INDIVIDUAL AND CULTURAL FACTORS AFFECTING STUDENTS' ANXIETY

DURING LANGUAGE STUDY ABROAD

Thesis

Submitted to

The College of Arts and Sciences of the

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

The Degree of

Master of Arts in Communication

By

Nicole Ann Miller

Dayton, Ohio

May, 2009

INDIVIDUAL AND CULTURAL FACTORS AFFECTING STUDENTS' ANXIETY

DURING LANGUAGE STUDY ABROAD

APPROVED BY:

_____
Teresa L. Thompson, Ph.D.
Committee Chair
Professor of Communication

_____
James D. Robinson, Ph.D.
Committee Member
Professor of Communication

_____
Jeffrey L. Griffin, Ph.D.
Committee Member
Associate Professor of Communication

_____
Jonathan A. Hess, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Communication
Professor of Communication

ABSTRACT

INDIVIDUAL AND CULTURAL FACTORS AFFECTING STUDENTS' ANXIETY

DURING LANGUAGE STUDY ABROAD

Name: Miller, Nicole Ann
University of Dayton

Advisor: Dr. Teresa L. Thompson

Submersing oneself in a foreign culture for an extended amount of time is a complex process, and students who study abroad experience varying degrees of anxiety while doing so. The present study uses Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory and Communication Accommodation Theory to identify certain factors related to this anxiety. Qualitative data in Phase One measured students' uses of idiomatic expressions in the homestay, ability to tolerate ambiguity, time spent with the host family and proficiency levels to find them all significantly related to anxiety at moderate levels. Phase Two expanded to look at cultural factors associated with anxiety. Students from individualistic cultures experienced significantly lower levels of anxiety while studying a second language in a classroom than students who identify as more collectivistic. Finally, as more time passed, individualistic students displayed higher frequencies of upward convergence behaviors toward individuals from the collectivistic culture.

DEDICATION

Dedicated to la familia Caroca Jara, for bringing me in as one of your own.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My special thanks go out to Dr. Teri Thompson, my advisor, for her dedication and patience throughout this entire process. Without her energy, passion for research and guidance, I would not have been successful in completing this thesis. Thanks for being such a great mentor and friend.

I would also like to thank everyone else who has helped me with this work. This includes Dr. Danny Robinson, who truly helped me understand the crucial need for using theory to guide research. This also includes Dr. Jeff Griffin, who provided wonderful insight from the intercultural communication perspective. Finally, I am truly appreciative of International Studies Abroad and all the ISA alumni who took time to share their study abroad experiences with me. Our common passion for this topic has made this thesis a rewarding experience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

Introduction

In order for second-language learners to expand on and practice the content they learn in the classroom, students seek out study abroad options. The number of students studying abroad to learn a second language is growing rapidly, with more than two million post-secondary students living in foreign countries as of 2004 (Campbell, 2004). With this number expected to increase to more than seven million by 2025, it is necessary that students are open to taking advantage of every opportunity the programs offer them in and out of the classroom setting (Campbell, 2004).

While abroad, students will experience intercultural communication situations first-hand. Intercultural communication is the study of interpersonal communication between individuals of different cultures (Hart, 1999). Intercultural communication focuses on the interaction, which, in effect, includes each member of the interpersonal dyad's culture (Hart, 1999). Students enter a foreign country prepared with some prior classroom knowledge to study a second language and its culture abroad. Although this is true, Kramsch (1991) notes that in many language classrooms, culture is frequently reduced to "foods, folklore and statistical facts", but culture is actually far more complex. The teaching of the language must be linked directly to that of the culture and must surpass the

notion that second language learning is affected by interpretive principles and paradigms in the learner's native culture (Moerman, 1988).

In other words, while abroad, students are exposed to cultural aspects that cannot be learned by study in their home country. These aspects, such as the use of idiomatic expressions in a second language, can affect a learner's anxiety and uncertainty abroad. Similarly, other components not related to learning the language add to the level of anxiety while abroad; these include tolerance for the situation and first-hand involvement in the culture, among others.

This study first attempts to identify the most important individual factors related to studying a foreign language abroad while living with a host family through the guidance of Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory. This will be done in Phase I of the proposed study. Then, the study expands in Phase II to look at how individuals of a specific culture adapt and converge to the new culture through the use of Communication Accommodation Theory. Combined, the study will identify anxiety differences between studying the second language in the classroom and studying the language in the context of the daily homestay interactions.

<div align="center">Review of Literature</div>

Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory. Before entering a new culture for the first time, most students are aware that they will experience a degree of stress. Holmes (2000) defines cultural stress as "the tension and uneasiness that accompanies encounters with a new environmental culture" (p. 78). This stress can be related to multiple factors, and according to Gudykunst (1988), anxiety

and uncertainty are the key factors that need to be controlled in order to engage in effective communication in a foreign culture. Anxiety is defined as feelings of being uneasy, tense, worried or apprehensive and is affective (Gudykunst, 1988). Uncertainty is defined as the inability to predict or explain others' attitudes, behavior or feelings, and differing from anxiety, is cognitive (Gudykunst, 1988).

Gudykunst's Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory (1995) builds upon Simmel's (1950) original notion of the stranger from his 1908 book *Soziologie*. He defines a stranger as an individual who is present in the situation but is not a member of the ingroup, or culture. All intercultural situations involving Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory assume that at least one person is the stranger and another is part of the ingroup (Gudykunst, 1995). In a study abroad context, the student is considered the stranger.

In his research, Gudykunst (1995) explains that effective communication comes from minimizing misunderstandings between the groups by accurately predicting and explaining the other's behavior and language. He uses mindfulness as the mediator between effective communication and the causes of effective communication (Gudykunst, 1995). The extent to which individuals are mindful of their behavior moderates the influence of their anxiety and uncertainty management on their communicative effectiveness. The theory includes 47 axioms that have been tested as superficial causes of communication effectiveness.

Building on Howell (1982), Gudykunst (1995) defines mindfulness as conscious competence. Howell (1982) claimed that conscious competence is

when an individual thinks about his or her communication and continually works at changing what is done in order to be more effective. Along with conscious competence, Howell (1982) suggests three other levels: unconscious incompetence, when the individual is unaware he or she is misinterpreting the other's behavior; conscious incompetence, when the individual knows he or she has misinterpreted a behavior but does not act on the situation; and unconscious competence, when an individual's communication skills are automatic. Effective communication is achieved at the intercultural level when the stranger has become mindful and is conscious about what he or she is communicating to the member of the ingroup.

The 47 axioms offered by Gudykunst (1995) in the theory are split into sub-groups labeled superficial causes of effective communication. Some of these axioms are highly related to individual language acquisition while studying abroad and facilitate understanding the new culture and becoming more mindful of it. To be more specific, axioms under the Mindfulness, Reactions to Strangers and Connections with Strangers categories of effective communication are related to anxiety and uncertainty levels of individuals acquiring a second language while living with a host family abroad.

Examples of relevant axioms, or causes of increased mindfulness, include the following: In Axiom 36 Gudykunst (1995) states that more understanding of the dialect leads to less anxiety and uncertainty. Axiom 13 states that more ability to tolerate ambiguity leads to less uncertainty. Finally, in Axiom 31, more shared communication networks lead to less anxiety and uncertainty (Gudykunst, 1995).

Further explanation as to why these axioms were chosen for this study and how they will be operationalized will follow.

Idiomatic Expressions. In Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory, Axiom 36 states that an increase in the knowledge of strangers' languages and/or dialects leads to less anxiety and uncertainty in the intercultural encounter (Gudykunst, 1995). A major contribution to the anxiety experienced in a new culture comes from not fully understanding the language used there (Campbell, 2004). Language learned while in the classroom is different than the culturally-shaped language used every day in the native tongue. Native language speakers use idiomatic expressions while speaking that are technically not grammatically correct and cannot be taught in the classroom (Campbell, 2004).

Idiomatic expressions are defined as terms or phrases that do not have a literal translation but hold meaning in a particular culture (Campbell, 2004). Idiomatic expressions are not considered part of the language but instead part of the culture (Campbell, 2004). For example, Coady and Huckin (1997) use "break a leg" as an example of an idiomatic expression in English. Also, words such as "pupil" and "glass" present different translations for the same written word (Coady & Huckin, 1997). Second-language learners who are considered fluent cannot contribute fluently to out-of-class conversations if they know only strict grammar learned in the classroom and are not aware of slang terms (Wilkinson, 2002). According to Edmondson (1986), "The successful learner, who can use the foreign language practically without error in the classroom, nonetheless has severe communication problems in other contexts, quite simply because what is

5

learned in the classroom cannot appropriately be transferred to other situations"
(p. 113). The problem with understanding accents and trying to copy the native
accent is also relevant to the action of communicating effectively with a second-
language culture (Scarcella, 1983).

According to Wong (2004), the level of use of idiomatic expressions
decreases in conversations between a first-language speaker and a second-
language speaker. In first language – second language conversations,
participants use fewer idiomatic or slang expressions (Hatch, Shapira & Gough,
1978). The second-language speaker typically does not have the command of
the language required to use these expression, and the first-language speaker
may want to calm the second-language speaker by using fewer cultural
expressions (Hatch, Shapira & Gough, 1978).

A primary objective of studying a foreign language in the classroom is to
prepare students to use the skills appropriately and effectively in real-life settings
(Wilkinson, 2002). When students place themselves in the culture of the second
language they are studying, research indicates that non-natives rely heavily on
classroom roles to manage interactions (Wilkinson, 2002). Hashimoto (1993)
found that although students acquire some knowledge of cultural language while
abroad, they do not use it when they are in situations with native speakers. He
discovered that students received a great deal of information on the language
and culture from the families, but they did not speak using culture-specific words
when they were out of the classroom (Hashimoto, 1993). Therefore, when
communicating in a homestay environment, levels of anxiety and uncertainty are

higher for the second-language student because more culture-specific words are used than in the classroom.

Tolerance of Ambiguity. A student's tolerance of ambiguity in the new situation is another possible factor of anxiety in intercultural situations, according to past research. In Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory Axiom 13, Gudykunst (1995) suggests that being open to ambiguity leads to less anxiety and uncertainty. The term ambiguity can be defined as perceiving insufficient information regarding a particular stimulus or context (McLain, 1993). In all, McLain (1993) notes that the act of tolerating ambiguity spans over a range, from rejection to attraction, of reactions to stimuli perceived as unfamiliar or uncertain.

According to Tanaka (2007), students are more tolerant of ambiguity if they are motivated to learn the second language and are willing to communicate in the second language outside of the classroom. A qualitative study conducted on four American students studying in Argentina showed that students with high motivation developed more extensive social networks and had more opportunities to learn idiomatic expressions in that culture (Isabelli-García, 2006). These students were also more open to making mistakes and being respectful of cultural gaps they did not comprehend.

This factor is also related to looking at learning a second language in relation to the stranger's concept of self (Tanaka, 2007). Gudykunst (1995) states that an increase in self-esteem will lower anxiety and uncertainty. Studies in social psychology have indicated that individuals will behave abroad according to perceptions they have of themselves, others, the environment and the attitudes

they perceive others to have toward them (Anronson, 1995). If a student believes that using the second language will threaten his or her self-presentation, thereby increasing the discrepancy between the real self and the ideal self, he or she will not be as likely to use the second language even while abroad (Pellegrino, 2005).

Original quantitative studies by DeKeyser (1991) and Lafford (1995) suggested that personality factors had a larger part in determining how a student would participate in the second language than where the learning took place, for example in the classroom versus in the homestay program. This research led Wilkinson (2002) to follow up with results that indicated immersion in a second-language homestay may not take the students as far beyond the classroom as they'd like to be because these individual factors such as tolerance for ambiguity get in the way of managing anxiety while abroad.

Time Spent With Native Speakers. Research also pinpoints that Gudykunst's (1995) 31st axiom may be one of the key factors related to anxiety for students living with host families. This axiom states that an increase in networks we share with strangers will produce a decrease in the stranger's anxiety and increase their confidence in predicting the native speaker's behavior (Gudykunst, 1995). One study suggests that when studying abroad, the majority of the time spent outside of the classroom is with peers from the same country (Tanaka, 2007). The students studied by Tanaka also spent that time speaking in their first language instead of practicing the second language (Tanaka, 2007). Wilkinson's study (2002) showed that this contact with peers was due to a lack of

understanding of the culture and the idiomatic expressions used. This variable of amount of native-speaker contact was affected by the level of French proficiency, the level of motivation of the student, and the student's self-esteem while abroad (Wilkinson, 2002). Freed, Segalowitz and Dewey (2004) found that students studying in France spoke English more than twice as much as French outside of the classroom.

Hashimoto (1993) discovered that students who were more comfortable with their host families tended to ask more questions and were more patient with responses. For example, compared with classroom situations, the time period for conversation with the host family is not restricted, and the participants in this study enjoyed explaining items to their students (Hashimoto, 1993). If second-language speakers are more willing to keep a conversation going even though they do not understand all of the information, they are more willing to spend time with native speakers and create these common networks (Tarone, 1980). Aside from common networks in the host family, Hashimoto (1993) also found in qualitative interviews that other common networks for second language students include social parties, speaking in groups, being invited to a teacher's home and visiting public offices.

Proficiency. Finally, the level of second-language proficiency before the student enters the country is a factor that must be examined in relation to how students are able to manage anxiety and uncertainty outside of the classroom. Kaplan (1989) claimed that learners need to be at a certain level of proficiency before the dialogue between host families and students can be beneficial. Frank

(1997) found that for Americans studying in Russia, both the students and the host families explained their frustrations at the students' inability to understand the language. Tanaka (2007) found that it was difficult for students to understand the second language media, and therefore hard to understand cultural idioms. The more advanced students are when they enter the foreign country, the better chance they will have to understand the idiomatic expressions and be able to use them outside of the classroom (Tanaka, 2007).

