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WORLD LANGUAGES COURSEWORK AND INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

By

Islam Karkour

University of New Hampshire, May 2018

The world continues to witness a crisis when it comes to reconciling cultural differences. In many cases, failure to bridge cultural differences has led to a continuum of violence that begins with individual conflict and ends with wars and terrorism. College campuses, such as the University of New Hampshire (UNH), experience increasing cultural tensions and racial conflict. This dissertation argues that education, particularly liberal arts and world language (WL) programs, ought to address the issues of misunderstanding and violence that stem from the failure to reconcile cultural differences. This dissertation investigates the capacity of the liberal arts and world language education to improve students’ intercultural sensitivity. The study assesses the College of Liberal Arts (COLA) students at UNH who study world languages. The study uses the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) to measure the intercultural sensitivity of 71 students from five different world language classes. The study finds that there is a negative change in the total average score of the IDI, as the average mean score of the pretest was statistically significantly lower than the average mean score of the posttest, with a large negative effect size. Additionally, the professors of the five WL classes were interviewed, and their syllabi were critically reviewed to investigate their pedagogical approach to teaching culture. This study finds that professors’ pedagogical approaches for teaching culture may impact the change in students’ IDI scores, and that best practices identified in the literature for teaching culture, namely reflections, are important for increasing students’ intercultural sensitivity in WL classes. This dissertation not only helps to fill gaps in the literature on
the relationship between WL classes and intercultural sensitivity, but also offers practical recommendations for universities based on the findings of the study.
Chapter 1: Introduction

The 2016 American presidential election has brought to the surface potentially long-standing issues of political tension and party polarization, with an increase in racial and cultural incidents across the country. Some of these tensions have manifested on U.S. college campuses, including at the University of New Hampshire (UNH). Located in Durham, New Hampshire, UNH’s student body is predominantly comprised of white, American undergraduates; its 2016 university undergraduate profile found that only 9% of undergrads were students of color. Immediately following the 2016 election, then-UNH president Mark Huddleston tried to ease tensions and apprehension on campus by sending an email to the university community, in which he said, “…we also affirm our university’s commitment to diversity, inclusion and mutual respect. We value all campus voices and seek to maintain an environment in which all can engage in robust but civil dialogue and interactions…” However, throughout the spring 2017 semester, racial incidents increased on campus. Controversy emerged, for example, over the way a group of white students celebrated Cinco de Mayo, sparking conversations about cultural appropriation and insensitivity. Not long after, other students posted photos online in black face, while swastika graffiti was found in a dorm on campus, and artwork representing solidarity was vandalized outside of a university hall. In total, more than 100 reported bias incidents were reported at UNH by the start of fall semester 2017, according to New Hampshire Public Radio. All of these incidents indicate that there is a gap between UNH as it should be—a university that is committed to “diversity, inclusion, and mutual respect”—and UNH as it really is.

The ability to behave and communicate appropriately with people from different cultures is known in the research literature as “intercultural sensitivity.” This term has many synonyms and definitions, which will be discussed in the dissertation. One of these definitions, for instance, defines
intercultural sensitivity as, “the ability to effectively and appropriately execute communication behaviors to elicit a desired response in a specific environment,” (Chen & Starosta, 1998, p. 231).

Dealing and communicating with the “other” successfully is the essence of human existence. By the “other,” I refer to anyone who is different on the basis of color, culture, religion, sexual orientation, political view, or any other source of difference. It is believed that everyone should do his/her best to communicate effectively with the “other” as a first step toward achieving the peace and harmony that any society longs for. Certainly, “how to live together peacefully and without violence has been a challenge for all humanity throughout history,” (Stavenhagen, 2008, p.161). This dissertation is based on the assumption that an appropriate form of relationship, communication, mutual understanding, and respect can help humanity to overcome the one of the greatest challenges it faces—violence.

Based on a review of the literature, liberal arts education, specifically world language (WL) classes, are supposed to be among the most effective ways of cultivating intercultural sensitivity. Nevertheless, little research exists on the practical influence of higher education, liberal education, and WL classes in promoting intercultural sensitivity. More studies are needed to investigate the ability of American higher education to provide students with the intercultural sensitivity needed in a diverse world, and to explore the effectiveness of studying foreign languages for increasing students’ intercultural sensitivity. This dissertation seeks to analyze the ability of WL classes at UNH to foster intercultural sensitivity among undergraduate COLA students, and is timely research in light of the current campus, as well as the greater national, political and cultural climates.

Statement of the Problem
While all levels of education should aim at developing students’ intercultural sensitivity, higher education could be most influential in this field. It was the Think-Academy’s mission to produce “citizen of the world,” as Socrates argued. Socrates’ Think-Academies are equivalent to
universities in our modern word (Nussbaum, 1999). Martha Nussbaum, in her commentary on Socrates’ Think-Academies, stresses the role of liberal arts higher education in promoting intercultural sensitivity. She argues that U.S. universities ought to be able to produce citizens who could be described as “world citizens.” She goes on to argue that American campuses, in the ideal world, should aim to graduate “educated citizens.” To become educated citizens, according to Nussbaum, requires learning how to be “a human being capable of love and imagination,” (Nussbaum, 1999, p.14). This love is not limited to those who are similar to oneself, but should be extended to cover those who are different. Likewise, Derek Bok (2006), in his book, Our Underachieving Colleges, indicates that college education should pursue a variety of purposes. He stresses “living with diversity,” and “living in a more global society,” as important aims American colleges should strive to achieve. However, he sadly implies that American higher education is doing a poor job in achieving those aims, hence the title of his work.

This dissertation tries to investigate and bridge the gap between the normative ideal world and the real world. This study tries to investigate whether there is a gap between college education as it should be and college education as it is. For example, as mentioned in the introduction, after the 2016 American presidential election, the University of New Hampshire’s (UNH) president, Mark Huddleston, sent an email to the campus community, in which he said, “…we also affirm our university’s commitment to diversity, inclusion and mutual respect. We value all campus voices and seek to maintain an environment in which all can engage in robust but civil dialogue and interactions…” This statement resonates with the UNH strategic plan, which states that a “culture of inclusion and diversity” is one of UNH’s visions and values. To what extent, however, does UNH place a high value on diversity and inclusion in practice (or what Aristotle described as praxis, an ethical engagement akin to friendship)? To what extent do we, as faculty, succeed in cultivating the capacities among our students to communicate in diverse societies, among diverse ethnic groups,
and to welcome the influence of a range of values and cultures? What forms of assessment are available to measure our students’ capacity for mutual respect, acceptance, understanding, and civil dialogue? To achieve “inclusion,” UNH needs to assess its ability to cultivate intercultural sensitivity.

Dr. Mitchell R. Hammer, the co-author of the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), argues that diversity and intercultural competence (IC) are the two components that lead to inclusion. Figure 1 diagrams this idea.

![Diagram of components of inclusion](image)

Figure 1. Components of Inclusion, (Hammer, 2015. From the IDI Qualifying Seminar, 2017)

This dissertation is designed to address the above issue, i.e. assessing intercultural sensitivity in the College of Liberal Arts (COLA) at UNH, to see if it achieves its goal of “inclusion.”
Given the role education can play in cultivating intercultural sensitivity, Michael Byram (1997) argues for the considerable need to assess students’ intercultural sensitivity in each university to ensure that the education in that institution is promoting intercultural sensitivity. He asserts that educational institutions have a responsibility to teach and assess intercultural sensitivity. To conclude, the problem this study tries to address is the lack of assessment of American higher education in terms of promoting students’ intercultural sensitivity. Hence, the purpose of this study is to assess UNH students’ intercultural sensitivity, if it exists, and to investigate the role world language classes play in promoting such an important construct.

Research Questions
1. What is the level of intercultural sensitivity of world language COLA students at the beginning of the semester? On average, does intercultural sensitivity improve over the course of a semester?

2. Is there a positive association between the level of intercultural sensitivity and the number of world language courses students have taken?

3. a) How and to what extent do world language teachers’ pedagogies integrate aspects of the cultural communities (e.g., information about traditions, practices, and values) that use the language they teach?

   b) Does asking for teachers’ own explanations of changes to their students' IDI scores provide information that explains IDI score differences across world language classrooms?

Nature of the Study
The study is observational in nature, in that it investigates degrees of intercultural sensitivity in a specific sample of students. The study also explores potential correlations between stages of intercultural sensitivity and participating in world language classes. This study is conducted using a quantitative and qualitative data collecting method. Quantitative data collection depends on using a
psychometric instrument called the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), while qualitative data is collected through interviews (more details in chapter three).

**Significance of the Study**

The results of this study contribute to current conversations about diversity, inclusion, cultural differences, and intercultural sensitivity in American universities. The results shed light on the present level of intercultural sensitivity of the sampled students, which can be used to create suggestions for how universities can better achieve “culture[s] of inclusion and diversity.”

In addition, the results contribute to discussions of how world language classes should be managed in the real world. As intercultural sensitivity is believed to be one of the expected outcomes of world language classes, the study investigates the best possible ways by which world language classes can effectively improve students’ intercultural sensitivity.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

The aim of this chapter is to review current literature on intercultural sensitivity, as well as identify critical gaps in the existing research. Identifying these gaps helps to orient this dissertation correctly in the ongoing dialogue about intercultural sensitivity.

Intercultural sensitivity is discussed in literature from two different perspectives. The first is a theoretical perspective, which deals with the philosophical background of intercultural sensitivity, such as definitions, importance, and philosophical roots. The second perspective focuses on empirical issues, like intercultural sensitivity assessment in different settings. Therefore, this literature review is divided into two parts:

1) A theoretical review of intercultural sensitivity, including a discussion of different terms and definitions, as well as how the construct developed from multicultural to intercultural competence, and then on to intercultural citizenship. Next, a discussion of Martha Nussbaum’s “cultivating humanity” and Dwayne Huebner’s “love” is provided. After discussing the different terms, literature is reviewed to find out the relationship between intercultural sensitivity, education, and world language education. Finally, how intercultural sensitivity could be practically taught in language classroom is summarized, and a summary of the best practices for teaching culture in world language classes is presented.

2) A review of how the concept of intercultural sensitivity is practically investigated in educational settings, i.e. how the concept has been measured in literature.

Each of these two parts ends with a discussion of critical gaps in the literature, and how they can be filled.
Part One: Theoretical Review

Dealing with the other is not a new topic in humanities. What happens when two different persons interact with each other is a leading question in the history of humanities. Indeed, “what may transpire between man and man? This seems to be the question which guides the study of all human relations” (Huebner, 1960, p.75). Dwayne Huebner goes on to elaborate that it is not only important to study the interaction between two different people, but more focus is needed on the form of this interaction:

Relating to others cannot be a goal of life or education, for it is the sine qua non of human existence. To relate or not to relate to others is not a choice offered to the child, nor even to the adult. The problem is not to relate to others, but to find a mode of relationship, and a way of talking about that relationship, which offer the greatest meaning today (Huebner, 1960, p.74).

Typically, when two humans from different cultural backgrounds gather in one place, Huebner identifies four “modes” that could happen. Berry, Kim, Power, Young, and Bujaki (1989) offer the same modes of relationship, but they call them “acculturation attitudes.” The first acculturation attitude, or mode of relationship, is marginalization, which happens when the minority group members lose cultural and psychological contact with both their traditional culture and the larger society. Second, assimilation occurs when the non-dominant group members absorb and get so deeply involved in the dominant culture that they lose their own culture. Third, segregation or separation, which takes place when the non-dominant group cannot build any positive relationship with the dominant culture and prefers to maintain only its ethnic identity and traditions. The fourth acculturation attitude is integration, which means that the non-dominant group maintains its own
culture and traditions and, at the same time, builds a positive relationship with the dominant groups to be an effective part of the larger society (Berry et al., 1989).

Among those four acculturation attitudes, only one enhances understanding, tolerance, and peace, all of which are greatly needed in the modern multicultural world. According to David Coulby (2006), “current affairs are all too easily conceptualized as a ‘war on terror’ or ‘a clash of civilizations.’ In this context the need to recognize, tolerate and, at best, understand cultures other than that of the state into which people are born has never been more vital.” The attitude that provokes understanding, tolerance, and peace is named “cultural integration” in Berry et al.’s (1989) typology, as discussed above. This construct has many other names in other resources, including “multiculturalism,” “intercultural competence,” “interculturality,” “intercultural sensitivity,” “intercultural citizenship,” “humanity,” and “love.” Therefore, the following review is divided into four parts: terms and definitions, the relationship between intercultural sensitivity and curriculum, models of intercultural sensitivity, and the gap found in the literature review about intercultural sensitivity.

**Terms and Definitions**

**Intercultural Competence or Intercultural Sensitivity?**

While many scholars deal with “intercultural competence” and “intercultural sensitivity” as synonyms (for example, Pusch, 2009; Cushner and Mahon, 2009; Anand and Lahiri, 2009; Fantini and Tirmizi, 2006; and Fantini, 2009), Hammer, Bennett, and Wiseman (2003) make a distinction between the two terms. For them, intercultural competence is “the ability to think and act in interculturally appropriate ways,” while intercultural sensitivity is “the ability to discriminate and experience relevant cultural differences” (Hammer et.al, 2003, p. 422). As discussed in detail in the following sections, Milton Bennett provides a groundbreaking model in the field of intercultural
sensitivity. His perspective is that intercultural sensitivity leads to intercultural competence. To explain his model, he emphasizes that “the underlying assumption of the model is that as one’s experience of cultural difference [intercultural sensitivity] becomes more complex and sophisticated, one’s potential competence in intercultural relations increases,” (Hammer et al., 2003, p. 423). Therefore, he claims that the ultimate stages in his developmental mode, the advanced phases of ethnorelativism, include the concept of intercultural competence (Bennett, 1986).

A careful review of the literature indicates that scholars tend to use the term “intercultural competence” in theoretical, philosophical discussions and qualitative studies that do not deal with the measurement issues of interculturalism. On the other hand, “intercultural sensitivity” is used more in quantitative works, as many of them depend on Bennett’s DMIS model (a detailed review of those studies is included in the second part of this review).

Thus, to go through the first part of this review, which deals with the theoretical background of interculturalism, the term “intercultural competence” will be the dominant term, as it is most commonly referenced in the theoretical literature. However, the remainder of the dissertation will employ the use of the term “intercultural sensitivity,” as this language better encapsulates what the study is trying to measure, i.e. how students think about and experience cultural differences.

**From Multicultural to Intercultural Competence to Intercultural Citizenship**

The call for studying intercultural communications skills began in the 1960s (Byram & Peiser, 2015). It was obvious that people who traveled abroad for political and commercial tasks needed a special kind of training that would enable them to communicate effectively with the host culture they traveled to (Bazgan & Daniela, 2014; Xue, 2014). At that time, the most common and accepted term in literature was “multicultural” communication skills. This term had a major defect, however, as it focused on preparing people to act as guests or minorities; as mentioned earlier, the focus was on preparing politicians and businessmen who traveled abroad to deal with the host
communities. The study of “multicultural” skills ignored preparing the trainees to deal with minorities and different ethnicities who lived with them in the same community. In other words, the studies of “multicultural” communication skills were designed to ignore racism. The studies were only to help people who wanted to travel abroad for political or commercial reasons. Therefore, the concept of “multicultural” communication skills was under attack in the 1980s, according to Coulby (2006), for two main reasons. First, nationalists criticized the word “multicultural” because it was perceived as a call to give up one’s national identity for the sake of different cultures, whereas the nationalists believe the focus of education should be on one’s own national culture, values, and language. Second, it failed to address racism. Indeed, it was obvious that “multicultural” communication skills would not win any war against racism because the focus was on dealing with abroad cultures, not local races and ethnicities.

Accordingly, a new term started to appear in literature in the 1990s: “intercultural competence.” Although this term did not solve the defects the previous term was criticized for, it served as a fresh restart (Coulby, 2006). The basic character of “intercultural competence” was ambiguity, as there is no agreed upon definition for this term. Perhaps one of the reasons that this term has so many definitions is that its components, culture and competence, have endless definitions themselves. To clarify, if the term “intercultural competence” is broken down, it is obvious it has two main elements, which are culture and competence. Culture is a concept so complex and complicated that it becomes difficult to have one agreed upon definition. According to Xue (2014), in 1925, 164 definitions of culture were found in the literature (Samovar & Porter, 1994, as cited in Xue, 2014). One of the most comprehensive definitions of culture is provided by Ferraro (1995), as he defines culture as “everything that people have, think, and do as members of a society.” Competence, on the other hand, is another problematic term because there is disagreement as to how it should be measured or assessed. One of the most common definitions of competence in
literature is by Florin Voiculescu’s (2011); it is defined as “an individual or a collective ability attached to the possibility to mobilize and put into action in an effective manner in a given context a set of knowledge, skills and behavioral attitudes” (Bazgan & Daniela, 2014, p. 47).

As a result, it could be argued that the many of definitions of the terms “culture” and “competence” caused a wide variety of definitions for the term “intercultural competence.” Bazgan and Daniela (2014) summarize the various definitions of intercultural competence in educational literature and conclude that it is “management and effective interaction between people who in a lesser or greater degree, are different not only culturally, but also emotionally, cognitively and behaviorally” (p. 49). According to a study conducted by Darla K. Deardorff (2006), the most common and widely accepted definition among leaders, researchers, and teachers of higher education institutions is Michael Byram’s definition. Byram defines intercultural competence as, “knowledge of others; knowledge of self; skills to interpret and relate; skills to discover and/or to interact; valuing others’ values, beliefs, and behaviors; and relativizing one’s self” (Byram, 1997, p. 34).

