years become globally engaged in a variety of ways in their future, and many of them credit it to their study abroad experience (Paige et al., 2009, February).
Another large-scale alumni study ($N=2,500$) of high school students who participated in an international exchange and those who did not revealed that those who participated in the international program were more likely to:

- have been encouraged to explore other cultures by their parents,
- to study abroad again during college,
- speak a second (77%) or more than two (30%) languages,
- be more comfortable around other cultures, and
- to have greater intercultural networks and friendships

This study also incorporated the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), which is an instrument used to measure where individuals fall on an intercultural development continuum. The IDI data revealed a small, but significant difference in intercultural development (Hansel, 2008; Hansel & Chen, 2008).

Nearly all these scholars who study education abroad note the need for additional research in the field, as well as the challenges that research in this area can present. Most research focuses on subjective evaluation of the student experience. Few studies use experimental designs with valid and reliable research instruments. Other specific weaknesses in the research include the comparative understanding of various types of models and the educational outcomes they foster or achieve. Many studies deal with only one program and at one school. Specific research on short-term education abroad programs is even more limited. The field of education abroad presents a rich opportunity to advance scholarly knowledge (Chieffo & Griffiths, 2009).
Other related areas, such as acculturation and adaptation, intercultural competency and worldmindedness, which are much broader than study abroad, have been researched more extensively and certainly inform the field.

**Worldmindedness**

Worldmindedness is the extent to which one values a global perspective or perspectives different from one’s own—the extent to which one recognizes and appreciates difference (Sampson & Smith, 1957). Worldminded individuals’ primary reference group is humankind rather than a specific ethnic group. Sampson and Smith (1957) developed a survey instrument to measure World-minded attitudes.

Research on worldmindedness conducted by Boatler (1990, 1992) and Douglas and Jones-Rikkers (2001) addressed the relationship between study abroad and the development of worldmindedness. Douglas and Jones-Rikkers (2001) found that worldmindedness increased as the difference between home and host culture increases. Other studies of worldmindedness and study abroad participants have consistently failed to demonstrate any significant increase after the experience (Boatler, 1990, 1992; Dotson, Tashakori, & Courbois, 1988; Smith, 1955). However, Boatler (1992) suggests that contact with foreign cultures along with cultural awareness content in teaching can produce significant increases in student worldmindedness.

**Adjustment, Acculturation and Adaptation**

Positive social and psychological adjustments abroad are key elements of a successful international experience (Ward & Rana-Deuba, 2000). Acculturation refers to the changes that occur as a result of continuous firsthand contact between people from different cultures (Redfield, Linton, & Herskovits, 1936). The concept of acculturation
was first used in reference to group-level phenomena, primarily by anthropologists and sociologists. In more recent times, the phenomena have been studied by psychologists as an individual variable (Ward, 1996). The concept of cultural distance was first introduced in the 1980s to account for the distress experienced by travelers during the process of acculturation (Babiker, Cox, & Miller, 1980). They originally argued that dissimilarities between cultures of origin and entry accounted for the degree of psychological adjustment problems. Research indicates that a strong relationship between cultural distance and sociocultural adjustment has been consistently observed (Babiker et al., 1980; Searle & Ward, 1990; Ward & Kennedy, 1992, 1993). This is not surprising and can be understood within the context of an underlying assumption that those who experience greater cultural distance experience greater incidences of life changes during cross-cultural transition.

Cross-cultural adaptation, sometimes referred to as culture shock, is the process by which people who are moving to an unfamiliar cultural environment seek to establish a stable, reciprocal, and functional relationship with it (Kim, 2005). It is often considered the stage in which the adaptation process is characterized by frustration, anxiety and inadequacy that comes from the realization that the new culture may be more difficult to navigate than one thought and that it will take time to learn (Ward, 2004). Gudykunst (2005) would argue that “culture shock” need not be construed as a problem, but rather something that is necessary to develop intercultural communicative competence. The affective and physiological impact of the experience transitioning to a new culture has been measured and analyzed in a variety of studies (e.g., Berry, 2005; Black, 1999; Black & Mendenhall, 1990; Shaffer et al., 2006; Ward, Bochner, & Furnham, 2001; Yang,
Noels, & Saumure, 2006). Kim (2005) asserts that the adaptation to another culture occurs through communication and the building of social networks. She was the first scholar to link language immersion and communication to the adaptation process. Cultural immersion, she posits, is generally positively related to language/communication fluency in the host culture, and should be viewed as a combination of adaptability and interaction. She identified three stages: stress, adaptation and growth, and notes that sojourners acquire host cultural practices through acculturation and deculturation simultaneously.

*Intercultural Competence*

Intercultural competence is the ability to establish and maintain relationships; to communicate with minimal loss or distortion; and to collaborate in order to accomplish something of mutual interest or need with individuals or groups from other cultures. It includes four important dimensions of one’s own and other cultures: knowledge, positive attitudes, skills, and awareness (Fantini, 1995; Fantini, Arias-Galicia, & Guay, 2001).

Various studies have shown that intercultural competence is critical to increase understanding between people of different cultural backgrounds, and for successful intercultural relationships. Overseas effectiveness (Brislin, 1981; Kealey & Ruben, 1983; Landis & Bhagat, 1996; Ruben & Kealey, 1979), international management (Adler, 1991; Black & Mendenhall, 1990; Neuhauser & Smith, 1996; Shaffer et al., 2006), international study abroad (Bird, Heinbuch, Dunbar, & McNulty, 1993; Kraft, Ballentine, & Garvey, 1994; Saghafi, 2001), international transfer of technology (Kealey, 1996), and domestic intercultural relations (Gardenswartz & Rowe, 1998) are among the areas in which intercultural understanding has been examined.
Traits such as empathy, open-mindedness, flexibility and tolerance are associated with success in cross-cultural activities (Kealey & Ruben, 1983). Development of these or other traits has not been clearly linked to outcomes of study abroad programs. One study (Ruben & Kealey, 1979) found that those who were not judgmental, were respectful and relativistic in their orientations to knowledge, and tolerant of ambiguity were relatively more effective in an international environment than those who lacked these orientations. Bird, Heinbuch, Dunbar, and McNulty (1993) argue that efficacy in cross-cultural relationships increases with the duration and level of interaction with another culture, and as exposure to non-Western environments increases, confidence and interest in interacting with people from different cultures also increases. Saghafi (2001) contends that exposure to other cultures through international travel reduced ethnocentrism in graduate and undergraduate business students. He also found that students who had been exposed to other cultures through international business courses were less ethnocentric than their contemporaries.

Olsen and Kroeger (2001) studied the relationships between international experience, global competencies and levels of intercultural sensitivity in university administrators, faculty and staff. They used the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (J. M. Bennett & Bennett, 2004; M. J. Bennett, 1986, 1993) framework and defined global competency as a person that has “enough substantive knowledge, perceptual understanding, and intercultural communication skills to effectively interact in our globally interdependent world” (Olsen & Kroeger, 2001, p. 117). This definition was based on the work of Wilson, Stohl, Singer and Hanvey (Hanvey, 1982, 2001, 2004; Singer, 1998; Stohl, 1996; A. H. Wilson, 1996). Olsen and Kroeger found that second-
language proficiency and substantive experience abroad (more than 3 months) increased the likelihood of a more advanced level of intercultural sensitivity. However, the results cannot be generalized as the number of participants was small (N=52). They further argue that we need to understand the educator’s role in developing these understandings and skills (2001).

*Developmental Frameworks*

There are several developmental frameworks that are useful to consider and inform our understanding of this research. First, I will review frameworks of intercultural maturity, sensitivity and competence. The latter is the foundation on which the instrument used in this research was developed. Next, I review several broader, related frameworks related to values and ethics.

*Developmental trajectory of Intercultural Maturity.* One approach to how we might develop a deeper understanding of other cultures is the model developed by King and Baxter Magolda (2005). This model asserts that intercultural maturity occurs when people become “increasingly capable of understanding and acting in ways that are interculturally aware and appropriate (p. 573)” It integrates three major domains of development and their interconnectedness—cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal—which are derived from Kegan’s (1994) model of lifespan development.

The cognitive dimension relates to how an individual constructs a view and develops a system for making meaning (e.g., understanding of cultural difference). The intrapersonal involves one’s own beliefs, values, and self-identity, and how these guide individual choices (e.g., capacity to accept and not feel threatened by cultural difference). The interpersonal focuses on relationships to and with other people, and how this impacts
social interactions (e.g., capacity to function interdependently with diverse others). Kegan argues that the cognitive, interpersonal and intrapersonal dimensions are essential.

King and Baxter Magolda also integrate existing theories of human development and prior research on student development and intercultural competence into what they call a developmental trajectory of intercultural maturity. It has not yet been subject to empirical analysis, but provides an interesting way of framing and aligning this work. Table 4, adopted from King and Baxter Magolda (2005), provides an outline of the developmental levels at the cognitive, interpersonal and intrapersonal stages and offers references to prior research.

Understanding diverse worldviews and accepting ambiguity requires cognitive complexity (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005). Perry (1981), Baxter Magolda (2001), and King and Kitchener (2004) all agree that early stages of cognitive development can be characterized by concrete thinking and belief in absolute knowledge. Later stages are more complex and are developed in a context which draws judgments from one’s own experience as well as other sources of information and perspectives. This seems to indicate that cognitive complexity is a prerequisite for understanding different worldviews.
### Table 4

**A Three-Dimensional Developmental Trajectory of Intercultural Maturity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain of development and related theories</th>
<th>Initial level of development</th>
<th>Intermediate level of development</th>
<th>Mature level of development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Baxter Magolda, 1992, 2001; Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, &amp; Tarule, 1986; M. J. Bennett, 1993; Fischer, 1980; Kegan, 1994; King &amp; Kitchener, 2004; Perry, 1970)</td>
<td>Assumes knowledge is certain and categorizes knowledge claims as right or wrong; is naïve about different cultural practices and values; resists challenges to one’s own beliefs and views differing cultural perspectives as wrong</td>
<td>Evolving awareness and acceptance of uncertainty and multiple perspectives; ability to shift from accepting authority’s knowledge claims to personal processes for adopting knowledge claims</td>
<td>Ability to consciously shift perspectives and behaviors into an alternative cultural worldview and to use multiple cultural frames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrapersonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cass, 1984; Chickering &amp; Reisser, 1993; Cross, 1991; D’Augclli, 1994; Helms, 1995; Josselson, 1996; Kegan, 1994; Marcia, 1980; Parks, 2000; Phinney, 1990; Torres, 2003)</td>
<td>Lack of awareness of one’s own values and intersection of social (racial, class, ethnicity, sexual orientation) identity; lack of understanding of other cultures; externally defined identity yields externally defined beliefs that regulate interpretation of experiences and guide choices; difference is viewed as a threat to identity</td>
<td>Evolving sense of identity as distinct from external others’ perceptions; tension between external and internal definitions prompts self-exploration of values, racial identity, beliefs; immersion in own culture; recognizes legitimacy of other cultures</td>
<td>Capacity to create an internal self that openly engages challenges to one’s views and beliefs and that considers social identities (race, class, gender, etc.) in a global and national context; integrates aspects of self into one’s identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M. J. Bennett, 1993; Chickering &amp; Reisser, 1993; Gilligan, 1993; Kegan, 1994; Kohlberg, 1984; Noddings, 1984)</td>
<td>Dependent relations with similar others is a primary source of identity and social affirmation; perspectives of different others are viewed as wrong; awareness of how social systems affect group norms and intergroup differences is lacking; view social problems egocentrically, no recognition of society as an organized entity</td>
<td>Willingness to interact with diverse others and refrain from judgment; relies on independent relations in which multiple perspectives exist (but are not coordinated); self is often overshadowed by need for others’ approval. Begins to explore how social systems affect group norms and intergroup relations</td>
<td>Capacity to engage in meaningful, interdependent relationships with diverse others that are grounded in an understanding and appreciation for human differences; understanding of ways individual and community practices affect social systems; willing to work for the rights of others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adopted from King and Baxter Magolda, 2005). Reproduced with permission from the *Journal of College Student Development.*
Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity. Another framework is the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS), developed by Milton Bennett (J. M. Bennett & Bennett, 2004; M. J. Bennett, 1986, 1993; Hammer & Bennett, 1998). King and Baxter Magolda (2005) include the DMIS in their meta-model as one of the related theories.

The DMIS was based on Bennett’s observations of people’s experience with cultural difference. He noted that people behaved in some predictable ways as they acquired more intercultural competence (J. M. Bennett & Bennett, 2004; M. J. Bennett, 1986, 1993; Hammer & Bennett, 1998) and that it is not an innate ability (M. J. Bennett, 1993, 2002). At this point, clarification of definitions may be beneficial:

— *Intercultural sensitivity* refers to the ability to discriminate and experience relevant cultural differences

— *Intercultural competence* refers to the ability to think and act in interculturally appropriate ways

— *Cultural worldview* refers to the set of distinctions or the experience of difference and similarity between one culture and another (Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003, pp. 422-423).

A number of variables have been identified as having the ability to impact intercultural sensitivity, including personality traits, and the cognitive, affective, and behavioral characteristics of individuals. Bennett and Hammer suggest that none of these factors alone is sufficient for developing intercultural competence. For example, it is not uncommon to know someone who has a great deal of knowledge about a particular country (cognitive), but who is not very culturally sensitive or competent. Nor is it
uncommon to know someone who can understand and use a culture-specific greeting (behavioral), but who does not have the sensitivity to do it in a culturally appropriate way. Bennett and Hammer believe that the reason for the inconsistency of any of these factors to predict intercultural competence is that individually these characteristics are not sufficient. They argue the variable that is missing is the individual’s cultural worldview perspective, the meaning-making part of an individual’s understanding of difference or commonality (M. J. Bennett, 1986, 1993, 2004; Hammer, 2009c; Hammer et al., 2003).

Bennett (1986, 1993, 2004) offers a six-stage developmental model for intercultural sensitivity that accounts for the sense-making variable. The six stages are represented by two groups: ethnocentric and ethnorelative. In general, individuals in early stages (ethnocentric views) attempt to avoid cultural difference, while those in later stages (ethnorelative views) attempt to seek out and understand cultural differences and commonalities. Individuals move through these stages of development when their experience of cultural difference and commonality deeply shift their cultural perspective or worldview (M. J. Bennett, 1986, 1993, 2004; Hammer, 2009c; Hammer et al., 2003). Figure 1 provides a graphical view of the stages.

![Figure 1. Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS)](image-url)
Bennett’s theory is based on constructivism using a grounded theory approach (Hammer et al., 2003). The constructivist view assumes that experiences are based on how one construes them. The more depth with which one experiences an event, the more complex the construction of it. In intercultural relations, the event becomes the experience of cultural difference.

Grounded theory is a method that is used across various social science disciplines and is well-suited to constructivism. The fundamental assumption of this approach is that the theory must emerge from the data; hence the approach purports to be inductive rather than deductive. Corbin and Strauss (2008), two of its major proponents, define it as a qualitative research method using a systematic set of procedures to develop an inductively derived grounded theory about a phenomenon. The intent is to develop an account of a phenomenon that identifies the major constructs or categories, their relationships, and the context and process resulting in a theory that is much more than a descriptive account.

This model offers a structure under which developmental stages in the recognition of cultural difference can be viewed. The DMIS assumes that construing cultural difference can become part of one’s worldview. Hammer et al. (2003) argue that as intercultural sensitivity increases, so does the potential for intercultural competence. Generally, people do not move in both directions on cultural orientation. “The crux of the development of intercultural sensitivity is obtaining the ability to construe (and thus to experience) cultural difference in more complex ways” (p. 423). King and Baxter Magolda (2005) note that Bennett’s model specifically addresses the cognitive complexity needed to develop intercultural competence.
Intercultural Development Continuum. Intercultural competence is the capability to accurately understand and adapt behavior to cultural difference and commonality (Hammer, 2009c). It reflects the degree to which cultural differences and commonalities in values, expectations, beliefs, and practices are effectively bridged. It also indicates the ability to operate in an inclusive environment where cultural differences are addressed from a “mutual adaptation” point of view (Hammer, 2009b).

People differ in their capabilities to recognize and effectively respond to cultural differences and commonalities. The Intercultural Development Continuum (IDC) emerged from empirical data collected from the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) which was originally based on the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) proposed by Bennett (1993). While similar to the DMIS, Hammer (2009c) used data from the IDI to further refine the developmental orientations. He also positions the continuum within a more 21st century framework of our global society using a reference of monocultural to intercultural mindsets. This continuum indicates that individuals who have a more intercultural mindset have a greater capability for responding effectively to cultural differences and recognizing and building upon true commonalities. This also speaks to a world in which technology and communication, as well as the diaspora of people and cultures is dynamic and changing. Table 5 provides an overview of the characteristics of monocultural and intercultural mindsets (Hammer, 2009b).
Table 5

*Characteristics of Monocultural and Intercultural Mindsets*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monocultural</th>
<th>Intercultural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Makes sense of cultural differences and commonalities based on one’s own cultural values and practices</td>
<td>— Makes sense of cultural differences and commonalities based on one’s own and other culture’s values and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Uses broad stereotypes to identify cultural difference</td>
<td>— Uses cultural generalizations to recognize cultural difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Supports less complex perceptions and experiences of cultural difference and commonality</td>
<td>— Supports more complex perceptions and experiences of cultural difference and commonality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted from IDI Individual Report (Hammer, 2009b)

The first stage of the IDC is *denial* which occurs when individuals are isolated from other views and their own cultural view is unchallenged. Individuals in this orientation are likely to recognize more observable cultural differences (e.g., food, dress) but may not notice deeper cultural difference (e.g., conflict resolution styles, tolerance for uncertainty). This orientation can be characterized within two areas—*disinterest* and *avoidance*. An individual may benignly neglect cultural difference and give superficial statements of tolerance toward outsiders, or often have a lack of interest or even avoidance of cultural difference. As experience with cultural difference occurs, an individual begins to establish categories for understanding cultural difference which leads to the next orientation.

*Polarization* is a judgmental orientation that views cultural differences in terms of an us-them worldview. This can take two forms—*defense* or *reversal*. Both maintain the
hierarchical value of one culture over another, and negative stereotypes of the other can sometimes play a role. Defense occurs when there is recognition of other views, but there is an uncritical view toward one’s own cultural values and practices, and a critical evaluation of others. Reversal is the opposite of defense with an overly critical orientation toward one’s own and an uncritical view toward other cultural values and practices. The difference here is that the positive view is shifted to another culture which is viewed as superior to one’s own. This can occur when one has experienced a positive, but limited view of another culture and begins to recognize the negative elements of her/his own. Both denial and polarization represent monocultural orientations where one’s own culture is the fundamental reference point for understanding the world.

As the experience with other cultures continues, one moves into a transitional worldview (Hammer, 2009c). Individuals with a minimization orientation recognize, appreciate, and are respectful toward cultural differences of which they are aware. In other words, cultural differences are fit into culturally familiar categories that highlight cultural similarities and universal values and principles. At the same time, the overarching view of commonalities may mask deeper recognition and appreciation of cultural differences. The definition of the commonality or universal principle can be unconsciously defined by the individual in her/his cultural terms (e.g., expressions of regret/apology, definitions of honesty). This can often take one of two forms. The first, highlighting commonality that masks equal recognition of cultural differences due to less cultural self-awareness, is more commonly experienced among the majority members within a cultural community. The second, highlighting commonalities that masks recognition of cultural differences that functions as a strategy for navigating values and
practices largely determined by the dominant culture group, is more commonly experienced among non-dominant group members within a larger cultural community (Hammer, 2009a).