In Tanaka's study (2007), one Japanese student did not understand her host mother's strong English accent and became very frustrated by this. The host mother also looked displeased, thus causing the student to become more anxious in the situation. This lack of language proficiency compounds other problems and adds further to the anxiety and uncertainty felt in the host country, but not to the extent that other variables do (Campbell, 2004). If a student is prone to high levels of anxiety, proficiency in the language will not significantly affect whether or not the student is more comfortable in the situation (Campbell, 2004). Additionally, Coady and Huckin (1997) found that if second-language learners mistakenly assume they know a word, they will ignore context clues that could help them more adequately understand. Therefore, when they realize they are wrong, it may be too late to alleviate any anxiety that has arisen from the situation (Coady & Huckin, 1997).

If a student is more adequately prepared for the language, he or she will be more open to speaking with natives. This will facilitate the opening up of more shared communication networks with the host family and natives in the country

(Gudykunst, 1995). But this preparation level cannot be determined solely from classroom proficiency. It extends to the level of confidence the student has while in intercultural situations away from his or her first language peers (Gudykunst, 2005). Overall, communication has been found to be central to learning culture (Holmes, 2000). Close social interaction with individuals in the foreign culture leads to a positive stranger-host relationship and can lessen anxiety and uncertainty in a small way (Holmes, 2000). Therefore, a student's proficiency must be taken into consideration when looking at the individual anxiety-causing factors discussed above.

In all, by incorporating Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory in the study abroad homestay context, understanding what is being communicated as a part of the culture and being mindful of language differences are the major goals in managing anxiety and uncertainty pinpointed in this argument. According to past research, factors such as using idiomatic expressions, being tolerant of ambiguity, spending time with the host family and level of proficiency are related to how mindful the student is in the foreign culture.

Acquiring a Second Language in a Homestay. As noted earlier, research shows that students experience anxiety while learning a second language abroad. Past work has looked at classroom anxieties, but attempts to look at the homestay environment are rarely made. Although students go abroad to study a second language, they are still in the classroom the majority of the time and are learning technical aspects of the language, such as grammar and writing (Wilkinson, 2002). Because students want to seek cultural experiences outside of

11

the classroom while abroad, they look to submerse themselves into a context that includes native speakers. This includes living in the homestay environment, which is the most popular choice of overseas accommodation and is used globally (Fryer & Lukasevich, 1998).

The concept of a homestay as an industry evolved in the mid 1980s (Richardson, 2001). By definition, a homestay is an accommodation that provides shelter and food for a student with a native family while studying in a foreign country. According to McMahon and Reuter (1972), however, the student should also be provided with security, warmth, informal friendships and family support. There are several members of the homestay environment, including the homestay host, the homestay student and the homestay provider (Richardson, 2001). The host refers to the family providing the care, the student is the second-language speaker who lives with the host for a finite amount of time and the provider is the institution or agency that arranges the homestay and coordinates the financial aspect of the stay (Richardson, 2001).

Along with providing care, the homestay experience should also give students a chance to experience the local culture in real, every day terms outside of the classroom (Campbell & Guyton, 2003). In a report on homestays, 29 American students in Guatemala claimed that the homestay, combined with the classroom experience, truly enhanced cultural understanding (Hokanson, 2000).

Few studies have been conducted looking at student interaction with a second language outside of the classroom while abroad (Tanaka, 2007). Studying the homestay is the obvious answer to this problem, but the available

research has shown that while some host families provide excellent environments, others do not. In studies of American university students in Russia and France, Miller and Ginsberg (1995) and Wilkinson (2002) found that students tend to expect native speakers outside of the classroom to help them learn the cultural aspects of the language. The host mother, as the initial participant in the family, takes on one of two roles: the language-teacher role or the caretaker. When the mothers take on the language-teacher role, students feel more comfortable communicating with the host families and with natives in general (Wilkinson, 2002). When the mothers do not take on that role, the students have negative views on the homestay experience (Wilkinson, 2002).

Host mothers who take on the teacher role give corrective feedback, try to simplify the conversation, and adjust to the students' level of second language proficiency (Tanaka, 2007). For example, Japanese homestay students in the U.K. were successful in understanding the host mothers' language when they adjusted to the students' proficiency by using repetition and syntactic and lexical simplification (Iwami, 2001). When host mothers in Japan, Mexico and Spain played the role of conversation partner and teacher, the students reported positive results (McMeekin, 2006).

On the other hand, some host mothers view the homestay process as a commercial endeavor, providing the family with extra income, and treat the students as boarders instead of family members (Tanaka, 2004). In 2007 Tanaka found that Japanese students' contact with their host families was more limited than expected. Most time was spent watching television rather than in practicing

13

second language skills (Tanaka, 2007). Studies by Wilkinson (2002) and Miller and Ginsberg (1995) reported even less out-of-class contact in homestays than that found by Tanaka.

Welsh (2001) found that although most of the participants in his study (36 Asian students learning English as their second language) had a positive home stay experience, 58% of them reported having spent less than one hour of interaction with the home stay family on an average day. Meal times comprised most of the time spent with the family, and only simple daily activities were discussed (Welsh, 2001). Also, Welsh (2001) discovered that students spent most of their time in their individual bedrooms.

Acquiring a Second Language in a Classroom. The more obvious context in which a student acquires a second language while studying abroad is in the classroom setting. Some students choose to study abroad in classes with native speakers, but others choose to take classes abroad with other foreign exchange students that speak the same native language. When students are abroad but studying a second language in a class with students of the same cultural background, it is proposed that their anxiety will be lower because the cultural styles are similar (Gudykunst, 2002). Classroom settings abroad provide students with an escape from the ingroup, even though they are learning the second language at the time.

According to Tanaka (2007), many students cannot establish a relationship with their host families but instead spend the majority of their time with peers from the same country and frequently use their native language. In

qualitative studies conducted by Wilkinson (1998, 2000), American students in France primarily spoke in English in order to help adapt to the new culture. Although students go abroad to study a second language, they are still in the classroom the majority of the time and are learning technical aspects of the language, such as grammar and writing (Wilkinson, 2002). For this reason, it is proposed that students are more capable of managing their anxiety and uncertainty while learning a second language abroad when in the classroom surrounded by their native peers than they are when conversing with members of the host family.

Cultural Variability in Managing Anxiety and Uncertainty. As stated earlier, the 47 axioms in Gudykunst's (1995) theory are split into 10 sub-groups called superficial causes of effective communication. The previous variables discussed focus on individual factors in managing anxiety and uncertainty while interacting in the second language in the host country. The final sub-group of Anxieyt/Uncertainty Management Theory is labeled Cross-Cultural Variability in Strangers' Adjustment, and looks at how cultural differences affect how individuals are able to react to the new culture in terms of their anxiety and uncertainty. These axioms center on how members from individualistic cultures deal with anxiety in comparison to members of collectivistic cultures. This section of Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory assumes that certain factors while interacting with strangers are out of an individual's control and are subconsciously carried as part of one's native culture (Gudykunsy, 1995).

According to Triandis (1995), it is more difficult for strangers to become members of the ingroup if this group is part of a collectivistic culture. Therefore, study abroad students have a harder time managing anxiety with members of a collectivistic host family than they would have in a classroom with fellow students from individualistic cultures.

This cultural notion of individualism versus collectivism revolves around how group members view the way they live together (Hofstede, 2001). An individualistic culture focuses on person-based information to manage anxiety and uncertainty while a collectivistic culture focuses on group belonging to manage anxiety and uncertainty (Gudykunst, 2005). Individualistic cultures tend to push for competition, dominance and gain in society, while collectivistic cultures are concerned about the well being of the ingroups instead of individual success (Hofstede, 2001). An example of an individualistic nation is the United States, with characteristics such as teaching children to be independent, working toward individual goals and staying separate from groups (Maloney, 2003).

Collectivistic societies would include the majority of Latin American nations, and in these countries close relationships are of prime concern (Maloney, 2003). People in these cultures often do not trust outsiders and tend to be dependent on one another. Hofstede (2001) also relates individualism-collectivism to Edward Hall's (1976) research on low-context and high-context cultures. Hall says that low-context cultures fit the individualistic mold, while high-context cultures are collectivistic.

Communication Accommodation Theory. When students from individualistic cultures spend time abroad in collectivistic cultures, the initial period of adaptation can be quite stressful as the students are trying to become members of the ingroup (Gudykunst, 2002). Over time it is possible that these students will display more collectivistic tendencies in the way they view the world, behave and predict behaviors (Gallois, Franklyn-Stokes, Giles, & Coupland, 1988). This phenomenon can be looked at through Howard Giles' (1973) Communication Accommodation Theory, which explores the relationship between language, context and identity and how outsiders adapt to the ingroup's communication style. When strangers converge, they change their linguistic or paralinguistic behaviors to become more similar to the ingroup (Gallois et al., 1988). Divergence is the opposite, where the speakers emphasize a difference between their speech and that of the ingroup's. Communication Accommodation Theory also emphasizes that the convergence (or divergence) stems not from the actual behavior of the ingroup, but of the stranger's perception of this behavior (Gallois et al., 1988).

In relation to intercultural contexts, over time members of the subordinate group eventually arrive at some type of convergence with the ingroup's cultural communication style (Gallois et al., 1988). The amount of time that is necessary varies, but past studies show it may take a year for convergence to be noticeable (Gallois & Callan, 1987; Trudgill, 1986). The present study attempts to examine convergence across the duration of the study abroad program. For example, by converging, the student will begin adapting communication styles similar to those

of the host culture. It is expected that some convergence will occur, although in most instances the study abroad programs do not last long enough for the convergence to be extremely high.

Individuals differ dramatically on the ability to learn a second language. For years, second-language acquisition research resulted in data on how learners processed the new language on an individual level, without paying attention to the larger context in which the acquisition took place. In the 1970s, researchers and scholars identified the need to investigate the link between second-language acquisition and the ability to accommodate to a native conversational partner in a face-to-face interaction. Through the application of Communication Accommodation Theory and research in the intercultural context, specific implications for learning a second language can be proposed and used in native-nonnative interactions.

Howard Giles first published early research on Communication Accommodation Theory in 1973, looking at how communicators adapt to each other to gain approval. Many years earlier, researchers had been interested in looking at contact between communicators in intercultural encounters and how this contact had a role in reducing prejudices (Allport, 1954), but until Giles directed this research toward theory, it remained unnamed. Overall, Communication Accommodation Theory explores the relationship between language, context and identity and how outsiders adapt or deviate from a particular ingroup's communication style (Giles, 1973).

Communication Accommodation Theory was originally published under the name Speech Accommodation Theory, in which Giles (1973) proposed that communicators use specific linguistic strategies to either gain approval or show distinctiveness in interpersonal interactions with others. These strategies used to communicate were based on specific motivations and were labeled speech convergence and speech divergence (Giles, 1973). In 1987 Giles, Mulac, Bradac and Johnson chose to expand Speech Accommodation Theory to include not only language use but also the context, identity, nonverbals and addressees' attributions. At this point Speech Accommodation Theory was renamed to the Communication Accommodation Theory to which researchers refer today (Giles et al., 1987). Then, a year later, Gallois, Franklyn-Stokes, Giles and Coupland (1988) adapted Communication Accommodation Theory to include intercultural communication, which placed specific focus on the definite encounter and how this affected either the convergence or divergence of the communicators.

Convergence and Divergence. The foundation of Communication Accommodation Theory is found in the strategies of convergence and divergence. Giles (1973) originally studied the phenomenon of convergence by looking at "accent mobility" in an interview situation. He looked at the role of formality-informality in the interview context in relation to how the interviewer chose his or her speech patterns when he or she talked to the interviewer (Giles, 1973). For example, Giles (1973) found that casual speech from the interviewee came not so much from the specific interview behavior but from the speech used by the interviewer before and after the interview. After interviews were complete,

19

the switch from formal to informal speech used by the interviewer had an effect on how the interviewee responded. This research provided the first big step away from individual status (such as socioeconomic status) as the major variable in interpersonal communication accommodation and placed the focus more on dimensions such as receiver characteristics (i.e. language used). Prior to this point, scholars such as William Labov (1966) had proposed that an individual's speech style comes from his or her social class and not from the interaction itself.

By definition, convergence is the strategy by which individuals adapt to each other's communicative behaviors in terms of verbal and nonverbal features (Giles, Coupland, & Coupland, 1991). These features include but are not limited to speech rate, vocal intensity, pausing, response latency, self-disclosure, gestures and information density (Aronsson, Jonson, & Linell, 1987; Mauer & Tindall, 1983; Street, 1983).

On the other hand, divergence is the strategy through which speakers make known verbal and nonverbal differences between themselves and the other communicators (Giles, Coupland, & Coupland, 1991). Early research on interethnic divergence by Bourhis and Giles (1977) looked at accent differences among Welsh people. They found that those who placed high value on their ethnic identity diverged from the English speaker that was interviewing them for the research. These subjects used more Welsh words and phrases in their answers to distinguish their identity from the foreign speaker (Bourhis & Giles, 1977).

From here, Communication Accommodation Theory research has also distinguished between specific types of convergence and divergence. The most important distinction that must be made is the difference between linguistic and psychological convergence and divergence (Thakerar, Giles, & Cheshire, 1982). In his preliminary research, Thakerar and researchers (1982) concluded that linguistic convergence is when an individual uses specific words to become more like the receiver, and linguistic divergence is when word choices are intentionally chosen to be different from those of the receiver. On the other hand, psychological convergence is an individual's integrative orientation to the receiver, while the psychological divergence is the intentional desire to achieve greater distance and distinctiveness from the receiver.