Intercultural Competence and Intercultural Citizenship

Another term that appears in literature is “intercultural citizenship.” Intercultural citizenship is most common in the U.K. educational literature; it gains its credibility from “citizenship education,” which is the most common and accepted principle in education there. According to Himmelmann (2006), “In Great Britain…, one term seems to be widely accepted. It is ‘citizenship education,’ as the National Curriculum defined it in 1999 (DfES, 1999)” (p. 90). Himmelmann goes on to add, “citizen education besides ‘knowledge’ and ‘practical skills’ is to provide opportunities to promote the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of pupils. This seems to be a core intention, the underlying idea of citizenship education in the U.K.” (p. 71). Interestingly, in his comparison between the United Kingdom and the United States, Himmelmann (2006) argues that
the concept of citizenship education is not common in the U.S. simply because there is no official national curriculum; each of the 50 states have their own educational systems and curricula.

Although Byram (2006) agrees with and supports the concept of citizenship education, he argues that the perspective of “citizenship” should be expanded to deal with more than the nation’s culture. He states, “in a world where states are economically and politically interdependent, education for citizenship has to take a wider perspective, involving engagement with people of other forms of life or cultures” (p. 127). The relationship between citizenship education and intercultural citizenship education is that the earlier is at a local level, whereas the latter is at an international level. As Byram describes this relationship, “education for citizenship leads to engagement and action, and education for intercultural citizenship (italics mine) should equally involve learners in engagement and action, at an international level as well as at a local, regional or national level” (Byram, 2006, p. 127).

To summarize, the idea of “interculturalism,” or being intercultural, began to appear in modern literature in the 1960s. In educational literature, the term has evolved from “multicultural education” to “intercultural competence,” and then to “intercultural citizenship.” The notion of “intercultural citizenship” is the most acceptable in the U.K. because the aim of education there is to instill the nation’s values in its students. The term “intercultural citizenship” seems more effective than the other terms, as it guarantees dealing with the “other,” whether this “other” is abroad or local. It deals with any different culture inside or outside one’s own society. However, “intercultural competence” is the most common in the American education literature. Regardless of the specific term used, being intercultural means:

- questioning the conventions and values we have unquestioningly acquired as if they were natural;
• experiencing the otherness of others of different social groups, moving from one of the many in-groups to which we belong to one of the many out-groups that contrast with them;
• reflecting on the relationships among groups and the experience of those relationships;
• analyzing our intercultural experience and acting upon the analysis (Alerd et al., 2006, p. 1).

Love and Cultivating Humanity

Martha Nussbaum’s Cultivating Humanity

One of the best arguments in favor of multiculturalism can be found in Martha Nussbaum’s profound book, *Cultivating Humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Nussbaum believes that the need for multiculturalism (or world citizenship) is not a matter of required change in education, but of cultivating humanity. She warns that both the current education system and universities fail to provide students with the skills and attitudes they need to be world citizens and to deal with those who are different from themselves. She states, “we may continue to produce narrow citizens who have difficulty understanding people different from themselves, whose imaginations rarely venture beyond their local setting” (1998, p. 14). She goes on to add that, despite the depressing status quo, American educators still have a chance to fix this problem. For Nussbaum, calling for more intercultural education is not “political correctness,” it is the “cultivation of humanity.”

Although there are many authors that argue for intercultural competence, few connect their arguments to the time of ancient philosophy. Martha Nussbaum and Dwayne Huebner are among those who do. Nussbaum structures all of her argument on the teachings of Plato, Aristos, and Diogenes the Cynic. To explain further, Nussbaum strengthens her argument by indicating that the roots and the call for interculturalism in education stretches back to the time of the ancient Greek
and Roman philosophers. According to Nussbaum, the term “citizen of the world” is believed to be first said by Diogenes the Cynic (404-323 B.C.). When anyone asked Diogenes where he came from, he said: “I am a citizen of the world.” In her commentary on Diogenes’ claim of world citizenship, Nussbaum believes Diogenes refused to be defined only as a member of his local closed community. Instead, he declared his belonging to the whole world and professed his openness toward different cultures. Nussbaum goes on to argue that the Stoics developed Diogenes’ idea of kosmopolites, or world citizens. A core Stoic belief centers around the following sentiment: “we should regard all human beings as our fellow citizens and local residents” (p. 52). The Stoics, according to Nussbaum, write intensively about the nature of hatred and anger and how societies can use world citizenship to defeat these negative attitudes. They insist that to be a good citizen, one has to be a citizen of the world. But how could this world citizenship, or “cultivating humanity,” be achieved? Nussbaum indicates that the best possible method involves development of the following three capacities: the examined life, the ability to think as a citizen of the whole world, and the narrative imagination. Each of those capacities will be explained in Part II, when discussing the possible applications for interculturalism in schools.

Dwayne E. Huebner’s Love

One of the major gaps in literature about intercultural sensitivity is that there are no references to one of the most important educational philosophers in recent century, Dwayne E. Huebner. This is likely because Huebner uses a unique language. Human relationships are one of the major themes in Huebner’s writings. In 1963, Huebner published his paper, *New Modes of Man’s Relationship to Man*. Its contents were so significant that William F. Pinar (1999) describes it as a “landmark paper.” In it, Huebner creates a profound and salient model of human relationships that offers a different way of thinking about dealing with the “other.” He believes that the question is not whether or not to deal with the “other;” rather, it is how to deal with them. Most shocking,
however, is that, although the importance, clarity, and simplicity of the model is apparent, it cannot be found in any published works about intercultural competence. Perhaps the reason is that Huebner does not use typical curriculum language and terms (he has an argument for that, and he uses his own terms). For example, in his paper he uses the term “love” to indicate acceptance and openness toward the “other.”

To set up his model, Huebner asks a central question: “What may transpire between man and man?” (p. 75). He indicates that human nature tries to avoid loneliness and separateness; for Huebner, it is all about loneliness and love. Any type of human interaction is based on that attempt to prevent from loneliness. He quotes Ortega y Gasset: “love is nothing but the attempt to exchange true solitude.”

Huebner argues that in the case of two different men in a single situation, four forms of social encounters could happen: denial, submission, domination and freedom. In denial, one may ignore the existence of the “other” and dismiss their humanity by dealing with them as a “thing” and not as a human being. He goes on to state: “stereotypes and prejudices function effectively as conceptual tools of denial, for by quickly categorizing another person as a thing of no significance, the first person may ignore the second” (p. 72). In submission, man may recognize his loneliness and separateness and try to overcome that, even if it costs all of his freedom and power to the other, or becoming subservient and completely giving up his freedom and identity in hopes of exchanging loneliness for love. Domination, the third form of interaction, is when man accepts domination over the other who seeks to overcome loneliness and separateness. “In these encounters, the possessive individual is denying the other's freedom and his own, for he is not open to the other but is walled off by his own self” (p. 75). Finally, freedom is the situation in which the two men each maintain their maximum independence; it is a situation in which both mirror one another, with each man
having a similar attitude towards conversation, understanding and mutual respect. Huebner labels
the first three modes as “negative” and the fourth as a “positive” form of encountering. To
illuminate the difference between positive and negative forms of encountering, he quotes a text from
Motes from the fourth century B.C., and further elevates the importance of “love:”

...individuals have learned to love themselves and not others. Therefore, they
do not scruple about injuring others. When nobody in the world loves any
other, naturally the strong will overpower the weak, the many will oppress the
few, the wealthy will mock the poor, the honored will disdain the humble, the
cunning will deceive the simple. Therefore, all the calamities, strife, complaints, and hatred in
the world have arisen out of a lack of mutual love (p. 77).

He goes on to use verses from the Holy Bible to support his argument of the importance of
love for humanity. He indicates that this text and others like it should not be looked at as “old;”
rather, they should be brought to the present, as they remind humanity of the essence of its
existence, which is “love.”

To achieve this love, Huebner argues that conversation is key. By conversation, Huebner
means to be open to the other, to talk to the other, to listen to the other, to understand their
background, and even to be willing to be influenced by the other. He distinguishes distinctly
between conversation and communication: communication is simply the transferring and
exchanging of information without taking any action based upon it. Huebner explains that
collection, meanwhile, “suggests that the recipient act on this information, or reshape it himself,
and continue the dialogue at a new level” (p. 78). In addition, in his paper, Classroom Action (1962),
after highlighting the difference between conversation and talking, he confirms the importance of
being open to influence during the conversation and how this is important in promoting co-
existence with the other. He writes, “conversation is not simply talking. It is talking and listening. It demands internalization of what the other says and reworking of one's own thought and being. It requires a willingness to give of one's self and to receive from the other, and an eagerness to bring the I and the Thou together in a significant act of relationship and living” (p. 68). Hence, the educational environment should create and foster the circumstances which promote this type of conversation. For Huebner, the best educational situation that could lead to greater conversation skill is the one in which both encounters are open to being influenced by one another. Indeed, Huebner states, “both the speaker and the listener must be disposed to speak, to listen, and to accept the responsibility and opportunity for change” (p. 78). This conversation is the way man can avoid situations of violence and conflict. To highlight the importance of this conversation, Huebner’s argument is as follows:

If man does not learn to converse with those who surround him and impinge upon him, then he must find other ways of dealing with them; either ignoring them or turning them into objects of use or control. Ignoring, controlling or using others leads eventually to rebellion, resistance and conflict, and a realignment of the power field which supports the using, controlling or ignoring (p. 82).

Huebner highlights the importance of such conversation to maintain love in humanity. Indeed, “it is through conversation among children that the individual child learns that aloneness is not the same as loneliness” (1962, p. 68). He even goes on to claim that humanity is in real danger if this conversation vanishes, as this leads to absence of love and the promotion of hate and hateful behaviors, including ignoring, controlling, and violence.

It is unfortunate that Huebner’s works in human relationships did not find their way into the body of literature about intercultural competence. It is interesting to compare his model to other
dominant work in the field, like Bennett’s model. Huebner uses a different and unique language. There are so many terms that refer to intercultural competence, but “love” is not one of them. Also, Huebner’s insistence on using the word “conversation” instead of “communication” sets his work apart. Thus, Huebner’s works give a good deal of attention to the importance of dealing with those who are different from one’s self. It would be advantageous for interculturalists to give attention to his works and include them in their research.

Although Martha Nussbaum, David Coulby, and Dwayne E. Huebner all wrote about intercultural education, each of them uses a different language and different lens. Whereas Coulby uses common, well-known terms like “intercultural” and “multicultural education,” Nussbaum and Huebner use their own unique terms: “cultivating humanity” for the former and “love” for the latter. Whereas Nussbaum and Huebner use the ideal philosophical arguments and connect their argument to ancient texts, Coulby provides a practical argument using examples from modern events like current wars and recent acts of violence in the East and the West.

Conclusion

Whether it is called love, humanity, or intercultural competence, all of the above authors agree that construct is crucial. Many thinkers, philosophers, and authors agree that lack of love, failure to cultivate humanity, or lack of intercultural competence is the reason behind violence, wars, hate, terrorism, and ignoring or controlling behavior. They all agree that education is the answer; education is the way to cultivate love and humanity and to develop intercultural competence.

Critique of Cosmopolitanism

The basic premise of this dissertation is that cosmopolitanism is the normative position education should strive to achieve. This premise is derived from works of philosophers like Diogenes the Cynic, Nussbaum, Coulby, and others. However, cosmopolitanism theory has its own
opponents. In this section, I will offer some of the critiques against cosmopolitanism and briefly refute those critiques.

One of the critiques of cosmopolitanism is raised by David Miller (2002). Miller argues that cosmopolitanism is based on a premise that all human beings are equal. However, since this premise in not true in the real life, cosmopolitanism is not politically correct. Miller gives two examples to support his argument that human beings are not equal. First, he assumes that there are two starving peasants, one in Ethiopia and the other in Poland. Miller asks-- will both starving peasants get the same level of attention and help from the rest of the world? Most likely no. The second example is a missing child. If there is a missing child, the child’s family will care so much and will try so hard to find him for personal reasons, and police will care for professional reasons. Neighbors will care less than the family, and stranger will care least, if they even care at all. Therefore, according to Miller, humans are not equal, and cosmopolitanism as a concept is not correct. To put it in his words,

This is the point that ethical cosmopolitans miss when they slide from saying that every human being has equal moral worth to saying that therefore we are required to treat all human beings equally, in the sense that we have the same duties to each. This, as the missing child example shows, is simply a non sequitur. Yet it plays an important part in cosmopolitan rhetoric. (Miller, 2002, p.82)

In my opinion, although Miller’s two starving peasants will likely receive different treatment form the rest of the world, and the missing child will probably receive different levels of care depending on the individual’s relationship to the child, this does not mean that Miller’s argument is correct. The flaw in Miller’s argument is that he does not distinguish between the normative position and the descriptive position; the world as it is, and the world as it should be. Yes, the world might care more about a starving man from Poland than a starving man from Ethiopia, but this awful fact
does not mean that it is right. The absence of justice does not mean that injustice is right. The notion of cosmopolitanism does not say that everyone is already equal; it says that everyone should be equal. As educators, we should not accept the descriptive position, the world as it is, but instead strive to change it to get to the normative position, the world as it should be.

Sharon Todd (2010) provides additional critiques of cosmopolitanism, as she argues that there should be a shift from cosmopolitanism to what she calls “agonistic cosmopolitics.” In her opinion, “cosmopolitan theory fails to address adequately the tensions, paradoxes, and legitimate conflicts that arise from encounters across cultural differences” (p. 216). She builds on the works of Chantal Mouffe, Judith Butler, and Bonnie Honig to “move from a focus on harmony to agonism, and from cosmopolitanism to the cosmopolitical” (p. 216). To make her argument more appealing to her Western audience, she uses Muslim women’s sartorial in European schools as an example to question the concept of cosmopolitanism.

In her discussion of the Muslim women in Europe, Todd cites Western, non-Muslim scholars, like Mouffe and Honig, who talk about Muslim woman, questioning their liberty, without making any effort to talk to Muslim women about their personal experiences and perceptions. To explain, the basic flaw with Todd’s argument is the absence of the Muslim women’s voice, and making the assertion that Muslim women lack liberty without getting those women involved in the conversation. This is a typical gap found in Western cross-cultural works. In addition, using terms like “Muslim women” is quite broad and simplistic, as inside Muslim communities, there is a wide variety of beliefs, values, and sartorial practices. Therefore, it seems that Todd’s argument is grounded more in Xenophobic and Islamophobic beliefs than it is notions of co-existence and peace.
Finally, some may argue that cosmopolitanism threatens local cultural identity. Concepts like acceptance, adaptation, and integration may insinuate that an individual has to give up or negotiate their own identities. Huebner’s notion of freedom may be a good response to this critique of the IDI and the ideal of adaptation, however. As mentioned in chapter 2, Huebner distinguishes among four forms of human encounters: Denial, Submission, Domination and Freedom (or Love). Huebner argues that the fourth encounter, Freedom, is the one we should support and encourage everyone to achieve. For Huebner, Freedom is the situation in which two people each maintain their maximum independence; it is a situation in which both mirror one another, with each person having a similar attitude towards conversation, understanding, and mutual respect. In his words:

In these meetings, man freely gives to and freely receives from the person he meets, for no other reason than that each recognizes that he is alone, separate, but able to give and receive from the other. For Ortega Gasset and Fromm, this is the essence of love; the former defining "love as nothing but the attempt to exchange true solitude... (Huebner, 1963, p. 76).

Accepting the other and adapting one’s own behavior to explore and exchange Huebnerian love and cultural identities does not risk one’s own cultural identity; instead, it challenges individuals to develop, grow, and expand. However, it could be argued that tensions between cosmopolitanism and local cultural identity are so difficult to reconcile. For some, it might be difficult to both retain a local identity and a more cosmopolitan identity. The tensions between cosmopolitanism and local cultural need more attention from curriculum scholars as this might be the gate to achieve peace and coexisting that we all have been longing to.
Intercultural Sensitivity and Education

One of the dominant questions in curriculum studies is “What are the aims of education?” Regardless of the many debates in the field about the answer to this question, I argue that intercultural competence should be considered as one of the most, if not the most, important aims of education. Herbert Kliebard, as cited in Noddings (2004), counts “citizenship” as the fifth aim of education. However, as discussed in the previous section, Byram (2006) argues that, because societies now are changing demographically, the concept of citizenship should be expanded to “take a wider perspective, involving engagement with people of other forms of life or cultures” (p. 127).

Some other scholars list intercultural competence as an aim of education, but they use different terms. Bowen (1977), for instance, counts human understanding as the desired outcome of education. He states, “capacity for empathy, thoughtfulness, compassion, respect, tolerance, and cooperation toward others, including persons of different backgrounds” (p. 56). These components of Bowen’s definition of human understanding are the core of intercultural competence. Teaching diversity and dealing openly with different cultures becomes a demand no one can ignore.

