

ABSTRACT

Title of Thesis: AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDENTS' INTERACTION WITH HOST NATIONALS WHILE ON STUDY ABROAD AND THEIR DEVELOPMENT OF INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY

Degree Candidate: Patricia Anne Armfield

Degree and year: Masters of Arts, 2004

Thesis directed by: Dr. Susan R. Komives, Associate Professor
Department of Counseling and Personnel Services

This study examined the relationship between students' interactions with host nationals while on study abroad and their development of intercultural sensitivity. The theoretical base was drawn from Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis. The researcher used the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (Chen & Starosta, 2000), items revised from previous studies concerning interaction with difference, and demographic items. The sample consisted of 60 undergraduate students who had returned to the University of Maryland from a Fall 2003 semester abroad.

Regression results found a significant increase in students' level of intercultural sensitivity prior to participating in study abroad and their level upon their return. The results are limited by low response rates. No significant relationship was found between the students' interactions with host nationals as measured in this study and their development of intercultural sensitivity. Future research is needed to further apply and operationalize Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
STUDENTS' CONTACT WITH HOST NATIONALS WHILE ON STUDY ABROAD
AND THEIR DEVELOPMENT OF INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY

By

Patricia Anne Armfield

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
May 2004

Advisory Committee:

Associate Professor Susan Komives, Chair
Associate Professor Karen Kurotsuchi Inkelas
Affiliate Assistant Professor James Osteen

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this work would not have been possible without the constant love and support from my family and friends. Thanks to my mom, dad, Margie, Juan, Ellie, Abby, and especially Susie, from whose inspiration I have learned to make the most of my experiences. Thanks to my friends and Peer Career Educators and colleagues at the University of Maryland Career Center for their support and well wishes throughout this process.

A giant thanks to Dr. Susan Komives, who provided support and feedback, never gave up on me, and kept me on track.

Thank you Heather Rowan, Graziella Pagliarulo, and Dr. Karen Inkelas, who provided me with statistics help and advice—often times at the last minute.

Thanks to the Dr. Michael Ulrich and the staff of the University of Maryland Study Abroad Office for their cooperation and allowing me access to their students. I hope this research will contribute to the work that they do.

Thank you to my many friends and students in Japan, whose understanding and patience allowed me to have wonderful interactions with host nationals that contributed to my personal development in so many ways.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
History of Study Abroad	2
Study Abroad Participation Trends	4
Goals of Study Abroad Programs	5
Study Abroad Program Characteristics	6
Statement of the Problem	7
Purpose of the Study	9
Research Questions	11
Significance of the Study	12
Definitions	13
Summary	15
Chapter 2: Literature Review	16
Contact with Difference	16
Contact Hypothesis	18
Equal Status	19
Cooperation	20
Support from Authorities	20
Quantitative Aspects of Contact	21
Real versus Artificial Contact	21
Pre-existing Characteristics	21
Areas of Contact	22
Studies Employing the Contact Hypothesis	22
Applied Domestically versus Internationally	25
Overview of Study Abroad Research Findings	28
Study Abroad Outcomes Relating to Contact with Host Nationals	29
Global Attitude Development	39
Global Perspective	39
International Understanding	40
Global Competency	41
Worldmindedness	41
Multicultural Competence	41

Intercultural Maturity	42
Intercultural Competence	42
Intercultural Sensitivity	43
Definitions	44
Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity	44
Model of Intercultural Competence	46
Contact with Host Nationals and Intercultural Sensitivity	49
Conclusion	50
Chapter 3: Methodology	52
Statement of the Problem	52
Hypotheses	53
Design	54
Participants	56
Instrument	56
Intercultural Sensitivity Scale	57
Study Abroad Program Characteristics	60
Interaction	60
Measures of Other Variables	64
Language	64
Previous International Experience	64
Demographic Data	65
Data Collection Procedure	65
Obtaining the Sample	65
Pilot Test	66
Procedures	66
Web-based Survey	67
Data Analysis	68
Researcher	73
Summary	73
Chapter 4: Results	74
Description of Sample	74
Data Analysis Modifications	77
Hypothesis One	77
Hypothesis Two	79

Hypothesis Three	81
Hypotheses Four, Five, Six, Seven, and Eight	82
Post-hoc Analyses	87
Hypothesis Nine	88
Summary	88
Chapter 5: Findings	89
Discussion of Hypotheses	89
Hypothesis One and the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale	89
Hypothesis Two and Intimate Interaction	91
Hypothesis Three: Time Spent with Host Nationals	91
Hypotheses Four, Five, and Six: Equal Status, Direct Contact, and Support from Authorities	92
Hypotheses Seven and Eight: Language Proficiency and Previous International Experience	94
Post-hoc Analyses	94
Hypothesis Nine	95
Limitations	95
Suggestions for Future Research	98
Implications for Practice	102
Summary	104
Appendix A	105
Appendix B	117
Appendix C	118
Appendix D	119
Appendix E	120
References	121

LIST OF TABLES

3.1	ISS Scales, Definitions, and Sample Items	59
3.2	Nature of Contact	61
3.3	Measures of Other Variables	65
3.4	Pearson Correlation Matrix	70
3.5	Collinearity Statistics (VIF)	71
4.1	Sample Description Summary	76
4.2	Development of Intercultural Sensitivity Repeated Measures ANOVA Summary Table	79
4.3	Number of Intimate Interactions	80
4.4	Block 2 (Number of Intimate Interactions) Multiple Regression Summary	81
4.5	Time Spent with Host Nationals	82
4.6	Block 3 (Nature of Interaction) Multiple Regression Summary	83
4.7	Equal Status	84
4.8	Direct Contact	85
4.9	Direct Contact Individual Activities	85
4.10	Academic Sponsored Activities	86
4.11	Language Proficiency and Previous International Experience	87

CHAPTER 1:

Introduction

The over-arching goal of higher education is to prepare an educated citizenry to contribute to the well-being of our society and world (King & Baxter-Magolda, 2002). Therefore, the major role of higher education is to prepare students to be effective members of society and the workforce. As Hoffa (1998) writes, “in a world becoming every year more interdependent, the educational value to students of spending at least some portion of their undergraduate years living and learning in another country is no longer really debatable” (p. 1). As the world becomes increasingly interconnected because of technology development, globalization of the economy, widespread population migrations, the development of multiculturalism, and the demise of the nation-state in favor of sub- and super-national identification (Chen & Starosta, 1996), students’ ability to function successfully and effectively will depend largely upon their ability to communicate, work, and live with people culturally different from themselves. As a result of these trends, the likelihood and frequency of communicating with people from different cultures have increased, and the necessity that students develop the ability to successfully interact with people different from themselves is no longer questionable. Study abroad is one of the most important experiences that students can participate in during their college years because it offers the opportunity to interact with people culturally different from themselves. Because of the increased opportunities for contact with difference, anything learned today about international contact will be important in the future (Kamal & Maruyama, 1990).

As a result of the increased interdependence of the world, many of the outcomes that we expect of students as a result of their participation in higher education have

changed. The ability to communicate across cultures is becoming increasingly important as the likelihood that we will work, live, and socialize with people from other cultures increases. Thus, research is needed to uncover the effects of study abroad on the outcomes that have become more important in the past several decades, particularly intercultural sensitivity, which is the acknowledgement and respect for cultural differences. The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between students' interaction with host nationals while on study abroad and their development of intercultural sensitivity.

History of Study Abroad

Just as the history and present state of higher education have been shaped largely by societal events and trends, so has the history of study abroad and its present state. Government, politics, and history significantly impacted, and continue to impact, the development and advancement of study abroad programs in the United States. Leaving one's home for education is a long-standing practice in this country. Before higher education became a fixed institution in the colonies, sons of upper-class families traveled to Europe to study. As institutions were founded in the colonies, students continued to travel abroad to study and train in foreign universities (Sell, 1983). The creation of the League of Nations after World War I caused politicians and academics to become invested in international educational exchange (Gingerich, 1998). The importance of relating to other countries and increased opportunities for international activity were on the horizon, and the government began to understand the importance of preparing its citizens to lead in an interconnected world, and as a result, sought to involve themselves in international education. The League of Nations created a Committee on Intellectual Cooperation, and at the same time, philanthropic foundations were established by Andrew

Carnegie, Daniel Guggenheim, John D. Rockefeller, and W. K. Kellogg which endowed scholarships for foreign study and international exchanges (Gingerich). For the thirty years following World War II, the purpose of international education became specifically associated with assisting developing countries to work to improve fundamental health, education, literacy, and agriculture of developing countries (Gingerich).

World War II also increased the demand for international studies specialists. Funding to support graduate and research programs was created and supported by the government, such as the 1946 Fulbright Act, which authorized federal exchange programs for American and foreign teachers and students. At this time, international education was a governmental responsibility (Gingerich, 1998). An increase in American students studying abroad occurred between World War I and II with the development of junior year abroad programs. For the most part, the abroad experience was valued because of the unique opportunity to increase students' foreign language fluency (Sell, 1983). After World War II, the world virtually opened up, and access to foreign study increased (Battsek, 1962). However, after World War II the character of the programs and students began to change; semester, quarter, and summer programs became available, and participants represented a wide variety of disciplines (Sell).

In the late 1970's, President Jimmy Carter's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies reported American students' competency in languages other than English and knowledge of world affairs was severely lacking. As a result of this reality and America's weakening position in the world economy, interest in international higher education was revived. At this time, the focus of international higher education also expanded to include the issues of multicultural sensitivity, cross-cultural understanding, and the environment (Gingerich, 1998). At the end of the 1980's,

Congress recognized that Americans' ignorance of world cultures and languages were a threat to the nation's ability to lead the world. In 1991, the National Security Education Act was established with the intention of increasing opportunities for American college students to study abroad, increasing support for training specialists in languages and area studies, providing curriculum grants to colleges and universities, and increasing graduate fellowships (Gingerich). Since institutions of higher education are educating those who will be leaders in the global marketplace, international education is seen as an investment that will produce profits (Gingerich). Study abroad has been a recognized means of educating future leaders and continues to be important to American public policy.

Study Abroad Participation Trends

Study abroad participation has been on the rise virtually every year since the 1950's (Institute of International Education, 2002). This increase serves as evidence that students and institutions of higher education clearly understand the importance of international education. During the 2000-2001 academic year, the number of students receiving credit for study abroad increased 7.4 percent from the previous year, meaning 154,168 students were studying abroad (Institute of International Education). The increase during 2000-2001 follows four years of double-digit growth—11 percent in 1999-2000, preceded by increases of 14 percent in 1998-1999, 15 percent 1997-1998, and 11 percent in 1996-1997, which is a total increase of 55 percent in the number of students studying abroad in the past five years. Since 1991-1992, the number of students studying abroad has more than doubled, from 71,154 to 154,168, an increase of 116 percent (Institute of International Education, 2002). Despite heightened tensions regarding foreign travel after the events of September 11th, 2001, a significant number of students continue to choose to leave their American institutions to study abroad. Indeed, it may be

argued that the events of September 11th have increased the importance of gaining experience abroad and learning about other cultures.

Goals of Study Abroad Programs

Study abroad programs provide students with the ability to interact with people different from themselves on a daily basis for an extended period of time. Study abroad has several aims. First, students have access to resources and methods of research not available on their home campuses, which provides enriched educational opportunities (Hoffa, 1998; Hopkins, 1999). Second, study abroad “provides U.S. students with a global outlook that emphasizes the ties among nations and cultures, the universality of human values, and the necessity of working together” (Hoffa, p. 2). Students learn about both the differences and similarities between cultures and see first-hand how the world is interconnected. Students will likely also come to appreciate diversity and understand other cultures, and hence their own. As students immerse themselves in a new culture, they come to better understand and more critically evaluate their own beliefs, values, and culture (Kauffmann, 1982). Third, it “enhances career preparation by teaching cross-cultural and workplace skills of value to today’s employers, often through internships and other hands-on experiences” (p. 2). Students can learn how to cooperate and work successfully with others, an important ability in the increasingly diverse workforce. Finally, it “deepens intellectual and personal maturity, fosters independent thinking, and builds self-confidence” (p. 2).

While these are the over-arching goals of study abroad, several researchers have sought to understand whether these goals are achieved, under what conditions they are achieved, and what other developmental outcomes can be contributed to studying abroad. The review of literature will introduce studies that have explained study abroad outcomes,

and provide structure for the present study.

Study Abroad Program Characteristics

Study abroad programs differ significantly (Pearson, 1981). It is not simply the countries that differ, but rather the various aspects of the programs, which means that any attempt to understand students' learning and development must consider and account for the diversity of the programs. Several aspects of study abroad programs can be generally placed into three categories—academic, residential, and social. Within each of these components, several options exist. In terms of academics, students can be taught by American professors in English, by foreign professors in English, or by American or foreign professors in the host country's language. Additionally, students may take classes with students from their U.S. universities, students from other American universities, students from foreign universities, and students from the host country. The residential situations also vary significantly. Most of the options are dormitories where students live with fellow nationals, dormitories where students live with host nationals, homes of host nationals with fellow nationals, as well as other foreign students, and host families. Finally, socially, students may work, participate in community activities, and travel. Working or interning while abroad gives students insight into the world culture and values of the host country. Participation in community activities allows students to play sports or learn aspects of the host culture, such as music and crafts. Traveling provides students with additional experiences in new environments and the ability to explore places that they may have only had the opportunity to read about. In each of the components, academic, residential, and social, students may interact only with their fellow Americans, with students from other countries also participating in the study abroad program, and with host nationals. This study seeks to understand the nature of students' interactions with host

nationals during their experience abroad and how it may contribute to one of the many intended outcomes of study abroad, intercultural sensitivity.

Statement of Problem

There is a level of understanding of diversity that is often achieved by students at their home institutions. However, for students who have never traveled abroad, it is likely that their understanding of diversity is a domestic one; they understand the diversity of their peers in terms of race, gender, sexual orientation, and ability, but not often in a global sense. Students' understanding of diversity has likely come from experiences in the classroom, the residence hall, and other places on campus. Interacting with people culturally different from themselves in a foreign culture is hypothesized to provide an enhanced learning opportunity. In the U.S., students are able to use a common language, culture, and values system with which to communicate with students different from themselves. Often when living abroad, students must learn to communicate across these differences because a common understanding of American culture and values is not available to facilitate students' interactions with host nationals. They must now develop a more complex understanding of difference and learn how to communicate effectively despite those differences.

One of the most influential experiences students can have that will contribute to their acknowledgement and respect for cultural difference is contact with people different from themselves (Milem, 2003). Students can learn about other cultures' customs and ways of living through movies and/or books, but traveling to and living in the country allows them to see the culture and experience it first-hand. However, simply being in the presence of the culture's customs and ways of living does not require students to change their views unless they choose to; they may simply observe it and accept or disregard

what they see. As Gareis (1995) stated, “contact per se does not result in positive attitudes” (p. 67). Being in the presence of difference does not mean that learning is occurring. If students develop relationships with people of that country, and if their relationships are genuine and involve more than an exchange of greetings on the street or an exchange of money at the store, then they must learn to adapt to their communication patterns and the ways in which they interact with people from different cultures. Because many students, often White students, the majority that are going abroad, are not put in situations where they must interact with people culturally different from themselves, the interactions with host nationals will likely lead to learning (Kaufmann, 1982). Thus, interacting with host nationals while on study abroad is much like experiential learning; students learn by doing. In this case, the doing is interacting with host nationals, and a key learning outcome may be their development of intercultural sensitivity.

Intercultural sensitivity is a likely outcome of this interaction because of the affective components that are involved in interactions with others and the possible development of relationships. Intercultural sensitivity is the affective aspect of intercultural communication (Chen & Starosta, 2000). Thus, it is hypothesized that as students interact with host nationals while on study abroad, they will develop an increased level of intercultural sensitivity because the affective nature of interaction with others will generate development along the affective component of intercultural communication, which is intercultural sensitivity.

Several historic studies on study abroad outcomes demonstrated students’ interactions with host nationals as one of the main contributors to their development along various dimensions. Intercultural sensitivity describes one of the many types of development that refer to acknowledgement and appreciation of difference. Constructs,

such as global perspective (Hanvey, 1976; McCabe, 1994), worldmindedness (Hensley & Sell, 1979; Kafka, 1968; Smith, 1955), intercultural maturity (King & Baxter-Magolda, 2002), and intercultural sensitivity (Bennett, 1994; Chen & Starosta, 1996) can be classified into the general category of outcomes of study abroad. With study abroad participation on the rise (Institute for International Education, 2002), it is necessary that institutions and students are best utilizing the classroom provided by another culture and its people.

Purpose of the Study

The study abroad experience is important to study because of the opportunity it presents for student learning, growth, and development. The environmental aspect that will be looked at in this study is contact with host nationals. As students are exposed to new situations and ideas that are different from their own, they begin to reassess their ideas and create a new worldview that will accommodate their experiences (Kauffmann, 1982). A foreign country and its culture and people will certainly provide numerous experiences that create this dissonance in students' thinking. Experiencing extremely different views will likely force students to change their way of thinking. "It is likely that sensitivity to cognitive strain will be relatively great in a foreign country when one considers that the unfamiliar environment may reduce the probability of some of the usual alternatives to attitude change, i.e., persuading the other or discounting his competence" (Hofman & Zak, 1969, p. 166). Changes in students' attitudes will result from encountering difference on a daily basis. "Persons change as they encounter new conditions, new experiences, and new kinds of people for which pre-established responses are inadequate, and for which new skills, behaviors, words, concepts, and attitudes are required" (Chickering & Kuper, 1971, p. 260).

This study seeks to extend our understanding of the impact of interactions with people culturally different on students' level of intercultural sensitivity. Particularly, this study will focus on how interactions contribute to students' understanding and appreciation of difference, as well as their ability to work and communicate effectively with diverse people. It is hypothesized that the more interaction that students have with host nationals while on study abroad, the more they will learn about the culture and its people, as well as develop the ability to interact with people culturally different from themselves in the future. A majority of the research that seeks to understand the impact of contact with difference on understanding diversity and multiculturalism has been domestically-based. It is necessary to further understand how participation in study abroad contributes to students' understanding of diversity and multiculturalism. As institutions of higher education continually seek to understand what contributes to that dimension of student development, difficulty arises when there are vast differences in the execution of programs.

Previous research has shown that interaction with host nationals while on study abroad contributes to various developmental outcomes (Hensley & Sell, 1979; Hofman & Zak, 1969; Kafka, 1968; Kauffmann, 1982; Klineberg & Hill, 1979; Salter & Teger, 1975; Smith, 1955; Smith, 1971). An important outcome of experiences abroad is appreciating and understanding difference, which can be referred to as intercultural sensitivity. Interacting with people of a different culture and having to assess personal cultural values during those interactions will likely contribute to students' intercultural sensitivity. The increasing diversity of American society demands that students develop intercultural sensitivity in order to effectively contribute and interact with others different from themselves. While over 150,000 students study abroad each year, their programs

and experiences are vastly different. This study seeks to determine whether or not interaction with host nationals contributes to students' development of intercultural sensitivity. Students' experiences while abroad certainly allow them to experience a culture and way of life different from their own. While students may spend time in a foreign culture, their presence in the foreign culture in and of itself, does not provide sufficient conditions with which to facilitate change and development (Hansen, 1999).

Research Questions

The over-arching goal of this study is to understand the relationship between students' interaction with host nationals while on study abroad and their development of intercultural sensitivity. Because of the complexity of the independent variable, students' interaction with host nationals, several separate research questions will guide this study in an attempt to understand the nature of host national contact that relates to students' development of intercultural sensitivity.

The following research questions guided this study:

1. Do study abroad students experience a significant increase in their level of intercultural sensitivity?
2. Does the frequency and intimacy of contact with host nationals that study abroad students interact with on a weekly basis significantly relate to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity?
3. Does greater average amount of time spent weekly with host nationals significantly relate to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity?
4. Does interaction with host nationals of equal status (i.e., peers) significantly relate to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity?
5. Does the amount of direct contact with host nationals significantly relate to greater

overall development of intercultural sensitivity?