Before significant findings can be made relevant to the study of intercultural communication and language acquisition, the scope of the theory in this context must be understood. Gallois, Giles, Jones, Cargile, and Ota (1998) developed a model for the basic elements of intercultural interaction based on Communication Accommodation Theory. Accommodation begins with a certain initial orientation to the communication event, where the communicator can be either high or low on the intergroup dimension, intrapersonal dimension, or both. This takes into consideration how knowledgeable the individual is about the other communicator's values, codes and characteristics (Gallois et al., 1998). Initial orientation involves the intrapersonal dimension by concentrating on how comfortable an individual is before entering the interaction (Gudykunst, 2005). For example, this may take into consideration the degree of anxiety present in

the interaction for the nonnative speaker and whether or not the minimum or maximum anxiety thresholds have been met (Gudykunst, 2005). Initial orientation is also influenced by society and personal identity (Gallois et al., 1998; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). For example, one variable in this preconceived notion is the status of the communicator in relation to the other. Most commonly, members of subordinate groups will accommodate their language to those of the powerful group in order to be accepted (Callahan, 2006).

For example, one study looked at accommodation between service providers and customers in relation to using English or Spanish in the interaction (Callahan, 2006). Non-Latino subjects entered stores in New York City and used Spanish to communicate with Latino employees. Being the subordinate group, the workers tended to respond in Spanish, despite the ethnicity of the customer. This study showed that at times young employees responded back in English more than older employees; therefore the chose to accommodate to the non-Latino customers due to a perceived power status (Callahan, 2006).

Next, once a communicator is in an interaction, his or her initial orientation may change because each interaction has its own situational boundaries. Therefore, situational norms must now be taken into consideration. Also, according to the research by Gallois et al. (1998), various strategies are used in reaction to the partner's communication style aside from basic language convergence and divergence. These include but are not limited to goals, focus, discourse management, language, accent, topic management and labeling.

Intercultural research examining these strategies will be introduced later in the present review.

Finally, Communication Accommodation Theory addresses the ultimate evaluation of the dyad's communication in an interaction. The focus must be placed on the communicator's perception of the behavior in the interaction and not on the specific behavior itself (Gudykunst, 2003). This can also be referred to as objective or subjective accommodation (Gallois et al., 1988). Objective accommodation is the result of direct observation and measurement by researchers. It is what actually happens in the interaction. Subjective accommodation refers to the communicators' beliefs about how the interaction is played out and whether or not they converge or diverge based on these perceived behaviors.

Overall, convergence and divergence are the standard strategies used to discuss accommodation in Communication Accommodation Theory across all research. Using these standards, accommodation has been researched in multiple contexts, including in mass media, courtroom interaction, health, therapy, organizational and intercultural contexts (Giles, Coupland & Coupland, 1991). The following section of this literature review will focus on the intercultural context and the process of second-language acquisition for nonnative speakers while learning a new language abroad. The review will continue with practical application, combining Hofstede's (2001) work on individualistic and collectivistic cultures with Communication Accommodation Theory and examining whether

this knowledge can better help second-language students become aware of factors affecting their anxiety and uncertainty but that may be out of their control.

Second-Language Acquisition and Accommodation. Not until the 1980s did second-language acquisition begin to be studied in communication interaction contexts (Krashen, 1981). Until that time, language researchers studied second-language acquisition in isolation, as the interaction between native and nonnative speakers was denied as having any effect on how well the second language was learned. Scholars discovered that research on these interactions would be necessary to accurately assess second-language acquisition in nonnative speakers (Krashen, 1981). Beebe (1981) was among the first researchers to present the idea of relating communication accommodation to second-language acquisition. An early study looked at interactions between Chinese-Thai children and adults who were interviewed separately by one ethnically Thai speaker and one ethnically Chinese speaker, both using Thai as the choice language. When talking to the Thai speaker, the subjects pronounced five of the six vowels with a stronger native Thai accent, and when speaking with the Chinese speaker, they increased their Chinese accent while speaking in Thai (Beebe, 1981). To summarize, the speakers converged to the receivers' accents and pronunciations while in the interaction. Although not originally used to study Communication Accommodation Theory, these findings led researchers to look into the mechanisms native and nonnative speakers use in order to create a better shared meaning in communication.

Before Communication Accommodation Theory can be applied to the intercultural situation, it must be emphasized that at least one communicator in the interaction is at a disadvantage. The nonnative speaker holds a lower status than the native speaker, due to the higher proficiency of the native speaker in the language being used in conversation. Beebe and Giles (1984) refer to this higher status as "linguistic status" or "automatic status" in the interaction.

A second boundary condition in the intercultural context of Communication Accommodation Theory is the difference between the limitation to accommodate and the motivation to accommodate. Due to differing proficiency levels, certain individuals may not have the linguistic capability to fully converge or diverge toward the receiver (James, 1993). According to Kaplan (1989), nonnative speakers need to be at a certain level of proficiency before native-nonnative dialogue can be beneficial. If a nonnative speaker is more prepared for the language, he or she will be more open to speaking with the natives, thus learning to manage anxiety and expressing the ability to converge (Gudykunst, 1995). Nonnative speakers must also be intentionally motivated to become better speakers of the second language if accommodation strategies are to be useful. According to Tanaka (2007), speakers are more tolerant of ambiguity if they are motivated to learn and communicate in the second language outside of the classroom setting. Highly motivated students, for example, develop more extensive social networks and have more opportunities to intentionally either converge or diverge in an interaction based on the perceived behavior from the native speaker (i.e. the receiver) (Isabelli-García, 2006).

The majority of intercultural Communication Accommodation Theory research is based on the description and explanation of specific mechanisms used in accommodation. The general theory provides convergence and divergence as the main ways in which accommodation is achieved in an interaction. Within the specific context of second language acquisition, four mechanisms are provided that take into consideration the inequality of language status, as mentioned above. The four specific mechanisms are upward convergence, downward divergence, downward convergence and upward divergence (James, 1993). The term "upward" refers to accommodation that takes place toward the language of choice in the interaction, or the language of the native speaker. The term "downward" refers to accommodation that takes place away from the native language (i.e. toward the nonnative speaker's native language.) Each mechanism for second-language acquisition and its research will be discussed in detail below.

Upward convergence is when nonnative speakers are motivated and converge their communication toward that of the native speaker's style in the interaction (James, 1993). An assumption in this mechanism is that the nonnative speaker is fairly proficient in the second language, and minimal limitations exist. This is the ideal accommodation mechanism taught by second-language teachers, as they push to teach the language by modeling it after native speakers. James (1993) makes note that although with upward convergence the nonnative speaker is trying to speak the language successfully, he or she does not necessarily want to adopt the identity of the second-language speakers. An

example of upward convergence can be seen in a study by Richards and Malvern (2000). The interviews of 34 nonnative French language students were analyzed in comparison to the communication used by the native teacher. It was found that for eight of the ten communication variables analyzed, upward accommodation did take place for the nonnative students.

Another study looked at accommodation strategies used by Americans offering apologies in their second language of Russian (Shardakova, 2005). This research found that although trying to converge to Russian standards of apologetic statements, the Americans overgeneralized in their responses across contexts. They kept their statements the same among strangers, friends and authority figures, where as native Russian speakers use different statements for each context. This general convergence was seen in nonnative speakers with low proficiency but with the motivation to become more like the native speakers. Upward convergence was also shown in a similar study where a French Canadian worker was motivated to adopt the language patterns of his English-speaking boss (Barkhuizen & de Klerk, 2000).

Another mechanism for second-language acquisition accommodation is downward divergence. This refers to situations when the nonnative speaker in the interaction chooses to use his or her native speech and diverge from the second language (James, 1993). Originally Giles (1979) referred to downward divergence as having two equally linguistically competent groups in the interaction, but this concept was later changed to take nonnative speakers into account. Downward divergence also emphasizes the importance of the initial

27

orientation to the situation, as it can be noted that in a native-nonnative speaking context the native speaker holds greater status in the conversation, thus forcing the nonnative speaker to diverge at times toward his or her own language (James, 1993).

A study by Ng (2007) discusses the forced pressure to become acculturated into the mainstream culture despite the desire to maintain the native language as a way of communicating. Ng looked at interactions of native Chinese speakers living in New Zealand and discovered that although most of the nonnatives strove to accommodate their communication to that of the native New Zealanders for the ease of their lifestyle, ethnic Chinese communication was still valued on a daily basis. Downward divergence is also examined in the Shardakova (2005) study discussed above. Americans who were highly proficient in speaking Russian and who have studied abroad tended to diverge from Russian apology statements and reverted to their individualistic, native styles. In conclusion, the more proficient and comfortable a nonnative speaker is, the more likely he or she is to diverge from the native language because he or she feels confident enough to do so.

The third type of intercultural accommodation mechanism that has been studied is downward convergence. This is when the native speaker uses simple communication strategies to talk with the nonnative speaker in the interaction (James, 1993). These simple strategies have been named "foreigner talk" in the field of linguistics (Ferguson, 1975). In the early research on foreigner talk, the concept was developed in accordance with the idea of baby talk (i.e. how adults

speak to small children) (Zuengler, 1991). In particular, foreigner talk and downward convergence have been studied in second-language classrooms, and this is referred to as "teacher talk" (Zuengler, 1991). Features of foreigner talk include slower speech rate, shorter sentences, greater pronunciation articulation, less use of pronouns, and simple vocabulary (Ferguson, 1975).

In order to understand why foreigner talk is a competent strategy to use in accommodation, it must be assumed that the native speaker has a certain goal in mind when communicating with the nonnative speaker (Coupland, Coupland, Giles, & Henwood, 1988). Past research shows that foreigner talk is most often used to ensure comprehension. Ross and Shortreed (1990) surveyed Japanese students to analyze their attitudes about communicating with nonnative Japanese students. Results indicate that foreigner talk is considered to be the most "polite" accommodation strategy to use with nonnative speakers. On the other hand, using standard Japanese with the nonnative speakers is considered rude, no matter how proficient those nonnative speakers are in the second language (Ross & Shortreed, 1990). Along with this research, Evans (1987) supports the idea that foreigner talk is used to show that the native speaker is supportive of the nonnative speaker's efforts at wanting to accommodate interculturally to the second language. Wagner (1996) goes further in his research to point out that when foreigner talk is used, at times it may be modified too much to the point that grammar falls apart.

The final accommodation mechanism used in second-language acquisition is upward divergence. According to James (1993), this is when the

native speaker feels the nonnative speaker is threatening the authenticity of the

native language, and chooses to diverge from the nonnative's attempt to

converge. In other words, the native speaker tries to set her or himself apart from

the nonnative speaker. Beebe and Giles (1984) originally coined this term in their

article while discussing it in relation to Ethnolinguistic-Identity Theory. Native

groups feel threatened, and in turn, revert to local accents or characteristics

opposite of foreigner talk, in order to communicate with nonnatives (James,

1993). The study by Barkhuizen and de Klerk (2000) also illustrates upward

divergence, when the male English boss interacts with the French worker and

chooses to display his power by continually speaking his native language.

Finally, another study conducted in Hong Kong looked at individuals who chose

to maintain strong ties with their own country and diverged from the Mandarin-

speaking Chinese people from the mainland by speaking Cantonese (Tong,

Hong, Lee & Chiu, 1999).

Although much research has focused upon the four intercultural

accommodation mechanisms described above, it is possible that within native-

nonnative interactions neither convergence nor divergence takes place. In an

area of study called bilingual accommodation, it is possible for partial

accommodation to take place (Sachdev & Bourhis, 2001). This partial

accommodation involves the use of two or more languages within the same

interaction and can be called code switching (Gardner-Chloros, 1991). Despite

the ease of this strategy when interacting in a native-nonnative setting, studies

indicate that it is not the preferred method of communication (Sachdev & Bourhis, 2001).

As stated earlier, Communication Accommodation Theory has expanded to include not only the specific language used in accommodation, but also the behavior at hand, including all forms of nonverbal communication (Giles et al., 1987). According to Jones, Gallois, Callahan and Barker (1999), much of the Communication Accommodation Theory research looks at the approximation strategy and how individuals converge or diverge based on these differences. Approximation includes items such as accent, speech rate, pauses, or nonvocal behavior (Jones, Gallois, Callan, & Barker, 1999). Much like general Communication Accommodation Theory research, second-language acquisition Communication Accommodation Theory research focuses on these items. More specifically, phonetic convergence is one of the most commonly used strategies in native-nonnative interactions (Lewandowski, Jilka, Rota, Reiterer, & Dogl, 2006). Giles and Powesland (1997) support the concept that a nonnative speaker who converges his or her pronunciation to the second language will have an easier time being successful in that convergence. Again, proficiency plays a role in whether nonnative speakers choose to converge or diverge.

Another strategy different from convergence or divergence used in Communication Accommodation Theory that receives less attention is interpretability, where speakers modify the complexity of the issues discussed in the interaction (Jones et al., 1999). This study by Jones et al. looked at 50 interactions between two students (one Australian and one Chinese) to

31

determine what accommodation strategies other than speech were used. The individuals were labeled as interpretable if each discussed topics that he could understand being from another culture. Also, they were considered to accommodate to interpretability if they were able to answer clarification questions asked of them during the interaction.

Similar to the interpretability strategy is discourse management, which is a strategy that incorporates being accommodating to turn-taking and topic selection in an interaction (Coupland et al., 1988). This involves looking at who in the interaction chooses the topics, for how long they are talked about and how often topics are changed. Topic selection, as proposed by Chen and Cegala (1994), will reflect the knowledge each speaker in an interaction has based on the common issues they share. Chen and Cegala (1994) found that in native-nonnative interactions, the nonnative speakers were accommodating to topics the native speaker valued in order to not offend the native speakers. Also, in native-nonnative interactions, topics change more often than in native-native interactions because there is less room to develop deep dialogue on certain issues.

