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ABSTRACT

The question addressed in this project is whether pre-departure preparation can help students to gain intercultural competencies when they study abroad, especially on shorter length programs. Specifically, the following research questions were examined; 1) How does a pre-departure orientation course titled Intercultural Experiential Learning (IS 693) affect the cultural learning for students on study abroad programs? 2) How do the changes in intercultural learning of students on study abroad programs compare with students who studied abroad without the pre-departure orientation course, and with students who did not study abroad, as measured by the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) post-test scores on the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS)? 3) What dynamics or factors influence the nature of student learning about intercultural competence on study abroad programs?

A mixed method comparative study using qualitative and quantitative research was conducted with three groups of students. A pre-test/post-test measured change in participant behavior. The IDI and DMIS scores showed change in intercultural development. Both qualitative (interviews and observations) and quantitative (IDI instrument and questionnaires) research methods were used to gain greater insight into the experience of the participants.
The statistical analysis showed that students who had the treatment did not have significant increases on their post-test scores over non-treatment students, and no significant difference on post-test scores existed for students who studied abroad when compared with non-study abroad students. The statistical analysis also showed that two different conditions increased the likelihood that students would have a significant increase in sensitivity: 1) having parents who have had overseas experiences and 2) being non-minority students (racial and ethnic minorities as well as international students).

The qualitative data analysis illuminated other factors that encouraged intercultural growth including: 1) significant intercultural interactions with international peers, 2) not having prolonged negative experiences with international people, 3) having the goal of gaining cultural understanding and students seeing an applicable use in their future career for their experience, 4) the chance to speak with international peers in English on a variety of cultural topics, and finally, 5) being members of the majority race and ethnic groups in the U.S.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH PROJECT

Study Abroad and Intercultural Development: an Important Part of Undergraduate Education

Students gain an education not only through the formal curriculum but also through the influence of their peers, faculty members, and other campus life experiences (Bess, 1991). U.S. institutions of higher education have long aimed curricular goals at developing student character as well as scholarship (Komives, 1996). While the goals for study abroad are not as clearly defined as those for higher education, they are complementary. Most study abroad programs have the following general goals for their students: intellectual development (including language learning), expanded international perspectives, and personal development (Kauffman, 1992). Many study abroad programs have specific goals such as improving students’ language learning or providing a comparative view of architecture. Thus, the overarching goals are to develop the student intellectually and personally in addition to expanding their perspective and promoting social change. Given the increasingly intercultural nature of the workplace and community, goals relating to expanded perspectives and personal development are important for graduates who will need skills to communicate effectively with people from all different backgrounds.
The number of students from US universities and colleges studying abroad has steadily increased from 1985 until the present time. *Open Doors* (2003) reports that the number of students receiving credit for study abroad in 2001-2002 increased 4% over the previous year, with a total of 160,920 students going abroad to study. The three years prior to 2001-2002 saw double-digit growth in numbers of students studying abroad for academic credit. In fact the number of students studying abroad has doubled in the past 10 years (*Open Doors*, 2003). After September 11, 2001, international education professionals wondered if the terrorist attacks would decrease the number of US students studying abroad. *Open Doors* (2001) show enrollment increases during other times of war and conflict as students became more curious about the world they are seeing in the news and other media. The *Open Doors* report for 2003 proved that despite a weak economy and post 9/11 safety concerns, American students continue to study abroad.

While American students still favor Western Europe as the most popular study abroad destination, greater numbers of students are going to more varied destinations. Additionally, students are going abroad from a broad range of ethnic and racial groups and a wider variety of majors (*Open Doors*, 2003). Another noticeable trend in study abroad has been the decreased amounts of time students spend abroad. Most Americans who studied abroad stayed for one semester or less in 2001/2002 (*Open Doors*, 2003). The number of shorter-term programs (less than 8 weeks in length according to *Open Doors*, 2003), including summer, and January term options, internships, and other short-term programs has increased dramatically.
Traditionally, the benefits of study abroad have been believed to have been gained from an extended period of time spent immersed in the host culture (Kauffmann, 1992). As students spend less time in the host culture on shorter programs, it is possible that they will not gain as much cultural sensitivity as students on traditional and longer study abroad programs. However, if current pre-departure orientation methods were able to prepare students for the intercultural experiences, then it might be possible to increase students learning opportunities despite the shorter lengths of most study abroad programs. The question that will be addressed in this project is whether pre-departure preparation can help students to gain intercultural competencies when they study abroad, especially on shorter programs.

Overview of the Dissertation

In this document I present the reader with my dissertation research. Chapter 1 outlines current trends in the field of study abroad, a statement of the problem and the research questions that guided the research. In order to examine the way that students experience study abroad and to learn whether or not they gain intercultural sensitivity from either their pre-departure preparation or their experiences abroad, a specific theory and instrument, the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) instrument and Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) theory, will be introduced as well. Chapter 2 reviews the literature related to the complexities of the study including intercultural sensitivity, student development literature, study abroad and orientation and training literature as well as expatriate employee experiences. Chapter 3 gives the research design for this mixed method study and explains why such a design was selected. The quantitative and qualitative research methods along with the
treatment are discussed in detail. Chapter 4 presents the quantitative data and an overview of the findings. This is where we learn that neither the treatment course nor the study abroad experience seems to have impacted students’ intercultural sensitivity. Chapter 5 presents the qualitative data which adds to the story already presented in the previous chapter. The findings in the qualitative section give new clues as to the types of experiences overseas students should have in order to increase their intercultural growth such as spending time with international peers and having discussions about cultural differences in English. The findings also reveal experiences that actually decrease students’ intercultural sensitivity when they study abroad such as prolonged negative experiences or a loss of minority or ethnic status in the host country. Chapter 6, the final chapter, presents a discussion of the findings and compares the quantitative and qualitative research findings. Additionally, implications for future practice, suggestions for further research, and limitations of this study will be presented. The appendix and bibliography follow Chapter 6 and allow the reader a closer look at the surveys, questionnaires, the treatment, the data, the statistical analyses conducted, and the resources used for the dissertation.

**Statement of the Problem**

It is difficult to measure potential outcomes of study abroad such as cultural acquisition, intercultural competence, and other characteristics that may come from study abroad. It is easier to measure outcomes such as language learning or achievement as reported by grade point average. Few studies have attempted to measure the cultural acquisition, cultural learning, or cultural competence that students might gain from studying abroad.
Two studies that focused on cultural learning and cultural competence were reviewed. The authors either created instruments or had students self-report to specific questions addressing cultural learning. Findings from one study showed that students were friends with one another, rather than with host nationals, regardless of length of study. The study concluded that cultural learning occurred despite the short length of the immersion experience of 2-10 weeks (Jones, 2000). The second study examined the long-term effects of study abroad using data from the past 50 years of study abroad programs through IES, a third party provider of study abroad (Akande, 2000). A majority of respondents (68%) felt that they developed intercultural competence as a result of the non-academic elements of the program including friends, home stays, travel and cultural exposure during the program. This result also appears to have been sustained for years after the study abroad experience had ended (Akande, 2000).

While both of these studies examined intercultural competence, neither used an instrument that has been validity tested to measure this competence nor did they examine whether or not pre-departure activities affected student development.

In order to measure intercultural competence, it is important to have a specific criterion for ‘intercultural development’. The Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) will be used in this study as a model to quantify the term ‘development’. The DMIS uses stages of cognitive development based on personal construct theory and its extension, radical constructivism, which suggests that if someone has no way to construct an event, they will not really experience it. The DMIS divides people into two different stages, ethnocentric and ethnorelative, which are on the same developmental continuum. Ethnocentrism is the understanding that
one’s own culture is experienced as central to reality while ethnocentrism is when
one’s own culture is experienced in the context of other cultures

The ethnocentric stages include:
1) Denial of cultural difference or when one’s own culture is experienced as the only
   real culture.
2) Defense against cultural difference occurs when one’s own culture is experienced
   as the only good one; there is a division between ‘us’ and ‘them’ when we are
   superior and they are inferior.
3) Minimization of cultural difference, when elements of one’s own cultural
   worldview are experienced as universal, cultural differences are trivialized or
   romanticized.

The ethnorelative stages include:
4) Acceptance of cultural difference which is when one’s own culture is experienced
   as one of a number of equally complex worldviews.
5) Adaptation to cultural difference, or when the experience of another culture yields
   perception and behavior appropriate to that culture. This worldview is expanded to
   include constructs from other worldviews, or seeing the world through different eyes.
6) Integration of cultural difference, which is when one’s experience of self is
   expanded to include the movement in and out of different cultural worldviews.
   (DMIS model, 2002)

The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) was created to quantify or
measure the DMIS theory. The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) was
developed as a valid, accessible, self-assessment instrument that would provide
feedback based on the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS). Dr.
Milton Bennett and Dr. Mitchell Hammer based this instrument on Dr. Bennett’s
DMIS model and uses grounded theory to measure an individual’s orientation toward
cultural difference. This instrument will be used in this study to determine whether
there is any change in pre-test post-test intercultural development scores for the
students in this study.
Research Questions

The goal of this research study is to determine whether or not it is possible to affect the intercultural development of students who study abroad through a specially designed pre-departure course. The study is designed to answer the following questions:

1) How does a pre-departure orientation course titled Intercultural Experiential Learning (IS 693) affect the cultural learning for students on study abroad programs?

2) How do the changes in intercultural learning of students on study abroad programs compare with students who studied abroad without the pre-departure orientation course, and with students who did not study abroad, as measured by the IDI post-test scores on the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS)?

3) What dynamics or factors influence the nature of student learning about intercultural competence on study abroad programs?

The following table describes the components of the pre-departure preparations students receive for all OSU study abroad programs as well as the pre-departure class components for students who chose to take the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Pre-Departure Orientation</th>
<th>Pre-Departure Class (IS 693)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Review nuts and bolts details (passport, flights, insurance)</td>
<td>-Discussions about concept of culture throughout the course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Discuss the housing situation</td>
<td>-Exploration of American culture or culture of students in the class if other than US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Share information about the classroom experience</td>
<td>-Readings and reflection about topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Explain field trips/weekend travel</td>
<td>-Experiential activities about culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Brief overview of cultural adaptation</td>
<td>-Cultural immersion project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Little opportunity for group interactions</td>
<td>-Exploration of future host culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4-5 hours total time with students</td>
<td>-10 week course, 3 hours per week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Standard Orientation vs. Orientation Course
Important Literature to Review for this Study

In order to discover how pre-departure orientation might impact students' cross-cultural learning, two broad areas of the literature will be examined: (1) inter-cultural competence and personal development, and (2) preparation for overseas experiences. Topics within the first area include: current definitions of intercultural competence, including cross-cultural adjustment; how intercultural competence is currently being measured; the outcomes of study abroad; how the development of intercultural competence relates to the process of personal development during college years for students, e.g., 18-22 year olds; the characteristics of students participating in study abroad; the types of study abroad programs attracting the largest numbers of students; and the ways in which learning outcomes from study abroad programs relate to the goals for liberal arts education. The various types of study abroad programs will be introduced and defined and current trends in study abroad will be discussed to determine their overall importance within higher education.

Within the second area, we will focus on the ways in which students and working professionals are prepared for their experiences abroad. The student discussion begins with the pre-departure orientation and its importance, which includes studies on cross-cultural adjustment, and goals and outcomes of orientation programs. Other types of preparatory work done by students will also be studied including cognitive, class work, personal preparation, and students’ cross-cultural communication experiences and opportunities. While not much data exists on the ways in which students are prepared for overseas experiences or the resulting outcomes of these experiences, American expatriate employees have been researched extensively. Because both groups of Americans face similar challenges, namely
working and living in a new culture, the expatriate literature will be examined for useful parallels that might be applicable to the student population. The research findings about the ways that multinational corporations prepare their expatriates for overseas experiences will complement, and hopefully inform, the existing study abroad literature.

**Research Design**

A mixed method comparative study using qualitative and quantitative research was conducted with three groups of students receiving different levels of treatments, here referred to as group 1, group 2, and group 3. All three groups of students completed an Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI). This inventory seeks to place individual participants in an intercultural competence stage. Group 1 took the course about culture called Intercultural Experiential Learning (IS 693) while groups 2 and 3 did not take the course. Both groups 1 and 2 studied abroad in France and these students had the standard pre-departure orientation sessions. Group 3 did not have an orientation because they were enrolled in classes on the Columbus campus rather than going abroad. Group 3 is the control group to control for maturity.

**Summary of groups 1, 2, and 3:**

Group 1: studied in France, pre-test, taking pre-departure course, standard orientation, observed in France, post test
Group 2: studied in France, pre-test, standard orientation, observed in France, post-test
Group 3: studied French at OSU, pre-test, post-test

Observations and informal interviews that were conducted with students in groups 1 and 2 while the students were overseas helped to inform about their stage of intercultural development according to the DMIS model. After groups 1 and 2
returned to campus, all 3 groups were given the IDI again to determine if any change occurred in intercultural competence as measured by the IDI. Some students were then selected from each group and interviewed in order to learn more about their cross-cultural experiences.

**Significance of the Problem**

Study abroad has been moving toward the trend of offering shorter length programs for students (IIE, 2001). Because students are spending less time in the host culture, it has been theorized that they will not gain as much cultural learning as students with traditional and longer study abroad programs (Carlson, 1990). Given that programs are getting shorter, the value of understanding the relationship between pre-departure orientation and intercultural development is evident. Sending students overseas with better preparation could potentially counteract the lessened impact of shortened study abroad programs. The additional training might be effective if it equips students to handle many of the cultural issues immediately upon arrival. However, incorporating this type of pre-departure training would require institutions to commit substantial teaching resources, and might impact student class options, because this type of course requirement could conflict with the scheduling of other courses. Thus, information about the efficacy of pre-departure courses will assist international educators to evaluate the costs and benefits of creating such programs.

This study will help illuminate the potential to increase intercultural development by expanding the types of pre-departure preparations students are given. The questions that will be answered include whether or not the pre-departure course is effective in increasing intercultural development or whether other factors have a
greater influence, such as student demographics, major, or past international experiences. The major significance related to the field of education is that the study will reveal the factors that might produce an increase in student outcomes from an educational experience abroad, especially those related to pre-departure orientation.

Definitions of Terms:

1. Students - undergraduate students of any age, enrolled at Ohio State University
2. Study abroad - taking university courses in any country other than the U.S. for graded credit
3. DMIS - The Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) was created by Dr. Milton Bennett as a framework to explain the experiences of students he observed when they confronted cultural difference and they became more competent intercultural communicators (IDI Manual, 2001).
4. IDI - The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) is an empirical measure of ‘intercultural sensitivity’, which is “a sensitivity to the importance of cultural differences and to the points of view of people in other cultures” (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992, p.414)
5. Intercultural competence - any one of the levels along the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS)
6. Intercultural Experiential Learning (IS 693) - the course taught at Ohio State to help prepare students who have been accepted to study abroad. Also called the course and the treatment
7. Pre-departure orientation - the meetings and materials that are shared with students prior to departure for a study abroad program
CHAPTER 2

THE LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this research is to learn how pre-departure preparation of students studying abroad might affect their learning outcomes. More specifically, can participation in a pre-departure class in addition to the regular orientation sessions increase students’ level of intercultural development while studying abroad? Is there a larger gain in intercultural development for students who have more preparation before they study abroad when compared with students who have less pre-departure preparation? One outcome of the research will be to measure the degree to which study abroad in general helps students to increase their intercultural competence as measured by a specific cultural sensitivity instrument, the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) based on the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) (IDI Manual, 2001). These findings will be compared with a control group of OSU students who did not study abroad.

Important Areas of the Literature:

In order to determine whether it is possible to affect the intercultural development of students who study abroad through a specially designed pre-departure course, it will be useful to review the research literature in these areas: current definitions of intercultural competence, including cross-cultural adjustment; how
intercultural competence is currently being measured; outcomes of study abroad programs; how the development of intercultural competence relates to the process of personal development during college years for students, e.g., 18-22 year olds; the characteristics of student participating in study abroad; the types of study abroad programs attracting the largest numbers of students; and how learning outcomes from study abroad programs relate to the goals for liberal arts education. The various types of study abroad programs will be introduced and defined and current trends in study abroad will be discussed to determine its overall importance within higher education.

The manner of student preparation for their experiences abroad will be the next focus. Beginning with the pre-departure orientation and its importance, including studies on cross-cultural adjustment, the goals and outcomes of orientation programs will be examined. Other types of preparatory work done by students will also be studied including cognitive, class work, personal preparation, and students’ cross-cultural communication experiences and opportunities. While there is not much data on the ways that students are prepared for overseas experiences and the resulting outcomes, American expatriate employees have been researched extensively. As both groups of Americans are facing similar challenges, namely working and living in a new culture, the expatriate literature will be examined for useful parallels. The research findings about the ways that multinational corporations prepare their expatriates for overseas experiences will complement and hopefully inform the study abroad literature used.
Current Definitions of Intercultural Competence, Including Cross-Cultural Adjustment:

“IES uses this term to describe its objectives to ensure that all of its students have a better understanding of cultural differences and learn ways to function effectively in a multicultural world. We strive to provide students with both academic quality and intercultural competence” (Akande p. 3). Rosovsky (1990) states that liberal education should help students to have a critical appreciation (of different cultures) as well as not allow them to be provincial. Bess (1991) writes that another well-known goal of higher education is to help students view their societies from afar and compare them to other societies in order to gain perspectives on social issues.

Research conducted about cross-cultural adaptation, intercultural effectiveness, job performance during international assignments, and other forms of intercultural contact, show that intercultural sensitivity is a key to working and living effectively with people from different cultures (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992). Intercultural sensitivity has been identified in a number of studies focusing on the effectiveness of international sojourners, international business adaptation and job performance, and foreign student adjustment (IDI Manual, 2001).

Cushner & Brislin (1996, quoted in the IDI Manual, 2001) identify four criteria for assessing intercultural effectiveness (1) you have positive feelings toward interactions with people from different cultures, (2) people from different cultures have positive feelings toward you, (3) the task/job responsibilities are fulfilled successfully, and (4) you are not plagued by (culture contact) stress-related ailments. More recently, three core aspects of intercultural effectiveness have been identified: (1) personal/family adjustment and satisfaction, (2) intercultural interaction, and (3) professional effectiveness (Hammer, in press; Kealey, 1996; Black, Heslin & Curtis, 1996 in IDI Manual, 2001).

While these criteria are useful in characterizing intercultural effectiveness, the task, as Bhawuk & Brislin (1992) suggest, is to identify predictors for intercultural
effectiveness. They suggest that in order to be effective in another culture, people must be interested in other cultures, be sensitive enough to notice cultural differences, plus possess a willingness to modify their behavior as an indication of respect for the people of other cultures. A reasonable term that summarized these qualities of people is intercultural sensitivity, and this may be a predictor of effectiveness.

How Intercultural Competence is Currently Being Studied:

Few studies have attempted to measure cultural acquisition, cultural learning, or cultural competence that students might gain from studying abroad. Two studies reviewed focused on cultural learning and cultural competence. In a study done on students participating on a short-term cultural immersion program two instruments were used to measure cultural learning. The ‘Expectations Questionnaire’ and the ‘Best Friends Check List’ were completed by students and analyzed in order to see which factors caused significant learning. Younger students and students from lower incomes tended to perceive a greater expectation of cultural difference. In general, students had high expectations of cultural difference, which decreased in the post-test analysis. The ‘Best Friends Questionnaire’ sought information about who were important peers and friends to the students studying abroad. Primarily students were friends with one another, rather than with host nationals, no matter the length of study. The study concludes that cultural learning occurred despite the short length of the immersion experience of 2-10 weeks (Jones, 2000). The second study to examine cultural competence examined the long-term effects of study abroad using data from the past 50 years of study abroad programs through IES, a third party provider of study abroad (Akande, 2000). Past participants were surveyed and given the same definition of ‘intercultural competence’. Sixty-eight percent of respondents felt that
they developed intercultural competence as a result of the non-academic elements of the program including friends, home stays, travel and cultural exposure during the program. The nonacademic components of the program gave students opportunities to practice intercultural communication activities. This result also appears to have been sustained for years after the study abroad experience ended (Akande, 2000).

Outcomes of Study Abroad Programs

It is generally agreed that students who study abroad learn and grow intellectually and personally from this experience. The research on the outcomes of studying abroad for college students indicates that study abroad has an impact on students in three major areas; intellectual development (including language learning), expanded international perspectives, and personal development (Kauffman, 1992).

Language

When intellectual development is studied, the focus is generally on language acquisition. Historically, the majority of students who studied abroad did so to gain fluency in a second language (Carlson, 1990). In addition to studying language acquisition from courses overseas, studies have been conducted to examine if host family experiences, out of class experiences (Laubscher, 1994), or other factors have contributed to language learning (Crust, 1998) and the students overseas findings are often compared to groups who did not study abroad but continued taking language classes on campus (Terrell, 1982). Most studies show that students who study abroad have higher levels of language acquisition than students who study a language on their home campus. The same has been found to be true for family and out of class experiences. Another area that study abroad impacts is in giving students new insights and perspectives into their fields of study (Carlson, 1990).
Overall Attitude Towards Education

Many students report that they have an increased knowledge and interest in their general studies and learning overall after studying abroad. Their attitudes and expectations toward learning are often greater than before they studied abroad (Kauffmann, 1992). These students developed reflective thinking skills and are able to be more critical in everyday activities (Carlson, 1990).

Developing International Perspective

Study abroad also tends to help students develop an international perspective in three ways: their perceptions of their host culture, perceptions of their own culture, and their overall global understanding. Length of stay, student expectations, and level of immersion into the host culture all play a large role in this area of development (Kauffmann, 1992).

Personal Development

Another area of growth for students who study abroad is in their personal development due to their experiences. Some of the literature reviewed suggests that the level of personal development and growth might be related to the level of difficulty of first adjusting to the host culture and then readjusting to their home culture at the end of the study abroad experience (Kauffmann, 1992). Personal development is also called autonomy, independence, self-confidence, and tolerance of ambiguity in many studies. In addition, it encompasses social skills, self-esteem, self-reliance, and self-concept (Cash, 1993, Laubscher 1994). Generally all of the studies show an increase in autonomy, self-confidence, independence, and other measures of personal development. Only one study (Nash, 1976) showed that students who studied in France for their junior year actually lost self-confidence after the experience. This
could have been due to the culture shock upon returning to the US, or may have reflected students understanding that they know less about the world than they thought they did before studying abroad.

**Career Goals and Vocational Interests**

Students’ career goals and vocational interest also are also affected by studying abroad. Often times, students were introduced to areas of study or fields that they did not know existed before they studied abroad. Some students choose to study abroad because they believe that it will help their odds of finding employment while those who study abroad are more open to changing careers (Carlson, 1990). Ninety-Five percent of the students surveyed in the Carlson study believed that they would be able to use their international experience in their future professional lives.

In terms of our understanding of the development of intercultural sensitivity, the research conducted on study abroad outcomes offers only limited insight. Most studies use very small sample sizes because those students are easily accessible to them. This findings in low generalizability because the groups were not randomly selected and there are typically very few people in each sample. In addition, the terms and outcomes are not clearly stated, and most research does not return back to the previous studies completed to try to clarify the characteristics they are trying to examine in their study and especially how to measure these outcomes (Akande, 2000). Another difficulty with the research done around study abroad programs is the problem with the ways that the data is collected. Often instruments have been created in order to try to get at some topic, but the validity of the instrument has not been tested. Many studies use self-reporting methods from present or past participants, which could include information that the student wished or hoped they would gain
from such an experience. Students also could report behavior they wished they had exhibited during the study abroad experience. Many standardized tests show little correlation between study abroad and change. This could be a result of the instrument not being a good indicator of that concept being studied. Most questionnaires and self-report studies show positive growth occurs through studying abroad (Kauffmann, 1992). Finally, most studies would be difficult to replicate because they are qualitative in nature and have had special circumstances surrounding the studies. This makes it difficult to know if the findings could be applied to other students and programs or if they are specific to the studies completed.

How the Development of Intercultural Competence Relates to the Process of Personal Development During College Years for Students, e.g. 18-22 Year Olds

Student Development Theory and Identity

Entire bodies of literature have been written about college students’ development during their college years by such researchers as Astin, Chickering, Perry, and Kohlberg. Student development can be divided up into several different types of theories; 1) psychosocial theories, viewing development as a series of developmental stages, 2) cognitive theories, describe changes in thinking and framing of values and beliefs, 3) typology theories, describing differences in learning style, personality type, or temperament, and 4) person-environment interaction theories, focusing on the ways that the environment influences behavior through its interactions with the individual (Chickering, 1993).

Many factors have been shown to have an impact on traditional aged college students' development and many can be traced to the experiences that occur on study
abroad programs. The following are key factors from Chickering (1993) that influence student development:

1) Institutional objectives: clear and serious objectives have an impact on students.

2) Institutional size: if an institution is small enough that all students have the opportunity to actively participate, there is a greater impact.

3) Student-faculty relationships: the more frequent and friendly the interaction, the greater the impact on students, especially in non-classroom settings.

4) Curriculum: an educationally strong curriculum encourages student development.

5) Teaching: has the greatest impact when active learning is expected and students and faculty interact regularly.

6) Friendships and student communities: allows students the opportunity to participate in communities that are diverse, meaningful cultures.

7) Student development programs and services: have an impact when deliberate attempts are made to use theory in programming.

Applying Chickering’s theory to study abroad programs generates interesting insights;

1) Institutional objectives: typically study abroad programs have a narrow and specific focus, usually on one region of a country, or even on one area subject, such as language acquisition or art of a particular region.

2) Institutional size: most study abroad programs are smaller than typical university departments and classes, allowing interaction and participation of all of the students.

3) Student-faculty relationships: typically have the opportunity to flourish on study abroad programs as the faculty and students are experiencing new aspects of the culture together. Also, as class size tends to be smaller than on most campuses, there is more interaction between students and faculty and often this continues out of the classroom on field trips and other informal settings.

4) Curriculum: usually is focused and very strong with regional specialists giving lectures to students.
5) Teaching: the opportunity exists for a great impact in this area as many study abroad programs use experiential learning activities and active learning is expected and students and faculty interact regularly, even in non-academic settings.

6) Friendships and student communities: due to its small size and unique setting, students typically form close bonds with their peers on the program, who they may not have connected with if they were not sharing similar experiences.

7) Student development programs and services: is one area where many study abroad programs exhibit weakness. The administrators are often not familiar with the theories and do not make an effort to provide appropriate programming based on the theories.

This brief analysis using Chickering's factors, shows that study abroad has the potential of giving students the opportunity to develop and grow as much, if not more than time spent on the home campus.

**Retention and Success Factors:**

Other researchers have focused on factors that matter most in student success in college or factors which have an impact on students development, learning, and the overall university experience.

For example, Astin’s theory of student involvement shows the more activities and out of class participation a student engages in, the more they will gain from the overall university experience (Astin, 1999). More specifically, Astin’s research showed the factors that appear to enhance student retention and persistence at University. Positive influences include living in a residence hall, being involved in social organizations and other campus activities, participating in sports teams, holding down part time on-campus jobs, having a good fit between student and institution type, and students interacting with faculty (Astin, 1999).

Chickering’s research has also shown that the peer group is the most influential factor for students during the college years. His research supports Astin’s
findings, that faculty-student interaction also has a great impact on student learning (Chickering, 1969). The impact is often greatest when the non-class interactions between students and faculty are related to ‘real world’ matters such as learning through cooperative education or internship experiences. Pascarella and Terenzini (1993) also state that ‘the educational impact of a college’s faculty is enhanced when their contacts with students extend beyond the formal classroom to informal non-classroom settings’ (page 620).

Study abroad offers these opportunities in abundance. Most students study abroad with peers from their home institution, peers from other universities, or with host-national peers. This allows them to get to know a new group of students with similar interests in an in-depth way and have the opportunity to experience other cultures as well as having an intensive cohort interaction with their peers. Many study abroad programs also have a faculty or staff member along from the host institution. This faculty resident director will have a much closer relationship with the students than a faculty member traditionally would on a U.S. campus as they are responsible for both teaching and student support services. Often, the faculty abroad spend significant amounts of non-class time with the students, on field trips, site visits, or talking about the cultural differences that they are all encountering. Students abroad generally spend more time with their professors than students on a home campus normally would. This can occur because they have all lost their usual social outlets of friends in the residence hall, or school clubs and because they go on field trips and excursions together and often, faculty teach more than one class and see students more than once per day, which would be the norm on their home campus. Study
abroad programs also often have smaller class sizes, which allow them to get to know their peers and professors more intimately, thus supporting growth and learning.

Finally, Sanford’s (1967) theory states that college students respond well to a system of challenge and support. Specifically, students appear to develop when the stress is great enough to challenge them but not so great as to create defensive reactions (Sanford, 1967). If students are challenged by their environment and surroundings then they need to have a place to be supported as well. Most study abroad programs provide challenges for students as they navigate new cultures, norms, and ways of doing thing. Many study abroad programs offer the balancing support with faculty, staff, or overseas centers where the student can be heard, express their challenges, and then be ready to face the next, greater challenge. Study abroad programs often offer the best of what researchers have shown that universities can give to students to help them to grow and learn and have an impact on their overall university experience.

Astin’s research reported in What Matters in College (1993) found that study abroad positively impacted student growth in cultural awareness and foreign language skills. However, this same study found that some impacts of study abroad are not always positive. The ‘summary of environment effects on self-reported growth’ showed a negative effect on student growth in a few specific areas including public speaking skills, leadership ability, and interpersonal skills (Astin, 1993). It is possible that students reported that studying abroad negatively affected them because they were not on campus and thus unable to hold leadership positions or work on their speaking and interpersonal skills.
The Characteristics of Students Participating in Study Abroad

In 1999, less than 10% of the total U.S. college student population (113,959 students) studied abroad during their college experience (Open Doors, 1999). Of the population of study abroad students in 2001-2002, 65% were women, 83% were white, only 3.5% of all American students abroad were African American (Krane, 1997 and Open Doors, 2003), and 63% of students studied in European countries (Desruisseaux, 1999 and Open Doors, 2003). Thirty-five percent of these students majored in humanities and the social sciences, 18% majored in business, and 8% each in the areas of foreign languages and fine or applied arts (Desruisseaux, 1999 and Open Doors, 2003). Finally, 40% of all participants studied abroad during their junior year with 42% of all students came from research institutions (Desruisseaux, 1999 and Open Doors, 2003). While the overall study abroad numbers have increased every year in the past three years, the demographic distribution has remained the same with white women being the majority group participating in study abroad (Open Doors, 2003). One of the biggest signs of change in recent years has been an increase in less traditional study abroad locations such as Africa and Latin America (Desruisseaux, 1999 and Open Doors, 2003).