6. Does support from authority (e.g., professors, study abroad advisors) for contact with host nationals significantly relate to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity?
7. Does proficiency in the host country's language significantly relate to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity?
8. Does previous international travel experience significantly relate to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity?
9. Is there a positive relationship between students' satisfaction with the study abroad program and their overall development of intercultural sensitivity?

Significance of the Study

This study holds particular relevance to those who design and oversee study abroad programs. If one of the desired outcomes for students studying abroad is the development of intercultural sensitivity, an appreciation of difference, and the ability to work and live successfully with those different from themselves, then it is important to understand more fully how the various aspects of study abroad programs contribute to this outcome. Additionally, students and institutions of higher education invest a significant amount of time and money to the study abroad experience. Thus, uncovering the impact of students' interactions with host nationals allows both students and administrators to make decisions about the experiences that the student will seek, as well as ensure that opportunities are available for students to develop relationships with host nationals. Only a small number of studies linked specific experiences abroad with changes in personality functioning (Hofman & Zak, 1969), so this study is designed to expand the research on outcomes of specific aspects of the experience abroad. Because

the development of intercultural sensitivity on students who study abroad has not been researched, this study will expand our understanding of the significance of study abroad programs, further justifying their necessity and importance.

Several research studies have focused on the overall effect of study abroad on various outcomes. However, it is necessary to isolate the specific components of the study abroad experience to understand how they contribute to students' developmental outcomes. This study holds particular significance for international educators that send students abroad. Traveling abroad requires significant resources, particularly of time, money, and personal well-being. Students must also leave behind their social network of support, family and friends, in order to embark upon this experience.

Students' ability to understand and appreciate difference is one of the main goals of higher education. The main reason for this outcome is because successful functioning in the global economy is predicated on the intercultural competencies of workers (King & Baxter-Magolda, 2002). "In times of increased global interdependence, producing interculturally competent citizens who can engage in informed ethical decision-making when confronted with problems that involve a diversity of viewpoints is becoming an urgent priority" (King & Baxter-Magolda, 2002, p. 3). Studies have been conducted that seek to understand which programs and experiences at the American institution contribute to the development of tolerance and appreciation of difference. It is assumed that study abroad contributes to students' intercultural competence because of the environment that brings students in contact with difference, but it is necessary to understand the ways that study abroad programs achieve this.

Definitions

Study abroad is defined as an educational program whereby students live and

study in a foreign culture for some time during their academic career. Students' residential, academic, and social situations vary significantly from each other.

Student in this study will represent the individuals that participate in study abroad programs.

Host nationals are people native to the countries that students visit.

Foreigners refer to people from countries other than that of the students in this study, America, and the host country. In one case, an Australian may be a host national to one of the respondents studying in Australia, but may be considered a foreigner for an American studying in Japan.

Contact varies greatly from simple physical proximity to close friendship. The term *contact* stems from Allport's (1954) well-known contact hypothesis, which states that in order for positive intergroup relations to occur, several conditions must be in place, including equal status among members, cooperation, and support from authorities.

Genuine contact and superficial contact must be distinguished from each other. Genuine contact is contact that leads people to do things together, whereas superficial contact can be defined as a situation where you are in the physical presence of someone else, but where no interaction occurs (Salter & Teger, 1975).

For purposes of this study, the term *intimacy* will be used to define the type of interactions that students have with host nationals that requires them to have conversations with them, as well as plan and participate in activities and events together.

Interaction refers to the act of communicating with someone. Simply being in the presence of people who are culturally different will not bring about change. However, interaction assumes that accommodations are made in order to effectively communicate.

Friendship has varying degrees of intimacy and for the purposes of this study

will be used to understand students' relationships with host nationals. Gareis (1995) stated that "the phenomenon of friendship satisfies all or most of the conditions usually posited for the reduction of stereotypes and ethnocentric attitudes in intergroup contact" (p. 47).

Intercultural communication competence is a combination of skills, attitudes, awareness, and knowledge that fosters effective interaction with people of different cultures, races, and religions (Fantini, 1991).

Intercultural sensitivity reflects the emotions or feelings that people experience as a result of particular situations, people, and environments (Chen & Starosta, 1996). It is an affective process, which means that "interculturally competent persons are able to project and receive positive emotional responses before, during, and after intercultural interactions. These positive emotional responses will in turn lead to acknowledgement of and respect for cultural differences" (Chen & Starosta, p. 363).

Summary

The purpose of this investigation is to explore changes in students' level of intercultural sensitivity that may result from their interactions with host nationals while studying abroad. The primary reason for the selection of intercultural sensitivity as the focus of this inquiry is the importance of this attitude for students who will live, work, and lead in our increasingly complex and diverse world.

The next chapter will review the literature regarding study abroad outcomes, an overview of the theoretical basis of this study, and a discussion of the dependent variable, intercultural sensitivity.

CHAPTER 2:

Literature Review

This literature review provides a context for exploring the relationship between students' interactions with host nationals while on study abroad and their development of intercultural sensitivity. It examines the literature surrounding study abroad program outcomes, interaction with difference using contact theory as the underlying theoretical base (Allport, 1954), and intercultural sensitivity (Chen & Starosta, 1996).

A majority of the research on study abroad was conducted in the 1950's and 1960's because of the rise in popularity of and increased access to international experiences around that time. Research focusing on changes and developments occurring during study abroad has produced conflicting results. Varying methodologies have resulted in a body of literature on study abroad that leads to some strong conclusions but many more tentative ones (Kauffmann, 1982). There has neither been a consistently-used instrument to measure attitude change as a result of study abroad nor an instrument to measure intercultural sensitivity or personal development (Chen & Starosta, 1996; Kauffmann). Because of the diversity of study abroad programs which vary in length of stay, language of instruction, location, residential situation, students' purposes, institutions' purposes, and various other structural differences, there are a lack of supported conclusions which clearly describe the optimal program.

Contact with Difference

Interaction with difference has been proven to contribute to developmental and learning outcomes on college campuses (Gareis, 1995; Milem, 2003). The setting of a foreign culture also provides extensive opportunity for students to interact with difference. A majority of the evidence that supported this interaction has been based on domestic

difference, rather than cross-cultural difference. Several studies (Hensley & Sell, 1979; Hofman & Zak, 1969; Kafka, 1968; Kauffmann, 1982; Klineberg & Hull, 1979; Smith, 1955; Smith, 1971) found that contact with host nationals while on study abroad contributed to developmental outcomes, which will be discussed later in this chapter. Additionally, Brislin (1981) contended that one way to ensure positive outcomes of cross-cultural experiences was the development of close interpersonal relationships with people from a different culture. The present study explores whether or not students' interaction with host nationals also contributes to students' development of intercultural sensitivity. This line of reasoning, which originates from domestically-based studies that state that contact reduces intergroup hostility, is not complete. Rather, the desired outcomes depend on several factors and occur under certain conditions. Among the factors that form the contact hypothesis are equal status of the participants, contact based on cooperation between the groups, and contact supported by authorities (Bochner, Hutnik, & Furnham, 1985; Brislin). Additionally, other researchers (Brislin; Gareis, 1995) have argued that the contact must be genuine, as opposed to artificial. Each of the caveats of the contact hypothesis will be discussed further in this chapter.

Cook and Selltiz's (1955) study presented several variables that contributed to outcomes in cross-cultural contact situations. They recognized that the term "contact" had been applied to varying situations, which resulted in varying findings of the effect of contact. Cook and Selltiz recognized the necessity for a common ground upon which contact was defined, and sought to understand the characteristics of the contact that produced positive attitude change. Variables involving intergroup contact and intergroup attitudes can be separated into three categories—characteristics of the contact situation, characteristics of the individuals who are in contact, and the attitudinal and behavioral

outcomes (Cook & Selltiz).

This portion of the literature review first looks at Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis, which serves as the theoretical basis of this study. It is necessary to understand the origins of his hypothesis, research that has utilized the hypothesis, the ways in which it is applicable to cross-cultural contact, and how it will be utilized in this study. Several studies have determined that American students' interaction with host nationals while on study abroad have contributed to various outcomes. Thus, the next section of the literature review focuses on several studies that have found host national contact to be an important contributing factor in various student development outcomes. This chapter concludes with a discussion of the dependent variable, intercultural sensitivity and studies that have sought to further understand it.

Contact Hypothesis

Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis has been used to explain a great deal about human relations, particularly in terms of prejudice and difference. Allport theorized that as people come into contact with others different from themselves, their prejudiced ideas will diminish as they truly come to understand the other person. His hypothesis has been used to shape policies regarding school desegregation and intergroup contact in the United States (Amir, 1969). Allport's hypothesis continues to be used widely today in higher education. It was cited in the recent Supreme Court affirmative action decisions (*Gratz et al. v. Bollinger et. al., 2003; Grutter v. Bollinger et al., 2003*) as a means of understanding the importance and benefits of diversity on student learning and development in college. Allport argued that there are three aspects of the contact situation that are important in determining whether positive intergroup relations will develop—the existence of equal status within the situation for members of all groups, an emphasis on cooperative rather

than competitive activities, and the support of relevant authority figures for positive relations. Allport presented about 30 variables, including the three previously stated, that contribute to the outcome of contact with difference. Other variables include quantitative aspects, the social atmosphere surrounding the contact, the personality of the individuals in contact, and finally, areas of contact (Amir, 1969).

This large, but still not exhaustive, list of variables and categories serves only to emphasize the complexity of the problem. We should not, therefore, be surprised to find that research has not as yet satisfactorily covered all these variables. But, on the other hand, research has already advanced enough to indicate some of the relevant factors in this area (Amir, p. 321).

Several researchers have tested Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis and further extended our understanding of the type of contact necessary to facilitate positive attitude change (Amir, 1969; Bochner, 1982; Brein & David, 1971; Cook & Selltiz, 1955). For the most part, these studies have been conducted in a domestic environment and most have focused on contact between White people and minority groups (Amir, 1969). The concept of contact alone does not produce changes in attitudes in regards to ethnic relations (Amir). Kamal and Maruyama (1990) argued that the applicability of the contact hypothesis in the domestic environment can extend to the international arena as well. The general idea of the importance of contact with others will be studied to understand if specific characteristics of contact facilitate students' development of intercultural sensitivity.

Equal Status. The first caveat of Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis is that the contact situation must give equal status to the majority and minority groups. The status aspects include minority member having inferior status, the minority member having equal status, the minority member having superior status, and the status of the groups

involved. Another aspect of this includes whether or not there is a superordinate or subordinate role relationship involved, such as a student-teacher relationship, which would be common during the study abroad experience. This study expands upon Allport's concept of equal status; for students who are studying abroad, equal status individuals are defined as host national peers.

Cooperation. In addition to creating a situation that gives members of all groups equal status, it is also important that the activities required in the situation are cooperative rather than competitive (Allport, 1954). Schofield (1995) states that the cooperation aspect is necessary because competition often provides support for stereotypes and because "considerable research suggests that competition between groups can lead to stereotyping, to unwarranted devaluation of the other group's accomplishments, and to marked hostility, even when the groups initially have no history that might predispose them to negative reactions to each other" (p. 639).

Support from Authorities. The third caveat, support from authorities for positive relations, is likely necessary in order for students to have positive outcomes from contact with people different from themselves. The support of authority, law, and custom for positive equal-status relationships among members of all groups is vital to producing change in intergroup attitudes (Allport, 1954). Students abroad may be lost in a foreign culture and unsure about their ability to interact with host nationals. If this is the case, study abroad advisors will likely need to encourage students' interaction with host nationals because it is often easier for students to simply spend time with fellow Americans. Study abroad advisors and professors can promote the idea of interaction to students. If the students understand that being in contact with host nationals will contribute to their adjustment to the foreign culture, language fluency, and other

developmental dimensions, then they will likely seek out the interaction.

Quantitative Aspects of Contact. The quantitative aspect of contact, which includes frequency, duration, number of persons involved, and variety, is also important. Although it is not enough to determine the outcome of contact with difference simply by the number of host nationals students interact with for reasons previously mentioned, this information is necessary in order to under the whole picture of students' experiences abroad with host nationals.

Real versus Artificial Contact. The social atmosphere surrounding the contact was also important to Allport (1954). For example, is there segregation or egalitarianism, is the contact voluntary or involuntary, is the contact real or artificial, "is the contact regarded as typical or exceptional", and finally, "is the contact regarded as important and intimate, or as trivial and transient" (Allport, 1979, pp. 262-263). The necessity of contact as intimate as opposed to casual was supported by several studies (Brislin, 1981; Salter & Teger, 1975).

Pre-existing Characteristics. The personality of the individual is also important. This refers to the individual's initial prejudice level and type, the individual's feeling of life security or lack thereof, the individual's previous experiences with difference, and the individual's age and education level (Allport, 1954). The personality of the individual cannot be separated from their attitude development. By employing the retrospective data collection technique, which will be discussed further in chapter three, the respondents of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (Chen, 1993) will provide their pre-study abroad level of intercultural sensitivity, as well as their current level of intercultural sensitivity. Thus, after understanding the nature of their interaction with host nationals, the students' development can be measured by comparing their retrospective and current attitudes.

Areas of Contact. Finally, Allport (1954) offered several possible areas of contact, which include casual, residential, occupational, recreational, religion, civic and fraternal, and political activities. In this study, it will be important to understand the various situations that may elicit students' contact with host nationals, and more specifically, in regards to practice, the extent to which those situations, activities, and experiences encouraged and facilitated contact.

Studies Employing the Contact Hypothesis

Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis has lead many researchers to conduct studies to understand the applicability of his idea. The relationship between amount of contact with difference and stereotypes was studied by Triandis and Vassiliou (1967). The researchers utilized a semantic differential instrument to understand the stereotypes held by Americans and Greeks that work together. The subjects were separated into six groups, which were defined by their amount of contact. The Americans and Greeks with higher amounts of contacts with each other had more favorable attitudes than the Americans and Greeks who had little or no contact with each other. Triandis and Vassiliou, however, did not distinguish between the types of contact the subjects participated in; the findings of Allport's previous work were not included in the analysis of the results.

Kamal and Maruyama (1990) conducted a study based on Allport's contact hypothesis that sought to understand the relationship between the experience of 223 students from the State of Qatar studying in the U.S. and their attitudes toward the U.S. "It delineates a conceptual framework frequently used for examining intergroup contact among American groups, translates that framework to international contact, and applies it to the study of a group of foreign college students attending schools in the United States" (pp. 123-124). The instrument employed in their study contained demographic questions,

measures that sought to understand the quantity and quality of the Qatari students' contact with Americans, questions about the students' adjustment and satisfaction, as well as their attitudes toward American and Qatari cultural values. They measured types of direct contact with items about time spent with Americans, number of American friends, number of American parties attended, and interaction preference. They also measured the amount of indirect contact, length of stay, previous cross-cultural contact, perceived ease of establishing friendships with Americans, and their feelings of being treated as equal by Americans.

Although this study focused on foreign students in the United States, the findings provided insight into the present study. Kamal and Maruyama (1990) related dimensions of the students' contacts with host nationals to their satisfaction with the academic program, satisfaction with the education, social adjustment, attitudes toward Americans, attitudes toward the American government, perceptions of American attitude toward Arabs, and attitudes toward traditional views about women. However, they did not attempt to understand the specific types of contact Qatari students had with Americans to the caveats of Allport's contact hypothesis. The authors' argument for the need to explore contact theory between people from different countries was particularly relevant to this study. The items the researchers used to measure contact will be utilized in this study because of the emphasis on friendship, which is often characterized by several of the caveats of Allport's hypothesis. Focusing specifically on the relationship between contact with host nationals and adjustment, Kamal and Maruyama found "that positive attitudes do not result simply as a function of time spent in proximity with Americans" (p. 130). Rather, the type of interaction, in this case direct contact with Americans as measured by time spent with Americans, number of American friends, number of American parties

attended, and interaction preference, contributed to positive attitude development.

Perceived ease of establishing friendships with Americans was also found to correlate significantly to several of the dependent variables.

Stephan and Stephan (1992) tested their model of intergroup anxiety by studying a group of 86 college students that participated in a brief study abroad program in Morocco. They found that students' anxiety about interacting with Moroccans decreased significantly as a result of their stay. The researchers found that the students' contact with host nationals was associated with both decreased anxiety and increased anxiety, depending upon the amount and type of contact. Thus, the type of contact created differing levels of anxiety, which supported the assertion that only specific types of contact lead to positive change in students' anxiety levels. Contact was measured by six items, which listed settings in which participants had contact with Moroccans, a 10-point scale measuring the number of host nationals they spoke with for five minutes or more, which ranged from none to 25 or more, and a 10-point pleasantness-of-contact scale on which the students indicated how positive the contact was, ranging from not at all to extremely (Stephan & Stephan). The researchers found a difference between threatening and non-threatening contact. Threatening contact, which was associated with increased anxiety, occurred when the subjects were in contact with host nationals at restaurants, cafes, nightclubs, bars, on the street, and in parks, open markets, and private homes. Non-threatening contact situations occurred at cultural events, sporting events, movies, social events, such as parties and outings, and institutional settings, such as schools and hospitals. The researchers explained that although students' time spent in private homes increased anxiety, it was for different reasons that the other threatening contact situations; the individualized contact may have caused increased anxiety because of the students'

inability to interact effectively within the host culture since their stay was very short (Stephan & Stephan). The fact that differing types of contact led to differing outcomes follows Allport's theory that not all contact with people different will lead to positive outcomes; specific types of contact are necessary.

Nesdale and Todd (2000) implemented an intervention in a residence hall at an Australian university that promoted intercultural contact among Australian students and international students living in the hall. The 76 Australian and international students who lived in one residence hall for a seven month period were compared with a control group of 71 Australian and international students in a controlled residence hall on three variables, cultural stereotypes, cultural knowledge, and cultural openness. When compared with a control group, encouraging intercultural interaction significantly influenced the level of intercultural acceptance and cross-cultural knowledge and openness of the Australian students. These findings are of particular relevance to Allport's caveat that support from authority is necessary to promote a change in attitudes between different groups.

Applied Domestically versus Internationally

The majority of the studies conducted that seek to understand more fully the contact hypothesis have been conducted domestically. Allport (1954) argued that being in the mere presence of people racially, culturally, or religiously different than oneself is not going to bring about change in prejudicial attitudes and develop friendly relations. However, Allport's theory is based upon domestic ideas and situations. For students that are studying abroad, the opportunity for contact with host nationals is an everyday occurrence. It is important to understand contact that students have with host nationals while on study abroad in regards to the caveats of Allport's hypothesis to determine

whether or not the relevance of the contact theory changes when applied internationally. An important difference to note between the use of Allport's hypothesis internationally is that the negative feelings on the part of study abroad students toward host nationals may not be present. Thus, this application differs from how Allport envisioned the use of the contact hypothesis. The present study seeks to extend the contact hypothesis to the international realm and understand how contact with people different from themselves will contribute to students' development of intercultural sensitivity. Because intercultural sensitivity represents the affective aspect of intercultural communication competence, the emotions that are required in the interactions between people can be understood by examining the contact hypothesis.

Nearly fifty years ago, Selltiz, Hopson, and Cook (1956) recognized the differences that appear when attempting to apply Allport's (1954) domestically-based contact hypothesis to the international arena. Although there are similarities between the two situations, there are also several differences which must be discussed. "One difference between the two types of situation is likely to be the extent to which individuals have well-structured preconceptions of the groups with whose members they are entering into contact" (Selltiz, Hopson, & Cook, p. 33). Because, for the most part, students choose the country that they will visit, it is more likely that they will have positive feelings about the country and its people, as opposed to strong prejudices. Allport's work revolved around groups that had "well structured negative stereotypes about the other group" (Selltiz, Hopson, & Cook, p. 34). Additionally, in the domestic arena, the groups spoke a common language, and often had common cultural and national values upon which they could relate to each other (Selltiz, Hopson, & Cook).

Interactions that cross national identities may well prove to be more complex

than intergroup contacts between individuals from a single country. In the latter case, there is typically a common language, shared cultural symbols, and common citizenship. In the former, cultural differences and language barriers may contribute to the formation of negative attitudes by producing divergent perspectives and by inhibiting contact (Kamal & Maruyama, 1990, p. 125).