Understanding the impact of one’s own cultural perspective can create conditions for moving into a more intercultural orientation. As individuals deepen their perceptions of and openness to other cultures, as well as increase their ability to evaluate one’s own cultural values, an acceptance orientation can emerge. Bennett (2004) states that “resolution of the issue of value relativity and commitment allows you to take the perspective of another culture without losing your own perspective” (p. 70).

Acceptance is the first of the intercultural stages in which cultural differences and commonalities are both recognized and respected. Differences here are seen as necessary and preferable in human existence, while understanding and appreciating the commonalities that we share. At this stage, there is an understanding of the impact of culture on both one’s own and others’ behavior. In this stage, there is a greater self-awareness and understanding that while individuals can be equally human, cultural differences and similarities are complex and impact our understanding of the world. As individuals shift their worldview to this orientation, the importance of behavior, and ways of thinking and feeling are recognized, setting the conditions for the next orientation of intercultural competence.

Adaptation is characterized by a heightened sensitivity to another culture or an ability to empathize and sensitively interact with the reality of another. Here, a person consciously tries to take the other’s perspective, and may be able to shift his/her frame of reference. As a result, individuals in adaptation are more effective at interacting with
people from other cultures. This shift might include *behavioral* as well as *cognitive* aspects. In this stage, concerns for being authentic within another culture can emerge. Individuals at this stage have a sincere and deep capacity to understand and be in another cultural context. Hammer argues that people at both the acceptance and adaptation stages are able to obtain desirable levels of intercultural competence.

Figure 2 graphically represents the IDC.

**Intercultural Development Continuum**

![Intercultural Development Continuum](image)

*Modified from the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS), M. Bennett, 1986*

Figure 2: Intercultural Development Continuum

*Intercultural Development Inventory.* The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) is a statistically reliable and cross-culturally valid measure of intercultural competency. It was developed by Hammer in 1988 and originally based on Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) and then refined using the Intercultural Development Continuum (IDC). It is a 50-item questionnaire with responses to statements made on a 5-point agree-disagree scale. The IDI has been translated into 12
languages, using a rigorous back translation method. Back translation is the process of
translating a document that has already been translated into another language back to the
original language by an independent translator to ensure the quality of the translation
process.

The IDI has been psychometrically tested and determined to be a robust cross-
culturally generalizable, valid and reliable assessment of an individual’s or group’s core
orientations toward cultural difference (Hammer, 1999, 2007, 2009c; Hammer et al.,
2003; Paige, Jacobs-Cassuto, Yershova, & DeJaeghere, 2003). Validation of the IDI is
based on confirmatory factory analysis, reliability analysis, and construct validity tests.

Hammer recently conducted an even more comprehensive testing of the IDI with
a large sample of 4,763 respondents across a wide range of cultures, age groups and
professions (Hammer, 2007). Tests on the latest version provide confirmatory support for
seven scales and two composite scales for the IDI. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA)
allowed for empirical differences between the Denial and Defense orientation and
between Acceptance and Adaptation, which were combined under earlier versions of the
IDI. Additional analysis indicated no systematic differences were found by gender, age,
or educational level, providing further evidence of the robustness and generalizability of
the measure. Finally, there was no significant correlation of the IDI scales to social
desirability.

Two composite scores of the IDI are Perceived Orientation and Developmental
Orientation. The *Perceived Orientation* (PO) score reflects where the individual or group
places itself along the continuum of monocultural to intercultural mindsets. The
*Developmental Orientation* (DO) score uses a weighted formula to identify the primary
orientation along the continuum, or the perspective that is most likely to be employed in situations involving cultural difference.

The *Cultural Disengagement*\(^1\) (CD) score was identified as a new and distinct dimension which is not considered part of the continuum, but is an important aspect of how people relate to their own and other cultures. It reflects a level of disconnectedness or alienation one feels from his/her own cultural group. This can arise from a variety of experiences, including adaptation to one or more new cultures, or an experience of being rejected or made to feel as an outsider (J. M. Bennett & Bennett, 2004). Table 6 provides an overview of the most recent IDI scales with their respective reliabilities and number of items associated with each.

Table 6

*IDI V3 Scales and Reliabilities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversal</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural disengagement</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived orientation</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental orientation</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Bennett originally referred to this as cultural marginality
In summary, validity of the IDI was established in several ways. Content validity was established by using actual statements drawn from interviews, along with the reliable categorization of these statements by both raters and the panel of intercultural experts. Construct validity was established by correlating the early version of the IDI scales with the Worldmindedness scale (Sampson & Smith, 1957; Wiseman, Hammer, & Nishida, 1989) and with the Intercultural Anxiety scale, a modified version of the Social Anxiety scale (Gao & Gudykunst, 1990). Correlations between the individual IDI scales and the Worldmindedness and Intercultural Anxiety scales were in the direction predicted. More information about the development of the IDI can be found in Appendix A.

Epistemological/ethical/moral development. Scholarship related to moral/ethical development may also provide insight into intercultural sensitivity. Perry’s work, for example, has played an important role in our understanding of epistemological beliefs (1970, 1981). His scheme of abstract structural aspects of knowing and valuing are captured in his model of intellectual and ethical development. His nine positions are clustered into four sequential categories: dualism, multiplicity, relativism, and commitment within relativism. Dualism is characterized by an absolutist, right/wrong view of the world. Learners expect authorities to know the truth and convey it. Multiplicity is a variation of dualism but with the initial recognition of diversity and uncertainty. “Truth” is still obtainable in most cases and authorities just need to keep searching for it. In this position, individuals are likely to believe that each person has a right to his or her own opinion. Relativism requires a shift from a dualistic view of the world to a more contextual-relative view. The recognition of self as an important part of making meaning enters here. Commitment within relativism includes acknowledgement
of responsibility and engagement. In this position, individuals establish commitments to values, personal identity and relationships within relativism. Hofer and Pintrich (1997) summarize individual change within Perry’s scheme this way:

   The positions appear to represent an invariant sequence of hierarchically integrated structures. Change is brought about through cognitive disequilibrium; individuals interact with the environment and respond to new experiences by either assimilating to existing cognitive frameworks or accommodating the framework itself. (p. 91)

In recent years, more attention has been paid to the connections between cultural perspectives and their effect on social functioning and moral behavior. Most research on interculturalism focused on intercultural competence and communication skills, with little focus on moral development or values (Narvaez, Endicott, Bock, & Wong, 2000, June). At the same time, the goals of ethical and multicultural education share the same underlying goal of helping students understand how they fit into the world in which they live (Endicott, Bock, & Narvaez, 2002, April). Endicott et al. (2002, April) developed a theory with empirical data supporting the relationship between moral and intercultural development, with a focus on learning and flexible thinking. It can be thought of as increasing socio-cognitive flexibility. Both intercultural and moral development share the critical shift that takes place from rigid to flexible thinking. In the DMIS theory (M. J. Bennett, 1993; Hammer et al., 2003), it is a shift from ethnocentric to ethnorelative thinking. More recently, Hammer (2009c) frames this as moving from a monocultural to an intercultural mindset. In moral terms, it is a move from conventional to post-conventional thinking.
Kohlberg’s theory of moral development has been one of the foundational models in the field (1969). Based on interviews about moral dilemmas, he identified six stages of moral reasoning, grouped into three larger levels that represent fundamental shifts in the individual’s sociomoral perspective. Kohlberg observed that growing children advance through definite stages of moral development in a manner similar to their progression through Piaget’s (Piaget & Gabain, 1951) well-known stages of cognitive development. His observations and testing of children and adults, led him to theorize that human beings progress consecutively from one stage to the next in a constant or fixed sequence, not skipping any stage or going back to any previous stage. These conclusions have been verified in 75 cross-cultural studies involving 23 countries. In a recent review and comparison of other frameworks, multi-method convergence is found for common moral values, basic moral judgment stage development, and related social perspective-taking across cultural groups (Gibbs, Basinger, Grime, & Snary, 2007). Appendix B offers a summary of Kohlberg’s stages.

Scholars from many different disciplines (e.g., human development theorist, cognitive psychology researchers) have been critical of Kohlberg’s theory (Endicott et al., 2002, April). For example, Gilligan (1993) argues that women are socialized differently from men and that concerns for others (nurturing, serving behaviors connected to socially-dictated female roles) prevent women from developing moral reasoning per Kohlberg's model. Gilligan would propose three levels of female development:

1. Focus on self to exclusion of other
2. Focus on other to exclusion, and detriment of self
3. Focus on all which includes self
However, these levels seem to parallel Kohlberg’s pre-conventional, conventional and post-conventional levels to some degree. Gilligan makes important points, but does not support her critique with research data. Rest, Darcia, Bebeau, and Thoma (1999b) propose a theory based on many of Kohlberg’s primary ideas, yet attempt to account for many of its criticisms. Their Neo-Kohlbergian approach characterizes the development of moral reasoning as shifting whereby the earlier ways of thinking are gradually replaced by more complex ways. The forms of thinking are called schemas, or frameworks, rather than stages, and reside in long-term memory. They are formed through a person’s recognition of similarities and recurrences in his/her socio-moral experiences. According to schema theory, these structures include knowledge, expectations, past experiences and any other memories that become activated in relation to the current task. Schemas are acquired both through first-hand experience and indirectly, through observation or reading. In order to acquire new moral schemas or build on existing ones, an individual often has to bump up against a quandary that cannot be adequately explained using his or her existing schemas. This is similar to Perry’s notion of cognitive disequilibrium. This interaction encourages different, more complex ways of thinking about ethical issues.

When applying schema theory to intercultural development, the assumption is that an individual’s intercultural schemas provide a repertoire of frameworks regarding social beliefs, cultural values, expectations, and assumptions that the person can use to make sense of the intercultural events and relationships in his or her environment. As people become more expert at intercultural skills, their schemas regarding intercultural problem-solving grow in breadth and depth, in addition to becoming interconnected in more sophisticated ways. The breadth increase comes with exposure to a variety of new
cultural frameworks. In contrast, the depth increase comes with extended familiarity within a specific framework. In other words, both intensive exposure to one culture and exposure to many different cultures can impact one’s schema. This qualitative change involves enriching the schemas one has, shifting from an overly simplistic to a more sophisticated one that incorporates the complexities of overlapping systems (e.g., a pluralistic society; Endicott et al., 2002)

There are networks of organized and interconnected concepts in long-term memory. Three qualitatively different moral schemas form the Neo-Kohlbergian developmental hierarchy. *Personal interest schema* is considered “presociocentric” since one lacks notions of an organized society at this level. An egocentric and interpersonal perspective dominates the person’s focus. Dilemmas and consequences are framed in terms of the personal stakes that the individual, as well as those close to her/him have in it. *Maintaining norms schema* is characterized by a society-wide system of cooperation, and the application of laws, norms, and duties. It generally has an authoritarian orientation and is developed in adolescence. Finally, *postconventional schema* is the most complex and is characterized by the core belief that “moral obligations are to be based on shared ideals, which are reciprocal and are open to debate and tests of logical consistency, and on the experience of the community” (Rest, Darcia, Bebeau, & Thoma, 1999a, p. 307).

Both the neo-Kohlbergian and DMIS theories have the common element of development as the critical shift from rigid to flexible thinking. In moral terms, it is characterized by the shift from conventional to postconventional which moves from the reliance on rules and norms for solutions to a perspective in which abstract principles are
weighed and considered. Translated into intercultural development terms, the movement is from monocultural to intercultural (Hammer, 2009c) or ethnocentrism to ethno-relativism (Endicott et al., 2002, April). Therefore, using the schemas framework of learning and development, encountering multiple frameworks should be an effective way of enhancing both moral and intercultural schemas, thereby facilitating more advanced ethical and intercultural problem solving and attitudes (Endicott et al., 2002, April). In research conducted to explore this relationship, Endicott et al. (2002, April) used the Multicultural Experiences Questionnaire (MEXQ), the Defining Issues Test-2 (DIT-2) and the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI). They found that intercultural sensitivity and moral judgment were moderately correlated ($r = .24, p < .05, n = 71$). Intercultural sensitivity was also strongly correlated with multicultural experience, ($r = .47, p < .001$). The patterns of relationships found by Endicott et al. (2002, April) may suggest that postconventional and intercultural thinking share some common underpinning. They propose that it is rooted in cognitive flexibility, or the ability to understand and consider multiple frameworks or schemas. Further research is necessary to establish this concept. However, the patterns in the data point to flexible thinking as a critical developmental factor for both moral and intercultural development. A causal relationship cannot be established until further research proves the impact of multicultural experiences on development of general flexible thinking.

Equilintegration Theory and the Beliefs, Events and Values Inventory. Another theory of value in understanding intercultural development is Equilintegration (EI) Theory which strives to explain the process by which beliefs, values and worldviews are acquired and maintained. Importantly, EI theory also seeks to understand why alteration
is typically resisted, and how and under what circumstances worldview modification occurs (Shealy, 2004). The Beliefs, Events, and Values Inventory (BEVI) is an inventory that is designed to determine and predict developmental, affective and attributional processes that are integral to EI Theory.

Shealy (2004) argues that the EI and BEVI together provide a model and method that may enhance individuals’ understanding and development of processes that are inextricably linked to competencies. In the context of EI Theory, the BEVI would appear to be suitable for the assessment of international learning, as it is designed to assess a number of relevant processes and constructs including (but not limited to) basic openness; receptivity to different cultures, religions, and social practices; the tendency (or not) to stereotype in particular ways; self and emotional awareness; and preferred but implicit strategies for making sense of why “other” people and cultures “do what they do.”

Key hypotheses and principles of EI Theory are that values and beliefs are central mediating processes for behavior at individual and societal levels, but they may or may not be known (implicit or non-conscious), and are not necessarily rational or logically-grounded. Values and beliefs, inculcated over time, are also determined by an individual’s history, larger culture, and unique generation or era in which one grows up; they may or may not transcend a specific time and place. Although values and beliefs may be relative to a given time or place, the human capacity and need for an organizing worldview is a core part of the self. Therefore, the process by which beliefs and values are acquired is common to all individual humans, but the content of our beliefs and values is contingent upon that which is available for acquisition. In other words, beliefs
and values are reflective of the cultural context in which they are acquired. In addition, when combined with sufficient knowledge about important life experiences and events, belief and value statements often provide a great deal of information about the hypothetical structure and organization of personality or self.

Finally, beliefs and values are not easily modified because they represent, for each individual, the unique culmination of an interaction among these affective and attributional processes and developmental/life experiences, which are codified (ultimately at a psychological level) in personality and self. Because human beings balance the desire for equilibrium and stability against the inevitable pressures for development and growth, altering beliefs and values often means changing underlying structures (and vice versa). This process of understanding how structure came to be inevitably involves an emotionally charged and not-always-conscious examination of what one believes and values about self, others, and the world at large (Shealy, 2005).

Ultimately, the BEVI is designed to understand whether, how, and to what degree people are (or are likely to be) “open” to various transformational experiences, such as participating in international education. However, its application to international education has yet to be demonstrated. Currently, it is being used in several national, large scale studies of the beliefs and values of students, including one in collaboration with The Forum on Education Abroad.

*Preparing Sojourners*

There are many approaches to curriculum integration with education abroad, and at the same time, a clear definition has yet to be established. Common approaches can include permitting education abroad credit to apply to degree requirements, requiring
education abroad to meet degree requirements, developing curriculum changes to incorporate education abroad, and advising on education abroad. High levels of integration such as requiring an education abroad experience in order to graduate or weaving an international experience in a complex way into a degree program are very rare. In general, minimal levels of integration, such as advising on education abroad, have occurred in U.S. higher education. A survey conducted by The Forum (Woodruff et al., 2005) created a baseline for curricular integration practices in education abroad. The data show that most schools have achieved minimal levels of integration. The data also indicate that education abroad professionals are most likely to be responsible for (60%) and to actively promote (70%) integration. Faculty participate in this process at a much lower rate with only 45% taking an active role. At the same time, however, the only statistically significant positive correlation (Pearson coefficient) that could be found in the data is between faculty members who are involved in curriculum integration and the application of credits from education abroad toward students’ majors \((p < .05)\), though the number of respondents was small \((N = 46)\).

Preparation for and reflection on education abroad experiences are critical. Yet, the majority of institutions do not require predeparture or reentry courses. Geoffrey Bannister, Executive Director of The Forum presents the case for strongly recommending a required predeparture course rather than a brief orientation session. Most colleges and universities have an office that is established to assist students with the education abroad process. This often includes selection of programs, recruitment into programs, particularly those run by the home institution, and the preparation of student travelers for the experience. Given the potential importance of these experiences on the development
of students, and complexity of the transition process (e.g., cross-cultural adjustment and acculturation), study abroad professionals should have knowledge and skills to prepare travelers in order to minimize the negative and maximize the positive impacts of it (Sobre-Denton & Hart, 2008).

Predeparture training can play an important role in preparing students for the education abroad experience. At the same time, intercultural training is considered to be a relatively new field (Landis, Bennett, & Bennett, 2004) and the role of the education abroad professional and predeparture preparation/training should be further explored. While much literature examines the impact of the transition process on the students’ psychological, social, communicative and physical health (Ward, 2004), there is little research on the effectiveness of models of training on student travelers. Students may, if not prepared for this cultural transition, even prematurely end the experience or never open up to the opportunity to experience it (Gao & Gudykunst, 1990; Gudykunst, 2005). Sadly, valuable learning opportunities would be lost.

Interviews of students from a private liberal arts college who had studied abroad revealed that they viewed it as a rite of passage that would foster personal growth and development. Reflecting on their predeparture views, students often cited that it was something that was predetermined (“It was always something I knew I would do”) and there was little to no reflection on why or where they would go abroad. The researcher summarized that the interviewees appeared to be passive consumers of education abroad (Zemach-Bersin, 2009). If this is the case, it has strong implications for schools who offer programs to both focus on educational outcomes they desire and prepare students for the
experience. In other words, if students today are going to do study abroad for studying abroad sake, schools should seek to develop the maximum benefit for student learning.

In the late 90s, the University of Minnesota’s Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA) and its Office of International Programs received funding from the U.S. Department of Education’s Language Resource Center program to create a set of user-friendly materials on language- and culture-learning strategies designed to maximize students’ study abroad experiences. This project was an extension of previous work on culture and language learning and strategies-based instruction developed by CARLA. Its guidebook, Maximizing Study Abroad: A Students’ Guide to Strategies for Language and Culture Learning and Use, hereafter referred to as MAXSA, and the associated facilitators guides (Paige, Cohen, Kappler, Chi, & Lassegard, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c), are designed to specifically advance language and culture learning. The student guide and the ancillary materials for facilitators are not meant to teach specific language and culture that might often be taught in traditional language, sociology, history or other disciplinary courses, or not offered at all in cases of infrequently taught languages (e.g. Thai, Ewe, Telugu). Rather, the guide facilitates strategies for language- and culture-learning designed to maximize students’ study abroad experience. It is designed to be used with students with all levels of experience—those beginning the international learning journey to those with extensive experience. The guide has predeparture, in-country, and re-entry components that seek to challenge students to take their learning to the next level.