From the data, it is clear that the underrepresented students in study abroad programs include men, minority students, students majoring in the fields of science, education, math, engineering, agriculture, disabled students, or any students of a non-traditional age (Desruisseaux, 1999 and Open Doors, 2003). The available literature sheds much light onto the topic of who is going abroad and why these students choose to study overseas. Originally, most students who studied abroad did so from private colleges and universities. Interestingly enough, two-thirds of all American study
abroad participants are women, which is the reverse for International students who study in the U.S. The imbalance of women has been explained by the idea that study abroad was traditionally best suited for foreign language and liberal arts majors, which has a high proportion of female students. Krane (1997) offers an explanation for why more women study abroad than men.

…the imbalance reflects U.S. cultural values. Societal and parental expectations in the United States have traditionally encouraged young men to pursue ‘serious’, career oriented degrees, while young women are encouraged to ‘cultivate’ themselves and/or prepare for marriage.

One of the strongest indicators of whether a student would study abroad or not is related to their family background. Students who study abroad, especially for extended periods of time, tend to be sons and daughters of well-traveled parents. Children of parents who have lived abroad and speak other languages are also over-represented in the study abroad statistics (Krane, 1997).

Though not stated explicitly, readers of the literature can begin to see why a certain profile of student is more likely to study abroad than others. Students who go abroad have more resources, international experience, relatively higher GPA’s, and their parents have gone to college and perhaps lived overseas themselves.

Before World War II, many American students went to Europe to learn about their roots, but presently students who participate in study abroad go to all different regions of the world and not specifically to their ‘home land’. The countries with the largest reported heritage-seeking students in the study were Poland, Israel, Egypt, and Ireland (Szekely, 1999). Many Asian-American students choose to study in Japan, Korea, and China, but African American students were not found to want to study in Africa for heritage seeking purposes. Rather, more African American students wanted to study in “traditional” study abroad locations (Western Europe) rather than in Africa.
(Szekely, 1999). The variety of destinations suggest that students choosing to go abroad seek the opportunity to experience of "different" nations, and might offer evidence of a readiness to develop the skills and attitudes that lead to intercultural competence.

The Types of Study Abroad Programs Attracting the Largest Numbers of Students

There are perhaps as many different types of study abroad program as there are students. Study abroad began as a junior year abroad for privileged students whose parents or sponsors wanted them to have a cultural experience, to see the world (i.e. Western Europe), and to have a finishing school effect (Krane, 1997). Now, less than 8% of all students who study abroad stay overseas for an academic year or longer (Open Doors, 2003). Currently there are many different types of programs with various lengths, goals, and options that exist for the diverse student population who study abroad (Hoffa, 1997).

Such programs can range from short-term summer programs to academic year programs, from very expensive programs to economical options, with different academic challenges as well as different levels of intercultural immersion. The four types of programs that will be discussed include 1) the branch campus option, 2) exchange options, 3) field or experiential study, and 4) course based short term programs.

Branch Campus Programs:

These programs typically are in a foreign country but are run by the mother institution and include students from the same American university who study specialized topics about a specific region of the world in the students’ native language. Some programs offer host family experiences and interactions with local
culture, but others keep students in apartments together and encourage group interactions, which have been called ‘American ghetto’s’ or ‘island programs’ or sometimes ‘peninsula programs’ if there is a link to the host culture (Hoffa, 1997).

Some unique features of branch campus programs include isolation of students and a potential lack of interaction with the local culture. In addition, students have a smaller class choice on campus as it is not a full university. There can be extensive liability and expense for the university to own or rent property on a foreign country. Branch campus programs have complete control over the academic component of the program, students typically have an easy academic transition, and such programs have the unique ability to offer courses in English for Americans in non-English speaking countries where students might not otherwise be able to study due to linguistic limitations, such as China, Slovenia, and the Czech Republic (Hoffa, 1997). These programs also offer ease in transferring grades and credits and can accommodate large groups of students at little increased cost. Another important characteristic of these programs is that they generate faculty support back on campus. Many faculty members teach at the branch campus, have positive experiences in the host culture, conduct their own research as well, and are invaluable supporters of study abroad back on campus. (Hoffa, 1997). These programs also provide anxious parents and students the peace of mind that because it is a ‘branch campus’ and the University has personnel and professors to take care of students’ needs.

**Exchange Programs:**

Exchange programs are very different from a branch campus model. These programs involve the exchange of a few students from one domestic institution to an overseas institution. Students pay tuition at their own institution and then take classes
as international students at the foreign institution. These programs are designed for students who have a high tolerance for ambiguity, are interested in an immersion experience, are fluent in a foreign language if one is required, and are interested in navigating a new educational system and norms (Hoffa, 1997).

Exchange programs are not designed to accommodate large numbers of students and usually only very independent students will be successful in such a venture because there is little in-country support for student services, housing, cultural adaptation, or academic issues. Exchange programs are very affordable as their regular, domestic tuition covers the program abroad. It provides a high level of challenge and immersion for students who are seeking that experience or who have already had significant international experiences before participating in such a program.

Some schools have begun to offer a hybrid or mixed method model, where there is a branch campus at which students have support and student services and can go for help, but they are also integrated into the local universities and culture for part of their experience (Hoffa, 1997). These programs are more expensive than exchange programs and have some of the same characteristics of branch campus models, while providing an increased opportunity for interaction with the local culture and experience in an international academic setting.

Field Study and Experiential Programs:

These two types of programs might be the most varied of all. The programs can include internships, work, field trips, lectures, a faculty led program, or any combination of the above (Hoffa, 1997). Students tend to have interactions with the local culture as they are studying or working in one area of society.
Field study and experiential programs include the need for a very high level of organization in order for programs to run smoothly, and if this is not in place, then students and coordinators can feel unprepared. Also, if connections are not made about the varied experiences and academic content students receive, and if time for processing this information is not factored into the program, students may not understand the implications of the experiences they are having or learn as much as they could have with more structured experiences. These programs offer students the chance to integrate more fully into the host culture. They also can offer a hands-on experience and allow non-traditional study abroad majors to do research, labs or other work that they could not do on a traditional classroom based program. The information studied and learned is usually practical and field related.

**Course Based Short-Term Programs:**

This is a new and fast growing type of program that incorporates a term-length class and a trip with the class and professor to the host country. These programs allow diverse student populations to participate as they might be as short as one week up to 3 weeks in country, allowing parents, students who work full time, or have other family commitments, the opportunity to have an overseas experience.

Course based short-term programs use the majority of students’ time abroad in organized activity making it difficult to have contact with the local people and culture. These programs also take enormous faculty support as faculty members need to teach a course and tie in the location that they will travel to, as well as accompany the group overseas. At the same time, these shorter-length programs allow various types of students to participate in addition to serving as a ‘tease’ to students who are thinking about going abroad for a longer time in their academic careers. The costs for students
of going overseas for a short time are also usually less prohibitive than spending a longer time abroad.

The following matrix shows a quick view of each type of program highlighted above. It is difficult to classify each program type, because there are as many exceptions as there are similarities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program type</th>
<th>Length of program</th>
<th>Interaction with culture</th>
<th>Language immersion</th>
<th>Housing Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Branch campus</td>
<td>1 semester, year, or summer</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>host family student residential or apartment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exchange-direct enroll</td>
<td>1 semester or year</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>host family student residential or apartment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field study experiential</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>host family student residential or apartment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course based, short term</td>
<td>less than 6 weeks</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>hotel or hostel or host family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Study Abroad Components by Type

Study abroad seems to have followed a general trend in higher education to diversify program offerings so that students have more options for an overseas experience. These different program types each offer differences in terms of learning
outcomes. At the current time, programs offered seem to meet the diverse needs of the university community.

**Trends in Study Abroad:**

Recently, there has been more success in keeping records of those participating in study abroad programs. Efforts by the Institute of International Education (IIE) with support of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the U.S. Department of State, and the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs: Association of International Educators, (NAFSA: AIE) have encouraged U.S. institutions of higher education to report to the *Open Doors Report*, which used to be reported once every two years and currently publishes every year (*Open Doors*, 2001). The data reported show trends in study abroad, allow institutions to compare themselves to their peers and competitors, and help all university administrators to determine which types of programs might work best for their campus, students, and faculty.

Important to this study are many trends noticed regarding numbers of students studying abroad, study abroad destinations, length of programs, and types of programs offered by U.S. institutions of higher education. These trends include a continuous increase in the number of overall students studying abroad and earning academic credit for their time studying in another country, more variation in the destinations of programs, shorter term study abroad program options, and flexibility of types of programs for non-traditional study abroad majors.

The number of students from U.S. universities and colleges has steadily increased from 1985 until the present time. *Open Doors* (2003) reports that the number of students receiving credit for study abroad in 2001-2002 increased 4% from
the previous year, making a total of 160,920 students. The three years prior to 2001-2002 had seen double-digit growth in numbers of students studying abroad for academic credit. In fact the number of students studying abroad has doubled in the past 10 years (*Open Doors*, 2003). After September 11, 2001, international education professionals wondered if the terrorist attacks would decrease the number of US students studying abroad. At the end of 2001, IIE conducted an on-line survey of 650 institutions and received 600 responses. From this survey the following was learned: 91% of institutions reported no change in plans for students going abroad, fewer than 2% of respondents reported more than 30% cancellations of student participants. The report also stated that 97% of respondents believe that international education, including study abroad, continues to be regarded as more or equally important aspect of their institutions programming as it was before September 11th, 2001 (*Open Doors*, 2001). *Open Doors* (2001) reports that we have seen enrollments increase during other times of war and conflict as students become more curious about the world they are seeing in the news and other media. The *Open Doors* Report for 2003 proved that despite a weak economy and post 9/11 safety concerns, American students continue to study abroad, and in greater numbers.

Most U.S. students still favor Western Europe as the favorite study abroad destination with 62% of all study abroad students going to Europe (*Open Doors*, 2001). There are many reasons why the majority of students still go to Western Europe. Initially when students studied overseas, it was in the 19th century when they went for theological and medical training and is related to our long history with Europe (Krane, 1997). Another reason is that language study is still a large factor in study abroad and the languages spoken in Western Europe (Spanish, French, Italian,
and German) are the most common ones taught in U.S. high schools and universities (Krane, 1997). Despite Western Europe's popularity, there has been an 18% decrease in the percentage of students studying in Europe since 1985-86. The percentage of students studying in Latin America has doubled since 1985 and many other regions are seeing larger numbers of US students in their countries including the Middle East, Africa, Oceania, Asia, and North America (Open Doors, 2001).

Another noticeable trend in study abroad has been the lengths of time students spend abroad. Currently, Open Doors (2003) states that 92% of Americans who studied abroad did so for one semester or less in 2001-2002. Shorter-term programs (less than 8 weeks in length according to Open Doors, 2003), including summer, and January term options, internships, and other short-term programs increased dramatically in the past years. These shorter programs tend to be more affordable for students, both financially and academically, as being away costs less money and the less time they are away from campus, the more chance they will have time to finish their graduation requirements as scheduled. Additionally, students now have more demands on their time with part-time jobs, internships, volunteer opportunities, and other campus activities, which are seen as important experiences to prospective employers. These shorter study abroad programs also allow more diverse majors to go overseas because the experience does not conflict with strict course sequences and requirements (Open Doors, 2003). Shorter-term programs are often innovative and allow students opportunities such as field seminars and independent research options (Krane, 1997).

Other trends include diversity in study abroad. The types of diversity include diverse choice of destination by students and non-traditional types of majors studying
abroad including major increases in the business and technical fields. Of all students who study abroad, only 8% are language majors, a marked change from the belief that foreign language majors were the only students who would study overseas for the ‘junior year abroad’ (Krane, 1997), (Open Doors, 2003).

Goals of Higher Education and How Study Abroad Supports Those Goals:

A major purpose of higher education is student development as well as scholarship (Komives, 1996). It was believed that students would gain an education not only through the formal curriculum but that they would also learn by being influenced by their peers, faculty members, and campus life experiences (Bess, 1991). It has been stated that education should be for the whole person, that each person must be considered as an individual, and it should be accessible for a range of ability, circumstance, and age (Bess, 1991). Bess also lists three specific goals of higher education; 1) Cognitive learning or knowledge, 2) Affective development including moral, religious, and emotional aspects of the student, and 3) Practical competence, including citizenship, work, family life, health and other practical areas. Students are also encouraged to learn about ‘real life’ while they are in college (Veysey, 1965).

Another way to look at the goals of higher education is to examine them from both an individualistic and a collectivist point of view. From an individualistic point of view, education should produce effective people, and a society of people who will work well and make decisions and take actions. Learning should be for its own sake, and learning will help both cultural development and practical competencies. The collectivist view is that society has goals that are different from individuals goals. Education should serve nations’ purposes and help with social issues and research should aim for national goals to solve national problems. Higher education in the U.S.
tends to look at the goals of higher education in a more individualistic manner (Bess, 1991).

Goals of liberal and general education are synonymous and are in line with the goals of higher education in general (Levine, 1993). Many universities use the idea of a general or liberal curriculum for their programs of study, which includes problem solving, acquiring skills, individual and social change, and seeking study (Levine, 1993). Rosovsky (1990) argues that the idea of general education is about the development of the whole person, including purpose in life, emotions, and understanding natural phenomena. Liberal education should allow for three qualities, humility, humanity, and humor (Rosovsky, 1990).

Accessibility is another goal that institutions of higher education have, not for their students, but for themselves. Institutions want to have a diverse group of students with regard to experience, age, and situation to enable students to learn from one another (Bess, 1991 and Komives, 1996).

Some of the goals of higher education are specifically areas in which study abroad programs help to encourage the desired findings. Helping students to develop a comparative view of their own culture and others comes naturally with living and studying in a different culture. In addition, students who study in a foreign culture typically do not see the world as a provincial place after their overseas experience because they have been exposed to new ideas and ways of living. Study abroad programs and host cultures also treat students as adults and offer them a first hand view of real life in another country. Students then naturally compare the events that they are seeing to their own home country and culture and this allows them to gain insight into both cultures and to think critically about their experiences. Finally, while
students might go abroad for individualistic reasons such as enhancing their resume or learning a foreign language, or to improve their marketability, there is a larger collectivist goal met when these students learn more about their own cultures and people from other places as well. Students gain the following from study abroad: global knowledge, adaptability to social norms, critical thinking, competence, appreciation of own country, interest in learning, and personal values. Many of these factors are related to the goals of higher education (English, 1995).

Orientation and Training for Overseas Experiences

Training and Orientation for Overseas Sojourners

It is clear that study abroad experiences can contribute substantially to student development, and that study abroad programs are one means to achieve several important goals in a liberal arts education. The purpose of this study is to determine whether pre-departure preparation might enhance these experiences for sojourners who will spend time immersed in a new culture. As there is not much study abroad literature about the effects of orientation on the success and experience abroad, the literature about effects of university orientation is reviewed, and then the literature about American expatriates preparing for working abroad will also be examined.

Culture Shock and Adaptation

People who live in a new culture often experience difficulties while adapting to a new way of doing everything. This is also the case for students who are studying abroad and might be adapting to a new educational system, style of communication, and mindset. Culture shock has been defined by Oberg (1960) as “shock precipitated by the anxiety that results from losing all our familiar signs and symbols or social intercourse” (p. 177). P. Adler’s (1977) definition is more descriptive.
Culture shock is primarily a set of emotional reactions to the loss of perceptual reinforcements from one’s own culture, to new cultural stimuli which have little or no meaning and to the misunderstanding of new and diverse experiences. It may encompass feelings of helplessness, irritability, and fears of being cheated, contaminated, injured, or disregarded (p.13).

P. Adler has another definition which is ‘the frustration and confusion that result from being bombarded by unpredictable cues” (p. 343). In 1955 Lysgaard developed the U curve of adjustment (see figure below) to explain experiences that overseas sojourners could expect to go through in their time abroad.

Figure 1: U Curve

This curve starts with the initial euphoria of being abroad in a new and exciting place. It then moves to the increased participation phase, which can be more challenging for students. As they hit the crisis phase they are really struggling to
understand and make sense of the cultural difference. Eventually most people get to the gradual adjustment phase where they literally either adjust or at least can compartmentalize the events happening around them so they can function without much frustration in the culture. Finally, the re-entry time comes and students often begin the whole curve again (Lysgaard, 1955). This concept is key to the research study as there could be a link between pre-departure preparation and how strongly a student feels the impact of culture shock or how quickly they move through cultural adaptation.

When the idea of culture shock is introduced, it is important to consider the following three ideas introduced by Bennett (2002). Culture surprise is a small thing that is noticeable, such as how the toilets work. Culture stress is handling the small events in the new culture such as how to wait in lines or cultural rules in social settings. Finally, culture shock is the overarching larger events such as realizing that the ideas of values are different in this new place. Because many study abroad programs are very short in length and many students spend most of their time abroad with other American students, they may not ever experience more than cultural surprises or stress. One of the goals of the orientation sessions is to alert students to differences in culture so that they are better prepared to notice the differences as well as learn more about the host culture and their own culture.

Culture shock is an important concept to introduce because if the problems that students experience overseas come from their difficulties in adapting to the new culture, then if the pre-departure preparations can give the students skills to handle these new challenges, perhaps their culture or adaptation shock will be less severe.
Orientation Programs:

Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) note that one of the major transitions for students in going from high school to college is attending an orientation program. Orientation is a time when students are perhaps the most prepared to change than at any other time in their college careers (Pascarella and Terenzini, 1991). The transition of orientation gives students the chance to establish their new identities and interpersonal networks as they learn new academic and social structures, develop new attitudes, values, and behaviors. Orientation programs can function as a time to teach new students to understand the values and norms and expectations in their new setting. Administrators and scholars are starting to believe that the most effective orientation programs are not limited to the first few days or weeks of the new experience, but rather that they last throughout the whole first year (Pascarella and Terenzini, 1991). This new idea suggests that study abroad professionals might look at the current types of orientation offered for students, which is usually pre-departure with a few days in-country orientation experiences.

As Kohls states in his book *Survival Kit for Overseas Living* (1984) orientation is a very important feature of helping to prepare students for study abroad and helps to improve the odds that one will have a satisfying experience overseas. Orientation helps to create realistic expectations and to reduce the multitude of unknown, unpredictable factors involved in studying in a foreign culture.

NAFSA’s Guide to Education Abroad for Advisers and Administrators (Summerfield, 1997) states:

…pre-departure orientation, participation in a program abroad, and reentry programming should be seen as parts of a continuous and unified process. The profound learning that leads, at its best, to multiculturalism and ethno-
In general, study abroad pre-departure orientations are intended to help students prepare for meaningful and successful education abroad experiences. Covering both specific and more general information in orientation, the main goals, as stated by Summerfield (1997) suggests that staff:

- provide practical information
- motivate students to learn about the host culture and American culture before they depart
- help students gain a better understanding of world issues and their role in the world
- assist students in investigating their academic objectives overseas

It is recommended in the NAFSA handbook (1997) that orientation sessions for study abroad balance the content between practical and philosophical, culture general and culture specific and academic and non-academic content. They suggest that the process is intellectual and experiential, a combination of reading, telling and showing or experiencing. The Handbook (1997) also states that experiential learning is especially appropriate and lends itself well for study abroad experiences, which are typically academic and experiential. The goal is to provide a foundation of information from which students can build on their own or in the host country after they arrive.

Cross-cultural issues are an important part of pre-departure orientation sessions for study abroad and should be woven into the fabric of the orientation session. The specific information about the culture is important as well, but most educators agree that the ‘how to learn’ is more valuable than trying to give all of the available information to the students (Summerfield, 1997). Most students have not experienced different cultures and are not aware that cultural norms affect every
aspect of our daily lives from the way that we think about time, our beliefs, or relationships with other people (Summerfield, 1997). If time permits, international educators are encouraged to help students build cross-cultural skills before they depart. This can be done via exercises, activities, or discussions about transitions, verbal and non-verbal communications, or by assigning reading about transition shock to the students.

However, in practice, due to time and staff constraints, study abroad professionals cover the nuts and bolts of study abroad first and foremost. The goal is to be sure that students understand about getting passports, plane tickets, and the practical issues of where they will live and the way that their classes and program will run. Anecdotal data collected at professional conferences suggests that occasionally a program coordinator will have time to focus more on the cultural aspects of a specific region or country, but it is rare when cross-cultural issues are covered in the pre-departure orientation sessions due to limitations of staff and student time.

For this reason, the pre-departure class (the treatment) in this study was created to help students learn about experiences they will face overseas and allow them to have realistic expectations. The course gives the students skills to use to attempt to make sense of and learn from the cultural differences they will undoubtedly encounter.

Re-Entry Issues

Re-entry is the period when students return to campus after their overseas experience. This phase is part of the U-curve of cultural adaptation. It is important to work with students because some of the learning that can occur from study abroad experiences happens after the program ends, while students are making sense of their
experience. The reasons for working with students after they return include helping them to readjust to American culture and campus life, to allow them space and time to reflect upon their experiences abroad, to help them assimilate and use the learning they gained abroad in their studies, and to guide them to learn about the ways that they can build on this experience for their future graduate work or career path (Summerfield, 1997). Re-entry programming is often neglected by international educators due to lack of time and resources, as staff are busy preparing new groups of students to go abroad and their needs seem more immediate than students who are ‘just returning’ home, a place with which they are familiar and know the system. The reality of the situation is that re-entry can be much more difficult for students than going abroad or the culture shock that they may have encountered because it is unexpected (Sussman, quoted in Summerfield, 1997). As was mentioned earlier…

…pre-departure orientation, participation in a program abroad, and reentry programming should be seen as parts of a continuous and unified process (Summerfield, 1997). The profound learning that leads, at its best, to multiculturalism and ethno-relativism necessarily begins well before departure and continues long after return. (page 233).

The goal is to find a way to best help students who are returning from study abroad. It is important to be in touch with them before they return to let them know to expect another transition, much like they experienced when they went abroad. It is also helpful to have a re-entry session or program for them to attend. If students are given the opportunity to participate and reflect on their experiences, it has the potential to make the impact of their study abroad experience that much more powerful and meaningful for them.

The following model examines the differences between orientation, training, and education. This is an important distinction to make in this research, as all three
areas will be considered. Orientation is the current program given before students study abroad, training is discussed in the expatriate literature section, and education is the goal of the pre-departure course. This model shows that the three types of preparation can almost be considered a continuum.

 Models Examining Orientation, Training, and Education
- Orientation is acquainting people to existing situations. Orientation is appropriate to introduce students to the way the study abroad program will work but does not fully prepare them for their overseas experience.
- Training is to teach a habit, teach how to do something continuously and repeatedly. Training can help students to be prepared for some situations they will face abroad, but not everything as each student and situation is different.
- Education is to lead forth, it includes the element of why. Education is the manner in which students have been conditioned to learn. It might be the most effective way to help students prepare for their experiences abroad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOALS</td>
<td>cognitive</td>
<td>affective</td>
<td>cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>behavioral</td>
<td>behavioural</td>
<td>affective behavioral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT</td>
<td>who, what,</td>
<td>who, what,</td>
<td>who, what,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>when, where</td>
<td>when, where and how</td>
<td>when, where, how and why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCESS</td>
<td>intellectual</td>
<td>experiential</td>
<td>Experiential intellectual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(J. Bennett, 2002)

Table 3: Orientation, Training and Education Model
Another model will be examined next. The Dynamic Model, created by English (1995) looks at outcomes of study abroad and which factors have affected these outcomes. By noting the student background characteristics as well as institutional approaches, it leads to the desired outcomes, the unexpected outcomes, and leaves room to see if any other predictors may have been at play.

The Dynamic Model
English, 1995

This model uses both students background characteristics as well as institutional approaches to explain student outcomes.

![Figure 2: The Dynamic Model](image)

It is important to examine the factors that are affecting students in addition to the pre-departure preparation they are given. Some students might be more prone to handle intercultural situations better than other students due to other factors such as socio-economic status, previous experience travelling, or growing up in a
multicultural home. It is possible that the institutional approaches and other predictors will have different expected and unexpected outcomes based on student characteristics. These factors will be considered in the research and the following model will help to determine where inputs and outputs fit.

Training and Orientation for Overseas Sojourners

It is very important that the literature is examined to help determine any effect pre-departures activities and orientations have on sojourners who will spend time immersed in a new culture. As not much literature in study abroad exists about the effects of orientation on the success and experience abroad, the literature about American expatriates preparing for and working abroad will be examine to see if any parallels can be drawn. Both of these groups of sojourners live in the host culture for a relatively short period of time, know that they will return home, yet are expected to live and work in a new society and culture.

Much research has been done on this special group of expatriate employees. Research has been conducted to determine the most effective way to select and train expatriate employees. In addition, studies have been conducted on the effectiveness and adaptation of expatriates, as well as which factors influence expatriate success and failure, including their accompanying spouses and children’s adaptation.

Selection of Expatriates

Much of the literature about expatriates and their success is centered around how to select employees in order to prepare them for their overseas assignment (Mendenhall, 2000). Many companies select an employee for an expatriate posting for one of two reasons, either that employee is an effective employee at the parent institution, or they have specific technical skills needed for the overseas job (Black,
Unfortunately, an employee with one or both of these positive characteristics is not necessarily a good fit for an overseas post (Noe, 2000). Successful expatriate managers must also be able to be sensitive to a new culture, able to adapt to the norms of the culture, and able to be effective even while facing culture shock. Finally, one of the most important pieces of the puzzle is whether or not the expatriates’ family can also adjust in similar ways. There are many ways to learn if an employee possesses or can acquire the tools required to help their success overseas. One such way to learn about the expatriate is to collect biographical and background data, to use standardized tests to determine the suitability of the candidate, to put the candidate in a work setting similar to one they would experience overseas, with different communication styles, and ambiguity to see how they perform. Another tool is the assessment center concept, which is typically a 2 or 3-day process with in-depth interviews, standardized tests, and work samples. The goal of these tools is to determine if the employee has cultural flexibility, a willingness to communicate, the ability to develop social relationships, perceptual abilities, skills in conflict resolution, and a good leadership style (Black, 1992). While valuable for corporations who are selecting individuals to go abroad, in the context of the self-selection model for college-based, student study abroad programs, this research is most useful in highlighting the characteristics of individuals who may be most likely to develop strong intercultural skills and gain intercultural competence.

**Training**

The firms who send expatriates abroad usually focus on technical or specific skills needed to perform job duties overseas. Most studies that examined whether or not cross-cultural training improved the expatriate work performance and adjustment
to the culture have shown that training makes a positive difference (Kealey, 1996). While many studies show a connection between cross-cultural training and improved work performance over those managers who did not receive training, it is difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of the training versus the personal characteristics of the manager (Morris, 2001). Despite the literature which shows that cross cultural training can improve effectiveness of employees, this is not a common topic for training. Forty percent of firms offer no cross-cultural training (Noe, 2000). Black (1992) notes that the reality for most expatriate managers is that only about 35-40 percent of them have had any training, and often, the cross-cultural training that is received is not rigorous. They often watch films, read books, and speak with people who have lived in the country of assignment. Very few firms offer the spouses any training. These are surprising statistics when cross-cultural training programs have shown that they improve global managers job performance, their adjustment, and the development of the skills they need to be a successful manager (Black, 1992). When firms are planning their training sessions for expatriates they must be certain that their programs include training rigor and a degree of mental involvement in order for there to be maximum effort required to learn new concepts. Training rigor is often associated with length of time spent on the training (Black, 1992). In order for a firm to decide the level of rigor they need for their expatriates, it is important to consider three factors, the 1) cultural toughness, 2) communication toughness, and 3) job toughness, or difference from the home country. A cultural group that is very difficult to adapt to requires more training than one that is more similar to the home culture or is not difficult to adapt to (Black, 1992). Communication toughness includes not only how difficult it is to communicate in the new culture, but also how much intercultural
interaction will be required for the manager in their position. Job toughness questions whether the new job will include greater responsibilities, greater autonomy, or more challenges. If so, then there is more training required for these types of positions (Black, 1992).

Another key factor relates to when the training should occur. Most expatriates and families prefer to have training before they leave and feel more confidence knowing that they will get some type of preparation before they depart for their overseas experience. Black (1992) states that some cultural learning is helpful before arrival in the host country, but it is actually much more effective when presented in-country. This is most likely because before departure it is difficult to imagine the challenges one might face, yet when they are ‘in country’ the training is suddenly very relevant. In addition, before departure, people are busy finishing up their jobs, preparing to move and spending time with family and friends, yet after they arrive in a new country, they have few friends and a lot of time on their hands. Selmer (2001) asked expatriates which they preferred, pre-departure cross-cultural training, or post-arrival cross-cultural training. The authors hypothesis had been that expatriates with significant overseas experience would find the post-arrival preparation more beneficial, but the findings did not support their hypothesis. The findings showed that a majority of expatriates preferred to be informed about the culture before they left for the assignment (Selmer, 2001). The researchers state that the longer the expatriates were abroad in one location, the more they then began to favor post-arrival training, perhaps due to the fact that they realize that they need to learn more about the culture and how to interact within it (Selmer, 2001).
Other studies have examined the effectiveness of on-site training and host-company support for expatriates. Suutari (2001) examined the types of training received by expatriates who were living in Finland. The pre-departure training was limited, but the practical arrangements and briefings were common. Written information was also offered to the candidates. Most areas such as language, management, and cross-cultural training all took place upon arrival (Suutari, 2001). There was still a perceived gap between the training provided and the training requested. Most expatriates, especially those who stayed overseas longer felt that they did not receive enough training from their firms.