Another difference between the domestic and international environments includes the compounding factors that occur when a student is in a foreign country. The student is participating in new experiences, with their contact with host nationals being one of many of those experiences (Selltiz, Hopson, & Cook). Whereas studies based on the contact hypothesis conducted in the U.S. were able to keep all other situational factors constant, except for the new interactions between different groups of people, studying the contact hypothesis on students' experiences while studying abroad does not allow for such a clean research design (Selltiz, Hopson, & Cook).

In summary, the general idea of Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis that states that contact with people different from oneself will lead to attitude change contributes to our ability to understand the importance of students' interaction with host nationals while studying abroad. Allport's hypothesis sought to understand the nature of contact that will produce positive attitude change. It focused on the quantitative aspect of contact, contact as real or artificial, as well as the various caveats previously found in other studies to contribute to positive attitude change, equal status, cooperation, and support from authorities. This hypothesis and previous research are particularly relevant to the present study and will be included in the construction of the instrument. The next section of this literature review will discuss the studies that have found interaction with host nationals to be a contributing factor to students' development along various dimensions.

Overview of Study Abroad Research Findings

Previous research has focused on the ways in which study abroad contributes to students' personality, interests, values (Smith, 1971), attitudes towards the host country (Hofman & Zak, 1969; Salter & Teger, 1975), worldmindedness (Hensley & Sell, 1979; Kafka, 1968; Smith, 1955), political attitudes, independence (Kauffmann, 1982), and career choice and vocational goals (Carsello & Creaser, 1976). Additional effects of studying abroad that have been researched include greater awareness of cultural relationships, increased open-mindedness, broadening horizons, and new insights into one's own self (Kauffmann). Impacts of study abroad on behavior, educational and job decisions, values, and American identity have also been studied (Abrams, 1979).

Kauffmann (1992) stated that there are three categories of study abroad research. The first is intellectual development, including such areas as academic achievement, language acquisition, discovery of a new career related to their major, and knowledge of different subjects. The second category, personal development, includes four parts: intrapersonal understanding, such as individuals' self-concept, self confidence, self esteem, and independence, interpersonal skills, such as a broader range of friends and new criteria for friendship, values, and life direction. Kauffmann's third category of research is composed of changes in international perspectives, which includes three areas—perceptions of their home culture, perceptions of the host culture, and the individual's level of global understanding. Whether or not study abroad impacts students is no longer questionable; the experience abroad facilitates students' learning and development because of the environment and opportunities to encounter difference.

While extensive studies have been conducted to understand the impact of study abroad on various student attitudes, values, personalities and behaviors, there is a lack of

research surrounding the possible outcome of intercultural sensitivity after participation in a study abroad program. Since “international and intercultural contacts on a global scale are a reality of modern life” (Fantini, 1991, p. 15), uncovering how study abroad programs could contribute to students’ level of intercultural sensitivity is important because their intercultural sensitivity is a measure of their outlook on difference. The majority of the studies focused on various aspects of the study abroad experience and cited interaction with host nationals as one of many aspects of their time abroad as influential. This study seeks to isolate the interaction variable.

Study Abroad Outcomes Related to Contact with Host Nationals

Several studies conducted on study abroad outcomes have found contact with host nationals to be important in students’ development along the various dimensions researched. This portion of the literature review focuses on those studies. Each of the studies found contact with host nationals as one of many causes of students’ change while abroad. However, this study seeks to isolate the influence of students’ interaction with host nationals to better understand what conditions are necessary in those interactions for them to impact students’ learning and attitudes. In order to reach an appropriate conclusion, it is necessary understand the types of variables that other researchers have found as important in order to make accurate conclusions about the students’ experiences.

Smith’s (1955) study was one of the first attempts to research the effects of study abroad. Smith’s study included 310 American high school and college students. The majority of the sample went to Europe and the subjects were divided into four experimental groups based upon their study abroad experience. The main experimental group was composed of 136 students who participated in the Experiment for International Living program. The other experimental groups included 26 students who participated in

the Quaker International Voluntary Service, 40 students who traveled with the United States National Student Association, and 44 who went to Europe as tourists. A control group of students who stayed in the U.S. for the summer were also included in the study. Specifically, Smith's study looked at whether certain types of intercultural experience have differing impacts on students' attitudes and behavior using, among other measures, the Worldmindedness Scale. Relevant to the present study, Smith determined that people who developed close relationships with host nationals were significantly more likely than others to participate in international activities after living abroad. Because the study was conducted with students in four different environments, Smith also concluded that "an unstructured, heterogeneous intercultural experience does not have a significant impact on general social attitudes" (p. 477). This finding is important as it relates to Allport's contact hypothesis, as well as implications for study abroad programs; simply being in the presence of difference does not bring about change. Rather, it may be important to promote interaction with host nationals to students during their time abroad. Smith concluded that a short international experience does not greatly affect general attitudes, and that a student's post-sojourn attitudes are "determined more by what his attitudes are like before he leaves home than by what happens to him while he is away" (p. 475). Smith suggested "that a person's attitudes before an overseas experience were a greater determinant of attitude change than what happened while he was abroad" (as cited in Kafka, 1968, p. 18) because students with high worldmindedness scores on the pre-test seemed to place greater importance on their relationships with host nationals, but did not show significant changes in their worldmindedness or ethnocentrism scores. Thus, the importance of understanding students' attitudes before their time abroad is necessary to understand how the experience affected them. Smith was one of the first researchers to

dismiss the effects of an international experience. Although Smith's conclusions were made when research on study abroad outcomes was just beginning, the research continued, and the effects of international experiences were seen in other research.

Using Smith and Sampson's World-mindedness Scale, the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, and Prince's Differential Values Inventory, Kafka (1968) sampled 81 students who studied abroad, and compared them with a control group of 127 students, all Justin Morrill College undergraduates. For the purpose of his study, worldmindedness was defined as "purely a value orientation, or frame of reference apart from knowledge about, or interest in, international relations. A worldminded person favors a worldview of the problems of humanity; his primary reference group is mankind..." (p. 8). Many studies sought to understand this dimension of development, worldmindedness, but were hard-pressed to do so, because there were no existing instruments used to measure it. The purpose of Kafka's study was to evaluate the effects of a study abroad experience on the "development of toleration for diversity and appreciation for the similarities of mankind" (p. 5). Kafka explored how selected variables related to changes in the attitude of worldmindedness and "how these personal and situational variables related to each other in the context of an intensive experience in another culture" (p. 59). Kafka hypothesized that students who were initially less worldminded would increase in worldmindedness more than those who were initially high in worldmindedness; the amount of change would be greater for students with initially lower levels of worldmindedness, so the abroad experience would affect students differently.

Kafka's (1968) research sought to understand the effect of intercultural exposure on students' attitudes and was based upon the idea that "overseas educational programs are predicated on the belief that contact with another culture accelerates change" (p. 4).

However, contact with the culture in and of itself did not necessarily lead to change; relationships and human interaction provided experiences that often lead to change (Gareis, 1995). While his first hypothesis seemed unrelated to the stated purpose of his study, Kafka also hypothesized that students who made a close host national friend increase in worldmindedness more than those who do not make a close friend from the host country.

Kafka's (1968) results did not find any variables related to change in world-mindedness. Kauffmann (1992) summarized other results of Kafka's study in the following way: "Those who achieved cross-cultural immersion had more frequent and more intimate contact with host nationals, had more confidence in their language ability, and their rating of the host country improved at the expense of the U.S." (p. 165).

Hofman and Zak (1969) studied 112 Jewish high school students during an abroad experience in Israel. Their study, although conducted on high school students not college students, is closely related to the present study. They hypothesized that "interpersonal contact mediates attitude change in a cross-cultural situation" (Hofman & Zak, p. 170). The results of the pre- post- test were analyzed by placing the students in two groups according to their degree of interaction with host nationals. The authors sought to test two groups of variables—attitudes towards Jewishness (interest, closeness, interdependence, solidarity, and centrality) and attitudes toward Israel (help, interdependence, immigration, and Hebrew). They found that Jewish students with high levels of contact with host nationals developed favorable attitudes on all items, while the low contact group became less favorable on three variables and evidenced no change on the other six. While the results of their study supported their hypothesis, and students with high levels of contact with host nationals experienced attitude change to a greater

degree than those students with a low level of contact, a major question still remained—“Why some [students] made more contact than others” (Hofman & Zak, p. 170)? The program was not designed so that one group had more contact than the other. However, some students had more contact with host nationals, which contributed to changes in their attitudes. Additionally, Hofman and Zak did not distinguish between the type of contact experienced by the high contact group; was the contact with peers, was it cooperative, was it supported by authorities of the program? Hofman and Zak did not provide a theoretical base for their findings in their study. However, it is likely that Allport’s (1954) contact theory would have been applicable.

Smith (1971) used the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values scale to understand changes in students’ attitudes, values, and interests and specific programmatic characteristics of their study abroad experience. Smith found that the two most influential program characteristics in producing greater development of attitudes, values, and interests were breadth of exposure to non-Americans and the presence of an American subculture. Smith included several independent variables in his study, such as units of enrollment, language of instruction, residence, breadth of exposure to non-Americans, presence of an American subculture, course differences, and perceived helpfulness of the hosts. Other characteristics that were found significant in promoting change were living with a host family, as opposed to living in a dormitory, and classes held completely or partially in English, as opposed to instruction only in the host language. While Smith’s study found exposure to non-Americans to result in the greater development of attitudes, values, and interests, it is unclear from the research how breadth of exposure to non-Americans was measured.

Salter and Teger (1975) sampled 73 Intersarsity Christian Fellowship (IVCF)

workers and tourists, which were split in four groups, two experiment groups and two control groups. Salter and Teger hypothesized that contact with host nationals enhances the sojourner's attitude toward the countries visited. For the researchers, it was important to control for two problems in earlier studies that they identified. First, they sought to understand the distinction between genuine and superficial contact, and second, they sought to address the failure to specify the dimensions of contact of attitudinal measurement (Salter & Teger). Salter and Teger developed a questionnaire to measure the degree of positive feelings about the host country. On a seven-point scale, the subjects rated the positivity of their feelings about the country in general, its internal governmental systems, the style and quality of life of the people, the food, culture, and entertainment, the sights and tourist attractions, the warmth and friendliness of the people, how hardworking and efficient the people were, and whether the U.S. should send foreign aid and/or military assistance if they country needed it in the future. While the experimental design of this study separated the subjects into four groups, the researchers generalized the effects of the different situations. In terms of questions relating specifically to their contact with host nationals, the respondents rated how well they could speak the local language, how they felt toward their fellow IVCF members, how their socioeconomic status compared to that of the host nationals, if they felt their attitudes had changes, how intimate their contact was with the local populace, how much they traveled before the trip, and how much contact they had had previously with people from other cultures. Although the researchers stated the need to distinguish genuine contact from superficial contact, their study was unclear as to what items were used to measure the difference.

Salter and Teger (1975) found that travelers increased in positive attitudes,

working sojourners decreased in positive attitudes, and that the host country also influenced the changes in attitudes. When the participants experienced genuine in-depth contact, there was change, but there was no change associated with superficial contact. As stated earlier, simply greeting people on the street or exchanging money with a store clerk in a foreign country do not require the same effort as does participating in genuine contact with host nationals.

The authors argued that “genuine contact should be distinguished from superficial contact, in which another person is physically present although the subject does not actively interact with him” (Salter & Teger, 1975, p. 214). This argument is key to the present study as well; being in the presence of difference is not sufficient in bringing about development of intercultural sensitivity. Rather, interaction with host nationals in the context of another culture is hypothesized to facilitate the development of intercultural sensitivity. Salter and Teger used the findings of a previous study by Selltitz and Cook (1962) to influence their study. “Simply the amount of time spent in another country had little effect on the international attitudes of visitors. However, the proportion of free time which had been spent with host nationals correlated with how favorable the attitudes towards them were” (Salter & Teger, p. 214). Thus, there must be interaction with host nationals for attitude change to occur.

Salter and Teger (1975) made another conclusion that contributes to the purpose of this study. They “concluded that while interpersonal contact is important in inducing attitude change, reaction to the overall experience may be a more powerful determinant” (Sell, 1983, p. 140). However, Hensley and Sell’s (1979) study, which will be discussed next, found evidence against this claim. Thus, it is important to understand students’ overall reaction to the experience as a whole, as well as their reaction to the specific area

of contact with host nationals.

Hensley and Sell (1979) assessed students' attitude change surrounding the areas of worldmindedness, the support of the United Nations, self-esteem, and tolerance of ambiguity from a sample of 52 students enrolled in the UN component of a semester abroad program in Geneva. Worldmindedness was studied in order to understand the effect of the overall study abroad experience. The United Nations construct was studied because the students in the sample were studying in Geneva, Switzerland, the European headquarters of the United Nations. Self-esteem and tolerance of ambiguity were studied because these psychological variables are often associated with international understanding and personal development (Hensley & Sell). Using Sampson and Smith's worldmindedness scale, Rosenberg's self-esteem scale, Budner's tolerance of ambiguity scale, and a conglomeration of questions from various sources to test attitudes of support for the United Nations, Hensley and Sell sought to understand the students' attitude change as a result of studying abroad.

One of Hensley and Sell's (1979) guiding questions was, "what specific characteristics of the environment seem to have the strongest effect upon student attitudes" (p. 392)? The students were also asked about their overall satisfaction with the program, as well as their degree of contact with non-Americans because of previous studies (Kelman, 1975; Salter & Teger, 1975) that suggested that these concepts are influential in determining the effects of the study abroad experience. In order to understand the participants degree of contact with non-Americans, the respondents were asked about the number of non-American homes they visited, the number of non-American friends they made, the number of those friends that they expect to keep in contact with, and the percentage of time spent with non-Americans during an average

week. The authors found that the change that occurred in the students was an increase in self-esteem. Important to the present study, Hensley and Sell found evidence that students' enjoyment of their study abroad experience and their contact with non-Americans contributed to their changes in self-esteem. Hensley and Sell's study supported Smith's (1955) view that a person's attitude before an international experience is more likely to explain their attitude upon their return more than what happens while abroad. Hensley and Sell's final conclusion was that "the extent of contact with non-Americans is a more important factor in attitude change, although the impact is on psychological and non political attitudes" (p. 407).

Klineberg and Hull (1979) conducted a comprehensive study of the effects of study abroad on over 2,500 college students studying in eleven different countries. The authors sought to understand the relationships between the problems students faced abroad and personal interactions and friendships with host nationals to students' adjustment. The students in this study responded to items about the types of people they spent their time with, with whom they were in contact as a result of their residential situation, how they would categorize their best friend in terms of nationality, and the situations in which they have social and indirect contact with host nationals. The researchers sought to understand what types of individuals the students were spending time with, and found that differing campus characteristics (i.e., size) resulted in differing amounts of time spent with host nationals and other non-Americans. The students responded to items about having friends during their time abroad because, regardless of the nationality of the friends, the support of such a relationship would likely contribute to their adjustment. The situational items focused on social and indirect factors that could bring students and host nationals together. These included opportunities for social contact

with local families, invitations to visit them, walks, outings, or evenings with families, doing academic work in cooperation with host nationals, involvement in community activities, artistic and social activities, the opportunity to discuss significant issues (as determined by the respondents) with host nationals, positive contact with neighbors, and meals with neighbors (Klineberg & Hull).

Klineberg and Hull (1979) found that some factors will influence students' contact with host nationals, such as prior international experience, but that over time these factors do not significantly impact their experience abroad. The researchers also noted the difficulties related to studying social contact; "what is seen as contact by one individual may be seen as nothing but pure routine politeness by another" (p. 54). They found that social contact with host nationals and prior foreign experiences were most important to students' coping process while abroad.

The stated purpose of Kauffmann's (1982) study was to determine whether changes in personality functioning were related to studying abroad. For his sample, Kauffmann compared a group that studied on their home campus and a group that spent a trimester abroad. The control group consisted of 81 students who did not study abroad, and the experimental group consisted of 126 students who participated in the Study Service Trimester abroad program. Each of the groups was surveyed before and after the experience using the Omnibus Personality Inventory. The study found that students who participated in study abroad had an increased interest in reflective thought, increased self-esteem and independence, and an increased interest in the welfare of others. He determined that the personality changes were related to the students' depth of contact with the culture and service assignments. Students' extent of contact with host nationals and the quality of their host family were two aspects of the study abroad experience most

often related to increased intrapersonal development and with the liberalization of attitudes, values, and interests (Kauffmann). While this study found that depth of contact with the culture, service assignments, and home stays as contributing to students' personality changes, the researcher failed to quantify or qualify the contact component. Kauffmann stated that "the development of individuals is facilitated through the exposure to situations and ideas which cannot be assimilated into their present worldview" (p. 6). This idea shows that students develop cognitively as a result of experiences that are unlike anything they have ever dealt with. It is clear that students have such experiences while studying in a new culture, with differing norms, values, and beliefs than those of their home culture.

Global Attitude Development

The studies discussed in this chapter have measured a variety of constructs, including attitudes toward the host culture (Hofman & Zak, 1969; Salter & Teger, 1975) and worldmindedness (Hensley & Sell, 1979; Kafka, 1968; Smith, 1955). Several other constructs, such as global perspective, internationalism, international understanding, international awareness, intercultural maturity, intercultural competence, and intercultural sensitivity seek to measure similar ideas. It is beneficial to understand how the constructs mentioned above both relate to each other, as well as differ. For purposes of this study, students' development along the dimension of intercultural sensitivity will be measured.

Global Perspective

Hanvey (1976) was one of the first researchers to attempt to define the characteristics that comprise a global perspective. Hanvey sought to describe the cognitive, affective, and intellectual aspects that would contribute to the formation of a global perspective. Hanvey's work was specifically geared toward developing a construct

that may be acquired by students in the course of their formal and informal education. “A global perspective is not a quantum, something you either have or don’t have. It is a blend of many things and any given individual may be rich in certain elements and relatively lacking in others” (p. 2). McCabe (1994) was another major contributor to the concept of a global perspective. In his study of students participating in the Semester at Sea program, McCabe argued for five dimensions of a global perspective—fear versus openness, people as the same or different versus people as the same and different, naivety versus cross-cultural knowledge and understanding, pro or anti-Americanism versus pro- and anti-Americanism, and ethnocentrism versus globalcentrism. Another researcher stated that a global perspective has two elements—substantive and perceptual (Case, 1993). The substantive aspect “refers to knowledge of various features of the world and how it works; it promotes knowledge of people and places beyond students’ own community and country, and knowledge of events and issues beyond the local and immediate” (p. 318). The perceptual aspect refers to the “capacity to see the ‘whole picture’ whether focusing on a local or an international matter; it involves nurturing perspectives that are empathic, free of stereotypes, not predicated on naïve or simplistic assumptions, and not colored by prejudicial sentiments” (p. 318).

International Understanding

“International understanding involves knowledge of and awareness about issues and events of national and international significance as well as general attitudes that reflect heightened sensibility to international issues, people, and culture” (Carlson & Widaman, 1988, p. 2). International understanding is more cognitive in nature and would not necessarily require interaction with difference in order to develop. Rather, this understanding may be obtained through studies done in one’s home country, which does

not provide students with the challenges that often accompany attitude change.

Global Competency

Global competence is characterized by substantive knowledge, perceptual understanding, and intercultural communication skills that allow the person to “effectively interact in our globally interdependent world” (Olson & Kroeger, 2001, p. 117).

Knowledge of cultures, languages, world issues, global dynamics, and human choices comprise the substantive knowledge of global competency (Wilson, 1996). Perceptual understanding includes open-mindedness, resistance to stereotyping, complexity of thinking, and perspective consciousness (Wilson). The components that fall under the category of intercultural communication include skills, such as adaptability, empathy, cross-cultural awareness, and intercultural relations (Olson & Kroeger).

Worldmindedness

Worldmindedness is not comprised of simply knowledge about or interest in international relations. Rather, “a worldminded person favors a worldview of the problems of humanity; his primary reference group is mankind...” (Kafka, 1968, p. 8). Developing worldmindedness often results from experiences that are international in nature, such as traveling or living abroad. Worldmindedness requires individuals to expand their domestically-based viewpoint, and think of the global ramifications of issues.