CARLA then sought to field test the materials and conduct research on the degree to which and in what ways a “strategies-based approach to developing language skills
and enhancing ability to function in a new culture, transmitted by means of a set of integrated study abroad guides for students, program professionals, and instructors respectively, promote language gain and cultural adaptation by students abroad” (Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, 2007) Three research projects were established. One focused on students and sought to answer questions such as:

— Do study abroad students use the strategies in the Students’ Guide in order to deal with the target language and culture?

— How, and in which contexts do they utilize these strategies?

— How frequently do they use the language and culture strategies?

The study utilized an experimental design in which the sample of undergraduate university students was randomly assigned to receive a curricular intervention using the student MAXSA guide and a control group who did not. The students who participated in the study were all studying for one semester. A set of research instruments, including the IDI, was administered to the students prior to and at the conclusion of their semester studying abroad. The data set also included bi-weekly electronic journal entries and a follow-up interview was conducted with a sub-sample. The curricular intervention consisted of a 2-hour orientation to the curriculum and a copy of the Maximizing Study Abroad Students’ Guide, and bi-weekly electronic journal assignments in which students reported on their use of the MAXSA, on their language and culture strategy use, and on their reactions to the guidebook itself. The other group completed a study abroad program, but did not receive the orientation or the MAXSA.

The qualitative results indicate that the Guide did have a positive effect on students’ study abroad experience, while the quantitative data did not confirm a
significant relationship. The Intercultural Development Inventory did not yield any significant differences between the 2 groups; however, the qualitative data suggest that the use of the MAXSA guide had a positive impact on language and culture learning for the students who used it (A. D. Cohen, Paige, Shively, Emert, & Hoff, 2005).

Summary

It is important that scholars and higher education professionals continue to study the relationships between our educational goals and methods, and the role international education can play. Education abroad is an important, but not well understood, component of a 4-year undergraduate program. It is essential to understand how to advance students’ development in multiple areas (moral/ethical, intercultural) via the education abroad experience, and how to link these experiences with the entire curriculum. Outcome assessment today focuses on competency-based education that centers on learner outcomes over faculty teaching (Fantini et al., 2001) which in turn puts a greater emphasis on understanding education abroad. Deardorff (2009) stresses that we cannot expect to prepare students as global citizens or for them to articulate learning outcomes of their experiences if they have not been adequately prepared with concepts and language to do so.

Up to now, most assessments of study abroad programs have used fairly simplistic research methods (McLeod & Wainwright, 2009). Many studies present theories that are not grounded in either theory or developmental approaches. Others are subjective attitudes or self reports. Scholars are increasingly advocating for a more rigorous approach to the assessment of education abroad (Engle & Engle, 2003).
This study contributes to the need for greater understanding in the field of international education. As more and more students participate in education abroad programs, particularly those of short duration, and as institutions increasingly seek to understand and implement comprehensive approaches to international education, including the integration of education abroad into the larger picture, it will become increasingly important to align efforts and leverage opportunities to foster students’ development of intercultural competence. The research questions that this study will address are:

1. Do students who have participated in short-term summer study abroad (SSA) programs have more developed intercultural competency than students who do not participate in any summer abroad program?

2. Do students who participate in a semester-long credit-bearing predeparture orientation course develop more intercultural competency than those who receive a more traditional 2-day orientation?

3. Is there a difference in the ongoing intercultural engagement of students who participate in SSA programs and those who do not?

4. Is there a difference in the ongoing intercultural engagement of students who participate in the semester-long versus 2-day orientation upon return to the US?

It is important that the relationship between predeparture orientation and intercultural development is studied and understood.
CHAPTER 3 - RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study looked at the relationship between participation in predeparture orientation programs for short-term international summer study programs and the development of students’ intercultural development and engagement. The purpose of this study was to provide empirical findings concerning the effects of predeparture orientations on students’ intercultural competency for popular short-term education abroad programs. In addition, it sought to identify the impact that participation in summer study abroad programs had on students’ ongoing depth or breadth interactions with cultural difference; in other words, the exploration of whether education abroad and the type of predeparture orientation impacts students’ behavior and curiosity to continue intercultural exploration.

The study used the Intercultural Development Continuum and the Intercultural Development Inventory as the core conceptual framework. To examine these questions, I studied three different groups—two that studied abroad and a control group who did not. Group A (Traditional) received a traditional and more narrow predeparture training. Group B (MAXIE) received a developmentally-oriented, one-credit hour, semester-length predeparture orientation that contained many of the features summarized in my theoretical review. Group C (Control) did not participate in education abroad at all. In general, the study focused on the relationship between two different predeparture orientation models and the development of intercultural sensitivity and competence, and
whether an orientation program specifically designed with a developmental framework targeted to advance intercultural sensitivity had a significant impact on students’ core intercultural worldview orientations.

As with on-campus curriculum, it may be rather straightforward to assess the knowledge outcomes of education abroad. However, education abroad offers the opportunity to develop critical intercultural perspectives and sensitivities which are more difficult to measure and assess. Further, this research examined the role of preparation in the overseas learning experience, an under-researched and not well understood process (Chieffo & Griffiths, 2009; A. D. Cohen et al., 2005).

Research Setting

The research takes place at the University of Dayton (UD), a medium-sized Midwestern university of approximately 10,000 students, with over 7,000 studying at the undergraduate level. The University of Dayton, located in Dayton, Ohio, was founded in 1850 by the Society of Mary (Marianists), a Roman Catholic teaching order of priests and brothers. It is one of the 10 largest Catholic universities in the United States. The University prides itself on providing a diverse community committed to educating the whole person, while linking learning and scholarship with leadership and service.

The University is comprehensive and has a College of Arts and Science, and Schools of Education and Allied Professions, Business, Law and Engineering. It has over 2,600 full-time faculty and staff. It is a residential campus with over 90% of its undergraduate students living on campus in traditional dorms and apartments, as well as in houses in the surrounding neighborhoods. The University owns and maintains these neighborhood houses, creating a unique community living environment. The University

2 http://www.marianist.com
has one of the largest campus ministry programs in the country and it fosters a culture of service.

The undergraduate student population is predominantly White, non-Hispanic. Over the last 4 years, this majority population represented over 85% of the student body. International, Asian, Black and Hispanic students made up, on average 1%, 1%, 4% and 2% respectively. Table 7 contains reported enrollments for the last 4 years (University of Dayton, 2008).

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Dayton Undergraduate Enrollment by Racial/Ethnic Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The limited diversity on campus would suggest that most majority-race students would not have extensive exposure to students from non-majority backgrounds.
At the same time, the University of Dayton’s Catholic and Marianist heritage calls it to transform society for the ends of justice, peace, and the common good. Its *Vision of Excellence* establishes the “promotion of international and multicultural learning” as one of the key components of our commitment to excellence in transformative education. “Advancing *international and intercultural citizenship and engagement*” has recently been established as one of the University’s five strategic goals derived directly from its mission and identified as “fundamental to its future” and “its ability to form distinctive graduates.” Finally, internationalizing the overall educational experience, and enhancing and integrating education abroad opportunities are two important components of the University of Dayton’s international strategy (University of Dayton, 2004, 2006, 2007, 2008).

**Institutional Support and Marianist Education**

The University of Dayton offers a unique and synergistic environment in which to develop this research interest. The mission of the university and the Marianist tradition of education are congruent with the overall goals of this research. Distinctive characteristics of Marianist educational tradition include:

- Educate for formation in faith
- Provide an integral quality education
- Educate in family spirit
- Educate for service, justice, and peace; and
- Educate for adaptation and change (Wesselkamper, Moder, & Fitz, 1999, p. 7).
The Catholic socio-economic justice doctrines also support the general thesis of this work. Marianist educational philosophy provides guidance relative to the need for international education and intercultural competency:

As the people of the world come increasingly into contact with one another, differences as well as similarities among them become more apparent. If the world of the future is to be more peaceful than the 20th century has been, we must learn how to appreciate cultural differences and how to work with people very unlike ourselves. To this end, we cultivate both in ourselves and in our students various skills and virtues: the skills required for dialogue, consensus and teamwork depend on the virtues of loving acceptance of others, the discipline required for responsible, rigorous analysis, and faithful dedication to a collaborative, honest and hopeful search for truth. (Wesselkamper et al., 1999, p. 23).

The University of Dayton context presents some typical challenges in the area of leadership in international education. While it recognizes the need, racial, ethnic and gender diversity is low among the faculty and staff. Minority and international students are underrepresented relative to comparable institutions. UD typically ranks high among institutions of its type in the number of students who travel abroad. Yet, the most popular international programs are those that send students to Western countries, and provide limited challenges in terms of language or cultural difference, or intimate exposure/contact with the host culture. In the last few years, international enrollments have been increasing and there has been a push to diversify the study abroad program sites.
Overview of Education Abroad Program Offerings

The University of Dayton offers a variety of education abroad programs, including semester options for direct study at exchange partner schools, summer immersion experiences where service and appropriate technology projects are a key part of working with communities in developing countries, and a host of short-term, credit bearing faculty-led summer study programs. Study abroad programs are also offered through several units or departments on campus. The Center for International Programs (CIP) hosts interdisciplinary programs and those serving the Schools of Engineering, Education and Allied Professions, and Law; and the College of Arts and Sciences. The CIP also administers the exchange program with partner universities. The School of Business has its own set of programs, as do the Center for Social Concern, Department of Languages, and Department of Biology. Participants in the CIP summer programs constitute the largest number among all the programs offered by the University. Table 8 provides an overview of participation by unit. In fact, 92% of students who participated in a study abroad program during the 2007-2008 school year went on a short-term program—80% were in the summer and 12% were during spring or winter breaks. Over half traveled to programs in Europe. Over one quarter (26%) of students participated in programs through the CIP and these programs are the focus of this study.
Table 8

2007-2008 Participation in Education Abroad Programs at UD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program type</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIP summer</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP exchanges</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business summer</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages summer</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersions/service spring break and summer</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other summer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UD programs</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>623</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CIP’s Summer Study Abroad Program, hereafter referred to as SSA, offers students an opportunity to study in a variety of countries, primarily in the developed, Western world. Though, in recent times, study in non-western countries have been offered and encouraged (e.g., China, India, and Ecuador). Programs are 4 to 5 weeks in duration, offer academic credit, and are both led and taught by UD faculty. Generally, one to three faculty members lead medium to large groups (15 to 40). Students typically live in dormitories or hotels at the SSA locations. The objective of the program is to provide international experience while allowing students to earn academic credit and develop cultural understanding. A second language is not required and intercultural interaction is relatively limited. Many of these programs have been operating for years, but as new sites are added, a greater emphasis on language and intercultural contact and learning is incorporated into the program design.
Students must be 18 years of age and eligible to take courses for credit at the University of Dayton. A minimum grade average of 2.5 is required for participation. The courses offered are from a variety of disciplines and most often serve to count for general education or elective requirements. The Web site for the SSA program is: http://international.udayton.edu. Table 9 provides a brief summary of the SSA program characteristics.

Table 9

SSA Program Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>4-5 weeks during summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Primarily developed countries in Western Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional &amp; faculty</td>
<td>Faculty-led and taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Group dorms or hotels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Not required, limited challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Medium to large group (15-40 students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural interaction</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>International experience, academic credit, cultural understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-orientation</td>
<td>2 days to one semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td>Open, gpa requirement 2.5 or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Center for International Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Orientation Programs

It is common for colleges and universities to provide predeparture orientation for education abroad programs. Like many schools, UD offers predeparture orientation for all its programs, as well as to students participating in non-UD offerings. There is little research on the types of orientation programs or their effectiveness. Time is often limited and logistical concerns, such as travel arrangements and health and safety, are often a bigger priority for orientation programs (A. D. Cohen et al., 2005). Given the popularity of short-term faculty-led and Europe-based programs both at UD and across the country, this research focused on the orientation programs for the SSA offered in the summer of 2007 and 2008.

Traditional orientation. For many years, preparation for the SSA programs consisted of a one-day orientation that brought together students and the faculty, along with other professional staff (e.g., public safety, health and counseling centers) of the university. The orientation was held on a Saturday morning for 4 hours which was not a very popular time for students. Traveling abroad, health and safety issues, and program logistics were the primary topics covered. The focus of this orientation was on practical aspects of travel. Little, if any time, was spent discussing or reflecting on culture, that of the sojourners or the host country, let alone developing intercultural sensitivity or competence. After meeting the first day, faculty and students met to prepare one more time prior to the travel experience. These sessions typically covered information about the courses that were to be delivered in country, and travel logistics. This model seems to be rather common in this researcher’s experience and is referred to as the “traditional” model in this paper.
MAXIE orientation. Maximizing Your International Education: An Integrating Approach to Internationalizing Learning and Living in Community, or MAXIE for short, began in 2007 as a new approach to orienting students to international education. It used a developmental framework with a focus on preparing students for intercultural learning and understanding through a series of four one-hour courses. The four courses are outlined in Table 10.

Table 10
MAXIE Structure Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course no.</th>
<th>Short title</th>
<th>Developmental goals</th>
<th>Most common timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UDI 110</td>
<td>MAXIE: Explore</td>
<td>Awareness and planning; Local and global</td>
<td>First or second year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDI 210</td>
<td>MAXIE: Prepare</td>
<td>Knowledge and strategies; Application to education abroad</td>
<td>Second or third year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDI 310</td>
<td>MAXIE: Experience</td>
<td>Applying skills and developing competencies</td>
<td>Second or third year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDI 410</td>
<td>MAXIE: Integrate</td>
<td>Reflection, integration and on-going development of local-global orientation</td>
<td>Third or fourth year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MAXIE: Prepare courses were linked to a specific study abroad program and the focus of this research. Before going into more detail about the MAXIE: Prepare course, it may be helpful to have a general overview of the entire MAXIE program so that it can be viewed in context of the broader structure.
The overall goal of MAXIE was to offer a holistic and developmental approach to facilitate learning before, during and after an international or intercultural experience, in order to increase the academic excellence of and engagement in international programs, and further the development of intercultural skills and abilities of each student. The MAXIE model also involved a wide variety of faculty and staff in the process of leading students through the learning process by engaging the campus community in the development and delivery of the program.

This 4-course curricular structure was offered in a sequence with the intention of facilitating the development of intercultural perspective in students. It also offered a consistent approach that provided students, faculty and staff with common tools and terminology to facilitate dialogue and engagement across campus. Students took these courses over the 4 years of study at UD which provided the ongoing opportunity to integrate classroom and out-of-classroom experiences, for academic advising, to assess and evaluate student international learning, and to engage students in the development of their own international learning plan.

The model used the work of the University of Minnesota’s Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA) and its user-friendly materials on language- and culture-learning strategies designed to maximize students’ study abroad experiences—Maximizing Study Abroad: A Students’ Guide to Strategies for Language and Culture Learning and Use (Paige et al., 2004a, 2004b, 2004c). The four-sequence design developed at UD is an enhancement to the “Minnesota model” by both integrating it into the curriculum, and moving beyond merely study abroad to a more comprehensive approach to international and intercultural education, both local and global.
The goal of the UD approach was to create what Maki (2004) calls a *chronology of learning* which calls for thoughtfully sequencing and integrating a set of opportunities that result in desired learning outcomes. The MAXIE model took a developmental approach to international education and incorporated a holistic view of learning which integrated curriculum with experiences both in the US and overseas. It also represented a curricular integration as the approach is based in credit-bearing courses rather than being self directed by the student.

The UD model exposed students during the first year of undergraduate study, through the first one-hour course, to both on-campus and off-campus opportunities, and sought to develop early thinking and reflection on culture and its meaning, and to encourage students to pursue a personal intercultural learning journey that fosters local and global understanding. Overall, each subsequent course built on the former to allow for the development of distinctive skills and competencies.

The first course, MAXIE: Explore (UDI 110), focused on exploring the various options and opportunities students had to internationalize, or more broadly “interculturalize,” their education both on- and off- campus. Emphasis was on helping students to integrate international and intercultural education into their university experience, planning for these experiences, and exploring why an intercultural perspective and internationalized education was important in their chosen discipline and in today’s world in general.

The second course, MAXIE: Prepare (UDI 210), focused on preparing the student to take part in an experience overseas by focusing on strategies for success. Students were guided to develop intercultural communication and sensitivity skills and techniques
that could be used in any context, as well as explored site-specific strategies to be employed in country.

The third course, MAXIE: Experience (UDI 310), occurred during the education abroad experience to facilitate the acquisition of intercultural and language skills and competencies in an applied way. They were guided by faculty on site to employ strategies learned in the earlier modules in the host country context and continue to explore themselves as members of a culture or cultures.

Finally, the fourth course, MAXIE: Integrate (UDI 410), helped students to process the experience through reflection and integration, and to develop an ongoing plan for the future. They evaluated strategies used in the host country context and contemplated strategies in other settings and contexts, including the US. The goal was to establish the need for and develop interest in lifelong intercultural learning that incorporates both the local and global context which makes up the complex environment in which we live today.

In addition to the student learning outcomes described above, the MAXIE program intended to foster a number of specific long-term outcomes. Faculty and staff participating in MAXIE would gain a deeper understanding of students’ developmental needs and learn methods to facilitate and enhance international learning, ultimately raising the capacity of the campus as a learning organization in this area. If the model was effective, it has potential as a permanent framework for facilitating both international and intercultural learning.

One of the unique features of the MAXIE model is the collaboration of a wide variety of units, academic and non-academic, across campus, including the Center for
International Programs, International Studies, Department of Languages, and individual faculty from diverse disciplines such as History, Teacher Education, Music, Political Science, Engineering, Psychology, Languages, English, Visual Arts, and Physics. In addition, Student Development, including the Health Center, Public Safety, Community Standards and Civility, and the Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention assisted with the delivery of the program.

MAXIE: Prepare. A subset of the students who participated in this research participated in the MAXIE: Prepare course offered over the spring semester prior to departure for the SSA program. This model maintains the essential elements of the traditional orientation model (e.g., logistics, health and safety), but adds the important goal of preparing and facilitating intercultural learning. The students, along with the faculty who would teach in the program and staff from the CIP, met once per week during the semester. The stated objectives for the course were:

— Develop strategies for successful intercultural interaction and language learning
— Reflect on the impacts of international experience on personal and professional development
— Develop a personal plan for maximizing the education abroad experience in a particular context, including country-specific strategies for intercultural understanding and language development.
— Begin or continue development of an electronic portfolio of your international/intercultural learning experience.

The course was offered as a graded option (rather than pass/fail) and required assignments include international learning journal, completion of various inventories and
assessments, a culture/program specific international learning plan. Faculty and CIP staff worked together to determine the focus of the learning plan which left some flexibility for faculty teams to craft site-specific assignments. A sample syllabus can be found in Appendix C.

Overview of Research Methodology

This research focuses on participants in the second one-hour course, Maximizing your International Education, MAXIE: Prepare. I used a mixed-methods design as a quantitative and qualitative approach as the best way to fully explore these complex topics. This research project combines the strength of both research methodologies by using a cross-culturally valid and reliable assessment of intercultural competence, along with the personal stories, experiences, and observations of participants.