**Organizational Support**

Finally, it is important to look at the issue of organizational support. It is very important that expatriates have the perception that their companies are preparing, supporting, and working with them throughout the expatriation (going abroad) and repatriation (returning from abroad) experience. Research shows that there is a direct relationship between an expatriates satisfaction and performance and their overall relationship with their parent company (Dounes, 2000). Because expatriate employees move overseas for their jobs, they tend to lose their familiar systems of support and are more reliant on the company to provide social and work support systems (Grant-Vallone, 2001). Grant-Vallone (2001) also found that employees who perceived that their organization offered support had lower levels of depression, anxiety, health problems, and work-personal life conflicts. Shaffer (2001) reiterated these points noting that the only thing that stays the same when an employee becomes an expatriate is their relationship with their company. Their perception of support makes a large impact on their adjustment and commitment to the company (Shaffer, 2001).
Perhaps the most important thing learned from this study is that the perceived organizational support has a positive impact on employee commitment. In addition to helping employee commitment while on their foreign assignment, supportive repatriation after the employees moved back to their home country, and adjustment practices were found to increase expatriate retention (Lazarova, 2000).

When applying the expatriate literature to study abroad students several parallels are clear. The selection for both experiences of an overseas assignment or a study abroad program is usually not where administrators begin with preparation. If a different kind of employee or student was intentionally sought out, the rest of the experience might also change. Having noted this, orientation for both groups is vitally important. The question that remains for managers and coordinators is when orientation should be conducted and the amount that should be given. Both organizations, companies and universities, have more resources available to them to share with sojourners before they depart, but on-going orientation once in the host country might be more beneficial. Finally, the issue of organizational support can be applied. If students feel that their home institution is not helping them or available to them they might have a harder time with the overseas experience because they will feel isolated and like they are going it alone, as many expatriate workers report feeling. Being in touch with students and expatriates while they are away can help this perceived notion of organizational support.

Conclusions, What will be Added to the Above Areas of Literature

The extensive research conducted about study abroad has shown that students gain many skills and competencies from their overseas experiences. A few studies
show that intercultural competence is gained from the experiences involved with studying abroad. However, very little research has been done comparing the ways that the preparation for the study abroad program has affected the outcomes. The goal of this research project is to examine how a pre-departure class including discussions about culture, guided reflections, and actual practice interacting with other cultures affects students' intercultural development and overall study abroad experience. A second goal is to examine if students studying abroad without such a class also develop intercultural skills when compared to a group of students staying in Columbus and attending classes. The proposed research will fill an important gap in the literature reviewed. It will give insight into how well students are being prepared for their study abroad experiences and help to determine appropriate types of orientations that will match the goals for outcomes of the study abroad programs. All of the literature reviewed about culture shock and adaptation, student development theory, expatriate literature, and cultural acquisition will help to guide this research and add understanding to the topics being studied.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

This chapter outlines the purpose and procedures of the research undertaken to measure the change in student intercultural development as a result of a pre-departure study abroad course. The research project used a mixed methodology design and both the quantitative and qualitative procedures will be described. The outline of the research design to learn the impact of pre-departure preparation on college students’ intercultural competence will be presented first. The epistemologies, which have framed the research project will be examined next, along with the conceptual framework which has been informed by anthropological perspective on culture and identity. Then the quantitative data collection and analysis are covered, followed by a review of the qualitative data collection and analysis, along with trustworthiness criteria and the ways in which the experiences of participants were represented. Finally, the treatment will be discussed along with ethical issues of conducting research.

The Mixed-Method Research Design and Methodology

Using combined methods allows the researcher to better understand the concept being tested or explored (Glesne, 1999). Using mixed methods was also desirable in order to be able to triangulate the data and make it more reliable due to
my sample size. This study seeks to examine change in participants. For this reason, a pre-test/post-test project was created to measure change in participant behavior before and after the treatment. The quantitative pre-test and post-test IDI and DMIS scores will show if the group who had the treatment changed their intercultural development. Both qualitative (interviews and observations) and quantitative (IDI instrument and questionnaires) research methods were chosen for the study in order to gain greater insight into the experience of the participants. Qualitative interviews coupled with the use of an instrument were chosen to get insight into the experience of the student. While the hierarchical regression using the pre and post-test will be very helpful in determining some statistical findings from this study, it is not possible to understand the whole picture of the students study abroad experience from these findings alone. Because other factors such as foreign language study in any location or world events could affect participant intercultural development, group three is included in the study to control for maturity.

The research design is a pre and post-test experimental model involving three groups of students: a study abroad group who participated in a quarter-long orientation course as a treatment, a study abroad group without treatment, and a control group. The research design can be presented visually as follows:

Group 1: O1  X  O2  O3  O4 (selected students)
Group 2: O1  O2  O3  O4 (selected students)
Group 3: O1  O3  O4 (selected students)
| Group Description | One  
(N = 17) | Two  
(N = 20) | Three  
(N = 9) |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Study Abroad      | France,  
8 weeks | France,  
8 weeks | Columbus, Ohio 
Studying French |
| Pre Test          | Yes       | Yes       | Yes       |
| Treatment         | IS 693 class  | None       | None       |
| Orientation       | Yes       | Yes       | None       |
| Observations      | Yes       | Yes       | None       |
| Post Test         | Yes       | Yes       | Yes       |
| Interviews        | Yes (8)   | Yes (9)   | Yes (2)   |

Table 4: Research Design

All three groups of students were given the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) and a questionnaire in the first few weeks of Spring Quarter 2003 as the pre-test. Because groups 1 and 2 studied abroad in France, they had the regular pre-departure orientation sessions consisting of 5 hours of orientation sessions covering topics from passports, financial aid, and the group flight, to health and safety, travel, and cultural adaptation. In addition, group 1 took an academic, pre-departure study abroad course called Intercultural Experiential Learning (IS 693), which is the treatment in this study. Groups 2 and 3 did not take the pre-departure course. Group 3 also did not have an orientation because they were enrolled in French
language classes on the Columbus campus rather than preparing to go abroad.

Observations and informal interviews of student groups 1 and 2 while they were in France provided the data which permitted the interpretation of their intercultural sensitivity on the DMIS model during the two months they were studying abroad. After groups 1 and 2 returned to campus, all 3 groups were given the IDI and another questionnaire for the post-test to determine if any intercultural sensitivity development occurred as measured by the IDI. Students were then interviewed to seek understanding about their intercultural development and they were asked their perception of their feelings about cultural difference. The research study lasted for 9 months in its entirety, from April 2003-December 2003.

While the quantitative data collection portion of the study highlights whether students intercultural competence changed due to pre-departure preparation, it does not address why changes might occur or guide administrators to help encourage an increase in intercultural sensitivity. In order to gain a better understanding about the experiences students are having overseas, qualitative research methods were employed in addition to the quantitative methods. Glesne (1999) notes that being present in others’ lives is the way to learn about another culture. For this reason, I used qualitative methods in order to try to interpret and understand the experience of the undergraduate students studying abroad. Prolonged periods of observation and interviews occurred while the students in groups 1 and 2 studied abroad in France. The three French language programs the students attended were conducted at language institutes, which have lobby spaces where students congregate and spend time. It was possible to observe students before, during, and after classes as well as during their free time and on weekends. By spending time observing the students and
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watching them interact and react to many different cultures and situations much was learned about how they were handling the challenges of intercultural interaction. Due to the qualitative and emergent nature of this study based in grounded theory, new ideas and theories were generated and this informed and helped generate additional questions for the interviews.

Observing students during part of the duration of their study abroad experience, gave me the opportunity to see the ways in which the participants construct the world and I was able to ask them questions informally to confirm my understanding of their experience. In addition, the interview findings give the detailed story of the quantitative data findings in the students’ words, thus helping to make meaning from the research data.

**Feminism and Ethnography: Framing Qualitative Epistemologies**

Epistemologies are the study of the nature of knowledge and the justification for using particular methodologies (Schwandt, 1997). In this study, two primary epistemologies guided the research, feminism and ethnography. I will also mention another theory, that of constructivism. This theory states that each individual produces a reconstructed understanding of the world and the theory encourages experimental and multi-voiced texts. As this theory goes a step closer to social action, it will not be considered a primary epistemology for this study.

Feminist epistemology holds that the only legitimate basis for testing hypotheses and theory are experiential and observational data (Schwandt, 1997). As I used data that was both experiential and which came from observing my participants, this methodology fits well with my study. Additionally, in feminist study, the idea of
voice is important, just as it will be to learn from my participants’ voices. The goal of this type of research is to produce a more accurate picture of the social reality of those being studied (Schwandt, 1997) and to empower the researched (Lather, 1991). Ethnography, including extensive hanging out with my participants in order to learn the insider view, is the process of describing and interpreting cultural behavior (Geertz, 1973). Culture is examined through first hand field study, using participant observation. This allowed me to learn about the culture and to be guided to discover the ways in which students’ stories would be portrayed. I also engaged more equally with students by listening to their conversations and being present daily so that I was almost seen as ‘one of them’ and they were not viewing me as a researcher who was ‘researching down’ on them, as often happens with school-based studies (Nader, 1992). Ethnography is also used synonymously with several other concepts; field work, descriptive data, developing rapport, empathy with respondents, having multiple data sources, and taking field notes (Schwandt, 1997). These two epistemologies, feminism and ethnography, were carried out through observations and direct first hand eye-witness accounts. Being there first hand allows one to answer the question of what is going on. In observing in the field there are several desired traits: 1) that the events actions and meanings are viewed from the perspectives of the people being observed, not the researcher’s perspective, 2) a premium is placed on attention to details, 3) events and actions are best understood if they are placed in a social and historical context, 4) social action is seen as a dynamic process and not as a set of separate events, 5) efforts need to be made to avoid premature imposition of theory on the participants (Schwandt, 1997). At the same time it is important to think of relativist epistemology. The researcher needs to remember that they are studying
the world as objectively as they can, but the researcher is also culturally and historically situated which means that they interpret and see events relative to their own experiences (Denzin, 1997 in Denzin and Lincoln, 2000).

**A Framework of Anthropology, Culture and Identity, and Globalization**

My conceptual framework was influenced by many different areas of study. Anthropology, culture and identity, and globalization are some of the most important areas that have influenced this research study. Anthropology has many important lessons to teach about how to conduct research including the idea of verstehen, or understanding. It is believed that understanding will develop over time, through discussions and collaborations between the observer and the observed. This helps to give ethnography its validity and encourages thick description, which allows the reader to feel as though they were present during the observations (Hall, 1999, Nader, 1992). My research design allows for adequate time to be spent with the participants to help facilitate this understanding. Additionally, anthropologists have long been cognizant of the self-awareness of the researcher as well as the recognition that the researcher’s goal is to represent the researched. These are both required to conduct good research and it helps to be able to be a bricoleur, or one who can see events with different eyes (Nader, 2001). There must also be an acceptance of the researcher in the community being researched in order for the research to be as close to the experience of the participant as is possible (Nader, 1992).

Anthropology also encourages us to ask important questions about phenomenon that would not normally be explored (Nader, 1992). As a study abroad coordinator, the instructor of the course, a student of culture myself, and someone
living with the students and experiencing the same events they will, my goal was to be able to see events from many different perspectives and through different lenses. I am aware of my relativism in these settings, but feel that I gain an advantage by having familiarity with the various settings. Additionally, interpretivism is helpful for me to use, and this philosophy includes understanding the meanings behind the actions (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). A subject can make an action or say something that seems easy to interpret, but in reality, they mean something completely different so it is vital that I know what is meant by the actions that I observe.

Culture and identity are also important concepts related to this study. Study abroad participants first need to recognize their own culture and identity before they are able to begin to see differences in the culture in which they will be immersed (Holland, 1998). There are three terms that can cause confusion in the discussion of intercultural development: intercultural awareness, intercultural sensitivity, and intercultural competency (Chen, 1997). For the purposes of this research, they will be defined as such: intercultural awareness means a person is aware of differences, they may not know appropriate behavior to exhibit or ways to act, but they have an understanding that difference exists (similar to the DMIS Acceptance stage). Intercultural sensitivity is when a person recognizes the need to change their behavior to be more sensitive to difference, but they might not know how to behave (similar to the DMIS Adaptation stage). Intercultural competence is a person who is competent and knows how to behave in many different intercultural situations or settings (similar to the DMIS Integration stage) (Chen, 1997, IDI Manual, 2001). This study is looking for intercultural development to see if participants become more aware, sensitive, or even competent during the study. It was also important for the researcher to notice the
ways that the participants responded to events in France; did they passively encounter cultural differences, did they actively engage in the new culture, or did they even notice it (Holland, 1998)? Also, the ways that behavior is adopted or learned, whether students spoke more French, altered their views of the world, or style of clothing, represent data about how students responded to a new culture (Holland, 1998).

Globalization, or the free movement of people and goods, has transformed natural cultures and boundaries. The expanding labor markets and movement of people and ideas has changed the way we examine culture. There is a global culture being created or a cultural homogeneity that did not exist before (Hall, 1999). I looked to see if students could see and discern the cultural differences that they encountered, or if they were noticing and interacting with domains that were the same in the cultures involved, such as technology, and media (Sahlins, 1999). It has been suggested that the idea of Westernization was been replaced by globalization, which was then replaced by Americanization. Many aspects of American pop culture (movies, music, clothing, food chains, technology such as internet, text messaging, and cell phones) have rapidly spread around the globe. Yet, it seems to be a young generation culture that is spreading, more than an overall Americanization of a culture (Sahlins, 1999). I watched to see if students examined the French culture while they were abroad, or if they mainly stayed within the youth culture areas, in which they might feel more comfortable. I also studied the similarities in research methods of anthropologists and feminists as many ideas overlap in the two bodies of literature.

Cultural acquisition is a concept that has been studied by anthropologists, sociologists, and linguists for years. The majority of these studies focus on the ways that a particular culture acquires their specific cultural norms and the ways that
different cultures share these norms with their young to acclimate them to their world. Some cultures pick a specific age and then begin to treat their children as adults; other cultures wait for a specific sign or time (puberty for example) and then put the children through a ritual to induct them into the culture and; other cultures treat children as if they are an important part of the culture originally, and their acquisition happens gradually over time (Spindler, 1997). Some studies focus on the ways that indigenous cultures have been taught Western values and the way that this has changed their cultures. For example, the Baruya of New Guinea and the Huaorani of Ecuador began to change their behaviors based on teachings in school. Children learned to wear their school uniforms and comb their hair and brush their teeth before entering the school grounds (Godelier, 1991 and Levinson, 1996). Whether or not they acquired a new culture or only adapted to expected behaviors was not discussed.

The aforementioned studies relate to the area of interest to be researched. Do American students studying overseas learn to adapt to appropriate behaviors when studying in a foreign culture (learning appropriate greetings, change clothing styles, or lowering voices in public) or do they actually acquire culture in the process, making the newly learned way of being part of their own? Cultural acquisition is a process and the goal is to learn another way of being, so the question is whether or not this happens on study abroad programs.

Another important area to consider is whether or not it is possible to study cultural acquisition. It is difficult, if not impossible, to share another persons’ meaning and understanding. Ways to try to understand others’ experience include learning the local meanings. There are a few different ways this can be done, as not only was it important to have a good understanding of French culture, which students
experienced, but it was also necessary to gain insight into the student culture because this peer group culture had a large impact on their learning as well. It was important to have prolonged engagement and to observe and spend time around the students to be able to observe these factors and to gain an insiders view of the way that they see the world. Another interesting question involves the extent to which students were aware that they would gain cultural capital, or possible future economic gain from their study abroad experience (Levinson, 1996), and to the extent that the university is training them within a system to make them useful to society (Foucault, 1984).

The final area of cultural acquisition to explore is the question about the way that formal schooling helps students acquire culture. Education is seen as a major form of cultural transmission (Spindler, 1997). The underlying goal of this research was to determine if learning takes place as a result of the calculated intervention, which is the pre-departure study abroad course, or from other factors. The educational anthropology literature has much to add to this area of study and was instrumental in working with this research project.

**How I Selected Students for the Study**

Participants in this study were selected because of their status as either undergraduate students who were accepted to study abroad during summer quarter on one of 3 French language immersion programs or as students who would take French language classes at OSU during Summer 2003. While the research population was chosen due to the access available to these students, the group is representative of nearly 80% of all OSU study abroad students, who go abroad in the summer quarter for programs of 6-8 weeks in length. Most study abroad participants (70%) are female
and the groups are normally aged 18-22. The initial goal, to have between 10-15 students in each of the three groups participating in this study, with a total of 30-45 participants was surpassed for groups 1 (19 participants) and 2 (20 participants) and not achieved with group 3 (9 participants).

Students who were accepted for the summer 2003 study abroad programs in Lyon, Nice, and Paris were asked to participate in the study when they receive their acceptance notification via e-mail. This population of 39 students make up groups 1 and 2 of the sample. In addition, this whole group was asked to participate in the treatment of the pre-departure class and approximately half of the group volunteered to take the pre-departure study abroad course. The students in groups 1 and 2 could not be randomly assigned to groups because the treatment was a 3-hour academic course and some students did not have room in their schedule or had time conflicts with the course. The 19 students who took the pre-departure course were given a $150 grant, which went toward the cost of their study abroad program fee. The third group of students were solicited by e-mail based on their status of being enrolled in French language classes for summer quarter and remaining on campus for summer 2003. Students replied to my e-mail message if they were interested in participating. These 9 students who comprised group 3 were offered $25 to take the IDI instrument and complete a survey before summer classes began and again at the end of the summer. This group did not register for summer quarter 2003 until the 4th or 6th week of the quarter, so they took the IDI inventory after they had been contacted, later than the other two groups.

As previously mentioned, the participants were divided into 3 separate groups. Group 1 consisted of students who studied abroad and received the treatment. Group 2
also consisted of students who studied abroad, but these students did not receive the treatment, and group 3 stayed in Ohio and took French courses and did not experience the treatment and they did not study abroad. Group three, who took a French class during summer quarter 2003 on the Columbus campus was tested to control for maturity, which will determine if students naturally increase their intercultural development with age, further language study, or current world events. There were 48 participants total in my study and of these 48 students, complete data was collected and is usable for 43 students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Participants</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable Data</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Usable Data by Group

The loss of 5 participants was caused by various factors including students from groups 1 and 3 not returning post-test data after multiple contacts. Some students from group 3 did not complete their post-tests through no fault of their own. One student was unable to take French this summer due to a problem with his financial aid, so he was ineligible for my study, and the other student had returned home to China for a vacation and when he reapplied for his student visa, he was rejected and was in China trying to get back to the US at the time of the data collection.
Standard Pre-Departure Preparation

Both groups one and two participated in two pre-departure orientation sessions to help prepare them for their overseas experiences. These orientation sessions are the usual pre-departure preparation that all OSU students receive before going abroad. These sessions lasted for 5 hours and covered topics including ‘nuts and bolts’, class registration and credit, passports and flights, health and safety, money, travel, financial aid, housing, academic and course details, ‘country specific information’ such as specific cultural traits, values, norms, expectations, and ‘culture’ information such as cultural adaptation and shock. This orientation is given by the Office of International Education (OIE) Program Coordinator (the researcher in this study) and included all study participants, the resident directors who will travel with the group, and past participants who shared their experiences, offered advice, and answered questions. The orientation sessions occurred in weeks two and six of the same quarter when the treatment was given.

A Description of the Treatment

The Intercultural Experiential Learning (IS 693) pre-departure study abroad course was co-taught by the researcher and another OIE staff member during spring quarter 2003 for ten weeks. Nineteen students who had been accepted to go to France in the summer volunteered to take the course. Student participants had been solicited through e-mail notices and with fliers in their acceptance packets to the study abroad programs. The course covered topics including learning about culture and perspective taking as described earlier.
Selecting the Research Location

The research was conducted partly on Ohio State University’s (OSU) campus and partly in France at OSU study abroad sites in Lyon, France at the Institut Lyonnais and at the Ecole France Langue Campuses in Paris and Nice. The site selection was chosen primarily due to access and convenience. As the researcher was a study abroad coordinator, access had been granted to work with these students who went abroad. While on the OSU campus, data was collected in the pre-departure study abroad class (treatment), in the pre-departure orientation sessions for students who attended these French language programs, and in the researcher’s office in Oxley Hall. Additionally, the set up of the study abroad programs allowed the researcher to live in the residence hall with the students and observe them on a daily basis at these locations. All three overseas programs were the same length, had the same goal of focusing on the French language, were held at language institutes, included students living in a residence hall, and involved significant interaction with international students from many different countries both in and outside of class. This opportunity for interaction with multiple cultures with international students was a secondary reason these sites were desirable and ultimately chosen. I wanted to explore intercultural sensitivity, rather than just American-French relations or interactions.

Quantitative Data Collection

The Pre-Test

The three groups of participants were gathered in two separate groups and given the consent and waiver forms and information about the study. Both groups 1 and 2 took the IDI inventory at their regular orientation session for the Summer
Program in the second week of the quarter in the same room where they took the post
test in October (Oxley Hall room 122). Group 3 also took the IDI inventory after they
had been selected for the study in the end of the quarter. This group took both the pre
and post-test IDI in the same room, the researchers office, room 118 Oxley Hall on an
individual appointment basis. For all three groups, the IDI was explained and
directions were given about how to complete the questionnaire. Participants were
assured that the IDI findings would be kept confidential and that names would not be
attached to the study in any way. All students were asked to complete a written
consent form at that time. The students took, between 15 and 20 minutes to complete
the IDI inventory. Students were also given a survey to complete with background
information about themselves. The survey questions were based on findings from the
literature about what impacts intercultural sensitivity as well as researcher hypotheses.
Students were asked to list their major, level of study, goal for French proficiency
(language requirement, minor, major, or fluency), and parents level of education. (see
appendices A-E) Students in group 3 who took the IDI and completed the surveys and
both the pre-and post-tests were paid $25.00.

The Post-Test

The three groups of participants were again gathered in two separate groups in
October 2003 and were once again given the explanations and directions about how to
complete the instrument. The students took the IDI inventory for a second time, which
took between 15 and 20 minutes to complete. All three groups completed the post-test
questionnaire. This second questionnaire was grounded in the theory and hypotheses
which were gained during the prolonged engagement time with the participants in
France. Groups 1 and 2 took the IDI inventory in the same room where their regular
orientation sessions occurred. This post-test data was collected during the reunion for the group in early October. Group 3 took the post-test in the same room as their pre-test. After the post-tests were completed, it was possible to analyze the scores and compare them with the pre-test. The goal was to see if any difference existed between the scores or if patterns emerged which could be attributed to the treatment given.

The IDI Results

The IDI scoring software is part of the DMIS theory and IDI instrument. The IDI CD-Rom allows the researcher to view the scores and interpret the participant’s sensitivity score. This data was then entered into the SPSS statistical analysis program to determine change. The impact of the course was determined by comparing the pre-test and post-test IDI scores to see if a measurable difference exists in any direction.

The Survey Findings

The participants were given two surveys to complete, one when they took the pre-test IDI and one when they took the post-test IDI. These findings were analyzed using SPSS statistical analysis program. The type of descriptive statistics that were collected includes age, gender, race, class rank, major/minor, other experiences overseas, number of weeks of instruction in anthropology or other culture classes.

Quantitative Validity

External validity is how well the instrument measured the factors that it is trying to learn. For example, a group of conservative people should score conservatively on an instrument. If this happens, then this instrument would be said to have external validity (Babbie, 1998). Some threats to external validity that have been controlled include multiple treatment interference, because only one treatment was given which allowed the researcher to see if the class indeed had an impact. The post-
test was given several weeks after students returned from their study abroad program. This should have avoided the initial return period and allowed us to see reactions when they are moderated.

Instrumentation: Specifics About the IDI

As a previously existing instrument is used in this research, please find the details about the validity of the IDI instrument below. I am not permitted to include a copy of the IDI instrument due to copyright regulations.

Scale Development

The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) was developed as a valid, accessible, self-assessment instrument that would provide feedback based on the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS). Dr. Milton Bennett and Dr. Mitchell Hammer based this instrument on Dr. Bennett’s DMIS model and used grounded theory to measure an individual’s orientation toward cultural difference (IDI Manual, 2001). First Drs. Bennett and Hammer developed a qualitative interview guide which related to how people experience difference. These responses were examined in terms of the six stages and 13 forms of intercultural sensitivity. The sample size was 40 individuals who represented a diversity of experience and cultural backgrounds. Next an item pool was generated and redundant, unclear, or ambiguous questions were removed. The next step was to decide how to present the format and it was decided that it would be an agree/disagree format using equal weight for each item: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=neutral, 5=slightly agree, 6=agree, 7=strongly agree. A pilot test was conducted and based on the feedback from respondents, the IDI was further revised. A panel of experts then
reviewed the item pool. These experts’ professional backgrounds varied from intercultural sensitivity to reliability and validity estimates. The experts’ comments and ratings were included for consideration and they discussed each question’s clarity and consciousness. The instrument was then given to 226 respondents and the data was analyzed. Statistics were applied and the most valid items of the 145 were examined to determine if they would be included in the final instrument. If items within each six stage were not found to be reliable, they were removed from the instrument (IDI Manual, 2001).

Instrument Reliability

The creators of the IDI were aware that research bias could play a role in the creation and type of items in the instrument. For this reason they invited the previously mentioned expert panel to evaluate the instrument. The items in each stage were also measured and they were reliable in reflecting the stage that they were representing from the DMIS model (IDI Manual, 2001).

Instrument Validity

Validity is concerned with whether or not a measurement procedure actually measures the areas that it is trying to measure. Both the content and construct validity of the IDI will be discussed.

The content validity of the IDI was addressed in two ways. First, the sampling of the items related to the construct being measured was done. The second way content validity was insured was by using the panel of experts who rated each item. The calculations for these items provided content validity with the items in the DMIS theory.
Construct validity is testing whether the instrument that was developed indeed measures that specific construct. The scores resulting from that measure should be related to the variables with which the construct is supposed to be connected. The construct validity of the IDI was tested by examining the relationship of the IDI scale scores for Denial, Defense, Minimization, Acceptance, Cognitive Adaptation, and Behavioral Adaptation. The constructs examined proved to be valid when compared to the DMIS theory.

In addition to the other validity testing done, the IDI was also tested to see if findings of responses varied based on gender, social status, educational level, and international living experience. The only significant difference found between men and women was in the stage of acceptance where women obtained a higher mean score than men. No significant difference was found in any of the other stages. No significant difference was found between scores of those with higher educational level or social status. The area where the most significant difference appeared is with those people who have had international living experience. In every stage except for denial, people with international living experience scored significantly different than people without any international living experience. These findings lend strong support to the idea that intercultural experiences are associated with intercultural sensitivity.

The IDI descriptive statistics are based on the idea that the DMIS is a developmental model. This means that a progression from more ethnocentric stages to more ethno-relative stages is assumed. If there is an underlying developmental assumption present in the way people experience cultural differences, then correlations between adjacent stages should be greater than the correlations between the stages which are developmentally farther away from one another. The statistical
findings do show that the pattern of correlation among the six scales reflects a developmental progression which indicates higher correlation among adjacent scales and a negative correlation between ethnocentric scales and ethno-relative scales. This pattern indicates a higher correlation between ethnocentric scales and ethno-relative scales. This same pattern is consistent with the theoretical formulations of the DMIS (IDI Manual, 2001).

Intercultural sensitivity is a difficult concept to measure. Very few studies examine intercultural competence or sensitivity due to the difficulty in measuring such a concept. The studies that do exist have mainly used the IDI and DMIS as their measure which does not help us to determine its validity. Therefore the qualitative findings were especially important in order to measure students’ intercultural growth and the observations and interviews helped to gain insight into the students’ views and growth.

Introduction to the Qualitative Research Section

Statistics are very useful to use to answer specific questions, for example, when a researcher knows exactly the questions that he or she wants to ask, these findings are usually helpful. Overall, the statistical analysis of IDI scores on the DMIS model has given some information about whether the treatment of the pre-departure class was effective, but many questions remained even after this analysis. Because much research is emergent it is not always possible or desirable to know at the start of the study the questions we will want to ask at the end of the study. For this reason the qualitative data reveals more about the students’ experiences, and how they
were able to make meaning of culture and difference and their many experiences overseas and at home.

Qualitative research methods are desirable in this study because we are exploring an entirely new area and there is much basic information to be learned in the process. The inductive approach used in qualitative observation and informal interviews in this study allowed the researcher to begin to observe the participants and then make hypotheses and theories about events and happenings. As new theories and observations were made, it was possible to look for meaning and to begin to understand what the students were experiencing. As only 39 students were observed abroad, it was only possible to make hypotheses about the larger population of study abroad students by examining these specific cases and inferring from them (Schwandt, 1997). After hypotheses have surfaced in the research, negative case studies will be presented. Negative cases are participants or observations which do not fit the pattern or theory developed in the research setting (Schwandt, 1997). Negative cases will help to hone and clarify the theory and test it. It is possible that the theory is not correct, or that the negative case is simply a special case. Theories are usually improved when they are closely examined and when such negative case studies appear.

Qualitative Data Collection

This research was conducted and data collected during Spring, Summer, and Autumn 2003. The treatment lasted for 10 weeks (group 1 only), the study abroad program lasted for 8 weeks (groups 1 and 2), and the observations lasted for 6 weeks (groups 1 and 2). The interview portion of the research occurred partly in France.
during the summer (informally) and partly during autumn quarter with selected students from each group. A copy of the pre- and post-test questionnaires, interview guide, and observation sheets can be found in appendices A, B, C, D, and E.

Observations and Interviews

In order to gain a better understanding about the experiences students had overseas, a prolonged period of observation and interviews occurred while the students were in France. I spent time living with and observing the students and watching them interact with French nationals and students of other nationalities besides French or American. Observations noted how they react to many different cultures and situations and much was learned about the way that they handled the challenges of intercultural interaction. Due to the qualitative and emergent nature of this study, information that surfaced during observations in France was used to inform the final interview questions asked to participants.