Multicultural Competence

Multicultural competence is defined as “the awareness, knowledge, and skills necessary to work effectively and ethically across cultural differences” (King & Howard-Hamilton, 2001, p. 123). Pope and Reynolds (1997) enumerate several skills of a multiculturally competent person, which include “the ability to identify and openly discuss cultural differences and issues,” to “differentiate between individual differences, cultural

differences, and universal similarities,” and “to use cultural knowledge and sensitivity to make more culturally sensitive and appropriate interventions” (p. 271). Often, multicultural competence has a scope that is limited to the domestic arena. While it refers to the ability to work across differences, it is assumed that the work is being done in one’s home culture. Additional skills and abilities, beyond those that compose multicultural competence, are necessary when working with difference in a culture where the students are the difference.

Intercultural Maturity

Intercultural maturity is an alternative way of describing the development of intercultural competence (King & Baxter-Magolda, 2002). Knowledge of facts and awareness are no longer sufficient to be considered interculturally competent. Rather, students must achieve “a level of individual transformation that enables them to apply their knowledge and skills in a variety of contexts” (p. 5). King and Baxter-Magolda argue that the ultimate educational outcome is not intercultural competence, but rather intercultural maturity, which is a framework that includes cognitive, identity, interpersonal development and their interconnections.

Intercultural Competence

Intercultural competence is an approach that relates directly to the skills and abilities necessary to live and work effectively in a culture different from one’s own. Intercultural competence can be understood as the ability to adapt to different cultures by developing an inclusive and interactive view of the world (Taylor, 1994). It requires people to adapt their view to succeed in a different culture. King and Baxter-Magolda (2002) suggest that

intercultural competence is a complex, multi-faceted phenomenon that appears

to require a wide variety of attributes; these include having an informed understanding of cultural practices, reasoning abilities that enable one to analyze complex problems and construct solutions, social skills that enable one to enhance conversations among diverse groups, and personal attributes (such as tolerance, openness, and the courage to stand up for one's beliefs) that enhance and support the application of one's knowledge and skills (p. 6).

Intercultural competence cannot be achieved by developing one skill, but rather it requires the development of several skills "that develop independently, but that are interdependent and mutually reinforcing" (King & Baxter-Magolda, p. 6).

Fantini (1991) views intercultural competence as the ability to establish and maintain positive relationships, communicate effectively, and cooperate with others who are different. Intercultural competence is a combination of skills, attitudes, awareness, and knowledge that fosters effective interaction with people of different cultures, races, and religions (Fantini).

Intercultural Sensitivity

In their discussion of intercultural communication competence, Chen and Starosta (1996) explain while there has been a great deal of research conducted on this topic, and intercultural sensitivity in particular, scholars "have been unable to provide a consistent framework for an understanding of the notion of interdependence and interconnectedness of the complex multicultural dynamics" (p. 370). Additionally, "operationally, they have failed to provide a clear direction for the development of a valid and reliable intercultural communication competence instrument" (p. 370). While it is clear that several constructs exist that attempt to understand the ideas of intercultural competence, intercultural sensitivity will be measured in this study.

Much like the complexity involved with understanding the differences between globalmindedness, global perspective, and other such terms, there are several definitions of intercultural sensitivity. “With increased attention paid to intercultural sensitivity in the multicultural and globalizing society throughout the past decades, confusions relating to the concept have increased as well” (Chen & Starosta, 2000, p. 3). There are several researchers that have sought to define and measure intercultural sensitivity (Bennett, 1986; Chen & Starosta). Additionally, other scholars have used the term intercultural sensitivity to further extend the construct of intercultural competence and intercultural maturity (Brislin & Bhawuk, 1992; King & Baxter-Magolda, 2002). Following a discussion of the ways in which intercultural sensitivity have been defined and expanded, Bennett’s developmental model of intercultural sensitivity will be discussed. Finally, the model of intercultural sensitivity developed by Chen and Starosta that will be utilized in this study will be presented.

Definitions. Intercultural sensitivity is an individual’s awareness, knowledge, and appreciation of cultural difference (King & Baxter-Magolda, 2002). To Brislin and Bhawuk (1992), intercultural sensitivity consists of three elements, including the understanding of cultural behaviors, open-mindedness towards cultural differences, and the ability to be flexible in the host culture. “To be effective in another culture, people must be interested in other cultures, be sensitive enough to notice cultural differences, and then also be willing to modify their behavior as an indication of respect for the people of other cultures” (Brislin & Bhawuk, p. 416). Brislin and Bhawuk viewed these qualities as intercultural sensitivity, and further suggested that individuals’ level of intercultural sensitivity may be a predict how effective they are in a culture different from their own.

Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity. Bennett (1986) provided a six-stage developmental model of intercultural sensitivity that begins with ethnocentrism

and moves through to ethnorelativism. In the ethnocentric stage, there is a denial that differences among people and cultures exist. Someone who can be described as ethnocentric does not see difference and believes that everyone is the same. However, pure ethnocentrism is a rarely found. (Bennett). The second level is defensiveness, in which people perceive of differences as threatening (Bennett). In this stage, it is common for the individual to make negative judgments against those who are different. The next stage is a minimization of the perceived differences, whereby the differences are not perceived as great or important. “We’re all alike under the skin” (Hess, 1991, p. 5) is a common statement made by someone in this stage. Acceptance is the next level and this is when people recognize that differences exist, that differences are important, and that they can be both positive and negative” (Bennett). After acceptance is adaptation, which is “the willingness to accommodate and adjust one’s behavior to the patterns and styles of another culture” (Hess, p. 5). The final stage of Bennett’s model is adoption and integration, which is characterized by “the merging of selected aspects of another culture into one’s own cultural identity or patterns of thinking and behaving, leading to one’s becoming a bi- or multicultural person” (Hess, p. 6).

The stages of Bennett’s (1986) developmental model intended to provide a series of stages, which would correspond to individuals’ level of intercultural sensitivity (Bennett). Bennett’s “objective is to help us deal with the ‘concept of fundamental difference,’ which is the ‘most problematic and threatening idea that many of us will ever encounter” (Bennett as cited in Olson & Kroeger, 2001, p. 119). It is a subjectivist approach, which is based upon the belief that “the key to such sensitivity and related skills in intercultural communication is the way in which learners construe cultural difference” (Bennett, p. 179). Bennett’s model of intercultural sensitivity sought to

describe the development from ethnocentrism, which is a worldview where one's culture is the only reality, to ethnorelativism, where all cultures are given equal respect. To Bennett, intercultural sensitivity was seen as an individual's ability to change affectively, cognitively, and behaviorally from denying other cultures to an integration of those cultures. "Bennett asserts that students are asked to transcend traditional ethnocentrism and to explore new relationships across cultural boundaries in the development of intercultural sensitivity, with the goal of moving from ethnocentrism through stages of greater recognition and acceptance of difference toward ethnorelativism" (Gingerich, 1988, p. 51).

Olson and Kroeger (2001) conducted a study using a survey based on Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity that sought to understand the relationships between previous international experience and global competencies on a university's faculty and staff's level of intercultural sensitivity. (Olson & Kroeger). An important relationship was found between subjects' proficiency in a foreign language and experience abroad with their level of intercultural sensitivity. Three months or more experience abroad was considered substantial by the researchers and was found to be a significant contributor to the respondents' level of intercultural sensitivity. This provides encouragement to the present study because it will measure students' development of intercultural sensitivity following a semester, typically three to four months, abroad. Although substantial international experience contributed to their increased levels of intercultural sensitivity, Olson and Kroeger's study failed to uncover the specific aspects of those experiences that could account for the increased levels of intercultural sensitivity.

Model of Intercultural Communication. Chen and Starosta (2000) developed a model of intercultural communication competence, which defines intercultural sensitivity as one of its

three aspects. “The model aims at promoting interactants’ abilities to acknowledge, respect, tolerate, and integrate cultural differences, so that they can qualify for enlightened global citizenship” (Chen & Starosta, 1996, p. 362). The model represents an affective perspective, or intercultural sensitivity, a cognitive perspective, or intercultural awareness, and a behavioral perspective, or intercultural adroitness (Chen & Starosta).

The affective component of intercultural communication competence, intercultural sensitivity, focuses on the changes in feelings that result from situations, people, and environments (Chen & Starosta, 1996). The idea behind the intercultural sensitivity is that when people are interculturally competent, they are “able to project and receive positive emotional responses before, during, and after intercultural interactions” (p. 363). These emotional responses will lead to the individual’s acknowledgement of and respect for cultural differences (Chen & Starosta).

Four personal attributes form the foundation of the affective perspective on intercultural communication competence: self-concept, open-mindedness, nonjudgmental attitudes, and social relaxation. The first is self-concept, which is the view a person has of him- or herself (Chen & Starosta, 1996). Open-mindedness is described as an individual’s willingness to share their ideas and opinions openly, as well as to accept the views of others (Chen & Starosta). Adler stated that the open-mindedness attribute is parallel to “the characteristics of a multicultural person, who is willing to accept different patterns of life and to accept, psychologically and socially, a multiplicity of realities” (as cited in Chen & Starosta, p. 363). Third, “being nonjudgmental means holding no prejudices that will prevent one from listening sincerely to others during intercultural communication” (Chen & Starosta, p. 363). The final attribute of intercultural sensitivity, social relaxation, can be defined as one’s comfortability with intercultural communication (Chen & Starosta).

The cognitive aspect of intercultural communication competence, also referred to as intercultural awareness, focuses on changes in individuals' thought process about their environment by understanding both others', as well as their own, cultures (Triandis as cited in Chen & Starosta, 1996). Intercultural awareness includes both self-awareness and cultural awareness (Chen & Starosta). Self-awareness is an individual's capacity to understand themselves, as well as their ability to monitor their behavior based upon this understanding. (Spitzberg & Cupach as cited in Chen & Starosta). "Cultural awareness refers to an understanding of the conventions of one's own and others' cultures that affect how people think and behave" (p. 365). To summarize the difference between the two concepts, "self-awareness involves knowledge of one's own personal identity, whereas cultural awareness involves understanding how cultures vary" (p. 366).

The behavioral component of intercultural communication competence, also referred to as intercultural adroitness, emphasizes one's ability to be effective in intercultural interactions (Chen & Starosta, 1996). It includes both the verbal and nonverbal means of communication that allow us to be effective in interactions with others. (Chen & Starosta). "Such behaviors...include message skills, appropriate self-disclosure, behavioral flexibility, interaction management, and social skills" (Chen & Starosta, p. 367).

Intercultural sensitivity is "a person's 'ability to develop a positive emotion towards understanding and appreciating cultural differences that promote appropriate and effective behavior in intercultural communication'" (Chen & Starosta, 2000, p. 4). Based on this conceptualization of intercultural sensitivity, Chen and Starosta developed 73 items that represent the six components of intercultural sensitivity—self-esteem, self-monitoring, open-mindedness, empathy, interaction involvement, and non-judgment.

The instrument that will be used to measure students' level of intercultural sensitivity in this study, the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (Chen, 1993), focuses on five areas—interaction engagement, respect for cultural differences, interaction confidence, interaction enjoyment, and interaction attentiveness (Chen & Starosta, 2000). Initially, a 44-item scale was developed responding to five factors. Then, it was further reduced to the current 24-item scale. Pritchard and Skinner (2002) utilized the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (Chen) in their study of international students studying at an Irish university. Responding to the trend of the separation of students studying abroad from host culture students, the authors conducted a study that sought to understand how participating in a cross-cultural partnership program would affect students' level of intercultural sensitivity. By creating opportunities for intercultural interaction, students' attitude of hostility toward people from different cultures decreased (Pritchard & Skinner). The researchers found that participation in the partnership program alleviated the stress of cultural maladjustment for the internationals and helped all individuals to develop a higher level of intercultural sensitivity (Smith & Bond as cited in Pritchard & Skinner).

Contact with Host Nationals and Intercultural Sensitivity

It is clear from previous research that interaction with host nationals has an impact on students' attitudes during their experiences abroad. However, additional research is necessary to understand what other outcomes result from interactions with host nationals. Students interact with people different from themselves culturally during their time abroad. As multiculturalism and appreciation of differences become increasingly pivotal to students' success both during and after college, how does the experience abroad, and those interactions, contribute to their development of intercultural sensitivity?

Intercultural sensitivity, the affective component of intercultural communication competence, is an individual's motivation to understand, appreciate, and accept cultural differences (Chen & Starosta, 2000). Students' interactions with host nationals will provide them with opportunities to project and receive positive emotional responses, thus allowing them to acknowledge and respect cultural differences; they will develop intercultural sensitivity (Chen & Starosta). Positive interactions with host nationals while abroad will likely encourage students to continue to pursue intercultural interactions after their experience abroad. Ideally, they would be more open and possess the skills, knowledge, and abilities necessary to interact with those different from themselves in an effective manner. Since intercultural sensitivity results from experiences with particular situations, people and environments, this study will focus on students' contact with host nationals in the environment of a foreign culture on the students' development of intercultural sensitivity.

Conclusion

From the reviewed studies, it is clear that students' interaction with host nationals while participating in study abroad programs contributes to students' adjustment, as well as promotes various developmental and attitudinal changes. Sell (1983) concludes her review of study abroad research by acknowledging that "the cross-cultural experience therefore does not, in itself, necessarily produce change" (p. 142). "A student may go to Europe or Mexico and spend all his time with fellow Americans, read English language newspapers, and have as an ideal goal traveling to exotic places otherwise inaccessible" (Sell, p. 142). However, being in the presence of difference, as argued by Allport (1954) and supported by several other research studies, does not lead to positive attitude change. "Allport noted that 'only the type of contact that leads people to do things together is

likely to result in changed attitudes” (Salter & Teger, 1975, p. 214). This refuted the “assumption that contact per se will enhance the favorableness of attitudes toward the nations visited” (Salter & Teger, p. 213). Allport argued that particular characteristics of contact are necessary to produce positive attitude change. It is necessary to understand the type of contact students have with host nationals and its affect on students’ development of intercultural sensitivity.

Informed by the literature in this review, the methodology will be described in the next chapter. It will describe the methods that were used to study students’ development of intercultural sensitivity and its relation to students’ interactions with host nationals while studying abroad.

CHAPTER 3:

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between students' interactions with host nationals while on study abroad and their development of intercultural sensitivity. Based on the review of the literature cited in the previous chapter, the hypotheses stated below guided this study.

This chapter outlines the research design, participants, instrumentation, procedures, and statistical analyses that were used in this study. The problem statement and hypotheses are also presented.

Statement of the Problem

Over 150,000 college students participate in study abroad each year (Institute of International Education, 2002). It is assumed that the students will develop along certain dimensions as a result of their experiences abroad. However, it is unclear which experiences, and the characteristics of those experiences, facilitate the greatest amount of development along various student outcomes. One of the goals of study abroad is the development of intercultural communication competence, which has affective, cognitive, and behavioral components.

It has been found that students' interactions with peers on campus contributed to students' development (Astin, 1993). Thus, it is necessary to understand how students' interactions with host nationals contribute to their development. It therefore follows that the characteristics of students' interaction with host nationals, including host national peers, which contribute positively to students' development of intercultural sensitivity, are unknown.

This study sought to understand the ways in which interaction with host

nationals while on study abroad relates to students' development of the affective component of intercultural communication competence, intercultural sensitivity.

Hypotheses

Based on literature and the theoretical basis of this study, Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis, the following hypotheses were proposed.

Hypothesis 1: Study abroad students will experience a significant increase in their level of intercultural sensitivity (i.e. overall score and on each of the five components of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale).

Hypothesis 2: The number of host nationals that study abroad students interact with in an intimate manner on a weekly basis will be significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.

Hypothesis 3: The greater the average amount of time spent weekly with host nationals will be significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.

Hypothesis 4: Interaction with host nationals of equal status (i.e., peers) will be significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.

Hypothesis 5: The amount of direct contact with host nationals will be significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.

Hypothesis 6: Support from authority (e.g., professors, study abroad advisors) for contact with host nationals will be significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.

Hypothesis 7: Study abroad students' proficiency in the host country's language will be significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.

Hypothesis 8: Study abroad students' previous international travel experience

will be significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.

Hypothesis 9: Satisfaction with the study abroad program will be significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.

Design

In order to understand whether the students changed as a result of their interactions with host nationals on the dimension of intercultural sensitivity, it is necessary to understand their level of intercultural sensitivity before they participated in study abroad. From his findings, Smith (1955) concluded that students' attitudes before going abroad were often more of a determinant of their attitudes after their international experience, than their experiences abroad.

This study employed a retrospective research design. The design used in this study was similar to that of a pre-post test because it compared students' levels of intercultural sensitivity at two points in time. The difference is that the pre-measure was gathered at the same time as the post-measure, and the students were required to think back to their attitudes before going abroad. The retrospective technique, referred to as the "then/post" approach (Rohs & Langone, 1997), is useful in this situation because a true pre-test data gathering was not possible and the standard of measure may be perceived differently after engaging with the study abroad experience. For example, if the respondents had completed the measure in a true pre-test fashion prior to departure, they may have felt that they were extremely open-minded before going abroad, but as a result of experiences with host nationals while abroad, they may have realized that they really were not as open-minded as they had thought they were before going abroad. In a study of change in leadership skills, Rohs and Langone sought to understand the response shift involved when the traditional pre/post measure is used, in comparison to the then/post

measure. The researchers found that by asking students at the post-test to retrospectively assess their leadership skills before the intervention, the students' perceived development of leadership skills was less dramatic than the students who participated in the same intervention, but who took the traditional pre/post-tests of surveying the students before the intervention and again after the intervention. The then/post approach has been shown by other researchers (Howard & Dailey, 1979; Pohl, 1982; Rockwell & Kohn, 1989; Sprangers & Hoogstraten, 1988) to show a more accurate measure of change related to interventions.

Cronbach and Furby noted that to compare pretest and posttest scores, a common metric must exist between two sets of scores. In using self-report measures, evaluators and practitioners assume that a person's standard for measurement of the dimension being assessed will not change from the pretest to posttest. If the standard of measurement were to change, the posttest rating would reflect this shift in addition to the actual changes in the persons' level of functioning. Consequently, comparisons of pretest with posttest rating would be confounded by this distortion of the internalized scale, yielding an invalid interpretation of the effectiveness of the program. (Rohs & Langone, p. 151)

However, retrospective analysis is not without its limitations; the students may think that they needed to have changed, and thus the problems associated with self-reporting and social desirability may confound their responses.

This study looked at the type of contact and its relationship to students' level of intercultural sensitivity. Thus, the students were asked to rate themselves on the dimensions of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (Chen, 1993) as they recalled before their study abroad

experience, and again in relation to their present views about the statements. Consistent with Allport's (1954) theory of contact and research that has sought to further understand the nature of contact with difference, this study looked at the effect of interaction with host nationals with specific attention paid to what types of contact are necessary. It is important to understand the nature of the contact to determine whether or not the type of contact students have with host nationals contributes to their development of intercultural sensitivity.

Participants

The sample for this study was obtained from the Study Abroad Office at the University of Maryland, College Park, a large, public, four-year research university. One hundred and twenty-one (121) undergraduate students returned from a semester abroad during the winter break of the 2003-2004 academic year and were asked to complete the survey, which will be discussed in more detail below. Thus, this study employed a full population selection.

Instrument

This study utilized the 24-item Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (Chen & Starosta, 1996) to measure the dependent variable, the development of intercultural sensitivity. Accompanying the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale, the students completed a section of demographic data, as well as several questions that sought to measure the various dimensions of the independent variable, contact with host nationals. The University of Maryland Study Abroad Office also had the opportunity to add questions to this survey, but elected not to do so. Since the survey was administered on the web (see section on procedures), it should be noted that the response options had to be designed in some cases to fit the web-administration format. Particularly, the response choices for the ISS were reversed, with "strongly agree" being the left-most choice and "strongly disagree" as the

right-most response choice. For the complete survey in web format, please see Appendix A.

Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS)

When the ISS was originally created in 1996 it contained 73 items (Chen & Starosta, 2000). In an effort to reduce the number of items, 168 students in basic communication studies courses responded to the 73 items, and subsequently 44 items with greater than .5 loading were used to construct the scales (Chen & Starosta). An initial study was conducted to determine the factor structure of the 44 items by having a sample of 414 college students complete the survey. The authors then performed a factor analysis, and the five factors were found. The concurrent validity of the ISS was established in the design stage using 162 students in a communication course. The current version used in this study has 24 items, strong reliability ($r=.86$), and appropriate concurrent validity.