UNESCO’s International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, Learning: The Treasure Within, states, “the task of education is to teach, at one and the same time, the diversity of the human race and an awareness of the similarities between, and the interdependence of, all humans” (Stavenhagen, 2008, p. 161). Additionally, some scholars argue that interculturalism is not simply an aim of education; rather, it is described as a “noble and critical” aim of education. Hammer (2012) strongly believes that “building positive relations among cultures, breaking down walls of prejudice and racism, and fostering international goodwill are noble —and critical—goals for universities and K–12 schools in the 21st century” (p. 115-16).
Unfortunately, it is common in literature to connect the task of teaching and learning intercultural competence to the realm of world language education as if intercultural competence is an aim and a task that only world language classes should achieve. This perspective limits the importance of intercultural competence. Coulby (2006) argues that intercultural competence cannot be limited to one course or schedule. He explains:

Interculturalism is not a subject which can be given timetable time alongside all the others, nor is it appropriate to one phase of education only. Interculturalism is a theme, probably the major theme, which needs to inform the teaching and learning of all subjects (p. 246).

Thus, in a world that is full of violence and hatred, educators should never underestimate the influence that intercultural competence education can have. As in the above quote, intercultural competence should be “the major theme” in curriculum studies. As education is an act of influence (Huebner, 1975), it could be argued that if curriculum studies focus more on intercultural competence, positive influences would result. Promoting intercultural competence can, in fact, help with solving problems like racism, violence, anger, terrorism, and wars. Alternatively, if curriculum ignores intercultural competence, it fosters self-centrism and racism. As Coulby (2006) writes, “if education is not intercultural, it is probably not education, but rather the inculcation of nationalist or religious fundamentalism.” (p. 246). Intercultural competence in education could be an effective tool to achieve peace, tolerance, and mutual understanding locally and internationally.

**Intercultural Sensitivity and World Language Education**

*A Historical Review of Using Culture in World Language Classrooms from the 1880s to Present*

The relationship between culture and language deeply influenced world language education practice. That influence is as old as the world language teaching realm itself. Michael Byram and Gillian Peiser (2015) mention that in the 1880s culture was taught through focusing on the world
literature, which resulted on focusing on what they call *high culture* which roughly means the elite culture because it does reveal much about everyday real life of the target society, as it was derived from the “great old works” of literature. Claire Kramsch (1995) calls that era the “universal links between language and culture” because the paradigm then was that the way to universality for any modern language was it is literature. She adds, “we all know how up until recently, the sole rationale for the teaching of modern languages was access to the "great works," the universal canon of world literatures” (p. 3). One of the reasons behind focusing on the great works, according to Kramsch, was that education was only for the elite of the society who had no interest in interacting with the locals of the target language. As a result, focusing on the "great works" of literature as the only cultural components in language education was not so useful in teaching about everyday life and cultural communication skills, which are called *low culture*.

This view started to change dramatically in the 1960s. According to Byram and Peiser (2015), the major feature of that era was the racial, political, ethnic conflicts. That feature provoked world language educators and theorists to call for a change in education, especially in world language education. The target of that change was to facilitate the intercultural communication for business or political purposes through focusing on *low culture* or everyday life of the target language. Kramsch (1995) call that era the “local links between language and culture.” She thinks that the shift from the “universal links” to the “local links” between language and culture happened because the education itself became not limited to just elite; rather, more public has access to education.

I find the interpretations of the shift from focusing on high culture or universal links to low culture or local links different and interesting. Whereas Byram and Peiser think that happened because there was an urgent need to handle the racial, political, ethnica conflicts through improving intercultural communication, Kramsch thinks that the reason was that more of the public had access
to education. Both could be right because the 1960s were a featured era of conflicts and, at the same time, there was a wider access for the public to education.

Until the 1980s the mainstream paradigm in world language education was the *communicative approach*, which focuses on the everyday use of language and low culture skills. To use Byram and Peiser (2015) words in describing that era, “It was a period in which the communicative approach for teaching languages was extremely popular; the purpose of world language learning was to give learners the skills for authentic or functional communication in a more interconnected world and economy” (p. 205). The basic critique that approach received, and still receives, as it is widely perceived as the current paradigm, is although it includes low culture knowledge and skills like buying something from the market or ordering food in a world restaurant, it ignores improving positive attitudes, acceptance and better understanding of the other culture.

There was a change in the relationship between culture and language in world language education in the 1990s. Many theorists began to call for an intercultural approach in language education that “promotes language education for bridging cultural differences and developing harmonious relationships between different cultural groups in ever increasingly diverse and multicultural societies” (Byram & Peiser, 2015, p.205). The main feature of the intercultural approach in language education is moving from the native speaker model to the intercultural speaker model as a target. Before the intercultural approach, the target of any teacher was to help her students speak like the native speaker. Native speaker accent and language were the model students strove to imitate. In the intercultural approach, the model is not the native speaker, but the intercultural speaker, which is “someone who can operate their linguistic competence and their sociolinguistic awareness of the relationship between language and the context in which it is used, in order to manage interaction across cultural boundaries, to anticipate misunderstandings caused by
difference in values, meanings and beliefs, and thirdly, to cope with the affective as well as cognitive demands of engagement with otherness” (Byram, 1995, p. 25). Since that time, a huge amount of literature on how to use culture education in the world language to achieve the model of the intercultural speaker has emerged.

To summarize, the history of using culture in world language education began with focusing on the great works of literature. This era was called the *high culture* era because it ignored everyday life and focused on the life of the elite. In the 1950s, a shift started to take place. The new approach was the communicative approach, which largely focused on *low culture* and everyday life skills such as ordering food or shopping at a world market etc. This was the dominant paradigm in language education until the 1990s. That paradigm slowly shifted in the 1990s to focus more on improving students’ positive attitudes and increasing their ability of tolerance and understanding. The best description of this development of the relationship between culture and world language education is that “language education over time has ranged in its various endeavors from the teaching of grammar to the teaching of peace” (Lo Bianco, Liddicoat, & Crozet, 1999, p. 13).

**Best Practice for Teaching Culture in World Language Classrooms**

To achieve the goal of helping students reach the intercultural speaker level as defined earlier, Milton J. Bennett (1993) stresses the importance of reflection, critical analysis, and comparison. He asserts that just putting students in an intercultural experience that does not include reflection, critical analysis, and comparison will not help improve intercultural competence. Although this framework may seem outdated, it is so profound that many interculturalists followed those three main dimensions to illustrate the best practice of including culture in world language classes. Moreover, the American Council of Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), which is considered to be the biggest and the most accredited community of world language education in America, has set three basic dimensions for using culture in world language classrooms, which are
based on Bennett’s suggestions. These dimensions are “the need for learning about cultures and comparing them as well as the need for ‘intercultural exploration’” (Fantini, 1997). To explain ACTFL standards, I discuss each of the three standards in the following section.

Knowledge of the Culture:
This simply means that cultural knowledge should be included in world language classes.

Indeed, “without culture learning of knowledge and skills, it is much more difficult, if not impossible, to become interculturally competent” (Paige, 2015, p. 203). Knowledge about culture for some may not look suitable in the elementary levels and should be saved for the advanced levels, but this is not true. Knowledge of culture can take place even in the very elementary classes (Crozet & Liddicoat, 1999). Byram (1997) indicates that simple things used in elementary level of language classes, like greetings and clothes, could be critical resources for cultivating and improving intercultural competence. He mentions that the stories and the values behind things like greetings and clothes are highly conscious. If a language teacher uses the story behind clothes and its value in the target culture, this may better form a good deal of knowledge about the culture than just teaching words and greetings in the target language.

Comparing Cultures
Comparing cultures is a practice all interculturalists agree on. The main argument behind comparing is to help students to think critically about their culture and to understand that there is always another perspective that differs from their own. Comparing cultures help students to “learn how to distance themselves from their native language/culture environment to see it for the first time as what it really is, as just one possible world view and not the only world view” (Crozet & Liddicoat, 1999, p. 117).

Intercultural Exploration
After students learn about the target culture and compare their own culture to it, a conflict in values may start to take place, especially if the two cultures have a different set of values. The ability
to resolve such a conflict is called the “intercultural exploration” (Crozet & Liddicoat, 1999). The reason that conflict occurs is because the learner finds herself in a position in which she feels that she is between two different sets of values, her own native cultural values, and the target cultural values. Resolving this conflict successfully does not include rejecting the target culture completely nor being imprisoned in one’s own culture; rather, it is in a *third place* between the two cultures.

“The ability to find this third place is at the core of intercultural competence” (Bianco, Liddicoat, & Crozet, 1999, p. 5). The third place has been a major concept in intercultural competence. It is the place in which one finds herself comfortable between her own culture and the target culture; it the place in which one will not give up her own values and beliefs, but also will not reject and refuse the different values. The third place is the ability to compromise and understand the difference. World language educators should strive to make their classes an environment for developing the third place. Kramsch (1993) goes on to argue that teachers’ role here is not to tell the students’ where to locate themselves; rather, to help them to find their own third place. There are intense and different ways that describe and discuss the variety of third place in literature. The following quote might be the best way to understand the uniqueness of each student’s third place:

For some, it [the third place] will be the irrevocable memory of the ambiguities of the word 'challenge'. For others, it will be a small poem by Pushkin that will, twenty years later, help them make sense out of a senseless personal situation. For others still, it will be a small untranslatable Japanese proverb that they will all of a sudden remember, thus enabling them for a moment to see the world from the point of view of their Japanese business partner and save a floundering business transaction. For most, it will be the stories they will tell of these cross-cultural encounters, the meanings they will give them through these tellings and the dialogues that they will have with people who have had similar experiences. In and through
these dialogues, they may find for themselves this third place that they can name their own (Kramsch, 1993, p. 257).

So, how should educators help the students to get to this third place? The answer is: reflections. Reflections play a critical role in developing the third place. Indeed, “teaching methods, curricula and materials can either promote or impede the development of the third place, by including or excluding opportunities to reflect on the cultures involved in language learning” (Bianco, Liddicoat, & Crozet, 1999, p. 185). The best way to help students to find their third place is to reflect. Reflection is so important that Michael Byram built all of his models of intercultural competence on it. He stresses that the intercultural competence will never be developed without a deep reflective critical analysis of the meanings and values of the one’s own culture and the target culture (Byram, 1997).

In order to promote students’ intercultural competence in WL classes, curriculum and activities should be focused on knowing the target culture, learning about the culture, thinking critically about one’s own culture and comparing it to the target culture, and helping each student to find her own third place through reflection on her experience in learning the target culture.

*The Gap*

The move from teaching grammar to teaching “peace” does not automatically happen in all language classrooms (Golub, 2014; Lo Bianco, Liddicoat, & Crozet, 1999; Steele, 2000). The claims that world language classes do influence students’ intercultural sensitivity are mere normative claims based on a theoretical perception. In other words, in the ideal world language classes should increase students’ students’ intercultural sensitivity, but what happens in the real world has not been deeply researched yet. Richard Lambert (1999) indicates that
The service of language instruction in the production of transcultural empathy deserves much more research evidence than is now available. It is especially important that such research establish the connection between the learning of a little bit of one language—the situation that faces most learners—and the generalised cultural broadening and ethnonrelativism now included in the rationale for foreign language study (p. 76).

Although Lambert’s call for more research in the above quote might look outdated, it was released in 1999, it is still a valid call till now as there has still a dearth of intercultural sensitivity research in world language classrooms (Bickley, Rossiter, & Abbott, 2014).

**Intercultural Competence Models**

As discussed above, there is no agreed upon definition of intercultural competence in literature. This leads to a wide variety in models and measurement methods of intercultural competence. Another reason for this variety is the different fields and contexts that deal with intercultural competence; each field has its own models. For instance, in education, there are Bennett (2007); Berry et al. (1989); Beyram (1997); Deardorff (2006); Pope and Reynolds (1997); Rathje (2007) and numerous others. In sales or service: Chaisrakeo and Speece (2004); Hopkins, Hopkins, and Hoffman (2005); in organizations/management: Fisher and Härtel (2003); Torbiörn, (1985); Valentine and Yunxia (2001).

A number of sophisticated efforts were undertaken to organize the many models in a meaningful way. Spitzberg and Changnon (2009), for example, argue that there are two approaches to review intercultural competence in literature. The first is a sequential approach, in which the models are discussed one after another in a sequential fashion. The second is a topical approach, in which topics across the models are discussed. They confirm that “the sequential approach
emphasizes uniqueness of models, whereas the topical approach emphasizes commonalities of models” (p. 9).

Another approach to discuss the different models is based on typology. Bazgan and Daniela (2014) provide five main categories under which all models could be distributed. These types are:

1. Structural models: These models try to determine and identify the components of intercultural competence. They tend to take the shape of a list of features that should exist in intercultural competence;

2. Interaction models: These models are more about people’s behavior when they interact with others from a different culture;

3. Development models: The focus of these models is on the temporal dimension and the stages of progress of intercultural competence development;

4. Adaptive models: As Bazgan and Daniela (2014) describe these models, “they are based on the presumption of the existence of several interacting actors, and secondly, they emphasize the interdependence between them, resulting in time their modeling and adjusting for each other” (p. 50);

5. Causal models: This type of model aim to determine the interdependence of the components of intercultural competence.

The two approaches of exploring models of intercultural competence show that, just like the definitions of intercultural competence, there is no agreed upon way among scholars and experts to categorize the different models because they are so different from each other.

To give a brief example of how different the models are, I will discuss here the two most common models in education, which are Bennett’s model for becoming interculturally competent as an example of developmental models, and structural models of intercultural competence.
Developmental Models: Milton J. Bennett’s Model of “Becoming Interculturally Competent”

One of the most popular developmental models is Milton Bennett’s model of Intercultural Sensitivity. The basic feature of this model that it is related to the stages of personal growth (Bennett, 1986; Bennett, 2004; Bennett, Bennet, & Landis, 2004; Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003). Bennett divides intercultural sensitivity into two main stages: ethnocentrism and ethnorelativism. Each of these stages has three phases. Figure 2 illustrates this model.

![Figure 2. Developmental Intercultural Sensitivity Model (Bennett, 2004)](image)

Bennett defines the ethnocentrism stage as “the experience of one’s own culture as “central to reality.” The beliefs and behaviors that people receive in their primary socialization are unquestioned; they are experienced as “just the way things are” (Bennett, 2004, p. 62). He goes on to explain that there are three phases in this stage. The Denial phase is characterized by denying differences or psychological or physical barriers erected in the form of isolation or separation from other cultures. The Defense phase includes a tendency of defensiveness by denigrating other cultures the tendency of manifestation of superiority towards them. Bennet believes that Nazism, white settlers’ attitudes toward American Indians, and genocides are examples of these two phases overlapping. The final phase of this stage is Minimization of differences, which is characterized by the surface recognition of cultural differences and consideration of cultures as fundamentally similar (Bennett, 2004).

Ethnorelativism, on the other hand, means that one recognizes, accepts, and appreciates other cultures. To put it in Bennet’s words, it means “the experience of one’s own beliefs and
behaviors as just one organization of reality among many viable possibilities” (Bennett, 2004, p. 62). We can see the term “intercultural competence” included in the late stages of the ethnorelativism. According to Bennett (1986), “the later stages of ethnorelativism include concepts such as… and “intercultural competence” as discussed by a number of authors (e.g., Dinges, 1983; Brislin et al., 1983)” (Bennett, 1986, p. 182). There are three phases in this stage as well: Acceptance, Adaptation, and Integration. In the first phase, one accepts the fact that, although his or her beliefs are the absolute truth for him or her, those beliefs may not be the same in different cultures and vice versa. In this phase, one’s culture is just one of many different cultures. The following phase in this stage is Adaptation, in which one is able to show empathy to the different culture, and even in some cases behave appropriately according to that culture’s criteria for appropriate behavior. Perhaps the most important feature of this phase is the actual practical behavior one takes toward the other. The difference between acceptance and adaptation is that acceptance is just recognizing and accepting the other, while adaption goes beyond just accepting the other. It is a behavior that is based on this acceptance. According to Bennet (2004), “people of both dominant and non-dominant groups are equally inclined to adapt their behavior to one another” (p. 71). Finally, the third phase is Integration. Barbara Deane (1991) gives an example to explain this phase. She says that someone at this phase says things like, “Sometimes I don’t feel like I fit in anywhere,” or, “I feel most comfortable when I am bridging differences between cultures” (p. 2). A person in this phase becomes so intercultural that he feels that he belongs to more than one culture.

Structural Models of Intercultural Competence

There are many models that focus on the components of intercultural competence. These include Byram, Nichols, and Stevens (2001); Hamilton, Richardson, and Shuford (1998); and Pope and Reynolds (1997). The common feature of these models is that all of them assert that intercultural competence consists of knowledge, attitudes, and skills. These structural models of
intercultural competence differ in the way they discuss, evaluate, and relate these components to each other. Figures 3 and 4 give a summary of two different structural intercultural competence models.

**Figure 3. Hamilton et al.'s model (Bazgan & Daniela, 2014, p. 53)**

**Knowledge**
- **Awareness**: Knowledge of...
  - Self as it relates to cultural identity;
  - Similarities and differences across cultures.
- **Understanding**: Knowledge of...
  - Oppressions;
  - Intersecting oppressions (race, gender, class, religion, etc.)
- **Appreciation**: Knowledge of...
  - Elements involved in social change;
  - Effects of cultural differences on communication

**Skills**
- **Awareness**: Ability to...
  - Engage in self-reflection;
  - Identify and articulate cultural similarities and differences;
- **Understanding**: Ability to...
  - Take multiple perspectives;
  - Understand differences in multiple contexts;
- **Appreciation**: Ability to...
  - Challenge discriminatory acts;
  - Communicate cross-culturally

**Figure 4. Byram's model of intercultural competence (Alred, 2006, p. 118)**

As the above figures show, knowledge, attitudes, and skills are common components in the structural models of intercultural competence. Because of the limited space, I will not be able to go
through each component. The point of mentioning these models, however, is to give an example of the wide variety of intercultural competence models that exist.