The Observation Sites in France

The observation sites in France included one site in Paris (Ecole France Langue), one site in Nice, (Ecole France Langue), and two sites in Lyon (Residence Halls Benjamin Delessert and Escale Lyonnais). Most of my time was spent in Lyon, as 29 of the 39 students abroad were studying in Lyon and living in one of two residence halls. The Benjamin Delessert housed 24 of the students and the two resident directors and the l’Escale Lyonnais housed the other 5 students, including me. Benjamin Delessert is where office hours were held daily and where we had group meetings as it was next door to the language institute where students had their classes. The building has a large lobby which is like a living room for the whole building. At any given time, there were 5-20 students sitting around talking, doing
homework, writing letters, sleeping, using the phone, watching TV or checking e-mail in an adjoining room. Benjamin Delessert houses only international students. There were no ‘pure’ French students living there (as the students called them) but there were 20-30 Algerian student residents. These students have French nationality but they say they have North African culture, rather than French culture. There were always other people in the lobby besides our group, some were international students, sometimes professors who led other groups over, or professors from the institute were there. This meant that there were usually a few people smoking, as it is permitted in the lobby. Also, the summer was the hottest on record for France, and the lobby was one of the coolest places in the building which worked to my advantage as students usually spent time every day seeking relief from the heat, at any given time of night or day.

The other residence in Lyon, l’Escale Lyonnais was set up differently. The students who lived there and I often spent time in the outdoor courtyard, talking, studying, and eating. But as the summer went on and the temperatures rose, it became too hot to sit outside, so the students migrated to the kitchen on the 3rd floor. Not all of the students lived on the 3rd floor, but this is where they ate, sat, talked, and hung out. This residence had a different feel because all of the students who lived here besides our group were French and they were all doing internships or had jobs during the day. As a result, the residence was empty until 6pm when everyone got home and prepared dinner. The students who lived in this residence spent time in Benjamin Delessert during the day and moved back ‘home’ in the evenings to see their French friends. The other big difference was that these students all spoke French with their friends, where English was much more common to hear in Benjamin Delessert.
Paris and Nice were very different as observation sites. I met with the 5 students studying in Paris outside of their classrooms (which were in 4 different locations) and then we spent time in the city together, at cafés, restaurants, or parks. Nice was similar in that I met the 5 students at their school and then we spent time together out in the city, walking by the beach, and at restaurants.

Interview Protocol Development

The interview questions were developed to assess students’ understanding of their own change in intercultural sensitivity throughout the research project. The questions were sequenced to help warm up the respondent to ensure that they are comfortable in the interview. The questions were tested in a pilot study with students who have studied abroad. This pilot was not audio taped as the main goal was to test the interview questions for clarity and flow and to see if they encourage discussion about the topics discussed. Changes were made based on this experience, the suggestions of the pilot participants, and the themes that emerged when the observations took place.

Post Study Abroad Interviews (Ex-Post Facto)

Whether or not a statistical difference was found to exist between the IDI pre and post-test scores, it is important to understand the ways that the students experienced their study abroad program and which factors they believe might have affected their intercultural competence. Based on the differences that existed between the IDI pre and post-test scores as well as the other patterns that emerged, I selected potential participants based on the following structure. I considered the following factors for all 3 groups of participants:

1) a score change on the IDI vs little or no IDI score change
2) high amount of language experience vs low amount of language experience
3) majority students vs minority students
4) high international experience vs low international experience
5) storytellers students vs quieter students
6) Male vs female students

I then e-mailed 23 students using the above structure and hoped I would be able to interview 8-12. I was overwhelmed by the response. Twenty students agreed to be interviewed, and I interviewed 19 of them. I made the decision to interview all 19 students instead of selecting 12 of them because their situations offered the possibility of exploring options that were interesting.

Initially, the interview questions were generated based on the literature about what impacts students’ intercultural sensitivity and what impacts their overseas experience. I also based questions on personal observations over the past 10 years as I have experience with students as they prepared to study abroad and while they were abroad. Finally, I used the observation data that I had collected in France to help shape the questions which were eventually asked to the participants upon their return. These interviews were conducted in various coffee houses around the Ohio State campus. Each participant was asked if I could audio tape the interviews.

The interviews lasted between 35 minutes to 55 minutes and they generated 56 pages of single spaced transcriptions. However, students often spent more time with me than those 35-55 minutes. Many students wanted to talk more about the experience, to reflect on what they had learned and also to ask me how their experiences could translate into a career or their future plans. These conversations took place before, after, and sometimes during the interview and lasted as long as two hours in some cases. Students often unintentionally answered questions in clumps and their answer to question two might also cover question three, four, and five, for example. Often the last question, “Knowing that I want to understand how this
experience affected you, is there anything else that you want to tell me about your summer?” was the one where I learned the most from the students. They usually had something to share about the experience that I did not know was important to them and this question yielded enormously rich data.

The participants were asked to give a member check by reviewing the transcript of their interview.

**Observations and Interview Transcript Analysis**

The observation notes and the interview transcripts were read and reviewed thoroughly before they were divided into themes or codes. During the second reading the computer analysis program (NUD*ST) was used to code and organize the qualitative observation and informal interview notes. The NUD*ST program allows the researcher to see patterns and notice correlation between ideas and codes that might not have been visible before analysis. The open ended questions from the survey data were also entered into NUD*ST to look for themes with the other forms of data collected. I used the inductive approach to sort through my data set. Initially I searched all data for themes and patterns in order to look for key assertions. This approach, when you use specific cases to find patterns among the larger group, was helpful as I could then make and disprove theories as I analysed the data (Erickson, 1985). Moustakis (1990) says that inductive analysis has five stages, when the researcher is immersed in the setting, then being aware of the meaning around you, when your awareness is expanded, describing to capture the experience of the individual, and finally bringing the individuals story together (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000).
Internal Validity and Credibility

Trustworthiness is considered the quality of, or goodness of the qualitative inquiry (Schwandt, 1997). Threats to internal validity can affect the findings of a research study. For this reason, the goal is to try to limit these threats. Internal validity is when a relationship that was observed between two or more variables was meaningful on its own rather than the relationship being due to something else (Glesne, 1999). Member checks of the data by the participants are one way to work towards validity in a qualitative project. The threats to internal validity, which were controlled for, include maturation which was accounted for in this study by group 3, who remained on the Ohio State University (OSU) campus and took a French course. Their experience showed us the impact of time or world events as the only factors for students who study languages within the time frame of the study. In addition, testing threat is not a problem because the IDI is not an exam with right or wrong answers or socially desirable responses, whatever the respondent answers is right for them at that moment, so students do not learn the ‘right answer’ with time or practice.

The threats to internal validity that were not able to be controlled include selection, as it is difficult to be sure if this relatively small sample of students who study French are indeed representative of the larger population of undergraduate students who study abroad. The sample size is small (n=43) and for this reason the statistical power is low. These statistical findings have been complemented by the qualitative measures which has helped validate the findings. In addition, the group of students who volunteered to take the course could be atypical and already have an interest in intercultural development and thus not give a fair comparison of the rest of the group who went to France who did not take the course. Mortality, or drop outs
from the study was not an issue as no students dropped from the treatment (IEL class) or withdrew from the study abroad program before or during the summer. However, mortality did cost 5 participants, who did not complete the post-test and final survey. One of the major threats to this study is that of diffusion or imitation of the treatment. If the participants taking the course (group 1) have shared the information discussed in class and talked with the group of students who did not take the class (group 2) then the treatment could have bled into the non-treated group which makes the treatment look less effective. There is some evidence of diffusion from the interview data collected.

Credibility examines the issue of whether there is a good fit between the respondents’ views of their ways of life and the representation presented by the researcher (Schwandt, 1997). Ways to provide credibility include peer debriefing and member checks. Peer debriefing involves the researcher finding a trusted colleague with whom they can share their research and concerns. This colleague can give advice and share attempts to describe the research. Member checks occur when the researcher solicits feedback from respondents about the findings in the research. These checks can reassure the researcher that they have correctly observed or noted events and it allows the participants to be certain that they were understood, both of which help provide credibility and allow the researcher to gain insight.

In this study, several methods were used to assure credibility. Peer debriefing has been instrumental in uncovering questions and clarifying ideas. My colleague Allen Delong worked with me throughout the research project and has given advice and asked questions to help me make my project better. Another check occurred in France when I was collecting observation data. I did not want students to be self
conscious about their behavior so I did not want to member check them directly after I took notes. Instead, I enlisted the help of the two Resident Directors who were responsible for the group. As they were present for most of the observation periods, we were able to discuss events that had occurred, so that I had validation that I had understood and represented most of the events that happened. Finally, my student interviewees provided valuable member checks by reviewing their interview transcript and letting me know if the transcript looked accurate. The rest of the data was self reported by students and so I did not need to validate it for accuracy.

**External Validity and Transferability**

While the goal of all research is to generalize findings to a larger population, it will not be possible to widely generalize these findings to the wider population of undergraduate students who will study abroad because the participants were not randomly sampled or assigned to groups. This study is exploratory research and more research will be needed in order to be able to generalize to a wider sample. The goal is to offer recommendations to Ohio State’s Office of International Education related to the outcomes of a pre-departure class and the factors that affect students’ experiences abroad. Comparing the demographic data, it appears that students who participate in the study are similar to other students who study abroad through Ohio State University, as 80% of students who go abroad participate in similar summer programs. Therefore the decision about benefits of offering the course on a more wide reaching basis or recommending in-country program components is possible. The readers can decide transferability to wider audiences, and other contexts, themselves.

There are, however, many threats to the external validity of this study including the possibility that the students who volunteered to be in the treatment
group might have a propensity to be more interested in intercultural interactions than the other students studying abroad. Another threat is the interaction of selection and treatment because the researcher has three roles in this study, researcher, instructor of the course, and coordinator of the study abroad program. The researcher could be biased and have seen an effect during the experiment because it was expected, even if it not really there. The students in the study might have simply reacted to simply being studied (Hawthorne effect) and that would encourage them try to present the researcher with the behavior that is desired or expected (Bolman, 1991). The group of participants also were a convenience sample and they are a threat to population validity, as they were not randomly selected or assigned to groups.

Transferability also deals with the issue of generalization. It is usually examined as the researchers responsibility to give the reader sufficient information about the cases studied. With this information, the reader is able to identify similarities between the material presented and the degree to which the findings might be transferred to other groups (Schwandt, 1997). My readers have been told that the research findings presented will not be widely generalizable to other groups. The readers must decide for themselves if the findings about these OSU study abroad students can be transferred to other groups. On the other hand, because I have used inductive reasoning with this research study, I am in a position to generalize to a larger group of study abroad students based on the specific observations I have seen and the theories, hypotheses, and findings that have come from these specific cases. The goal of any research project is to create a theory, in this case the goal was to learn how students intercultural sensitivity is impacted by academic courses (Schwandt, 1997). Other research goals included whether or not study abroad alone affects
intercultural learning, and if other factors do a good job of predicting intercultural growth.

Reliability and Dependability

Reliability and dependability both are focused on the process of the research and the researcher’s responsibility to ensure that the process was logical, traceable, and documented. Reliability is a problem related to measurement. Specifically, when doing field work, observations are very personal and how one researcher observes and describes the situation might vary from another person’s view. Reliability is how we try to make the description true to what happened (Babbie, 1998). Auditing is a procedure when another person examines the audit trail maintained by the researcher. The goal is for this examiner to judge about the dependability of the researchers conclusions (Schwandt, 1997). Both Resident Directors and my colleague Allen Delong have examined the research and helped to determine if the research conclusions are sound.

Objectivity and Confirmability

Objectivity and confirmability are examining that the data and interpretations actually exist. It calls for linking assertions, finding interpretations. Objectivity is described as an attempt to get beyond our individual views (Babbie, 1998). Ethnography is my primary method of gathering data. For this reason it was important that I was self-reflective and aware of my role as an interpreter and researcher. My voice is visible in the dialogue so that my thinking is clear in relation with the voices of my participants (Glesne, 1999). Schwandt (in Denzin and Lincoln, 2000) warns of relativist epistemology which believes that it is not possible to understand or make hypotheses about a group unless it is from one single perspective. This was a
challenge in my research and the two Resident Directors and students helped with member checks to be sure that hypotheses and theories could be made from the observations conducted.

Another point to consider is that I conducted ‘backyard research’ (Glesne, 1999). In contrast to ethnography where the researcher observes and learns about an unfamiliar culture or area, backyard research means that the immediate area of study is literally in the researchers local area. As I was a study abroad coordinator and I studied a group of study abroad participants on their study abroad program in France, this research is considered my backyard. The benefits include easy access and the basis for rapport; both of these were true for my research project. The research is also usually very useful for the personal or professional life of the researcher. Some problems exist with this type of research including preconceived ideas getting in the way. While the research project will be useful for my professional life, I had had to be aware of my existing biases and preconceived notions so that they did not affect the study. Often times the researcher already has a role in this particular community and this new researcher role can be confusing to participants. This was the case in my study, students were used to me as their professor and as their study abroad coordinator and then I shifted roles and become a learner and observer, rather than the expert imparting knowledge.

The researcher roles in this study were very challenging. As the co-instructor of the treatment, the coordinator of the study abroad program, and the primary investigator, I needed to be conscious of my impact on the participants. My goal was to be a researcher and learner rather than acting as an expert or authority. While students were used to seeing me as an authority, my role shifted in France and I was
there solely to learn about the experience from their perspective. I had no formal role as far as the program administration was concerned, I was there solely to conduct my research. There were two Resident Directors to act as the authorities on-site for the students for the duration of the program. A benefit that grew from my various roles was that I had my students trust, and this seemed to allow them to feel comfortable talking to me and in front of me as I observed them, about events they experienced abroad.

One other problem that backyard research faces is an ethical and political one (Glesne, 1999). What happens if the findings are not popular in the institution where the research is being conducted? Will there be negotiation about the results that get reported? Fortunately, my project is outside of the main responsibilities of the office in which I used to work and is considered something ‘extra’. While my former office is interested in my research, it will not reflect negatively on the office or institution, no matter what the findings show. Some of these same challenges exist with any research project, but they can be amplified by being too familiar and involved with the research site.

**Interpretation and Representation of Participants Voices and Experiences**

One of the biggest challenges in this study was interpreting and representing the experiences and voices of my research participants. Fortunately, I was able to understand my research participants whether they speak in English or French, so I was not reliant on translators during this process. At the same time, while I could literally understand the words that they were saying, voice is a question of the way that I represented the figurative meaning behind those words. There is a greater breadth of data provided when unstructured interviewing occurs in the course of participant
observation and ethnography (Fontana and Frey in Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). The analysis of text and examining who speaks, the authority that the speaker has, how it is represented and the connection between who speaks, who is heard and which topics are voiced as well as who is given a voice, are all ideas that are important in feminism (Schwandt, 1997). This issue is central to my study and for this reason, I conducted frequent member checks and asked students to clarify comments in order to ensure that I represent their data as they meant it, rather than the way that I interpreted and understood it.

One important part of observation and ethnography is the way that one presents oneself as the researcher. Am I a researcher, there to learn, an expert on some subject, someone there to help with the overall experience? All of these decisions about the way that the researcher expresses themselves go into the discussion of voice because it helps us to decide whose voice we will include and exclude (Hertz in Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). Also, I was aware of the way that students reported and spoke to me, whether they used English or French. My goal was to invite joint participation to explore the issues with my participants (Lather, 1991). Reciprocity turned the students from stranger to friend and turned me, the researcher to someone they could trust and speak to freely. Negotiation of meaning was important, as I came to theories or meanings, it was often necessary to show the data to the students and be certain that I had represented what they had said, felt, and meant by their actions and comments (Lather, 1991). To gain full reflexivity it was important that the informal interviews were unstructured and interactive so that both the interviewer and interviewee could learn. A big question in this type of research is the way that you explain the lives of others without violating their reality (Lather, 1991). I had to be
self aware and seek feedback from the students to ensure that their reality matches the
notes I had captured and I had to check and be self aware to ensure that I was not
adding in my own ideas, feeling, and interpretations to my research participants
reality.

An older view of observation is that the observer should not interfere with the
observed. However, in recent years, this paradigm has changed, and it is now
acknowledged that participant observers can cause changes to occur (Angrosina &
Mays de Perez in Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). The benefit of realizing that the
observer affects the study is that the researcher can now ask for feedback, member
checks and clarify observations they do not understand about events they are seeing,
which makes the interpretation more accurate and allows for better understanding and
an emic or insiders view of the situation.

The Treatment: The Pre-Departure Course (IS 693)

As stated in the syllabus, the learning goal of the class is to prepare for the
intercultural experience of study abroad by: 1) learning about our own culture, the
‘American culture’, and other cultures, 2) gaining an understanding of the role of
perspective-taking in cultural immersion experiences, and 3) identifying ways in
which the study abroad experience defines each person’s role in our global society.
The course was designed to teach students how to think about cultural difference
rather than to teach students about the specific host culture where they would be
studying abroad. In addition, it was hoped that students would gain competencies in
coping with cultures new to them through the various activities and simulations in the
course. Students should learn to think critically about culture as they discuss topics
including stereotypes and cultural traits. Students also learned reflexive thinking with guided reflections and they received feedback from the teachers on their work.

Finally, it is hoped that students would have enhanced cross-cultural communication as a result of taking this course which would ultimately help them to better integrate and adapt to the host culture when they study abroad.

When creating instructional designs, it is possible to use many resources regarding types of learning and teaching methods. For more experiential types of learning, such as study abroad, a good framework is Kolb’s experiential learning cycle (Landis, 2004). Kolb’s experiential learning model shares four ways that people like to learn and teach. These are: concrete (experience), reflective (observation), abstract (conceptualization), and active (experimentation).

The following model shares how different types of learners can best be offered instruction to help them learn most effectively.

Kolb’s Experiential Learning Model

CONCRETE

Experience

ACTIVE

Experimentation

REFLECTIVE

Observation

ABSTRACT

Conceptualization

Figure 3: Kolb’s Experiential Learning Model
Each type of learner has strengths and preferred situations in which they learn. Some learners prefer reading materials ahead of time and reflecting on materials they have read. Others are visual learners and need to see everything, while others prefer to listen to a speaker. Yet others are active learners and gain the most by learning while doing something. By consciously using each of these types of learning and teaching in instructional designs, every type of learning style should be accommodated. These styles are summarized in the following table:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning strengths</th>
<th>Preferred Learning Situations</th>
<th>Appropriate activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Concrete Experience                        | -learning by intuition  
- learning from specific experiences  
- relating to people  
- sensitivity to feelings | -learning from new experiences, games, role plays, and so on  
- peer feedback and discussion  
- personalized discussion  
- teacher as coach/helper | -small group discussion  
- examples  
- films  
- exercises  
- guided imagery  
- music  
- peer teaching |
| Reflective Observation                     | -learning by perception  
- careful observation before making judgements  
- viewing things from different perspectives  
- introversion, looking inward for meaning | -lectures  
- opportunities to take an observer role, to see different perspective on an issue  
- objective tests of one’s knowledge about an issue  
- teacher as guide/task master | -journals  
- discussion  
- brainstorming  
- thought questions  
- reflective papers  
- observations  
- worksheets  
- structured tasks |
| Abstract Conceptualization                 | -learning by thinking  
- logical analysis of ideas  
- systematic planning  
- deductive thinking, acting non the basis of one’s understanding of a situation | -theory readings  
- study time alone  
- clear, well structured presentation of ideas  
- teacher as communicator of information | -lectures  
- papers  
- projects  
- analogies  
- theory construction  
- research  
- reading |
| Active Experimentation                     | -learning by doing  
- ability to get things done  
- risk taking  
- extroversion, acting to influence people and events | -opportunities to practice and receive feedback  
- small group discussions  
- projects and individualized, self-paced, learning activities  
- teacher as role model on how to do it | -projects  
- fieldwork  
- homework  
- case study  
- simulations, games  
- self-paced learning demonstration |

Smith and Kolb, 1986, p. 28.


**Table 6: Table of Kolb’s Experiential Learning Model**
The course called International Studies 693 (Intercultural Experiential Learning), was created by two people with very different learning and teaching preferences. One instructor favored the reflective and abstract sides of Kolb’s learning cycle. She preferred lectures, reflections and readings and handouts as a way to share and learn information. The other instructor preferred learning and teaching in the active and concrete areas of the cycle. She favored experiential activities, discussion, projects, and learning from one another. With these preferences in mind, careful attention was paid to the class design and syllabus to accommodate all types of learner and both styles of the teachers.

The complete syllabus for IS 693 is located in appendix F. The table below provides a description of some of the components of the class and for which learning style they were selected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Style</th>
<th>IS 693 components that accommodate these learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>- experiential activities in each class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>- discussion of readings in each class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- feedback from teachers about reflection exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>- weekly reflection exercises for homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>- lectures on new topics by teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- teacher acting as guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>- weekly readings assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualization</td>
<td>- homework given each week, reflections and other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- handouts with clear directions and information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>- Simulations (BaFa BaFa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimentation</td>
<td>- Cultural Immersion Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Small group discussion for half of the classes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Learning Styles Table
This course was first taught in March 2001 and the biggest challenge was getting students to see that they were part of a larger American culture. One goal was to help students realize that they had acquired a culture as they were growing up without realizing it. The cultural acquisition literature informs not only the way that cultures acquire their individual culture, but also shows the way that students might view a culture new to them. The students in the spring of March 2001 did not believe that such an ‘American Culture’ existed and they resisted the idea. The following year we added more information about American culture to help students with this concept. When the course was offered a second time, 6 months after the September 11th attacks, students immediately understood the concept that there was an American culture and they even had a good sense of the way others perceive Americans and the American culture. It is interesting that a concept that was hard to explain before became so clear to students in light of world events. The spring of 2003, when the course was taught as the treatment for this study, was the third time the course was offered. The full syllabus for the course can be found in the appendix F.

IS 693, Intercultural Experiential Learning course content condensed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>Introduction to class, research study, discuss meanings of culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Learn about American culture, take IDI inventory, definitions of culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>Learn about US Diversity and stereotypes about US culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>Learn the DIE model (describe, interpret, and evaluate) perspective taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>Watch intercultural classroom video and DIE characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>Present Hofstede’s cultural dimensions panel discussion with int’l students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7</td>
<td>BaFa BaFa, experiential learning simulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8</td>
<td>Discuss culture shock/adaptation and panel on global career paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9</td>
<td>Discuss challenges of study abroad, half of cultural immersion presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 10</td>
<td>Finish cultural immersion presentations and complete evaluations (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: IS 693, Intercultural Experiential Learning course content condensed
Ethical Issues

In addition to trust, the four ethical issues which arose related to participants as part of this research study, are harm to participants, consent, deception, and confidentiality. Each of these issues will be discussed in this section. Approval was gained from the Ohio State University Human Subjects Committee (OSU IRB Board) before any research was conducted and due to the nature of the research, an exemption in category #2 was requested and granted as this research involves the use of education tests, survey procedures, observations, and interviews with participants. The participants’ trust was earned throughout interactions with the researcher before the observations begin, in the pre-departure class and the pre-departure orientation sessions.

Harm to Participants

There was no risk of physical harm to participants in this study. The only possibility of harm was that of psychological harm to the participants. As the course is co-taught by the researcher, participants might have been concerned that their grade in the course would be affected by their participation in the research study. Two remedies for this risk were taken, 1) participants were informed that at any time they could withdraw from the course without any negative impact to them or their opportunity to study abroad, and 2) the course was graded S/U, or Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory which means that the grade would not affect the grade point average (GPA) of a student while the hours earned would appear on the final record.
Consent

Informed consent was obtained before the research was begun as well as throughout the study. The participation in the class was voluntary and written consent was gained from all three groups of students before each pre-test and survey. If any participant wished to withdraw from the research, they were free to do so without any negative repercussions whatsoever.

Deception

Deception was not be used in this study. The research was up front about the goal of the research study and the students were informed of the purpose. In addition, participants were able to ask questions of the researcher at any time throughout the study.

Confidentiality and Anonymity

Participants understand that their responses would be kept anonymous and that all information would be kept confidential. Because a limited number of students participate in the summer study abroad programs in France, it is not possible to completely protect the identities of those in the study, but it is possible to store and code the data so that no one could know which responses or test scores match with which participant. All responses to the interviews and information gathered during the observation period were kept marked and stored and the responses were coded to protect the participants’ identity. As each student was given a code number, their names do not appear on any of their responses. The responses and observation notes will all be kept until the study is completed and then will be destroyed. The researcher is the sole person with the access to the codes, which will hide the students responses from their identities. This information is kept in a locked area accessible only to the
researcher, along with all of the research data. The findings from the study will be shredded one year after the dissertation is completed and approved.

**Conclusion**

This research study has been an exciting one, but not without challenges! There are many issues that I have had to keep in mind as the researcher. The reflexivity that was needed due to my multiple roles was kept in a research journal so that I could continue to be aware and use this data to review and determine the unintended impact I had on the research. I enjoyed working with both quantitative and qualitative data collection procedures and the opportunity to learn more about conducting field research as well as the way that ethnography and feminism worked for this study and the way that they interacted in their methods. While the overarching goal of this project was to learn something about the impact of college students’ study abroad experience on their intercultural competence, I feel that I learned just as much, if not more, about designing, conducting, and writing up quantitative and qualitative research in the process. The whole process makes me eager to conduct more research while the experience is fresh in my mind.
CHAPTER 4

QUANTITATIVE DATA AND PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

My data can be described in many ways including numbers, words, statistics, observations, instrument findings, questionnaires, and interviews. I collected both quantitative and qualitative data for my dissertation research. The goal of collecting two different kinds of data was two-fold. I wanted to see if the quantitative data would give clues as to any effect the treatment had on the participants, and I hoped that the qualitative data would describe any effects. I also wanted to have the chance to analyze both types of data to see for myself the strengths and weaknesses inherent in each type of research. This chapter will focus on the quantitative data and findings and chapter five will examine the qualitative data and findings. The quantitative chapter will describe the types of data that were collected and explain the way that they were analysed. The reader will then be introduced to my participants by way of demographic information. Then the quantitative data will be presented along with initial findings.

How Data Types Were Analyzed

This section familiarizes the reader with the types of data collected. I will first describe the data that was collected and then will share the initial descriptive statistical findings about my participants. Next, a description of how the research
questions were answered using the SPSS computer based statistical analysis program will be described. Finally, the statistical findings and their meaning will be examined.

The seven types of data collected are summarized in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>Analyzed With</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test IDI Instrument (Qt)</td>
<td>Scale, actual IDI score</td>
<td>IDI CD Rom, specifically to analyze test findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test IDI Instrument (Qt)</td>
<td>Scale, actual IDI score</td>
<td>IDI CD Rom, specifically to analyze test findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test Survey (Ql and Qt)</td>
<td>Categorical, nominal, ordinal, and short answer</td>
<td>SPSS and NUD*ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test Survey (Ql and Qt)</td>
<td>Categorical, nominal, ordinal and short answer</td>
<td>SPSS and NUD*ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations (Ql)</td>
<td>Descriptive stories, observations</td>
<td>NUD*ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Interviews (Ql)</td>
<td>Descriptive stories and clarifying information</td>
<td>NUD*ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews (Ql)</td>
<td>Transcriptions of taped interviews</td>
<td>NUD*ST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qt = Quantitative data and Ql= Qualitative data

**Table 9: Data Types**

The data which was classified as quantitative due to its numerical or short answer nature was collected in 4 modes, 1) the pre test IDI scores, 2) questions on the pre-test survey, 3) the post test IDI scores and 4) questions on the post-test survey.
Meet My Participants

The total sample for this study included 43 students, 37 of whom went abroad for the summer, and 6 who stayed on campus as the control group. The participants who studied abroad are a pretty typical group of U.S. undergraduates who go abroad as part of their college career. They are like 50% of all students who study abroad as they went abroad in the summer or on other short term programs and like 91% of all study abroad students who stay abroad for one semester or less (Open Doors, 2003). My participants, like 63% of study abroad students nationally, choose Europe as their destination. Specifically, Open Doors 2003 reported that France attracted 7.6% of all students who studied abroad in 2001-2002. Eighty-one percent of my participants were aged 18-21 with 16.3% aged 22-30 and only 2.3% were aged 31-40. They were mostly working toward their undergraduate degree (88.4%) while a few students had already graduated from college (2.3%) or had already completed graduate studies (9.3%). The following table compares my participants’ gender, majority or minority status and rank with the national average. My participants are almost exactly within the bounds of the U.S. national average of study abroad students. The only large difference is that the sample included 10% more women and 10% fewer men.
### Table 10: Study Participants vs. National Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Characteristics</th>
<th>My Participants</th>
<th>National Average (Open Doors, 2003)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority students</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority students</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rank 1</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rank 2</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rank 3</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rank 4</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>20.4% +11.8% unspecified undergrads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate students</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost sixty-eight percent of the study abroad participants were a declared French major or minor. Eighty-eight percent of my participants were Americans with 11.6% holding another nationality besides American. Of these 88.4% Americans, 7% hold a dual nationality. While the vast majority of my students were Americans, only 34.9% of these students consider themselves ethnically American, 65.1% identify with another ethnicity. The vast majority of the students were raised in North America (88.4%); 2.3% were raised in South America, 2.3% were raised in Western Europe, and 7% were raised in Southeast Asia. Likewise, 86% of these students report English as their mother language. Other mother tongues included 4.7% Chinese, 4.7% Spanish, 2.3% Indonesian, and 2.3 % Portuguese. Sixty-five percent of the participants only speak English fluently, while 23.3% speak another language besides English fluently, and 11.6% speak at least two other languages fluently.
At the time of the pre-test, 83.7% of my participants already held a valid passport and 76.7% had been abroad before. Most of the students (86%) felt that they had friends who were of a different culture than theirs while 14% felt that all of their friends were of the same culture as their own. These students have high expectations of their education, as 20.9% expect to earn a Ph.D., 4.7% hope to earn J.D., and another 4.7% expect to become M.D’s. Over 11% of the group wants to earn an M.B.A, and 25.6% plan to pursue a M.A. or M.S. degree. The last 30.2% plan to stop their education after they have earned their B.A. or B.S. degree. These students’ parents have a completed educational level of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mothers</th>
<th>Fathers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>some high school</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high school degree</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some college</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college graduate</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate degree</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Parents' Educational Level

Most parents had been abroad before (74.4%) with only 25.6% of students’ parents never having travelled overseas at the time of the pre-test. These participants reported their Socio-Economic Status (SES) by answering a question about how much money they had growing up, 74.4% felt they had enough money, 7% reported that they did
not have enough money, and the remaining 18.6% of students said that they had more than enough money.