The students were asked to respond to the statements on the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale using a 5-degree Likert scale, ranging from “strongly agree=1” to “neutral=3” to “strongly disagree=5.” Items 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 24, and 25 for the pre-ISS and items 31, 33, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 49, 51, 53, and 54 for the post-ISS were reverse coded before summing the 24 items. The web-based survey required that “strongly agree” corresponded to the score of 1, whereas the ISS called for “strongly agree” to be a score of 5. Thus, the above items were reverse scored in order to remain consistent with the scores intended to reflect high and low levels of intercultural sensitivity. The 24-items are separated into five scales, (see table 3.1) *interaction engagement*, which is the dimension “concerned with feelings of participation in intercultural communication and behavior in particular situations,” *respect for cultural*

differences, which is the dimension “concerned with how participants orient to or tolerate their counterparts’ culture and opinion,” *interaction confidence*, which is the dimension “concerned with how confident people feel in an intercultural setting,” *interaction enjoyment*, which is the dimension “concerned with positive or negative reaction toward communicating with people from different cultures,” and *interaction attentiveness*, which is the dimension “concerned with participants’ effort to understand what is going on in intercultural interaction” (Pritchard & Skinner, 2002, p. 344-345). As was intended by the ISS authors, this study summed the items on the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale, which produced one score for the students. Scores, therefore, could range from a low intercultural sensitivity, which was a score of 24, to the highest level of intercultural sensitivity, which was a score of 120. Additionally, scores on each of the five scales were also calculated. Cronbach alphas were calculated to determine reliabilities for this sample. It was found that both the overall pre-ISS and post-ISS had very strong reliability, with alphas of .9 and .89 respectively. Individually, one of the scales, interaction enjoyment, presented reliabilities not within the acceptable range, with a pre-level alpha of .5863 and post-level alpha of .5166. Another scale, interaction enjoyment, had differing extremely different alpha levels between the pre- and post- levels, with a pre-level alpha of .4527 and post-level alpha of .7055. Individual scale reliabilities are also reported in table 3.1.

The ISS was administered twice in the web instrument; once to recall how the student felt about the intercultural sensitivity before they left for their study abroad experience and a second time for how they feel now.

Table 3.1 ISS Scales, Definitions, and Sample Items

VARIABLE	DEFINITION	MEASURE	SAMPLE ITEMS	SCORING	CHRONBACH ALPHA
Interaction Engagement (IE)	Feelings of participation in intercultural communication and behavior in particular situations	Pre items: 2, 12, 14, 22, 23, 24, 25 Post items: 31, 41, 43, 51, 52, 53, 54	I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures; I am open-minded to people from different cultures.	Likert 5-point scale 1=strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=neutral 4=agree 5=strongly agree	Pre: .8194 Post: .7283
Respect for cultural difference (RD)	How participants tolerate others' culture and opinion	Pre items: 3, 8, 9, 17, 19, 21 Post items: 32, 37, 38, 46, 48, 50	I respect the values of people from different cultures; I respect the ways people from different cultures behave.	Likert 5-point scale 1=strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=neutral 4=agree 5=strongly agree	Pre: .7637 Post: .8086
Interaction confidence (IC)	Feelings of confidence in an intercultural setting	Pre items: 4, 5, 6, 7, 11 Post items: 33, 34, 35, 36, 40	I am pretty sure of myself in interacting with people from different cultures; I can be as sociable as I want to be when interacting with people from different cultures.	Likert 5-point scale 1=strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=neutral 4=agree 5=strongly agree	Pre: .8256 Post: .7675
Interaction	Positive or	Pre items: 10,	I get upset easily	Likert	Pre: .4527

enjoyment (IJ)	negative reaction toward communicating with people from different cultures	13, 16 Post items: 39, 42, 45	when interacting with people from different cultures; I often feel useless when interacting with people from different cultures.	5-point scale 1=strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=neutral 4=agree 5=strongly agree	Post: .7055
Interaction Attentiveness (IA)	Individuals' effort to understand what is going on in intercultural interaction	Pre items: 15, 18, 20 Post items: 44, 47, 49	I am very observant when interacting with people from different cultures; I am sensitive to my culturally distinct counterpart's subtle meanings during our interaction.	Likert 5-point scale 1=strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=neutral 4=agree 5=strongly agree	Pre: .5863 Post: .5166

Study Abroad Program Characteristics

The study abroad program information questions sought to understand the types of programs the students participated in, including the structure of their residential situation and their academic experiences, particularly classes and academic-sponsored activities. Information about the study abroad program that the students participated in was important, particularly as this study attempted to better understand and assist in the design of study abroad programs in the future.

Interaction

The independent variables were the nature of students' interaction with host

nationals while on study abroad, which were studied along various dimensions related to Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis.

The items to measure interaction, which are found in table 3.2, were selected from other surveys that have studied this concept, as well as adapted and created by the researcher. These items were drawn from or adapted from measures in previous studies on this topic and the main components of Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis. However, their validity remains a limitation for this study. Cronbach alphas were calculated for the composite variables, which proved that the items were reliable (see table 3.2).

Table 3.2 Nature of Contact

VARIABLE	DEFINITION	MEASURE NUMBER and SAMPLE ITEMS	SCORING	CRONBACH ALPHA
H ₂ Number and intimacy of interactions	Number of people students interacted with in an intimate manner.	Items 56, 58 -Select the number of host nationals you HAD EXTENDED CONVERSATIONS with (did not plan to do things together, but had conversations when you happened to see each other) on a WEEKLY BASIS. -Select the number of host nationals you EXPERIENCED INTENTIONAL ASSOCIATIONS (e.g. visited their homes, helped one another out, did things together) with on a WEEKLY BASIS.	1=0-5 host nationals 2=6-10 host nationals 3=11-15 host nationals 4=16-20 host nationals 5=20 + host nationals; Two scores were added together to obtain the number of host nationals students intimately interacted with; thus,	.7565

			scores ranged from 2-10.	
H ₃ Average amount of time spent weekly with host nationals	Percentage of waking time spent each week with host nationals	Item 55 Approximately what percentage of waking time each week did you spend with host nationals while abroad?	1=0-20% 2=21-40% 3=41-60% 4=61-80% 5=81-100%	n/a
H ₄ Equal status	The frequency with which students interacted with host national students	Items 57, 59 -Think again to your answers above about the host nationals that you interacted with. Rate the likelihood that they were HOST NATIONAL STUDENTS with whom you HAD EXTENDED CONVERSATIONS with (did not plan to do things together, but had conversations when you happened to see each other) - Think again to your answers above about the host nationals that you interacted with. Rate the likelihood that they were HOST NATIONAL STUDENTS with whom you EXPERIENCED INTENTIONAL ASSOCIATIONS (visited their homes, helped one another out, did things together).	1=Never 2=Almost Never 3=Rarely 4=Sometimes 5=Often 6=Almost Always 7=Always The frequency rating, ranging from 1-7 for the two types of intimate interactions was added to obtain one score ranging from 2-14.	.7498
H ₅ Direct contact	Amount of direct contact situations and experiences with host nationals	Items 60-67 -How often did you visit a host national family? - How often did you go for walks, outings, or evenings with host nationals?	1=Never 2=Almost Never 3=Rarely (once or twice during my	.7367

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -How often did you do academic work in cooperation with host nationals? - How often were you involved in community activities with host nationals? - How often did you collaborate on an artistic function or social activity with host nationals (e.g. theatrical performance, film club, or social action)? - How often did you discuss what you consider to be significant issues with host nationals? - How often did you have positive contacts with host national neighbors at your apartment, hotel, pension, or other residence? - How often did you have meals with host nationals in your neighborhood? 	<p>time abroad)</p> <p>4=Sometimes (once a month)</p> <p>5=Often (once every 1 or 2 weeks)</p> <p>6=Almost Always</p> <p>7=Always</p> <p>Score was summed, with a possible score ranging from a low of 8 to a high of 56.</p>	
H ₆ Support from authorities	Whether or not activities that would provide opportunity for direct contact with host nationals were part of the academic program	Item 68 Which of the following activities were included as part of formal academic work? (use same activities as in items 60-67)	Respondents checked all that applied. Counted the number of activities that were supported by the academic program. The score ranged from 0 to 8 because each item was	n/a

			equally weighted.	
--	--	--	----------------------	--

Measures of Other Variables

Language. Previous research studies have noted the importance of students’ language ability in their success abroad. Knowledge of the students’ language ability is particularly necessary for this study because it seeks to understand the influence of students’ interactions with host nationals. In countries where English is not the national language, interactions with host nationals are likely predicated on the students’ ability to communicate with the host nationals in the host country language. Language proficiency was assessed using a Likert Scale, where respondents reacted to the following statement and stated whether they strongly disagree, disagree, agree, or strongly agree: “I started the study abroad experience with functional proficiency in the host language.”

Previous International Experience. Additionally, it is important to know about students’ previous international experience because it may confound the findings; it is possible that students who had previous international experience initially had higher levels of intercultural sensitivity than those without previous international experience. This previous experience abroad may also affect the amount and type of contact they have with host nationals. Although the type of international experience students have had is important, only the amount of international experience was asked here, as measured by the number of countries they have previously visited or lived in. This was noted as a limitation in chapter five.

Table 3.3 Measures of Other Variables

VARIABLE	DEFINITION	MEASURE NUMBER and SAMPLE ITEMS	SCORING
H ₇ Satisfaction with experience	How satisfied the student is with their overall experience abroad	Item 70 In general, how satisfied are you with your study abroad experience?	1=very unsatisfied 2=unsatisfied 3=neutral 4=satisfied 5=very satisfied
H ₈ Language proficiency	Level of proficiency of host country language	Item 72 React to this statement if the host country language was a language other than English: I started the study abroad experience with functional proficiency in the host language.	1=strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=agree 4=strongly agree
H ₉ Previous international experience	Traveled abroad	Item 75 How many foreign countries had you visited/lived in before this semester abroad experience?	1=1 country 2=2-4 countries 3=5-7 countries 4=8+ countries

Demographic Data

It was necessary to gather demographic data from the respondents in order to understand the sample of students to know whether or not the data and results are generalizable to the entire population of University of Maryland students who studied abroad during the Fall 2003 semester. The demographic questions (see Appendix A, items 26-30) collected the following data from the respondents: gender, age, class standing, ethnicity, and college of major.

*Data Collection Procedure**Obtaining the Sample*

Authorization from the University of Maryland College Park Study Abroad Office to sample the returning Fall 2003 study abroad students was requested and

received in November, 2003. Following IRB approval to survey the study abroad students, information about the students, including their names, email addresses, and study abroad countries, was obtained from the Study Abroad Office.

Pilot test

A pilot test was conducted in order to understand the amount of time required to complete the survey and to determine if any items or directions are unclear to respondents. The survey was given to three University of Maryland College Park undergraduate students who previously participated in a study abroad program, but not during the Fall 2003 semester. The pilot test sample was obtained using a snowball technique; a student that the researcher works with had studied abroad and recommended other students who have studied abroad. The survey was also reviewed by the Director of the Study Abroad Office.

Following the pilot test by three undergraduate students who studied abroad during the Fall 2002 semester in Spain (one student) and Australia (two students), items 56 and 58 were re-written in clearer language. The prompt reminding students to answer in their “then” state of mind following the first ISS item was added because one of the students missed the first set of directions. Additional feedback from the students was that the survey took approximately ten minutes to complete. The information about the duration of the survey was used in the invitation email to participants.

Procedures

The students were requested to participate in this web-based survey via email from the director of the University of Maryland Study Abroad Office, Dr. Michael Ulrich (see Appendix B). Following Institutional Research Board approval, an email was sent to the students requesting their voluntary participation, directions for completing the survey,

the web link to the survey, <http://cgi.umd.edu/survey/display?StudyAbroadSurvey/StudyAbroad2004>, as well as incentives for their participation. It was sent to the 121 students during the third week of February. Per requirements of IRB, the students were also required to acknowledge that they had read the consent form by selecting “yes,” which was the first screen they were directed to when they went to the web link provided in the initial email (see Appendix A). The students were asked to reply within three days of receiving the survey. In order for the students’ responses to be confidential, but to allow them to be entered in a drawing for the incentives, a pop-up screen (see Appendix A) appeared after they submitted the survey, where they entered their name. The pop-up clearly stated that their responses would, in no way, be connected to their identity and that they would be entered into a drawing for one of three \$30 gift certificates to Target. Students were also given the option to receive a summary of the results, which will be sent to them via email following the conclusion of this study.

The students received a follow-up email from the director of the Study Abroad Office (see Appendix C) one week after the original email and web link was sent requesting their participation and reminding them of the incentives. A week following that, the researcher sent an individual email (see Appendix D) to each of the approximately 65 students in the sample who had not yet responded. That information was determined by looking at the pop-up screen responses, which had the students’ information for the incentive drawing.

Web-based Survey. The web-based survey design was used for this study following encouragement from the Study Abroad Office. The office constantly communicated with the students during their time abroad via email and was confident

that a higher response rate would be achieved if the students were asked to respond to a web-based survey. A free service was provided by the University of Maryland's Office of Information Technology for members of the university community who are interested in using web-based survey instruments. The benefits of using the web-based approach are three-fold. First, it ideally provided a higher response rate. Second, it reduced the cost of conducting this research. Finally, the data from the survey was automatically entered into a usable spreadsheet, thus eliminating the possibility of human error during the data entry phase of the research.

The main limitation of the web-based approach included the limitations of the program's response options. The program only allowed for multiple choice, multiple select, Likert (using only agree/disagree scales), true/false, yes/no, short answer, essay, comment or fill in the blank. Items that require students to rate things in order, for example, were not available through the web survey. This limitation did not affect the type of questions needed for this study.

Data Analysis

This section will restate each of the hypotheses and identify the variables in the hypotheses and the statistics that were calculated to analyze the findings. A significance level of $p < .05$ was established to determine significance.

Hypothesis 1: *Study abroad students will experience a significant increase in their level of intercultural sensitivity (i.e. overall score and on each of the five components of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale).* The independent variable is the "then" (or pre-test) measure of intercultural sensitivity and the dependent variable is the post test measure of intercultural sensitivity. Repeated measures ANOVA was used to test for significance. Each of the five scales of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale were tested for

significance using repeated measures ANOVA, where the independent variable was the “then” measure on the items of each scale and the dependent variable was the post test measure on the items of each scale.

Hypothesis 2: *The number of host nationals that study abroad students interact with in an intimate manner on a weekly basis will be significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.* This hypothesis was analyzed using a multiple regression analysis. The criterion or dependent variable was the post-test ISS score. The “then” ISS score was entered first to control for the amount of intercultural sensitivity that was perceived to exist prior to the start of the study abroad experience. The independent variable was the number of intimate contacts experienced by the students, as measured by survey items 56 and 58.

The following grouping of hypotheses, four through eight, were analyzed in a second multiple regression. The criterion or dependent variable was the post-test ISS score. The “then” ISS score was entered first to control for the amount of intercultural sensitivity that was perceived to exist prior to the start of the study abroad experience. Other independent variables were entered as a block after the “then” ISS score.

The sample size did not provide a large enough number of responses with which to test all of the intended hypotheses. Because a minimum of ten responses were needed for each variable in the multiple regression, data corresponding to hypothesis three, time spent with host nationals, was removed from the analysis. It was chosen, as opposed to the other variables, because of its indirect relation to Allport’s (1954) contact hypothesis.

Because this study was the first to use these items to measure interaction together, it was necessary to ensure that they were not measuring the same constructs. Thus, to ensure that multicollinearity issues were not involved with the items, a

correlation matrix was run on the data (see table 3.4). Two of the items seemed moderately correlated, so a variance inflation factors (VIF) test for multicollinearity was run (see table 3.5). The relationship in question indicated a VIF of 1.939, which was under the 2.0 cut off (Neeter, Wasserman, & Kunter, 1985). Thus, no multicollinearity problems were present and we proceeded with the regression.

Table 3.4 Pearson Correlation Matrix

	Pre-ISS sum	Post-ISS sum	Number of intimate interactions	Equal status	Direct contact	Academic-sponsored activities	Proficiency	Previous international experience
Pre-ISS sum	1							
Post-ISS sum	.681(**)	1						
Number of intimate interactions	-.072	-.169	1					
Equal status	-.023	-.1	.379(**)	1				
Direct contact	-.248	-.168	.577(**)	.315 (*)	1			
Academic-sponsored activities	.023	-.001	.082	-.212	.299(*)	1		
Proficiency	.005	.128	-.132	-.116	-.094	-.177	1	
Previous international experience	-.214	-.121	-.018	.074	-.095	-.216	.047	1

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

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3.5 Collinearity Statistics (VIF)

	Variable	Unstandard- ized Coefficients: B	Unstandard- ized Coefficients: Std. Error	Standard- ized Coefficients: Beta	T	Sig.	Colli- nearity Statistics: Tolerance	Colli- nearity Statistics : VIF
1	Pre-ISS sum	.57	.08	.68	7.09	.00	1	1
2	Pre-ISS sum	.56	.08	.67	7.02	.00	1.0	1.01
	Intimate interactions	-.6	.48	-.12	-1.26	.21	1.0	1.01
3	Pre-ISS sum	.59	.09	.71	6.75	.00	.86	1.16
	Intimate interactions	-.79	.62	-.16	-1.27	.21	.61	1.63
	Equal status	-.22	.37	-.07	-.59	.56	.73	1.36
	Direct contact	.16	.15	.14	1.06	.29	.52	1.94
	Academic-s pon- sored activities	-.18	.56	-.04	-.32	.75	.75	1.34
	Profici- ency	.76	.76	.10	1.0	.32	.94	1.07
	Inter- national experi- ence	.27	.8	.04	.34	.74	.9	1.12

a. Dependent Variable: Post-ISS sum

Hypothesis 3: *The greater the average amount of time spent weekly with host nationals will be significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.* The independent variable was the percentage of time spent by the students with host nationals during an average week, ranging in five twenty percent increments, beginning with 0-20 percent up through 81-100 percent.

Hypothesis 4: *Interaction with host nationals of equal status (i.e., peers) will be*

significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity. The independent variable was the frequency of intimate contact with host national students. The students rated the type of interaction had with host national peers. The frequency of intimate contact ranged from one through seven (1=never, 2=almost never, 3=rarely, 4=sometimes, 5=often, 6=almost always, and 7=always) on survey items 57 and 59.

Hypothesis 5: *The amount of direct contact with host nationals will be significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.* The independent variable was the frequency of direct contact with host nationals as measured by eight items concerned with various activities that would have brought students into direct contact with host nationals. The scores ranged from 1 (never) to 7 (always) on eight survey items, 60-67.

Hypothesis 6: *Support from authority (e.g., professors, study abroad advisors) for contact with host nationals will be significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.* The independent variable was the number of activities from the direct contact list that were part of the students' academic program, and thus supported by authorities.

Hypothesis 7: *Study abroad students' proficiency in the host country's language will be significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.* The independent variable was the students' self-reported language proficiency when they began their study abroad program. The students responded to a statement using a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). A post hoc analysis was calculated to determine if there was a difference in students' experiences in English and non-English speaking countries and amount of contact with host nationals.

Hypothesis 8: *Study abroad students' previous international travel experience will be significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.*

The independent variable was the extent of students' previous international travel before studying abroad measured by the number of countries students visited before their semester abroad. This item was scored by grouping the number of countries, so 1=1 country, 2=2-4 countries, 3=5-7 countries, and 4=8+ countries.

The following hypothesis was analyzed with a Pearson r correlation.

Hypothesis 9: *There will be a positive relationship between students' satisfaction with the study abroad program and their greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.* The independent variable was the students' satisfaction rating of their experience, ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). The dependent variable is the post-test (or "now") level of intercultural sensitivity.

Researcher

The researcher of this study is a second year master's student in the University of Maryland College Student Personnel program. The researcher participated in the Japanese Exchange and Teaching (JET) Program from July 2000 until July 2002, and drew inspiration from her experiences in Japan for this study.