The quantitative dimension of the study used a pretest-posttest with control group design, using the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI). Prior to the beginning of the education abroad orientation program, the IDI was administered to all participants via the on-line format. The IDI was again administered during the academic year after the experience. The set of open-ended questions was also asked during both the pre- and posttests of the on-line administration of the IDI and responses are included as part of the qualitative data. Students in the MAXIE orientation completed journal entries as part of the course, and both of the study abroad groups completed course and program evaluations at the end of the orientation and at the end of the education abroad program. A few participant interviews were also conducted after the posttest administration of the IDI. All of these materials were included in the qualitative data analysis to support the interpretation of the quantitative results.
*Quantitative design.* The research used the following pretest-posttest control group design:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>O IDI</th>
<th>X Traditional</th>
<th>O IDI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A&lt;sub&gt;SSA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>O IDI</td>
<td>X Traditional</td>
<td>O IDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B&lt;sub&gt;SSA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>O IDI</td>
<td>X MAXIE</td>
<td>O IDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C&lt;sub&gt;Non-participants&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>O IDI</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>O IDI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case, X represents the treatment variable or a particular study abroad preparation experience, and O refers to the measurement or the pretest-posttest IDI. Group A represents students who participated in an SSA program and received a traditional orientation. Group B represents those who participated in an SSA program and received the MAXIE: Prepare orientation, and Group C represents students in the control group who did not participate in the SSA programs.

The primary independent variable is the orientation intervention prior to study abroad and dependent variable is the intercultural development of students. Other independent variables that are examined are location of SSA program, gender, previous intercultural exposure, and ongoing engagement with intercultural experiences.

The IDI was given as both a pretest and posttest. This design allows the comparison of two groups that have experienced two types of X with one which has not, for the purpose of establishing the effect of X. The dashed line separates the study abroad groups from the comparison group (Campbell & Stanley, 1963).

The design of this study has several strengths and weaknesses. It is not a true experimental design as the participants were not randomly assigned to groups, which impacts the internal validity. Participants self selected into a program or course without knowledge of the type of orientation program or the differences between them. Students’ motivations for selecting and participating in the particular program of choice were not
known. This could be a confounding variable. The length of time participants spent in each of the orientation models was also an important covariate. This is a challenge to control as one of the orientation models was a semester long. Some might argue that the “Hawthorne effect,” the phenomenon in which subjects in behavioral studies change their performance in response to being observed, may have impacted the students.

At the same time, the study incorporates objective data from a proven research instrument that is statistically valid and reliable. It also controls the timing of the treatment, the term prior to departure, in that the groups experienced it at the same time which addresses history, testing, instrumentation, and maturation as common threats to internal validity.

There were no financial barriers to participation as one-hour courses at this University are included as part of tuition and no additional fee is assessed regardless of the number of credit hours a student takes. The study was conducted with students in only one university environment that has some specific characteristics (e.g., private, Catholic, highly residential) which would be a weakness in term of being able to generalize the results. A summary of the groups is outlined in Table 11. In the SSA groups, all students were asked to participate. In the comparison group, three groups were selected based on similar gender and their exposure to intercultural concepts and experiences.
Table 11

Summary of Participation by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study abroad - traditional orientation</th>
<th>Total students</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Pretest participation rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>62%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study abroad - MAXIE orientation</th>
<th>Total students</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Pretest participation rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London B</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
<td><strong>92%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control/comparison group</th>
<th>Total students</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Pretest participation rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REL 308</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDT 313</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>73%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REL308 = Islam, ILLC = International Learning Community, EDT313 = Developmentally Appropriate Practice for Preschool

Qualitative methods. Like Newman and Benz (1998), I believe we should work toward “abandoning the dichotomy” between qualitative and quantitative research. The mixed-methods approach enhances the possibility of bringing the two perspectives closer in dialogue. Experiences overseas can be complex and in order to better understand the outcome for individual participants, it is important to explore qualitative methods for relating students’ experiences. Providing a more “thick description” (Geertz, 1973) of
these experiences may help us understand the need to develop more impactful, developmentally oriented, curricularly integrated and goal-driven international programs in the future.

The qualitative data include written questionnaires, participants’ reports and journals, and personal interviews. When the IDI is used with individuals, specific questions are used as a guide to put the quantitative results into context. Each participant was asked to answer the most current IDI contexting questions (Hammer, 2008). Each student in the MAXIE orientation completed at least five reflective journal writings. A limited number of interviews (4) were also part of the qualitative data. At least one student from each group was interviewed. A complete set of qualitative questions can be found in Appendix D. Table 12 provides an overview of the qualitative data used.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Data Types and Administration</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contexting questions for the IDI</td>
<td>All 3 groups</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal questions</td>
<td>MAXIE</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/program evaluations</td>
<td>Both summer study</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>All 3 groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metz (2000) explains that researchers must “compare and contrast all these pieces of data with each other and ‘triangulate’ them in systematic ways in order to develop, question, refine, and/or discard interpretations of them and the underlying perspectives they reflect” (p. 39). Page (2000) asserts that readers will ultimately use the information presented and determine if they can relate it to their own experiences. “Put bluntly, readers, rather than research, generalize” (p. 5).
While I value both data types, it is important to recognize that subjective evaluation of transformative experiences is not a consistent indicator of objective experience. In other words, travelers often report having a ‘transformative experience’ but the objective evidence of the IDI does not measure this. Travelers’ accounts of ‘transformation’ may be due to the intensity of the experience and a temporary euphoria, rather than a deep change or shift in worldview that would result in actual advances in intercultural development (M.R. Hammer, personal communication, 2009). The review of participants’ writings and interviews focused on the participants’ ongoing interaction with and understanding of culture difference to explore both the breadth (engagement with multiple cultures) and depth (more extensive engagement with one other culture) of their actual experiences with cultural difference and commonality.

Given the complexity of understanding intercultural development and the factors that impact it, and the amount of data available, the qualitative data were evaluated using a holistic approach. Rather, the researcher looked for stage appropriate and experiential evidence that demonstrated intercultural understanding and engagement. I carefully read through each of the data and highlighted statements that were reflective of the Developmental Orientation score and stage of the respondent. I then looked for patterns of statements among the responses in order to select some that were illustrative of the group.

*Researcher’s subjectivity.* Fine (1994) argues that research in the social sciences often seeks to hide the researcher/writer giving the impression that s/he is neutral or objective. Giroux advances that researchers can no longer be transparent, but rather need to position themselves as classed, gendered, raced, and sexual subjects. All these positions impact the constructions of selves and others (as cited in Denzin & Lincoln,
2000; Giroux, 1991, 1997). Peshkin (1988) would advise that subjectivity affects the results of all investigation and challenges researchers to “systematically identify their subjectivity throughout the course of their research” (p. 17). He suggests that a researcher names her/his “I’s” in order to identify their power to help as well as to hinder.

The genesis of this research came from my own professional experience working with students to send them abroad, and a deep interest in understanding the developmental process students go through when they participate in an international experience. In particular, I have a desire to understand how educators can foster specific learning outcomes, and how they are achieved through different models. Intercultural skills and capacities are becoming a crucial priority. Assessment and the integration of education abroad into the overall undergraduate education experience are all key priorities for international educators today as they seek to enhance the capacity to develop these skills. Educators must play a key role, not just in the delivery of knowledge content, but in the preparation, fostering of reflection and developing tools and abilities for cultural awareness and sensitivity. I have long believed that not all international experiences are created equal, yet colleges and universities tend to focus on mere numeric outcomes, such as number of participants or number of programs to measure success, thus began the development of this research proposal.

I definitely tapped into an area of personal interest in the selection of the topic of international education and its role in developing intercultural competency. The interest is closely related to my personal growth journey through international experience, and my own discovery of the complexity and nuance of culture both at home and abroad. My own experiences living, working and building relationships across cultures is rather
extensive, ranging from living in West Africa and South America and teaching in Asia and the Caribbean, to living in my home culture for over 10 years in a predominantly African American neighborhood. These experiences have profoundly impacted my own worldview and taught me a great deal about other cultures. They have also helped me realize the challenge that developing a cultural worldview within Acceptance or Adaptation presents. I continually reflect on the impact of my culture on my own behaviors and thinking when dealing with the many international students and scholars with whom I come into contact on a daily basis.

I recognized that my bias is toward an integral perspective which values a broad worldview that unites East and West, ancient wisdom with modern science (Wilber, 2001a, 2001b) to advance intercultural understanding, social justice and world peace. My ‘I-Have-Been-There-Too I,’ being able to relate to students as they struggle to make sense of their experiences, helped me to more clearly see the process. At the same time, I have learned a great deal about this development process through my doctoral education. This has also expanded my ability to make sense of my own intercultural experiences. It has also helped me appreciate the need for a deeper understanding of how values, beliefs and attitudes are shaped and maintained.

As Peshkin (1988) advises, I’ve kept in touch with my subjective I’s and note my own “warm and cool spots” (positive and negative feelings) toward experiences during the research process. I have been involved with the design and delivery of the MAXIE orientation. This effort is secondary to seeking an understanding of what actually impacts student learning. I strived to put aside my interest in the MAXIE program ‘working’ in order to truly understand if such a model might truly foster critical learning and growth.
Research Questions and Hypothesis

All of the above considerations have helped shape my research questions. As a result, the qualitative and quantitative methods described above will be used to address the following questions and corresponding hypotheses:

1. Do students participating in an SSA program have more developed intercultural sensitivity than students who do not participate?

   — H₀A: There is no significant difference in the mean intercultural development scores between participants of the SSA and non-participants. H₀A: DO_{SSA} ≤ DO_{CONTROL}

   — H₁A: There is a significant positive difference in the mean intercultural development scores between participants of the SSA and non-participants.

   H₁A: DO_{SSA} > DO_{CONTROL}

2. Do students participating in the MAXIE: Prepare orientation model develop more intercultural sensitivity than students who participate in the traditional orientation?

   — H₀B: There is no significant difference in the mean intercultural development between participants of the two orientation models. H₀B: DOJ_{MAXIE} ≤ DOJ_{TRADITIONAL}

   — H₁B: There is a significant positive difference in the mean intercultural development between participants of the two orientation models. H₁B: DOJ_{MAXIE} > DOJ_{TRADITIONAL}

3. Is there a difference in the ongoing intercultural engagement of students who participate in an SSA program and those who do not?
— **H₀C**: There is no difference in the distribution of rates of ongoing intercultural engagement of students who participate in an SSA program and those who do not. **H₀C**: IEₘ₀ ≤ IEₜᵢₐᵢᵢₚₜᵢₐᵢᵰᵢₚᵣₒₜᵢₒᵢₜᵢₒᵢₚ. 

— **H₁C**: There is a significant positive difference in the distribution of rates of ongoing intercultural engagement of students who participate in an SSA program and those who do not. **H₀C**: IEₘ₀ > IEₜᵢₐᵢᵢₚᵣₒₜᵢₒᵢₚ. 

4. Is there a difference in the ongoing intercultural engagement of students who participate in the MAXIE: Prepare orientation and the students who participated in the traditional orientation?

— **H₀D**: There is no difference in the distribution of rates of ongoing intercultural engagement of students who participate in the MAXIE: Prepare and the traditional orientation. **H₀D**: IEₘₐₓᵢₑ ≤ IEₜᵢₐᵢᵢₚᵣₒₜᵢₒᵢₚ. 

— **H₁D**: There is a significant positive difference in the distribution of rates of ongoing intercultural engagement of students who participate in the MAXIE: Prepare and the traditional orientation. **H₀D**: IEₘₐₓᵢₑ > IEₜᵢₐᵢᵢₚᵣₒₜᵢₒᵢₚ. 

**The Instruments**

Three instruments were used in this research, the Intercultural Development Inventory, the IDI contexting questions and a specific set of demographic questions. Information on each is provided in the following sections.

*Intercultural Development Inventory.* The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) is a statistically reliable and cross-culturally valid measure of intercultural sensitivity. The IDI has been psychometrically tested and determined to be a robust cross-culturally generalizable, valid and reliable assessment of an individual’s or group’s
core orientations toward cultural difference (Hammer, 1999, 2007, 2009c; Hammer et al., 2003; Paige, Jacobs-Cassuto, Yershova, & DeJaeghere, 2003). Validation of the IDI is based on confirmatory factory analysis, reliability analysis, and construct validity tests. Seven distinct dimensions or scales were validated: Denial (D), Polarization (P), Minimization (M), Acceptance (AC), and Adaptation (AD). Within polarization, there are two scales—Defense (DF) and Reversal (R); Hammer, 2007). In addition, two composite scores are provided—Developmental Orientation (DO) and Perceived Orientation (PO).

The Perceived Orientation (PO) score reflects where the individual or group places itself along the continuum of monocultural to intercultural mindset. The Developmental Orientation (DO) score uses a weighted formula to identify the primary orientation along the continuum, or the perspective that is most likely to emerge in situations involving cultural difference (Hammer, 2007, 2009c). Finally, the Cultural Disengagement score, which is not considered part of the continuum, reflects a level of disconnectedness or alienation one feels from his/her own cultural group. More information about the IDI can be found in the literature review in chapter 2 and in Appendix A.

IDI qualifying seminar. In order to use the IDI, attendance at a 3-day qualifying seminar is required. The goal is to prepare qualified administrators (QAs) to explain, defend and implement the IDI in both corporate and academic settings. Seminars are given throughout the year in various locations. In May 2004, I attended the qualifying seminar in Portland, Oregon. At the time, approximately 500 individuals had been qualified to administer the IDI. The seminar was facilitated by Drs. Mitch Hammer and Milton Bennett. Participants receive a manual that includes detailed interpretive guides.
and written descriptions of procedures. During the seminar, participants had the opportunity to:

- Understand the DMIS theory and its relationship to the IDI
- Learn how the IDI differs from other measures of intercultural competence
- Learn to use the IDI to gauge individual and group potential for intercultural competence
- Review the research procedures used to construct the IDI and establish reliability and validity
- Learn how to use the IDI for needs assessment and large group profiling
- Acquire techniques for creating individual and group profiles
- Practice interpretation and presentation of group and individual feedback

During the qualifying seminar, I met with Dr. Bennett to review the results of my own IDI. I also met with Dr. Hammer to discuss this research project.

As of February 2009, approximately 1,500 people have participated in the qualifying seminar (M.R. Hammer, personal communication, February 5, 2009) representing 30 different countries and use of the IDI continues to grow in all sectors.

*IDI contexting questions.* The IDI has contexting questions that are designed to tease out actual experiences or cultural stress points that may be associated with a developmental stage. These contexting questions were asked of all respondents in the pretest and posttest administration of the IDI. The respondents who were interviewed were also asked to elaborate on these questions during the in-person interview with the focus on the education abroad experience pre-, during and post-travel. A list of contexting questions can be found in Appendix D.
**Additional questions.** Respondents were also asked some questions to determine the amount of international and intercultural engagement that had taken place since the initial IDI. These questions target the level and type of ongoing interaction with different cultures, and the perceived impact of international and intercultural experience on personal and professional growth. Questions are listed below:

1. At your educational institution, on average over the past 6 months, what percent of time do you directly (face-to-face) interact with people from other cultures (e.g., national, ethnic) per week:
   a. 0-10%
   b. 11-25%
   c. 26-50%
   d. 51-75%
   e. 76-100%

2. At your educational institution, on average over the past 6 months, what percent of time do you interact through email, telephone, texting and other virtual communication with people from other cultures (e.g., national, ethnic) per week:
   a. 0-10%
   b. 11-25%
   c. 26-50%
   d. 51-75%
   e. 76-100%
3. Would you say that study in [insert program or class name] had _____ impact on your personal development
   a. Significant
   b. Some
   c. Little
   d. No
   e. Explain______________________

4. Would you say that study in [insert program or class name] had _____ impact on your professional development
   f. Significant
   g. Some
   h. Little
   i. No
   j. Explain______________________

*Participant interview format.* When the IDI is used with individuals, specific questions are used as an interview guide to put the quantitative results into context. The participant interview format for this study followed the suggested questions for the IDI contexting interviews (Hammer, 2008). The questions have already been listed in the previous section. In addition, interviewees were asked to discuss specific examples of intercultural experience (both in the US and overseas) that they have had since the experience occurred.

*Summary*
This research focused on several pressing issues in the field of international education, including the role of short-term study abroad in the development of intercultural sensitivity, and the role of education abroad professionals and predeparture orientation programs in fostering that competency. A robust, valid, and reliable psychometric instrument was used to measure changes in overall intercultural development scores of students who participated in study abroad programs in 2007 and 2008. These changes were compared to a control group to determine differences between study abroad and non-study abroad informants. Within the study abroad group, two orientation treatments were compared.
CHAPTER 4 – RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Overview of the Data

This study focused on three groups of students: (a) those who participated in an education abroad program and MAXIE predeparture orientation, (b) those who participated in an education abroad program and a 2-day predeparture orientation, and (c) a group of students who did not study abroad. The study abroad and on-campus experiences took place over the 2007 and 2008 time period. Five study abroad programs participated in the study and received the traditional predeparture orientation, while five other programs participated in the study and received the MAXIE orientation. The study abroad sites were all European cities and included Florence and Rome, Italy; Paris, France; Vienna, Austria; Dublin, Ireland; and Leipzig, Germany. All but the German site are in Western Europe. The programs were all faculty-led, 4-week summer study abroad programs offered through the Center for International Programs.

The control group consisted of three groups—students in a Religion course on Islam (REL 308), students in a Teacher Education class called Developmentally Appropriate Practice for Preschool (EDT 313), and students in an international learning living community (ILLC). They were selected to be the control group for their similar demographic characteristics, and the faculty and staff interest in having the students exposed to intercultural concepts and to complete the IDI.
Each student was asked to complete the IDI, and answer the contexting and demographic for both the pretest and posttest. A total of 210 students completed the pretest IDI, while 59 completed the posttest IDI, for a response rate of 28%. Of the 59 respondents who completed the posttest IDI, 48 were matched-pairs to the pretest data.

Table 13 provides an overview of the participants by group for both the pre- and posttest administrations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Participants by Program Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXIE orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control/comparison group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDT 313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I reviewed the names and characteristics of the respondents as well as non-respondents to determine if there was some type of pattern. I looked more closely at the MAXIE group to determine if the most involved or enthusiastic during the course responded at a higher rate, perhaps because they knew me from being part of the course. The response rate from the traditional orientation group was higher than the other two groups. The MAXIE and control groups response rates were the same at 26%. Upon closer examination of the MAXIE group, I did not find a pattern among the students who responded to the posttest.

Demographic overview. The participants in this study were all residential college students aged 18 to 22 years. The participants were majority female which is the national trend for study abroad. Females participate in education abroad at much higher rates than males, with a ratio of approximately 70% to 30% (Bhandari & Chow, 2007). An overview of the gender composition of each group is in Table 14. Given the high rate of participation by females in education abroad and at this University, the control groups were selected in an effort to balance gender among the groups. A chi-square test revealed, however, that there were significantly more females in the pretest control group than the other two groups, \( \chi^2(2, N = 210) = 18.317, p = 0.000. \)
Table 14

Gender Composition of Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional orientation</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXIE</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison group</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Posttest group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional orientation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXIE</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison group</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students’ pretest experience of living in another culture was very limited with the majority (57%) never having lived in another culture, and another 37% having had limited experience of less than 3 months. Only a few students had extended overseas living experience of one year or greater (3%). Table 15 provides a breakdown of the groups’ pretest and posttest responses regarding overseas living experience.
Table 15

*Overseas Living Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>MAXIE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pretest group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3 months</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 months</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Posttest group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3 months</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 months</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, the control group had more international living experience with 9 students having spent from 3 months to over 10 years in another country, though the difference among the three groups was not significant, \( \chi^2(12, N = 210) = 20.568, p = .06 \). Upon closer examination of the data at the individual student level, the majority of students were either international students or students who had expatriate families and were in the ILLC subgroup. In the posttest data, the education abroad group’s acknowledgment of their education abroad experience is reflected in the shift from “never” to “less than 3 months.”
When looking at where participants spent their formative years, an overwhelming majority (97%) did so in North America. The post-group respondents had only one person who spent formative years outside the US, an international student in the control group. The childhood region among the three groups was similar, $\chi^2(10, N = 210) = 10.878$, $p = 0.367$. Table 16 provides an overview of where the students grew up.