When students were asked for their reasons and goals for studying abroad they could select as many answers as they wanted, so the percentages will not add up to 100%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For a language requirement</th>
<th>To complete a French minor</th>
<th>To complete a French major</th>
<th>To gain fluency</th>
<th>For their career</th>
<th>For other reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Reasons for Study Abroad

The groups were divided up in the following manner: 39.5% of the group took the treatment, studied abroad, and were in group 1, 46.5% of the participants did not take the treatment but studied abroad and were in group 2, and group 3 consisted of 14% of the participants. So, 86% of the participants studied abroad in the summer of 2003.

Starting Point of Students on the DMIS and IDI Instrument

At this point, it is important that the reader learn more about the model (DMIS) and instrument (IDI) being used to measure students’ levels of intercultural sensitivity to add to the discussion in chapter 3. Most college students score in the Minimization Stage of the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) when taking the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) (IDI training, 2001). This means that they see cultural similarities more clearly than they see cultural differences between people, and is the last stage in the ethnocentric range.
Minimization of Differences (from IDI Manuel, 2001)

Minimization of cultural differences is the state in which elements of one's own cultural worldview are experienced as universal. Because these absolutes obscure deep cultural differences, other cultures may be trivialized or romanticized. People at Minimization expect similarities, and they may become insistent about correcting others' behavior to match their expectations.

Below are two figures for the reader to see the DMIS and IDI. The developmental model begins on the left and progresses to the right. The second figure shows the scoring on the IDI and how it maps with the DMIS.

### Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnocentric Stages</th>
<th>Ethnorelative Stages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reversal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encapsul. /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marginality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denial/Defense (DD) or Reversal (R)</th>
<th>Minimization (M)</th>
<th>Acceptance/Adaptation (A)</th>
<th>Encapsulated Marginality (EM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(IDI CD Rom, 2002)

Figure 4: Comparison of DMIS and IDI Models
Participants’ pre-test scores are shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1 pre-test</th>
<th>Group 2 pre-test</th>
<th>Group 3 pre-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense/Reversal</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Participants’ pre-test IDI scores

As expected, most of my participants were in the minimization stage. This table shows that group 3 had the highest percentage of participants in Minimization, while the majority of group 1 and 2 were either in Defense/Reversal or Minimization for their pre-test scores. The table helps the reader see the starting point of the majority of the students on the DMIS and IDI.

How the Statistical Technique was Selected

There are many different options available to the researcher hoping to find relationships in data findings and each method has its strengths. While both hierarchical regressions and ancova's were considered for this study, the ancova test was less useful for the purposes of this research as it is not possible to separate effects in this model. A major goal was to separate out the pre-test score and the intervention effects. Running hierarchical regressions were selected for this study because it can separate effects.
Hierarchical Regression

The statistical technique called regression was created in order to describe and measure the linear relationship between two variables. This technique, done by the SPSS computer in this case, mathematically figures out the distance between each data point and the line. These regression equations are useful to predict but they are not perfect and there will be an error value generated as well. A perfect regression would have a score of $r = 1.00$ or $r = -1.00$. As the $r$ score gets closer to 0, the error increases. While the regression equation allows predictions to be made it does not provide any accuracy about the predictions. In order to be able to calculate their accuracy, the standard error of estimate can be calculated. This figure is related to the magnitude of the correlation between the two variables. If the correlation is near 1.00 or -1.00, then the standard error of estimate will be small, but as the correlation gets closer to 0, the lines provide less accurate predictions and the standard error of estimate increases.

One of the goals of this research was to determine the factors that contributed to post-test IDI scores. Hierarchical regression allowed me to examine the data in steps, so it was possible to determine which of the 4 variables impacted the post-test score. It is also possible with regressions to eliminate data that is not relevant or significant. This type of regression allowed me to add the intervention variable, which enabled me to see above and beyond the pre-test prediction.
Quantitative and Statistical Data Findings

Effects of the Pre-Departure Course

Various analyses were conducted using the above coded data in SPSS. The quantitative codes used in the research study are located in Appendix G and the full SPSS statistical analysis charts are located in appendix H. First to answer research question 1) How does a pre-departure orientation course titled Intercultural Experiential Learning (IS 693) affect the cultural learning for students on study abroad programs?, a hierarchical regression was run to determine if the intervention (the study abroad pre-departure course) affected the post-test IDI score. The pre test score was controlled as that score would likely affect the post-test score.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.500 (a)</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>13.3593</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>11.647</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.503 (b)</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>13.5285</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), PRE
b  Predictors: (Constant), PRE, INTERVEN

Figure 5: R Square Change From SPSS, Q1

The table above marked 'Model Summary' (model 1) shows that the pre-test score significantly predicted the post-test score by the R square Change score of .250. This means that roughly 25% of the post-test score is accounted for in the post-test score.
One would expect the score on the pre-test to affect the post-test because if a subject scored very high on the pre-test, one could hypothesize that they might also score high on the post-test. Next the relationship between the post-test score and the intervention was examined controlling for the pre-test score effect. When the intervention variable was added, the same table (model 2) above shows us that the R square change is not significant as the intervention only accounted for roughly .003% of the variance in the post-test score, or roughly 0.3%. In fact, 58.8% of group one had intercultural growth, while the rest either stayed the same or had a lower intercultural sensitivity score on the post-test. Seventy percent of group two, who did not have the treatment, also experienced intercultural growth. Thus we can conclude that the intervention of the pre-departure study abroad class did not have a significant impact on the participants post-test IDI scores when controlling for the impact of the pre-test scores.

The other important information the analysis shows includes the P value of 0.721, which indicates that the obtained coefficient is not significantly different from 0, which confirms that the intervention does not yield significant findings. The statistics also show that the two predictors (post test score and intervention) are not too closely related to one another, as there is a partial correlation of -0.062, which is a very small correlation between the pre-test variable and the intervention. In this model, the two predictors of the post-test and intervention are not related and did not affect the findings.

To summarize the findings of the first regression the analysis shows that the two variables are not closely related and so there is not a problem with the variables affecting one another. The analysis also shows that students who took the treatment of
the academic pre-departure study abroad class did not have significantly increased scores on the IDI when compared with students who did not take the course. The only significant predictor of the post-test score increase was the participants pre-test score result. We can conclude then that the treatment did not have a significant effect on post-test scores on the IDI.

**Effects of Studying Abroad**

Next, to answer research question 2) How do the changes in intercultural learning of students on study abroad compare with students who studied abroad without the pre-departure orientation course, and with students who did not study abroad, as measured by the IDI post-test scores on the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS)?, a hierarchical regression was run using SPSS. The pre-test score was again controlled for to determine if a study abroad experience affected post-test scores when compared with students who did not study abroad.

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R Square Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>13.5211</td>
<td><strong>.230</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>13.3565</td>
<td><strong>.037</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Predictors: (Constant), PRE  
*b* Predictors: (Constant), PRE, ABROAD

**Figure 6: R Square Change From SPSS, Q2**

The table above marked 'Model Summary' (model 1) shows that the pre-test score significantly predicts the post-test score by the R square Change score of .230. This
means that roughly 23% of the post-test score is accounted for in the pre-test score.

One would expect the score on the pre-test to affect the post-test because if a subject scored very high on the pre-test, one could hypothesize that they might also score high on the post-test. Next the relationship between the post-test score and whether or not a student studied abroad was examined controlling for the pre-test score effect. When the study abroad experience variable was added, the same table (model 2) above shows us that the R square change is not significant as the intervention only accounted for roughly 0.037% of the variance in the post-test score, or roughly 3.7%. Again, intercultural growth was experienced by 64.5% of all students who studied abroad (groups 1 and 2 combined) while 66% of group 3, made up of students who did not go abroad, had intercultural growth. Thus we can conclude that the study abroad experience did not have a significant impact on the participants post-test IDI scores when controlling for the impact of the pre-test scores.

In addition, the analysis shows include the P value of 0.163, which indicates that the obtained coefficient is not significantly different from 0, which confirms that the study abroad experience does not yield significant findings. The statistics also show that the 2 predictors (post test score and intervention) are not too closely related as they have a partial correlation of -0.219, which is a very small correlation between the pre-test variable and a study abroad experience. In this model, the 2 predictors of the post-test and study abroad experience are not related and did not affect the findings.

The summary of the findings of the statistical analysis of question 2 are similar to those we saw with question 1. The two variables were not too closely related to confound the findings. At the same time, the analysis does not show a
significant increase in the post-test IDI score for students who studied abroad versus those who did not study abroad. The conclusion can then be drawn that the experience of studying abroad for 2 months does not significantly increase intercultural sensitivity when compared with students who did not study abroad.

**Which Factors Affect Intercultural Competence**

Finally, to examine research question 3) Which dynamics or factors influence the nature of student learning about intercultural competence on study abroad programs? A hierarchical regression was used again but rather than adding one variable as we did to answer questions 1 and 2, we added 5 variables. Various demographic variables were used including, having a declared French major or minor, previous experience abroad, parents' international experience, nationality, majority or minority status, to see if any of these variables affected the post test scores when controlling for the pre-test scores.

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>13.6872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>12.4115</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>12.4115</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), PRE
b Predictors: (Constant), PRE, FAMILY_E, NATIONAL, ABROAD_B, MAJOR, MAJMIN, PREVIOUS

*Figure 7: R Square Change From SPSS, Q3*
The table above marked 'Model Summary' (model 1) again shows that the pre-test score significantly predicts the post-test score by the R square Change score of 0.230 or roughly 23%. The relationship between the post-test score and the variables were examined controlling for the pre-test score effect. When the variables were added, the same table (model 2) above shows us that the R square change is significant as the variables accounted for roughly 0.232% of the variance in the post-test score, or roughly 23%. Thus we can conclude that the variables did have a significant impact on the participants’ post-test IDI scores when controlling for the impact of the pre-test scores. The hierarchical regression shows that the following P values were found to be not significant:

- Students with a major or minor in French 0.248
- Students who have been abroad before 0.878
- Students with US Nationality vs. US and/or other 0.164

The probability that the above factors were caused by chance are all quite high, 24.8%, 87.8%, and 16.4%, thus they are not significant findings. However, the following P values were significant:

- Students parents had an international experience 0.077
- Students status as a majority or minority 0.010

These two coefficients are significant because only 1% of majority/minority status and 7% of family international experience are explained by chance. The findings show that both family international experience and the students’ majority or minority status significantly affected students’ post-test IDI scores when the pre-test scores were controlled for. The statistics also show that the 2 predictors (post test score and variables) are not too closely related, as there is a range of partial correlation of -0.044 to 0.309, which is a very small correlation between the pre-test
variable and the intervention. In this model, the 2 predictors of the post-test and variables are not related and did not affect the findings.

The summary of the findings show that the variables are not too closely related so there is not a multi-collinearity problem. The statistical analysis states that there are a few significant factors that predict an increase in IDI score among my participants. The first variable is the pre-test score, which we saw in the first two analyses as well. The other factors that show a significant impact on post-test score are family international experience and majority or minority status. Students whose family had international experience and students who were in the majority had greater score gains on the post-test than students whose family had no international experience and minority students.

Summary of the Statistical Findings

First, the reader must keep in mind that the sample size is very small with only 48 total participants and usable data from 43 participants. The statistical findings could be very different with a larger sample. The main purpose of the quantitative data in this study was to get a skeleton picture of the framework to begin to see possible patterns or trends so that they might be more fully explored and examined in the qualitative data analysis, which will be presented in chapter 5. Nonetheless, these findings are interesting to me as a researcher, as a study abroad coordinator, and as a teacher of intercultural learning. I undertook this study because I believed that the pre-departure course was affecting students’ intercultural growth and I believed that students who studied abroad would gain more intercultural growth than those who stayed in Ohio. The surprising findings make me re-examine how students are
prepared for studying abroad and I can see that changes need to take place in order for
students to have the opportunity to gain more intercultural sensitivity while they study
abroad. A further discussion of the recommendations for changes will be discussed in
chapter 6, after all findings have been discussed.
CHAPTER 5

QUALITATIVE DATA AND PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

The qualitative data for this research study was collected in 5 modes, 1) open-ended questions on the pre-test survey, 2) observations conducted in France 3) informal interviews with students in France 4) open-ended questions on the post-test survey, and 5) student interviews on OSU’s campus. This data was examined carefully, coded, and analyzed partly by hand and also with the help of the qualitative analysis computer program NUD*ST. I used the newest version of the software, called N6, for student use. This data will be presented in the form of key assertions and frequency tables. Key assertions are statements or findings formed on patterns in the data and they are backed up with quotes and specific instances of the pattern. Frequency tables are a method of displaying data which actually help to quantify or count the instances in the data. I hope that these two forms of data presentation will help the reader understand what I learned from my participants in this study.

Specifics Features of Qualitative Research

The statistical analysis of the pre and post test IDI’s yielded important and relevant findings about students’ intercultural sensitivity, and I was able to see which students had positive or negative gains. If my research had stopped there I would have only known which students gained or lost intercultural sensitivity. It would have been
impossible to know which factors caused their intercultural changes, thus the
importance of the qualitative data. The qualitative data elicited the most interesting
findings. Before presenting the data it is important to point out a few aspects inherent
to qualitative data collection and analysis. Qualitative research aims to uncover
cultural meaning and this can be done many ways. In my case I lived with the
students in France and observed them every day. I also conducted one-on-one
interviews ex-post facto, after the study abroad program had ended. Both experiences
enabled me to hear directly from the students about their experiences including their
thinking, learning, and feeling. Of course it is not possible to say that I observed or
understood everything that happened for each of my participants. I could not be aware
of every detail of each of the students lives, but I was able to gain insight into many of
their thoughts and feelings while they were abroad through my observations, member
checks, reunions back on campus, and interviews. This gave me a much clearer idea
of ways to interpret and present what I was learning. The reader is hearing the
participants’ story through the researchers eyes. I have become the students’
mouthpiece and will share with you the description of the events abroad.

Additionally, using the analytic approach of inductive reasoning, I moved
from noting specific events to generating general themes and patterns for the larger
group based on the direct observations of my students. My prolonged period of
observation in France (6 weeks of the 8 week program) allows me some certainty of
the validity of my findings. Prolonged observation at a research site contributes to the
equivalent of power in statistics mode. In other words, the more frequently one can
observe, the more trustworthy the findings (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). As I observed
my participants in France I also began to acquire saturation with data as the students
in the three different locations (Paris, Nice, and Lyon) showed similar actions and patterns of behavior. In my one-on-one interviews after the study abroad program, students recalled their experiences with cultural difference using similar expressions to one another.

**Situated Self**

Before presenting the qualitative findings, it is important for the reader to know a little bit about the way that who I am affects my role as a researcher. When I first began this research I was very nervous, and I had many questions about my role as a researcher. Would I be able to observe the students and really get a sense of their experience? Would it be possible for me to understand the experiences of my students who have never been abroad or who have never lived abroad? Would I be able to step back from my usual role of study abroad advisor and problem solver and not give students advice about having a better experience? Would my participants feel comfortable around me and let me see a real picture into their world? I have been passionate about international education from the time I was studying abroad as a 20 year old college student and I have been working with university students who were abroad or who were preparing to go abroad for ten years. For this reason I was determined not to let any of my pre-conceived notions about student learning get in the way of the findings. I enlisted the help of the always present Resident Directors to tell me (privately) if they heard me giving advice to students, encouraging them to meet locals or speak French. I worked hard to not to affect the outcome of the students’ experience. It was with these questions, anxieties, and goals that I began my research.
My main challenges of observing were two-fold. 1) I was observing a group of 37 students who shared some similar characteristics, but unlike some ethnographic setting where a relatively homogeneous cultural group is observed, this group had 37 unique backgrounds, ethnicities, level of language, and goals for their program. This made my job of observing an enormous one as I could not see the manner in which one female student reacted to a situation and assume that all other female students would behave in a similar way. I spent a lot of time informally interviewing students to try to get a feel for the way different students would handle the situations I was seeing. 2) I had to stop myself several times every single day not to act in my normal, professional role of a study abroad coordinator. Normally, I try to help students get through their rough times abroad by encouraging them to spend more time out meeting locals, speaking French, or enjoying the culture around them and less time on the phone with home, writing e-mails, or sitting around complaining. But I was not able to do any of this over the summer because that could have affected the findings of my research study. Instead, I wrote in my researcher journal (almost daily) when I was frustrated that I could not play my normal role as study abroad coordinator.

Research Findings from the Qualitative Data

Five key assertions came from the qualitative data and each will be examined individually. Not all of the students in my study are given a voice in this data presentation. I have selected the most salient quotes and those that are representative of most of the students interviews and experiences. In appendix I, there is a chart with qualitative raw data from all of my participants and the students who are given a voice are highlighted.
The Role of Peers from Different Cultural Backgrounds in the Development of Intercultural Sensitivity

Students gained intercultural sensitivity from spending most of their time with peers from different cultural groups. This assertion includes many aspects of the students experience abroad. All students attended 20 hours of French classes per week, and most of their classmates were international students. Some students met and dated other international students while they were studying abroad and five of the 37 students lived with host families and lived with other international students also being hosted by the same family. The other 32 students lived in residence halls filled with international students. The data indicate that students who spent the majority of their time with peers who came from a different cultural background exhibited significant growth with increases between 1 and 3 intercultural stages. Students who developed meaningful and lasting romantic relationships with someone of different cultural backgrounds exhibited the most significant growth increasing from 2-3 stages on the DMIS. Meaningful here is defined as the students telling me about the experience and describing their relationships as meaningful. Lasting means that they were still in a relationship at the time of the interviews in December. Students who dated someone international but did not develop a lasting relationship did not experience this significant growth. Additionally, students who spent most of their time with fellow American study abroad students did not have the same type of intercultural growth and they either stayed within the same stage as their pre-test position or actually moved backwards.

The following students, whose quotes appear below, spent the majority of their time with international peers. Nicholas, a third year student studying in Paris told me
that he feels the extensive time he spent with people from different cultural backgrounds in France changed his worldview. Before studying abroad, Nicholas says he did not have a good sense of what it really takes to survive in a different cultural environment and with a new language. He believes that now, due to his interactions with people from different cultural backgrounds, he is more understanding about the challenges people face and he has new respect and patience for people of different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Nicholas moved from high defense/reversal to high acceptance on the DMIS, or 2 whole stages.

The majority of the time I was with international students and people. I spent 85% of my time with internationals. Most of my friends ended up being from Holland and I also lived with a girl from Switzerland, and that was really cool and really helped my French because she did not speak one word of English. Then a girl from Mongolia moved in, talk about multiple perspectives, she was born in Mongolia, her parents were Mongolian and then she lived in Hungary, so she spoke Hungarian, Mongolian, English and she was working on French. This really gave me an appreciation of what other people go through when they learn another language and live in another culture. Every time I experience it, I feel like I am learning about it…I still feel a lot of appreciation for it. That is the number one thing I took away… also I think I learned a lot more about being more open and more understanding. I think it was easy to tell that there were times when my host and I were just coming from different places and I am really glad that she is so understanding… (Nicholas Interview, 26 Dec 2003, 11am Starbucks in N. Canton, OH)¹

Sophie had a different reaction to the challenges she faced when interacting with internationals. She noticed that she preferred being with Americans because it was easier to communicate, talk and share ideas due to the fact that they had so much in common. Sophie then goes on to talk about what she learned from her international friends and the ways in which those experiences impacted her while she does not

¹ I have taken out any unnecessary sounds such as um or ah, pauses, grammatical errors or other distractions from the quotes I will use in the dissertation. When a pause has meaning, such as implying a student was thinking for a while before answering, or a sound they made adds to the readers understanding, it was left in. Additionally, (   ) marks in a student quote are my words, added to clarify for the reader.
mention these same factors when talking about her new American friends from the summer. Sophie had significant growth, she moved on the DMIS from low on the acceptance scale right to the border of adaptation, or 1 whole stage.

I think it’s (time she spent with Americans and Internationals) kind of equal actually, but I definitely found myself more attracted to (spending time with) Americans. I met a lot of people from all over the world, Bolivia, Spain, I met one girl from Spain that I really, really loved, she was great, and I learned a lot from her. I met a guy from Ireland, he was great. I met a guy from Denmark, and he taught me a lot about how much I didn't know about life and how much I didn't know about other cultures. He and I were at each others throats all the time, but he definitely taught me a lot. (Sophie Interview, 17 December 2003, 2pm Nick’s Diner in Columbus, OH)

When asked if anything specific changed her view of cultural difference, Sophie replied: ‘Definitely the conversations with my international friends’ (Sophie Interview, 17 December 2003, 2pm Nick’s Diner in Columbus, OH)

Finn was the student who experienced the most growth in intercultural sensitivity. He moved from defense/reversal to adaptation, which is growth of three intercultural stages. He believes that his change is thinking is due to his new German girlfriend Ursula. He met her on the program, and they spent the summer together along with many other international students. Ursula has since transferred to OSU to be near Finn and to complete her undergraduate degree. Despite his growth on the instrument, Finn had a hard time articulating the way he feels differently about cultural difference.

I try to go back to my thinking 1 year ago and I can't go with my mind back then. I never really thought I was, well, I know I was never racist, or anything like that, but ... I don't know how my cultural outlook was. If anything has changed, it has probably been that, I see things more on a continuum now rather than like an objective evaluation. (Finn interview, 23 December 2003, 11am Jimmy John’s in Columbus, OH)
Finn's change in thinking mirrors his move from defense, where he saw events as more or less black and white and very evaluative to adaptation where he can see that there are different perspectives to each issue, much like a continuum.

Max has a Brazilian father and an American mother, so he is used to traveling between cultural environments and languages. Yet, he felt that his experience in France made him more aware and helped him to learn more about minority and marginalized populations in France, the U.S., and Brazil. Max spent all of his time in a mixed group of a few Americans and mostly international students. Max moved one cultural stage on his post-test, from the middle of defense/reversal to the middle of minimization.

Normally it was a mixed group and Carlos (a Venezuelan student the group ‘adopted’ as on of their own and he spent every day with our students) was practically 24/7, all the time. He was one of us. The trip as a whole was just a growing experience. I always try to tell myself that I'm not racist and that I don't want to be and still sometimes it does happen a little bit. But interacting now with Magreban\(^2\) people near my age really allowed me to see and get to know them and that really helped out for me to understand that kind of culture, that kind of ethnicity. I mean in Brazil for example, there is still a lot of discrimination against blacks, and in the U.S. against different ethnicities, and I feel myself being really liberal, and sometimes in my mind I discriminate. That helped me to be able to grow because I was able to interact with those people. I find that taking a look at a person a second time just having an open mind really helped out a lot. I think that just being in touch with people that I got along so well, I was able to like go and find myself with them. Being in touch with people from different ethnicities, that I hadn't really been in touch with before helped me grow. (Max interview, 3 December 2003, 9am Nick’s Diner, Columbus, OH)

Maddy did not study abroad this summer, she was part of the control group (group 3). She lived in Columbus and took classes but her unique living experience exposed her to many different cultural groups. Maddy described a house with 90%

\(^2\) Typically marginalized North African immigrants living in France.
minority and international students with a total of 18 girls. She spent all of her time with people of different cultural backgrounds. Maddy moved two stages on her post-test score from low on the minimization scale all the way to the high end of acceptance.

I was with everyone 60 hours a week, not only in work but out of work, and hanging out, a lot of time. I honestly think the experience has changed me dramatically. I know that 10 weeks seems like a very little time to do that, but it really has. I think I view people differently, I am more open to people of different backgrounds instead of categorizing on differences between people, it think it has really helped me. I also dated this guy from Malaysia, and it was really interesting. The thing that bothers me about other cultures, what is really hard for me to grasp is the way they view gender stereotypes and gender expectations in general. That is the one thing that may still affect how I feel about different cultures. I wish women had a different role in every culture to realize and expect. I initially judged and did not like a lot of people in the house and in the end I realized that I learned so much from them, and I found that I enjoyed them the most, as far as their personalities when I got to know them better. (Maddy interview, 13 December 2003, 9am Starbucks, Columbus, OH)

These quotes show the learning and growth the students feel they experienced as a result of the interactions they had with peers of different cultural backgrounds than their own. These students spent most of their time surrounded by intercultural difference unlike the majority of the participants who spent their time with other Americans. Normally I would observe the students walking to classes, going to the grocery store, going to take the metro into town, and going out for meals in small groups of 3 or 4 Americans. The notable exceptions were the students whose quotes you just read.

Many study abroad programs have been criticized for allowing American students to live in a bubble, surrounded by other American students, with American resident directors or faculty as their leaders. This leads to students developing friendships with one another and often limits their interactions with local peers in the
host country. My participants were no exception to this rule. Most of the group interacted only with other American students outside of class. They felt more comfortable being able to speak English and did not develop friendships with any international students. Most of the students only interacted with people of different cultural backgrounds in class, when they went to the grocery store, restaurants, the post office, or train station. French classrooms do not allow the chance for students to have discussions and interact with one another as happens in the U.S. In France, the professor does the majority of the talking and the students listen rather than discuss or ask questions. The data show that students who broke from this pattern and had the opportunity to make international friends benefited their levels of intercultural sensitivity tremendously. Also, all of the students above attributed their increase in intercultural sensitivity to time spent with their international peers rather than believing it was due to another factor, such as studying abroad or being exposed to a new cultural group in general terms. These students are cognizant that their interactions with peers had an impact on their feelings about cultural difference.

Interestingly, a similar set of findings came from examining the data related to participants’ free weekends. Most of the students travel every single weekend to places in France and as far away as Barcelona, Berlin, Greece, and Rome. Because I was examining their general intercultural sensitivity growth I was not concerned with the location of their travels, as I would have been if I had been studying language acquisition. However, I was interested in their travel companions. Students spend a lot of time on trains and then the entire weekend together and I wanted to see if there was any difference in students who travelled exclusively with Americans versus those who travelled with international friends. I observed some of this in France, but to be
certain I had the data, students reported on their travels in the post-test questionnaire which asked the number of weekends they travelled and with whom they travelled. Every student who selected international travel partners for three or more weekends had positive growth on the DMIS. This suggests they were greatly influenced by their peers from different cultural backgrounds and that it was helpful to spend significant time interacting with one another in order for their intercultural sensitivity to be increased.

As the student development literature tells us, the peer group is the most important and influential group in college students lives (Chickering, 1983). The findings show that intercultural growth is possible if this peer group includes students from different cultural backgrounds.

**The Detrimental Effects of Limited Exposure to Culturally Different Peers on Intercultural Growth**

There was a group of participants who primarily spent time with other Americans and yet they increased their IDI scores. Therefore, it is clear that time spent with international peers is not the only factor affecting intercultural sensitivity. However, the students who spent their time with other Americans did not experience as much growth as students who spent most of their time with international students. Annie and Susie are two students who spent very little time with peers from different cultural backgrounds. Both students’ pre-test scores were in minimization, one of the higher starting stages for students, and they had very minor growth in intercultural sensitivity. When asked the amount of time she spent with international students Annie replied:

Besides Bethany (an OSU international student from Singapore who was part of the group), I would say, other than class, not often because I didn't hang out
with them (the international students). (Annie interview, 3 December 2003, 11:15am OSU Library Coffee Shop, Columbus, OH)

Susie added that she spent her time with:

95% Americans, or maybe 90% Americans and the rest international. Class was the only time (she spent with internationals), but then outside of class was 90% with the Americans. (Susie interview, 18 December 2003, 1:30pm Nicks Diner, Columbus, OH)

Annie attributed her growth and new openness to her study abroad experience rather than her interactions with internationals. Her post-test score placed her a little bit higher in the minimization stage than where she was on the pre-test.

I think that more than anything, even more than academically, it (studying abroad) opened me up to new ways of seeing things and new ways of being open to other people. I am trying to keep that open mind as I am here (back in the USA). (Annie interview, 3 December 2003, 11:15am OSU Library Coffee Shop, Columbus, OH)

Susie shares her new feelings and shows her ability to take multiple perspectives, which shows growth, but like Annie, her growth did not come from sustained intercultural interactions. Susie attributed her growth to her experience with the cultural environment rather than with people or her peers specifically. She moved just over the border from minimization to acceptance on her post-test IDI. Susie said, that the experience really:

…opened my eyes to a whole different way of thinking and speaking and different cultures that I didn't know. I think I know all about the culture, and at the same time, I am so in my American mindset and so I needed to switch it and think about what it would be like from their point of view and in reality, that was huge because I can think on a higher level as far as culturally. (Susie interview, 18 December 2003, 1:30pm Nicks Diner, Columbus, OH)

Both Annie and Susie may have had gains in intercultural sensitivity due to another factor all together. They both are planning to become French High School

---

3 The term ‘Internationals’ is used to represent students who are not from the U.S. or from France
teachers. A discussion about they way students see the usefulness of the experience on their future career will be discussed in a later section.