Summary

This chapter has explained the methods that were used in the quantitative study of the relationship between students' interaction with host nationals while on study abroad and their development of intercultural sensitivity. The next chapter will present the results that were obtained using those methods.

CHAPTER 4:

Results

This chapter presents the descriptive information of the participants and the empirical data gathered, as well as addresses the primary research questions relating to the aspects of students' interactions with host nationals while studying abroad contribute to their development of intercultural sensitivity. Findings were based on the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (Chen & Starosta, 1996), locally-developed survey items seeking to address aspects of Allport's (1954) contact theory, and demographic questions. Statistical findings from the stated hypotheses are provided.

Description of Sample

The total population of students in this study was 121. A total of 63 responses were received, with 60 (49.6%) of those being usable responses. Although several of the usable samples needed data substitution for a few items (see Appendix E), they were included in the sample. The three respondents not used in the analysis had ten or more missing responses. All of the demographic population data was not available from the University of Maryland Study Abroad Office. Only information about the students' gender and study abroad country was available. Thus, it is not possible to determine whether the sample was representative of the population on the dimensions of age, class standing, racial/ethnic background, and college of major.

Of the 60 respondents, 43 (71.7%) were female and 17 (28.3%) were male. The total population was 38 percent male and 62 percent female. In terms of age, two students (3.3%) were 19 years old, 23 students (38.3%) were 20 years old, 27 students (45%) were 21 years old, six students (10%) were 22 years old, and two students (3.3%) were 23 years old or older. The mean age for the students was 20.72 years old with a standard

deviation of .83. The class standing of the respondents included one sophomore (1.7%), 27 juniors (45%), and 32 seniors (53.3%). In terms of racial/ethnic distribution, the sample included five Asian students (8.3%), one Black/African American student (1.7%), 47 Caucasian students (78.3%), two Hispanic students (3.3%), and five bi-racial/multi-racial students (8.3%). The respondents represented a variety of colleges. One student was from the College of Agricultural and Natural Resources (1.7%), one student was from the School of Journalism (1.7%), two students were from the College of Health and Human Performance (3.3%), three students were from Letters and Sciences (5%), which included individual studies majors, four students were from Engineering (6.7%), six students were in Computer, Mathematical, and Physical Sciences (10%), seven students were double majors (11.7%), nine students were in the College of Arts and Humanities (15%), ten were from the School of Business and Management (16.7%), and sixteen students were from the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences (26.7%). The majority of the students, 49 (81.7%), in this study participated in study abroad programs in Europe. One student (1.6%) studied in Asia, two (3.3%) in South America, two (3.3%) in Africa, and six (10%) in Australia. The population was relatively similar to the sample in that 77.7 percent studied in Europe, 5 percent in Asia, 5 percent in South America, 3.3 percent in Africa, and nine percent in Australia.

Table 4.1 Sample and Population Description Summary

	GENDER	CLASS STANDING	AGE	RACE	COLLEGE OF MAJOR	STUDY ABROAD REGIONS
Sample N=60	Female: 43 (71.1%) Male: 17 (28.3%)	Sophomore: 1 (1.7%) Junior: 27 (45%) Senior: 32 (53.3%)	19: 2 (3.3%) 20: 23 (38.3%) 21: 27 (45%) 22: 6 (10%) 23+: 2 (3.3%)	Asian: 5 (8.3%) Black/African American: 1 (1.7%) Caucasian: 47 (78.3%) Hispanic: 2 (3.3%) Bi-racial/multi-racial: 5 (8.3%)	Agricultural and Natural Resources: 1 (1.7%) Journalism: 1 (1.7%) College of Health and Human Performance: 2 (3.3%) Letters and Sciences: 3 (5%) Engineering: 4 (6.7%) Computer, Mathematical, and Physical Sciences: 6 (10%) Double majors: 7 (11.7%) Arts and Humanities: 9 (15%) School of Business and Management: 10 (16.7%) Behavioral and Social Sciences: 16 (26.7%)	Europe: 49 (81.7%) South America: 2 (3.3%) Asia: 1 (1.7%) Australia: 6 (10%) Africa: 2 (3.3%)
Population N=121	Female: 75 (62%) Male: 46 (38%)	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	Europe: 94 (77.7%) South America: 6 (5.5%) Asia: 6 (5.5%) Australia: 11

						(9%) Africa: 4 (1.6%)
--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------------------

Data Analysis Modifications

Because of the small population of this study (121 students), and thus the corresponding small number of respondents (60 usable responses), it was necessary to remove one of the analyses from the multiple regression. The data addressing the time spent with host nationals was not included in the regression analysis because of the low sample size. It is necessary that there were at least ten subjects for each variable entered into the regression, thus time spent with host nationals was chosen by the researcher to be removed from the analysis because of its indirect relation to the contact hypothesis.

Hypothesis One

The literature review showed that students often change their attitudes, beliefs, and values following participation in study abroad programs. Specifically, as students' contact with difference becomes a daily activity, it is necessary to understand how their participation in study abroad can contribute to their ability to successfully interact with others across difference. This study sought to understand the students' perceived change in their level of intercultural sensitivity. Thus, the first hypothesis stated:

Study abroad students will experience a significant increase in their level of intercultural sensitivity (i.e. overall score and on each of the five components of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale).

The 24-item ISS Likert-type question responses from the “then” and “post-ISS” scores were summed and the sum of the scores could have ranged from 24-120, with 24 representing low intercultural sensitivity and 120 representing most intercultural sensitivity. The pre-ISS sum had a mean of 93.34 and standard deviation of 10.98 and the

post-ISS sum had a mean of 101.83 and standard deviation of 9.14. Additionally, the five scales were analyzed for significance. Their means, standard deviations, F scores, betas, and significance levels are reported in table 4.2. Sixty cases were analyzed and data was replaced in various items (see Appendix E).

A test of differences between the respondents' "then" level of intercultural sensitivity and their "now" level was conducted with a repeated measures ANOVA. For the development of overall intercultural sensitivity, the ANOVA showed an F-test score of 64.0 and a significance of .00 (below $p < .05$) for the Huynh-Feldt within subjects test (see Table 4.2). Therefore, this hypothesis was accepted.

Additionally, each of the five scales showed significance. For *interaction engagement*, the ANOVA showed an F-test score of 45.22 and a significance of .00 for the Huynh-Feldt within subjects test. As for *respect for cultural differences*, the ANOVA showed an F-test score of 15.76 and a significance of .00 for the Huynh-Feldt within subjects test. The ANOVA for *interaction confidence* showed an F-test score of 45.17 and a significance of .00 for the Huynh-Feldt within subjects test. For *interaction enjoyment*, the ANOVA showed an F-test score of 12.35 and a significance of .001 for the Huynh-Feldt within subjects test. For *interaction attentiveness*, the ANOVA showed an F-test score of 54.75 and a significance of .00 for the Huynh-Feldt within subjects test (see table 4.2).

Table 4.2 Development of Intercultural Sensitivity Repeated Measures ANOVA Summary Table

VARIABLE	Possible MIN	Possible MAX	PRE-TEST MEAN (SD)	POST-TEST MEAN (SD)	F	SIG.
ISS total (24 items)	24	120	93.34 (10.98)	101.83 (9.14)	64	.000
Interaction Engagement (7 items)	7	35	27.78 (3.71)	30.19 (2.8)	45.22	.000
Respect for Cultural Differences (6 items)	6	30	24.89 (3.39)	26.17 (3.15)	15.76	.000
Interaction Confidence (5 items)	5	25	17.52 (3.36)	19.72 (2.8)	45.17	.000
Interaction Enjoyment (3 items)	3	15	12.32 (1.49)	12.91 (1.48)	12.35	.001
Interaction Attentiveness (3 items)	3	15	10.83 (2.05)	12.85 (1.51)	54.75	.000

Students' level of perceived intercultural sensitivity, as measured by the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale, changed in the positive direction. There was a significant difference between the pre- and post- ISS scores. Additionally, there were significant differences between the pre- and post- scores on each of the five scales as well. This hypothesis, therefore, was accepted.

Hypothesis Two

The second research question sought to understand whether intimate interactions with host nationals contributed to students' perceived development of intercultural

sensitivity. The hypothesis stated:

The number of host nationals that study abroad students interact with in an intimate manner on a weekly basis will be significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.

The number of host nationals students interacted with in an intimate manner was measured with one composite variable made up of two items. The respondents rated the number of host nationals they had extended conversations with and intentional experiences with, ranging from 0-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, and 20+ host nationals. The possible range of scores on the composite variable was between 2 and 10, with a low score of 2 being 0-10 host nationals with whom the students had intimate contact and a high of 5 representing more than 40 host nationals with whom they had intimate interactions with on a weekly basis.

Frequencies of students' intimate interactions with host nationals were examined.

(See table 4.3.)

Table 4.3 Number of Intimate Interactions (N=60, mean=3.8, std. deviation=1.84, min=2, max=10)

SCORE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
0-2=0-10 host nationals	16	26.7
3-4=11-20 host nationals	27	45.0
5-6=21-30 host nationals	12	20.0
7-8=31-40 host nationals	4	6.7
9-10=41+ host nationals	1	1.7

The results of the multiple regression showed that there was no significant relationship between students' intimate interactions with host nationals and their development of intercultural sensitivity. The total variance explained by the first variable, the pre-test score, was 46.4%. The percent variance explained by the next variable containing the various measures of intimate interaction (block 2) is 1.4%, with a total of

47.9% of the variance of the post-ISS score explained by the pre-ISS score and the number of intimate interactions with host nationals. F-tests showed no significance, as .214 is greater than .05 (see table 4.4). This hypothesis, therefore, was rejected.

Table 4.4 Block 2 (Number of Intimate Interactions) Multiple Regression Summary

MODEL	VARIABLE ENTERED	R SQUARE	R SQUARE CHANGE	F CHANGE	Beta	SIG.
1	Pre-ISS	.46	.46	50.24	.673	.00
2	Number of intimate interactions	.48	.01	1.58	-.120	.21

Hypothesis Three

The third hypothesis stated:

The greater the average amount of time spent weekly with host nationals will be significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.

This hypothesis was not included in the regression because of the low sample size. In order to use the multiple regression data analysis as planned, a minimum of ten cases per variable were needed. However, due to the fact that the number of variables in the analysis required a greater number of respondents than was obtained in this study, it was necessary that an analysis be removed from the study. The analysis of this question was removed because it was the only hypothesis not directly related to Allport's (1954) contact theory. Additionally, it is likely that the idea of time spent with host nationals would have been captured in other items because of the nature of the questions, which focused on specific activities done with host nationals.

Although the time spent with host nationals was not factored into the regression analysis, the data obtained can be useful to understanding students' experiences with host

nationals. Table 4.5 represents this data.

Table 4.5 Time Spent with Host Nationals (N=60, mean=3.13, std. deviation=1.21, min=1, max=5)

PERCENTAGE OF TIME	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
1=0-20%	5	8.3
2=21-40%	13	21.7
3=41-60%	23	38.3
4=61-80%	7	11.7
5=81-100%	12	20.0

Hypotheses Four, Five, Six, Seven, and Eight

Hypotheses four, five, six, seven, and eight were addressed by entering these independent variables into the regression as a block to determine their significance.

Hypothesis four stated:

Interaction with host nationals of equal status (i.e., peers) will be significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.

Hypothesis 5 stated:

The amount of direct contact with host nationals will be significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.

Hypothesis 6 stated:

Support from authority (e.g., professors, study abroad advisors) for contact with host nationals will be significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.

Hypothesis 7 stated:

Study abroad students' proficiency in the host country's language will be significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.

Hypothesis 8 stated:

Study abroad students' previous international travel experience will be

significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.

Multiple regression results for study abroad students, as indicated by table 4.6, showed that the total variance explained by all of the variables was 50.3%. The percent variance explained by the pre-ISS score (block 1) was 46.4%, the additional variance explained by the number of intimate interactions (block 2) was 1.4%, and the variance explained by the remaining five variables, equal status, direct contact, support from authorities, language proficiency, and previous international experience, (block 3) was 2.4%, thus explaining a total of 50.3% of the variance. F-tests were not significant for all predictors at the $p < .05$ level, except for the pre-ISS score as previously discussed. We therefore reject these hypotheses.

Table 4.6 Block 3 (Nature of Interaction) Multiple Regression Summary

MODEL	VARIABLE ENTERED	R SQUARE	R SQUARE CHANGE	F CHANGE	Beta	SIG .
1	Pre-ISS score	.46	.46	50.24	.712	.00
2	Number of intimate interactions	.48	.01	1.58	-.158	.21
3	Academic-sponsored activities, proficiency, number of countries, equal status, direct contact	.50	.02	.51	Academic-sponsored: -.037 Proficiency: .101 Number of countries: .035 Equal	.77

					status: -.068 Direct contact: .144	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Frequencies of the nature of students’ interactions with host nationals included in the survey are included below (see tables 4.7, 4.8, 4.9, and 4.10).

Equal status was defined as peers in this study. The question sought to understand students’ interactions with peers by measuring the likelihood that their intimate interactions with host nationals were with host national peers, as opposed to host national children, professors, host parents, or older host nationals. The mean reported was 8.92, which most closely corresponded to the “sometimes” and “often” categories, with a standard deviation of 2.84.

Table 4.7 Equal Status (N=60, mean=8.92, std. deviation=2.84, min=2, max=14)

SCORE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
1-2=Never	0	0
3-4=Almost never	4	6.6
5-6=Rarely	11	18.4
7-8=Sometimes	9	15.0
9-10=Often	20	33.4
11-12=Almost always	8	13.3
13-14=Always	8	13.3

Survey respondents ranked the likelihood that they participated in a variety of activities with host nationals that comprised aspects of direct contact. Each of the eight items’ responses ranged from “never=1” to “always=7.” The eight items were summed to create a composite variable representing direct contact with scores ranging from eight to 56, where the mean was 32.73 and the standard deviation was 8.13. The students reported a great deal of direct contact on the eight items they answered.

Table 4.8 Direct Contact (N=60, mean=32.73, std. deviation=8.13, min=8, max=56)

SCORE RANGE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
8=Never	0	0
9-16=Almost never	1	1.6
17-24=Rarely	9	15.0
25-32=Sometimes	19	31.7
33-40=Often	21	35.0
41-48=Almost always	9	15.0
49-56=Always	1	1.6

Additionally, the frequencies for each of the individual items of direct contact provide a great deal of information about the types of activities and the nature of the contact that students are having with host nationals while on study abroad. Table 4.9 presents the means and standard deviations for the individual items that were summed in table 4.8 to create the direct contact item. For each of the items, 1=never, 2=almost never, 3=rarely, 4=sometimes, 5=often, 6=almost always, 7=always, thus a minimum score of 1 and a maximum score of 7 was possible for each individual activity.

Table 4.9 Direct Contact Individual Activities (N=60, min=1, max=7)

ACTIVITY	MEAN	STD. DEVIATION
Visit host family	3.63	2.07
Walks, outings	4.6	1.43
Academic work	3.52	1.69
Community activities	3.43	1.51
Artistic functions	3.35	1.83
Discuss issues	4.9	1.4
Contact w/ neighbors	4.98	1.49
Meals w/ host nationals	4.32	2.12

The frequency with which the academic program sponsored or encouraged students to interact with host nationals in a variety of different situations was minimal, as shown by table 4.10. The number of activities that students participated in a result of an

academic project or requirement was not a major component of their experience abroad.

Table 4.10 Academic Sponsored Activities (N=60, mean=2.12, std. deviation=1.84, min=0, max=8)

NUMBER OF ACTIVITIES	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
0	0	0
1	14	23.3
2	12	20.0
3	12	20.0
4	8	13.3
5	8	13.3
6	3	5.0
7	1	1.7
8	2	3.3

The students responded to a phrase about their level of fluency of the host country’s language, ranging from strongly disagreeing (“1”) with the statement that they began their study abroad program with a functional proficiency of the host language to strongly agreeing (“4”). Students who responded that their study abroad’s country’s language was English were assigned a 4, representing that they strongly agreed with the statement about proficiency. A majority of the students were relatively confident in their ability to communicate in the host country’s language, as evidenced by the mean score of 2.86, which is close to “agree.” For a large number of the respondents, the host country language was English, which certainly contributes to the mean language proficiency score.

Students’ previous international experience was measured by the number of countries visited prior to their semester abroad. The scores were 0=no countries, 1=1 country, 2=2-4 countries, 3=5-7 countries, and 4=8+ countries. The mean score of 2.17 and standard deviation of 1.18 show that many students had international experience before studying abroad. The mean shows that the average number of countries previously

visited by students was between 2-4 countries (see table 4.11).

Table 4.11 Language Proficiency and Previous International Experience

VARIABLE	MEAN	STD. DEVIATION	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
Language proficiency	2.86	1.22	1	4
Number of countries	2.17	1.18	0	4

Post-hoc Analyses

In order to understand more about the likelihood of students' interactions with host nationals and whether pre-existing characteristics increase their interactions, a post-hoc analysis was conducted which sought to examine the relationship between students' proficiency in the host country's language and the number of interactions with host nationals. A t-test was conducted to determine whether the 25 students in English speaking countries had a significantly greater number of intimate interactions with host nationals than the 35 students in non-English speaking countries. The results of the analysis showed that there is not a significant difference between the two groups of students, with $F=.243$ and non-significance of $.624$, which is above the $.05$ level. The mean number of intimate interactions for students in English speaking countries was 3.96 with a standard deviation of 1.88 and the mean number of intimate interactions for students in non-English speaking countries was 3.69 with a standard deviation of 1.83 . These numbers correspond to intimate interactions with 12-20 host nationals each week. While the students in English speaking countries had a slightly higher number of interactions, it was not a significant difference. Thus, being in an English speaking country, where it can be assumed that U.S. students are proficient in English, language proficiency does not lead to more interactions with host nationals.

A second post-hoc analysis was conducted focusing solely on the 35 students in non-English speaking countries, which sought to understand if there was a difference in the number of intimate contacts had based on students' level of proficiency. The mean proficiency level was 2.15, corresponding to the response choices of disagreeing and agreeing with the statement that they had started the study abroad experience with functional proficiency in the host language, with a standard deviation of 1.12. The results of the correlation showed a non-significant relationship between proficiency level and number of intimate interactions, with $r = -.317$ and a non-significance of .063. The implications of the post-hoc analysis findings are discussed in chapter five.

Hypothesis Nine

The final hypothesis sought to understand the importance of students' overall satisfaction with their experience to understand their attitude change. The ninth hypothesis stated:

Satisfaction with the study abroad program will be significantly related to greater overall development of intercultural sensitivity.

The result was a relatively weak Pearson r correlation of $-.054$. The mean of students' satisfaction with the program was relatively high at 4.65, with a range from 1 to 5. The standard deviation was .84. The significance level was .68 and thus, this hypothesis is rejected.

Summary

This chapter has reviewed the results of the data analysis of the research questions and hypotheses. The next chapter will provide an interpretation of the study's results, as well as present a discussion of limitations of the study, suggestions for future research, and implications for practice.

CHAPTER 5:

Findings

This chapter presents a discussion of the results reported in the previous chapter. The hypotheses and results are examined, followed by the limitations of the study, suggestions for future research, and implications for practice.

The results of this study should be interpreted with caution since the response rate was modest (49.6%) and only gender and study abroad population data was provided by the Study Abroad Office, so the entire demographic representativeness of the sample is unknown. The results of the data analysis showed that there is no significance between students' interactions with host nationals while on study abroad and their development of intercultural sensitivity. Importantly however, the students showed a significant increase in their level of intercultural sensitivity, but other factors may explain the development of intercultural sensitivity better than those measured in this study. Smith (1955) concluded that the overall experience, also known as the halo effect, may have more of an impact on attitude changes while abroad, than specific aspects of the experience.

Discussion of Hypotheses

Hypothesis One: Intercultural Sensitivity Scale

The students in this study experienced a perceived increase in their level of intercultural sensitivity as a result of their study abroad experience.