Table 16

*Formative Years of Pretest Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pretest group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>MAXIE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were also asked about their experience with other cultures in the open-ended questions. Some common responses about their experience with diversity that also reflect the limited exposure include:

— *I have not had much experience with cultural difference. I live in a town that is not very diverse at all, so I only come into contact with those from different cultures when traveling or at college (SSA-Traditional).*

— *The university embraces culture differences, but I do not partake in any of the activities. I can’t say that I’ve had much experience (SSA-MAXIE).*
Growing up, I always affiliated myself with people of the same culture as mine. Once high school came around, my life experience started to become more diverse as I started to play sports with people of different cultures (Control Group).

I have little experience dealing with different cultures because I grew up in an area where everyone is basically the same. I did travel to Spain at the end of my high school where I was able to see another culture firsthand (Control Group).

We have international students and UD offers international coffee hour. I have not gone, so I do not know how they are. I have had Thanksgiving dinner with international students and it was very interesting because they did not celebrate Thanksgiving (SSA-Traditional).

I have little experience with cultural differences. I have never been out of the country and I attended a Catholic single sex high school and a private Marianist university, neither of which had much diversity (Control Group).

It is clear from the quantitative and qualitative data that the majority of participants across the groups had limited experience with cultural difference.

Other than gender, the pretest groups were not significantly different in terms of age, second culture living experience, or childhood region.

Intercultural orientation. In terms of intercultural development, the IDI provides two composite scores (interval data). The composite scores are grouped into ranges of scores and associated with a particular stage (ordinal data). The stages range from Denial to Adaptation. Please refer to chapter 2 for a complete review of the stage descriptions.
The Perceived Orientation (PO) indicates an evaluation of one’s own capability to understand and adapt to cultural differences. In other words, it represents where the group places itself on the intercultural continuum. The Developmental Orientation (DO) indicates the group’s primary orientation toward cultural differences and commonalities along the continuum as assessed by the IDI. The DO is the perspective most likely used in those situations where cultural differences and commonalities are exposed.

The difference between the PO and DO scores is referred to as the Orientation Gap. A gap score of 7 points or higher can be considered a meaningful difference between where a group perceives it is on the developmental continuum and where the IDI measures its level of intercultural competence. It is common for the PO score to be higher than that DO score.

Table 17 provides an overview of the pre and posttest PO scores, along with their respective stages for each group and subgroup.
Table 17

*Perceived Orientation (PO) Scores and Stages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PO score</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>PO score</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>PO change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>122.83 AC</td>
<td>116.21 AC</td>
<td>-6.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>116.05 AC</td>
<td>115.02 AC</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>118.38 AC</td>
<td>119.03 AC</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>116.05 AC</td>
<td>115.08 AC</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>118.95 AC</td>
<td>117.61 AC</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>117.68 AC</td>
<td>117.02 AC</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAXIE orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>117.89 AC</td>
<td>121.41 AC</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>118.95 AC</td>
<td>117.13 AC</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London B</td>
<td>119.41 AC</td>
<td>120.11 AC</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence B</td>
<td>118.25 AC</td>
<td>118.57 AC</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liepzig</td>
<td>118.89 AC</td>
<td>126.96 AC</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>118.65 AC</td>
<td>119.31 AC</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control/comparison group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL 308</td>
<td>118.28 AC</td>
<td>115.27 AC</td>
<td>-3.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLC FY</td>
<td>118.53 AC</td>
<td>117.97 AC</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDT 313</td>
<td>118.73 AC</td>
<td>114.60 AC</td>
<td>-4.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>118.64 AC</td>
<td>116.50 AC</td>
<td>-2.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: AC=Acceptance

A one-way analysis of variance revealed that there was no difference in the pretest PO scores of the traditional, MAXIE and control groups, $F(2, 207) = 0.751, p = .473, MS_{error} = 20.009, \alpha = .05$.

The PO was within Acceptance (AC) for each group and subgroup for both pre- and posttest IDI. This indicates a belief in their capability to recognize, appreciate and
respond appropriately in intercultural situations. Some sample comments that are representative of this self evaluation include:

— *I feel that we should be open to other cultures and make a conscious effort to get to know about them (Control Group).*

— *I feel that more exposure to and more proactive association with people of different cultural backgrounds is the most important and effective method of understanding cultural difference among communities. I personally do not like the idea of ‘tolerance.’ You can learn to tolerate a buzzing noise in your stereo or a dim light bulb, but that doesn’t mean that you welcome the situation and are in complete harmony with it. Acceptance and understanding should be the ultimate goal (SSA-traditional).*

— *I believe I am open to other cultures and behave with respect and kindness toward others (SSA-MAXIE).*

While the PO scores for each group fell within the same orientation (AC). The DO stages varied among the groups in both the pre- and posttests. The mean pretest DO scores for the MAXIE group was 87.18. The control group had a mean score of 86.87, and the traditional orientation group’s mean was 84.83. Table 18 outlines the Pre and Post DO scores and stages for each subgroup within each group.
### Developmental Orientation (DO) Scores and Stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre (N=210)</th>
<th>Post (N=59)</th>
<th>DO change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DO score</td>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>DO score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>81.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>71.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>84.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>79.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>87.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>84.83</strong></td>
<td><strong>CM</strong></td>
<td><strong>82.89</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAXIE orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>85.47</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>91.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>88.62</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>84.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London B</td>
<td>88.15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>89.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence B</td>
<td>85.70</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>88.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liepzig</td>
<td>87.67</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>87.18</strong></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td><strong>89.23</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control/comparison group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL 308</td>
<td>84.50</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>78.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLC FY</td>
<td>86.66</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>83.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDT 313</td>
<td>88.45</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>81.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>86.87</strong></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td><strong>81.84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: P=Polarization, CM=Cusp of Minimization, M=Minimization, CAC=Cusp of Acceptance

The traditional orientation group started with a DO score of 84.83 which puts it in the primary orientation at the Cusp of Minimization (CM), reflecting a relatively early tendency to highlight commonalities across cultures that can mask important cultural differences in values, perceptions and behaviors. Both the MAXIE and Control groups
had starting DO scores within Minimization (M), reflecting a more consistent tendency to highlight commonalities across cultures.

When looking more closely at the subgroups within each group, a greater variation of DO scores within the traditional orientation group was observed. In other words, the traditional subgroups began in three different stages: Polarization (P), Cusp of Minimization (CM), and Minimization (M), while each subgroup that received the MAXIE orientation started with an orientation in M. The Control group started with two different orientations: CM and M. The ranges of the scores were not significantly different, however. A one-way analysis of variance revealed that there was no difference in the pretest DO scores of the traditional, MAXIE and control groups, $F(2, 207) = 0.813, p = .445, MS_{error} = 133.894, \alpha = .05$.

Qualitative responses by some of the students may help to contextualize the various intercultural orientations. Individuals in Minimization have a tendency to draw on the similarities between cultures which can, often unconsciously, minimize important cultural differences in values, perceptions and behaviors. Examples of statements by students in minimization:

— *There are numerous universal principles and morals guiding humanity.*

*Yes, smaller differences exist among different cultures because we are socialized in different environments (SSA-Traditional).*

— *I think cultural difference provides individuality which is one of the core values (Control Group).*
— I think humans are generally a lot alike, yet there are cultural standards that shape a person's likes and dislikes. Overall, humans have a basic united understanding of values for others (SSA-MAXIE).

— I feel that we all have universal value and that is the most important thing to focus on rather than the differences or conflict (Control Group).

— I think in reference to cultural differences that everyone should try and get along and rather than focusing on the differences between cultures should instead put the most emphasis on the characteristics that tie all cultures together. Additional efforts could be made to try to integrate the cultures together so that there is no longer such a great divide (SSA-Traditional).

— People are universally the same deep down; therefore, people should all be treated equally. Only some actions are formed from cultures (SSA-MAXIE).

— I think it’s good to have roots and a sense of belonging, but at the same time I feel that cultural difference can be easily overcome because we are all human beings who basically just want love and acceptance (SSA-MAXIE).

Individuals in Polarization have a tendency, either consciously or unconsciously, to frame cultural differences in a more hierarchical way. Within Polarization, individuals can tend to view one’s own culture more favorably (Defense) or more critically (Reversal). The later would also indicate a favorable, though less complex, view of other cultures.

Examples of statements by students in Polarization with a stronger Defense view:
— My philosophy regarding cultural differences is that we all come from similar principles, and therefore differences should be overlooked. With these similar principles we should realize that we are more alike than cultural difference show. I am in a sorority on campus and our service events have to do with literacy. We have been exposed to many different types of cultures and have had similar effects in all of them. There is so much to understand about literacy, that the cultures are never the focus of activities (Control Group).

— I found that cultural differences are not as big a boundary as one may think. I worked with non-Americans professionally for a year doing scientific research. I think it depends on how open and friendly the foreigner is. I was very taken back and almost upset, however, how easily and often the foreign people I worked with made fun of and put down Americans and American culture. I love my culture and feel that this was not appropriate (Control Group).

— I think culture is not a big part of who a person is and does not dictate a person’s life. I don’t think any organizations I’m part of have really taken any initiative to address culture. Simply anyone is welcome to come and participate despite your culture (SSA-Traditional).

Sample statements from individuals in Polarization with a more dominant Reversal view:

— What drives me crazy about Americans is that we tend to herd together in a group. It is so obvious that we are Americans. We also worry too much
about what others think of us. This drives what we wear and how we act with others (SSA-MAXIE).

— I feel that our media is terrible and gives off this vibe that we are the biggest and the best and that’s what allows the people in our country to think the way they do.

The gap scores for each of the groups for both the pre- and posttest were at least 30 points which indicates an overestimation of their level of intercultural competence. The statement below provides a glimpse of this orientation gap. The DO for this respondent is in Polarization, with 60% relating to Defense, while the PO score is in Acceptance.

*Each culture is different and their way of life should be respected even if it is different from your own. You do not have to agree with it, but if it goes against basic human values it should not be condoned. For the most part, if you offer understanding of a foreign culture then it is likely that those people will offer the same.*

The respondent acknowledges that each culture is different and should be respected (belief or desire for acceptance), but establishes a condition that it should conform to “basic human values” (implicit preference for standard which is set by his own culture).

Another subscore from the IDI is called *Cultural Disengagement (CD)*. This is a sense of disconnection or detachment from a primary cultural group. A score of less than 4.00 indicates that the group is not “resolved” and may be experiencing a lack of involvement or connection to some core aspects of being a member of the home cultural community. The pretest score for each group is 4.0 or higher, which indicates that, in
general, the students feel that they are part of their own culture. No significant difference was found between the mean scores of the three groups. Table 19 provides an overview of the pretest data DO, PO and CD statistical results. There was no significant difference in the pretest intercultural development scores across groups.

Table 19

Analysis of Pretest DO, PO and CD Scores Between Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>PO</th>
<th>CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>84.83</td>
<td>117.68</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXIE</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>87.18</td>
<td>118.64</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>87.66</td>
<td>118.64</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test of homogeneity of variance</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA F value</td>
<td></td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA sig.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DO=Developmental Orientation, PO=Perceived Orientation, CD=Cultural Disengagement

Research Question 1

The first research question that I examined was if students participating in an SSA program develop greater intercultural sensitivity than students who do not participate.

The null and alternative hypotheses were expressed as:

— $H_0$: There is no significant difference in the mean intercultural development scores between participants of the SSA and non-participants. ($H_0$: $DO_{SSA} \leq DO_{CONTROL}$)
— H1A: *There is a significant positive difference in the mean intercultural development scores between participants of the SSA and non-participants.*

(H1A: \( \text{DO}_{\text{SSA}} > \text{DO}_{\text{CONTROL}} \))

The mean posttest DO score for the two SSA groups (\( M = 86.97, SD = 12.84 \)) was higher than that of the control group (\( M = 81.84, SD = 14.59 \)) by 5.13 points. This trend is in the predicted direction. The mean score places the SSA group within *Minimization.* Given that the group was nearly all from the majority culture, this may mean that they have a tendency to highlight commonality that masks equal recognition of cultural differences due to limited cultural self-awareness. The qualitative data would appear to support this as well.

The control group fell within an earlier stage of intercultural competence, *Polarization* (P). This can take the form of *Defense* (D), in which home culture is viewed more favorably, or *Reversal* (R) in which other cultures are viewed more favorably. Within the Control Group’s P orientation, it is important to look at the D (\( M = 3.97 \)) and R (\( M = 3.28 \)) subscores which indicates that the group has a stronger reversal than defense tendency. This means that cultural practices within one’s own group are likely to be judged from an overly critical standpoint.

Another observation about the data is that the posttest DO scores for each of the SSA groups increased, while the Control Group decreased. The orientation stages for each of the SSA groups fell within the same pretest stage, while the Control Group’s posttest score moved back a stage from Minimization to Polarization. Nearly 60% of the SSA group had a posttest stage of Minimization or Acceptance, while the Control group was less than 30%. While the intercultural development of the SSA groups was in a positive
direction and the control group reverted to an earlier orientation, the difference was not statistically significant. A \( t \) test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean DO score for the education abroad group and the control group, \( t (57) = 1.337, p > .05, \alpha = .05 \). However, when looking at the ordinal data of DO stages and using a non-parametric measure, a Mann-Whitney \( U \) test did reveal a significant difference in the DO stage of the study abroad group (\( Medn = 3.0, n = 42 \)) as compared to the Control Group (\( Medn = 2.0, n = 17 \)), \( U = 247, z = -1.993, p = .023, r = .16 \). This appears to demonstrate that there was a significant positive movement in the orientation stage which is based on ranges of DO scores. Given the small sample and effect sizes, however, additional research would be required to establish the correlation with confidence.

The statistical analysis is inconclusive, therefore, I will fail to reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the intercultural sensitivity between participants of the SSA and Control groups.

*Research Question 2*

The second research question looked at differences between the type of SSA orientations to determine if participating in the MAXIE orientation model fosters the development of greater intercultural sensitivity than students who participate in the traditional orientation. The null and alternative hypotheses are:

\[ H_0: \text{There is no significant difference in the mean intercultural development} \]

\[ \text{between participants of the two orientation models.} \quad (H_0: DO_{\text{MAXIE}} \leq DO_{\text{TRADITIONAL}}) \]
— $H_{1B}$: There is a significant positive difference in the mean intercultural development between participants of the two orientation models. ($H_{1B}$: $DO_{\text{MAXIE}} > DO_{\text{TRADITIONAL}}$)

The MAXIE orientation group achieved the greatest DO score gain ($M = 89.23, SD = 11.87$) of 2.05 points which is in the predicted direction. The Traditional orientation group had a slightly lower posttest DO score ($M = 82.89, SD = 13.90$) gain of 1.94 points. Both gains, however, were still within the DO range of the Minimization stage. A $t$ test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean DO score of the MAXIE and Traditional orientation groups, $t (40) = 1.560, p < .05, \alpha = .05$. However, when looking at the ordinal data of DO stages and using a non-parametric measure, a Mann-Whitney $U$ test did reveal a significant difference in the median DO stage of the MAXIE group ($Md_n = 5.0, n = 27$) as compared to the Traditional orientation group ($Md_n = 3.0, n = 15$), $U = 140, z = -1.798, p = .0036, r = .28$. The $r$ reveals that 28% of the difference in scores can be accounted for by the orientation model. According to Cohen (1998), this is a medium effect size.

Another observation about the data is that the posttest DO scores for each of the five MAXIE groups increased except for one. The MAXIE subgroup who went to Liepzig, Germany group had the greatest gain of all the subgroups and moved from a Minimization to Cusp of Acceptance orientation stage. This was the only group to move beyond Minimization. In the SSA-Traditional group, the DO score decreased in four of the five groups which resulted in two of the groups moving backwards in terms of their stage orientation.
The Intercultural Continuum begins with monocultural views and moves toward more intercultural views. The Minimization stage is considered a transitional orientation where people move from an “us-them” to a “we” worldview. It is not yet intercultural, but is an important step in establishing an understanding of the universal things that pull us together. As one moves beyond Minimization, one’s understanding of universal becomes more nuanced and differences can be viewed and understood in a more complex and holistic way. When reviewing the percentage of respondents at the various DO stages, the MAXIE group had a greater ratio of respondents in the more advanced stages (Minimization and beyond) than the traditional orientation. Table 20 reflects the percentage of students in the early versus later DO stages.

Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Early stages (D, CP, P)</th>
<th>Later stages (M, CAC, A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXIE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual students in both groups moved both forward and backward in terms of DO scores and stages. This reflects the individual and unique nature of each person’s experience with cultural difference. The qualitative statements below were included as examples of students’ perspectives.
The individual student who made the biggest gain participated in the MAXIE orientation and moved from Minimization to the Cusp of Acceptance. The statement below is an example of her post-experience thoughts on culture:

*I think cultural difference is a very interesting subject. We are all human, but there are very major differences in how we see the world and how we live. I think we can all learn a lot from each other. We have been exploring how different cultures think, feel and understand different things. For example, Americans tend to be concerned for individual interests. In Italy, a son can live with his family until he is married. This would be viewed as a little crazy from an “American” perspective. Yet, neither approach is right or wrong. There is nothing inherently better about one way over the other. We need to keep having actual experiences with people from other cultures to be able to see more things like this.*

When reviewing the qualitative data, it does appear that some students seem to believe that the MAXIE orientation had value in terms of intercultural development. The following responses are from the standard course evaluations. They were *not* prompted to respond to intercultural learning, rather answered general questions about their “overall impression” and what they “learned” and “liked best” about the class.

— Currently, the study abroad class is helping me build an understanding of culture and how my own cultural experiences impact my views and opinions of others. I think this is helpful to have before traveling abroad. *It has also helped me to see that being in touch with my emotional response to things is a clue to my culture, and that keeping a journal will help me process this.*
— *I have never been outside the country before. The orientation course has been helpful in getting me to think about my own culture and how that will impact my experience in other cultures. The readings and assignments have helped a lot to prepare me for the experience.*

— *The class has been helpful to expose us to things we should think about, what to observe and notice. It has been very helpful to me so far. It is a good place to ask questions.*

— *The study abroad course is very successful. It opens our eyes to other cultures so when we travel abroad, we aren’t in culture shock. It also allows us to view our own personality so that we understand ourselves, and will in turn allow us to get the most from the experience.*

— *The class was really the first time I was exposed to concepts of cultural difference. The only program I have ever taken about cultural differences is the one I am taking currently. The MAXIE class prepared me more than I thought it did.*

Students also noted that the process of writing a journal seemed to help connect them to their own cultural self-awareness, which is important for individuals who are within Minimization in order to transition to a more intercultural orientation.