**Gaps in the Theoretical Literature**

A review of the relevant literature offers many theoretical arguments regarding the importance, models, and assessment of intercultural competence education. Nevertheless, few works have been done about the practical implementations of this theoretical knowledge in the United States. More studies are needed to investigate the ability of American higher education to provide students with the intercultural competence/sensitivity needed in an intercultural world. This gap creates many future research questions. For example: How does higher education affect the development and preparation of global citizens who are interculturally competent? How is intercultural competence developed in students through higher education?

In addition, the different models of intercultural competence in literature are all discussed from a Western perspective. All the models are designed by scholars from either Europe or the United States. This fact makes me wonder how intercultural competence is perceived in the Eastern perspective. How do Asian, Arab, or African theorists and philosophers perceive and think about the importance and the models of intercultural competence? In a similar vein, some western authors wrote about the roots of interculturality in their religious traditions. Dwayne Huebner, for example, connects interculturality to the Christians tradition using texts from the Old and the New Testaments. But no one, to the best of my knowledge, has tried to investigate how interculturality is treated in the Islamic tradition, for instance. This point also creates a need for more future comparison studies between the East and the West in terms of intercultural competence.

Finally, the absence of a universal, or even a national, agreed upon definition and model of intercultural competence is puzzling. It creates a kind of chaos and waste in research. Curriculum
theory associations need to agree on a unified model, definition, and assessment criteria of intercultural competence to ease research and implications of intercultural competence education.
Part Two: Empirical Review: How Intercultural Sensitivity has been Measured in Literature

Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria

One of the basic problems in reviewing the literature about interculturality is the vast variety of terms that are used to refer to the same construct. As mentioned earlier, it is agreed that all terms like global citizenship, intercultural communicative competence, biculturalism, multiculturalism, bilingualism, multilingualism, plurilingualism, communicative competence, cross-cultural adaptation, cross-cultural awareness, cross-cultural communication, and intercultural sensitivity refer to the same concept (Fantini, 2009). However, after a deep and intensive review of the literature, I used the most common terms as entries in different databases (Google Scholar, JSTORE and EBSCO) to conduct a review of how intercultural competence has been assessed. The terms used included intercultural competence, intercultural communicative competence, and intercultural sensitivity. I ended up with more than 150 items that seem to be in the field of measuring intercultural competence. To narrow my research, I had to use eliminating filters, which focused my search. The basic eliminating criterion was actual empirical quantitative measuring of the intercultural competence, not just talking about different methods for measuring intercultural competence. To explain, there are many works that highlight the importance of assessing intercultural sensitivity and suggest some qualitative methods to assess it, all of this works were excluded and only the empirical quantitative works that focused on intercultural sensitivity as an outcome were included. This criterion decreased the studies to 13 studies. A summary of those studies and their critique is in Table 1.

Validity Critique Framework:

Conducting a validity critique review will help in understanding how intercultural sensitivity has been assessed in literature; hence, choosing an appropriate assessment tool and designing the study would be easier. In addition, scanning the empirical studies that investigate intercultural
sensitivity as an outcome will help in locating studies that assess world language education as a predictor. The validity critique is built on the *Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference* by William Shadish, Thomas Cook, and Donald Campbell. In this book, validity is defined as the “approximate truth of an inference” (p 34). The authors stress that validity is always “approximate” or “tentative.” In addition, the book offers a profound discussion of validity issues and how they could be addressed. The authors discuss four types of validity: Statistical, Internal, Construct, and External validities. All of the 13 studies I cover are reviewed to evaluate the four types of validity in each study.

In addition, Darla Deardorff, the editor of *The SAGE Handbook of Intercultural Competence*, provides a set of strategies to assess IC. Although some of her strategies are covered by the four types of validity discussed in Shadish et al.’s book, Deardorff uses a non-technical, non-statistical language to explain her strategies. Furthermore, she goes beyond statistics to assess intercultural sensitivity. She states that to conduct a successful assessment of intercultural sensitivity, one should:

1- Clearly define intercultural sensitivity goals and learning outcome;

2- Align assessment tools with learning outcome;

3- Develop intercultural sensitivity assessment plan;

4- Integrate a multi-method, multi-perspective assessment approach.

I will refer to both Shadish et al. (2002) and Deardorff (2016) to review the validity issues in the research that measures intercultural competence.
Table 1. Summary of selected intercultural sensitivity empirical studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Aim and predictors</th>
<th>Methods and tools</th>
<th>Threads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penbek et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Natural experiments</td>
<td>IC development &amp; causal relationships with 1) learning more about international business; 2) college education; and international experience</td>
<td>The Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS)</td>
<td>Mono-method bias, evaluation apprehension, ambiguous temporal precedence, and maturation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aktaş (2015)</td>
<td>Natural experiments</td>
<td>IC development &amp; causal relationships with students year of study, income level, knowledge of a foreign language</td>
<td>Mixed: ISS &amp; interviews</td>
<td>Ambiguous temporal precedence, and maturation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson and Kroeger (2001)</td>
<td>Natural experiments</td>
<td>causal relationships between IS and second language proficiency and substantive experience abroad</td>
<td>Intercultural Sensitivity Index (ISI)</td>
<td>Mono-method bias, ambiguous temporal precedence, selection, and interaction of the Causal relationship with Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloom and Miranda (2015)</td>
<td>One-group, pre- and post-test.</td>
<td>causal relationships between IC and study abroad programs</td>
<td>Mixed: Intercultural Sensitivity Index (ISI) and students’ reflections</td>
<td>Low Statistical Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straffon (2003)</td>
<td>Natural experiments</td>
<td>Assessing students level and Relationship between IC and attending International school</td>
<td>Mixed: Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), and interview</td>
<td>ambiguous temporal precedence, history, selection, and interaction of causal relationship with units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dong, et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Natural experiments</td>
<td>The relationship between intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism</td>
<td>ISS</td>
<td>Inadequate explication of the construct and construct levels confounding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etri (2015)</td>
<td>Natural experiments</td>
<td>The relationship between (ELT) contextual frame, the teachers’ biographical and teachers’ intercultural sensitivity</td>
<td>Only qualitative methods (focus group discussions, interviews, observations and diary entries)</td>
<td>inadequate explication of constructs and evaluation apprehension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sebnem Penbek, Dicle Yurdakul, and Guldem Cerit (2012) investigate the effectiveness of education and intercultural experience on the development of intercultural competence. The study includes 200 sophomores, junior and senior students from two different Turkish universities. The authors conclude that:

1) “as the students learn more about international business, they become more sociable and ready to interact with people from different cultures” (p.9);
2) “at the end of third year at the university the cumulative knowledge they taught let them become more respectful and sensitive to the people from different cultures” (p.9);

3) “students who had a previous international experience are more open minded and respectful to behaviors of different cultures” (p. 10).

**Construct Validity**

The authors quote Chen and Starosta’s (1998) definition for Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC). They state that ICC is defined by Chen and Starosta (1998) as: “the ability to effectively and appropriately execute communication behaviors that negotiate each other’s cultural identity or identities in a culturally diverse environment.” Interestingly, they use a scale from the same resource to assess ICC. They use The Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS) which is developed by Chen and Starosta (2000). Using the same scale from the same resource they use to define their construct sounds legitimate, as it helps them to avoid any kind of construct validity threats. However, the study may still suffer from some construct validity issues. For example, this study suffers from what Shadish et al. (2002) calls the mono-method bias, which means that the author depends only one data collecting method. The same criterion is mentioned in Deardorff’s (2016) strategies, referenced above.

In addition, one of the major threads for all of the research about IC is evaluation apprehension. According to King and King (1991), evaluation apprehension could happen when “the construct being assessed is confounded with the subject's need to appear competent, healthy, adjusted, friendly, cooperative, and the like” (p. 115). This study includes students from International Business department and when those students answer a question like: “I often feel useless when interacting with people from different cultures,” one of the questions on the survey, they may think twice before they give the real answer as, for them, this question actually tests their quality as students in the International Business department, not their ICC.
Internal Validity

Unlike construct validity, this study has some serious issues with internal validity as follow:

1- Ambiguous Temporal Precedence

Ambiguous Temporal Precedence is defined as “lack of clarity about which variable occurred first may yield confusion about which variable is the cause and which is the effect” (Shadish et al., 2002, p. 55). In this study, the authors state that “students who had a previous international experience are more open minded and respectful to behaviors of different cultures” (p. 10). There is no indication as to whether the students decided to gain the international experience, like traveling abroad or having foreign friends, because they are open-minded and respectful to behaviors of different cultures or the other way around.

2- Maturation

Shadish et al. (2002) indicate that this threat could happen when “participants in research projects experience many natural changes that would occur even in the absence of treatment, such as growing older, hungrier, wiser, stronger, or more experienced” (p. 57). In this study, the authors conclude that the more years students spend at the university, the more they become respectful and sensitive to the people from different cultures. However, this may not be attributed to the number of years students spend at the university; instead, it could be just students’ maturation.

In Demet Aktaş, Nurcan ErTuğ, and Esra Öztürk (2015) the authors’ aim is to measure nursing students’ intercultural competence. The study sample includes 152 nursing students at a university in Ankara, Turkey. The authors compared freshmen, sophomore, juniors, and seniors using mixed methods including interviews and the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS), which is mentioned in the above study, to assess the development of intercultural competence. The study concludes that: “nursing students’ intercultural sensitivity is affected by factors such as their year of
study, income level, knowledge of a foreign language, and having chosen the nursing profession willingly” (p. 55).

**Construct Validity**

Just like Penbek et al.’s study, this study has a high level of construct validity. The authors here define their construct clearly: they state that “intercultural sensitivity is defined as a necessarily actionable desire to ensure personal motivation in the understanding, accepting and appreciating cross-cultural differences” (Quine, Hadjistavropoulos, & Alberts, 2012; Bulduk et al., 2011; Chen & Starosta, 2000, p. 49). In addition, they use the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS), which is developed by Chen and Starosta (2000). In other words, they use Chen and Starosta (2000) to define the construct and to measure it. To avoid mono-method bias, they use interviews along with ISS. In addition, as both ISS and interviews are self-report methods, the study may suffer from evaluation apprehension. Students may tend to express that they are culturally sensitive, friendly, cooperative, and the like even if they are not.

**Internal Validity**

1. **Ambiguous Temporal Precedence**

   The authors find a relationship between factors like students’ knowledge of a foreign language, the personal choice to enter into the nursing profession, and intercultural sensitivity. Based on this relationship, the authors conclude that these factors affect intercultural sensitivity. However, this may not be accurate because it is not clear what affects what. In other words, students may have a good knowledge of foreign language because they have a high level of intercultural sensitivity. There is no clue in this study of the direction of the effectiveness or which variable occurred first.

2. **Maturation**

   In addition, the authors compare responses among freshmen, sophomore, junior and senior students to measure the progress of intercultural sensitivity and how it could be affected by a
number of years’ students spend at the university. Maturation may be a serious threat here, as it is not known if the change occurred because of the years of education, or because of maturation and the process of getting older.

The third study in this empirical review is conducted by Christa Lee Olson and Kent R. Kroeger (2001). The study is a widely cited work in the field of intercultural competence. The target sample of this study is not students; rather, faculty and staff at New Jersey City University (NJCU). The authors use Melton Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) to develop their own instrument of measurement, which they call Intercultural Sensitivity Index (ISI). They mailed the survey to 500 staff and faculty of NJCU and received 52 completed surveys. It is important to mention that ISI found its way into many studies after this study was published. The authors conclude that both second language proficiency and substantive experience abroad increase educators’ level of intercultural competence.

Construct Validity

The study has a solid construct validity. The authors use Melton Bennet’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS). They depend on his six stages of intercultural sensitivity: Denial, Defense, Minimization, Acceptance, Adaptation, and Integration. They develop an interesting survey to measure and place the participants in each of these six stages. The survey is called Intercultural Sensitivity Index (ISI). I went through its items for each stage and my conclusion is that it seems it has a high level of face validity as it measure each stage as defined by Bennet. Unfortunately, there are no other methods used along with ISI, which makes the study vulnerable to mono-method bias.

Internal Validity

1- Ambiguous Temporal Precedence
The authors find a relationship between both second-language proficiency and substantive experience abroad and the level of the participant’s intercultural sensitivity on Bennett’s model. This relationship leads them to state: “that both second-language proficiency and substantive experience abroad independently increase the likelihood that an educator will be more advanced on the Bennett Intercultural Sensitivity Scale” (p. 116). I do not think this statement is accurate, simply because there is no clue in the study of the direction of influence. In other words, the high second-language proficiency and substantive experience abroad may be a result of already existing high level of intercultural sensitivity.

2. Selection

Selection appears here as an internal validity threat. The authors mention that they mailed the survey to 500 members of NJCU and got only 52 responses. It could be argued that those who chose to respond may have more motivations to participate. This high motivation may lead to what Shadish et al. (2002) call “selection.”

External Validity

The main external validity issue in this study is the “Interaction of the Causal Relationship with Units.” Shadish et al. (2002) define this thread as, “an effect found with certain kinds of units which might not hold if other kinds of units had been studied” (p. 78). As the authors of this study sent the survey to 500 NJCU faculty and professional staff, the question that could be asked here is: “in which units does a cause-effect relationship hold?” (Shadish et al., 2002, p. 78). To explain, “faculty and staff” includes different levels of education: Ph.D., MA, BA, etc., which could affect the external validity of the study.

In fourth study in this review, Malina Bloom and Arturo Miranda (2015) use the Intercultural Sensitivity Index (ISI) along with qualitative methods to measure the improvement of
12 students’ intercultural sensitivity over the period of a four-week study abroad program. ISI indicates that students made little changes in intercultural sensitivity. However, the interesting part of this study is that the results of ISI conflict with the results of the qualitative method.

**Construct Validity**

The authors use Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) to define their construct; the construct and what they want to measure is clear. In addition, they use ISI, which is developed by Olson and Kroeger (2001) and is based on Bennett’s DMIS. The clarity of the construct and the choice of an instrument that, based on the definition of the construct, gives the study a good deal of construct validity. In addition, the researchers use students’ reflections to collect more data. Using more than one instrument is helpful in avoiding mono-method bias.

**Internal and External Validity**

The way this study is designed minimized the threats of internal validity as much as possible. The author uses one-group, pre- and post- test design, which helps in ruling out many threats. However, evaluation apprehension may still affect this study, as students may have tried to be more friendly and cooperative. The other threads I can find here may have something to do with sample number (n=12), which could be described as low statistical power. In addition, the fact the program duration is short (4 weeks) may threaten the external validity of the study.

David Strafforn (2003) investigates the level of students’ intercultural sensitivity in order to figure out which stage of Bennett’s six-level model those students belong to. In addition, the author investigates the relationship between attending international schools and students’ intercultural sensitivity. Using Bennett’s DMIS and Bennett’s Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), the author concludes that 97% of the students were operating in Bennett’s Acceptance level and that the
level of intercultural sensitivity positively correlated with the length of time that the student had attended international schools.

**Construct Validity**

The author clearly refers to Bennett’s DMIS and IDI which strengthens his construct validity. In addition, he uses interviews which decreases mono-method bias. However, as most of research is based on self-report methods, the thread of evaluation apprehension may still threaten the validity of the study.

**Internal Validity**

The study asks two questions, the first of which is “What is the range of intercultural sensitivity?” (p. 494). To answer this question, the author just administers IDI and collect the responses. The IDI, as mentioned earlier, aims to place the participant in one of six stages, which are: Denial, Defense, Minimization, Acceptance, Adaptation, and Integration. The IDI indicates that 97% are located in the Acceptance phase. It is a straightforward process, as there is no cause-effect relationship to explore here.

However, the process is not straightforward for the second question, which considers the relationship between the length of time attending an international school and intercultural sensitivity. Although the author does find a correlation between the level of students’ intercultural sensitivity and the time they spent in the school, this correlation does not mean anything. To explain, the participants are international students from 40 different countries and seemed to deeply affect the results of the study: “of the different nationalities represented in the school, the top five populations were; the United States with 19%, Korea with 14%, Japan with 13%, Malaysia with 8%, and Australia with 6%.” (p. 491).

This type of sample has other possible explanations of the high level of intercultural sensitivity. In other words, there are many internal threads here due to the nature of students
themselves. It could be their background, which is likely the reason, it could be their language proficiency etc. In statistical language, ambiguous temporal precedence, history, and selection strongly threaten the validity of this study. In addition, the interaction of causal relationships with units strongly threatens the external validity in this study because those students are different from the average students. In other words, as those students who participated in this study already have a multicultural background, I cannot expect the average students, who do not have such experience, to be at the same level of those students’ intercultural sensitivity if they receive the same treatment which is, according to the author, attending international school.