Students' increase in their level of intercultural sensitivity between their time abroad and upon their return is similar to findings of previous studies focusing on developmental outcomes of study abroad participation (Hensley & Sell, 1979; Hofman & Zak, 1969; Kafka, 1968; Kauffmann, 1982; Klineberg & Hill, 1979; Salter & Teger, 1975; Smith, 1955; Smith, 1971). Foreign countries provide a unique laboratory for

students to understand others, as well as themselves as they are exposed to different cultures, ways of life, and people. The development of intercultural sensitivity, as defined by the measurement of the ISS, is the change in feelings about cultural difference that result from situations, people, and environments (Chen & Starosta, 1996). Thus, participation in study abroad provided students with those situations, people, and environments necessary to promote increased levels of intercultural sensitivity.

As shown by the results of this study, participation in study abroad contributes to students' development of intercultural sensitivity, and thus support for study abroad programs must continue because of its promotion of this positive developmental outcome. Study abroad provides a unique experience for students to be surrounded by cultural difference. Their involvement and interaction with a different culture and its people allows students opportunities to expand their understanding of difference and increase their respect for difference. These tools are, without a doubt, necessary for successful participation in our increasingly global society and workplace.

Assuming that the use of the retrospective analysis technique was appropriate, the students began their study abroad experience with a relatively high level of intercultural sensitivity, with an overall ISS mean score of 93.34 and standard deviation of 10.98. Considering that the score ranged from a low level of 24 to a high level of 120, their initial level of intercultural sensitivity was relatively high. The post-test ISS mean score was 101.83 with a standard deviation of 9.14. The difference between the standard deviations of the pre- and post-ISS scores shows that there is more agreement among the respondents in terms of their post-level of intercultural sensitivity in comparison to their pre-ISS scores, which were more widely distributed. There was a wider variation in the pre-test and more agreement in the post-test level.

The individual scales also denoted high levels of intercultural sensitivity during the pre-test. This is not surprising because of the types of students that are interested in studying abroad have made a decision to dedicate a semester of their academic career to learning about another culture, country, and its people. Thus, it is not uncommon that the students in this study would have high levels of intercultural sensitivity before they go abroad. Despite their initially high levels, however, a significant change towards increased intercultural sensitivity was seen.

Hypothesis Two: Intimate Interaction

Based on previous studies (Hensley & Sell, 1979; Hofman & Zak, 1969; Kafka, 1968; Kauffmann, 1982; Klineberg & Hull, 1979; Smith, 1955; Smith, 1971) which held that interaction with host nationals contributed to the development of various outcomes, the data analysis was designed to reflect that by inputting data regarding students' intimate interactions with host nationals in the regression as the second block, following the pre-test score. A majority of the students, approximately 70 percent, interacted intimately with host nationals on the lower end of the spectrum, which is seen by a score of 2-4, which represents intimate interaction with approximately 12-20 host nationals on a weekly basis. The number of host nationals with whom the study abroad students had contact with did not explain a significant amount of the variance in their level of intercultural sensitivity.

Hypothesis Three: Time Spent with Host Nationals

More than 90 percent of the students spent more than a fifth of their waking time with host nationals. A fifth of the respondents, twelve students, reported that they spent between 81 and 100 percent of their waking time with host nationals. Encouraging students to interact with host nationals and spend their time with them will provide them

with more learning opportunities and involvement in the host culture.

The time in the item was not qualified; it is not clear whether the time spent with host nationals was in an intimate manner. As stated earlier in chapter two, being in the presence of difference will not necessarily lead to development of intercultural sensitivity. Thus, knowing what type of interactions occurred during the students' time with host nationals is important. Understanding the impact of students' interactions with host nationals is challenging because not just one aspect of students' experiences will lead to intercultural sensitivity development.

Hypotheses Four, Five, and Six: Equal Status, Direct Contact, Support from Authorities

The descriptive statistics provide a great deal of information about the experiences of students on study abroad programs. Approximately 60 percent of the students "often," "almost always," or "always" spent time with host national peers. This shows that the majority of the intimate interactions that students have with host nationals while abroad occurs with host national peers. In regards to the direct contact items, more than two-thirds of the students "often," "almost always," or "always" participated in the eight direct contact activities. After a more careful look at the specific direct contact items, it showed that being in contact with neighbors and discussing issues were two of the most participated-in activities with host nationals. Participation in artistic functions and community activities were the least participated-in activities. Students' reports of academic-sponsored activities showed that their academic programs rarely promoted the direct contact activities. It is clear that more participation in the host culture should be encouraged and promoted as part of the academic work because for the students in this study, it was not.

Although the data provided descriptions of students' experiences with host

nationals, the results of the data analysis did not show significance between the characteristics of students' interactions with host nationals focused on in this study and their development of intercultural sensitivity. These variables were identified in support of Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis.

Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis was created in the domestic arena, focusing primarily on how positive outcomes could result following interactions between majority and underrepresented groups in the U.S. The aspects of the contact hypothesis were also not operationalized because they were created and supported in structured settings, which provided environmental conditions that, for example, controlled for the status of the individuals in contact. Applying the contact hypothesis to the experiences of study abroad students was appropriate because they were in contact with people culturally different from themselves. However, additional research on the use of and operationalization of the contact hypothesis in the international arena should be conducted where a more structured environment is set up in order for the specific experiences of study abroad students to be understood.

There are more than 30 components of the contact hypothesis. Several, including equal status, cooperation, direct contact, and support from authorities, are more widely known and studied than others. Because of the lack of pre-established items to measure these components, items from other studies were revised and utilized. As a result, it was not possible to create items that represented cooperation and direct contact in different ways. Thus, cooperation was not measured in the analysis and is a limitation of this study. Because all of the components of the contact hypothesis were not measured, it is difficult to draw inferences.

The measurement of equal status in this study was expanded from the original

use of it in Allport's (1954) contact theory. Equal status was referred to as social status because Allport's theory was originally developed for use between Black and Whites in the U.S. Certainly, the use of Allport's theory was expanded in this study to understand students' interactions with host nationals in their host countries. The different environment, which included both the physical, as well as the human, components led to the expanded usage of the concept of equal status. Allport's theory was based upon the concept of negative attitudes being replaced by positive attitudes. In the case of students studying abroad, they often times do not have pre-existing negative attitudes toward the host nationals of the country they study in. Thus, it must be noted that measuring equal status as peers in this study deviates from Allport's original application of the theory. Additionally, while peers may be seen as equals in a domestic arena, the international arena may allow for a broader range of individuals to be considered of equal status.

Hypotheses Seven and Eight: Language Proficiency and Previous International Experience

Neither students' language proficiency, nor their previous international experience, contributed to the increased levels of intercultural sensitivity. These two constructs were included in the multiple regression analysis because they may have predisposed certain students to increased interactions with host nationals, which was hypothesized to contribute to students' development of intercultural sensitivity. Because interaction with host nationals proved to be insignificant in students' development of intercultural sensitivity, it is likely that their language proficiency and previous international experience were not as important as initially hypothesized.

Post-hoc Analyses. The post-hoc analysis showed that students in English speaking and non-English speaking countries do not have significantly differing numbers

of intimate interactions with host nationals. While intuitively it seems that interaction would occur only if there is a common language spoken, the students in non-English speaking countries did not have a different experience in terms of their interaction with host nationals than students in English speaking countries. Certainly, students may have been proficient in the non-English language, so the second post-hoc analysis sought to understand more about the 35 students' proficiency level. There was no relationship between the experiences with host nationals of students in non-English speaking countries based on their level of proficiency. Thus, being proficient in the host country's language proved not to be a necessity for interaction. Other components of the experience abroad may lead to more interactions, such as the structure of the academic program that provides opportunities for intimate interaction with host nationals.

Hypothesis Nine: Satisfaction

Previous studies about study abroad outcomes attributed students' level of satisfaction with the study abroad experience to various outcomes. This study did not find a significant relationship between students' satisfaction with their study abroad experience, which was relatively high, and their development of intercultural sensitivity. However, the level of satisfaction was extremely high among the respondents. Thus, participation in study abroad programs should continue to be promoted because of the positive experiences that students have.

Limitations

The results of this study must be viewed with the understanding that several limitations are present. A major limitation of this study is the small number of students in the population, which resulted in a relatively small number of respondents. The limited number of respondents restricted the ability to test all of the hypotheses originally set

forth in this study. Additionally, it is not clear whether the sample is completely representative of the population of University of Maryland students who returned from Fall 2003 study abroad programs beyond their gender and study abroad countries. The results and findings should be read with caution because of these limitations.

Although Allport's contact hypothesis (1954) has been used in other studies (Amir, 1969; Bochner, 1982; Brein & David, 1971; Cook & Selltiz, 1955), the environments have been controlled. The use of Allport's hypothesis to understand the experiences of students studying abroad did not allow for a controlled situation. Additionally, the expansive nature of the contact hypothesis did not allow for the use of all of the dimensions. However, the most important dimensions, as deemed by previous research, including intimate contact, equal status, support from authority, and direct contact, were included in the design and analysis. Another limitation of the use of Allport's (1954) contact theory is that while there are more than 30 conditions necessary for positive contact to occur, this study focused on four of the conditions. One of the important aspects of Allport's contact theory was not included, which was participation in cooperative activities with people different from oneself. This part of Allport's theory was removed from the study because of the inability to find a pre-existing item that could be altered to measure cooperation. The items used to measure direct contact, survey items 60-67, included activities that are cooperative in nature. However, those items were used in another study to measure direct contact, so it was decided to use them to measure what they were originally intended to measure, as opposed to a new construct. Each of the items used to measure parts of the contact hypothesis were modified by the researcher from previous studies and created with the review of the literature in mind. Thus, they lacked validity, which is a caution in reviewing the results of the analyses.

A limitation lies in choice of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS) as a measure of intercultural sensitivity. While the ISS is acceptable, the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (Bennett, 1986) is increasing in use and applicability. Because of its length, as well as logistics involved in its use (monetary and training time), it could not be employed in this study and would have been a preferred measure. However, the use of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale proved appropriate as well, as was seen by the significant change in students' development between their perceived level before their semester abroad and their current level of intercultural sensitivity, as well as by the reliability of the ISS overall measure in the both the pre- and post- responses. However, as seen in table 3.1, the reliability of two of the scales of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale is in question. The pre-interaction enjoyment reliability and post-interaction enjoyment reliability are strikingly different. Additionally, for both the pre- and post- interaction attentiveness, the scales do not prove reliable. Although the ISS as a measurement of intercultural sensitivity is reliable based on this study, further research should focus on the interaction enjoyment and interaction attentiveness scales and their reliability for appropriately measuring those concepts.

This is a complex topic and fully understanding each aspect of human thought and behavior is a difficult task. Previous studies have concluded that there are certain dimensions that are likely to predict intercultural effectiveness (Hammer, Gudykunst, & Wiseman, 1978). This study recognized these dimensions, but did not test for them. It is recommended that future studies seek to understand students' pre-departure ability to interact with host nationals to determine if that will create varying degrees of the effect of studying abroad.

As noted by Klineberg and Hull (1979), there is one major difficulty related to

studying social contact; students may view contact differently. However, the design of the instrument attempts to correct for this problem by asking tangible, specific questions about their interactions with host nationals.

This study sought to understand a change in students that we hypothesized occurred within the time period of one academic semester. Although four months is a relatively short amount of time, the intensity of the study abroad experience has been shown to facilitate student development along various dimensions. While development of intercultural sensitivity is plausible in the span of one semester, longer periods of time abroad may contribute to even greater degrees of development.

Comparing students' experiences abroad is a difficult task because of the varying study abroad programs and different experiences of students. The experiences of the students in this study's sample were diverse. It is possible that the numerous variables associated with the study abroad experience could have contributed to their development of intercultural sensitivity. The variance in their development may have less to do with the number of intimate interactions with host nationals, and more to do with their residential situation, length of time abroad, students' proficiency in the host country's language, or structure of the academic program. Although all of the characteristics of the study abroad experience were not included in the study, they may contribute to students' development of intercultural sensitivity. Thus, there are other components of the experience abroad that can contribute to students' development of intercultural sensitivity besides those studied here.

Suggestions for Future Research

The main undertaking of this study was the operationalization of items to measure the various aspects of Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis. As the relevance of

Allport's theory expands, particularly in terms of advocating for diversity on American campuses, it is necessary that further attempts are made to construct items that will measure his theory. The items adapted and applied in this study proved to be reliable measures of the aspects of Allport's theory that were tested. However, better measures of the concepts of the contact hypothesis must be constructed in order for his theory to be tested in a variety of contexts.

Domestic and international environments may provide different experiences in terms of learning about difference. In the U.S., difference is often accompanied by a variety of negative stereotypes that must be reversed. When students study abroad, they are often excited about interacting with host nationals and the need to reduce negative stereotypes may be less necessary. The use of Allport's (1954) theory is typically applied to the reduction of negative attitudes in the domestic arena. Thus, research utilizing Allport's theory as a means of understanding positive development, such as that of intercultural sensitivity, should be conducted. Studies should also be conducted that explore students' understanding of difference in the domestic setting and difference in the international arena. It would be interesting to know more about the differences and similarities between students' experiences with difference on their American campuses, as well as during their study abroad experiences.

The measure of intercultural sensitivity is just one of many ways to understand students' attitudes towards difference. Determining whether one is cross-culturally and multi-culturally competent is another area where research should be expanded. With an appreciation and understanding of difference being one of the many intended outcomes of a graduate of many colleges and universities across the country, it is necessary that we be able to measure that outcome.

This study seeks to understand only one dimension of intercultural communication competence, the affective domain, defined as intercultural sensitivity. However, it is necessary that students develop all three domains in order to be effective intercultural communicators. Thus, further research should seek to study all three domains if possible.

There are several ways in which to measure students' previous international experience. For this study, it was measured by the number of countries previously visited. However, the nature of their experience abroad was not measured. Additional information, such as the time previously spent abroad, as well as the reasons for going abroad (residency, study, or travel), were not included in the analysis. To fully understand the impact of previous international experience on students' interactions with host nationals, a more comprehensive measure should be considered.

Overall, the use of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale to measure students' development while abroad was applicable and should be utilized in other studies. If the retrospective analysis is to be used in other studies, however, it is suggested that a study, similar to that conducted by Rohs and Langone (1997) concerning leadership skills be conducted using the ISS specifically, to understand more about the different outcomes that may result from the use of that technique.

The retrospective data collection technique provided significant results in the development of intercultural sensitivity. Future research should employ this technique as a means of understanding how students change on a variety of developmental dimensions as a result of participation in their environment. It was necessary to understand students' level of intercultural sensitivity before studying abroad in order measure changes after their interactions with host nationals. Because of time limitations of this study, the

retrospective technique was used as a “pre-test” measure. As discussed in the design section of this chapter, using the retrospective technique presents both strengths and limitations. While it may allow students to more accurately assess themselves, it may also cause the students to rate themselves higher on the post-measures of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (Chen & Starosta, 1996) because they may think that they should have changed while abroad and, thus, rate themselves higher on the post-measures than they may have rated themselves had they been asked to complete the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale once. Additionally, the students may have “misremembered” their previously-held attitudes (Carlson & Widaman, 1988, p. 5). The design of the survey was such that attempted to decrease the respondents’ bias by having them answer the “pre” questions first, followed by demographic items, and then responding to the “post” items. It is unclear if this type of data collection skewed the results for the participants in this study because a comparison group completing the true pre/post test was not part of the research design. When possible, future research should attempt to have a controlled group that completes a true pre-/post-test to understand the accuracy of this data collection technique.

It would be interesting to see whether the study abroad students’ average intercultural sensitivity score would have been higher than other students who elected to stay on campus during the same semester. Future research studies should focus on the change that occurs in students who study abroad compared to those students who remain on their home campuses. By conducting a study in that way, it will be clearer whether or not it was the study abroad experience specifically that led to the change, as opposed to changes that occur because of students’ maturational development of their appreciation of difference and ability to interact with people culturally different from themselves.

Implications for Practice

Participation in study abroad, as shown by the results of this study, contributes to students' development of intercultural sensitivity. Faculty, staff, and administrators should continue to encourage students to experience another country and culture through structured study abroad programs. It is clear that the students are satisfied with their study abroad experience, thus the programs should continue to expand and include additional opportunities for students to explore culture difference.

There was an extreme difference between participation in study abroad programs between women and men. In this study's population, women greatly outnumbered men. Although gender differences as they relate to the development of intercultural sensitivity were not focused on in this study, the lack of male participation in study abroad programs is concerning. The gender participation differences may possibly be caused by typically male-dominated coursework in the science and technology fields, which have strict academic requirements that do not allow for students to spend a semester abroad without risking a later graduation date from the University. In order to encourage male students to participate in study abroad, practitioners can target male student organizations in their marketing of programs. Additionally, providing opportunities abroad that allow students to enroll in courses that are directly related to major requirements may also increase the number of participants in study abroad overall, but may also address the possible course conflict issue present for male students.

This study did not find significance between aspects of students' interactions with host nationals and their development of intercultural sensitivity. Although conclusions about the types of experiences students should have with host nationals while abroad are unable to be drawn from the results of the data analysis, students' contact with

host nationals must still remain an important part of their experience abroad. It is likely that any type of interaction with host nationals would be sufficient to bring about development of intercultural sensitivity. If that is the case, study abroad programs should seek out any opportunities for students to interact with host nationals.

The students who have returned from the semester abroad had increased levels of intercultural sensitivity. It is necessary that the University find ways to utilize students' experiences abroad to educate others. Because of the high cost and time commitment required for study abroad participation, a large number of students, under-represented students in particular, often do not participate in study abroad programs. The types of experiences the students have while abroad should be replicated on American campuses, utilizing both the intercultural sensitivity of study abroad returners, but also the diversity on campus, which often includes international students.

Students' interactions with host nationals were not as frequent as anticipated. Although interactions with host nationals as measured in this study were not a significant predictor of students' development of intercultural sensitivity, they should still be encouraged to participate in activities which bring them into contact with host nationals. The item seeking to understand the support from authorities for participation in a variety of interactive experiences with host nationals showed the students are not being encouraged by their faculty and administrators associated with the study abroad programs. Thus, the authorities should put more effort towards providing such opportunities and encouraging students' participation in them. It is possible that the characteristics thought to be necessary to promote possible development according to Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis are not necessary for study abroad students' interactions with host nationals.

Although it is not clear from this study what types of experiences students had

while abroad that contributed to their development of intercultural sensitivity, this development is an intended outcome for all students. Setting up environments and situations for students to experience different cultures, ways of life, and people must be continued and increased on college campuses.

Summary

Participation in study abroad programs contributes to students' development of intercultural sensitivity. Although this study was unable to find significance between students' interactions with host nationals and their development, it is necessary that additional research be conducted to determine ways to enhance students' experiences abroad.

APPENDIX A
Study Abroad Survey

Welcome to the Study Abroad Survey. In order to complete this survey, you must read the consent form below and agree to the terms by selecting yes.

Your participation in this study is voluntary, and you may skip any questions on the attached survey that you feel uncomfortable answering. Please be assured that, to the extent permitted by law, personal information obtained for this project will remain confidential, and will not be shared with anyone not associated with this project. Any publications of the study will be based on grouped data and will not reveal your identity or your individual records. If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to contact: Patty Armfield at parmfiel@umd.edu or (301) 314-7237, or Dr. Susan Komives at sk22@umail.umd.edu or (301) 405-2780. If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject or wish to report a research-related injury, please contact the Institutional Review Board Office, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, 20742. Email: irb@deans.umd.edu. Telephone: (301) 405-4212.

1. I state that I am over 18 years of age and wish to participate in the research being conducted by Patty Armfield and Dr. Susan Komives in the College Student Personnel Program in the Department of Counseling & Personnel Services at the University of Maryland.

Yes No

Questions 2-25 should be answered thinking back to your state of mind BEFORE going abroad last semester.