A final accommodation strategy different from convergence/divergence is interpersonal control (Jones et al., 1999). This includes the ability to manage interaction roles within the dyad, allowing for turn-taking and smooth face-to-face interactions. Jones et al. (1999) discovered that these roles included those of specific ethnicities, peers, students or teachers. For example, the foreigner talk research designed around student-teacher interactions places the teacher as the

role initiator, and the nonnatives rely heavily on classroom roles to manage the interactions (Wilkinson, 2002).

Overall, second-language acquisition has become a well-researched context in which to study Communication Accommodation Theory. Research has studied four language accommodation mechanisms, along with various other accommodation strategies in attempts to understand the degree to which native-nonnative interactions function. The last section will discuss this research in light of specific cultures and how it can be used in understanding why a student experiences anxiety and uncertainty when learning a second language abroad.

Individualism vs. Collectivism. The cultural notion of individualism versus collectivism revolves around how group members view the way they live together (Hofstede, 2001). An individualistic culture focuses on person-based information to manage anxiety and uncertainty, while a collectivistic culture focuses on group belonging to manage anxiety and uncertainty (Gudykunst, 2005). Individualistic and collectivistic cultures are profoundly different in the strategies speakers use to converge or diverge in a native-nonnative interaction (Gallois et al., 1995). For example, Gallois et al. (1995) found that in individualistic cultures, verbal communication is valued, and individuals converge more than do members of collectivistic cultures. These cultures (i.e. the United States) also are more welcoming to convergence by nonnative speakers. In reverse, members of individualistic cultures are more likely to converge toward the nonnatives, as seen with downward convergence (James, 1993).

On the other hand, Gallois et al. (1995) report that collectivistic cultures identify more with role relationships and context. These cultures are more likely to be polite and formal in their language choices, thus practicing proper foreigner talk to the nonnative speakers (Ross & Shortreed, 1990). Collectivistic cultures are also more likely to react negatively to nonnative speakers who try to converge beyond the perceived limit. At this point, the natives from collectivistic cultures would apply an upward divergence mechanism (James, 1993). If a member of a collectivistic culture is the nonnative speaker in the interaction, he or she is more likely to diverge if the potential convergence is seen as overstepping the boundaries of the native members (Gallois et al., 1995).

One study looking at cultural differences and accommodation in negotiation styles compared Brazil to the United States (Pearson & Stephan, 1998). The researchers substantiated past claims that the collectivistic Brazilians prefer negotiation styles that express concern for the outcome of the entire group, versus the United States where people are concerned for individual success. Also, the collectivistic Brazilians prefer to diverge and distinguish between the ingroup and outgroup in communication interactions. Americans tend to converge and practice similar communication strategies as the collectivistic counterparts (Pearson & Stephan, 1998).

Based on the understanding of the research and theorizing on Communication Accommodation, it can be concluded that this accommodation is directly relevant to how individuals can acquire a second language while studying abroad. According to research by Jenkins (2001), promoting communication

efficiency is the main goal for convergence. After studying many classroom

interactions, she concludes that both the teacher and the second-language

student need to converge in order to be successful. This may mean applying

both the upward convergence mechanism along with the downward convergence

mechanism (James, 1993). The most successful way to do this is through

pronunciation convergence (Jenkins, 2001).

Communication Accommodation Theory research also suggests that

nonnative speakers tend to process the language through acoustic signals, such

as pronunciation, and not through contextual clues, such as where a word or

phrase lies in a group of sentences (Souza, 2006). In the classroom,

Communication Accommodation Theory suggests teachers should give feedback

and discuss with the group the performance of each student on a regular basis

(Souza, 2006). Teachers should also encourage motivation, as this is necessary

for appropriate accommodation to occur. Finally, teachers must realize, through

the help of Communication Accommodation Theory, that pronunciation must be

recognized as the leading cause of accommodation and should be taught in

comparison with the student's native language (Souza, 2006).

Overall, Communication Accommodation Theory by Howard Giles has

developed immensely since 1973. Through the work of intercultural

communication scholars and linguists, the theory has provided insight into

second-language acquisition, looking at accommodation styles in native-

nonnative language interactions. From there, this research, combined with past

research on cultural differences, has been successful in assisting teachers in

making second-language acquisition as smooth as possible in the classroom setting when dealing with foreign exchange students. When studied along with Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory, it may be possible to combine individual factors related to managing anxiety and uncertainty with cultural factors in order to determine ways to make students more mindful of their interactions while abroad.

After looking at the past research, it has been determined that multiple individual factors are related to the anxiety experienced by second language students studying abroad and living in a homestay environment. Levels of idiomatic expressions used in the families and tolerance of ambiguity seem to be solid factors specifically related to anxiety in homestays. Time spent with the family may be considered as the same as Gudykunst's definition of time with shared networks (1995), and be related in either a positive or inverse way to a student's anxiety level. Finally, proficiency does not have a direct impact on anxiety levels, and will not act as a factor in anxiety in the homestay environment. All of the following hypotheses are 1-tailed except for the set on time spent with the family, because not enough research has backed this up relating host families to social networking while abroad. All in all, backed by Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory (Gudykunst, 1995), the following hypotheses can be addressed based on the factors that have thus far been found to most impact students.

H1a: *A higher frequency of idiomatic language used by the host family in the homestay environment will result in a higher level of anxiety for the second language student.*

H1b: *After controlling for proficiency, a higher frequency of idiomatic language used by the host family in the homestay environment will result in a higher level of anxiety for the second language student.*

H2a: *The higher the second language student's tolerance of ambiguity, the less anxious he or she will feel.*

H2b: *After controlling for proficiency, the higher the second language student's tolerance of ambiguity, the less anxious he or she will feel.*

H3a: *The amount of time spent with the host family is related to the level of anxiety experienced by the second language student.*

H3b: *After controlling for proficiency, the amount of time spent with the host family is related to the level of anxiety experienced by the second language student.*

These hypotheses will be addressed using survey methods in Phase One of the proposed study.

Phase Two will expand on the notion that more than individual factors play a role in determining a student's anxiety and uncertainty while studying abroad. The concept of becoming mindful goes much deeper than an individual's own influence, and how smoothly he or she adapts may have cultural implications out of his or her control. According to research conducted by Hofstede (2001), differences in how a student adapts to the nonnative culture depend on if he or

she is originally from an individualistic or collectivistic culture. When a student from an individualistic background studies in a second-language classroom with similar students while abroad, anxiety and uncertainty are expected to reduce due to similar expectations. On the other hand, when students of individualistic cultures interact in the homestay environment of a collectivistic family, anxiety and uncertainty are expected to increase due to the collectivistic culture's tendency to exaggerate cultural differences. Finally, based on Communication Accommodation Theory, it is possible that students from individualistic cultures will tend to converge with their collectivistic host families over time. Overall, the following hypotheses will be tested using quantitative procedures.

> *H1 – An American student with an increased individualistic cultural identity will experience lower levels of anxiety and uncertainty in a second-language classroom with other American students while studying abroad.*
>
> *H2 – An American student with an increased individualistic cultural identity will experience higher levels of anxiety and uncertainty in the home of a collectivistic host family while studying abroad.*
>
> *H3 – An American student with an increased individualistic cultural identity will be more likely to use upward convergence strategies when communicating with members of the collectivistic host country by the end of the study abroad experience than a student with a moderate or low individualistic cultural identity will use.*

RQ1 – Does the amount of time spent abroad have a significant influence on the extent to which individualistic students converge toward a collectivistic cultural identity?

CHAPTER II

Phase One Methods

Participants. During the winter of 2008, International Studies Abroad (ISA), a study abroad agency located in Austin, Texas, was contacted for a list of students from throughout the United States who had studied abroad within the last three years. A list was obtained containing the names of 1,000 students. Eight hundred students were randomly selected and were contacted via e-mail to fill out an online survey. Two hundred thirty six participants responded, including 189 females and 47 males. English was reported by 96.6% of the participants as their native language, with Spanish making up 1.7% of the participants' native language. Spanish was spoken by 87.2% of the respondents as their second language, while 4.7% spoke French, 3.0% spoke English and 5% spoke an assortment of eight other languages. The sample included 83.5% Caucasians, 8.5% Hispanics, 3.1% Asians, 1.8% African Americans and 3.1% others. The sample of International Studies Abroad students included individuals from 50 universities throughout the United States, having studied in 18 different foreign countries. Spain was the country most frequently visited by the participants, with 48.7% of students having lived in various cities there. Chile made up 10.6% of participants and Mexico followed with 8.5%.

Procedures. After gaining approval from the University of Dayton

Institutional Review Board, members of the sample were e-mailed asking for their

participation in the study. The e-mail included a link to a survey online made at

the Survey Monkey Web site. The survey was available for a two-week period,

during which a total of 236 individuals responded. After accepting the terms and

conditions of the study, each participant was given three sections of the survey.

In total, it took 10-15 minutes to fill out the entire instrument, and all responses

remained anonymous. After all responses were gathered, each set was given an

identification number, and the data were compiled and entered into the SPSS

software where it could be analyzed.

Instrumentation. Section One of the instrument used in the study was an

adaptation of the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (Horwitz, Horwitz,

& Cope, 1986). The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale was initially

developed to look at anxiety issues in foreign language learning that are

experienced in the classroom (Horwitz et al., 1986). The initial measure was

comprised of 33 items based on a five-point Likert-type scale. The scale has

demonstrated internal reliability, achieving an alpha coefficient of .93 (Horwitz et

al., 1986). Also, test-retest reliability over eight weeks yielded an r = .83, p <

.001. Construct validity was tested through a study that established foreign

language anxiety as a phenomenon related to but different from other specific

anxieties (Horwitz et al., 1986).

The items in Section One of the survey used in this study asked

participants questions dealing with anxiety levels while living in the homestay.

The items have been adapted from the classroom environment of the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale to the homestay environment. All questions were presented using a five-point Likert-type scale, with responses ranging from 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree. Items included those asking the difficulty of understanding the host family's language, the amount of time spent with the family, the amount of time spent with peers, the level of vocabulary used in the homestay, the difficulty of the vocabulary used, the ability of the host family to teach the participant and the overall level of satisfaction from the study abroad experience. Items 1-14, 17-18 and 20 were used to operationalize the level of foreign language anxiety a student felt. Items 15-16, 19, and 21-22 were used to operationalize the frequency of idiomatic expressions used by the host family. Items 23-25 were used to operationalize the amount of time spent with the host family. The adopted Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale used for this study has been tested for reliability, with an alpha coefficient of .891. The scale passes face validity, and through Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory, the operationalized predictor variables of anxiety level, use of idiomatic expressions and time spent with the host family are related to the constructs they represent, thus qualifying for construct validity.

Section Two of the instrument consists of items from the Multiple Stimulus Types Ambiguity Tolerance (MSTAT-I) scale by David McLain (1993). These items, presented in five-point Likert-type form with answers ranging from 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree, assessed how tolerant the participants were of misunderstandings while living with the host family. The initial Multiple

Stimulus Types Ambiguity Tolerance scale consisted of 22 items, in seven-point Likert-type form (McLain, 1993). Until this scale, measures of ambiguity tolerance were criticized for psychometric weakness (McLain, 1993). The Multiple Stimulus Types Ambiguity Tolerance scale was revised from past scales to measure willingness to take risks, cognitive complexity, dogmatism and receptivity to change. Overall, the scale achieved an alpha coefficient of .86, which indicated the scale's reliability. Evidence for the validity of the Multiple Stimulus Types Ambiguity Tolerance scale scores was obtained by administering the measure with other ambiguity tolerance measures (McLain, 1993).

The items on the instrument used here reflected the Multiple Stimulus Types Ambiguity Tolerance scale identically, except that this instrument cut the list from 22 items to 14. The decision to cut the scale was made in order to limit the items to the most relevant options for the context of this study. Items 1-14 under Section Two were used to operationalize the variable tolerance of ambiguity. The revised scale had an alpha coefficient of .806.

The third and final section of the survey asked for demographic information, including gender, native language, second language, race, city and country in which the participant studied abroad, the exact month and year the program began, and how long the experience lasted. The instrument also operationalized the variable of proficiency level by asking for how many years of second language experience the student had, how many semesters of college classes the student had in the second language before going abroad and a classification of proficiency level based on a five-point scale. Finally, the

instrument operationalized the variable "time spent with the host family" by asking how many hours a day were spent in activity with the native speakers.

For a copy of the instrument used, please see Appendix A.

Data Analysis. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data in order to test the hypotheses. The first hypothesis, that a higher frequency of idiomatic language used by the host family in the homestay environment will result in a higher level of anxiety for the second language student, was tested using a 1-tailed Pearson product-moment correlation. A 1-tailed correlation was used because the direction of the correlation was well-established in the hypothesis before the data were analyzed. The independent variable "frequency of idiomatic language used" and the dependent variable "level of anxiety" were used to look for a positive relationship between the two. When the independent variable "proficiency" was controlled for, a partial correlation was used to pull this from the data and make it irrelevant to the relationship found.

The second hypothesis, the higher the second language student's tolerance for ambiguity, the less anxious he or she will feel, was also tested using a 1-tailed Pearson product-moment correlation. It used the independent variable "level for tolerance for ambiguity" and the dependent variable "level of anxiety" to look at a suspected inverse relationship between the two. Again, proficiency was statistically controlled using a partial correlation.

The third hypothesis, the amount of time spent with the host family is related to the level of anxiety the second language student experiences, was

44

tested using a 2 -tailed Pearson product-moment correlation. A 2-tailed

correlation was chosen because its direction was not predetermined in the

hypothesis. This test used the independent variable "time spent with the host

family" and the dependent variable "level of anxiety" to look for a significant

correlation. A partial correlation was used to test H3b, which looked to see if the

time spent with the host family was related to level of anxiety after controlling for

proficiency.