In the following study, Qingwen Dong, Kenneth Day, and Christine Collaço (2008) aim to investigate the effectiveness of intercultural communication sensitivity and multiculturalism on overcoming ethnocentrism. The authors depend on Bennett’s DMIS to define their constructs. Although the authors use Bennett’s DMIS to define the constructs, they do not use the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), which is based on Bennett’s DMIS; instead, they use Chen and Starosta’s (2000) Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS) without giving any argument for that choice. The author surveyed 419 students from two universities located in the western United States. The authors conclude that: “higher levels of intercultural communication sensitivity and multiculturalism may lead to reduced ethnocentrism” (p. 34).

**Construct Validity**

The study suffers from a serious construct validity that may ruin, or at least deeply affect, the whole study. The authors fail to define the construct so that they mix up its levels. To explain, the authors depend on Bennett’s DMIS to test this hypothesis: “Those who have a higher level of intercultural communication sensitivity tend to have a lower level of ethnocentrism” (p. 32). This hypothesis does not make any sense because Bennett divides the intercultural sensitivity into two
main stages: ethnocentrism and ethnorelativism. Each of these stages has three phases. Ethnocentric stage, on one hand, consists of denial, defense and minimizing. Ethnorelative stage, on the other hand, consists of acceptance, adaptation, and integration. Again, in this study, the authors’ aim is to test a hypothesis that those who have high level of intercultural sensitivity tend to have lower ethnocentrism. How could this be, as ethnocentrism is a level of intercultural sensitivity? This is similar to testing a hypothesis which states that if someone is not tall, he is short. It is obvious that the authors do not have a good grasp of the construct they are studying. This thread, in statistic language, is called “inadequate explication of constructs” (Shadish et al., 2002, p. 73). In addition to the inadequate explication of the construct, the authors mix up the constructs levels, which makes the study threatened by construct levels confounding. Those two threads, in my opinion, are both strong and serious enough to ruin the whole study.

The seventh empirical study in this review is Waleed Etri (2015). This is one of a few studies about intercultural sensitivity conducted in the Arab world. The interesting part of this study is that it does not use any quantitative methods, the author uses only qualitative methods. The study includes nineteen teachers of English as a Foreign Language who work at a university in Saudi Arabia. To collect the data, the author uses focus group discussions, interviews, observations and diary entries. The author concludes that the English Language Teaching (ELT) contextual frame and the teachers’ biographical frame play important roles in shaping teachers’ intercultural competence.

**Construct Validity**

There is an obvious inadequate explication of constructs in this study. The author states that he tries to investigate intercultural sensitivity, but because the author does not state what he means by intercultural sensitivity, he mixes his construct with cultural awareness. In other words, there is no definition of intercultural sensitivity in this paper, which leads to measuring constructs that may
have nothing to do with intercultural sensitivity. For example, he measures “world view and religion” as an indicator of “a frame for intercultural sensitivity” without providing any theoretical background or any argument that “world view and religion” is a part of intercultural sensitivity. He quotes his participants as following:

I think as a Moslem, our religion has got ... a lot to do with ... culture. Our culture is driven by our religion. So, in my case my religion helps me teaching

(Sohail, p. 73).

The question arises here is, what does this response have to do with intercultural sensitivity? I may argue here that this has something to do with cultural awareness, not intercultural sensitivity. The reason for this confusion is that the author does not define his construct clearly at the beginning. In addition, evaluation apprehension strongly strikes the validity of this study. The participants’ need to appear competent and able to do their jobs threatens the validity of this study.

Angelica Galante’s (2015) aim is to investigate the effect of using a digital literacy project in language classrooms in improving adult language learners’ intercultural sensitivity in a 14-week program. The author uses Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) as a construct. To collect data, the author uses qualitative methods (reflective discussion, script writing, video recording scenes, editing, and final reflection). The author concludes that upon participating in the digital literacy project, students’ moved from “ethnocentricism toward ethnorelativism: they explored the early stages of denial, defense, and minimization, and gradually developed the stages of acceptance, adaptation, and integration of cultures” (p. 62).

Validity Critique

The study seems to have a good construct validity. The author is clear about using Bennett’s model to measure his students’ intercultural sensitivity. The data is collected in different five points 
Kristiina Holm, Petri Nokelainen, and Tirri Kirsi (2005), in their study, *Relationship of gender and academic achievement to Finnish students’ intercultural sensitivity*, investigate the role of gender and academic achievement in developing students’ intercultural sensitivity. They use Bennett’s DMIS to develop a 23-item Intercultural Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ICSSQ) and survey 549 Finish 12–16-year-old students to answer two questions: 1) Are there any differences between girls’ and boys’ intercultural sensitivity? 2) Are there any differences between high and low academic achievement students in intercultural sensitivity? The results indicate that girls have a higher level of intercultural sensitivity than boys.

**Validity Critique**

The study has a strong content validity as the authors use Bennett’s DMIS as a construct. In addition, the items of their instrument, the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ICSSQ), seem highly related to Bennett’s six stages of intercultural sensitivity. Besides, it seems that they use some advanced statistical techniques to develop their own instrument and to measure gender effect on intercultural sensitivity. They state that “to compensate for the risk of an increased Type I error rate, we applied the Bonferroni correction (Miller, 1981, pp. 6–8) for the alpha level by dividing the test wise significance level by the number of tests: $\alpha^*_B = \alpha/k$. For the six-dimensional ICSSQ, the adjusted alpha level becomes $\alpha^*_B$-ICSSQ = .008” (p.196). In addition, the number of the participants, 549, is large enough to avoid the Low Statistical Power thread. I could not find many threads here
apart from the mono-method bias, as the authors use only one method to collect their data and the most common thread in intercultural sensitivity research, which is evaluation apprehension.

In another study that focuses on the effect of studying abroad on students’ intercultural sensitivity, Jane Jackson (2011) conducts a case study of a few students at Hong Kong University who sojourned in England. The author uses the mixed-method case study approach. He uses Bennett’s DMIS and the IDI instrument, which is based on Bennett’s DMIS. In addition, the author uses qualitative methods such as journals and interviews. The results indicate that participating in study abroad programs helped students in developing their intercultural competence.

**Validity Critique**

The study has a strong construct validity as the authors use Bennett’s DMIS and IDI. The authors quote many studies that argue for the construct validity of the IDI. Besides this, the author uses qualitative methods like diary entries, weekly open-ended surveys, and interviews before and after the program. Using mixed methods rolls out mono-method bias and fulfills one of the basic strategies that Deardorff (2016) states, which is: “integrate a multi-method, multi-perspective assessment approach.”

In addition, using pre- and post-qualitative and quantitative data collection methods rules out many internal validity threads. However, one of the main threads here is “testing.” According to Shadish et al. (2002), “sometimes taking a test once will influence scores when the test is taken again” (p. 60). The program is only 5 weeks, which makes the study vulnerable to the “testing” thread. Further, the study may still suffer from an evaluation apprehension thread, as the students may feel that they have to show progress in their intercultural sensitivity due to the study abroad program.
In Thomas Fuller (2007), the author investigates the influence of studying abroad on intercultural sensitivity. Although this is one of many studies that focuses on the effect of studying abroad on students’ intercultural sensitivity, it comes with a different result. The author typically uses Bennett’s DMIS and IDI to compare between two groups: one which studied abroad and one that did not. His conclusion is that “while there was a positive difference in the scores of the two groups being compared, the difference was not significant” (p. 328). The results of this study conflict with many other studies that confirm the effective role studying abroad play in developing students’ intercultural competence. Instead of critically thinking about his research design to understand the reasons behind this conflict in the results, the author blames the nature of intercultural competence. To put it in his words, “intercultural sensitivity is a complex matter, and many factors work together to determine the developmental stage of an individual” (p. 328).

Validity Critique

Although the study seems to have a strong construct validity, as the author uses Bennett’s DMIS and IDI, there are some serious internal and external threads that are caused by how the study is designed. The author sent invitations to 180 MA students. Then, he chose the first 18 students who responded and could be accepted. He mentions that: “discrimination was exercised to ensure that 9 participants had study abroad experience during their years of undergraduate and/or graduate studies” (p. 325). To rephrase, he compares two groups: one which has not studied abroad and the other, which has studied abroad “during their years of undergraduate and/or graduate studies” without being precise about when or/and for how long the study abroad experience occurred. This leads to many internal validity threads like:

1. Ambiguous Temporal Precedence: it is not known which happens first; studying abroad or having high level of intercultural sensitivity
2. History: The history of the participants is really vague. The period between when they came from studying abroad and when they took the survey is unknown. This period may play a significant role in their responses.

3. Maturation: again, the participants are MA students who have been surveyed about the undergraduate studying abroad experience. Maturation is a strong thread here.

4. Sonia Shiri (2015) conducts another study about studying abroad as a predictor variable of intercultural sensitivity. The aim of the study is to assess intercultural sensitivity development among American students who spent a semester of studying abroad. The sample includes 352 American learners of Arabic who completed summer intensive language programs in five Arab countries. The tool is a survey that is based on a previous study about “Culture Proficiency Guidelines.” The survey is administered upon students’ return to the United States. The result of the survey indicates that students’ intercultural sensitivity is developed after participating in the programs.

Validity Critique

Maybe the most important critique of this study is that the author administers the survey one time after the students’ return to the states. This one-time measurement does not allow the author to discuss the development or progress of intercultural sensitivity as she argues; it may allow her to assess the intercultural sensitivity as it is then, but not its progress.

Construct Validity

Just like Internal Validity, there are so many threats to the construct validity of the study. For example, the inadequate explication of constructs is not explicitly stated in the study. In other words, it is not clear what the author means by intercultural sensitivity or what the expected outcome of developing intercultural sensitivity is. In literature, there are many different definitions, theories, and
models of intercultural competence. Although the author discusses the different models of the intercultural competence, she is not clear about which theory she depends on in her assessment. To clarify, one of the most common models of intercultural sensitivity indicates that intercultural sensitivity includes knowledge, skills, and attitudes. It is not clear if the author targets students’ knowledge or skills or attitudes or all of them.

Beyond this, there are two other easily identifiable error threads. The first is the mono-method bias, which occurs because the author depends only on the survey without using any other method. Another thread is the evaluation apprehension: after spending months abroad, students may want to appear as if they improved their IC because if they did not, this may mean that they were just wasting their time and that they did not learn anything.

**Internal Validity**

There are many threats to the internal validity of this study. For example:

1- Ambiguous Temporal Precedence: It is not clear if the students decided to travel abroad because they already had a high level of IC or vice versa.

2- Selection: The author does not provide any description of students’ background. Students’ racial, social and cultural background may help to understand the “selection” factor. For example, if students are “heritage students” the result may vary.

3- History: There is no discussion of students’ history with IC. They may have developed it before the program.

4- Maturation: Students spent an entire semester abroad. How could it be argued that the development they have achieved, if there is any, is not a result of maturation?

**Content Validity**

Depending on Lissitz and Samuelsen’s (2007) discussion of the internal factors that should be considered for the systematic evaluation of content validity, I can argue that the survey used in
this study suffers from a low content validity as well. To clarify, in terms of practical content, the items of the survey are not appropriate for the purpose of the assessment. In other words, I do not believe that any of the items of the survey really measures intercultural competence. For example, one of the items is about students’ ability to order food in a foreign restaurant. Although this is a really important skill, it has nothing to do with IC. In terms of reliability and theoretical latent process, the author does not provide any evidence that these issues are fulfilled.

The last study in this review is Daniel Uribe, Jean LeLoup, and Terrence Haverluk (2005). The aim of this study is to explore the development of intercultural sensitivity through the academic levels. In order to achieve this goal, the authors compared freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors using both quantitative methods (Bennett’s IDI) and qualitative methods. The results indicate that studying world languages and time spent abroad improve students’ intercultural sensitivity. In addition, the more time students spend at the U.S. Air Force (USAF) Academy, where the study was held, the more growth in intercultural sensitivity they ultimately achieve.

**Validity Critique**

The construct validity seems viable in this study, as the authors depend on Bennet’s DMIS and IDI. In addition, using mixed methods helped in avoiding many internal and construct validity threads. However, the authors compare four different groups of students: freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors, and found significant differences between the juniors and seniors in intercultural competence. These significant differences could be attributed to maturation and not only to the courses they have studied or the years they have spent at the USAF.

In addition, the unique nature of the study at the USAF may affect the external validity of the study. Fortunately, the authors mention this in their discussion of the study limitation. They state that “the unique environment of the Air Force Academy may limit the generalizability of the results
of this study” (p. 31), which is a thread known as “interactions of the causal relationship with settings” (Shadish et al., 2002, p. 89).

Conclusion of the Empirical Review

1. World Language Education as a Predictor

As the summary of the empirical review indicates, there are only three studies investigate world language education as a predictor (Aktaş, 2015; Olson & Kroeger, 2001; and Uribe et al., 2014). However, none of them isolates and measures world language education as an independent predictor. All the four studies merged world language education with another variable and created a new variable (that consists of world languages plus additional variable) and measured that new variable as a predictor of intercultural sensitivity For example, in Uribe et al. (2014), the sample is “freshmen, seniors, juniors and seniors who had completed a 3-week immersion abroad, and finally seniors who were Foreign Area Studies (FAS) majors who had studied abroad for one semester” (p. 29). Mixing study abroad experience variable and different level of college variable with world language variable cannot be used to build an argument that world language education is sufficient for developing intercultural sensitivity. If there any progress in intercultural sensitivity it could be a result of studying abroad, not just world language education. The same with the other three studies, in Aktaş (2015) the predictors are students’ year of study, income level, and knowledge of a world language all measured together. Again, the result is not cannot be attributed to only world language.

The gap the above conclusion indicates is that there is a dearth of empirical studies that focus on world language classes, separate from any other variable, and its role in developing intercultural sensitivity. Therefore, I try to fill this gap in my study by focusing only on world language education as an indicator of intercultural sensitivity.
2. Terms and Concepts

When it comes to theoretical publications about intercultural competence, there is a wide variety of terms and definitions that are used to describe the same construct. The two most common terms in the contemporary literature are intercultural competence (Byram’s definition) and intercultural sensitivity (Bennett’s definition), and both overlap with each other. However, when it comes to empirical research, scholars prefer to use intercultural sensitivity and Bennett’s model. The reason behind this choice becomes stronger if the researchers plan to use Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) and the measurement instrument that is built on the DMIS, which is called the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI). Using DMIS may encourage a researcher to use the term “intercultural sensitivity” to avoid any terminology problem. There is only one study in this review in which the authors use DMIS and IDI, as well as the term “intercultural competence” instead of “intercultural sensitivity” (Uribe et al., 2014). Ironically, in *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Intercultural Competence*, which is published most recently in 2015, and edited by Bennett himself, Bennett uses the term “intercultural competence” instead of “intercultural sensitivity.” In addition, in cases of using DMIS, many researchers prefer to use IDI, as this avoids many construct validity problems. Therefore, the majority of researchers tend to use Bennett’s definition and, hence, they tend to use either his tool, IDI, or one of the tools that is based on his definition.

3. Tools and Instruments

The empirical studies mentioned in this review use the following instruments: the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS), Intercultural Sensitivity Index (ISI), Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), Intercultural Sensitivity Scale Questionnaire (ICSSQ).

Three of these instruments (ISI, IDI, and ICSSQ) are built on Bennett’s model, DMIS. One of them, IDI, is developed by Bennett himself, along with co-authors. However, because IDI is
expensive to use, as a researcher needs to attend a special training workshop to be licensed to use it, the other two instruments, ISI and ICSSQ, were coined by other scholars to be free access alternatives to the IDI. Nevertheless, there is a vast amount of research that argues for the validity and reliability of IDI as a tool to measure intercultural competence. Unfortunately, the ISI and ICSSQ do not have the same amount of support from research or the same level of proven validity and reliability. Therefore, those who use IDI usually build a strong argument that supports their choice, such as Straffon (2003), Fuller (2007), and Uribe et al. (2014). On the contrary, those who do not use IDI tend to ignore providing any argument support the tool they chose.

4. **Validity Threads and Research Design**

As Table 1 summarizes, randomization is completely absent in research designs about intercultural competence. The majority of research is natural research in which the researcher cannot change or manipulate the cause in the experiment and just tries to explore the causal relationship. For a casual relationship, randomization is a “gold standard” that is, unfortunately, absent in all of the research I reviewed. Therefore, there are many threads that affect the validity of research about intercultural competence. The most common ones are: ambiguous temporal precedence, evaluation apprehension, selection, history, and maturation.

In addition, as stated earlier, using mixed methods is strongly recommended in research in general (Shadish et al., 2002), and in intercultural sensitivity specifically (Deardorff, 2016). However, only five out of 13 studies this review covers use the mixed method; two use qualitative methods, while six use only quantitative methods.

**Summary of Chapter 2**

In chapter two, theoretical literature and empirical studies about intercultural sensitivity/competence were critically reviewed and presented. Gaps in literature were identified and will be
used to help this dissertation to add a useful contribution to the ongoing dialogue about intercultural sensitivity.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Overview
This chapter provides a discussion of the methodology of the dissertation. It begins with a restatement of the research questions and provides a discussion of the research design, participation and data selected tools. Limitations, discussion and critiques of the research design and data collection method are discussed in the last chapter of the dissertation, chapter five.

Research Questions
1. What is the level of intercultural sensitivity of world language UNH College of Liberal Arts (COLA) students at the beginning of the semester? On average, does intercultural sensitivity improve over the course of a semester?

2. Is there a positive association between the level of intercultural sensitivity and the number of world language courses students have taken?