2. I enjoyed interacting with people from different cultures.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

3. I thought people from other cultures are narrow-minded.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

4. I was pretty sure of myself in interacting with people from different cultures.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

5. I found it very hard to talk in front of people from different cultures.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

6. I always knew what to say when interacting with people from different cultures.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
7. I could be as sociable as I want to be when interacting with people from different cultures.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
8. I didn't like to be with people from different cultures.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
9. I respected the values of people from different cultures.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
10. I got upset easily when interacting with people from different cultures.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
11. I felt confident when interacting with people from different cultures.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
12. I tended to wait before forming an impression of culturally distinct counterparts.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
13. I often got discouraged when I am with people from different cultures.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
14. I was open-minded to people from different cultures.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
15. I was very observant when interacting with people from different cultures.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
16. I often felt useless when interacting with people from different cultures.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
17. I respected the ways people from different cultures behave.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
18. I tried to obtain as much information as I can when interacting with people from different cultures.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
19. I would not accept the opinions of people from different cultures.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
20. I was sensitive to my culturally distinct counterpart's subtle meanings during our interaction.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
21. I thought my culture is better than other cultures.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
22. I often gave positive responses to my culturally different counterpart during our

interaction.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

23. I avoided those situations where I will have to deal with culturally distinct persons.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

24. I often showed my culturally distinct counterpart my understanding through verbal or nonverbal cues.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

25. I had a feeling of enjoyment towards differences between my culturally distinct counterpart and me.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

26. What is your gender?

Male Female

27. Please indicate your race/ethnicity: (Choose all that apply.)

Asian

Black/African American

Caucasian

Hispanic

Native American

Bi-racial/Multi-racial

28. What is your age?

19

20

21

22

23+

29. What is your current class standing?

Sophomore

Junior

Senior

Graduate Student

30. What is the college of your major? (Choose all that apply.)

Agriculture and Natural Resources
 Architecture
 Arts and Humanities
 Behavioral and Social Sciences
 School of Business and Management
 Computer, Mathematical, and Physical Sciences
 Education
 Engineering
 Health and Human Performance
 Journalism
 Letters and Sciences (including individual studies majors)
 Undecided/Unknown

Please respond to items 31-54 based on how you feel about each of the items RIGHT NOW.

31. I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures.
 Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
32. I think people from other cultures are narrow-minded.
 Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
33. I am pretty sure of myself in interacting with people from different cultures.
 Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
34. I find it very hard to talk in front of people from different cultures.
 Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
35. I always know what to say when interacting with people from different cultures.
 Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
36. I can be as sociable as I want to be when interacting with people from different cultures.
 Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
37. I don't like to be with people from different cultures.
 Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
38. I respect the values of people from different cultures.
 Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
39. I get upset easily when interacting with people from different cultures.
 Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
40. I feel confident when interacting with people from different cultures.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
41. I tend to wait before forming an impression of culturally distinct counterparts.				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
42. I often get discouraged when I am with people from different cultures.				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
43. I am open-minded to people from different cultures.				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
44. I am very observant when interacting with people from different cultures.				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
45. I often feel useless when interacting with people from different cultures.				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
46. I respect the ways people from different cultures behave.				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
47. I try to obtain as much information as I can when interacting with people from different cultures.				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
48. I would not accept the opinions of people from different cultures.				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
49. I am sensitive to my culturally distinct counterpart's subtle meanings during our interaction.				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
50. I think my culture is better than other cultures.				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
51. I often give positive responses to my culturally different counterpart during our interaction.				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
52. I avoid those situations where I will have to deal with culturally distinct persons.				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
53. I often show my culturally distinct counterpart my understanding through verbal or nonverbal cues.				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
54. I have a feeling of enjoyment towards differences between my culturally distinct counterpart and me.				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

The next set of questions will ask about your interactions with host nationals. Host

nationals are people native to the country where you studied.

55. Approximately what percentage of waking time each week did you spend with host nationals while abroad?

0-20%

21-40%

41-60%

61-80%

81-100%

56. Select the number of host nationals you HAD EXTENDED CONVERSATIONS with (did not plan to do things together, but had conversations when you happened to see each other) on a WEEKLY BASIS.

0-5 host nationals

6-10 host nationals

11-15 host nationals

16-20 host nationals

20+ host nationals

57. Think again to your answer above about the host nationals that you interacted with. Rate the likelihood that they were HOST NATIONAL STUDENTS with whom you HAD EXTENDED CONVERSATIONS with (did not plan to do things together, but had conversations when you happened to see each other).

Never

Almost never

Rarely

Sometimes

Often

Almost always

Always

58. Select the number of host nationals you EXPERIENCED INTENTIONAL ASSOCIATIONS (e.g. visited their homes, helped one another out, did things together) with on a WEEKLY BASIS.

0-5 host nationals

6-10 host nationals

11-15 host nationals

16-20 host nationals

20+ host nationals

59. Think again to your answer above about the host nationals that you interacted with. Rate the likelihood that they were HOST NATIONAL STUDENTS with whom you EXPERIENCED INTENTIONAL ASSOCIATIONS (visited their homes, helped one another out, did things together).

Never

Almost never

Rarely

Sometimes

Often

Almost always

Always

60. How often did you visit a host national family?

Never

Almost never

Rarely (once or twice during my time abroad)

Sometimes (once a month)

Often (once every 1 or 2 weeks)

Almost always

Always

61. How often did you go for walks, outings, or evenings with host nationals?

Never

Almost never

Rarely (once or twice during my time abroad)

Sometimes (once a month)

Often (once every 1 or 2 weeks)

Almost always

Always

62. How often did you do academic work in cooperation with host nationals?

Never

Almost never

Rarely (once or twice during my time abroad)
Sometimes (once a month)
Often (once every 1 or 2 weeks)
Almost always
Always

63. How often were you involved in community activities with host nationals?

Never
Almost never
Rarely (once or twice during my time abroad)
Sometimes (once a month)
Often (once every 1 or 2 weeks)
Almost always
Always

64. How often did you collaborate on an artistic function or social activity with host nationals (e.g. theatrical performance, film club, or social action)?

Never
Almost never
Rarely (once or twice during my time abroad)
Sometimes (once a month)
Often (once every 1 or 2 weeks)
Almost always
Always

65. How often did you discuss what you consider to be significant issues with host nationals?

Never
Almost never
Rarely (once or twice during my time abroad)
Sometimes (once a month)
Often (once every 1 or 2 weeks)
Almost always
Always

66. How often did you have positive contacts with host national neighbors at your

apartment, hotel, pension, or other residence?

Never

Almost never

Rarely (once or twice during my time abroad)

Sometimes (once a month)

Often (once every 1 or 2 weeks)

Almost always

Always

67. How often did you have meals with host nationals in your neighborhood?

Never

Almost never

Rarely (once or twice during my time abroad)

Sometimes (once a month)

Often (once every 1 or 2 weeks)

Almost always

Always

68. Which of the following activities were included as part of formal academic work that was required by or arranged by your program? (Choose all that apply.)

Visited a host national family

Went for walks, outing, or evenings with host nationals

Did academic work in cooperation with host nationals

Involved in community activities with host nationals

Collaborated on an artistic function or social activity with host nationals (e.g. theatrical performance, film club, or social action)

Discussed what you consider to be significant issues with host nationals

Had positive contacts with host national neighbors at your apartment, hotel, pension, or other residence

Had meals with host nationals in your neighborhood

69. Which of the following activities did you pursue on your own without being part of your formal academic work? (Choose all that apply.)

Visited a host national family

Went for walks, outing, or evenings with host nationals

Did academic work in cooperation with host nationals

Involved in community activities with host nationals

Collaborated on an artistic function or social activity with host nationals (e.g. theatrical performance, film club, or social action)

Discussed what you consider to be significant issues with host nationals

Had positive contacts with host national neighbors at your apartment, hotel, pension, or other residence

Had meals with host nationals in your neighborhood

70. In general, how satisfied are you with you experience abroad?

Very dissatisfied

Dissatisfied

Neutral

Satisfied

Very satisfied

71. What was the native language of the country in which you studied?

72. React to this statement if the host country language was a language other than English: I started the study abroad experience with functional proficiency in the host language.

Strongly disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly agree

73. Have you ever traveled abroad before your study abroad experience? (If no, please skip to question 76.)

Yes No

74. If yes, what was the longest amount of time spent abroad before your study abroad experience?

Less than 1 week

1-2 weeks

3-4 weeks

1-2 months

More than 2 months

75. How many countries had you visited before this semester abroad experience?

1 country

2-4 countries

5-7 countries

8+ countries

76. How many months did you stay in the study abroad country last semester?

1 month

2 months

3 months

4 months

5+ months

77. In which country did you study?

78. Where did you live for the majority of the time you were abroad last semester?

University dormitory

University apartment

Non-university apartment

Home stay with host nationals

79. Did you have a roommate? (If no, please select DONE at the bottom of this page.)

Yes No

80. If yes, which of the following describes your roommate(s)? (Choose all that apply.)

American

Host national

Other international student

Thank you for your responses. After you select DONE below, you will be directed to a site where you must complete your contact information in order to be eligible for one of three \$30 Target gift certificates.

DONE

Thank you for your participation in the Study Abroad Survey. If you have completed this survey by Friday, February 20th, 2004, please complete the fields below with your name, email address, and mailing address. You will be contacted by Friday, February 27th, 2004 if you have received one of three \$30 Target gift certificates.

APPENDIX B
Request for Participation

Dear Students,

Welcome back from your time abroad. I hope you had a wonderful experience and have found ways to incorporate your experience into your remaining time at Maryland.

A master's student at Maryland is conducting a research project to help her assess the impact of study abroad experiences. Hopefully, her findings will be of benefit to her and our office. If you can find the time to complete this survey (estimated 10 minutes to complete), I would appreciate your assistance. There are a small number of participants so your response matters. Please respond by Friday, February 27th, 2004.

Upon completing the online survey, you will be entered into a drawing for one of three \$30 Target gift cards. If you have any questions, please direct them to the graduate student, Patty Armfield, at 301-314-7237. Her thesis advisor, Dr. Susan Komives can be reached at 301-405-2870.

Select this link and you can complete the survey.

<http://cgi.umd.edu/survey/display?StudyAbroadSurvey/StudyAbroad2004>

Thank you for your assistance,

Michael Ulrich
International Studies Director

APPENDIX C

Follow up participation reminder

February 26, 2004

Dear Students,

If you missed this message the first time, or just haven't found the time to respond, please take a few minutes to do so now.

Welcome back from your time abroad. I hope you had a wonderful experience and have found ways to incorporate your experience into your remaining time at Maryland.

A master's student at Maryland is conducting a research project to help her assess the impact of study abroad experiences. Hopefully, her findings will be of benefit to her and our office. If you can find the time to complete this survey (estimated 10 minutes to complete), I would appreciate your assistance. There are a small number of participants so your response matters. Please respond by Friday, February 27th, 2004.

Upon completing the online survey, you will be entered into a drawing for one of three \$30 Target gift cards. If you have any questions, please direct them to the graduate student, Patty Armfield, at 301-314-7237. Her thesis advisor, Dr. Susan Komives can be reached at 301-405-2870.

Select this link and you can complete the survey.

<http://cgi.umd.edu/survey/display?StudyAbroadSurvey/StudyAbroad2004>

Thank you for your assistance,

Michael Ulrich
International Studies Director

APPENDIX D

Final participation reminder

Hello <student's name>. I am writing to personally request that you fill out the 10-minute survey about your study abroad experience. Your participation will help me to finish my masters degree thesis and because of the small number of participants, your responses are crucial to the completion of my study.

You are still eligible for one of three \$30 Target gift cards, so please reply by Sunday, March 7th.

Please go to this link to participate:

<http://cgi.umd.edu/survey/display?StudyAbroadSurvey/StudyAbroad2004>

Thank you so much for your help,
Patty Armfield

APPENDIX E

Intercultural Sensitivity Scale data replacement table

VARIABLE NUMBER	AVERAGE	CASE NUMBERS REPLACED
9	4.3	27, 31
11	3.61	20, 43
12	3.63	43
21	1.13	3
31	4.59	9
35	3.02	19
38	4.41	19
43	4.59	15
45	.63	32

REFERENCES

- Abrams, I. (1979). The impact of Antioch education through experience abroad. *Alternative Higher Education, 3*, 176-187.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Addison-Wesley: Cambridge.
- Alred, G., Byram, M., & Fleming, M. (2003). *Intercultural experience and education*. Multilingual Matters LTD: Buffalo, New York.
- Amir, Y. (1969). Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. *Psychological Bulletin, 71*, 319-342.
- Basu, A. K., & Ames, R. G. (1970). Cross-cultural contact and attitude formation. *Sociology and Social Research, 55*, 5-16.
- Battsek, M. (1962). A practical analysis of some aspects of study abroad. *The Journal of General Education, 13*, 225-242.
- Bochner, S., Hutnik, N., & Furnham, A. (1985). The friendship patterns of overseas and host students in an Oxford student residence. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 125, 6*, 689-694.
- Brein, M., & David, K. H. (1971). Intercultural communication and the adjustment of the sojourner. *Psychological Bulletin, 76, 3*, 215-230.
- Brislin, R. W. (1981). The benefits of close intercultural relationships. In S. H. Irvine, & J. W. Berry. *Human assessment and cultural factors*. Plenum Press: New York.
- Carlson, J. S., & Widaman K. F. (1988). The effects of study abroad during college on attitudes toward other cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 12*, 1-17.
- Carsello, C., & Creaser, J. (1976). How college students change during study abroad. *College Student Journal, 10*, 276-278.

- Case, R. (1993). Key elements of a global perspective. *Social Education*, 57, 6, 318-325.
- Chen, G.- M., & Starosta, W. J. (1996). Intercultural communication competence: A synthesis. *Communication Yearbook* 19, 353-383.
- Chen, G.- M., & Starosta, W. J. (2000). The development and validation of the intercultural sensitivity scale. *Human Communication*, 3, 3-14.
- Chickering, A. W., & Kuper, E. (1971). Educational outcomes for commuters and residents. *Educational Record*, 52, 255-261.
- Cook, S. W. (1962). The systematic analysis of socially significant events: A strategy for social research. *Journal of Social Issues*, 18, 2, 66-84.
- Cook, S. W., & Selltiz, C. (1955). Some factors which influence the attitudinal outcomes of personal contact. *International Social Science Bulletin*, 7, 51-58.
- Fantini, A. E. (1991). Becoming better global citizens: The promise of intercultural competence. *Intercultural Education*, 15-19.
- Gareis, E. (1995). *Intercultural friendship: A qualitative study*. University Press of America: Lanham, Maryland.
- Gingerich, K. E. (1998). *The impact of study abroad and didactic cross-cultural coursework experiences on the development of white racial consciousness and cultural sensitivity*. Dissertation (Univ. of Kansas).
- Gratz et al. v. Bollinger et al., 02-516 U.S. xxx (2003).
- Grutter v. Bollinger et al., 02-241 U.S. xxx (2003).
- Hanvey, R. G. (1976). *An attainable global perspective*.
- Hensley, T. R., & Sell, D. K. (1979). A study-abroad program: An examination of impacts on student attitudes. *Teaching Political Science*, 6, 4, 387-412.

- Hess, J. D. (1997). *Studying abroad/Learning abroad*. Intercultural Press, Inc: Yarmouth, Maine.
- Hill, D. J. (1987). *Innovative approaches to curriculum design in the study abroad program*. Renaissance Publications: Columbus, Ohio.
- Hoffa, W. W. (1998). *Study abroad: A parent's guide*. NAFSA: Association of International Educators: Washington D.C.
- Hofman, J. E., & Zak, I. (1969). Interpersonal contact and attitude change in a cross-cultural situation. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 78, 165-171.
- Hopkins, J. R. (1999). Studying abroad as a form of experience. *Liberal Education*, 36-41.
- Howard, G. S., & Dailey, P. R. (1979). Response-shift bias: a source of contamination in self report measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 64, 2, 144-150.
- Institute of International Education (2002). *Open Doors*. Institute of International Education: New York.
- Kafka, E. P. (1968). *The effects of overseas study on worldmindedness and other selected variables of liberal arts students*. Unpublished Dissertation.
- Kamal, A. A., & Maruyama, G. (1990). Cross-cultural contact and attitudes of Qatari students in the United States. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 14, 123-134.
- Kauffmann, N. L. (1983). *The impact of study abroad on personality change*. Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 5A [I-020].
- Kauffmann, N. L., Martin, J. N., & Weaver, H. D. (1992). *Students abroad: Strangers at home*. Intercultural Press: Yarmouth, Maine.

- Kelman, H. C. (1975). International interchanges: some contributions from theories of attitude change. In W. Coplin, & J. M. Rochester (eds.). *A multi-method introduction to international politics*. Markham: Chicago.
- Klineberg, O., & Hull, W. F. (1979). *At a foreign university*. Praeger Publishers: New York.
- McCabe, L. T. (1994). The development of a global perspective during participation in Semester at Sea: A comparative global education program. *Educational Review*, 46, 3, 275-286.
- McCabe, L. T. (1997). Global perspective development. *Education*, 118, 1, 1-7.
- Milem, J. F. (2003). The educational benefits of diversity: Evidence from multiple sectors. In M. J. Chang, D. Witt, J. Jones, & K. Hakuta (Eds.). *Compelling interests: Examining the evidence on racial dynamics in colleges and universities*. Stanford University Press: Stanford, CA.
- Neeter, J., Wasserman, W., & Kunter, M. (1985). *Applied linear statistical models*. (2nd ed.) Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Nesdale, D., & Todd, P. (2000). Effect of contact on intercultural acceptance: A field study. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24, 341-360.
- Olson, C. L., & Kroeger, K. R. (2001). Global competency and intercultural sensitivity. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 5, 2, 116-137.
- Pearson, R. P. (1981). Measuring adjustment and attitude change. *New Directions for Experiential Learning*, 11, 26-66.
- Pohl, N. F. (1982). Using retrospective pre-ratings to counteract response-shift confounding. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 50, 4, 211-214.
- Pope, R. L., & Reynolds, A. L. (1997). Student affairs core competencies: Integrating multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. *Journal of College Student Development*, 38, 266-277.

- Pritchard, R. M. O., & Skinner, B. (2002). Cross-cultural partnerships between home and international students. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 6, 4, 323-353.
- Rockwell, S. K., & Kohn, H. (1989). Post-then pre evaluation. *Journal of Extension*, 27, 2, 19-21.
- Rohs, F. R., & Langone, C. A. (1997). Increased accuracy in measuring leadership impacts. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 4, 1, 150-158.
- Salter, C. A., & Teger, A. I. (1975). Change in attitudes toward other nations as a function of the type of international contact. *Sociometry*, 38, 2, 213-222.
- Sampson, D. L., & Smith, H. P. (1957). A scale to measure world-minded attitudes. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 45, 99-106.
- Schofield, J. W. (1995). Improving intergroup relations among students. In J. A. Banks, & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.). *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. pp. 635-646.
- Sell, D. K. (1983). Research on attitude change in U.S. students who participate in foreign study experiences: Past findings and suggestions for future research. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 7, 131-147.
- Selltiz, C., & Cook, S. W. (1962). Factors influencing attitudes of foreign students toward the host country. *Journal of Social Issues*, 18, 7-23.
- Selltiz, C., Hopson, A. L., & Cook, S. W. (1956). The effects of situational factors on personal interaction between foreign students and Americans. *Journal of Social Issues*, 7, 1, 33-44.
- Smith, H. P. (1955). Do intercultural experiences affect attitudes, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 51, 469-477.
- Sprangers, M., & Hoogstraten, J. (1988). Response-style effects, response-shift bias and a bogus pipeline: A replication. *Psychological Reports*, 62, 11-16.

- Stephan, C. W., & Stephan, W. G. (1992). Reducing intercultural anxiety through intercultural contact. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 16, 89-106.
- Taylor, E. W. (1994). Intercultural competency: A transformative learning process. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 44, 3, 154-174.
- Triandis, H. C., & Vassiliou, V. (1967). Frequency of contact and stereotyping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 7, 3, 316-328.
- University of Maryland Study Abroad Office (2002). *Annual report*. University of Maryland, College Park: College Park, MD.
- Wilner, D. M., Walkley, R. P., & Cook, S. W. (1952). Residential proximity and intergroup relations in public housing projects. *Journal of Social Issues*, 8, 1, 45-69.
- Wilson, A. H. (1996). The attributes and tasks of global competence. In R. D. Lambert (Ed.), *Educational exchange and global competence*. Council on International Educational Exchange: New York.