The Role of Desire in the Attainment of Intercultural Growth

A few students had large amounts of intercultural growth while spending almost no time with peers from different cultural backgrounds. Jane is an example of such a student. She had enormous growth on the IDI post-test, she moved ahead 2 stages on the DMIS, from denial/reversal to acceptance, yet she spent little time with her international peers. She recalls:

Class was the majority of the time (I was with international students) but we would talk after class or hang out in the residence, but not that much. Not as much as I would have liked. (Jane interview, 3 December 2003, 12pm OSU Library Coffee Shop, Columbus, OH)

Throughout the summer Jane was frustrated that she could not spend more time with peers from different cultural backgrounds. She was afraid to speak French to people she did not know, which frustrated her ability to communicate and open up to international students. She was also very homesick and wanted to be around Americans who understood the way she was feeling and could give her support. It is likely that her few interactions with international peers coupled with her desire to spend time with more international students helped her to have intercultural growth. Jane sought me out every day to tell me about every interaction she had with someone who was French, or to whom she spoke French, or anyone she met from a different cultural background. She clearly was seeking out these opportunities and was interested in spending time with international students. The desire, even unrealised, to spend time with international peers seems to have affected her intercultural growth in a positive way.
The Impact of Prolonged Negative Experiences with Internationals on Intercultural Sensitivity

Students who reported having prolonged negative experiences with internationals had the largest loss of intercultural sensitivity. When 43 college students are living in a new country and cultural environment, there are bound to be some interactions with locals that are not pleasant. This is especially true because the students studied in a French city where the inhabitants do not have daily contact with Americans like they might in Paris or in the French Riviera. Additionally, when the students went to France they were met with an unusual political climate. The end of combat in the Iraq war had been declared two months earlier, and the French vehemently opposed the Iraqi war and the U.S. led occupation. There was strong anti-French sentiment in the U.S. The U.S. Congress voted to change the names of foods in the cafeteria from 'French' to 'freedom'. ‘Freedom fries', 'freedom bread', and 'freedom toast' were added to the menu. Likewise there was strong anti-American sentiment in France. Many students reported that they had a problem at the train station or post office or someone heckled them and shouted 'American go home!'. These were daily events and students would tell me the story and then seem to forget the event and move on. A few students though sustained interactions, which they perceived to be negative, and these interactions affected their overall experience. These students had prolonged negative experiences with people of different cultural backgrounds such as their host family or a roommate, which affected their outlook on
the whole experience. The result was negative growth on the DMIS. They all moved back from being more culturally sensitive to being less accepting of cultural difference. The following vignettes come from my observation notes.

Sonalii was frustrated every day for her first month in her original host family’s home. She tried to stay out in the city and would study in cafés so that she was only home in the evenings, from dinnertime on. She was a good sport about it and did not complain, but when we discussed it, she was clearly upset about it and was feeling jealous of others host family experiences. She felt that her experience was better in Nice and she was so happy in her new host family, but when her camera was stolen she was very angry and directed this anger at the French rather than the thieves. These two prolonged negative experiences greatly affected the way Sonalii remembers her experience and her IDI score went from low acceptance to defense/reversal, or one stage.

Sonalii told me that she is disappointed by her host family. The father is opinionated and talks to her and her roommate in very fast French. The host mom is in Brittany, France for the summer and will not be home at all. One of the families 2 children who lives at home cooks for them but Sonalii says that it is always vegetarian food and Sonalii is always hungry. She also told me a story about her Spanish roommate who does not speak French as well as Sonalii. They were all sitting down after dinner and the father was speaking very fast in French at them and started asking her Spanish roommate questions about France. He asked her several questions very quickly, he asked if she liked the food, if she liked the city, if she liked the men, if she liked 'merde' (French word for shit). When her roommate answered 'oui' to every question, the father doubled over laughing that she said she liked 'merde'. Sonalii was horrified and wondered if he had ever made fun of her when she did not understand something. (Paris observations 12:20pm 18 July 2003)

Sonalii decided that she wanted to try to move from her family after 2 weeks but the school said that they would have to put her in a residence hall (with no meals provided) as they did not have any host families on such short notice, so Sonalii stayed with the family despite being uncomfortable and unhappy there. (Paris observations 9:00am 21 July 2003)
When Sonalii moved to Nice for the second month of instruction, she was much happier in her new family. The host mom housed 3 international students and they had nice French meals with wine every night and discussed things together. She said the experience was 100% better for her. (Nice observations 1:00pm 28 August 2003)

The last week of the program in Nice, Sonalii's camera was stolen. It was a new digital camera but worst of all, it had every single picture she had taken of her entire 8 weeks abroad, all of the places she visited, and all of her new friends. She was VERY down about her camera and told me what happened. ‘I went into the church near the school and kneeled down to pray. I had just set my purse down next to me and was praying. When I got ready to leave, I realized that my bag was gone, and nothing else valuable was in it but my digital camera with ALL of my summer pictures. I was praying for God's sake, it is so unfair'. So, she told the people at the church and she put signs up asking whomever stole it to give her back the memory stick, she did not care if they kept the camera, (Nice observations 2:00pm 28 August 2003).

Even back on campus, Sonalii still discussed how her camera being stolen upset her and made her not trust anyone in France. (France Langue Reunion Observations, 6pm 8 October 2003)

Sonalii’s prolonged negative experience with her host family and then her stolen camera, which she thought about for the last week and a half of the program, negatively affected her overall view of people from different cultural backgrounds. Shelly had a similar experience while she was in France. She ended up voluntarily taking a roommate (a Russian student) even though she had paid for a single room. This experience turned into a negative one and Shelly lived with this roommate for most of the summer. While in France, she joked about it and was always full of ‘crazy Russian’ stories, but it was clear from our conversations that the situation bothered her and that she was thinking about it anytime she thought about going back to her room. Shelly’s roommate was in her room for six weeks and she moved back 1 stage from minimization to defense/reversal.

Shelly was not sure about her housing situation. She did not want to live with a family, so of the 5 students in Paris, she was the only one living in a residence hall. She liked her room at the Maison de Mines, a student residence near the center of the city. Originally she was in a double room by herself. She
did not meet anyone in the residence hall as she said they were all French guys who had been living there all year. One day, a Russian woman who was also studying at France Langue knocked on her door and asked to move in with her to save some money, so Shelly agreed in order to have some company. Shelly did not check with the school to see if she would get back half of her money for sharing her room. (Paris observations 1:00pm 18 July 2003)

As the weeks went on, Shelly began to not want to be around her roommate and she told me that she would become irritated by the smallest thing her roommate said or did. Shelly says that her roommate is loud, that she makes fun of her French, and is that she generally not kind to her. Now Shelly wants her room back to herself or she wants some money back if she needs to keep sharing. The school did not know that the students had made this arrangement and said that the Russian student should just pay Shelly directly. (Paris observations 3:30pm 21 July 2003)

As the summer went on, Shelly began to realize that the Russian student had no intention of paying her. When Shelly confronted her, the Russian offered to tutor her in French. Shelly told me that this never really happened, but she did give Shelly her old French textbook, which was helpful. (Nice observations, phone call from Shelly 10:00am 28 August 2003)

Like Sonalii, Shelley perceived her prolonged interactions with someone from a different cultural background as negative, which caused her to lose sensitivity according to the IDI. The impact that these experiences had on the students while they were abroad was evident during the observation period. It was also apparent when the students returned to campus in September that they were still thinking and talking about their negative interactions as they specifically mentioned them to me. Both students had to deal with these unpleasant situations on a long-term basis. The length of the interaction, coupled with the intensity of the experience, seems to have caused the students to have negative growth on the IDI moving them both to feel that their own cultural background is somehow superior to the new cultural environment they were experiencing. This seems to be due to the fact that their living space was affected so that they did not have a refuge from the unpleasant situation and they had to deal with it on a daily basis. Having said this, other students were unhappy with
their living situation and did not like their residence hall or host family, but these students did not have a loss of intercultural sensitivity which leads me to believe that it was the prolonged negative interactions rather than simply being unhappy with the housing situation.

**Daily Negative Experiences did not Affected Intercultural Sensitivity**

The men are awful. Women need to be warned. I wasn't prepared for how bad it really was. It made me very uncomfortable and upset. (Ella post test survey q# 16)

Ella is like many Ohio State Students, attractive and fashion conscious. The students nicknamed her Barbie because she was always dressed up (by their standards) and was very well put together, while the rest of the students were wearing the most comfortable clothes they could find to survive the heat and did not look glamorous at all. When you would be out in town and would see Ella, her style of clothing (usually including a very short skirt) would turn male heads. She was constantly receiving catcalls, men were coming up to her every day and asking her name and asking her for a date. She was very uncomfortable about the attention she received and when I was in town with her, she would mumble back at them 'oh you are disgusting', or 'what is wrong with them?', or just shake her head. She asked the resident directors why she attracted so much more unwanted attention than she did at home and they suggested that perhaps her clothes, combined with her American smile did it. The resident directors have noticed that American students tend to walk down the street in France and smile at passers by the way they would in the U.S. It is also very rare for someone to wear a very short skirt or shorts at all in France. That type of clothing is normally reserved for the beach. Ella said she was not willing to change who she was for the ‘irritating’ men. Despite this constant irritation that Ella
experienced, she had an increase in her intercultural sensitivity and she moved from a high score in the defense/reversal stage to minimization. She was one of the hardest working students in the school and every day during office hours she would do her homework, ask questions about the cultural differences and she made several international friends in her classes. It seems she compartmentalized her negative experience with men, perhaps because she made a conscious decision not to change her style of dress or behavior, and was able to focus on other aspects of the cultural environment. Or perhaps because her irritation was outside of school and the residence hall, she had a safe place to go where she knew she would not be harassed, unlike the other two students.

Students Construction of the Utility of Study Abroad: Goals and Career Aspirations

Students goals, specifically a) whether or not they mentioned wanting to gain cultural understanding before they went abroad or b) if they expressed that they felt they would use the experience professionally upon return seemed to affect their gain in intercultural sensitivity.

The following table shows the frequency with which students stated on the open pre-test questionnaire that one of their goals for study abroad was to gain intercultural understanding. The table shows that 27 out of 37 students cite intercultural understanding as one of their goals and 21 of the students did indeed gain in intercultural competence. Of the 10 students who did not list intercultural understanding as a goal of study abroad, 3 of them gained sensitivity while the other 7 did not.
The data suggests that student goals are very important as far as the learning outcomes they will achieve. The majority of students who consciously went abroad with the goal of learning more about different cultural groups usually gained intercultural understanding, while less than a third of students who did not have that goal gained intercultural sensitivity.

Likewise, after students returned from studying abroad, a common theme ran through the interviews of the students who had exhibited growth in intercultural sensitivity. The students who mentioned that the experience was going to be very useful in their careers and futures all had experienced an increase in sensitivity.

Max is not sure which field he would like to eventually go into, but he expressed in his interview that he feels that the study abroad experience has made him realize that he would like to use the French language and aspects of the cultural environment in the future.

I think the culture may contribute in the future, to (help me) always be in touch with things that have France in it. I have already been more active with French club, this happened this year after Lyon. I am vice president and we normally have a group from Lyon, usually about 3 or 4, and we hang out all the time. This definitely created a bigger role and I want to improve my French. I feel that it has increased my desire to be more in contact with the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Table</th>
<th>had goal of intercultural understanding</th>
<th>did not have goal of intercultural understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>had positive growth</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>did not have positive growth</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Frequency Table - Goal of Cultural Understanding
language and I try to speak outside as well. (Max interview, 9am, 3 December 2003, Nick’s Diner, Columbus, OH)

Annie is going earn her M.A. in French and wants to teach at the high school level. She shares the way she will use her time abroad in her future career:

…living in a country is the best way to teach someone about it and to (be able to) share your experience you need to actually have one yourself I think. That will help me more than anything. (Annie interview, 3 December 2003, 11:15am OSU Library Coffee Shop, Columbus, OH)

Susie is another student studying to become a foreign language teacher. She majored in French and is now completing her teaching certificate. She was the most outspoken about what the experience meant to her professionally.

It was so neat to have the total immersion experience especially because I want to be a foreign language teacher, a French teacher. I was able to pick up all of the colloquial things, I am very much a textbook French speaker and I know exactly how to say something, but I now have slang, so that was great. Being able to talk about the culture of France through first hand knowledge is going to completely improve my teaching. Rather than saying I heard the Eiffel Tower was cool, I can say, you know what, ‘I sat on it!,’ plus the culinary aspects, everything. It has changed a lot of the ways I see things, it has changed the way I view education ten-fold. Education is the biggest thing that I noticed. It is just amazing how they run their classroom, it is a more relaxed atmosphere, and it is more focused on learning and not on teaching to a test, and it is not high stress, it is a very low key classroom. But at the same time, it is reversed, at least the teachers I had, it was more of a holistic view and way of education, I want to integrate that into my classroom. I really hate teaching to a test and I know some of it has to be done but I really want to minimize that and work on having a complete immersion experience, only speaking in French and have a communicative approach. It changed my views on a lot of different things. (Susie interview, 1:30pm 18 December, Nick’s Diner, Columbus, OH)

The students who feel they can use the experience professionally have all exhibited intercultural growth. Perhaps the experience of studying abroad made the students more sensitive and interested in using the experience later in life. Or maybe students went abroad planning to use the experience in their careers and this enabled them to gain sensitivity in order to find applicable uses for their future. It is interesting
to compare the intercultural growth gained by students who see an applicable career use and the increase in sensitivity by students who spent most of their time with peers from different cultural backgrounds. Some students who spent most of their time with international students and had significant intercultural growth also mentioned that the study abroad experience will be helpful in their careers. These findings make it difficult to determine if either spending time with peers or job applicability had an impact on each other or if one might supersede the other. By going back to students Susie and Annie we see that both students spent time primarily with other Americans and yet they both had intercultural growth. Both students also knew going into the experience that studying abroad in France would impact their careers as future French teachers. It seems likely when examining these two students cases that the knowledge that they use their overseas experiences for their careers increased the chance that they would have intercultural growth.

**Negative Case: Not all Students who Saw a Direct Applicability for Their Careers Had Intercultural Growth**

Bethany is a well-traveled international student. Her father is from Malaysia, her mother is from Singapore and that is where Bethany was raised. She wanted to go to college in the USA and has been studying at Ohio State for three years. Bethany travels around the world, going to Australia, different parts of Asia, to the West coast of the U.S. and Europe often, as she meets up with her father while he is on business trips or she plans stops along the way home to Singapore. Bethany expressed a greater desire to involve France in her professional future, but she did not have an increase in intercultural sensitivity on the program. In fact she moved back one stage from the middle of adaptation to the middle of minimization.
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If I was given a choice to do something (professionally) in Europe, now France would be my first choice, if people had asked me before, I would have said England. I am interested in different places in Europe than before. I am more enthusiastic about the French culture, and it makes me really proud that I actually know about it. (Bethany interview, 12pm 13 December 2003, Brennans, Columbus, OH)

It is possible that Bethany’s actual loss of sensitivity may overshadow the benefits she sees from the experience. Or, her negative gain may be due to her minority status and will be discussed with the final key finding.

**Implications of Social Language Use for Depth of Discussion**

Students who spoke English exclusively outside of class had the largest levels of growth in their intercultural sensitivity. I find this assertion counterintuitive. For most of my professional career in international education over the past ten years I have been a staunch believer in the idea that students who speak the language where they study will be able to learn more about the host culture. I also believed that students going to France should try to speak French every chance they get to learn the nuances of the language and cultural environment. Before the data was analysed I had observed that students who spoke French more often seemed to be gaining much from the experience and I worried about the students who only spoke in English. I now understand the meaning of 'the data speaking' because while I was analyzing my various sources of data, I was very surprised to see this pattern appear. The seven students who had the most intercultural growth had this to say about their French Language use while abroad:

On a daily basis, I think, outside the classroom, my French speaking was really lacking. Its kinda hard when you have such an easy time speaking English, and to use the language that you are still learning, we did try a few times, we would go for a couple hours, consciously trying, but it wasn't every day, and it seems like as soon as like we had a hard time saying a something, we switched back to English, that’s how it worked. (Max interview, 9am, 3 December 2003, Nick’s Diner, Columbus, OH)
Not much, class and that was it. It was hard because we had such a diverse group, really the only common language we had was English, and everyone was pretty much at the same level of English, but we were all at different French levels". (Finn interview, 11am 23 December 2003, Jimmy John’s, Columbus, OH)

It depended on who I was with, if Susie and I went to visit Florence, even though Florence spoke English, she knew we wanted to speak French, and she only spoke French to us, I mean not counting class, an hour a day regularly, because Max always tried to make us all speak in French. (Skye interview, 2pm 16 December 2003, Nick’s Diner, Columbus, OH)

I spoke French whenever we went places, and we spoke French to each other at times, but not as much as I would have wanted. I mean if I had this experience to do all over again I would have rather have gone completely by myself, I mean it was hard because I loved hanging out with those girls. We became really good friends, and I wouldn't have wanted to not spend time with them because I got relationships, good friends out of that. But I would have much rather spoken a lot more French than I did. (Jane interview, 12pm 3 December 2003, OSU Library Coffee Shop, Columbus, OH)

Not a lot! (laughed) I spoke 4 hours in the morning in class and then I spoke maybe another half an hour per day, the rest of the time I spoke English. (Sophie interview, 2pm, 17 December 2003, Nick’s Diner, Columbus, OH)

Most days I didn't spend nearly as much time speaking French as I could have. I spent some time in class speaking French, of course, and occasionally before class I would spend 20 minutes to a half hour speaking with one of my classmates and sometimes between classes, it depended. But usually by the time I got out of class I was so like overwhelmed with it all from just concentrating so hard, it was so hard to listen to the French for 4-6 hours a day, I was like whew, okay, I need to turn my brain off for a little bit. Then I was speaking English all the time. (Maggie interview, 3pm 21 December 2003, Brennans, Columbus, OH)

Despite the fact that these students rarely spoke French outside of class, they all showed remarkable growth of at least one whole DMIS stage. Perhaps by not trying to use French they were able to discuss more in-depth issues without a language barrier. When I began to see the pattern of such large amounts of intercultural growth among students who had primarily spoken in English, I went back to my observation notes to look for clues about why this would happen. From my observations it appeared that
students asked different kinds of questions in English than they did in French. They seemed more comfortable asking questions about cultural differences and talking about more complex issues such as politics or family values than they would have if they tried the same conversation in French.

The students come to office hours every day with stories about what they learned from their conversations with their teachers, classmates, and people in the residence. Maggie always asks questions about the culture, why do you close your stores at lunch? Why does no one have a car? Why do French people always argue or debate with you? Sometimes the international students have a hard time expressing themselves in English but usually they can explain things quite well. By the end of the summer the students would tease one another about 'becoming French' when they were running late or would only plan to do a few things per day, or they would call the international 'honorary Americans' because they acted just like our students when they were in a rush, or frustrated that the shops were closed. The students also ask each other questions about their government policy about political events, usually the war in Iraq. They then sat around talking about it with each other in English discussing the various perspectives. (Lyon observations, 12-2pm 30 July 2003, Benjamin Delessert)

Some of the students who were determined to speak French all the time were very focused on grammar and getting the expressions and accent right and they did not show the same kind of intercultural growth or understanding that students who spoke in English did. Also, the students who spoke only in French and spent time with native French speakers asked different types of questions, about music, about their studies, or slang expressions. They did not talk about cultural values or get into discussions about politics.

Anna and Quincy only speak in French. They will stop a conversation or switch topics if they do not understand the French being spoken before they will switch to English to clarify the meaning. They spend hours every day with the students in the residence. They talk about TV shows or music and they ask for help with their homework from the French students. They also spend a lot of time learning French slang and swear words and expressions. They do not ask the same types of in-depth questions that the other group does nor have I ever heard them discuss politics or world events in French. (Lyon observations, 6-8pm 28 July 2003, L’Escale)
The finding is a surprising one. I had expected students who spoke exclusively in French to have more actual contact with the host culture and to have the chance to speak to more locals. My hypothesis was that students who could speak French well enough to carry on a conversation would be students who were at an advanced level of French and that they would have a better understanding of the cultural environment of France. This does not seem to have been the case. Rather, it seems that English is more prevalent and powerful than I had realized and most students had no problem finding international students who were fluent in English with whom they would spend time. The students who had the most intercultural growth did so speaking almost exclusively in English. These students also likely knew less about French cultural environment to begin with, so they had more to learn than the students with a good grasp on the French language which may show as a higher level of growth on the IDI.

On the other hand, I may have hypothesized correctly, the students with better language skills likely do know more about the French cultural environment which was one of the reasons they asked fewer cultural questions of their peers. The fluent speakers believed that they already understood the way in which the French culture worked and did not want to ask questions of their peers. Or, it may have to do more with the fact that the Americans who were fluent French speakers lived in the residence hall with more French students rather than a mix of different nationalities and so they were exposed less to different cultural differences and only saw the differences between American and French cultural groups.
Negative Case: The Effect of the Desire to Speak French on Intercultural Growth

Nicholas however gave mixed reporting. He said he only spoke in French to his host and he always spoke French to international students, but then he later says that he usually ended up speaking in English to the internationals because they preferred it. He also started spending time with another OSU student saying it was so nice because she spoke English. Nonetheless, he spoke more French than many students and yet he still had large intercultural growth.

Class was always, always French, but not on breaks, (laughs) breaks were English time and everyone was glad for it. I spoke French as soon as I got home and I always spoke French at dinner and dinner was an hour or hour and a half. Plus three and a half hours in class and then more than an hour and a half in the evening because she would pretty much try to get us to speak French the whole time. But she spoke such great English sometimes she would get a little frustrated and she would say 'just what is it in English?' (laughs). I spoke a lot of French, it was weird because it was the people from the other countries were usually the ones trying to get me to speak English (laughs). What is really strange is that my friends and I spoke English. There were times when I wanted to speak French, but they didn't want to because they didn't know it that well, but they spoke English really well. For a lot of people at the school, English was the international language, I saw Germans speaking English with other Germans, or Germans and Spanish or English and Spanish, or whatever, because that was the only language that we all shared. I almost always would ask people if they wanted to talk in French or English but there was literally only one person who was more comfortable in French that I met, maybe 2 at the school, but otherwise we always spoke in English. (Nicholas Interview, 26 Dec 2003, 11am Starbucks in N. Canton, OH)

These students speaking in English to him may have allowed him to have enough experience with cultural difference to gain sensitivity. Nicholas wanted to practice his French all of the time but he ended up speaking English more with his peers and French more in class and with his host mother. He used English with all of his friends who were from different cultural backgrounds, which is likely why he has such an increase in intercultural sensitivity.
The Qualitatively Different Intercultural Experiences of Minority Students

Minority students (any student identifying as a racial or ethnic minority and international students) had negative growth in the area of intercultural sensitivity. The final finding was a surprise to me. I had expected the minority students to feel comfortable in France with its cultural diversity as they would not be the only person of African, Asian, or Hispanic descent on the metro, in their classes, or in the residence hall as often happens in their OSU experience. I also believed that these students were used to getting along in the majority cultural environment in the U.S., and I thought they already possessed sensitivity that the majority students lacked due to the need for daily interactions in Ohio with cultural difference. Likewise in the observations abroad the minority students seemed to be adjusting and interacting with cultural difference in similar ways to the majority students. However, when the post-test IDI scores were in, it was evident that these students had different reactions to cultural difference than those I had remembered from my observations. The minority participants included two African-American students, one Hispanic student, one Indian American student, and two international students, one from Singapore and one from Malaysia. Of the six minority students on the program all but one student had negative growth on the IDI and corresponding DMIS.

Frequency Table Showing Minority Students Post-test Findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive growth IDI/DMIS</th>
<th>Negative growth IDI/DMIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority Students</td>
<td>1 out of 6 total</td>
<td>5 out of 6 total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Frequency Table - Minority Students Post-Test IDI Findings
Even more interesting than their decrease in intercultural sensitivity after the study abroad program was the amount they lost. Each of the five students moved a whole stage back from where they were on the pre-test. Again, I went back to my observation data after the findings showed this surprising information and I found some comments from students about their ethnicity in France.

Quincy (an African American student) commented to me that it was hard for him to know where to tell people he was from when they asked. He said that when he tells them he is American he loses his African heritage, but it sounds dumb to say I am from African America (laughs)! (Lyon observations, 8pm 8 July 2003, L’Escale)

Zona (an Indian-American student) said that she was mistaken for a Moroccan, "that was creative", she said, "I had never heard that one before, I can actually see it"! (Zona interview, 1pm 16 December 2003, Nick’s Diner, Columbus, OH)

Bethany (an international student from Singapore) said, "when I was in France I said 'je suis Americanie' (laughs), I am American! It was just easier otherwise they were like 'well why are you with the Americans?' (Bethany interview, 12pm 13 December 2003, Brennans, Columbus, OH)

Delaney was most bothered by her loss of African American culture. She shared her experience in her interview:

What did get on my nerves were the blatant questions. I am not used to people asking me 'what race are you?' and then actually having to talk to a lot of people and almost fighting with them to tell them what race I was, because nobody believed me! It is the most annoying thing. I told them that I was a black American when they asked. No, they didn't believe me, they told me I was Puerto Rican, I am Arab, or I am Indian, those were my 3 choices. It was a bit frustrating, after the umpteenth time it happened when going to church with Kim, you have all these French people coming in and that is one of their first questions, I would say 'hi my name is Delaney’ and does it really matter what race I am? I was like,' I can't believe you are actually arguing!' It wasn't a Mormon thing because the people asking me had been brought in by the missionaries and it also happened once when we were up sight seeing and they kept asking me and they thought I did not understand them, so they kept asking Bethany and Annie and after that, it still didn't work. We got on the metro with the old man and he asked Bethany again, he was guessing everyone's race and they knew Bethany was Chinese, you guys are American and you, you are Puerto Rican and I was like, no I am not. I think they must think every American is white and then you get people from other countries
coming to America, so everyone else is an immigrant, like how the black people are in France. That is the only rationale I could think of. That is definitely something that hit me. Before I left, I was so excited about going to France, all of these people of different cultures and more racial diversity, and I thought it was going to be so great, but by the end I was like, I swear to God if I don't get out of this country, I am going to smack the next French person that comes up to me. (Delaney interview, 2:30pm 18 December, Nick’s Diner, Columbus, OH)

While Delaney's quote articulates it the most clearly, each of the quotes above illustrates that the minority students temporarily lost their minority cultural status. This seems to have affected their ability to interact with cultural difference and they all lost sensitivity as a result of the experience. It is possible that minority students are used to knowing where they fit into the majority cultural group in the U.S. and in the minority cultural group of which they are a part. But it appears that the added cultural interaction with a totally new and different cultural group caused this negative movement on the IDI score. The minority students also noted that it is not usual to get into a discussion about race in the U.S. but in France people talked about race, race relations, and problems with ethnic immigrant groups. This made students feel uncomfortable as they did not expect to be discussing such issues in France.

There is another possibility about why they appear to have lost sensitivity, which will be discussed more fully in the next chapter, and that is related to the IDI instrument instructions. In the introduction you are asked to consider the ‘different’ cultural group they have most contact with as the ‘other cultural group’ in order to answer the questions on the instrument. In the case of minority students, it is likely that for the pre-test, the ‘other’ cultural group is that of the majority and for the post-test the ‘other’ cultural group became the French culture. They may feel better about interacting with the other cultural groups at home because they have had a lot of
practice with it, but may feel less sure about their status in French culture, which then appeared as a loss of sensitivity according to the instrument.

Negative Case: Identifying With the Host Culture Affected Minority Students

Intercultural Growth

The one minority student who had an increase in intercultural sensitivity was an international student from Malaysia of Muslim faith. Austin moved from defense/reversal to minimization on his post-test.

At dinner one night, he asked other students if any of them had experienced any anti-American sentiment since they had been in France for the past two weeks. The conversation that ensued was interesting as Austin commented that his host family had made derogatory remarks about past Americans who had lived with them, but they liked Austin and said how much better it was to have him than the Americans (Paris observations, 8pm 21 July 2003, Ile St. Louis Restaurant)

At dinner Austin relayed this story adding that he was sure that the other Americans had been 'jerks' and that they did not sound like anyone he knew in America. He said that he felt more comfortable with people knowing he is Muslim in France than in the U.S. From Austin's comments we learned that he felt uncomfortable revealing his faith in the U.S. and it was easier for him to be himself in France. Since September 11, 2001, the American media has put a focus on the Muslim faith and Austin has been sensitive to this. His growth in intercultural sensitivity could have been aided by the Anti-American sentiment, which he felt was not directed at him, or due to the fact that there are many Muslims living in Paris and he was not as much of a minority as he usually is in Columbus, Ohio.
Summary of Qualitative Findings

As I mentioned in the introduction, the quantitative data analysis and findings greatly helped my interpretation of the qualitative data. I might not have ever seen two of the most important findings about how English language helped and minority status hindered intercultural sensitivity if I had only collected qualitative data. But, the quantitative findings let me know to look specifically for students who spoke mainly in English as well as to examine the minority students more closely.

The analysis of the qualitative data has shown both expected and unexpected findings. The qualitative data helped to give a more full picture of which factors affected students study abroad experience as well as the factors that encouraged growth on the IDI and DMIS. The observations and interviews showed that several factors affected students intercultural growth positively including extended intercultural interactions with international peers, having the goal of gaining cultural understanding before departure and seeing an applicable use in their future career for their experience, and finally, the chance to speak in English to people with different cultural backgrounds about cultural difference. Two factors were found to decrease intercultural sensitivity and these are prolonged negative experiences with international people, and racial and ethnic minority students who lost their cultural identity in France.

These findings are very exciting and will be useful to study abroad administrators as they plan experiences for their students. The findings changed some of the long-held beliefs I have held in my ten years as an international education professional, specifically the way that speaking in English can help students intercultural sensitivity as well as the challenges minority students face while abroad.
Chapter six will analyze these findings further as well as compare the qualitative findings with those from chapter four, the quantitative data analysis.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS
FOR RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

I have learned much from my students about the experiences and factors that affected their intercultural sensitivity. This chapter will present an overview of the intersection of the quantitative and qualitative findings of my study. A discussion and further examination of the findings from the quantitative and qualitative data presented in chapters four and five will help the reader to understand the importance of the findings. The implications for practice will be discussed as will the limitations of this study. Finally, recommendations for future research based on the findings will be suggested.

Review of Research Findings

The statistical analysis showed that students who had the treatment (the pre-departure orientation course) did not have significant increases on their post-test scores when compared to students who were not in the treatment group. The IDI pre and post-test comparison is just one way that we can assess the affects of the pre-departure course. The observations and interviews allowed me to see if it appeared that the course affected students intercultural sensitivity. The qualitative data revealed changes in the use of language by students. During the observation period, it was clear
that the treatment students (group 1) were gaining intercultural sensitivity from their comments. It was evident that they were using the treatment material to make sense of their experiences. They talked about the experience using terms we had discussed in class, including ‘mindsets’, ‘perspective taking’, and ‘cultural understanding’.

The non-treatment students (group 2) used different language to discuss their experiences, but often they were expressing similar concepts, such as ‘I used to believe things worked in a specific way’, ‘I can see where they are coming from’, and ‘they do things differently here’. Students from both groups exhibited change in their thinking about cultural differences, but it did not appear that the students in group 1, who had taken the treatment, were exhibiting more growth than the non-treatment group 2, rather they were discussing issues using language they had learned in the treatment.