3. a) How and to what extent do world language teachers’ pedagogies integrate aspects of the cultural communities (e.g., information about traditions, practices, and values) that use the language they teach?

b) Does asking for teachers’ own explanations of changes to their students' IDI scores provide information that explains IDI score differences across world language classrooms?

Methodology
In this study, mixed methods were applied. The dependent variable, the outcome, is the intercultural sensitivity which is expressed by the numerical scores on the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), the major data collecting tool in this study. As indicated in the literature review, IDI is the only available psychometric survey that has many studies that support its validity. (A detailed discussion of the IDI is below and in chapter five).
To answer the first question, the difference in the IDI score between the pretest and posttest was used (discussed in more detail below). After the second administration of the IDI, the professors of the classes participating in the study were interviewed and their syllabi were reviewed to explore how these professors integrate culture education into their classes and their perspective on their students’ intercultural sensitivity level. A detailed discussion of this design and its strengths and weaknesses is in chapter five.

Participants
The target population of this study is white American students studying at the University of New Hampshire. The reason I focused on UNH students is merely pragmatic, as I do not have access to any other students at any other university. At UNH, COLA undergrad students have either a one-year (401-402) or one-semester (503) language requirement.

Before collecting the data, criteria were set to select the participating students who can meet the research goal. Those criteria were:

1- The University of New Hampshire has a very small percentage of students of color. According to the university’s 2016 undergraduate profile, only 9% of undergraduate students were students of color. Therefore, any non-white students were excluded from the study as their minority status may have given them a different college experience than the white students, a variable that would skew results for the purpose of this study. In addition, with only 9% students of color, there are not sufficient students of color to conduct an analysis of difference scores.

2- The vast majority of the undergraduate student body are of middle-class European heritage background and have spent most of their lives in relatively homogenous suburban communities in New England, according to the university 2016 undergraduate profile. In addition, growing up within a bi-lingual or bi-cultural family can impact students’
intercultural sensitivity. Hence, students who grew up in a house where English is not the only spoken language were excluded from the study.

3- In addition, students who studied abroad and returned home within the last four months were excluded. Studies show that studying abroad has only a short-term impact on students’ intercultural sensitivity that lasts about four months. (Rexisen, 2013; Rexeisen, Anderson, Lawton, & Hubbard, 2008).

4- International students also were excluded as they are supposed to have a dissimilar experience.

5- As the first research question aim to investigate the influence of Liberal Arts on students’ intercultural sensitivity, all participating students were in the COLA program.

To collect the data, an email was sent by LLC Chair Professor Holly Cashman to all language professors, informing them of the study and asking if any were interested in participating. Five professors contacted me to express their interest. These professors teach Russian, Japanese, German, Spanish and Arabic languages courses. I obtained approval from the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research (IRB) # 6759 on August 25, 2017 (see appendix A). After visiting the classes and explaining the project to the students, 137 signed up to participate. In the second week of the fall semester, I visited the classes and administered the IDI in the classroom using students’ personal laptops. Only 127 students completed and submitted the IDI. I added a few demographic questions to the IDI to apply the criteria mentioned earlier. These questions were:

1- In what world region did you primarily live during your formative years to age 18?

2- Country of citizenship (passport country). Indicate the country that you consider your primary country of citizenship.

3- Ethnicity origin (or Race): Please specify your ethnicity.
4- Have you studied abroad in the last four months?
5- Were you raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken?
6- Are you a COLA student?
7- Gender?
8- What is your current class standing?

To investigate the influence of world language classes on students’ intercultural sensitivity, the following question was asked:

9- How many foreign language courses did you take at UNH?

After applying the criteria mentioned above and removing students who completed the pretest but did not complete the posttest, the number decreased to 71 students. Those 71 students are white American students who grew up in North America, have not studied abroad in the last four months and were raised in homes where English is the only spoken language. Thirty-one of them were males, 38 females, and 2 students chose “not to say” in replying to the gender question. The following table, Table 2, summarizes the distribution of the 71 students regarding their class standing.

Table 2. Students distribution in terms of class standing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class standing</th>
<th># of students</th>
<th>% of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned earlier, the 71 students were selected from five separate language classes. Figure 5 and Table 3 summarizes the students’ distribution in terms of the language class they were
Languages were replaced by letters to keep the classes anonymous (Reasons behind this are discussed in the following chapter).

Table 3. Students distribution in terms of the language class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language class</th>
<th># of students</th>
<th>% of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language B</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language C</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language D</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language E</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Number of participant students in each class

Tools:

As mentioned in the empirical review in chapter two, there are different instruments that can be used to assess intercultural sensitivity, such as ISS, ISI, IDI, and ICSSQ. The IDI is the most common and “best-known instrument for measuring how people understand and address cultural difference” (Terzuolo, 2016, p. 57). The IDI went through three phases of development. In the first phase, 40 people from different cultural backgrounds were interviewed extensively. The transcripts
of the interviews were rated by experts using the six phases of Bennet’s DMIS. Items were then extracted from those transcripts and reviewed by seven acknowledged cross-cultural experts to confirm that they matched the six phases of the DMIS. The items were next administered to a sample of 226 individuals. Factor analysis was conducted, and the authors ended up with 60 items that represented the following factors: Denial, Defense, Minimization, Acceptance, Cognitive Adaptation and Behavioral Adaptation (Hammer, 1999; Hammer, 2014).

In the second phase, the IDI was administered to 591 respondents from different countries, and 10 items were eliminated. This resulted in the second version of the IDI, which presently consists of 50 items. The third phase of development utilized 4,763 respondents who spoke six different languages and were from 11 distinct, cross-cultural samples. According to Hammer (2014), factor analysis was conducted to confirm that IDI is a valid instrument to assess intercultural sensitivity as defined by Bennet. The following diagram, Figure 6, summarizes the IDI validation protocol:

Figure 6. IDI development process, From IDI qualifying Seminar, 2017.
As the IDI is based on the DMIS; its stages are similar but not identical. Figures 7 and 8 summarize the phases of the DMIS and the IDI. Definitions of those phases are discussed in the previous chapter when the DMIS was reviewed. To make the IDI more marketable, the author changed the names of the two main stages: ethnocentrism to monocultural mindset, and ethnorelativism to intercultural mindset.

Figure 7. The Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS). From: ARLT Foundation

Figure 8. Intercultural Development Continuum. Hammer and Bennett (2009, p. 119)
Unfortunately, IDI is a proprietary instrument and its 50 items are not viewable by those who are not licensed to use it. I had to attend a special training to be licensed to use it (for license, see Appendix B). However, IDI, LLC has compiled example items for each of the Intercultural Development Orientations measured.

Denial

- It is appropriate that people do not care what happens outside their country.
- People should avoid individuals from other cultures who behave differently.

Polarization - Defense

- Our culture's way of life should be a model for the rest of the world.

Polarization - Reversal

- People from our culture are less tolerant compared to people from other cultures.
- Family values are stronger in other cultures than in our cultures.

Minimization

- Our common humanity deserves more attention than culture difference.
- Human behavior worldwide should be governed by natural and universal ideas of right and wrong.

Acceptance

- I have observed many instances of misunderstanding due to cultural differences in gesturing or eye contact.
- I evaluate situations in my own culture based on my experiences and knowledge of other cultures.

Adaptation
When I come in contact with people from different cultures, I find I change my behavior to adapt to theirs.

Reasons for Choosing IDI

I chose the IDI to use in this study for four reasons. First, the IDI is a theory-based tool, as it is influenced by Bennet’s DMIS. The IDI defines intercultural sensitivity as DMIS defines it, which gives it a high level of construct and face validity.

Second, the validity of the IDI has been proven through extensive psychometric testing (Fantin, 2009; Greenholtz, 2003; Hammer, 2014; Hammer, 1999; Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003; Paige et al., 2003). In his review of all instruments that measure intercultural sensitivity, Alvino Fantin (2009) describes IDI as “a statistically reliable and valid measure of intercultural sensitivity, translated into 12 languages and applicable to people from various cultural backgrounds” (p. 471). Additionally, Michael Paige, Melody Jacobs-Cassuto, Yelena A. Yershova, and Joan DeJaeghere (2003) developed an empirical analysis of the IDI and concluded that it “is a sound instrument, a satisfactory way of measuring intercultural sensitivity as defined by Bennett” (p. 485).

Third, the IDI is not significantly influenced by gender differences (Greenholtz, 2000; Zhang, 2014). In addition, the author of the IDI, Mitchell Hammer, claims that the tool is valid across cultures (Hammer, 2014). To make such a claim, the tool was administered to 4,763 individuals, from a wide range of cultures, ages, backgrounds and languages. The IDI was designed using advanced statistic procedures like confirmatory factor analysis, which according to Hammer (2011) provides “strong support for the cross-cultural generalizability, validity and reliability of the IDI” (p. 485).

The fourth reason for choosing the IDI is based on a gap discovered in the empirical literature review and the critique of the validity in the empirical literature review. One of the common threats in studies about intercultural sensitivity is evaluation apprehension, which appears
to play a role in studies like Penbek et al. (2012); Etri (2015); Holm (2009), and Shiri (2015) (see Table 1 in literature review). As mentioned previously, evaluation apprehension happens when “the construct being assessed is confounded with the subject's need to appear competent, healthy, adjusted, friendly, cooperative, and the like” (King & King, 1991, p. 115). The IDI is expected to avoid this threat. The IDI is tested for social desirability bias using Marlowe–Crowne Social Desirability Scale short form (Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972). The results indicate that “IDI scale scores did not appear to be influenced by any general tendency for respondents to provide socially desirable responses” (Hammer et al., 2003, p. 439). This means that evaluation apprehension most likely will not be a threat if the IDI is used.

However, this does not mean that the IDI can go without critique. This is explored in chapter five with the discussion section of the study.

Design and Procedures

As mentioned earlier, the study was designed to investigate students’ intercultural sensitivity and whether or not it is developed through a semester at the College of Liberal Arts that includes studying a world language. The research was observational as I cannot assign the participants randomly. In addition, because it was not possible to use a control group, I used the one-group pretest-posttest design. The IDI, the online version, was administered in the class twice: first at the beginning of the fall semester and second at the end of the semester. After the second administering of the IDI, the five language professors were interviewed. After the interview, I asked them to share their syllabi, three out of the five professors agreed to share their syllabi.

The overall score of the two IDIs was used to answer the first research question: “What is the level of intercultural sensitivity of world language UNH College of Liberal Arts (COLA) students at the beginning of the semester? On average, does intercultural sensitivity improve over the course of a semester?” A paired t-test was used to compare the mean scores of the pretest and
posttest measurement. The comparison was between the IDI overall development score at the beginning and at the end of the semester. Also, each phase of the IDI in the pretest was compared to the same phase in the posttest.

To answer the second question, “Is there a positive association between the level of intercultural sensitivity and the number of world language courses students have taken?” a chi-square test was used to determine whether there is a relationship between the number of world language classes and the IDI subcategories.

The third question aimed to explore the pedagogical approach in the language classes. To answer this question, I asked the five world language professors if I could interview them. The five professors agreed to be interviewed for the purpose of giving their thoughts on teaching culture and the possible reasons behind the changes (if any) in IDI scores. Three out of the five shared their syllabi.

**Interviews Analytic Method**

The five interviews were transcribed and coded. Ethnographic description of each interview was written, and data were extracted from it and distributed into themes presented in chapter four alongside the ethnographic description of each interview. Codes were developed by building on patterns and findings in the literature and combining those patterns with ethnographically informed data from the interviews. Creswell (2012) uses different qualitative research books to argue that there are different ways to select the categories in data analysis and presenting phases. Those diverse ways form a “continuum of coding strategies that range from "prefigured" categories to "emergent" categories” (p. 152). Those “prefigured” categories, according to Creswell, can come from the literature review or a theoretical model. He encourages scholars who use the “prefigured” categories to “be open to additional codes emerging during the analysis” (p. 152). This is how the data were analyzed, presented and themes were selected i.e. some themes are “prefigured” based on how
culture should be taught as mentioned in the literature review, chapter two, and some themes are “emergent” from the interviews and are expected to be useful in this study context. In other words, the overall approach to coding was built on prefigured themes that are validated in the literature and modify those themes based on emergent patterns in the data.

Interview Protocol

Semi-structured interviews were conducted. As there are many types of interviews, the question was how to choose the appropriate type? Cohen et al. (2000) indicates that the purpose of the study is the main factor in choosing the right interview type. Because the purpose of the study is to explore what the participants think and the views they hold, the flexible interview style is likely the most appropriate. Therefore, semi-structured interviews have been selected for this study.

Semi-structured interviews lie between the structured and unstructured. Although the interview schedule should be prepared, there is some flexibility in the interview. The interviewer can change a question or modify it during the interview. To form interview questions, Kathleen deMarrais (2004) suggests three guidelines: 1) the questions should be clear and short; 2) questions should encourage interviewee to recall specific events or experiences in detail, which will lead to a full and rich narrative; 3) “A few broad, open-ended questions work better than a long series of closed-ended questions” (p.62). I tried to keep those guidelines in mind while forming the questions for this study’s interviews.

Professors’ Interview Questions:

1. What are the language skills you focused on in your class?
2. What about culture? Why/why not?
3. How do you teach culture to your students?
4. What is the expected outcome of teaching culture?

5. To what factors would you attribute changes, if there were any, in your students’ IDI scores?

Summary of Chapter 3

This chapter provided an overview of the methodology of the study. The chapter represented the study questions, research design, participants and their including criteria. In addition, the chapter presented the tools of data collection, IDI and interviews, and how the data was processed and analyzed. Limitations of the research design and data collecting tools will be discussed in chapter five, after presenting the results in chapter four.
Chapter 4: Data Collection and Analysis

Overview
This chapter presents the data collected and provides a summary of the data analysis. It is divided into two main sections: the first section provides a summary of the quantitative data analysis, while the second discusses the qualitative data analysis.

Ethics Memo
As previously mentioned, the posttest was administered at the end of the fall semester. Although it was planned to interview each professor after the posttest was administered, the semester ended before the interviews could be conducted, as the IDI data was not ready to be shared with the professor before winter break began. It was necessary to wait until the spring semester to interview the five language professors. Unfortunately, during this same time period, the College of Liberal Arts made the decision not to renew the contracts of 16 lecturers for fall 2018; six of these lecturers were in the Language department. Two of the professors who participated in this study were among those whose contacts were not renewed.

Considering that four classes out of five had a decline in the level of intercultural sensitivity as measured by the IDI, and considering the current situation in the Language department, the professors may have felt that the study was doubting the quality of their job, or that they might be risking their jobs by continuing to participate.

Therefore, detailing data for the classes were removed to avoid the risk of revealing the identities of professors, the languages they teach and how they conduct their courses. In this section, names of the language classes were replaced by letters (for example, Language A, Language B, etc.) to avoid revealing the identity of the professor who taught those classes. Gender neutral pronouns have also been used when describing professor interviews.
Part One: Quantitative Data Analysis

This section presents data collected by the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), followed by a statistical interpretation of the data. As mentioned in chapter three, the IDI was administered twice—once at the beginning, and again at the end of the 2017 fall semester. After excluding students who dropped their world language courses and students who did not meet the criteria discussed in chapter three, the final number of students who responded to the IDI was 71. Statistical analyses were performed to respond to the first two research questions of this study:

1) What is the level of intercultural sensitivity of world language COLA students at the beginning of the semester? On average, does intercultural sensitivity improve over the course of a semester?

2) Is there a positive association between the level of intercultural sensitivity and the number of world language courses students have taken?

To address the first question, this section summarizes the results of the first administration of the IDI, which took place during the second week of the semester. The IDI provides information on the students’ Developmental Orientation (DO), Perceived Orientation (PO) and Cultural Disengagement (CD). The focus will be only on the DO, which represents the overall score of students’ level of intercultural sensitivity, therefore addressing the first research question.

Coding the IDI

The DO score presented by the IDI is charted onto the Intercultural Development Continuum of DMIS, which is divided into two main stages: ethnocentrism (monoculturalism) and ethnorelativism (multiculturalism). Ethnocentric stages include Denial, Defense, Reversal, and Minimization. Ethnorelative stages include Acceptance and Adaptation.
According to the IDI, each phase of the intercultural development model begins and ends with a certain score. For example, Denial is from 55 to 66.99; Polarization is between 70 and 84.99; Minimization is from 85 to 114.99, and any score above 115 is in the ethnorelative stage. The following table, Table 4, illustrates where each score belongs on the IDI and on the DMIS.

**Table 4. IDI subcategories scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DMIS</th>
<th>Ethnocentric Stage</th>
<th>Ethnorelative Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDI</td>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>Polarization (Defense/Reversal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score Range</td>
<td>55 to 69.99</td>
<td>70 to 84.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results**

**First Administration of the IDI (Pretest)**

According to the IDI, the mean score of the sample of students (N=71) at the beginning of the semester was 84.84, which placed the group on the cusp of the Minimization phase. This means that the group was, on average, at the very early stage of emphasizing commonalities at the cost of hiding differences, and choosing not to address or to ignore those differences.