<div align="center">Phase One Results</div>

Hypothesis 1a. H1a stated, "A higher frequency of idiomatic language

used by the host family in the homestay environment will result in a higher level

of anxiety for the second language student." A 1-tailed Pearson product-moment

correlation was calculated examining the potential positive relationship between

students' levels of anxiety in a homestay and the level of idiomatic expressions

used by the host family. This was supported, as a moderate positive correlation

was found to be significant ($r(222) = .409$, $p < .01$, 1-tailed). The results indicated

that 16.73% of the variance was accounted for. As students heard more idiomatic

expressions being used by native speakers in their host families, they were more

likely to experience higher levels of anxiety. Please see Table 1 on the following

page.

Hypothesis 1b. H1b stated, "After controlling for proficiency, a higher

frequency of idiomatic language used by the host family in the homestay

environment will result in a higher level of anxiety for the second language

student." A partial correlation was calculated examining if the students' levels of

<div align="center">45</div>

Table 1: Hypothesis 1a Correlations

		Total Level of Anxiety	Total Level of Idiomatic Words
Total Level of Anxiety	Pearson Correlation	1	.409(**)
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.000
	N	224	224
Total Level of Idiomatic Words	Pearson Correlation	.409(**)	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	
	N	224	244

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed). significant ($r(214) = .369$, $p < .01$,

Table 2: Hypothesis 1b Correlations

Control Variables			Total Level of Anxiety	Total Level of Idiomatic Words
Total Proficiency Level	Total Level of Anxiety	Correlation	1.000	.369
		Significance (1-tailed)	.	.000
		df	0	214
	Total Level of Idiomatic Words	Correlation	.369	1.000
		Significance (1-tailed)	.000	.
		df	214	0

anxiety in a homestay and the level of idiomatic expressions used by the host family are still positively related after taking out a third variable, level of proficiency. This was supported, as the moderately positive correlation was 1-tailed). The results indicated that 13.62% of the variance is accounted for. As students heard more idiomatic expressions being used by native speakers in their host families, they were more likely to experience higher levels of anxiety despite their proficiency level in the second language, just with a slightly smaller relationship. Please refer to Table 2 for these results.

Hypothesis 2a. H2a stated, "The higher the second language student's tolerance of ambiguity is, the less anxious he or she will feel." A 1-tailed Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated examining the potential inverse relationship between students' levels of anxiety in a homestay and the level of students' tolerance of ambiguity. This was supported, as a moderate inverse correlation was found to be significant (r(222) = -.450, p < .01, 1-tailed). The results accounted for 20.25% of the variance. As students were more tolerant to ambiguity in the homestay environment, they were less likely to experience higher levels of anxiety. Please see Table 3 for results.

Hypothesis 2b. H2b stated, "After controlling for proficiency, the higher the second language student's tolerance of ambiguity is, the less anxious he or she will feel." A partial correlation was run looking at a potential inverse relationship between students' levels of anxiety in a homestay and the level of students' tolerance of ambiguity while controlling for proficiency level. This was supported, as a moderate inverse correlation was found to be significant

48

Table 3: Hypothesis 2a Correlations

		Total Level of Anxiety	Total Ambiguity Tolerance
Total Level of Anxiety	Pearson Correlation	1	-.450(**)
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.000
	N	224	224
Total Ambiguity Tolerance	Pearson Correlation	-.450(**)	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	
	N	224	224

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

Table 4: Hypothesis 2b Correlations

Control Variables			Total Level of Anxiety	Total Ambiguity Tolerance
Total Proficiency Level	Total Level of Anxiety	Correlation	1.000	-.465
		Significance (1-tailed)	.	.000
		df	0	202
	Total Ambiguity Tolerance	Correlation	-.465	1.000
		Significance (1-tailed)	.000	.
		df	202	0

(r(202) = -.465, p < .01, 1-tailed). The results accounted for 21.62% of the variance. Students who were more tolerant to ambiguity were less likely to experience higher levels of anxiety despite their proficiency level in the second language. Please refer to Table 4 on the previous page.

Hypothesis 3a. H3a stated, "The amount of time spent with the host family is related to the level of anxiety the second language student experiences." A 2-tailed Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated examining the relationship between the level of anxiety and amount of time a student spends with the host family. The test found a significant moderate inverse relationship (r(222) = -.478, p < .01, 2-tailed), meaning that as the student spent more time with the host family, he or she experienced a lower level of anxiety. The results accounted for 22.85% of the variance. Refer to Table 5 for results.

Hypothesis 3b. H3b stated, "After controlling for proficiency, the amount of time spent with the host family is related to the level of anxiety the second language student experiences." A partial correlation was run to examine the relationship between level of anxiety and time spent with the host family while removing the effects of proficiency on the situation. The test found a significant moderate inverse relationship (r(211) = -.511, p < .01, 2-tailed), meaning that as the student spent more time with the host family, he or she experienced a lower level of anxiety with proficiency being taken out of account. The results indicated that 26.06% of the variance was accounted for. Refer to Table 6 for the results.

Table 5: Hypothesis 3a Correlations

		Total Level of Anxiety	Total Time
Total Level of Anxiety	Pearson Correlation	1	-.476(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	224	224
Total Time	Pearson Correlation	-.476(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	224	224

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 6: Hypothesis 3b Correlations

Control Variables			Total Level of Anxiety	Total Time
Total Proficiency Level	Total Level of Anxiety	Correlation	1.000	-.511
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.000
		df	0	211
	Total Time	Correlation	-.511	1.000
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.
		df	211	0

CHAPTER III

Phase Two Methods

Participants. During the winter of 2009, students from International

Studies Abroad (ISA), a study abroad agency located in Austin, Texas, were

contacted to fill out a survey for this study. The sample consisted of participants

who spent no less than one month abroad in a country where they were leaning

to speak Spanish. The students' study abroad experiences must have taken

place in the last three years. The participants also lived in a homestay

environment while abroad and not in an apartment or with other nonnative

students. They also had studied Spanish as a second language abroad in a

classroom with students of similar cultural backgrounds (i.e. other Americans).

Once the students were recruited, those who chose to participate were asked to

fill out a survey. There was no compensation.

The sample was obtained from a list of 800 students who International

Studies Abroad identified as representatives of their program's alumni. A total of

267 respondents completed the survey for Phase Two, which tested the series of

hypotheses based on William Gudykunst's Anxiety/Uncertainty Management

Theory and Howard Giles' Communication Accommodation Theory. This sample

size was adequate for achieving an appropriate level of statistical power based

on findings in past, related research.

The sample of 267 students included 74.9% females and 18.4% males. The majority of participants (95.5%) reported English as their native language, with Spanish making up 1.1% of the participants' native language and 1.1% being other languages. Spanish was spoken as the second language by 94% of the participants, and 2.2% spoke English as their second language. The sample of International Studies Abroad students included individuals from more than 100 universities throughout the United States, having studied abroad in Spain (59.9%), Costa Rica (9.4%), Chile (7.5%), Mexico (5.6%), Argentina (5.6%), Peru (4.9%), and the Dominican Republic (3%). Therefore, all participants had studied their second language in a country identified by Hofstede (2001) as having a collectivistic cultural identity.

Procedures. Approval from the University of Dayton Institutional Review Board was gained in December 2008 for Phase Two of this study. Members of the sample were e-mailed in February 2009, asking for their participation in the study. The e-mail included a link to an online survey designed through the Survey Monkey Web site. The 70-item survey was available for a four-week period, during which a total of 267 individuals responded. After accepting the terms and conditions of the study, each participant completed four sections of the survey. In total, it took participants 15-20 minutes to fill out the entire instrument. All participants remained anonymous. After all responses were gathered, each set was given an identification number, and the data were compiled and entered into the SPSS software where it was statistically analyzed. After a participant completed the survey, the researcher answered various questions the participant

had on why the research is being collected. These responses were made via e-mail.

Instrumentation. Section One of the instrument used the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale by Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) in order to measure levels of students' anxiety/uncertainty in the classroom. This section of the questionnaire included exact questions from the scale looking at anxiety and uncertainty issues present in the classroom with same-culture students. The original measure was comprised of 33 items based on a five-point Likert-type scale. The scale had demonstrated internal reliability, achieving an alpha coefficient of .93 (Horwitz et al., 1986). Also, test-retest reliability over eight weeks yielded an r = .83, p < .001. Section One included 16 of these items. These items were chosen based on which ones are the most relatable to anxiety in the classroom setting. Also, the items were split based on those that corresponded with measuring anxiety and those that measured uncertainty. Items 1,2,3,4,7,9,10,11,13,14 and 15 were summed and averaged to measure anxiety. Items 5,6,8,12,15 and 16 were summed and averaged to measure uncertainty. The adopted Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale used in Section One has been tested for reliability, with an alpha coefficient of .837.

Section Two of the questionnaire included an adapted version of the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale by Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) to ask questions based on anxiety and uncertainty in the homestay environment. These questions were used to operationalize anxiety/uncertainty levels in the homestay. The adopted Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale

56

used for this study has been tested for reliability, with an alpha coefficient of .883. It included 16 items that directly match the anxiety and uncertainty questions asked in Section One, only now placed in the homestay context. Similar to Section One, the items were split based on what ones correspond with measuring anxiety and what ones measure uncertainty. Items 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, and 30 were summed and averaged to measure anxiety. Items 21, 22, 23, 27, 31 and 32 were summed and averaged to measure uncertainty.

A student's cultural identity was measured using Triandis' (1995) Modified Individualism/Collectivism Test (INDCOL). This 16-item instrument looked at the student's perception of his or her level of individualism or collectivism. Section Three (Items 33-48) corresponded to the Modified Individualism/Collectivism Test. This scale had been tested for reliability and has an alpha coefficient of .75. From the Modified Individualism/Collectivism Test, the responses were summed and averaged to place participants on a continuum of highly individualistic to highly collectivistic. This variable became relevant when studying the third hypothesis, looking at how individualistic students tend to converge to their collectivistic host country's communication styles by the time the study abroad experience ended.

Students' levels of accommodation were measured by evaluating their perceptions of their cultural orientation before and after the study abroad experience. Item 49 of Section Three asked the students if they would classify their cultural identity before they went abroad in the same way as they did when they returned (as will be seen in their answers to the questions in Section Three.)

Items 50-59 in Section Four asked the students a series of questions based on collectivistic behaviors they encountered while studying abroad. The students recorded their level of accommodation by responding to these items on a 5-point Likert-type scale. The accommodation items demonstrated internal reliability, achieving an alpha coefficient of .710. These 10 items were summed and averaged to operationalize the accommodation variable.

Finally, Section Five included demographic questions (Items 61-70). These items included gender, native language, second language, study abroad country, time spent studying abroad, proficiency level before and after the study abroad experience, and the participant's perception of accommodation on a five-point Semantic differential scale.

For a complete copy of the instrument, please see Appendix B.

Data Analysis. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data in order to test the hypotheses and research questions. The first hypothesis, an American student with an increased individualistic cultural identity will experience lower levels of anxiety and uncertainty in a second-language classroom with other American students while studying abroad, was tested using a 1-tailed Pearson product-moment correlation. The independent variable "cultural identity" and the dependent variable "level of classroom anxiety" were used to look for an inverse relationship between the two variables.

The second hypothesis, an American student with an increased individualistic cultural identity will experience higher levels of anxiety and

uncertainty in the home of a collectivistic host family while studying abroad, was also tested using a 1-tailed Pearson product-moment correlation. The independent variable "cultural identity" and the dependent variable "level of homestay anxiety" were used to look for an inverse relationship between the two variables.

The third hypothesis, an American student with an increased individualistic cultural identity will be more likely to use upward convergence strategies when communicating with members of the collectivistic host country by the end of the study abroad experience than a student with a moderate or low individualistic cultural identity will use, was tested using a 1-tailed Pearson product-moment correlation. The independent variable "cultural identity" and the dependent variable "accommodation" were used to look for a positive relationship between individualistic cultural identity and convergence (or positive accommodation).

The first research question, does the amount of time spent abroad have a significant influence on the extent to which individualistic students converge toward a collectivistic cultural identity, was tested using a one-way ANOVA to look for an impact between the independent variable "time spent abroad" and the dependent variable "accommodation." The independent variable "time spent abroad" was operationalized in five groups (1 month, 1-3 months, 1 semester, 1 year, more than 1 year).

The "classroom anxiety," "homestay anxiety," "cultural identity," and "accommodation" variables proposed in the hypotheses were operationalized in the questionnaires through three separate scales: the modified Foreign

59

Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (Horwitz, et al., 1986) to measure the dependent variables of anxiety in the classroom and in the homestay, the Modified Individualism/Collectivism Test (Triandis, 1995) to measure the independent variable cultural identity (individualistic vs. collectivistic), and the developed scale to measure accommodation.

<center>Phase Two Results</center>

Hypothesis 1. H1 stated, "An American student with an increased individualistic cultural identity will experience lower levels of anxiety and uncertainty in a second-language classroom with other American students while studying abroad." A 1-tailed Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated examining the potential inverse relationship between participants' cultural identity and their levels of classroom anxiety. This was supported, as a weak inverse correlation was found to be significant ($r(253) = -.155$, $p < .05$, 1-tailed). Participants who identified more with an individualistic culture experienced lower levels of anxiety while in the second-language classroom, although this correlation showed that only 2.40% of the variance was accounted for. Please refer to Table 7.