Group 3 was tested to control for maturity, which determined if students naturally increase their intercultural development with age, further language study, or current world events. The statistical analysis showed no significant difference on post-test scores for students who studied abroad in France during Summer Quarter 2003 when compared with students who did not study abroad. In fact, between 60-70% of all three group's post test scores increased, regardless of their location in France or the U.S. Observations occurred in France, therefore observational data is not available for the U.S. based group. However, the interviews and post-test questionnaire analysis shows that participants from group 3 also had significant increases in intercultural sensitivity, despite staying in Ohio for the summer. Furthermore, all students who were interviewed in groups 1 and 2 expressed the belief that they had experienced
significant intercultural growth even when the IDI post-test scores did not indicate any growth, or showed a loss of sensitivity.

The statistical analysis showed that two different conditions increased the likelihood that students would have a significant increase in sensitivity: 1) having parents who have had overseas experiences and 2) being non-minority students (minority students are defined as racial and ethnic minorities as well as international students). Students with one or both of these characteristics showed significant increases on their post-test scores when compared to students who reported that their parents had not been abroad or who identified as minority students.

The qualitative data analysis allowed us to see the other factors that encouraged intercultural growth including: 1) significant intercultural interactions with international peers, 2) not having prolonged negative experiences with international people, 3) having the goal of gaining cultural understanding and students seeing an applicable use in their future career for their experience, 4) the chance to speak with international peers in English on a variety of cultural topics, and finally, 5) being members of the majority race and ethnic groups in the US. These qualitative findings show overlap with the quantitative analysis in the area of majority students having greater growth than minority students.

Discussion of Findings

Had I conducted this study for another purpose I might not have been as enthusiastic about the findings. I am an international educator, I have long believed that study abroad makes a real difference in students level of intercultural sensitivity because I have seen students change from their time abroad, heard them speak about
the experience upon their return, and watched them make career and life decisions partly due to their study abroad experiences. As a study abroad coordinator, I have also seen students have a hard time adjusting due to the differences in culture that they were not expecting. These students adjust with time, but many current study abroad programs last just 6-8 weeks, which did not seem to offer enough time for students to have the chance to adjust to the cultural differences. This led me to believe that with more pre-departure preparation and orientation students would have a better chance to adjust with greater ease on their short program abroad. I also became familiar with the DMIS and IDI and believed that I would be able to accurately measure students’ levels of intercultural sensitivity. When the initial data came in and showed that the treatment course, which I helped to create based on the literature showing that training encouraged intercultural adjustment, did not have an impact on the students IDI scores, and that even studying abroad did not have a significant difference, it was disheartening. If I had conducted this study for an exploratory or other purpose, I might have stopped there. Fortunately, I did not stop analyzing data there, because it is my dissertation. The data that came with the second set of analysis began to show some significant and important findings.

**Discrepancies Between the Quantitative and Qualitative Research Findings**

The quantitative findings showed no significant gains by students who had taken the treatment course or by students who studied abroad when compared with students who neither took the treatment nor studied abroad. These findings may look the way they do due to diffusion of the treatment in France, making the course look less effective, or due to the unusual control group. However, the quantitative findings did show that 70% of each group had intercultural growth and it was interesting to
delve into the qualitative data which shows the factors that appear to have affected intercultural growth. Additionally, the IDI scores are only one way to examine learning that occurred from the treatment and the qualitative data showed students using the course material to make sense of their overseas experiences. There was one finding addressed in the quantitative data that did not surface in the qualitative findings, the idea that the level of parents’ international experiences would help predict which students would have more intercultural growth. Not one student mentioned in interviews that they felt differently about cultures due to their parents’ views and experiences, but this factor was statistically significant.

Some of the findings of this research could have been predicted based on the past research and literature that exists about the subject of study abroad and college student development. Other findings were unexpected as they either are contrary to past findings, or add knowledge to the existing literature where it was previously silent. These findings will now be discussed further.

Findings that were expected based on past studies

Standardized Tests do not Show Increase in Sensitivity

When examining research questions 1 and 2, which aimed to learn if the treatment or study abroad experience encouraged growth in intercultural sensitivity, it was expected that the findings from the standardized test would show little growth while the questionnaires and interviews would show growth based on the literature. From the review of the literature in Chapter 2, we know that many standardized tests show little correlation between study abroad and change (Kauffmann, 1992). I knew to expect that it was possible that most standardized tests would not show growth
even if students reported that they had changed on the post-test surveys and in interviews. However, the IDI, which is also a standardized instrument has repeatedly shown growth in study abroad students’ intercultural sensitivity (Klak, 2003). This is part of the reason why this particular instrument was chosen. In this case, students did not show intercultural sensitivity increases on an instrument which seems to accurately measure such growth. Students have been told that study abroad is a life changing experience, and it seems that they believe that change has occurred whether or not their IDI score backs them up. When given the opportunity to write or talk about their experience, almost all of the participants reported growth. This finding from the literature initially helped me to decide to use the IDI and to conduct a mixed method study, because I wanted to understand which factors caused intercultural growth and to see why it might not be measured by the instrument. I also wanted to learn whether students perceived an intercultural change and which factors they felt caused their growth or decrease in sensitivity.

Experiences with Cultural Difference Increase Sensitivity

When examining research question 3, which sought to identify the factors that caused the intercultural growth experienced by students, it was predicted that students who spent time with people of different cultural backgrounds from their own would encourage them to become more culturally sensitive. The Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) was created by Milton Bennett in 1986 as a way to explain the ways in which people make meaning of cultural differences. In academic and corporate settings, he found that people dealt with intercultural difference in predictable ways as they became more culturally competent (IDI Manual, 2001). The assumption is that as a person’s experience of cultural difference becomes more
complex, competence in intercultural relations increases. Based on this model, I hypothesized that the students in France would have more of an opportunity than their peers in Ohio to develop a more complex understanding of cultural difference by interacting with people from different cultures on a daily basis. I had not predicted that students who stayed in Ohio might also have interactions with people of different cultures, which would afford them the same intercultural growth. Along the same vein, Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) have found that people must be interested in other cultures and have a willingness to modify their behavior in order to become more interculturally competent. Most students who want to study abroad are interested in different cultures or they would not have chosen to go abroad. However, some study abroad students may not be interested in different cultures but may have chosen to go abroad based on a friend’s recommendation, with encouragement of their parents, for the adventure of travel, or for language acquisition. Likewise, students who did not go abroad may be very interested in other cultures but are unable to study abroad for financial, personal, academic, or other reasons. Interestingly, it was not general interaction that appears to have prompted intercultural growth, for example interactions with a host family member. Rather they had the greatest increase in sensitivity when they interacted with international peers. 

**International peers greatly impact intercultural growth**

It could also have been predicted that students would be impacted by their peers abroad as it is well documented in the literature that the peer group greatly influences college aged students’ development (Chickering, 1969). While the specific case of American students studying abroad and becoming friends with one another as well as other international students has not been studied, the college student
development literature about American students on American campuses supports the finding that the peers would have a large impact on my participants. In my study, students spent even more time than usual with their peers because they did not have other demands on their time such as work, family, or extra curricular activities which normally occupy some of their time on OSU’s campus. My students spent 4-5 hours a days in class Monday through Friday, and the rest of the day, nights, and weekends, with one another and their international friends in the residence halls. From my observation data, it appears that these international peers helped my participants to learn about cultural differences in a comfortable space. The students did not feel threatened in these interactions as they might have discussing them with someone older, or a professor, and the time with their peers allowed them the opportunity to ask questions about different cultures as they got to know their peers better. My students often talked to each other about the new aspects of Magreban, French, or Chinese culture that they were learning.

Students Goals and Career Plans are Linked to Sensitivity

Another research finding that could have been expected given the literature is the way that students’ goals for the program and their belief that the study abroad experience is useful for their future career, affected their intercultural sensitivity. We know that among other things, student expectations play a large role in intercultural competence gains (Kauffmann, 1992). If students expected to learn about cultural difference and gain cultural understanding, and listed this as a goal of their overseas experience, then it was more likely that the students would have a gain in these areas. Students’ career goals and vocational interest can also be affected by studying abroad. Sometimes students are introduced to areas of study or fields that they did not know
existed or they chose to study abroad because they believe that it will help their odds of finding employment (Carlson, 1990). Ninety-Five percent of the students surveyed in the Carlson study believed that they would be able to use their international experience in their future professional lives. There is an interesting link between the existing literature findings and my finding from the interview data that showed students who gained intercultural competence were the only ones who talked about using the study abroad experience as part of their future careers.

The idea of cultural capital was first introduced by Bourdieu. According to this concept, academic credentials and qualifications create a cultural competence which gives the students status (Halsey, 1997). It is likely that students have gained cultural capital from their study abroad experience. It is possible that students who experienced a significant increase in intercultural sensitivity realized they had changed and were looking for ways to incorporate their experience into their lives. Students may realize that they have invested time to gain these credentials while abroad and want to use their experiences to help them get ahead in their careers. In fact some students may have gone abroad specifically for this resume-building affect to help them in their futures.

How Reflection Affected Students Learning

David Kolb’s model of learning styles has been criticized for not including enough information about the power of reflection (Smith, 2001). It is also believed in the field of international education that students often learn the most from their overseas experience once they have returned and had time to reflect on the experience (Boud, 1985). Several students mentioned in their interview that they had not realized how much they had learned from their time abroad until they talked about it with me.
While it is impossible in this study to judge how much students might have learned from their experience in France if they had not been interviewed, it would be interesting to compare students with structured reflection to compare their learning.

The Findings that were Unexpected Based on Past Literature

Negative Experiences Decrease Students Sensitivity

The literature is silent about this finding, but one might expect that the negative experiences students had would not help them to develop more intercultural sensitivity. The data showed that students who had prolonged negative interactions also had negative growth interculturally. These students dealt with unpleasant situations with international people for the majority of their time abroad. Many other students also had negative interactions but they were not prolonged experiences. The students seem to have been negatively affected by their prolonged experiences and now see the whole culture abroad through the unpleasant interactions.

More Intercultural Training Did Not Increase Sensitivity

The literature reviewed about expatriate experiences with training lead us to this unexpected result. Cross-cultural training has been linked to improved work performance and adjustment to the culture for expatriate employees (Kealey, 1996). Cross-cultural training programs improve adjustment of global managers (Black, 1992). Because research has shown that the more training experience expatriates have, the more sensitivity they gain and the better they adjust, it seemed that the same might be true for U.S. college students. However, the findings show that students who had the treatment or extra training experience showed no more growth than students who did not have the same training. This is an interesting finding because it would
appear that the students who volunteered to take the treatment might have had a propensity to be more interested in intercultural relations than students who did not take the course. It is possible that the expatriate employees realized that they needed to learn new skills in order to be a manager in a new country while students were unsure what to expect and considered the treatment as a class and not as training for their experience. It is also possible that there is an age or gender difference at play. Most expatriate employees are in mid-career and much older than my participants and 80% of expatriates are men, whereas 70% of the study participants are women (Black, 1992).

Study Abroad Did Not Increase Intercultural Sensitivity

The next unexpected finding was that studying abroad does not significantly increase intercultural sensitivity when compared with the students in this project who did not study abroad. It is widely agreed in the literature that students who study abroad learn and grow intellectually and personally from this experience. The research on the outcomes of studying abroad for college students indicates that study abroad has an impact on students in several areas including expanded international perspectives. Study abroad helps students develop an international perspective in three ways: their perceptions of their host culture, perceptions of their own culture, and their overall global understanding (Kauffmann, 1992). These areas make up part of the concept of intercultural sensitivity. Bhawuk & Brislin (1992) suggest that in order to be effective in another culture, people must be interested in other cultures, be sensitive enough to notice cultural differences, plus possess a willingness to modify their behavior as an indication of respect for the people of other cultures. In this study, ‘intercultural sensitivity’ is used to refer to these concepts. Additionally, Astin’s
research reported in *What Matters in College* (1993) that study abroad experiences positively impacted student growth in cultural awareness. Like the students in the literature, my participants who studied abroad did develop intercultural sensitivity but they did not develop more sensitivity than students who did not study abroad.

**Unusual Control Group**

I would like to point out to the reader the unusual nature of the control group, group 3. In addition to being a small group and losing one third of the respondants, the findings in this study might look different with a more representative and larger control group. A relatively small number of French classes are taught on the Columbus campus during summer quarter and most of the courses taught are at the 100 level, to help students complete their language requirements. For these reasons, most of my participants were in the lower level language classes and I only obtained usable data from 6 students. The students in group 3 were also all starting off in a higher DMIS stage than the students in groups 1 and 2. The majority of participants in group 3 were in Minimization (83.2%) while only 35.2% and 30% of groups 1 and 2 respectively were in this stage. Another anomaly of the control group was that two of the students expressed that the only reason they were taking French courses was because it was necessary for their careers. These students would need to be researching and speaking in French as part of their professional daily lives. As the findings showed, students who can see that the study abroad experience will be beneficial in their future careers had more intercultural growth than other students, so it is possible that intercultural growth actually follows a career goal or need. For these reasons I believe that the findings of this group may make the other findings look less significant than they would have appeared with a larger and more random control
group. Additionally, two-thirds of the participants who stayed in Ohio this summer reported significant intercultural experiences with peers. They described these interactions in terms as intense as a study abroad experience, so this interaction may have caused their increase in sensitivity. Their intense interactions with internationals might be anomalous when compared with most students who enrol in beginning language courses.

**Speaking English to Internationals Greatly Increased Sensitivity**

A big surprise that adds to the existing knowledge base came from the qualitative data analysis. The largest overall increases in intercultural sensitivity occurred in students who reported speaking almost exclusively in English while they were abroad. Many studies show that language acquisition is one of the main areas of growth for students who study abroad. Students are able to communicate better in the host language and perform better in language classes. Historically, most students who studied abroad did so to gain fluency in a second language (Carlson, 1990). In addition to studying language acquisition from courses overseas, studies have been conducted to examine if host family experiences, out of class experiences (Laubscher, 1994), or other factors have contributed to language learning (Crust, 1998). The overseas students findings are often compared to groups who did not study abroad but continued taking language classes on campus. In most cases, study abroad students acquire more language proficiency than students who do not go abroad (Terrell, 1982). These studies only examine how much language students acquired during study abroad programs, but do not compare students who spoke in the target foreign language versus those who spoke in English. Some study abroad programs will not even send students abroad unless they are fluent enough in the target language to take
classes conducted in a foreign language (Middlebury College, personal conversation, 2000). Another study (Wilkinson, 1998) shared student perceptions of study abroad. The students, who studied in France, felt that their cultural miscommunications came from cultural differences rather than their ability to speak French. This study is supported by my findings in that students did not express language ability as a problem or reason for intercultural sensitivity to be gained or lost. These are interesting findings given the trend to send students to more non-traditional study abroad locations such as Asia, India, the Middle East, where students do not attempt to learn the language but study the new culture with English instruction.

Another way of describing this dynamic is mutuality or exchange of culture. The students who spent most of their out-of-class time with international peers and spoke English gained the most intercultural sensitivity according to the IDI. The OSU students who spoke in English got into in-depth conversations about culture and were often observed asking questions about how French, North African, or Asian cultures influenced their peers actions and belief systems. At the same time, these students were often explaining how American culture impacted their decisions and beliefs. It is possible that these students were interested in learning about the others cultures and the interactions were an exchange for both parties. It is also possible that the internationals wanted to practice their English skills and this was the reason for their interest in the conversations and ultimately friendships. Hence, the exchange was productive for both parties.
Students Who are Members of U.S. Racial or Ethnic Minority Groups Who Studied Abroad Lost Sensitivity According to the IDI Instrument

The finding that minority students had less intercultural growth than majority students was also not expected. Less than 20% of all students who study abroad are minorities, and while there has been some research conducted on this group, there has not been much in the literature to compare their intercultural development with majority students. Many minority students already live in an intercultural world and need to fit into a different way of communicating than the culture in which they grew up. I had hypothesized that these students would have more intercultural growth because they have had more experience and practice than other, majority students. In a previous study conducted using the IDI on a population of medical trainees, minority and foreign-born international students initially scored higher than their American counterparts and they also exhibited the most growth (Altshuler, 2003). My interviews with the students showed that most minority students had to explain their nationality or race and were constantly asked which race they were while they were in France. This is not a common experience for them in the U.S. as race is not often discussed, it is assumed that it is obvious or evident by seeing the person. Needing to adjust to this third culture, beyond their own culture and the American majority culture seemed to challenge these students’ views about cultural difference. Perhaps they were accustomed to moving between two cultures comfortably and knew where they fit into each one, but in France they were faced with new challenges of identity. They were identified as Americans rather than as an African American or Hispanic American or Indian American and this loss of cultural identity may have caused the students confusion resulting in a decrease in intercultural sensitivity on the DMIS as
measured by the IDI. Their definition of personal identity was challenged which required them to rework their own thinking about culture and identity.

**Weaknesses of the IDI instrument for Use with Minority Cultures**

I believe that the IDI is a very useful instrument and there is data to support its statistical validity. There is one aspect of the instrument that is worth to note. The instrument may have been a weak link in this study when examining minority students’ experiences with difference, as it seems not to have accurately captured their experiences. When the IDI pre-test was administered, students were told to think of the experiences they had with cultural groups with whom they have the most contact. For some students, this means the Mexican immigrants who work at McDonalds with them, for others it is the international students in their residence hall, for others it might mean the majority population of white students on campus. As instructed in the IDI manual, when students took the post-test, they were also told to think of the intercultural group with whom they had had the most interaction. It is highly likely that their two comparison groups were different for our minority students. The first time they took the instrument, most of them used the majority culture as their comparison group, but the second time, they primarily used the French culture, as they had just returned from two months abroad. It is possible then, that they actually have different levels of intercultural sensitivity when thinking about the majority culture and when thinking about French culture. The way the instructions for the instrument are given, it is not possible for students to distinguish the groups they used. Fortunately, through contact and interactions with my students I was able to ask them these questions and come to the hypothesis that they had used separate groups in the pre and post-test and this may have affected their scores and my findings.
Parents International Experiences Increased Students Chance for Growth

The last surprising finding emerged from the quantitative data: students showed more intercultural growth if their parents had been overseas before. I examined this factor because I knew from the literature that students who study abroad tend to be sons and daughters of well-traveled parents. Children of parents who have lived abroad and speak other languages are also over-represented in the study abroad statistics (Krane, 1997). But the literature did not speak to the finding that these students had an advantage from their parents’ experience which allowed them to have more intercultural growth than students whose parents had not been abroad. On the other hand, despite the pre-departure preparations for the minority students, the finding that they had the hardest time gaining intercultural sensitivity abroad is troubling. Few of the parents of these students had traveled abroad before, and so that factor did not support their chances for intercultural growth. This makes me believe that some of the predictors of students gaining intercultural sensitivity comes more from their past experiences at home and their background and less from the orientation training they receive before going abroad.

Time with International Peers had Largest Impact on Intercultural Sensitivity

The largest gain in intercultural sensitivity in the participants was not due to extra pre-departure preparation or even due to the fact that they studied abroad. Rather, the frequent interactions that the students had with their peers from a different culture, including in some cases, romantic relationships with peers from another culture, caused them to have more growth than other students in the study. Specifically, when students interacted with their peers from different cultures and spoke in English, they learned more about the other persons’ culture and their own as they asked and
answered questions and discussed differences. These interactions and discussions in English seem to be the main reason why some students had such large growth when other students had little or no intercultural growth given the same conditions.

**Considering the Finding, What Should be Done Differently?**

There are many implications for practice based on the findings of this research. We can assume that students who participated in my study are similar to other students who study abroad through Ohio State University, as 80% of students who go abroad participate in similar summer programs. Along the same lines, my population of students looks similar to the national average of students who study abroad, so recommendations about ways to increase students’ levels of intercultural sensitivity can be made from this study. The readers can decide transferability to wider audiences and other contexts themselves.

**Encourage International (Intercultural) Peer Contact**

If I could only make one recommendation based on the findings of my study, it would be to encourage intercultural contact among student peers. It is evident just how beneficial international peer interactions are to students’ intercultural growth. Many times when programs were being created at OSU the question would come up whether or not there was any opportunity for students to interact with local students in-country. Usually the answer was no, there would not be enough time, it was a vacation period for local students, the classes would be taught in English, about a specific region and would not be helpful to local students. For all of these reasons there were no plans to encourage intercultural interaction among peers. My data shows that peer intercultural interactions are one of the top ways to encourage
intercultural growth in students and so I would urge every study abroad provider and coordinator to find ways for their American students to have regular interactions with peers from the host country or any other country. Many students are too shy or afraid of their language skills to approach other students and so it would be best for these interactions to be a regular component of the program.

**Students Gain Sensitivity from Short-Term Programs**

Over half (51.6%) of U.S. students currently study abroad for less than a semester (Open Doors, 2003). The shorter lengths of overseas sojourns has concerned researchers who believe that students need to be abroad for a long period of time in order to gain the maximum benefits of their experience. My findings have shown that students can have significant gains in intercultural sensitivity in a short time, in this case in as little as a two-month time frame. I recommended that intercultural sensitivity should be stated as a goal for shorter-term study abroad programs because students can achieve this goal.

**Send Students to Non-Traditional Locations with Discussions in English**

More students than ever before are going to more locations on the globe than they have at any time in the past. These programs typically afford students the chance to study in more exotic study abroad locations, and often students cannot speak the local language fluently, if at all. In most cases, these students have their academic courses conducted in English, travel in a group of Americans with a professor from their home campus. This format allows the students to have most of their daily interactions in English and means that they understand most of the events that happen in their day. My findings have shown that one of the biggest factors supporting the development of intercultural sensitivity is having the opportunity to have these
experiences in an English language setting. By allowing the students to have the chance to learn in English and discuss the new cultural experiences in their mother tongue, they delve more deeply into the issues of cultural difference and do not stay on the surface like students did who were focusing on learning and practicing the foreign language. I believe that built-in English discussions about culture, even if students are on a language immersion program, would greatly benefit learning and thinking about cultural difference and has the potential to lead to intercultural growth.

Eliminate Prolonged Unpleasant Interactions

I would hope that every effort would be made to try to help students get out of bad living situations or to move students with roommate problems. This summer, my students who faced persistent conflict in these areas did not get help and the experience made them less culturally sensitive. Programs need to have other housing options available in case something like this happens so that it will not undermine the experience for the affected student. Additionally, a resident director or faculty member should be present who could discuss the situation with the students and help them when warranted. Some of the other students had intercultural conflicts but they grew and learned from them. The difference seems to be in the prolonged aspect of the conflict.

Give More Effective and In-Depth Minority Pre-Departure Preparation

This is one of the most difficult areas to give recommendations for and yet from my findings, it appears to be one of the most important. I believe more research must be conducted on minority study abroad students in order to learn ways to help them with intercultural growth. I feel that more targeted pre-departure preparation focusing specifically on racial issues and involving past minority participants, i.e.,
student peers, who could speak about their personal experiences would be valuable for minority students. Minority students need to be aware that overseas they will be perceived as an American, rather than as an African American. Furthermore, people in some cultures can be more blunt with their questions about race than they are used to in the U.S. Additionally, it is important to discuss the status and experiences of minorities in the host country and to learn from past participants who are minorities about racial dynamics in the host country. Students need to think and talk about these issues with their study abroad advisor and other students before they depart on the program and immediately start facing these cultural differences. This will help them to recognize the differences when they happen and to hopefully adjust more easily to these challenges.

**Review Students Goals of Program**

Because students whose goals included intercultural understanding usually gained sensitivity while abroad it is a good idea to talk to students about their expectations before departure. Discussions focused on outcomes from studying abroad such as new friends, language acquisition, cultural understanding, and travel opportunities, may prompt students to think more purposively about what they hope to gain from the experience. If they have specific goals for the program, they are more likely to achieve these goals.

**Encourage Students to See Future Usefulness of Experience**

Finding a way to make the experience meaningful and useful to students is often one of the goals of the study abroad office. By showing students ways to explain the experience on their resume or by helping them to learn about careers where they can use their newly acquired language and other intercultural communication skills, it
will help them to think about ways they can keep the experience with them, which also has increased sensitivity as a benefit in my study.

**Non-Study Abroad Options for Intercultural Growth**

Currently approximately 10% of all university undergraduate students study abroad during their college experience. In addition to encouraging more students to take advantage of the opportunity to visit and travel and live in a new culture, it is possible for students to stay where they are, on their U.S. campus and still have a tremendous intercultural growth. I do not believe the change in my control group was related to maturity as one-third of this group did not have any change at all, only students who had intercultural interactions showed significant growth. My data have shown that the students who had frequent and prolonged experiences with people who were of different cultures than their own exhibited just as much growth on the DMIS as those students who studied abroad. The good news is that on campuses such as OSU, we have close to 4,000 international students and 10% of our student body is comprised of ethnic and racial minorities, which allows the opportunity for students to interact. But it appears that few students seek out cultural difference on their own. Programs need to be created to encourage students to live together, take the same classes, study, and work together to give students the opportunity to spend significant amounts of time with students who come from a variety of different cultural backgrounds.
Limitations of this Study

I want to remind the reader of several limitations to the findings in this research study. These limitations are divided into three areas, internal validity, external validity, and researcher challenges.

**Internal Validity**

It is difficult to be sure if the small sample (n=43) of students who study French are indeed representative of the larger population of undergraduate students who study abroad. Small sample sizes lead to low statistical power for the quantitative data findings. It is also possible that the students who volunteered to take the treatment course could have a greater interest in intercultural development than other students.

I cannot be certain that the findings and my interpretations fully explain the relationships I have seen and that the relationships that were observed were meaningful on their own rather than the relationship being due to some other extraneous variable (Glesne, 1999). I tried to assure credibility, or a good fit between the respondents’ views of their ways of life and the representation that I presented by using peer debriefing and member checks.

I had three students drop out of the study from group 3 or roughly 30% of the group. This made it more difficult to use this group as a comparison control group because it was so small.

There is some evidence of diffusion from the interview data collected. The participants who took the course (group 1) discussed ideas and concepts that they learned in class with students who did not take the class (group 2) so the comparative treatment findings appear less significant as the treatment may have influenced into
the non-treated group. This means that the course may have been more effective than it appears in the data.

External Validity

The goal of research is to generalize findings to a larger population. These findings should not be widely generalized to the total population of undergraduate study abroad students because participants in this study were not randomly sampled or assigned to groups. These participants were a convenience sample and thus do not reflect population validity.

Another dynamic of this study is the interaction of selection and treatment because I had three roles in this study: researcher, professor of the course, and coordinator of the study abroad program. While I tried to avoid bias, it is possible that I did have a bias and that it affected the experiment. Additionally, The students in the study might have simply reacted to simply being studied (Hawthorne Effect) and that would encourage them try to present me with the behavior that is desired or expected.

Researcher Challenges

In doing my ethnographic study, it was important for me to be self-reflective and aware of my role as an interpreter and researcher. The researcher roles in this study were very challenging. As the co-instructor of the treatment, the coordinator of the study abroad program, and the primary investigator, I needed to be conscious of my impact on the participants. I am an inexperienced researcher. However, through this project, I have learned much about how to set up research studies, my weaknesses as an observer, and the challenges inherent in interviewing. I believe that my next attempts to conduct research will only be stronger.
While my unique roles presented challenges as a researcher, they also allowed me an inside view and better understanding than I might have gained as an outside researcher in the same setting. Because I am so familiar with the field of study abroad and the literature about college student development and I have had ten years of experience working with students who were abroad or who preparing to go abroad, I was able to be cognizant of the many factors affecting students. I was also very familiar with the participants as I had taught a course to them and given all of them orientation sessions as well as one-on-one advising sessions. This familiarity allowed me to gain students trust and I was able to ask questions and spend time with them from the start of the study.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

I would hope that the intersection of language acquisition and cultural understanding could be examined to determine why students who are focused on learning a language seemed to learn less about intercultural sensitivity than students who preferred to speak English outside of class. It is likely that the higher the foreign language proficiency, the better chance the student has to gain intercultural sensitivity while speaking in the target language and the students who are not as comfortable speaking the foreign language learn more by speaking in English. This finding goes against the conventional wisdom in the field of study abroad that students should never speak English while abroad, and it is important to find out the implications of language use on intercultural learning.

Another very important area for further research is how we can better prepare minority students to interact with the host culture in ways that will not negatively
affect their identity or their view of culturally different people. Studies should be conducted to add to our knowledge about the ways we can work with minority students so that they have similar outcomes as majority students. Perhaps the training needs to be conducted in-country rather than before departure? These questions need to be answered to allow students the available benefits of study abroad.

It would be useful to run this same study with students studying in a different destination, to compare the findings. France has often been called an unusual case, a challenging culture, or more difficult to adjust to than its other Western European neighbors (Wilkinson, 1998). It would be helpful to see a view of the outcomes when students study in a different geographic program with basically the same education goals.

Finally, my last area for suggested research is about the field of international education in general. Most of the long-term comprehensive studies about study abroad were conducted over 20 years ago when students and study abroad programs were different. It is important for more widespread research to be conducted about the outcomes of study abroad in the age of shorter programs, in more varied places involving all of the various types of students who are studying abroad today.

Conclusions

It is very exciting for me to have had the chance to examine issues that I have been working with and researching for my whole professional career. I was fortunate to be able to conduct research using many different methods and to engage in prolonged observation of my participants. The goal of any research project is to create a theory. In this case the goal was to learn how students intercultural sensitivity is
impacted by a pre-departure academic course (Schwandt, 1997). Other research goals included whether or not study abroad alone affects intercultural learning, and if other factors do a good job of predicting growth of intercultural sensitivity.

I would like to return to one of the models initially presented in chapter 2 to conclude my findings. The Dynamic Model, created by English (1995), looks at outcomes of study abroad and the factors that have affected these outcomes. By examining student background characteristics as well as institutional approaches, it leads to the desired outcomes, the unexpected outcomes, and allows for the possibility that other predictors may have affected the outcome.