— *The journal that has been required before and during the education abroad program allows me to observe my feelings when experiencing other cultures. This has been very helpful to try to understand the experience in a more meaningful way.*
— *The journal forced me to reflect more on how I felt and made me think and understand myself on a different level. I am excited to be able to look back at the journal because I probably would not have done one if not for the course.*

Students in the traditional orientation completed a session evaluation form. Using a 4-point scale of *poor* to *excellent*, students rated this orientation between average and good. Most of the positive comments were related to two key topics—practical travel information, and the chance to meet other travelers and the faculty. No student mentioned culture or the need for intercultural understanding which is not surprising as this was not a component of the session. At the same time, negative comments about it being too long (4 hours), boring, and at a bad time (Saturday morning) were relatively common.

The difference in the overall evaluations between the two orientations seems to indicate that students positioned the MAXIE orientation within a learning experience context, and the traditional orientation as a very practical predeparture exercise.

While the mean DO scores did not reflect a significant change in intercultural development, the *U* test (*U* = 140, *z* = -1.798, *p* = .0036, *r* = .28) did reveal a positive difference between the median stage scores of which a medium amount (28%) can be attributed to participation in the MAXIE orientation. The qualitative data also showed that MAXIE students expressed an awareness and interest in intercultural development, and that students in the traditional orientation were not thinking about this during the structured preparation program. It does appear that the MAXIE orientation has an overall positive impact on participants’ intercultural development.
While there is a stronger effect size and the qualitative data support the alternative hypothesis, the sample size was still small and all the qualitative results were not consistent. Additional research would be required to establish the correlation with confidence. Since the statistical analysis is inconclusive, I will fail to reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the intercultural sensitivity between the MAXIE and Traditional orientation groups.

*Research Question 3*

The next two research questions related to students’ ongoing engagement with intercultural experiences. In order to assess this, students in each group were asked in the posttest IDI about the time they spent directly (face-to-face) and virtually (email, phone, texting and other electronic communication) interacting with people from other cultures (e.g., national, ethnic) per week. Responses were 0-10%, 11-25%, 26-50%, 51-75% or 76-100%. Participants were also asked about their experiences and interactions in the open-ended contexting questions.

Parallel to the above comparisons, first I wanted to explore if there was a difference in the intercultural engagement between students who participate in an SSA program and those who did not.

— $H_0C$: *There is no difference in the distribution of rates of ongoing intercultural engagement of students who participate in an SSA program and those who do not.*

($H_0C$: $IE_{SSA} \leq IE_{CONTROL}$)

— $H_1C$: *There is a significant positive difference in the distribution of rates of ongoing intercultural engagement of students who participate in an SSA program and those who do not.* ($H_0C$: $IE_{SSA} > IE_{CONTROL}$)
The postgroup respondents were asked about the amount of time they spent interacting with people from other cultures, both face-to-face and virtually (e.g., email, phone, electronic social networking). Table 21 provides an overview of the responses both face-to-face and virtual.

Table 21

*Interaction Across Cultures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Posttest group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>MAXIE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Virtual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A high percentage of students across all groups had very limited interaction with other cultures. The traditional orientation group had the least interaction with other
cultural groups, both virtually and face-to-face, while the control group had the most. The relationship between study abroad and intercultural interaction was not significant when looking at either virtual ($U = 322, z = -0.664, p = .253$) or face-to-face ($U = 295, z = -1.142, p = .127$) interaction.

An analysis of the qualitative statements of some of the SSA and Control students reveals a desire for more intercultural interaction

— *I think a greater understanding of cultural difference needs to be brought to campus, and I think there needs to be more interaction between the international students and the UD students because I think that both parties would have so much to gain from building and maintaining those relationships (MAXIE Returnee).*

— *I am very open to meeting people from different cultures. It is just difficult sometimes (SSA-Traditional returnee).*

— *The campus needs to focus on more diversity. We don’t have enough opportunity to meet people. Some programs are great, but you attend and don’t get a chance to interact. We need more real interaction (Control Group).*

**Research Question 4**

The last question that I sought to answer was related to the ongoing intercultural engagement of students who participate in the MAXIE versus those who participated in the traditional orientation.
— $H_0$D: There is no difference in the distribution of rates of ongoing intercultural engagement of students who participate in the MAXIE: Prepare and the traditional orientation. ($H_0$D: $IE_{MAXIE} \leq IE_{TRADITIONAL}$)

— $H_1$D: There is a significant positive difference in the distribution of rates of ongoing intercultural engagement of students who participate in the MAXIE: Prepare and the traditional orientation. ($H_0$D: $IE_{MAXIE} > IE_{TRADITIONAL}$)

The difference in ongoing intercultural engagement between the MAXIE and Traditional orientation groups was not significant when looking at either virtual ($U = 158, z = -1.347, p = .089$) or face-to-face ($U = 166, z = -1.086, p = .139$) interaction.

The qualitative statements of some students who participated in MAXIE, however, noted a greater cultural awareness or engagement. Some noted a connection as a result of education abroad. Sample statements include:

— I’m working for a non-profit this summer that strives to reach a very diverse group of middle and high school students. This gave me the opportunity to experience the diversity that is a part of my hometown—religious, socioeconomic, race, and more. I realize this is not international, but I believe it is part of the bigger picture of understanding other cultures. It could be easy here to overlook differences or try to ignore them. I could also pull from the overseas experience when I realized that some people really liked Americans and others did not and made that clear. For example, not seating us at a restaurant when there were tables. This helps me understand the role of culture from both sides.
Study abroad exposed me to a number of things. Since then, I have explored the plunges and breakouts offered on campus. One of the plunges is how I was exposed to a lot of Appalachia even though I had been down there before. UD should make some of these things mandatory because they are valuable to students and they don’t always get that.

I am currently studying in Spain for the semester so my daily life is one continual interaction between cultures. Anything from meals to class are tasks that I must perform in which cultural differences may surface.

I have just started a new internship at a local elementary school in which the students are almost entirely African-American. As a White college student, I have to discover these cultural differences with the students as well as when communicating with the parents.

In terms of ongoing engagement, the quantitative data showed limited face-to-face or virtual interaction with others. At the same time, the qualitative data seem to show a greater interest in interacting with others among the study abroad group. Some in the MAXIE group could actually draw the connection between their overseas experience and ongoing intercultural interactions.

Summary

The study used a pretest-posttest design to measure the impact of education abroad, and specific orientation programs in particular, on intercultural development and engagement. The pretest group was compared and showed that although the sample population was not truly random, the groups were the same in terms of age, starting
intercultural living experience, childhood region, PO, DO and CD scores. The only difference between the three pretest groups was found in gender.

The study abroad students, in general, had a higher posttest IDI score than the on-campus group. Students who participated in MAXIE had the highest posttest average. When analyzing the posttest DO stages among the groups, the Mann-Whitney non-parametric $U$ test did reveal a positive effect between both study abroad and control groups ($U = 247, z = -1.993, p = .023, r = .16$) and between MAXIE and Traditional orientation groups ($U = 140, z = -1.798, p = .0036, r = .28$).

The qualitative data provide additional context into the complexity of intercultural development, and provide some evidence of intercultural understanding and development. However, these data are exploratory in nature and meant to illustrate the quantitative findings. The overall analysis of the data is inconclusive regarding the impact of study abroad in general, and MAXIE orientation in particular related to intercultural development.
CHAPTER 5 – INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS

Interpretation of the Results

The undisputed need for global knowledge, skills and abilities, and the growing interest in education abroad at the individual (student and family), institutional, and policies levels in society today, make this study an important contribution to a relatively new and growing area of scholarly research. This research can help develop a deeper meaning of four important and emerging areas of focus in education abroad: curricular integration, program quality, learning outcomes, and predeparture orientation.

Understanding and maximizing the impact and benefit of short-term programs is of particular interest given the large and growing proportion of students to take part in these types of programs. As college and universities seek to educate students with 21st century skills and abilities, and integrate education abroad into this process, research of this nature is critical and informs the important policy questions for the field.

Much can be drawn from the results of this study. Many evaluations of study abroad students have simply looked at outcomes in relation to students who do not study abroad. This study looked at different groups within study abroad and a control group on campus. It was also the first study to explore the role of a predeparture credit-bearing course model on intercultural development.

The design of this study has several strengths and weaknesses. It is not a true experimental design as the participants were not randomly assigned to groups, which impacts the internal validity. Participants self selected into a program or course without
knowledge of the type of orientation program or the differences between them. Students’ motivations for selecting and participating in the particular program of choice were not known. This could be a confounding variable. However, peer-to-peer word of mouth has been an important part of the recruitment process as many students indicate they heard about the experience from a peer who participated in the past. Nearly all the program sites had a history of being popular with students seeking general education credits.

The length of time participants spent in each of the orientation models was also an important covariate. This is a challenge to control as one of the orientation models was a semester long. Some might argue that the “Hawthorne effect,” the phenomenon in which subjects in behavioral studies change their performance in response to being observed, may have impacted the students. At the same time, a change in one’s cultural worldview, as measured by the IDI, is a fundamental and deep shift in the way one experiences cultural differences and similarities. While the time spent in the MAXIE courses was considerably longer than the traditional orientation, the additional time itself was not likely to explain a change in DO scores. However, the combination of exposure to intercultural frameworks and reflection on cultural identity during the class, along with the overseas experience could be an important combination to impact a shift in worldview. A deeper exploration of this possible phenomenon should be explored.

Certainly, the constraints of the small size of the groups, the limitations of the design, the low posttest response rate, and the only modest interpretation of the DO stages between the SSA and Control groups ($U = 247, z = -1.993, p = .023, r = .16$) and MAXIE and Traditional groups ($U = 140, z = -1.798, p = .0036, r = .28$) imply that the results of this study should be taken in moderation. Nonetheless, the implications of this
study are interesting and worth further investigation, and certainly raise a number of important and timely questions that should be explored in the future.

The trend for each of the four research questions was in the predicted direction. The analysis of the posttest DO scores and stages for each student group indicate that the students who participated in MAXIE had the highest net score gains among the three groups. The two study abroad groups combined achieved a larger gain in DO scores than the on campus group. The on campus group posttest score dropped by slightly over 5 points. While the MAXIE and SSA actual score gains were not statistically significant, the DO stage gains between the SSA and control groups were. This indicates that those students who studied abroad did show a greater developmental gain in intercultural competency. This finding confirms the results of other studies, particularly those that took a longer term approach to measuring this intercultural development (Hammer, 2003; Paige, Fry, LaBrack, Stallman, Josic, & Jon, 2009; Paige, Stallman, & Josic, 2008). The DO stage gains between the MAXIE and Traditional orientation groups were also significant, meaning that those students who studied abroad and participated in the MAXIE courses showed a greater developmental gain in intercultural competency than their peers who did not. Research on an orientation course of this type has not been done before. The results of another study (A. D. Cohen et al., 2005) in which students used the same MAXSA text (Paige, Cohen, Kappler, Chi, & Lassegard, 2006) but had a 2-hour introduction to it and then followed an independent study format, did not show a significant gain in DO scores. It is not known if DO stage measures were analyzed. Further research on the role of a structured course model as well as the impact of faculty and staff involvement would be beneficial.
Intercultural competency is something that can develop over a lifetime. Other studies have found that it can be difficult to measure a change in intercultural development in the short run as it takes time to process and reflect. The large study conducted by AFS of students who participated in a high school exchange revealed that students in early stages of intercultural development were more likely to move forward toward Minimization. Students who began in Minimization made smaller gains, suggesting that it may be hard to “move the needle” from this transitional state (Hansel, 2008; Hansel & Chen, 2008). The starting orientation for over 50% of the students in this research was in Minimization.

Several other observations are worth noting from the examination of the data. The nature of a developmental model is that each person moves through it in her/his own way. In terms of research data, the average scores are meaningful to determine differences between groups. At the same time, students start at different points and move forward and backward in different ways. When looking at the group data, the aggregate results do not represent the individual scenarios.

A narrow range of Orientations suggests the group has a more consistent perspective that they use when confronted with cultural differences and similarities. A wider range of Developmental Orientations within the group reflects a lack of consensus on how they make sense of and adapt behavior to cultural differences and commonalities. In these cases, the group has a mix of monocultural, transitional and intercultural mindsets, with the majority in Polarization and Minimization. SSA overall had a greater percentage of students in Minimization, and MAXIE an even greater percentage.

Table 22 provides an overview of the range of orientations for each group.
Table 22

Range of Developmental Orientations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Denial</th>
<th>Polarization</th>
<th>Minimization</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXIE</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXIE</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall four-course MAXIE design is developmental in its approach as it can address students at different points in the 4-year degree program. At the same time, the individual courses are somewhat fixed. In the case of the MAXIE: Prepare, the course was designed before the beginning of the term, prior to knowing the range of developmental orientations of the groups. The journal writing was meant to get at some of their individual experiences; however, the overall design of the course was targeted toward those in Minimization.

Again, individuals bring unique experiences to the group which means that each group is also different. It is helpful to see in more detail the individual experience of students. One MAXIE student, whose pretest orientation was Minimization with some trailing Defense, moved backward to Polarization in the posttest IDI with Reversal
emerging as an indicator that he became more critical of his own culture through the experience.

Trailing issues are those orientations that are “in back of” the DO on the intercultural continuum that are not “resolved.” When an earlier orientation is not resolved, individuals may draw on trailing perspectives to make sense of and respond to cultural differences at particular times, around certain topics, or in specific situations (Hammer, 2009a). In some cases, it appears that trailing issues pulled students back from their starting DO for dealing with cultural differences and commonalities. Intuitively, this would make sense as students on study abroad are exposed to many new things and find new ways to process these experiences.

In an interview with this student, he described the trip as “one of the best” in his college career. He also discussed that the experience “didn’t present many challenges” due to cultural difference. At the same time, he did make some observations which gives a sense for this new reversal perspective:

— The one thing I noticed right off the bat and then was really excited once I got back home was the Vespas and the bikes that they use. I thought that was the coolest thing ever. I came back and said that I needed to get a bike to ride to work or my friends’ house. Gas is so expensive and they are so ecological. It pleasantly surprised me even though the Vespas kept us up at times. I even thought about buying one when I got back. Kinda of on a gender thing, seeing males and females use them over there, I think Americans might be stereotypical in thinking that they might be more for females. I don’t mean to be rude about it, but seeing a guy on a Vespa in
America one might question his manhood. It helped me see that this view is a cultural thing and has no real basis in gender.

— My impressions of U.S. culture are slightly more negative now. The culture there is so laid back and then coming back I saw the busy culture here. We talk about food and the cuisine compared to ours. The food there was awesome.

At the same time, he reported an extremely positive experience and expressed how it made him learn in new ways. He noted that the biggest thing he will take away for the future is the learning experience:

— Personally, I think I learn better by experiencing the education itself, instead of going to a class like here on campus. Actually seeing the history and what we are learning about helps me learn. The freedom that we had to participate in what we learned was also something that surprised me. We were allowed to help determine what we would learn.

— The way that I made the trip special for myself and how I made it my own trip was also important. Yes, we went with the group, but there were times when I would go off on my own and walk around by myself and that was also what made it such a good experience. You know I mentioned the bikes. I ended up buying one—I couldn’t buy a Vespa, so I bought a bike. Every now and then I get on the bike and leave campus and go on the trail by the river and just be on my own. Just to get away from campus and think. I don’t know if you’ve ever heard this, but as a student we talk about the UD bubble. The bike helps me get beyond that and have time to think.
In terms of ongoing engagement, he reported being motivated to go back and travel more, and an interest in meeting new people:

— *It did make me wanna do more service with the breakout programs. This past fall, I went down to New Orleans and I think doing the study abroad trip made me wanna do the fall breakout. It is nice to meet a group of students that you don’t normally get to meet. Especially with the breakout you get more students from all different age groups and different majors all wanting to do the same thing. That was such a great trip too—to do hurricane relief was an eye opening experience.*

About the MAXIE course, he reported an overall positive impression:

— *There were some things that were very helpful about the MAXIE course. Getting started exploring the place. That was a great experience. Some other things, no offense or anything, for one credit hour course was a lot of work. But overall, it was good that we did it. I learned a lot about what to expect.*

Even though this student moved from Minimization into Polarization, his reflections on his own development are interesting and relevant to understanding the complexity of each student’s intercultural journey.

Another student, for example, had a pretest DO score within the *cusp of polarization*, reflecting a relatively early expression of an “us and them” judgmental viewpoint toward cultural differences. Denial was a trailing issue for this student which means that during certain times, topics or situations she likely recognizes more observable cultural differences (e.g., food) but may not notice deeper cultural differences (e.g., conflict resolution styles). A sample statement from this student regarding the MAXIE class:
The MAXIE class so far has been about culture and exploring differences. I’m not sure why we are focusing so much on them. England is different, sure, but we don’t need to go crazy on pointing out every single difference. Everyone should live to have equal values.

The posttest score for this student was Polarization indicating that she moved forward on the developmental continuum.

Meaning for Constituents

The study has shown the need to better understand education abroad, including the complexity of the individual student experience, the role of faculty and staff, and predeparture preparation in developing intercultural competency in undergraduates. Predeparture orientation may serve many goals. Most cover logistics, health and safety, and practical travel information. Some also hope to build community among students and faculty, or to begin developing content knowledge prior to travel. In the case of programs that also have goals of fostering intercultural sensitivity, special attention needs to be given to the developmental nature of this area and the perspectives students bring with them as a starting point. The MAXIE orientation ambitiously tried to accomplish all of this. Though the IDI data did not establish MAXIE as a clear means to do this, the qualitative data did provide some evidence that students took away greater intercultural awareness which is important to build a more complex perspective. The other goals of the MAXIE course were not the focus of this study so we cannot say whether these goals were also met. However, the importance of orientation and the need to continue to study it is clear.
The majority of the students began in Minimization. Other studies have shown that it may be hard to “move the needle” from this transitional state (Hansel, 2008; Hansel & Chen, 2008). Of the hundreds of IDIs that I have administered beyond this study, well over half of the results are in Minimization. This number increases when looking at only the responses from people who grew up in the US. Perhaps there is something about the cultural history of the US that fosters a desire to seek the similarities. Clearly this is a more advanced perspective than the “us – them” dichotomy of the earlier stage of defense. There may be more support culturally for moving from monocultural stages to the transitional stage of minimization in which individuals tend to seek common ground with others. Given the history of separation of cultures in the US, and the civil rights struggle to change it, perhaps this is not surprising.

This generation of students has more intercultural experience than any of those before them. As the US continues to develop as a multicultural country, the level of exposure will certainly increase. Moreover, students are entering college with more diverse backgrounds and experiences. The majority (61%) will have already traveled in another country with their families. Approximately 1/3 have an immediate family member who moved to the US from another country, and slightly over 1/4 will be from a home where English is not the language spoken at home (Green, Hesel, et al., 2008). Of course, we already know that mere exposure does not automatically foster development in sensitivity; however, with the number of people exposed, it seems likely that more of them could make meaning of the experiences in complex ways. As faculty and staff gain more intercultural experience and knowledge, and work with new generations of students who will be part of an even more diverse society, the question of their preparation and
role becomes even more important. As more people have increased exposure to cultural others, the possibility that more will move into the intercultural stages of acceptance and adaptation will increase. Perhaps more support for those in the transitional stage of minimization will also emerge to foster further intercultural development.