Hypothesis 2. H2 stated, "An American student with an increased individualistic cultural identity will experience higher levels of anxiety and uncertainty in the home of a collectivistic host family while studying abroad." A 1-tailed Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated to look at the inverse relationship between participants' cultural identity and their levels of anxiety

<center>60</center>

Table 7: Hypothesis 1 Correlations

		culture1	anxietyclass1
culture1	Pearson Correlation	1.000	-.155**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.007
	N	255	255
anxietyclass1	Pearson Correlation	-.155**	1.000
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.007	
	N	255	255

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

Table 8: Hypothesis 2 Correlations

		culture1	anxietyhome1
culture1	Pearson Correlation	1.000	-.090
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.083
	N	255	255
anxietyhome1	Pearson Correlation	-.090	1.000
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.083	
	N	255	255

experienced in the homestay. A weak inverse correlation that was not significant was found (r(253) = -.090, p > .05). Participants' cultural identity was not related to their levels of anxiety experienced in the homestay environment. Refer to Table 8 for the results.

Hypothesis 3. H3 stated, "An American student with an increased individualistic cultural identity will be more likely to use upward convergence strategies when communicating with members of the collectivistic host country by the end of the study abroad experience than a student with a moderate or low individualistic cultural identity will use." A 1-tailed Pearson product-moment correlation was used to test the potential positive relationship between participants' cultural identity and their levels of accommodation to the native speakers' behaviors. This was supported, as a weak positive correlation was found to be significant (r(253) = .181, p < .01). Only 3.28% of the variance was accounted for. Participants with higher individualistic cultural identities reported the use of more convergence strategies when accommodating with the native speakers in their host country. Please refer to Table 9.

Research Question 1. RQ1 asked, "Does the amount of time spent abroad have a significant influence on the extent to which individualistic students converge toward a collectivistic cultural identity?" The one-way ANOVA demonstrated a significant impact of time spent studying a second language abroad on the amount of accommodation that was reported by the participants (F(4, 247) = 6.879, p < .01), and homogeneity of variances was not violated. The LSD test determined the nature of the statistically significant differences among

63

Table 9: Hypothesis 3 Correlations

		culture1	accommodation
culture1	Pearson Correlation	1.000	.181[**]
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.002
	N	255	255
accommodation	Pearson Correlation	.181[**]	1.000
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.002	
	N	255	255

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

Table 10: Research Question 1 ANOVA

accommodation					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.095	4	1.274	6.879	.000
Within Groups	45.734	247	.185		
Total	50.829	251			

levels of time spent abroad on levels of accommodation. This analysis revealed

that participants who studied abroad for 1 semester (m = 2.090, sd =.439) used

convergence strategies more than those who studied abroad for 1-3 months (m =

2.237, sd = .430). Also, those who studied abroad for more than one year (m =

1.480, sd = .526) used more convergence strategies than those who studied

abroad for a year (m = 1.936, sd = .384). The lower the mean number, the more

those participants displayed accommodation behaviors of convergence. Overall,

the mean convergence score increased for each group as the time those

participants spent abroad increased. (m(1 month) = 2.358, m(1-3 months) =

2.237, m(1 semester) = 2.090, m(1 year) = 1.936, m(more than 1 year) = 1.480).

Please refer to Table 10 for the results.

CHAPTER IV

Discussion

Phase One. Based on the statistical tests in Phase One, all six hypotheses were supported. The three variables looking at individual factors related to a student's level of anxiety while communicating in the homestay environment were statistically significant, as predicted by Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory (Gudykunst, 1995).

As a student's host family used more idiomatic expressions in the home, that student was more likely to experience anxiety when communicating in the second language. Before going abroad, second language students gain the majority of their skills from the classroom. They initially begin learning basic vocabulary and dialogues that they are told will help them make it through typical situations while abroad, such as flying on an airplane, asking for directions and ordering food at a restaurant. It is common to cover a few culture lessons in second language classes, but very little is covered that would orient a student to a native speaker of the language if he or she had never experienced native-nonnative conversations first-hand. Also, as the student begins second language classes in the foreign location, these same types of basic lessons take place. Textbook grammar and vocabulary are taught, and slang is skipped because it is technically incorrect.

When the students enter the homestay environment, they are learning in a completely different context than while abroad in the classroom. The natives are more likely to speak at rapid paces while using slang words typical of the natives of the specific country or region. One can imagine the amount of slang used in a day in the English language, mixed together with the use of incorrect verbs and inadequate placing of words such as "like" in the middle of phrases. The same phenomenon takes place in any language, and it is nearly impossible to teach a foreigner these idiomatic expressions without repeatedly hearing them and being willing to accept uncertainty during the initial phases of submersion. Because of the initial shock of living under a roof where misunderstood expressions are being used to communicate, anxiety levels do tend to rise. It therefore becomes harder to communicate in the intercultural setting.

A student's proficiency level surprisingly did not have a large impact on the anxiety level experienced by students when they heard idiomatic expressions spoken by the natives. Although students with high proficiency can understand the second language better than beginner students, anxiety levels did not decrease much for these students when idiomatic expressions were used. Regardless of how much of the language the student knows and is able to speak, it is likely that the traditional second-language skills he or she has acquired will not help much in a homestay situation. By controlling for the proficiency variable in this study, the data showed that regardless of language skill, high anxiety was still positively related to high uses of idiomatic expressions. The only difference

was that the significant correlation is slightly weaker, meaning a higher proficiency level may help in a small way.

On the other hand, as a student is more open to ambiguity in the homestay environment, that student is likely to experience lower levels of anxiety. When individuals claim they can tolerate not being sure of a situation or not being able to always predict what will happen next, they are also more aware of their anxiety and know how to manage their feelings. Other predictors of being tolerant include being open to surprises and new situations.

The majority of students in this study had a mid to mid-high range of tolerance for ambiguity, as would be expected in those voluntarily choosing to go abroad to learn a language. These students appeared to be motivated and voluntarily chose to live with a host family to learn the cultural side of the second language. Although the students' levels of anxiety were not managed completely, they were at least somewhat aware that anxiety was expected in a situation where they were the strangers. Therefore, as tolerance levels rose, the students experienced less anxiety than individuals who may be less open to change and new situations. This finding supports Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory and is also related to higher self-concepts (Gudykunst, 1995). The more a student is tolerant of ambiguity, the higher the individual's self-concept is likely to be. Again, proficiency was not highly related to this issue, as the correlations for when it was versus when it was not controlled were very similar. How proficient one is in the second language did not necessarily determine on how tolerant he

or she was of ambiguity. Tolerance of ambiguity is an internal concept that is not consciously learned or taught.

Before data were collected, it was proposed that more time spent with the host family would be related to anxiety levels, because the students formed more shared networks with the native speakers. The results determined that anxiety decreased as the student spent more time with the family. As the interaction with the family increased, the students spent less time with peers who speak their native language, thus forcing the student into practicing and becoming more familiar with the potential idiomatic expressions used in the family. Again, the level of anxiety felt by a student who spent more or less time with the host family was not impacted by proficiency. Anxiety is a feeling that will come despite how well the language is technically understood. Students who were advanced or even fluent in the language still experienced high anxiety levels.

All of the correlations in this study were within the moderate range and accounted for roughly 13%-26% of the variance. With this being noted, it is obvious that many different factors are related to anxiety issues for study abroad students, and these factors may hinder communication between the natives and strangers. After testing three of the 47 anxiety-causing factors outlined in Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory for this study, it is clear that it is impossible for only one or two factors to account for most of the variance. The construct of anxiety is too broad to say only two or three factors are at the root of its existence. By finding significant, moderate results, this study has pinpointed some of the larger anxiety concerns in relation to the countless others that affect

70

these feelings in study abroad students. Overall, the results indicate that factors related specifically to the individual as opposed to that individual's culture best predict students' experience of anxiety while studying a second language abroad.

Phase Two. In contrast to Phase One of this study, Phase Two looked at cultural factors that may have an impact on how students adapt and manage their anxiety in a language study abroad program. Individual factors such as use of idiomatic expressions in the language, tolerance of ambiguity and time spent with native speakers are extremely important, but, according to Gudykunst's (1995) Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory, every intercultural encounter must be assessed from a cultural standpoint. Phase Two used the variable of culture to determine if students from an individualistic culture were able to manage their anxiety while living in a collectivistic country. Also, Phase Two provided a good contrast to explain anxiety issues from a different perspective. Is there more to managing anxiety while studying abroad that is determined by the culture in which one comes?

The instrument used in Phase Two had students rate themselves on a cultural continuum ranging from individualistic to collectivistic (Hofstede, 2001). Results indicated that students who identified with a more individualistic culture experienced lower levels of anxiety while studying their second language in the classroom. These results were significant, although the correlation was quite weak. This finding, along with past research, suggests that students who learn a second language abroad while in class with their native peers experience less anxiety because they are still interacting with others of similar cultural styles.

71

Although students are in a foreign country, they are spending time learning the language from textbooks while interacting with peers (Tanaka, 2007). This context eliminates the nonnative speaker, which in fact eliminates the intercultural interaction. Therefore, students who are more individualistic and independent in their learning styles find it easier to adapt when learning a language with peers of similar backgrounds.

Although individualistic students experienced less anxiety in the classroom setting, data from these same individuals did not indicate a significant connection between their cultural identity and the amount of anxiety they experienced in the collectivistic homestay environment. This finding presents a few issues. First, students who partake in a homestay while abroad have very different experiences that are unique to the individual (Hokanson, 2000; Wilkinson, 2002). Therefore, a student's culture may not be as significant in determining how successful he or she will be in conversations with the native speakers. A student with a highly individualistic identity may be very capable of taking risks and learning independently, but if he or she does not spend adequate time with the host family or does not experience the true cultural aspects of the second language, anxiety may still be present.

Also, the host families discussed in this study came from collectivistic cultures. According to past research, it is typically harder for strangers to become members of the ingroup if this group is from a collectivistic culture (Triandis, 1995). Therefore, despite the culture of the student, high anxiety levels may still be present because the ingroup prohibits clear communication and may not be

including that student in day-to-day interactions. Overall, these claims cannot be supported by the data in this study because the results indicated no significant relationship between how individualistic an American student is and how much anxiety he or she experienced while in the homestay environment.

Phase Two expanded on Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory and culture by looking at how students converged or diverged to the communicative behaviors used by native speakers. More specifically, the results examined whether or not individualistic students converged at a relatively high rate to members of the collectivistic host country. The data found a small but significant relationship, which suggested individualistic students are aware that they tend to become more like the collectivistic culture in which they live for that temporary amount of time.

As categorized by James (1993), the students in this study experienced upward convergence. As nonnative speakers, they were motivated to converge toward the behavior style of the native speakers. Although the relationship between accommodation and culture was small, the level of accommodation increased over time. As students spent more time with the host culture, they experienced more accommodation to the behaviors of the collectivistic host culture. For example, results indicated that students who spent one semester abroad expressed accommodation more than students who spent one month abroad. Also, students who spent one year abroad accommodated more than students who spent one semester abroad.

Participants in this study attested to their levels of accommodation by commenting on specific behaviors they used in daily activities. The following accounts come from students who exhibited varying levels of accommodation toward the collectivistic countries they studied abroad in.

> "I tried to adapt to the culture I was in by eating only their food and trying to dress to their fashion. I still stuck out, but I tried to be less American and more Spanish during my study abroad."

> "My accommodation was mostly subconscious, I guess. I tried my best to be as much a part of the culture of Spain as possible, figuring there was no risk of losing my own cultural identity."

> "Where I was (Spain and Argentina), I was in a more 'community' kind of culture versus in the independent United States culture. While I was there I made sure to adapt, although it may have been uncomfortable at times because I did not want to make the natives uncomfortable. It is important to adapt to the other cultures, and not expect them to adapt to your American culture."

> "I tried to blend in as much as possible, but things like men cat-calling at me on the streets and saying vulgar things were hard to ignore. Also, perceptions of time and what is considered late are very different."

The previous accounts demonstrate that a surprising number of students from individualistic cultures found it necessary to converge to the collectivistic behaviors of the host family in order to make the transition smoother. This accommodation can be seen as a goal of most nonnative students in order to reduce anxiety and make the cultural transition as smooth as possible (Jenkins, 2001). Overall, although convergence is significantly related to a student's cultural identity and the amount of time spent in the foreign country, students still find it important to maintain their individualistic beliefs. According to one student, "It was important for me to stick with my morals and judgment. Although I was

open-minded and tried to blend in with Spanish culture in appearance, I made sure not to sacrifice or compromise too much of my personal identity."

Individual versus Cultural Factors. After assessing the data from this study, it is apparent that the relationship between factors specific to the individual and anxiety is stronger than the relationship between one's cultural identity and anxiety experienced while abroad. This suggests that although a student's culture is an important issue in how he or she will adapt, the rate of anxiety management can be determined more from items specific to that individual. For example, a student's ability to adapt to idiomatic expressions, ambiguity and increased time spent with the host family may trump the notion that he or she is simply from the United States. Although this is true, the correlations show that each factor, including culture, are moderate or weak in relation to anxiety experienced while studying a second language abroad.

This is important because it shows that many factors are involved in causing students' anxiety while studying abroad. In understanding that many factors play a role in anxiety management while studying abroad, research is one step further in training students to be aware these factors do exist. The first step in managing anxiety is to identify its source, and this research allows students to consider multiple variables that play a role in anxiety while abroad.

Practical Implications. The previous findings highlight the importance for researchers, second language instructors and students of examining the many causes of anxiety before diving into the study abroad experience. Many times students are unaware of what they will truly experience while abroad, and

research such as the study reported herein may help to address these anxiety issues before students arrive in the foreign country. Although these findings cannot predict the level of anxiety any given student will experience in the nonnative context, they can help describe potential factors that may impact the amount of anxiety he or she will experience. Previous knowledge of these factors may assist students in making a smoother transition into their new cultural experiences while abroad. A smoother transition may then lead to a more positive and manageable overall study abroad experience.