![The Dynamic Model](image)

In my study, it appears that two student background characteristics importantly affect outcomes of study abroad: whether or not students’ parents have had previous international experience and whether or not students are in the ethnic and racial majority. The institutional approaches are the same for all students in my study as the students were all studying French, on an 8-week program in the summer, and they
also all lived and studied primarily with international students, rather than with other Americans or French. The other predictors that affected the outcomes include the time students spent with international peers, whether or not they had prolonged negative experiences with anyone of a different culture, if they had the expectation of learning about culture difference while abroad, and how much opportunity for intercultural discussions in English existed. I believe that this model is a useful way to conceptualize the way that study abroad programs and on-campus programs can be created and evaluated in order to use all of the knowledge that we have to help students have more intercultural growth during their college years which will help them in their future in an increasingly intercultural world.
APPENDIX A

PRE-TEST QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE GIVEN TO ALL STUDY PARTICIPANTS

WITH THE IDI INSTRUMENT IN APRIL 2003

1. Age: _____

2. Nationality:_______________

3. Nationality of your parents: ________________________________________

4. Rank at OSU: 1, 2, 3, 4 (circle one)

5. Major/s:________________________________________________________

6. Minor/s:________________________________________________________

7. What is the highest degree you plan to receive: B.A./B.S - M.A. - M.S. - M.B.A. -
J.D. - MD - Ph.D. - other __________________________ (circle one or write in other)

8. Highest Degree your Mothers obtained: (circle one)
some high school, high school degree, some college, college degree, graduate degree,
n/a

9. Highest Degree your Father obtained: (circle one)
some high school, high school degree, some college, college degree, graduate degree,
n/a

10. Highest Degree your Sister obtained: (circle one)
some high school, high school degree, some college, college degree, graduate degree,
n/a

11. Highest Degree your Brother obtained: (circle one)
some high school, high school degree, some college, college degree, graduate degree,
n/a

12. Please write in highest degree of other
siblings:__________________________________________________________

13. Has anyone in your family been abroad? Yes No (circle one)

14. If yes who: _________________________________________________
15. For what purpose/s? ________________________________

16. Have you ever hosted an international student in your home? Yes No (circle one)

17. Has anyone from another culture spent time regularly in your home? Yes No (circle one)

18. Do you consider your family to have: (circle one) 
   enough money, not enough money, more than enough money?

19. Have you been abroad before? Yes No (circle one)

20. If yes, for what purpose_________________________ and length ______________

21. Are you taking French to: (circle all that apply) complete language requirement, 
   for a minor, for a major, to gain fluency, to help with your career

22. What is the current or last class(es) you have taken/are taking in French: ______

23. Do you have any friends who are from a different culture than yours? Yes No (circle one)

24. How many languages besides English do you speak fluently? 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, (circle one)

25. If one or more, which one/s: ________________________________________________

26. What is your mother tongue? 
   ________________________________________________

27. What do you hope to gain by studying abroad?
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

28. How would you describe your culture? ________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

29. Your families? ___________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

30. Most of your friends? ____________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX B

POST-TEST QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE GIVEN TO GROUPS 1 AND 2 WITH
THE IDI INSTRUMENT IN OCTOBER 2003

Name:___________________

1. Since the pre-test have you sought out opportunities to meet people from other
cultures than your own? Yes No (circle one)

2. If yes, which cultures? ________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

3. How would you describe your culture? _________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

4. How would you describe your families’ culture? __________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

5. How would you describe your friends’ culture? __________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

6. Has anything happened since you took the pre-test to make you more interested in
cultural difference?___________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

Travel:

7. Did you travel before the program began? Yes No

8. If Yes, Where did you go?____________________________________________

For how long?_________________________________________________________

Who did you travel with?______________________________________________

-see other side-
9. During the program where did you travel? (see table below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekend Dates:</th>
<th>Where did you go?</th>
<th>Who did you travel with?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: July 11-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: July 18-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: July 25-27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Aug 1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Aug 8-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Aug 15-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Aug 22-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: Aug 29-31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Did you travel after the program ended? Yes  No (circle one)

11. If Yes, Where did you go? ____________________________________________

For how long? __________________________________________________________

Who did you travel with? ______________________________________________

12. Is there anywhere that you wish you could have seen but did not?  Yes  No

13. If Yes: Where: _______________________________________________________

14. Do you wish you had spent more time at any location you visited?  Yes  No

15. If yes: Where: _______________________________________________________

16. Do you want to tell me anything about your experience abroad? (about your experiences, about what you learned, or anything else?) __________________________

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX C
POST-TEST QUESTIONNAIRE FOR GROUP 3

October 2003

Name: ______________________

1. Since the pre-test have you sought out opportunities to meet people from other cultures than your own?  Yes  No (circle one)

2. If yes, which cultures? ________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

3. How would you describe your culture?____________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

4. How would you describe your families’ culture?____________________________
____________________________________________________________________

5. How would you describe your friends’ culture? ____________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

6. Has anything happened since you took the pre-test to make you more interested in cultural difference?_____________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

7. Do you want to tell me anything about yourself since we met last summer? (about your experiences, about what you learned, or anything else?)____________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Initial interview guide to be used to interview selected students from all three participant groups, not used, see actual questions used below:

1) Is there anything you would like to share with me about your summer?
2) Do you feel like you had any experiences which helped you to grow in any way this summer?
3) Did you learn more or less than you expected to?
4) Why do you think this happened?
5) What surprised you most about the program, living in France?
6) Did you get to know any French people well?
7) Would you call any of them friends?
8) Did you meet people of other nationalities this summer? Which ones?
9) Do you think you will stay in touch with them now that you are back.
10) How much French were you planning to take before you left for France?
11) How much French do you think you will you complete now?
12) Do you feel you were culturally prepared for your time abroad?
13) What could you have done before leaving for France that could have helped prepare you better?
14) Did you feel overwhelmed or helpless at any point during the program?

Actual interview guide used:

1) Tell me what it was like to live in France this summer.
2) What things did you like?
3) What things did you dislike?
4) Did anything surprise you about living in France? Did your expectations meet reality?
5) Did you get to know any French or other International people well?
6) How much time did you spend with international folks (versus Americans)?
7) Can you tell me about (describe the tone of) your interactions with French or international people.
8) How much French did you speak on a daily basis?
9) Did you experience anything in France that you felt culturally unprepared for? If yes, what thing/s?
10) Is there anything that you could have done to help with this preparation? Was there any previous experience that you had before departure that you feel helped you?
11) Do you feel you had any experiences which helped you to grow in any way this summer? Which ones? Why?
12) Do you feel that you are a different person (or find different things important) after the study abroad experience?
13) Knowing that I want to understand how this experience affected you, is there anything else that you want to tell me about your summer?
APPENDIX E

OBSERVATION SHEETS FOR FRANCE

Observation Sheets to be used in France to observe study participants during the months of July and August 2003

1) what language they are speaking
2) who are they spending time with
3) who do they travel with
4) where do they go on your weekends
5) what kind of food are they eating
6) what do they talk about
7) do they watch international tv
8) what are they listening to (international radio/their own music)
9) what are they reading (newspapers from where)
10) How much communication with home do they have
11) how much time do they spend on the phone/on e-mail/writing letters
12) what free time activities are they doing
13) what type of products are they using
14) what do they complain about
15) what do they miss from home
16) did they change their hairstyles or style of dressing
APPENDIX F

SYLLABUS FOR INTERCULTURAL EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING (IS 693)

Spring 2003 (Revised 10 March 2003)
Tuesdays 6:00-8:00pm / Location: see below, by section
Mixed Section and French Section

Instructor: Dr. John Greisberger, Director of the Office of International Education
Greisberger.1@osu.edu or 292 6101
Office Hours by appointment

Mixed section taught in CL 220 by:
T.A. Jeannie Bonner, OIE bonner.57@osu.edu
T.A. Jenny Kraft, OIE kraft.51@osu.edu

French section taught in BE 394 by:
T.A. Jane Palmer, OIE palmer.241@osu.edu
T.A. Stephanie Shaheen, OIE Shaheen.7@osu.edu
(Office Hours by appointment / please call 292 6101)

I. Learning Goal: To prepare for the intercultural experience of study abroad by:

   I. Learning about our own culture, the ‘American culture’, and other cultures
   II. Gaining an understanding of the role of perspective-taking in cultural immersion experiences
   III. Identifying ways in which the study abroad experience defines each person’s role in our global society

II. Learning Methodology
   A. Action
   B. Knowledge acquisition
   C. Structured reflection

III. Assessment: Graded S (Satisfactory) or U (Unsatisfactory) for 3 hours of IS 693 credit
   A. 20% Attendance, participation in experiential activities and group discussions
      Attendance is mandatory. Active participation in class discussions and experiential activities is expected. During each class you will be asked to participate in activities designed to simulate an intercultural experience and/or challenge you to be creative and to draw upon your experiences, ideas, and opinions while respecting others in the group.

   B. 50% Reflections Exercise
      A weekly reflection upon a question about the readings assigned. Each reflection exercise should take 20 minutes to complete and make reference to the readings. These entries will be collected at the start of every class.

   C. 30% Cultural Immersion Project
      You will be assigned a partner based on your interests. You both will spend a minimum of one hour at a cultural site that is new to you. You will write a one-page reflection paper about the experience and give a 5-10 minute presentation about your experience.

All students with disabilities who need accommodations should see one of the instructors privately during office hours to make arrangements.
Class 1: April 1, 2003
Goal: To get to know each other and review course materials.

-Introduction to course: Meet instructors, review syllabus, complete class contact sheet (name, email, phone, travel experience, study abroad destination)

-Experiential Icebreaker activity:

-Complete Reflection Exercise #1 in class

Readings for Class 2:
Latif, Shahruhl Nazim. Waking up in the U.S., (p. 32).
In Althen Text: Althen, Gary. Preface, (pp.xi-xv)
Althen, Gary. Introduction, (pp.xix-xxxii)
Althen, Gary. Chapter 1: American values and assumptions, (pp. 3-31).
Althen, Gary. Chapter 2: The communicative style of Americans, (pp. 33-54).

Assignment for Class 2:  
Turn in Reflection Exercise #2

Class 2: April 8, 2003
Goal: To learn about American culture and take the IDI Inventory (French Section Only).

-Experiential activity:

-Lecture on culture: Discuss possible definitions and emphasis placed on the distinction between “Culture” and “culture” as discussed in Bennett, Milton. Intercultural communication: A current perspective. In Bennett, Milton (Ed.), Basic concepts of intercultural communication (pp. 1-34). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press. (may use “Toe to Toe” activity to illustrate)

-Large group discussion of assigned readings

-Complete the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) (French Section Only).

Readings for Class 3:
In Exchange: Siriyothin, Peerasak. My life in the U.S.: The memorable, the funny, the bizarre, (p. 26).
Yin, Munchun. How I went over the ocean for an education...about myself, (pp. 5-7).
In Althen Text: Althen, Gary. Chapter 4: Differences in customs, (pp. 67-74).

Assignment for Class 3:
Turn in Reflection Exercise #3
Class 3: April 15, 2003
Goal: To learn about American culture and the differences (SES, regional, ethnicity, etc.) that exist within our culture.

-Experiential activity:

-Small group discussion of assigned readings

-Discussion of U.S. Diversity, Althen Article.

-Think about what questions you would like to ask to our International Student Panel.

Readings for Class 4:
In Exchange: Gilliom, Eugene. Thoughts on multicultural education with international overtones, (pp. 4-5). Handout based on Fisher Text: Mindsets Chapter 1.

Assignment for Class 4:
Turn in Reflection Exercise #4

Class 4: April 22, 2003
Goal: Learn to use the D.I.E. model: Describe, Interpret, Evaluate


-Perspective Taking / Energy Crisis Article

-Group discussion about readings

-Case studies in groups

-Preparation time for mini-presentations based on Mindsets Chapter 2 for next class
-Collect questions for international student panel

Readings for Class 5:
Handout based on Fisher Text: Mindsets Chapter 2.

Assignment for Class 5:
Turn in Reflection Exercise #5
Think about which cultural immersion site you would like to observe and be prepared to list your top three choices.
Class 5: April 29, 2003
Goal: To apply the D.I.E. model to an intercultural situation.

- Break into groups to watch the video “An Intercultural Classroom”. Each group will be assigned a character to discuss and present to the group.

- Each group will present its character using the D.I.E. model.

- Discuss readings and be prepared to give your mini-presentations from the Fisher handout in class.

- Turn in top 3 choices for which cultural immersion site you would like to observe.

Reading for Class 6:
Handout based on Hofstede’s Cultural Dimensions.
Handout based on Fisher Text: Mindsets Chapter 3.

Assignment for Class 6:
Turn in Reflection Exercise #6

Class 6: May 6, 2003
Goal: Discuss Hofstede’s Cultural Dimensions and learn how international students experience studying at OSU.

- Discussion of Hofstede’s Five Cultural Dimensions.

- Discuss Fisher Readings

- Explanation of reflection exercise involving information from your study abroad host culture. Resources will be shared to help students locate information.

- Discuss the cultural immersion projects and review the list of group assignments and discuss roles of each group member.

- Read and hand out ‘Sunglass Analogy’.

- Have panel discussion with OSU International Exchange Program (IEP) students.

Reading for Class 7:
No readings assigned this week.
Reminder-class is in OIE next week for BaFa BaFa

Assignment for Class 7:
Turn in Reflection Exercise #7

Class 7: May 13, 2003 –DIFFERENT LOCATION-in 122 Oxley Hall
Goal: To have an intercultural experience in the classroom.

- Experiential activity:
  Participate in the cultural simulation activity, BaFa, BaFa.

- Complete Reflection Exercise #8 in class.
Reading for Class 8:
In reader: Reading 1
   Bennett, Janet. “Putting culture shock into perspective” (pp. 215-223).
   
Reading 2
   Black, Morrison, Gregersen. “Exploring the global frontier”, (pp. 3-21).

Assignments for Class 8:
Turn in 1-page paper at the beginning of class on your cultural immersion project experience as Reflection Exercise #9

Class 8: May 20, 2003
Goal: To discuss culture shock/adaptation and challenges of study abroad in the context of the readings and learn about global career paths.

-Discuss “Culture Shock/Adaptation” readings and chapter on global careers.

-Both classes move to same room (CL 220) for International Career Panel
-Panel of Guests: *(or)John Greisberger, Director of the Office of International Education OIE
   Returned Peace Corps Volunteer and Foreign Student Advisor
   *(or)Grace Johnson, Assistant Director of Study Abroad in OIE
   Refugee Service Worker and Study Abroad Advisor
   John Aguilar, Nationwide Global Holdings, Columbus, Ohio
   International Business Perspective
   Ami Peacock, Big Brothers Big Sisters
   Volunteer and Non-Profit Job Opportunities

-Discuss the challenges you might face in your study abroad experience. (using the Suitcase Exercise)
-SignUp for a cultural immersion presentation time, with A/V needs

Readings for Week 9:
In Reader: Reading 3
   Shames, Germaine. “Exploring culture shock without leaving home: Diversity, change, and the future” (pp. 117-133).
   
Reading 4
   Bennett, Milton J. Overcoming the Golden Rule: Sympathy and Empathy. (pp.191-213).

Assignment for Week 9:
Reflection Exercise #10

Class 9: May 27, 2003
Goal: To discuss the idea of the golden rule in an intercultural context and to have cultural immersion presentations.

-Group discussion about the challenges of study abroad, focusing specifically on the concepts of empathy and sympathy.

-What to do when you change and the world hasn’t or when the world changes and you haven’t.

-Cultural Immersion Presentations (half of presentations).
Readings for Week 10:
No Readings Assigned.

Assignment for Week 10:
Reflection Exercise #11

Class 10: June 3, 2003
Goal: To complete the cultural immersion presentations, evaluate the course, and evaluate your immersion partner.

- Cultural Immersion Presentations (half of presentations).
- Fill out class and partner evaluations.
Required Text:
The text has been ordered for you and will be available to purchase at the OSU bookstore.


2) Exchange: The Ohio State University’s International Magazine. (1996-97). (Will be distributed at first class session.)

3) Class Handouts: Handout based on Fisher Text: Mindsets Chapters 1, 2 and 3 and Handout based on Hofstede’s Cultural Dimensions. (Will be distributed at first class session.)

4) Required Reader (May be purchased later on this quarter at Cop-Ez on Neil Ave).

Reading 1

Reading 2

Reading 3

Reading 4

Other References: (Students will not purchase)


Reflection Exercises

Each week you will be asked to complete a Reflection Exercise, designed to help you apply the weekly readings to your own experiences or opinions. After completing the readings for that week, sit somewhere quiet, and take about 20 minutes to write a response to the Reflection Exercise. These may be typed or written responses, but they must be legible.

Your weekly Reflection Exercise will be handed in at the beginning of each class period and returned to you in the next class.

Reflection Exercise # 1 (to be completed in class)
After the first class, what are your expectations of this course? Did you hear anything in class that surprised you?

Reflection Exercise #2 on Readings for Class 2 (to be turned in during week 2)
What are some of the ways that you related to or identified with Althen’s description of American values and customs? How would you describe your culture?

Reflection Exercise #3 on Readings for Class 3 (to be turned in during week 3)
Why did Munchun Yin want to go to China? What was the greatest lesson that he learned from his experience? Why do you want to go abroad? What do you think that your experience will teach you?

Reflection Exercise #4 on Readings for Class 4 (to be turned in during week 4)
Share an example of when you had a different mindset from a parent, teacher, friend, etc. here in the US. Next, explain the mindset of the person with whom you had the disagreement.

Reflection Exercise #5 on Readings for Class 5 (to be turned in during week 5)
Thinking about the handout based on Chapter 2 in Fisher and our class discussions, do you think that stereotypes can serve any positive function or are stereotypes always negative? Use examples from your own life to make your argument.

Reflection Exercise #6 on Readings for Class 6 (to be turned in during week 6)
Keeping in mind the handouts presented using Fisher’s concept of “mindsets” or “cultural lenses”, do you think that the professor in the video The Intercultural Classroom, considered his students’ cultural lenses when facilitating the class discussion? If so, how? If not, how would this concept helped him to better facilitate class discussion?

Reflection Exercise #7 on Hofstede and your Study Abroad Host Culture (to be turned in during week 7)
Considering Hofstede’s model of the five ‘typical American’ cultural dimensions, do you feel that your culture is ‘typically American”? Next, compare your study abroad host culture to your culture using Hofstede’s model. What are the challenges you might face knowing these cultural dimension differences?
Reflection Exercise #8 on BaFa BaFa (to be completed in class during week 7)
Use the DIE model to reflect upon the experience of BaFa BaFa.

Reflection Exercise #9 on your Cultural Immersion Project (to be turned in during week 8)
Write a one-page description of your Cultural Immersion Site. Do not include your interpretation and evaluation in this paper. Turn it in at the beginning of Class 8. Keep a copy for yourself to use when preparing for your presentation.

Reflection Exercise #10 (to be turned in during week 9)
Considering the chapter called “Exploring the global frontier”, in what ways, if any, do you think your study abroad experience will help you in your career?

Reflection Exercise #11 (to be turned in during week 10)
What, if anything, is wrong with following “The Golden Rule” in an intercultural setting? Describe an example of a situation in which “doing unto others” would create more misunderstandings than understandings.
Cultural Immersion Project

During the fifth class, you will be asked to indicate your interest in visiting one of the following approved Cultural Immersion Sites during Week 7 or 8 of this class.

1) Mifflin International School  
2) Sunrise Academy, Muslim K-6 School  
3) International Wives Group Meeting  
4) Shiloh Baptist Service  
5) Hindu Temple  
6) Sikh Church  
7) Martin Luther King Center  
8) Islamic Center/Mosque  
9) Korean Church  
10) Asian grocery  
11) Hillel or other Jewish service  
12) St. Mary’s Coptic Orthodox Church Service  
13) Hale Center  
14) African Christian Church  
15) El Napolito Mexican Restaurant  
16) ESL class  
17) Approved event during cultural week/months  
18) Chinese or Japanese School  
19) Meet with a Somali Cab Driver  
20) Greek Orthodox Church Service  
21) Nationality Club Meeting  
22) Approved event of your choice

You will be assigned a partner, based on the interest that you indicated, and you and your partner will go together to your Cultural Immersion Site and spend one to two hours observing the site and taking notes on what you see.

One-page description (individual)

After completing the observation, you will be required to turn in a one-page description of your Cultural Immersion Site at the beginning of Class 8 as reflection exercise #9. This description should answer the questions: who, what, where, when, and why. You should each write this paper separately from your partner.

10-minute presentation (with partner)

Describe, Interpret, Evaluate

During either Class 9 or 10, you and your partner will give a 10-minute presentation. You will Describe, Interpret, and Evaluate your experience at the Cultural Immersion Site for the class.

Creative representation

You will also creatively represent your experience through a visual display, music, food, dance, drama, poetry, or any other appropriate medium. Your goal is to help the class to gain an experiential appreciation of your site.

Evaluation

You will also be asked to complete an evaluation of your role and your partner’s role in completing the project.
APPENDIX G

CODES GIVEN AND MEANING FOR QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SPSS ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>group # 1, 2, or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>gender 1=m 2=f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>age 1=18-21 2=22-30 3=31-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>previous int'l experience 0=None 1= &gt;3 mos 2=3-6 mos 3=7-11 mos 4=1-2 yrs 5=3-5 yrs 6=6-10 yrs 7= &gt;10 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>education level 1=HS grad 2=college grad 3=MA or grad degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>nationality 1=US 0=other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>dual nationality, US+other 0=yes 1=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>ethnicity 1=American 2=other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>dual ethnicity 0=yes 1=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>region raised in 1=N.America 2=C. America 3=S. America 4=SE Asia (Asia Pacific) 5=W. Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>IEL (took treatment) or not 1=yes 2=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>day took pre-test 1=Lyon ORI 2=FL ORI 3=after 2 4=after 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>had passport at time of pre-test 1=yes 2=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>rank at OSU 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5=grad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>French major or minor 1=French major or minor 2=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>degree expectation 1=BA/BS 2=MA/MS 3=MBA 4=JD 5=MD 6=PhD 7=other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>mom's educational level 1=some HS 2=HS degree 3=some college 4=college degree 5=grad degree 6=n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>dad's educational level 1=some HS 2=HS degree 3=some college 4=college degree 5=grad degree 6=n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>international family experience 1=yes 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>socio-economic status 1=enough money 2=not enough 3=more than enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>student has been abroad before 1=yes 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>goals for French program 1=language requirement 2=minor 3= major 4=gain fluency 5=help w/career 6=other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>requirement 0=yes 1=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>french minor 1=yes 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>major in French 1=yes 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>fluency 0=yes 1=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>career 0=yes 1=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>other 0=yes 1=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>last French class taken before study abroad 1=101 2=102 3=103 4=104 5=201 6=401 7=other 400 level class 8=other 600 level course or above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>does participant have different culture friends 1=yes 2=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>how many languages fluent in: # languages 0, 1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>mother tongue 1=Eng 2= Portg 3=Mand Chin 4= Indonesian 5= Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>pre test IDI #=raw data score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH</td>
<td>post test IDI #=raw data score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>IDI change #=raw data calculated change in score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ</td>
<td>majority student or minority student 1=majority 0=minority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regression (answer to question 1)

Variables Entered/Removed(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Variables Removed</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PRE(a)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>INTERVEN(a)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  All requested variables entered.

b  Dependent Variable: POST

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R Square Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. F Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.500(a)</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>13.3593</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.503(b)</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>13.5285</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), PRE

b  Predictors: (Constant), PRE, INTERVEN
### ANOVA(c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regressio n</td>
<td>2078.715</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2078.715</td>
<td>11.647</td>
<td>.002(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>6246.439</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>178.470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8325.154</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Regressio n</td>
<td>2102.504</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1051.252</td>
<td>5.744</td>
<td>.007(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>6222.650</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>183.019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8325.154</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), PRE
b Predictors: (Constant), PRE, INTERVEN
c Dependent Variable: POST

### Coefficients(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>52.014</td>
<td>13.727</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>3.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Constant)</td>
<td>53.140</td>
<td>14.248</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>3.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVEN</td>
<td>-1.614</td>
<td>4.476</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.361</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: POST
### Excluded Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta In</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>INTERVE N</td>
<td>-.054(a)</td>
<td>-.361</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>-.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), PRE

b. Dependent Variable: POST

### Regression (answer to question 2)

#### Variables Entered/Removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Variables Removed</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PRE(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ABROAD(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. All requested variables entered.

b. Dependent Variable: POST

#### Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mod el</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Squ are</th>
<th>Adjust ed R Squ ar e</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.480(a)</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>13.5211</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>12.259</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.517(b)</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>13.3565</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>2.017</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), PRE

b. Predictors: (Constant), PRE, ABROAD
### ANOVA(c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2241.218</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2241.218</td>
<td>12.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>7495.593</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>182.819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9736.810</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2601.017</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1300.509</td>
<td>7.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>7135.793</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>178.395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9736.810</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Predictors: (Constant), PRE  

b  Predictors: (Constant), PRE, ABROAD  

c  Dependent Variable: POST  

### Coefficients(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>52.917</td>
<td>13.521</td>
<td>3.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>61.973</td>
<td>14.800</td>
<td>4.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABROAD</td>
<td>-8.388</td>
<td>5.906</td>
<td>-.193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Dependent Variable: POST
Excluded Variables (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta In</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ABROAD D</td>
<td>-.193(a)</td>
<td>-1.420</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>-.219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors in the Model: (Constant), PRE
b Dependent Variable: POST

Regression (answer to question 3)

Variables Entered/Removed (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Variables Removed</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PRE(a)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FAMILY_E, NATIONAL, ABROAD_B, MAJOR, MAJMIN, PREVIOUS(a)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a All requested variables entered.
b Dependent Variable: POST
### Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R Square Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.479(a)</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.679(b)</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), PRE

b Predictors: (Constant), PRE, FAMILY_E, NATIONAL, ABROAD_B, MAJOR, MAJMIN, PREVIOUS

### ANOVA(c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regressio n</td>
<td>2234.498</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2234.498</td>
<td>11.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>7493.600</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>187.340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9728.098</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regressio n</td>
<td>4490.559</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>641.508</td>
<td>4.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>5237.538</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>154.045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9728.098</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), PRE

b Predictors: (Constant), PRE, FAMILY_E, NATIONAL, ABROAD_B, MAJOR, MAJMIN, PREVIOUS

c Dependent Variable: POST
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>52.821</td>
<td>13.718</td>
<td>3.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>63.565</td>
<td>15.953</td>
<td>3.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PREVIOU</td>
<td>-.483</td>
<td>1.285</td>
<td>-.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NATIONA</td>
<td>-13.360</td>
<td>9.403</td>
<td>-.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAJOR</td>
<td>-5.237</td>
<td>4.460</td>
<td>-.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAMILY_</td>
<td>-8.858</td>
<td>4.854</td>
<td>-.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>-767</td>
<td>4.961</td>
<td>-.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABROAD</td>
<td>-5.767</td>
<td>4.961</td>
<td>-.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAJMIN</td>
<td>17.285</td>
<td>6.376</td>
<td>.423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  
Dependent Variable: POST
### Excluded Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta In</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PREVIOUS</td>
<td>-.154(a)</td>
<td>-1.110</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NATIONAL</td>
<td>-.039(a)</td>
<td>-0.275</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAJOR</td>
<td>-.239(a)</td>
<td>-1.727</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>-.267</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAMILY_</td>
<td>-.225(a)</td>
<td>-1.657</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABROAD</td>
<td>-.113(a)</td>
<td>-0.806</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAJMIN</td>
<td>.272(a)</td>
<td>2.027</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors in the Model: (Constant), PRE

b Dependent Variable: POST
## APPENDIX I

### QUALITATIVE RAW DATA TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>+3.66</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>at home LT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>int'l 6 w/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>+5.82</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no c</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>+5.07</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>+43.09</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>Int'l LT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sig Intl</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>+28.11</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>+21.73</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>OSU LT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sig Intl</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>+12.07</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>OSU LT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sig Intl</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>+15.6</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>+5.91</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>+5.48</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>-8.62</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sig Intl</td>
<td>no c</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>-14.05</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>host</td>
<td>- bad</td>
<td>Sig Intl</td>
<td>no c</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-10.24</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>at home LT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>-3.69</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>-16.77</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-7.49</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>host</td>
<td>at home LT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sig Intl</td>
<td>no c</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>+14.74</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no c</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>+2.71</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>at home LT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>+15.76</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>Int'l LT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>+34.15</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sig Intl</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>+34.15</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>host</td>
<td>at home LT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sig Intl</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>+26.21</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>at home LT-B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>+6.01</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>+5.16</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>+8.8</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>host</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sig Intl</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>+9.36</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>host</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sig Intl</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>+4.4</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sig Intl</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>+31.61</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>Int'l ST</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sig Intl</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>+6.44</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>married</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no c</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>+5.90</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sig Intl</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>-15.88</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no cc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>-12.26</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>Int'l ST</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sig Intl</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>-17.08</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>-6.23</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>Int'l ST</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sig Intl</td>
<td>no c</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>-6.15</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sig Intl</td>
<td>no c</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-19.51</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>dorm</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sig Intl</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>+0.42</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>+21.02</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Int'l ST</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sig Intl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>+34.73</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>married</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sig Intl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>+17.14</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-3.58</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sig Intl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Int'l ST</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:

A  Group Number  
B  ID Number, if **bold**, quoted in dissertation  
C  Male/Female  
D  Last French class taken  
E  IDI Score Change (increase, decrease, or same score)  
F  Majority or Minority status  
G  I = interviewed ex post facto  
H  Living arrangement in France  
I  Romantic Relationships, someone at home, someone from OSU group, or int’l  
J  Known bad experiences  
K  Significant international interactions  
L  Cultural Understanding stated as goal or not  
M  Number of weekends travelled with internationals  
N  Total number of weekends travelled total
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Mills, Thomas J., Campbell, Jean B. (1994). Educational Use of Foreign Students and Americans Returned from Study Abroad: A Project to Improve Global Education.


Rohrlich, Beulah F. *Expecting the Worst (or the Best!). What Exchange Programs Should Know about Student Expectations.* Occasional Papers in Intercultural Learning, Number 16, 1990.


The Ohio State University, Office of International Education: Statistical Report.