The design of the study did not incorporate exploration of the level of intercultural competency of the faculty and staff who delivered the MAXIE program. Faculty were offered the opportunity to take the IDI, however, most opted not to take it. The mean DO score of the few faculty who did complete the IDI fell within the Minimization stage. Olsen and Kroeger (2001) found that faculty with second-language skills and significant experience in another country increased the likelihood of their intercultural perspective. Many programs have intercultural understanding as a primary goal of the education abroad experience. If faculty are at the same level of intercultural development as the students they are teaching on an education abroad program, is intercultural development possible? How can it be facilitated? Many short-term programs are led by U.S. faculty. Does this make a difference in terms of the possibilities for intercultural development? What happens when programs are led by local faculty? Other scholars have noted the need for professional development of education abroad advisors/directors to develop greater capacity to match goals and outcomes with program design/offering (Sobre-Denton & Hart, 2008). If intercultural competency is a goal of education, we need to reflect on faculty and staff training and preparation to impact this important outcome.

Another theoretical framework that is worth considering in terms of education abroad program selection and orientation is social learning theory (Rotter, 1954, 1982).
The fundamental principle of the theory is the idea that people respond to both the expectancy that certain behavior will be rewarded and that reward is valued by the individual. The extent to which people see a connection between what they do and what happens to them, referred to as Locus of Control, is an important expectancy in social learning theory. McLeod and Wainwright (2009) posit that research findings using this theory point to an overwhelming consensus that internally controlled persons do better in unstructured situations in which they are left to their own devices to solve problems. While externally controlled individuals do best in structured situations in which they have more input on what to do and expect, it makes sense that individuals bring their locus of control perspectives with them into the new experience of traveling abroad.

Matching students’ locus of control with their intercultural competence to prepare for the education aboard program of choice may enhance the experience by reducing stressful situations that violate expectances and permitting students to process these challenges in the context of experiencing intercultural complexity. This matching between students’ locus of control and the preparation for the type of education abroad program may also be beneficial. Again, the challenge presented here is the individual nature of this approach, particularly if hundreds of students are involved.

Another area worth exploring in relation to intercultural development are students’ learning styles. Students can be visual, auditory or tactile learners, or extraverted or introverted, closure-oriented or open, impulsive or reflective. This came up in a student interview with an individual in the control group. She lived with international students in the international learning living community and moved from Polarization to Cusp of Acceptance, one of the larger gains among all the students in this study.
It was an overwhelming experience to be living with others your age and transitioning to school. At first, I probably reserved myself from engaging with the international students. Normally, I’m an introvert and just being with my American peers and dealing with classes was overwhelming. We did small talk and I didn’t get to know the international students very well. I went on to live in the ILLC again and this was very different as some of the community from the first year was in the community. I knew one of my roommates and that provided some security for me. It was more comfortable as I had familiar faces and new friends. It was a lot more fun and I was more socially active. I got to know them really well and they are now part of my family and it is great. My friends and I still talk about the experience the second year.

It was hard to address some of our differences directly. My Chinese roommates didn’t know how to use the appliances in the US, a sweeper for example. Sometimes they did not clean like us. There would be a pile of dishes and they wouldn’t clean them since they were used to having parents doing it. I assumed all people would learn basic courtesies and that people would know their responsibilities when sharing a space. I didn’t think less of them, but realized that we grew up differently. It could be frustrating for me at times, and I didn’t know how to tell them these things politely. I would just end up doing the dishes myself so as not to cause any conflict. I felt like I always treated them with care so that we would maintain good relationships.

She acknowledges both her own personality and cultural differences in the context of her experience. Her resistance to the idea of judging the behavior of her international
roommates and struggling with how to address it in an appropriate way sheds some light on her cultural worldview at the Cusp of Acceptance. The role that being introverted had on her intercultural development is not known. This relationship is something worth exploring in future studies.

Lessons Learned

Keeping a developmental framework in mind. Based on the quantitative results and close evaluation of the quantitative data, it is important to remember that developmental theories guide us to work with students from where they are. In some areas like reading or piano, it is easy to place students. Students who are participating in a study abroad program may be appropriately placed academically, but each student comes to the program with a different level of intercultural competency. This is generally not known in advance, so it is challenging to anticipate and develop an appropriate approach for a given class of students. In this case, the course syllabi were developed in collaboration with the faculty involved well in advance of knowing the DO scores of students. An ideal situation would be to have a baseline IDI when students enter the university. A variety of intercultural experiences and curricular options, both local and abroad, could be examined more broadly in order to determine those that have the most positive impact on students’ development.

Some students in the MAXIE: Prepare seemed to understand the orientation process as evidenced by the qualitative comments on their understanding for the need. Quite a number of students even suggested that universities consider requiring this type of program given its importance and the tensions between extremely busy lives of students. It may be that students who felt this way were more ready developmentally to
explore their own and other cultures. The course evaluations were anonymous and I was not able to test this.

On the other hand, a good number of students did not seem to appreciate the MAXIE course at all. The timing of the introduction and exploration of cultural information is important when considering the developmental framework. Perhaps students in early stages of intercultural development would be more prepared for this after the education abroad experience. This would be another interesting area to explore.

In the evaluations of the program, many students noted that they had “more important concerns” than learning about culture. While some students clearly expressed an appreciation for the MAXIE orientation, others were more ambivalent or even anxious to have other types of information. Again, consideration of the most appropriate intervention based on the developmental orientation is an important one. A sample of evaluation comments from those who felt time should have been spent on other things:

— I appreciated the value of the assignments, though it was too much work. I did not appreciate having to complete them while focusing on all my other classes.

— The MAXIE course forced us to consider the upcoming experience. However, I think it would have been more helpful to have had an emphasis on researching Florence in terms of things to do and places to see. Then we might have made more informed decisions regarding traveling and sight-seeking

— I wasn’t a huge fan of the MAXIE course, and had to rely on friends and my own research for recommendations.

— The general parts of MAXIE were pointless as we should have been more focused on Italy and group work.
— I would have liked to have more tips like we got in email about places to see and go. I wanted more information about how to get from the airport to the hotel, where we were staying, good places for weekend trips, and that kind of thing.

— The course was good, but I would focus more on students getting to know each other.

— It didn’t help at all and we should skip it or condense it. Focus on the practical information we need like the schedule and in country course expectation.

— I thought the MAXIE course prepared me very well for Firenze; however, I felt I did not take advantage of some of the material because it was difficult putting it into context having no previous knowledge.

— Too much work for one credit hour. Too much on culture general topics, not enough about our site.

Student expectations about the study abroad experience are important considerations. Some students in the MAXIE course “got it” while others clearly thought it was a waste of time. Some focused on more pressing issues, such as packing and their peers. Meeting other students and faculty who are traveling was also a very popular ‘benefit’ of the MAXIE course that was identified by the students. If what Zemach-Bersin (2009) concluded is accurate, that students are passive consumers of education abroad, this needs to be more fully understood in order to engage them in a way that will foster learning goals. Additional research in this area would benefit the field.

The MAXIE: Prepare course was one component of a larger developmental model. The focus of this study was only on the second one-credit course. Additional study of the model in its entirety would be beneficial to determine if an ongoing
orientation to intercultural understanding and competency would be a more effective approach. When looking at some of the cases of students who participated in the series, it may make sense that students need to have an ongoing opportunity to explore these issues over a 4-year program of study.

Several cases of students who have participated in the MAXIE: Explore module are worth noting here. This course focused on understanding the various options and opportunities students had to internationalize their education both on- and off- campus. Students began to develop an understanding of how an international education is tied to the process of academic inquiry and relates to their chosen majors. Students also developed a plan for integrating international education into their university experience.

Specific course objectives included:

1. Prepare to internationalize learning and living at UD.
2. Understand the impacts of internationalization on your personal, intellectual and professional development.
3. Develop a personal plan for internationalization for each year at UD, including curriculum planning, funding opportunities and timelines.
4. Begin to develop an electronic portfolio of your international/intercultural learning experience.

The internationalization plan included explorations of their own cultural background, core values and beliefs, as well as the target culture where they choose to study abroad. In addition, students identified outcomes such as language competency, disciplinary knowledge, and intercultural effectiveness/understanding. They also looked at practical aspects such as curricular planning and financial needs.
While no formal study has been completed, a fair number of students who have engaged in the course during the freshman or sophomore years have gone on to do some rather impressive things. One student identified an interest in continuing with her studies in French. She identified, and ultimately participated in, a semester exchange program at a partner school in northern France. Upon return, she engaged in a summer length program in Francophone West Africa where she conducted research, in French, for an honors thesis. Another student wanted to explore the intersection of human rights in Latin America. She planned to participate in an immersion program in Guatemala for the summer after the MAXIE course. Upon return, she decided to participate in a semester program in South America with a specific focus on human rights in the region. Two other students identified Arabic and the Middle East as foci for their education. Both have taken Arabic and related courses (e.g., history, political science of the region) here on campus. One decided to live with an international student from the region in the international learning living community, and had plans to complete a semester in Egypt next year. Another student participated in a summer program at a partner school in Morocco and then arranged to complete a semester in the West Bank. He will be doing yet another semester in Egypt in the coming fall. Each of these students is exceptional and I do not mean to imply that MAXIE was the factor that facilitated this. However, it does beg the question about the timely intervention of planning and intercultural material that can kick start a journey of exploration that can have even greater impact.

Data collection. The design of the study and the timing were important lessons. Selecting a broader range of students to participate in the three groups could have enhanced the results. A larger number of participants would have made the results more
meaningful. As mentioned earlier, gender differences between the control group and the abroad group were not equally distributed.

The timing of the posttest administration of the IDI was another factor that likely impacted the response rate. It was given near the end of the academic year when students were focusing on other things. Fatigue factor might have impacted the responses to the posttest administration as well. The respondents may have been tired by the length of the survey itself. They may have realized they answered similar questions before and did not want to take time to do it again. The respondents seemed much more willing to answer the open-ended contexting questions during the first administration of the IDI than the second. During the pre-administration of the IDI, 120 of 210 or 57% offered responses. The length of the responses, averaging 2-4 sentences per answer, was considerably longer in the pre-administration of the IDI. From the posttest, only 20 of 59 completed the contexting questions or 34%. In addition to a lower response rate, the answers were much shorter and often without much thought (e.g., I have had none, Can’t think of anything). This could also be a factor of the timing of the administration and that students were focused on finishing the year and leaving campus for the summer.

The number of paired samples was fewer than the total number of posttest results due to a couple of cases where the participants had the same last name and could not be matched with 100% certainty. In two cases, the first initial was also the same. In the future, I would ask for student ID which is a unique number.

It was also difficult to get students to respond to the request for an in-person interview. Even though I offered to conduct these over the phone, it seems students were
moving on to the summer and were not willing to make time for the interview. I had hoped to capture more individual stories, but was only able to arrange four interviews.

Though the qualitative data were very informative, I was not able to match all of them with specific respondents. Some of the data were collected (course evaluations) anonymously, so it was difficult to identify them with a particular student’s journey. Again, using a student ID number may have been an alternative approach that I did not consider.

These challenges would have been mitigated by better planning. At the same time, the process of designing this research was the educational experience that provides the kind of insight needed to develop as a researcher. I am confident that in a future research design, that the nuances of data collection learned during this process will make me a better scholar.

Recommendations

This research attempted to take a medium-term approach to assessing the relationship between education abroad and intercultural development by waiting one year to ask students to take the posttest IDI. Other scholars have taken a long-term approach and successfully identified a relationship (Hansel, 2008; Hansel & Chen, 2008; Paige et al., 2009, February; Paige et al., 2008). Future researchers may wish to develop a design that would look at both the short-term impacts, as well as the sustainability of those impacts over time.

This study was limited to students studying abroad for a summer, but future studies should look at other lengths of stay for similar kinds of comparisons. Or, future study could focus on credit bearing versus non-credit bearing, and different regional
outcomes (Africa, Asia, Latin America, etc.) Cultural learning and transition are
different across cultures and from home to destination. International students coming to
the US, versus U.S. students to Western Europe and then again to Latin America or
Africa, or Asia would also enhance our understanding of intercultural development both
on campus and in education abroad.

Little is known about the factors that influence students’ predisposition to study
abroad. Factors such as socioeconomic status, advanced placement credits upon entry,
and first year experience may all play a role. Openness to other cultures may also be a
factor. Perhaps there could be a link between predisposition and the advancement of
intercultural sensitivity that would be helpful to understand in the entire chain—
recruitment, preparation and development (Salisbury et al., 2009). This presents another
important area of research that could be investigated.

Policy Implications

Officials in institutions of higher education are called to make international
education in general, and education abroad in particular an integral component of
learning programs today. There are a wide variety of types of programs that vary on a
number of factors. The importance of education abroad is undisputed, yet nearly 90%
“never” or “rarely” require students going abroad to take a for-credit predeparture or
reentry course (Woodruff et al., 2005). This demonstrates that education abroad is still
rather limited in terms of a truly integrated approach to curriculum design or
comprehensive internationalization.

Engle and Engle’s (2003) recommendation that scholars in the field should work
to build on the classification system that would go beyond merely location and duration,
and include comparable factors such as language, cultural proximity, course focus, and objectives. would assist in the ability to compare other study outcomes and ultimately generalize more findings. The classification system could be connected to the standards of best practice and quality developed by the Forum for Education Abroad. This would also give institutional officials some guidance in terms of evaluation of quality of all facets of programs, including institutional mission and fit; learning outcomes; faculty development; health and safety; and financial management (Whalen, 2009). Moreover, campus officials are called to develop strategic approaches to study abroad and to:

— Develop and articulate a mission and goals for study abroad,
— Engage faculty as advocates for study abroad,
— Meet the challenges of financing study abroad,
— Build an effective organization to support study abroad, and
— Identify capacity for expansion of their programs (Heisel & Stableski, 2009).

The role of predeparture preparation has important implications for curricular integration, faculty and staff development, and learning outcomes.

Some scholars (Shealy, 2008; Tohidian, 2009) posit that knowledge is both conscious and unconscious. Both types of knowledge are acquired through experience or education. Much of what a person learns or ‘understands’ happens outside of conscious awareness. Culture is one of those areas that we tend to ‘know’ via an unconscious process. The very language we use and speak influences the way we perceive and think about the world, or at least makes it easier to think one way or another. According to the alumni study done by Paige et al. (2008), there is strong empirical evidence that undergraduate students who study abroad during their college years become globally
engaged in a variety of ways and that they recognize the role that education abroad plays in it. An investment in study abroad at all levels, federal, state, institutional and individual—can have a positive and long-term impact on social environmental and political elements of our world.

I hope that this study is merely the beginning of much research into this topic and that our knowledge will continue to develop in order to MAXimize International Education for all students.

Future Research Questions

If the goal of higher education is not only the development of career or professional skills, but also intellectual and moral capacities, exposure to different cultures, experiences, and ways of thinking may be essential. It is important to understand the role higher education plays in our increasingly global society by examining the theories and underlying assumptions of its policies and practices. In particular, it is critical to understand the internationalization of institutions of higher education in the US and their role in providing learning opportunities to students that link theory and practice for a deeper understanding of the world. Rationale for international expansion typically focuses on economic or career/professional goals that prepare students for the global workplace, while little emphasis is placed on the developmental aspects of international education (Gmelch, 1997). Perhaps such grounding is needlessly thin.

A better understanding of how international education transforms students’ understanding of the world might even have a reciprocal effect. Understanding the effects could itself deepen the justification for internationalization and more urgently demand that educators develop comprehensive strategic approaches to the internationalization
process that integrates curricular changes, faculty development, extracurricular programming, partnerships, and community outreach efforts. A number of important questions emerged, or were again raised, from this study that should be addressed in future studies, such as:

— What are the factors that impact students’ intent to study abroad? Choice of program, location and duration? How does this impact intercultural development?

— What are the barriers to participation in education abroad programs in the first place? Most schools (91%) offer study abroad options to students. Why do 25% of schools still report no participation?

— Why do females consistently participate at greater rates than males?

— What are the factors behind the growth of short-term programs? Why are colleges and universities focusing on growth in the short-term sector? Why are there differences between the type of institution and the participation rates in programs which are different in length?

— How do short-term programs versus semester or longer term models impact intercultural development, or other important program goals?

— Many education abroad programs have different primary goals for the education abroad experience. Do these goals have an impact on intercultural development?

— What are the characteristics of program design and structure that contribute most to intercultural development?
— What are the factors that impact intercultural development both on campus and overseas? Are there personal characteristics that make it easier to advance (e.g., being extroverted, externally controlled, motivated)?

— What type of on-campus and overseas experiences might facilitate this development (e.g., experience with international students/faculty, academic engagement, participation in intercultural activities)?

— If faculty are at the same or earlier stages of intercultural development as the students they are teaching on an education abroad program, how does this impact intercultural development? Can faculty facilitate intercultural development beyond their own worldview? How can faculty develop greater intercultural competency?

— Many short-term programs are led by U.S. faculty. Does this make a difference in terms of the possibilities for intercultural development? How is intercultural development impacted when local faculty lead a program?

— What educational outcomes result from integration of education abroad into the curriculum, what is the most effective way to integrate?

Additional research in this area is important to develop a more comprehensive and complex understanding of international education in general, and educational abroad in particular. Understanding the impact of integration of the on campus and overseas experiences is an important area of research in order to advance learning in its local and global contexts
Conclusion

This study was initiated in an effort to better understand and quantify the benefits of study abroad in the context of a global world. Although anecdotal evidence abounds, there has been little quantifiable research on the skills and traits that students develop as a result of studying abroad and how these apply to life today. Even more limited is the focus on short-term programs, the most popular and growing area for study abroad. Short-term programs represent more than half of U.S. study abroad participation; yet, published scholarship concentrating on these programs is limited. Studies that have been done often focus on smaller, discipline-specific groups of students or focus on second language acquisition and not intercultural development. Moreover, most studies do not establish preprogram baseline data or have a comparison group of peers on campus (Chieffo & Griffiths, 2009). Despite the increase in scholarship in this area, the surface has barely been scratched and there is a great deal to learn about these programs and how they impact students. The variety of programming, and the unique approach that each campus and even individual faculty take, makes assessment and evaluation challenging. Higher education must build infrastructure and systems for internationalization to support the strategic integration of education abroad if it is to succeed in providing education that will result in the perspectives and skills needed in the global context.
APPENDICES

Appendix A: Development of the Intercultural Development Inventory

The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) is a statistically reliable and cross-culturally valid measure of intercultural sensitivity. It was developed by Hammer in 1988 and originally based on Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) and then refined based on the Intercultural Development Continuum (IDC). It is a 50-item questionnaire that has been translated into 12 languages, using a rigorous back translation method. Responses to statements are made on a 5-point agree-disagree scale.

Pederson and Tower made initial efforts to measure DMIS concepts (Hammer et al., 2003). In the late 1980s, Hammer began work on the Intercultural Development Inventory following scale construction guidelines (DeVellis, 1991). The IDI was developed to measure six primary dimensions of the DMIS (Hammer, 2009b, 2009c) which can be placed on an intercultural development continuum, as presented in the following figure:

**Intercultural Development Continuum**

- Monocultural Mindset
- Intercultural Mindset

Copyright, 2007, 2009 Mitchell R. Hammer, Ph.D.

Modified from the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS), M. Bennett, 1986
The IDI has been psychometrically tested and determined to be a robust cross-culturally generalizable, valid and reliable assessment of an individual’s or group’s core orientations toward cultural difference (Hammer, 1999, 2007, 2009c; Hammer et al., 2003; Paige et al., 2003). Validation of the IDI is based on confirmatory factor analysis, reliability analysis, and construct validity tests.