Limitations. As in any study involving human subjects, there were limitations to the sample, design and results gained from this research. The first limitation regarding the sample in Phase One is that the participants came from many different second language backgrounds and studied abroad in many different countries. This may seem like a positive factor, increasing the generalizability of the study, but it may also limit the results because it is impossible to measure the cultural difference each student experienced. The participants in Phase Two came strictly from individualistic cultures and studied abroad in collectivistic cultures. In order to make the data more reliable, it would have been beneficial to have drawn upon these same demographics for Phase One.

A second limitation involving the sample was the disproportional numbers of men and women. Phase One consisted of 47 males and 189 females, and this may have had an impact on anxiety levels since gender differences were not taken into account. Again, only 18.4% of the participants in Phase Two were

males. One reason for this disproportion of men and women is that, in general, women are more likely to study a second language abroad than men. Although the sample represented a reasonable proportion of women and men that study abroad, the sample cannot equally report anxiety differences between men and women because the numbers vary so much. For this reason, gender was not used as a variable in the study.

When participants were contacted, the e-mail with the online survey link did not initially tell potential participants that they needed to have lived with a host family in order to take the survey. Due to this error, a handful of potential participants began the survey by accepting the consent form, but then had to stop immediately due to the nature of the questions. This caused a few skewed results because a few respondents later informed the researcher via e-mail that they went ahead and filled out the survey anyway. Despite this limitation, the number of participants who did this was too low to make an impact (n = 2).

One of the major limitations to this study involved the large number of variables that could potentially be relevant to the processes under examination. The use of Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory led to 47 potential factors that could affect anxiety in intercultural communication settings. By limiting the study to only three of these individual variables and the variable of cultural identity, this research relied heavily on past studies guided by Gudykunst's (1995) theory. This involved placing a lot of confidence in the work that had previously been done and accepting the reality that because there were many

variables related to anxiety levels in the homestay environment, the correlations for each particular variable would not account for the majority of the variance.

Phase Two used the variable "cultural identity" to look at an individual's culture as being related to anxiety while abroad. Although this goal was accomplished, in reality, by having participants fill out a measure of cultural identity, they were in fact turning this variable into an individual factor. Although all participants were from the United States, an individualistic country, not all participants rated themselves the same on their cultural identity. This flaw interferes with an examination of the relationship between individual and cultural factors and how they truly relate to anxiety in this context.

Lastly, the participants in this study took part in their second language experience within the last three years. The responses were gathered after they had returned to the United States and had been submersed back in the individualistic culture. Therefore, it must be noted that the data were based upon participants' recollections of their experiences and did not actually examine the real interactions or accommodation that took place. The study rests entirely on the participants' perspectives of how much anxiety they experienced and how much they accommodated to their host families. This factor is not necessarily a flaw, but must be taken into consideration when interpreting the results.

Future Research. By using the homestay environment as such a specialized epistemological site in which to study anxiety in intercultural communication, it is possible that quantitative research does not examine in enough depth the fine experiences that may be related to an increase in anxiety

in a communication context. A survey can only probe so deeply into what factors are related to anxiety, and it may be necessary to collect qualitative data in the future to reaffirm the results gathered here. Future studies should conduct in-depth interviews asking study abroad students to what they attribute any anxieties, and these interviews can be coded to further examine the variables in this study.

Future studies should also expand on the cultural variable taken into account in this research. This study looked at anxiety experienced from the individualistic perspective, and it would be necessary to look at collectivistic students who study a second language abroad to see if the factors identified in the present study as being related to anxiety transcend culture. Such examination may be important to reaffirm that anxiety is universal, thus validating that this study could be generalizable although only one cultural perspective was looked at.

A final obvious area for growth in this area of research could extend the depth of Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory and use the research to include more predictor variables. For this study, the use of idiomatic expressions, tolerance of ambiguity and time spent with the family, along with proficiency, act as the main variables relating to anxiety. Culture was then included to balance the individual factors. With more time, a larger sample and more research examining the claims of Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory, it should be possible to extend the list of significant anxiety-related issues in the homestay environment while studying abroad.

<center>Conclusion</center>

Imagine entering a foreign country for the first time. You have no concept of what to expect besides having an academic background in that country's language. Not only are the language and dialogue different, but so are all aspects of the communication, including nonverbal behavior, conflict styles and societal standards. It is inevitable that, as the stranger, you will feel some apprehension and anxiety while trying to find the most effective way to minimize misunderstandings among the natives and yourself. In order to fully understand these misunderstandings, you must know why they are occurring. With Gudykunst's (1995) Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory and Giles' (1973) Communication Accommodation Theory, you are able to pinpoint reasons why you feel this way and can start to adapt to the new and exciting culture that defines your new, temporary way of life.

In practical terms, an understanding of what gives way to higher levels of anxiety while communicating in an intercultural setting can only help reduce misunderstandings in the future. Acknowledging the problem is the first step to reducing it. If more foreign exchange students are educated about anxiety issues within the homestay before they go abroad, it may be possible for them to rationalize the inevitability of this occurrence and try to adapt despite the anxiety that is bound to get in the way.

After all, one such student put it best when she wrote, "Being immersed in a culture different from my own, I was able to ascertain my individual characteristics and which of those characteristics allowed me to adapt better in

<center>80</center>

my new country. After studying abroad, I feel more confident in my American

identity, yet more aware of different cultural identities."

REFERENCES

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Cambridge/Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Aronson, E. (1995). *The social animal.* (5th ed.). New York: W.H. Freeman and Co.

Aronsson, K., Jonson, L., & Linell, P. (1987). The courtroom hearing as middle ground: Speech accommodation by lawyers and defendants. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 6*, 99-116.

Barkhuizen, G., & de Klerk, V. (2000). Language contact and ethnolinguistic identity in an Eastern Cape army camp. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 144,* 95-117.

Beebe, L. M. (1981). Social and situational factors affecting the communicative strategy of dialect code-switching. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 32,* 139-149.

Beebe, L. M., & Giles, H. (1984). Speech-accommodation theories: A discussion in terms of second-language acquisition, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 46,* 5-32.

Bourhis, R. Y., & Giles, H. (1977). The language of intergroup distinctiveness. In Giles (Ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations* (pp. 119-135). New York: European Association of Experimental Social Psychology.

Callahan, L. (2006). English or Spanish?! Language accommodation in New York City service encounters. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 3*, 29-53.

Campbell, H. & Guyton, N. (2003). *The business of living with strangers: Difficulties and barriers in communication between homestay 'parents' and their international students.* Paper presented at the 5th ABC European Convention, Lugano, Switzerland.

Campbell, N. (2004). Home(stay) is where the heart(ache) is: A study of Chinese international students living with local families in New Zealand. *Australian Journal of Communication, 31*, 107-134.

Chen, L., & Cegala, D. (1994). Topic management, shared knowledge and accommodation: A study of communication adaptability. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 27*(4), 389-417.

Coady, J. & Huckin, T. N. (1997). *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Coupland, N., Coupland, J., Giles, H., & Henwood, K. (1988). Accommodating the elderly: Invoking and extending a theory. *Language in Society, 17*, 1-41.

DeKeyeser, R. M. (1991). Foreign language development during a semester abroad. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Foreign language acquisition research and the classroom* (pp. 104-119). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Edmondson, W.J. (1986). Some ways in which the teacher brings errors into

    being. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Learning, teaching and communication in the*

    foreign language classroom (pp. 111-123). Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus

    University Press.

Evans, M. (1987). Linguistic accommodation in a bilingual family: One

    perspective on the language acquisition of a bilingual child being raised in

    a monolingual community. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural*

    Development, 8, 231-235.

Ferguson, C. (1975). Towards a characterization of English foreigner talk.

    Anthropological Linguistics, 17, 1-14.

Freed, B.F., Segalowitz, N., & Dewey, D. P. (2004). Context of learning and

    second language fluency in French. *Studies in Second Language*

    Acquisition, 26, 275-301.

Freyer, C., & Lukasevich, A. (1998). Home away from home. *American*

    Language Review, 2(4). Retrieved October, 5, 2007, from

    http://languagemagazine.com/internetedition/ja98.fha14.htm.

Gallois, C., & Callan, V.J. (1987). Situational influences on perceptions of

    accented speech. In J.P. Forgas (Ed.), *Language and social situations*

    (pp. 159-193). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Gallois, C., Franklyn-Stokes, A., Giles, H., & Coupland, N. (1988)

    Communication accommodation in intercultural encounters. In Y. Y. Kim &

    W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication* (pp. 157-

    185). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gallois, C., Giles, H., Jones, E., Cargile, A. C., & Ota, H. (1995). Accommodating

    intercultural encounters: Elaborations and extensions. In R.L. Wiseman

    (Ed.), *Intercultural communication theory* (pp. 115-147). Thousand Oakes,

    CA: Sage.

Gardner-Chloros, P. (1991). *Language selection and switching in Strasbourg.*

    Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Giles, H. (1973). Accent mobility: A model and some data. *Anthropological*

    Linguistics, 15, 87-105.

Giles, H. (1979). Ethnicity markers in speech. In K. R. Scherer & H. Giles (Eds.),

    Social markers in speech (pp. 251-280). Cambridge: Cambridge

    University Press.

Giles, H., Coupland, J., & Coupland, N. (1991). *Contexts of accommodation:*

    Developments in applied sociolinguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge

    University Press.

Giles, H., Mulac, A., Bradac, J. J., & Johnson, P. (1987). Speech accommodation

    theory: The next decade and beyond, In M. McLaughlin (Ed.),

    Communication yearbook 10 (pp. 91-116). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Giles, H., & Powesland, P. (1997). Accommodation Theory. In N. Coupland & A.

    Jaworski (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 232-239). Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Gudykunst, W.B. (1988). Uncertainty and anxiety. In Y.Y. Kim & W.B. Gudykunst

    (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication* (pp. 123-156). Newbury

    Park, CA: Sage.

Gudykunst, W.B. (1995). Anxiety/uncertainty management (AUM) theory. In R. L.

　　Wiseman (Ed.), *Intercultural communication theory* (pp. 8-58). Thousand

　　Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gudykunst, W. B. (Ed.) (2005) *Theorizing about intercultural communication.*

　　Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hall, E.T. (1959). *The silent language*. New York: Doubleday.

Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.

Hart, W.B. (1999). Interdisciplinary influences in the study of intercultural relation:

　　A citation analysis of the *International Journal of Intercultural Relations.*

　　International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 23, 575-589.

Hashimoto, H. (1993). Language acquisition of an exchange student within the

　　homestay environment. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 4*, 209-

　　224.

Hatch, H., Shapira, R. & Gough, J. (1978). Foreigner-talk discourse. *ITL Review

　　of Applied Linguistics*, 39-40.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA:

　　Sage.

Hokanson, S. (2000). Foreign language immersion homestays: Maximizing the

　　accommodation of cognitive styles. *Applied Language Learning, 11*, 239-

　　264.

Holmes, P. (2000, December). *Strangers, sojourners, selves: Understanding

　　cultural identity change.* 5th Annual Cross-Culture Capability Conference,

　　Leads, United Kingdom.

Horwitz, E., Horwitz, M. & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety.
The Modern Language Journal, *70,* 125-132.

Howell, W.S. (1982). *The empathic communicator*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Isabelli-García, C. (2006). Study abroad social networks, motivation and attitudes: Implications for second language acquisition. In M. A. DuFon & E. Churchill (Eds.), *Language learners in study abroad contexts* (pp. 231-258). Clevedon: Multilingual Mattters.

Iwami, I. (2001). Observation of high school students' real-life communication during a study tour abroad. *Journal of the Japan-Britain Association for English Teaching*, *5,* 13-37.

James, C. (1993). Accommodation in crosslanguage encounters. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics, 27*, 39-48.

Jenkins, J. (2001). *The Phonology of English as an international language.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jones, E., Gallois, C., Callan, V., & Barker, M. (1999). Strategies of accommodation: Development of a coding system for conversational interaction. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 18*, 123-152.

Kaplan, M. (1989). French in the community: A survey of language use abroad, *French Review, 63*, 290-301.

Kramsch, C. (1991). Culture in language learning: A view from the States, In K. de Bot, R.B. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.) *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective*, (pp. 217-240.) Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning.*
Oxford: Pergamon.

Labov, W. (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City.*
Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Lafford, B. A. (1995). Getting into, through and out of a survival situation: A
comparison of communicative strategies used by students studying
Spanish. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study
abroad context* (pp. 97-121). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lewandowski, N., Jilka, M., Rota, G., Reiterer, S., & Dogl, G. (2006). Phonetic
convergence as a paradigm of showing phonetic talent in foreign language
acquisition. *Institute for Natural Language Processing, 1,* 1-7.

Maloney, T. (2003, January). *Understanding the dimensions of culture: Learning
to relate to Hispanic employees*. Managing the Hispanic Workforce
Conference, Grantville, Pennsylvania.

Mauer, R. E., & Tindall, J. H. (1983). Effects of posture congruence on client's
perceptions of counselor empathy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30,*
158-163.

McLain, D. (1993). The MSTAT-I: A new measure of an individual's tolerance for
ambiguity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53,* 183-189.

McMahon, J., & Reuter, I. (1972). The host family scheme. In S. Bochner & P.
Wick (Eds.), *Overseas students in Australia* (pp. 187-190). Randwick,
Australia: New South University Press.

McMeekin, A. (2006). Negotiation in a Japanese study abroad setting, In M. A. DuFon & E. Churchill (Eds.), *Language learners in study abroad contexts* (pp. 177-202). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Miller, L., & Ginsberg, R. (1995). Folklinguistic theories of language learning. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 293-315). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Moerman, M. (1988). *Talking culture: Ethnography and conversation analysis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Ng, S. H. (2007). From language acculturation to communication acculturation: Addressee orientations and communication brokering in conversations. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 1*, 75-90.