![Developmental Orientation (DO)](image)

*Figure 9. Pretest average score*
Figure 10. Pretest subcategories distribution showing number of students in each phase

Table 5. Pretest data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnocentric stage</th>
<th># of students</th>
<th>% of students</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum Score</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>64.41</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>53.29</td>
<td>69.99</td>
<td>67.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarization</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>78.08</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>70.32</td>
<td>84.82</td>
<td>78.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>96.68</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>85.13</td>
<td>112.89</td>
<td>95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>123.52</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>116.29</td>
<td>130.75</td>
<td>123.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All stages</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>84.84</td>
<td>15.08</td>
<td>53.92</td>
<td>130.75</td>
<td>83.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 and Figures 9 and 10 summarize the results of the IDI when it was administered for the first time at the beginning of the semester. Most of the students in this sample (97%, N = 69) were in the ethnocentric stage and distributed throughout the three phases of this stage as follows:

- 15% of the students (N=11) were in the Denial phase, which is an orientation that does not recognize deep cultural differences. People in this orientation tend to refuse to believe that there are different ways of life than their own.

- 40.8% of students (N = 29) were in the Polarization phase, where they recognize cultural differences but choose to judge those who are different from themselves and defend their culture as the only way of life that everyone should follow.

- The other 40.8% of students (N = 29) were on the cusp of the Minimization phase, where they tend to focus on commonalities but ignore differences, according to the IDI.

Only two students out of the 71 participants were in the ethnorelative stage. Both students were in the Acceptance phase. Neither of the students were in the Adaptation phase, according to the IDI.

The first research question studies the level of intercultural sensitivity of world language COLA students at the beginning of the semester. According to the data collected, more than half of the sampled students (55.8%) were between the Denial and Polarization phases. Furthermore, almost all of the sample, except only two students, were in the ethnocentric stage as defined in the DMIS and measured by the IDI.

Second Administration of the IDI (Posttest)

The first research question seeks to understand if intercultural sensitivity improves over the course of the semester. The IDI was administered for a second time in the last week of the semester.
According to the IDI, the mean score of the sample of students (N=71) at the end of the semester was 82.30, which is on the cusp of the Minimization phase. The posttest mean is slightly lower than the pretest mean, which was not expected.

Figure 11. Posttest average score

Figure 12. Posttest subcategories distribution
Table 6. Posttest scores including subcategories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnocentric stage</th>
<th># of students</th>
<th>% of students</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>SD Score</th>
<th>Minimum Score</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>62.18</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>52.47</td>
<td>69.09</td>
<td>62.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarization</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>75.43</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>70.04</td>
<td>84.18</td>
<td>74.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>95.94</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>111.97</td>
<td>97.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All stages</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>82.30</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>129.52</td>
<td>78.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures 11, 12, and Table 6 summarize the results of the IDI when it was administered for the second time at the end of the semester. As the data show, at the end of the semester, most of the students (97%, N=69) were in the ethnocentric stage as measured by the IDI. The students were distributed as follows:

- More than half of the students (60%) were in the Denial and Polarization phases. 15% of the students (N=11) were in the Denial phase which is, as explained previously, an orientation where one refuses to admit that there are cultural differences. 45% of the students (N= 26) were in the Polarization phase.

- 36.6% of the students (N=32) were in the Minimization phase.

Only two students were in the ethnorelative stage; neither was in the Adaptation phase, as both were in the Acceptance phase.
Pretest vs. Posttest

As the data show, the pretest average mean score (M= 84.84, SD= 15.08) was higher than the posttest average mean score (M= 82.30, SD= 15.37), which was unexpected. To see if this difference was statistically significant, a paired samples t-test was conducted to compare the average pretest score to the average posttest score. The t-test examined whether there was a significant mean difference between the two averages. There was a significant difference between pretest scores (M= 84.84, SD= 15.08) and posttest scores (M= 82.30, SD= 15.37) for the 71 students in the analytic sample (t(70)= -10.06, p<.001). The effect size for this analysis (d = -1.19) was found to exceed Cohen’s (1988) convention for a large effect (d = 0.80), which suggested a large difference in the negative direction. This result was unexpected, as it shows that throughout the semester, students’ average intercultural sensitivity level actually decreased. Table 7 summarizes the differences between the pretests and posttests on the overall score and on the subcategory levels.

Table 7. Pretest vs Posttest Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td># of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>64.41</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarization</td>
<td>78.08</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>96.68</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>123.52</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Score Mean</td>
<td>84.84</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 13. Pretest vs Posttest Scores

As Figure 13 and Table 7 show, there was a decrease in the overall score, which was statistically significant, and in all of the sub-categories except for the Acceptance score. The acceptance mean score slightly decreased from 123.52 to 125.26. There was not a significant difference in the scores for the Acceptance level for pretest (M=123.52, SD=10.22) or posttest (M=125.26, SD=6.02); t(1) = .586, p = .663.

As there was a surprising decrease in the overall score for the group, a deeper look at each class was needed to see if this decrease happened in all classes. A comparison of the mean of the differences of the classes indicates that the Language A class was the only one to exhibit a slight positive change. The average mean score of the Language A class in the pretest was 87.56 and increased to 92.68 in the posttest. Those differences in means are represented in the following table and figure (Table 8 and Figure 14).
Table 8. Pretest vs Posttest for each class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># students</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>87.56</td>
<td>92.68</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language B</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82.93</td>
<td>76.74</td>
<td>-6.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language C</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>82.33</td>
<td>79.65</td>
<td>-2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language D</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>91.01</td>
<td>84.57</td>
<td>-6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language E</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82.08</td>
<td>80.92</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>84.84</td>
<td>82.29</td>
<td>-2.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14. Difference in Means per class

As Table 8 and Figure 14 indicate, there was a decrease in the IDI mean score across a semester of study. On average, the whole group dropped -2.54 in the posttest compared to the pretest, which was a statistically significant decrease. However, the decrease did not happen in all classes; for one language there was an average slight increase of 5.11 points, while others exhibited
an average slight decrease. This provokes a question about the reasons behind this difference in the level of progress students made in intercultural sensitivity as measured by the IDI over the course of the semester. What was different about the Language A class that led to the score increase? This question is addressed using qualitative data in an attempt to respond to the third research question.

Second Question

The second question asks if there is a positive association between the level of intercultural sensitivity and the number of world language courses a student takes. The aim of this research question is to investigate the impact of world language classes on students’ intercultural sensitivity. As mentioned previously, this study includes 71 COLA students who are currently enrolled in WL classes. After completing the IDI, students had to answer a question about the number of language classes they took at UNH including the current class. Only six students out of the 71 participants reported that they took two WL courses (including the course they are currently enrolled in), while the other students (N= 65) said they took only one WL course (the course they are currently enrolled in.) It was unexpected that almost all of the students only took one course; the expectation was there would be a wide variety in the amount of language courses taken. Thus, running parametric statistical tests was not possible. Therefore, a Chi-square test of independent sample was conducted to determine whether students who took two language courses are more likely to be located on a subcategory higher than students who took one course. The following contingency table, Table 9, summarizes the results.

Table 9. Contingency Table of courses taken number vs IDI subcategory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Denial</th>
<th>Polarization</th>
<th>Minimization</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students who took one course</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within IDI Category</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 9 shows, of the 11 students who were located in the Denial phase per the IDI, ten students (90.9%) took one course, while one student (9.1%) took two courses. In addition, of the 32 students in the Polarization phase, 31 students (96.9%) took one course, while only one student (3.1%) took two courses. Finally, for the Minimization phase, 22 students (84.6%) took one course, while four students (15.4%) took two courses. The two students who are in the Acceptance phase both took only one language course.

These results show that the six students who took two courses are distributed among the three phases of the ethnocentric stage; one was in Denial, one was in Polarization, while the last four were in the Minimization phase. To test the correlation between the subcategory and the number of courses taken, a Chi-square of independence test was used to test the following hypotheses:

Null and alternative hypotheses:

- $H_0$: In the population of UNH COLA students, there is no relationship between the number of language courses a student takes and their level of intercultural sensitivity as measured by the IDI.

- $H_a$: In the population of UNH COLA students, there is a relationship between the number of language courses a student takes and their level of intercultural sensitivity as measured by the IDI.

Unfortunately, as Table 9 shows, over half of the cells have cell counts under 5, which limits the results and makes the question unanswerable using the collected data. The main problem is that
there is almost no variation in the number of WL classes taken, so it was not possible to address that question adequately.

**Conclusion of the Statistical Analysis**

The first part of this chapter analyzes the quantitative data collected by the IDI to investigate the impact of a semester of world language education on students’ level of intercultural sensitivity. The analysis did not find any indicators of statistically significant progress over the semester in the sample of 71 students from five different language classes. Only the Language A class achieved a slight progress. The reasons that could be behind the progress in the Language A class and the slight decrease in the other four classes are investigated using qualitative data in the second part of this chapter. In addition, the unexpected limited variation in number of WL classes did not allow for an answer to the second research question. Chapter five includes a detailed discussion of these results and a conclusion that is based on them.

**Part Two: Qualitative Data Analysis**

Data were collected to respond to the third question of the study:

RQ 3a: How and to what extent do world language teachers’ pedagogies integrate aspects of the cultural communities (e.g., information about traditions, practices, and values) that use the language they teach?

RQ 3b: Does asking for teachers’ own explanations of changes to their students' IDI scores provide information that explains IDI score differences across world language classrooms?

The five professors were interviewed to investigate this question. Three out of five agreed to share their syllabi. The interviews were transcribed and coded. Following is an ethnographic
description of each interview followed by a thematic presentation of the themes. Table 10 summarizes those themes. The themes are discussed in chapter five.

**An Ethnographic View of the Classes**

The ethnographic descriptions of each interview are presented and supported by some data from the available syllabi. As mentioned in the ethical memo at the beginning of this chapter, the study happened during a difficult time for the instructors. Therefore, for the sake of de-identification, gender pronouns were removed in an effort to make the instructors’ identities anonymous. In many cases, I use the pronoun “they” as a gender neutral pronoun to refer to each professor.

**Language A Class - Ethnographic View**

Language A class meets three days a week, devoting a fourth day to an online weekly project in which students have to write a two-page reflective paper, *in English*, about a cultural topic relevant to the target language, according to the professor. In the syllabus, this weekly cultural project is described as follows:

“**You will be completing many weekly projects that are designed to better acquaint you with [Language A] culture. The prompts for the weekly assignments will be posted ahead of time on the course homepage. Unless otherwise noted, weekly projects are due in class on Fridays. Weekly projects may include writing assignments, reading assignments, and individual research topics.”**

In addition to the weekly project, there is a bigger final cultural project, which is also mentioned in the syllabus:

“**The weekly projects will form the preparation for a larger research project that will be submitted at the end of the semester. This research will be on a topic of your choosing and**
will include a written assignment of three pages (in English) [emphasis added] with an accompanying one-page summary of your essay (in Language A).”

As for the course objectives, there are three “learning goals” listed in the syllabus. “learn[ing] about the cultural contexts of major [Language A] speaking countries” and “Understand[ing] differences and similarities between … cultures” are stated in the syllabus as two of the three goals of the course. The other learning goal focuses on communicative skills (e.g., speaking, listening, reading, and/or writing) in the target language.

Although this emphasis on culture is listed in the syllabus, when I asked the professor about the skills they focus on in the class, culture was not spontaneously mentioned. I asked, “what about culture?” to inquire about the weekly projects the student must complete. To teach culture, the professor mentioned that the textbook is not a sufficient resource for teaching culture, so they must systematically go beyond the textbook and design the weekly projects for the students to complete. The professor explained that the weekly paper should be submitted in English at the first half of the semester. During the second half of the semester, students are expected to add to a vocabulary list in the target language of the most important words mentioned in the reflective paper. The aim of the papers, according to the instructor, is to make students compare their culture with the target culture and reflect on any perceived differences. The instructor mentioned that the aim was to “shake the students a little bit and expose them to things that are uncomfortable or things that they wouldn't necessarily go out and search for themselves.”

In addition, the professor mentioned that their language program received a grant from the government of the country where the target language is spoken and used it to organize a few cultural events that were mostly about the elections that took place in the country where Language A is spoken. In those cultural events, students from all different Language A classes met outside their normal course times and had to write reflective papers on their experiences, in English for
elementary levels and in Language A for intermediate and advanced levels. The instructor mentioned that the program, for the first time in this instructor’s career, achieved a high level of cooperation among the different classes in coordinating and participating in the extracurricular projects. In the middle of the interview, I shared the IDI results with the instructor and explained the slight positive difference between the pretest and the posttest for his Language A class. I asked about their thoughts on the reason behind this difference. According to the Language A professor, reasons behind the positive change in his class’ scores could be attributed to two main factors: 1) extracurricular across-program projects and 2) the weekly reflective papers. The Language A professor believed that the whole program cooperating and organizing the cultural events might play a significant role in developing his students’ intercultural sensitivity. The instructor placed the importance of program-wide events even above the weekly reflective papers, stating:

We spent a lot of time as a program. I think that the weekly individual projects were important, but we spent so much time as a program talking about the [Language A] elections that I think that since I've started teaching… I've never had a semester where all of the [Language A] classes… were all working towards the same thing and at that level of coordination was something new…

In summary, the most prominent features of how the Language A instructor teaches culture in the class include: systematically going beyond the textbook; weekly reflective papers that contain comparisons, reflections, and critical thinking about the target culture; feeling comfortable asking students to reflect in English at the elementary level; co-curricular projects and cooperation across all classes in the program.
Language B Class - Ethnographic View

The Language B professor was one of the first instructors to contact me showing interest in participating in the study. This instructor was very cooperative and interested in the topic of the study; we also have a good personal relationship, as we shared an office for two years. The instructor wanted to help me in conducting this study. The class that participated in the study meets four days a week. This instructor is the only instructor who teaches Language B, as the Language B program is small at the university. The instructor agreed to share the course syllabus with me. In the syllabus, the focus is on “the fundamentals of communication in [Language B] in four skill areas: speaking, listening, reading and writing.” The syllabus has seven course objectives that students should achieve by the end of the semester. The seven objectives are focused on the fundamental use of the language; however, none of them have to do with culture.

The interview, which took place in their office, began with a question about the skills the instructor focuses on the class. In a confident tone, the instructor counted “the four skills:” reading, speaking, writing, and listening. When I asked about culture to see if culture is included, the instructor replied, “oh yeah, I incorporate culture in all classes.”

Replying to a question about how to teach culture, the instructor said: “in verbal explanation, sometimes I show videos.” The idea of verbally explaining culture appeared more than once in the interview. In a different statement, the instructor said, “I have to explain why people use the language the way they use it.” Overall, the reported method of how they teach culture in the Language B class is presenting the content using verbal explanation and sometimes videos.

In addition, this instructor thinks that the textbook is superficial in covering culture. For them, “the textbook handles culture in a very light way… it's like a paragraph per chapter, each chapter takes like two weeks. And there's like a paragraph about ‘culture notes: [Language B] people bow.’” The instructor went on to explain that the book does not explain the cultural background of
body language, which is so important in Language B, for instance. In the class, all of the content is organized around the textbook, and the sequence of the curriculum is dictated by the textbook. The instructor indicated that there is no time to do extra cultural activities outside of what is covered in the textbook.

After talking about culture in the class, I shared with the instructor the IDI score and phases of the class and explained what each phase on the scale means. The instructor showed a great deal of embarrassment when they saw the drop in the class score. I felt compelled to reassure the instructor that these results were not presented to make them feel badly. After the essential embarrassment had subsided, I asked about what the reason could be behind the class achieving no progress on the IDI scale. In this instructor’s opinion, the main reason behind the negative change of students’ scores was that students think that everyone should be in the Minimization phase. After the interview, the instructor sent me an email emphasizing this point. In this email, the instructor said:

I’ve been thinking more about the results and I think the biggest reason why students ended up in the Minimization zone of the spectrum is because most of them believe that that is the end goal of foreign language learning-- to learn more so we can see how we’re all alike. It’s very interesting to think about and to consider ways to get students to realize that is a step along the path, but not the goal at the end of it.

In summary, based on the interview and the syllabus, the prominent aspects of how this instructor handled culture are: using verbal explanation to present culture; the absence of reflections, comparisons, and critical thinking skills, which are necessary to teach culture as discussed in chapter two; the superficiality of the textbook and the level of adherence to it; and focusing on fundamentals of the language at the cost of ignoring culture, as there is not time to focus on both.
Language C Class - Ethnographic View

The Language C class meets four days a week. The professor is a native speaker of the Language C who has been in the United States for nine years. The instructor shared their syllabus and met me in their office. The syllabus is contained no course objectives, and has sections for class participation, homework, quizzes, tests, examination, film review, and grading. Under the film review section, the syllabus mentions that students have to write a one-page review of three Language C films during the semester.

In the interview, the instructor highlighted that the focus in the course is on speaking as the top priority skill; reading, writing, and listening are also important. According to this instructor, culture takes little priority in the course, as the focus is on the other basic language communicative skills. The instructor “talks” about culture only when it appears in the textbook. The instructor explained, “the idea is to introduce certain cultural topics that are covered in the textbook… if [the textbook] gives me the topic to talk about.” However, the professor did not evaluate the depth of the textbook in covering culture. According to the instructor, “there is no standard” to be used to evaluate the textbook and its discussions of culture. To teach cultural topics in the textbook, the instructor verbally “explains” them, shows movies. In addition, the instructor indicated that if there was time after watching videos, they may “ask what differences did [the students] see and what impact that movie had on [students’ understanding of] culture.”