The IDI went through three stages of development in order to establish its viability. The first stage of IDI development involved guided interviews of 40 men and women from a wide range of ages, experiences and cultures. Four researchers rated 25 of the interview transcripts across each of the six orientations (Defense/Denial, Reversal, Minimization, Acceptance/Adaptation, Integration) of the DMIS. Inter-rater reliabilities (Cohen’s kappa) across all scales were good, ranging from .66 to .86. Hammer then set out to develop items that reflected the latent variables underlying each orientation. A large number of statements (250+) were developed from comments made during the interviews. Some were ultimately eliminated due to lack of clarity or ambiguity. Pilot tests of the remaining 239 items were conducted to determine item clarity, instruction, response option applicability, and time to complete. Based on feedback from this stage, Hammer further refined the IDI using an expert panel review.

A panel of seven experts reviewed the items and independently placed each item into one of the six DMIS orientations, and unreliable items were eliminated. Those selected had inter-rater agreement of .6 or higher and at least five of the seven experts were able to categorize the item. This resulted in the selection of 145 items.

A sample test of the 145-item version was conducted with 226 subjects. The group was very diverse in areas of age, gender, education, international experience, and
ethnic background. Factor analysis was conducted for each orientation, in an effort to reduce the items to a manageable and reliable set. Based on these criteria, 10 items were chosen for each orientation (60 total) with alphas ranging from .80 to .91. These 60 items in turn were examined in a sample of 312 respondents. While six scales were identified, as shown in Table A1, placement of these scores along the developmental continuum was not determined (Hammer, 1999).

Table A1

**IDI Version 1 Scales and Reliabilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>N of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Adaptation</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Adaptation</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next version of the IDI was reduced to a 50-item questionnaire, with additional measures for reversal and integration included to further link the testing to the original DMIS theory. Paige and others (as cited in Hammer et al., 2003) conducted tests that indicated additional analysis was needed to establish a more stable set of factors and subsequent measurement scales. Additional items were eliminated and 122 items were selected for the next administration and response options adjusted. Three additional scales were included. Also, the Worldmindedness Scale and the Intercultural Anxiety
Scale were used to assess construct validity. Another scale was also included to check for social desirability effects.

A sample of 591 diverse respondents completed the final version. Hammer addressed both construct and content validity in the development of the IDI. Content validity was addressed by the in-depth interviews during the initial phases of the process, the use of raters and a panel of experts. Construct validity was addressed by comparing the scales with two other theoretically related constructs—Worldmindedness Scale and Social Anxiety scale (modified Intercultural Anxiety). Table A2 provides an overview.

Table A2

*Correlation Coefficients between Five IDI Sub-Scales and the Worldmindedness and Intercultural Anxiety Scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDI Sub-Scale</th>
<th># of Items</th>
<th>Worldmindedness scale</th>
<th>Intercultural anxiety scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>Ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>Ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were computed for gender, age, and education levels across each developmental orientation. No significant differences were found, except for gender in one orientation. No significant differences were found between each orientation and the Marlowe-Crown social desirability scale.
The confirmatory factor analysis of the revised IDI instrument indicated that the five-factor solution provided a good fit to the data. Five dimensions were validated: Denial/Defense (DD), Reversal (R), Minimization (M), Acceptance/Adaptation (AA), and Encapsulated Marginality (EM) (Hammer et al., 2003). The five-factor solution is a better fit than the original, seven-dimensional design matching Bennett’s model or the more general model of monocultural and intercultural mindsets. No significant effects were found for each on the five scales by age, education level, or social desirability, and no significant effect for gender was seen on four of the five scales. All in all, the analyses point to a well-constructed scale.

Hammer recently conducted an even more comprehensive testing of the IDI with a large sample of 4,763 respondents across a wide range of cultures, age groups and professions (Hammer, 2007). Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) allowed for empirical differences between the Denial and Defense orientation and between Acceptance and Adaptation, resulting in seven distinct scales. Two composite scores were also identified. Table A3 provides an overview.

The Perceived Orientation (PO) score reflects where the individual or group places itself along the continuum of monocultural to intercultural mindset. The Developmental Orientation score (DO) uses a weighted formula to identify the primary orientation along the continuum, or the perspective that is most likely to be employed in situations involving cultural difference (Hammer, 2007, 2009c). The cultural disengagement score was identified as a new and distinct dimension which is not considered part of the continuum. It reflects a level of disconnectedness or alienation one feels from his/her own cultural group. This can arise from a variety of experiences,
including adaptation to one or more new cultures, or an experience of being rejected or made to feel as an outsider (J. M. Bennett & Bennett, 2004). In addition, the CFA showed that the seven core orientations were a better fit to the data over the five-factor model used in earlier versions.

Table A3

IDI Version V Scales and Reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversal</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Disengagement</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Orientation</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Orientation</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the intercorrelations among the seven dimensions support the developmental continuum and the relationships among the core orientations. Table A4 provides an overview of the correlations. Strong correlations were identified between relevant scales. Negative correlations between Defense and Denial scales and the Acceptance and Adaptation scales were also found. Cultural Disengagement is not significantly correlated with defense, minimization, acceptance, or adaptation. This
supports the notion that cultural disengagement is related to the disconnection experienced with one’s own cultural group.

Table A4

*Correlations among Seven Orientations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Denial</th>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>Reversal</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>Adapt</th>
<th>CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversal</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>-.185</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural disengagement</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, validity of the IDI was established in several ways. Content validity was established by using actual statements drawn from interviews, along with the reliable categorization of these statements by both raters and the panel of intercultural experts. Construct validity was established by correlating the early version of the IDI scales with the Worldmindedness scale (Sampson & Smith, 1957; Wiseman et al., 1989) and with the Intercultural Anxiety scale, a modified version of the Social Anxiety scale (Gao & Gudykunst, 1990). Correlations between the individual IDI scales and the Worldmindedness and Intercultural Anxiety scales were in the direction predicted (e.g., DD scale was negatively related to Worldmindedness and positively related to intercultural anxiety while the AA scale was positively related to Worldmindedness and negatively related to intercultural anxiety).
Tests on the latest version provide confirmatory support for seven scales and two composite scales for the IDI. Additional analysis indicated no systematic differences were found by gender, age, or educational level, providing further evidence of the robustness and generalizability of the measure. Finally, there was no significant correlation of the IDI scales to social desirability.
Appendix B: Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development

The following chart provides a summary of Kohlberg’s stages (Coverston, 2007; Crain, 2005; Kohlberg, 1984).

**KOHLBERG’S THEORY OF MORAL DEVELOPMENT**

### A. PREMORAL OR PRECONVENTIONAL STAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS: Self</th>
<th>AGES: Up to 10-13 years of age, most prisoners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 1: PUNISHMENT AND OBEDIENCE</td>
<td>Behavior motivated by anticipation of pleasure or pain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONS: What must I do to avoid punishment? What can I do to force my will upon others?</td>
<td>- Morality seen as external.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Assumption that powerful authorities have a fixed set of rules that must be unquestioningly obeyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Avoidance of physical punishment and deference to power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Goodness and badness are determined by immediate physical consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 2: INDIVIDUALISM AND EXCHANGE</td>
<td>- Recognition that different individuals have different viewpoints and that there is not just one right view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONS: What's in it for me? What must I do to avoid pain, gain pleasure?</td>
<td>- Punishment is a risk that one tries to avoid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Individuals exchange favors, but there is still no identification with values of family or community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I'll scratch your back if you scratch mine.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. CONVENTIONAL MORALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS: Significant Others, &quot;Tyranny of the They&quot; (They say….)</th>
<th>AGES: Beginning in middle school, up to middle age - most people end up here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 3: INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS</td>
<td>Acceptance of the rules and standards of one's group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION: What must I do to be seen as a good boy/girl (socially acceptable)?</td>
<td>- Belief in living up to expectations of family and community and to behave in a ‘good’ way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Individual acts to gain approval of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Shift from unquestioning obedience to worldview that is relative and that is focused on concern for good motives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mostly framed within ‘in group’ references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 4: MAINTAINING SOCIAL ORDER</td>
<td>- Shift to concern about society as a whole that is framed with an understanding of the function of society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION: What if everyone did that?</td>
<td>- Respect for fixed rules, laws and authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Authority figures seldom questioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rights legitimized by authority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C. POSTCONVENTIONAL OR PRINCIPLED MORALITY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS: Justice, Dignity for all life, Common Good</th>
<th>AGES: Few reach this stage, most not prior to middle age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 5: INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND SOCIAL CONTRACT</td>
<td>• Individuals begin to reflect on what makes a good society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONS: What is the just thing to do given all the circumstances? What will bring the most good to the largest number of people?</td>
<td>• Moral action in a specific situation is not defined by reference to a checklist of rules, but from logical application of universal, abstract, moral principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 6: UNIVERSAL ETHICAL PRINCIPLES</td>
<td>• Recognition that different groups have different values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONS: What will foster life in its fullest for all living beings? What is justice for all?</td>
<td>• Belief in certain basic rights such as liberty and life, and democratic process for improving laws and society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Morality and rights take some priority over established authority or laws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pursuit of justice for all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Just change not always achieved via democratic process and requires impartial treatment of all parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Respect for basic dignity of all people, regardless of individual actions, beliefs or values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An individual who reaches this stage acts out of universal principles based upon the equality and worth of all living beings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of civil disobedience to address injustice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Sample MAXIE Syllabus

Maximizing International Education: Prepare LONDON (UDI 210)

| **Instructor(s)** | Director-International Studies and Human Rights  
| | Director-Center for International Programs  
| | Programs Director-Education Abroad  
| | Site Director-Teacher Education  
| | Faculty-Psychology  
| | Faculty-Political Science |

| **Class Meetings** | Section 1—Tuesday (4:30-5:45) for London |

Course Objectives:

This course focuses on preparing the student to take part in an experience overseas by focusing on strategies for success. Students will begin to develop intercultural communication and sensitivity skills and techniques that can be used in any context, as well as learn site-specific strategies to be employed in country. Approximately one third of the course will be devoted to providing an academic background for the experience by means of a reading list and written assignments. Specific course objectives include:

1. Develop strategies for successful intercultural interaction and language learning
2. Reflect on the impacts of international experience on personal and professional development
3. Develop a personal plan for maximizing the education abroad experience in a particular context, including country-specific strategies for intercultural understanding and language development.
4. Begin or continue development of an electronic portfolio of your international/intercultural learning experience.

About the Class Culture

The class will be very interactive. There won’t be all that much lecturing, rather lots of discussion, exercises, self-assessments, guest speakers and videotapes to help us accomplish course goals. As a result, it’s critical that you come to every class prepared and ready to participate. Reading the text and other assigned material, and completing the assigned out-of-class activities are your fundamental sources of knowledge about international education. However, we will not be spending time in class simply rehashing assigned readings. Instead, what happens in class is designed to augment the material in the text in terms of knowledge, perspective, and application.

Required Readings

2. Handouts distributed over the semester.

**Course Requirements**

- **All readings and out-of-class inventories and assessments prepared before class.** Since this is a seminar-style course, absorbing assigned material before coming to class is essential. Participation is extremely important. Being prepared will allow you to engage in dialogue and generally benefit from what happens in class.

- **Weekly e-Journal** (minimum 2 pages per week). Reflective journaling is an important part of your international learning experience. Writing in your journal will help you document your experience as well as clarify how various ideas and concepts in class and your research can be used to articulate and achieve your international learning plan.

- **Passport** As part of the class, you will be required to obtain a passport. We will provide more details during class. If you already have a passport, your assignment will be to help inform someone else about the passport application process and encourage her/him to obtain a passport as well.

- **Culture/Program Specific Learning Plan** (9-10 pages with a 10 minute class presentation). This assignment is an in-depth exploration of your individual learning goals for the program. The plan will include learning objectives and strategies for achieving stated objectives and grounded in the readings in the course.

- **Significant, quality participation in class discussions and activities.** As you will see, participation is an important part of your grade.

**Grades will be based on a 400-point system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>% of Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Learning Journal</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories and Assessments</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passport</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture/Program Specific International Learning Plan</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Participation</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Possible:</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tuesday (4:30-5:45) London**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Readings, Assignments, Journal Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1/16</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Course overview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Getting to know each other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday (4:30-5:45) London</td>
<td>Topic(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **1/23** | **Session 2**  
- What IS Culture, Anyway?  
- Dimensions of Culture Learning  
- Iceberg Concept of Culture  
- Culture, personal or universal  
- Core cultural values | **Reading:** page 1-35  
**Assignments:** Complete Learning Style Survey, Culture-Learning Strategies Inventory  
**Journal:** What has been your experience with international education to date? What do you hope to get from the class? What are your learning as well as personal expectations for the summer program? |
| **1/30** | **Session 3**  
- Culture General Theories—Hofstede, Chinese Culture Connection, Hall, Trompenaares  
- *Strategies for culture-specific learning*  
- Working with Stereotypes and Testing Hypotheses  
- Responding to stereotypes about you | **Reading:** page 36-51  
**Assignments:** Complete Culture Mapping Exercise  
**Journal:** Use reflection questions on page 44 as well as the results of your culture learning style and culture-learning strategies inventory as a guide for your entry. |
| **2/6** | **Session 4**  
- Understanding ways cultures can differ  
- Self discovery  
- Culture mapping | **Reading:** page 63-75  
**Assignments:** Complete IDI by 2/10  
**Journal:** Reflect on reading and culture mapping exercise. Explore you in relation to your home and host culture |
| **2/13** | **Session 5**  
- Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity  
- Intercultural Development Inventory | **Reading:** pdf on DMIS  
**Assignment:** Complete Language Strategy Use Inventory  
**Journal:** Reflect on your learning and writing over the last 4 weeks. Do you feel more prepared to travel this summer? Why, why not? |
| **2/20** | **Session 6**  
**Getting to Know the Team**  
- Building community  
- Quick Write  
- KWL  
- UDI 210 & 310 Specific course requirements  
- London course options for scheduling | **Reading:** *London, City Guide*, p. 5-6, 8-9, 67-74, and skim rest of tour guide  
**Assignment:** From your reading and skimming come to class with a preliminary list of at least 5-10 sites about which you are interested in visiting and/or learning more.  
**Journal:** "My major, my interests and why London?" |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Readings, Assignments, Journal Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Pre-Departure language learning Strategies</td>
<td>Journal: Reflect on the language learning section. Has your view of language learning changed? If so, how? What are your language learning goals for this summer and beyond?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/6</td>
<td>Session 8-Getting to Know London</td>
<td>Reading: <em>London, City Guide</em>, p 78-90, and p. 92, 436 and info under the various neighborhoods mentioned Assignment: From your further readings come to class with a list of additional sites you are interested in exploring. Journal: Create a basic time line in your journal including 12 major events you wish to remember.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/13</td>
<td>Mid-term Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/20</td>
<td>Session 9-Getting to Know the Courses—I</td>
<td>Reading: <em>London, City Guide</em>, p. 24-28; <em>Paige</em> p. 115-119 Assignment: Bring to class at least one book (fiction or non-fiction) set in London or about London/England and one newspaper or magazine article as well. Journal: Keep an ongoing listing of sites and books of interest with your notes and pages in tour guide noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Read Aloud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Explore different genres and their use in discovering London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Journaling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Course Overview—EDT 350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/27</td>
<td>Session 10-Getting to Know the Courses—II</td>
<td>Reading: <em>Paige</em>, p. 75-76, 83-100; <em>London, City Guide</em>, p. 30-32 Assignment: Journal: Write about 1-2 possible ways you may interact with Londoners. Also reflect on 1-2 strategies that will work for you to cope with your adjustments in London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Strategies for Social Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– In Country Adjustment Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Course Overview—POL 202 and PSY 363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday (4:30-5:45) London</td>
<td>Topic(s)</td>
<td>Readings, Assignments, Journal Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4/3</strong></td>
<td>Session 11-Getting to Know Our Cultural Learning Plans</td>
<td><strong>Reading:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Paper/presentation/poster session: &quot;Cultural/Program Specific Learning Plan&quot; sharing</td>
<td><strong>Assignment:</strong> &quot;Cultural/Program Specific Learning Plan&quot; due and ready to share with group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Journal:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4/10</strong></td>
<td>Session 12-Getting to Know the Logistics of Travel to London</td>
<td><strong>Reading:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Specific Course Requirements in London—EDT 350, POL 202, PSY 363, UDI 310</td>
<td><strong>Assignment:</strong> Share your journal that is ready for travel along with all appropriate paperwork that is due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Logistics of our study abroad in London</td>
<td><strong>Journal:</strong> Reflect on your thoughts as you prepare to travel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: List of Qualitative Questions

Contexting questions for the IDI

Pretest questions
What is your background around cultural differences?
  - Where and how long have you lived in a different culture(s)?
  - What kinds of family experiences have you had around cultural differences?

What is going on in your organization around cultural differences?
  - Have there been specific initiatives, programs or other efforts undertaken that address cultural differences?
  - What have been the outcomes—successful or unsuccessful—of these initiatives, programs or efforts?

What is your philosophy or viewpoint around cultural difference?
  - How do you see the relationship of commonality and cultural difference among people?
  - What do you see as the opportunities and obstacles, if any, to cultural differences?

What is the greatest challenge you are facing—personally or in your workplace—around cultural differences?
  - Have these challenges changed over time?
  - What kinds of solutions/directions are you contemplating for dealing with these challenges?

Posttest questions
What is your background (e.g., nationality, ethnicity) around cultural differences?

What is most interesting or intriguing and what is most challenging for you in working with people from other cultures (e.g., nationality, ethnicity)?

What are key goals, responsibilities or tasks you have, if any, in which cultural differences need to be successfully navigated?

Please give examples of situations you were personally involved with or observed where cultural differences needed to be addressed, and:
  — The situation ended negatively—that is, was not successfully resolved.
    Please describe where and when the situation took place, who was involved (please do not use actual names), what happened and the final result.
  — The situation ended positively—that is, was successfully resolved.
    Please describe where and when the situation took place, who was
involved (please do not use actual names), what happened and the final result.
Please reflect on the (insert: MAXIE Predeparture course, study abroad predeparture orientation, or name of campus group).
  — Please write a brief description of your participation:
  — How did this orientation impact your experience?
  — Did you achieve specific outcomes or goal accomplishments that were influenced by or resulted from your participation?

Sample Journal Questions
What has been your experience with international education to date? What do you hope to get from the class? What are your learning as well as personal expectations for the summer program?

Use reflection questions as well as the results of your culture learning style and culture-learning strategies inventory as a guide for your entry.

Reflect on reading and culture mapping exercise. Explore you in relation to your home and host culture.

Reflect on your learning and writing over the last 4 weeks. Do you feel more prepared to travel this summer? Why, why not?

“My major, my interests and why London?”

Create a basic time line in your journal including 12 major events you wish to remember.

Keep an ongoing listing of sites and books of interest with your notes and pages in tour guide noted.

Write about 1-2 possible ways you may interact with Londoners. Also reflect on 1-2 strategies that will work for you to cope with your adjustments in London.

Reflect on your thoughts as you prepare to travel.

Course Evaluation Questions
Why did you take the mini-course
How did you find out about this mini-course?
What did you like best about the mini-course?
What did you like least about the mini-course?
What did you hope to learn in this mini-course?

Did you learn what you expected?
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