Pearson, V., & Stephan, W. (1998). Preferences for styles of negotiation: A comparison of Brazil and the U.S. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 22*, 67-83.

Pellegrino, V. (2005). Student perspectives on language learning in a study abroad context. *Frontiers*: *The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, *4,* 91-120.

Richards, B., & Malvern, D. (2000). Accommodation in oral interviews between foreign language learners and teachers who are not native speakers. *Studia Linguistica, 54*, 260-271.

Richardson, K. (2001). *International education: The role of homestay hosts*. Melbourne: University of Melbourne.

Rivers, W. (1998). Is being there enough? The effects of homestay placements on language gain during study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals, 31*, 492-500.

Ross, S., & Shortreed, I. (1990). Japanese foreign talk: Convergence or divergence? *Journal of Asian Pacific Communicaiton, 1*, 135-145.

Sachdev, I., & Bourhis, R. Y. (2001). Multilingual communication. In W.P. Robinson & H. Giles (Eds.), *The new handbook of language and social psychology* (pp. 407-428). Chichester: Wiley.

Scarcella, R. (1983). Discourse accent in second language performance. In S. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Language transfer in language learning* (pp. 306-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Shardakova, M. (2005). Intercultural pragmatics in the speech of American L2 learners of Russian: Apologies offered by Americans in Russian. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 2*, 423-451.

Simmel, G. (1950). The stranger. In K. Wolff (Ed. & Trans.), *The sociology of Georg Simmel* (pp. 402-408). New York: Free Press.

Souza, L. (2006). Communication accommodation theory and the teaching of English as a second language. *Challenge Centro de Idiomas, 1,* 1-14.

Street, R. L. Jr. (1983). Noncontent speech convergence in adult-child interaction. In R. N. Bostrom (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 7* (pp. 139-169). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *Differentiation between social groups* (pp. 61-76). London: Academic Press.

Tanaka, K. (2004). C*hanges in Japanese students' beliefs about language learning and English language proficiency in a study-abroad context.* Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.

Tanaka, K. (2007). Japanese student's contact with English outside the classroom during study abroad. *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics, 13*(1), 36-54.

Tarone, E. (1980). Communication strategies, foreigner talk and repair in interlanguage. *Language Learning, 30,* 417-431.

Thakerar, J. N., Giles, H., & Cheshire, J. (1982). Psychological and linguistic parameters of speech accommodation theory. In C. Fraser & K. R. Scherer (Eds.), *Advances in the social psychology of language* (pp. 205-255). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tong, Y. Y., Hong, Y. Y., Lee, S. L., & Chiu, C. Y. (1999). Language use as a carrier of social identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 23,* 281-296.

Triandis, H. (1995). *Individualism & collectivism.* Boulder: Westview Press.

Trudgill, P. (1986). *Dialects in contact.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Wagner, J. (1996). Foreign language acquisition through interaction: A critical review of research on conversational adjustments. *Journal of Pragmatics, 26*, 215-235.

Welsh, A. K. (2001). *Homestay: The perceptions of international students at a tertiary institution in New Zealand.* Auckland, New Zealand: University of Auckland.

Wilkinson, S. (1998). Study abroad from the participants' perspective: A challenge to common beliefs. *Foreign Language Annals, 31*, 23-39.

Wilkinson, S. (2000). Emerging questions about study abroad, *ADFL Bulletin, 32*, 36-41.

Wilkinson, S. (2002). The omnipresent classroom during summer study abroad: Some participants' perspectives. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 4*, 157-173.

Wong, J. (2004). Some preliminary thoughts on delay as an interactional resource. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 114-131). New York: Continuum.

Zuengler, J. (1991). Accommodation in native-nonnatives interactions: Going beyond the "what" to the "why" in second-language research. In. H. Giles, J. Coupland, & N. Coupland (Eds.), *Contexts of accommodation: Development in applied sociolinguistics* (pp. 223-244). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Communicating in the Homestay Environment While Studying Abroad

Thank you for participating in this survey about your experiences while studying abroad. Please answer the questions as completely and honestly as possible by circling the response that best fits your opinion. All of your responses are completely anonymous and confidential. If you have any questions about this survey, please contact Nicole A. Miller at (920) 390-0740.

SA = Strongly Agree • A = Agree • N = Neutral • D = Disagree • SD = Strongly Disagree

Section One

1. I never felt quite sure of myself when I was speaking with members of my host family.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

2. I didn't worry about making mistakes when I spoke with my host family.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

3. It frightened me when I didn't know what my host mother was saying in the second language.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

4. I was usually at ease when speaking with my host family.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

5. I started to panic when I had to speak without fully understanding what was said around me.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

6. I worried about not getting what I wanted to out of my study abroad experience.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

7. I didn't understand why my host family was harder to understand than my teacher.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

93

8. I wasn't nervous speaking the second language with my host family.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

9. I got upset when I didn't understand what my host family was saying to me.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

10. Even after studying the language before I arrived, I felt anxious about living with a host family.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

11. I often felt better speaking in class than with the host family.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

12. I felt confident when I spoke with my host family.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

13. I could feel my heart pounding when I was going to be asked a question in my host family.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

14. The more I listened to my host family speak, the more confused I got.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

15. My family spoke using words I had yet to learn in the second language.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

16. My family never used cultural expressions when speaking with me.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

17. I felt more comfortable in the classroom than around the native speakers of my host family.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

18. I felt confident to ask my host family what words meant if I didn't understand them.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

19. My family did not use the basic vocabulary and grammar structure I learned in the classroom to communicate with me.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

20. I felt more anxious communicating with native speakers after having conversations with my host family.

      SA   A   N   D   SD

21. My host family often used expressions in conversation that didn't make sense to me.

      SA   A   N   D   SD

22. My host family always used cultural expressions when speaking with me.

      SA   A   N   D   SD

23. As the study abroad experience went on, I spent less time with my host family.

      SA   A   N   D   SD

24. It didn't bother me at all to spend more time with my host family.

      SA   A   N   D   SD

25. During time spent in the home, I found myself staying in my room.

      SA   A   N   D   SD

Section Two

26. I don't tolerate ambiguous situations well.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

27. I find it difficult to respond when faced with an unexpected event.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

28. I don't think new situations are any more threatening than familiar situations.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

29. I would rather avoid solving a problem that must be viewed from several perspectives.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

30. I am good at managing unpredictable situations.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

31. I prefer familiar situations to new ones.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

32. I avoid situations that are too complicated for me to easily understand.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

33. I am tolerant of ambiguous situations.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

34. I generally prefer novelty over familiarity.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

35. I dislike ambiguous situations.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

36. I have little trouble coping with unexpected events.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

37. I find it hard to make a choice when the outcome is uncertain.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

38. I enjoy an occasional surprise.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

39. I prefer a situation in which there is some ambiguity.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

Section Three

40. What is your gender?

    Male   Female

41. What is your native language?

    _____

42. What is your second language?

    _____

43. What city and country did you study abroad in?

    _____

44. When did your study abroad program begin?

    _____

45. For how long did you study abroad?

    _____

46. How many years of experience did you have in the second language before going abroad?

    _____

47. Classify your proficiency level before you studied abroad in one of the following categories:

    Beginner   Intermediate   High Intermediate

    Advanced   Fluent

48. Classify your proficiency level after you studied abroad in one of the following categories.

    Beginner   Intermediate   High Intermediate

    Advanced   Fluent

49. Approximately how many hours a day did you spend with the members of your host

family?

0   1-2   3-4   5-6   7-8   9-10   More than 10

Thank you for completing this survey. Your answers are valued greatly and will remain anonymous.

Communication and Anxiety in the Study Abroad Experience

Thank you for participating in this survey about your experiences while studying abroad. Please answer the questions as completely and honestly as possible by circling the response that best fits your opinion. All of your responses are completely anonymous. If you have any questions about this survey, please contact Nicole A. Miller at (920) 390-0740.

SA = Strongly Agree • A = Agree • N = Neutral • D = Disagree • SD = Strongly Disagree

Section One

*Think back to your **second language classes you took with fellow American foreign exchange students** while studying abroad to answer the following questions.*

1. I never felt quite sure of myself when I was speaking in my second language class.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

2. I didn't worry about making mistakes in the second language class.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

3. It frightened me when I didn't understand what the teacher was saying when she spoke in the second language.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

4. I was usually at ease when speaking in my second language class.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

5. I worried about not getting what I wanted to out of my second language class.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

6. I didn't understand why some people got so tense when interacting with the professor.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

7. I wasn't nervous speaking the second language in my second language class.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

8. I got upset when I didn't know what my teacher was correcting me on when I spoke in the class.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

9. Even if I was well-prepared for language class, I felt anxious about it.

     SA   A   N   D   SD

10. I felt confident when I spoke in my second language class.

     SA   A   N   D   SD

11. I could feel my heart pounding when I was going to be called on in my second language class.

     SA   A   N   D   SD

12. I always felt that the other students could predict the native speakers' behavior better than I could.

     SA   A   N   D   SD

13. Language class moved so quickly, I worried about getting left behind.

     SA   A   N   D   SD

14. I felt more comfortable in the second language classroom than in my classes in my native country.

     SA   A   N   D   SD

15. I felt confident to ask for the teacher's help if I didn't understand a concept discussed in the class.

     SA   A   N   D   SD

16. I felt comfortable predicting native speakers' behavior because of what I learned in class while studying abroad.

     SA   A   N   D   SD

Section Two

*Think back to **your homestay experiences and communicating with your host family** while studying abroad to answer the following questions.*

17. I never felt quite sure of myself when I was speaking with members of my host family.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

18. I didn't worry about making mistakes when I spoke with my host family.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

19. It frightened me when I didn't know what my host mother was saying in the second language.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

20. I was usually at ease when speaking with my host family.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

21. I started to panic when I had to speak without fully understanding what was said around me.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

22. I worried about not getting what I wanted out of my study abroad experience.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

23. I didn't understand why my host family was harder to understand than my teacher.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

24. I wasn't nervous speaking the second language with my host family.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

25. I didn't get upset when I struggled with understanding what my host family was saying to me.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

26. Even after studying the language before I came, I felt anxious about living with my host family.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

27. I often felt better speaking with my host family than in my second language class.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

28. I felt confident when I spoke with my host family.

     SA   A   N   D   SD

29. I could feel my heart pounding when I was going to be asked a question by my host family.

     SA   A   N   D   SD

30. I felt more comfortable in the classroom than around the native speakers of my host family.

     SA   A   N   D   SD

31. I felt more anxious communicating with native speakers after having conversations with my host family.

     SA   A   N   D   SD

32. I felt comfortable predicting native speakers' behaviors because of my host family's help.

     SA   A   N   D   SD

Section Three

*Think back to how you felt **after** your study abroad experience to answer the following questions.*

33. My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

34. Winning is everything.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

35. It annoys me when other people perform better than I do.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

36. It is important for me to maintain harmony within a group.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

37. It is important to me that I do my job better than others.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

38. I like sharing things with my neighbors.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

39. I enjoy working in situations involving competition with others.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

40. The well being of my peers is important to me.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

41. If a peer were in financial difficulty, I would help within my means.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

42. Competition is the law of nature.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

43. If a peer is successful in class, I would feel proud.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

44. To me, pleasure is spending time with others.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

45. When another student does better than I do, I get tense and aroused.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

46. Without competition it is not possible to have a good society.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

47. I feel good when I cooperate with others.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

48. Some people emphasize winning; I am not one of them.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

49. I would have answered these questions in Section Three in the same way before I studied abroad.

    SA   A   N   D   SD

Section Four

*Think back to when you **communicated with native speakers of your second language** while studying abroad to answer the following questions.*

50. I found myself using specific cultural phrases when conversing with native speakers.

      SA   A   N   D   SD

51. It was relatively easy to pick up new vocabulary and use it in daily conversation.

      SA   A   N   D   SD

52. When I speak in my second language, my dialect is similar to that of the native speakers.

      SA   A   N   D   SD

53. When I greet a native speaker, it is normal for me to kiss him or her on the cheek.

      SA   A   N   D   SD

54. It is easy for me to adapt to the word order used in my second language, for example saying "casa roja" instead of "red house."

      SA   A   N   D   SD

55. When I am in conversation with a native speaker, I am comfortable with standing very close to him or her.

      SA   A   N   D   SD

56. I dress in more conservative clothing than I did before I studied abroad.

      SA   A   N   D   SD

57. I have a tendency to identify with the country I studied abroad in.

      SA   A   N   D   SD

58. The dialect used in my host country is distinct from other dialects of the same language.

      SA   A   N   D   SD

59. I did not have a problem ignoring unwanted attention I received from natives because I was a foreign exchange student.

      SA   A   N   D   SD

60. Please list ways in which you distinguished your American cultural identity from you host culture while studying abroad.

Section Five

61. What is your gender?

   Male   Female

62. What is your native language?

   English Spanish   French German   Other _____

63. What is your second language?

   English Spanish   French German   Other _____

64. In what country did you study abroad?

   _____

65. For how long did you study abroad?

   1 month   1-3 months   1 semester   1 year   1+years

66. Classify your proficiency level in the second language before you studied abroad.

   Beginner   Intermediate   High Intermediate   Advanced   Fluent

67. Classify your proficiency level in the second language after you studied abroad.

   Beginner   Intermediate   High Intermediate   Advanced   Fluent

68. How would you rank your cultural orientation before you studied abroad?

   Individual-oriented   ____   ____   ____   ____   ____ Group-oriented

69. How would you rank your host family's cultural orientation?

   Individual-oriented   ____   ____   ____   ____   ____ Group-oriented

70. How would you rank your cultural orientation after you studied abroad?

   Individual-oriented   ____   ____   ____   ____   ____ Group-oriented

Thank you for completing this survey. Your answers are valued greatly and will remain anonymous.