While I was sharing the results of the IDI and explaining the theory behind it, the instructor asked, “is this a Big C or a little C?” (By Big C they meant high culture where the focus is on the great literature works, little C, on the other hand, refers to everyday communication task. Details about that topic are in chapter 2). The instructor thought that the reason there was no change is that one semester is not enough. “I think there is not much time because it is just three months,” the
instructor said. The Language C instructor suggested that the score would be higher if I gave the students the IDI at the end of the spring semester, after a full year of language courses.

To summarize, the prominent aspects of how this instructor handled culture are that cultured is not prioritized in the class, there is a strong adherence to the textbook, and verbal explanations are used whenever a cultural topic appears in the book. In addition, the instructor believed that one semester is not enough to improve students’ intercultural sensitivity.

Language D Class - Ethnographic Description

The Language D professor was recently notified that their contract would not be renewed. The interview was a little uncomfortable, as the department atmosphere has been tense. This instructor is not the only professor in the Language D program as the program is relatively big and has a few other instructors. Unfortunately, the instructor did not share their syllabus with me; I requested it once but did not ask again due to the pressure the instructor was under. When I went to their office, the instructor did not wait for me to ask my questions. Once I sat down, the instructor said, “So, you are here to talk about your topic, culture, right?” From there, the instructor started talking about culture without me saying a word.

This instructor indicated that they do not focus on culture in the class I visited because this instructor believes in using the target language as much as possible. The instructor said, “I believe that the emphasis should be on using a majority of the target language in class.” Therefore, this instructor does not teach or ask students to do homework on a cultural topic, as they do not have the language tools to do this task. “As far as you know, expanding the world and then being able to use the language, the target language, and talk about cultural topics, they’re just not at the level to be able to do that right,” the instructor explained. This instructor kept referring to this idea throughout the interview. This instructor called it “level appropriateness,” and referred to this notion several
times to confirm their beliefs that culture is not an appropriate topic in elementary level courses due to the language barriers. The instructor “just [doesn’t] see it [being] very possible at the 401 level,” where the focus must be more on basic language skills. This instructor used the textbook to support their point of view. They said, “according to the way the textbook is set up, it's a rather superficial way, you know, of teaching the culture.”

When I shared the IDI score with this instructor, he did not seem surprised. He even used the slight negative difference of the core to support his argument. The instructor said, “If there wasn't much interchange, I'm not surprised because just considering on what we covered throughout the year in a more superficial way with culture, there wasn't a lot of it, it wasn't a culture based course, it was more of the basics fundamentals of language”

In addition, the instructor mentioned that, although they have a master’s degree in teaching Language D, this instructor did not receive any kind of training on how to teach culture. The instructor said,

In my first master's thesis, the topic was on teaching culture and what I realized, because I felt like there's a lack of real understanding of how to do it, what I realized is there's not really a lot of good literature out there, articles to tell you the method, because it really depends on everybody's personal experience in how they understand the culture...

The instructor kept stressing that teacher preparation programs do not really train teachers on how to teach culture.

In summary, what this instructor calls “level appropriateness,” superficial textbooks, and teachers’ limited ability to teach culture are the prominent aspects of how this instructor handled culture taught in Language C class.
Language E Class - Ethnographic View

This was the most difficult, tense, and uncomfortable interview, as the instructor is one whose contract will not be renewed—a very serious issue to this instructor. It took this instructor many weeks to respond to my request for an interview. I went to this instructor’s house, as they did not want to hold this interview in the office. The instructor’s answers to my questions were short and did not reveal a lot of information.

The Language E class meets four days a week, 50 minutes every day. I did not have access to the syllabus or the course objectives as the instructor did not reply to my request for the syllabus. When I asked about the skills this instructor focuses on in class, the response was “reading, writing, oral comprehension, and speech.” I moved to the second question, which was if this instructor teaches culture; the instructor indicated that they do teach culture and moved on to explain how important culture is. However, the cultural portion in the class is spontaneous and not planned. I asked about how often they teach culture. “It is really hard to say because there are times [when] the focus is on the culture, it is probably a third of this one class unit. Sometimes a day goes by when there is a little bit of culture, sometimes a day goes by when there a quite a bit of culture,” the instructor replied.

The instructor did not give a clear response when I asked how they teaches culture. The instructor said, “Sometimes it is in relation to grammar, my own experience depending on whatever we are talking about…. we talk about [religion], we talk about women, we talk about different topics as long as it makes sense to them and is not out of the place.” When I asked for more clarification, the instructor confirmed that they depend on “explaining” cultural topics to the students; “I explain the topic and sometimes I give them my personal experience as an example of that.” In addition, this instructor believes that relying on the textbook is not enough for covering cultural topics. The instructor indicated that they go beyond the textbook and uses external material to teach culture.
When I asked for an example of how far the instructor goes beyond the textbook, the answer was “again, if I am teaching them vocabulary, and if it is applicable, like if I am teaching them the word for ‘tea,’ I take the advantage of that and start talking about what tea means in this culture.” The reported method of teaching culture is verbal explanation of topics that comes up spontaneously in the class. This indicates that the cultural topics appear spontaneously in their class and do not go beyond verbal explanation.

When I shared and explained the IDI reports to this instructor, they seemed defensive. The only explanation in this instructor’s opinion that the class did not achieve any positive change was that a semester is not enough: “the only explanation I would say is that you don’t change people’s minds overnight….” The instructor told me that if I want to see progress on this scale, I would need to come back and measure students’ progress after about two years. This instructor also indicated that, despite our best efforts, I may not find any change or impact even after two years.

In conclusion, the verbal explanation of cultural topics that appear spontaneously is the dominant feature of how culture is handled and taught in this class. Also, the instructor thinks that one semester is not enough to achieve any progress. Students, according to this instructor, need at least two years of courses to change their mindset and even those two years might not be enough.

Table 10. summary of the themes that appeared in the interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major skills they focus on in their class</th>
<th>Language A</th>
<th>Language B</th>
<th>Language C</th>
<th>Language D</th>
<th>Language E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 skills (culture is not spontaneously mentioned in the interview, but it is mentioned in the syllabus)</td>
<td>4 skills (culture is not spontaneously mentioned)</td>
<td>4 skills (culture is not spontaneously mentioned)</td>
<td>4 skills (culture is not spontaneously mentioned)</td>
<td>4 skills (culture is not spontaneously mentioned)</td>
<td>4 skills (culture is not spontaneously mentioned)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thematic Presentation of the Qualitative Data

As mentioned in chapter three, what Creswell (2012) called “prefigured” and “emergent” codes and themes were used. Some themes are prefigured, which means they were based on the literature review; other themes are completely new, while additional themes are both prefigured and emergent because they are extracted from the literature review but have been extended and built
based on the interview findings. As table 10 summarizes, the most important themes that appeared in the five interviews were:

Skills Focused on in Class

To see what attention culture gets in their teaching practice, professors were asked what skills they focused on during class. None of the five professors mentioned culture when they talked about the language skills they teach. One of the professors counted “all” of the language skills she teaches which included reading, writing, speaking and listening, but did not include culture. She did mention “I focus on all four [skills]: reading, writing, speaking, [and] listening.” The other professors highlighted certain skills, like speaking, that they focus on in their classes, but culture was always absent from their responses. The follow-up question was, “what about culture?” The answer from all professors was that they do focus on culture, although they did not mention it at first when they were asked about the skills they focus on. In addition, culture and learning about cultural differences appeared in only one syllabus out of the three shared with me.

Pedagogy of Teaching Culture

Professors were asked how they teach culture. The Language A professor, whose class was the only one to achieve a slight higher score on the IDI posttest, mentioned that they devote one day out of four every week for a cultural project. This weekly project is a reflection paper, in English, on a cultural topic, either of the students’ or professor’s choice. Moreover, the Language A professor mentioned that the whole Language A program received a grant from a foreign government to be used in cultural activities. The program cooperated and organized a variety of cultural events for all classes; students were then required to write reflective papers about those events.
As for the other classes, teaching culture did not take as much time as in the Language A class. In some classes, teaching culture did not go beyond “verbal explanation” or “watching videos” of a topic when it appeared in the textbook. For example, one professor said, “[In the textbook] each chapter takes like two weeks and there's... a paragraph about its culture at the end of each chapter.” In other classes, professors chose not to teach culture due to “level appropriateness” and the use of first language issues.

Textbook and Systematically Going Beyond It

The five professors indicate that they think the textbooks were superficial in covering cultural. However, there are differences in terms of how far they go beyond it. While the Language A professor has a systematic plan of going beyond the textbook, the other four professors do not. Nevertheless, some of them indicate that they occasionally “talk” about some cultural points whenever it comes up while they teach grammar or vocabulary.

Reflection, Co-Curricular Projects and Program Cooperation

As discussed in literature review, reflection activities play a critical role in teaching culture. Reflection activities and co-curricular events appeared in one class and completely missed in the other four. This may mean that only one class is following, to some extent, what could be described as the best practice of how to teach culture as mentioned in literature.

Feels Adequately Prepared to Teach Culture

Finally, three out of four of those who do not follow the best practice as described in world language education literature feel that they are on the right track of teaching culture. They feel that their approach, which is verbal explanation and showing video, is a sufficient strategy to teach
culture. In other words, three out of language instructors are not aware that they are not following the right strategies, as discussed in literature, to teach culture.

One Semester of Language Teaching Is Not Enough

Two out of the four professor whose scores slightly dropped down indicated that one semester of language teaching was not enough. They believed that to see an increase in the IDI scores, students need more than one semester. One of them mentioned that students need to study world language for three or four years to make any progress in their cultural mindset.

Summary of Chapter 4

In this chapter, quantitative data collected by the IDI are presented and followed by a statistical analysis to respond to the first two research questions. In the second part of the chapter, the qualitative data collected through interviews with the five professors, as well as from reviewing their course syllabi, are presented and analyzed to respond to the third research question. In the following chapter, those results are discussed in the context of the literature review, research questions, and current conversation about intercultural sensitivity.
Chapter 5: Discussion

In this chapter, the results which were presented in the previous chapter, chapter four, are interpreted and discussed. The discussion extends to cover not only the results, but also the research methodology and the limitations of the study. The chapter ends with a conclusion and recommendation for future research.

Discussion of Results for First Two Questions

The first question aimed to investigate the level of intercultural sensitivity of world language COLA students at the beginning of the semester and if intercultural sensitivity improves over the course of a semester. Data were collected from the sampled students at the beginning and at the end of the semester using the IDI. At the beginning of the semester, students were at the cusp of the Minimization phase on the IDI. At the end of the semester students’ score dropped down to lean more to the Polarization phase on the IDI. On average, the posttest mean score was significantly lower the pretest mean score. This result is shocking and alarming.

In theory, spending time in a liberal arts college, not to mention studying world language, should be effective in improving students’ intercultural sensitivity. As discussed in chapter two, it is argued in literature that teaching liberal arts and world language are some of the most influential ways in cultivating and increasing students’ intercultural sensitivity. The results of this study indicate that there might be a gap between the ideal theoretical world and the real world. This gap should be seriously addressed especially at a university that witnessed 100 reported incidents of hate and racial tension last academic year (according to New Hampshire Public Radio). The way we teach at COLA and what we teach should be revised keeping in mind that intercultural sensitivity is not a luxury in today’s world.
The second question was devoted to investigating the influence of the number of world language classes on students' level of intercultural sensitivity. The aim was to see if there is a correlation between the number of world language classes and students' level of intercultural sensitivity. Unfortunately, the limited variation in the number of world language classes taken was insufficient to address this question.

The above findings support former Harvard President Derek Bok’s argument in his book *Our Underachieving Colleges*, as mentioned in the literature review chapter. In his book, Bok believes that higher education in America fails in many areas including in diversity education. The results also confirm what Martha Nussbaum warned against, as mentioned in chapter two, which is the failure of the American current higher education in producing “citizens of the world” who are able to deal with those who are different from themselves.

In addition, the results show that only one language class out of five achieved a slight progress in the IDI score, while the other classes achieved a lower mean score at the end of the semester. This provokes a question about what happens in this class and does not happen in the other classes that could be the related to this change, which is discussed in the third question discussion.

**Variability in Individual Students’ IDI Scores**

Looking at individual IDI scores among COLA students, it is apparent that there is variability among student scores that the WL class averages do not convey. For example, although the overall class average IDI score decreased in four of the five WL classes after one semester of language study, some students’ individual IDI posttest scores increased, while others decreased. Similarly, although the overall class average IDI score increased in one of the five WL classes after one semester of language study, some students’ individual posttest scores in that class increased, while others decreased. Although this study does not address why some students' scores went up
while others went down, as an educator and a researcher, I am able to speculate that students’ individual IDI scores likely varied for a number of reasons. For example, perhaps individual students experienced their WL classes differently (i.e. varying levels of homework completed, relationships with professors, engagement with course material, prior knowledge of our interest in the target language and/or culture, etc.). It is also important to consider potential external variables, outside of the classroom, that may have impacted students’ IDI scores (i.e. events in students’ personal lives, current political climate, events and tensions at UNH, social media exposure, cross cultural experiences outside of the classroom, stresses students faced at the time they took the IDI, etc.). Therefore, because of the variability evidenced by individual students’ IDI scores, as well as the potential for counter reasons for this study’s results, it is recommended that future research include interviews with individual students in order to investigate variances observed, as well as to learn more about how students experience the pedagogy of their professors and how external factors impact students’ intercultural sensitivity/IDI scores.

The following figures present the variability inside Language Class A before and after excluding four students due to including and excluding criteria mentioned in chapter 3.
Using Language A as an example, as the above figures summarize, only two students’ scores decreased during the semester. Even after adding the four students who were excluded from this class for not meeting the study’s including criteria, the increase still happened to everyone in the class except those two students. While Research Question 3 may be able to explain the increase of the average score of Language Class A, it is almost impossible, using the available data, to understand the reasons for the decrease for those two students. In other words, it is not possible to know with certainty, but only to speculate, that perhaps scores varied for any number of reasons. Again, only speculating, the decrease in scores might have been due to how each student experienced their WL class, or even due to variables outside the classroom that impacted students perceptions—events in personal life, current political climate, events and tensions at UNH, social media, etc. Without future research that investigates the variances among individual student scores, it is impossible to account for the individual differences. Thus, studies that include students’ perspectives are imperative: how do students experience the pedagogy of their professors? How do external factors impact IDI scores? A follow up study that includes student interviews might be helpful to determine if increases and/or decreases are related to factors inside or outside of the
classroom. As the following figures suggest, student interviews would be helpful in explaining the variances this study found among individual IDI scores in each of the WL classes.

Figure 17. Variability in Language B Class. Each bar represents an individual student in the class.

Figure 18. Variability in Language C Class. Each bar represents an individual student in the class.
Figure 19. Variability in Language D Class. Each bar represents an individual student in the class.
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Figure 20. Variability in Language E Class. Each bar represents an individual student in the class.
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Discussion of Results for Third Question

The original third question was “What are the language teachers’ perceptions of the reasons behind the change, if any, of their students’ intercultural sensitivity?” However, during data analysis I discovered that I need to look at the overall pedagogical approach for each instructor in a more
comprehensive way than what just a question about teachers’ perception allowed me to do. I expanded out into analyzing the overall pedagogical approach in terms of how culture is taught in each class in addition to what teachers think about the IDI score change. Refining or adding questions during the qualitative studies is quite normal and common in qualitative research (Hatch, 2002). Therefore, the question was refined and phrased as follows:

RQ 3a: How and to what extent do world language teachers’ pedagogies integrate aspects of the cultural communities (e.g., information about traditions, practices, and values) that use the language they teach?

RQ 3b: Does asking for teachers’ own explanations of changes to their students' IDI scores provide information that explains IDI score differences across world language classrooms?

As mentioned in chapters three and four, five professors were interviewed. “Prefigured” and “emergent” themes and codes are used. The results are presented in chapter Four. The following is a discussion of those themes in terms of what might be related to students achieving no progress in their intercultural sensitivity as measured by the IDI. This discussion includes conclusion and interpretation for each of the themes that appeared in chapter four. In addition, the discussion tries to connect the results to the literature review, research questions and to the current conversation about the intercultural sensitivity. The discussion is followed by answering the research questions 3a and 3b.

Prioritizing Culture in Language Classes

It could be argued that the subject of culture and dealing with cultural differences is not a priority in most of the classes in this study. As results show in chapter four, language instructors did not mention culture when they were first asked about the skills they focus on in class. While culture is not on the list of the top priorities of many instructors, only one instructor systematically teaches it and four instructors reported that they teach it spontaneously when it comes up in the class.
discussions. It seemed to be a secondary priority. In support of this claim, culture is mentioned as a “learning goal” in only one syllabus of the reviewed syllabi. Most of the instructors still focused on communicative approach to teach world language. As discussed in detail in chapter two, there was a paradigm shift in the world languages education field. That shift happened in the 1990s and called for moving from focusing on the four communication skills to including culture as a major skill to target understanding, tolerance and peace; to move from communicative approach era to the intercultural approach era (Byram & Peiser 2015). However, it seems that some language instructors are still trapped in the communicative approach, and maybe in an era before that.

Using the Best Practice to Teach Culture

The results indicate that four out of the instructors are either not aware of the best practices of teaching culture or they think what they do is the best practice. One instructor mentioned that, although they have a Masters’ Degree in world language teaching, the program they graduated from did not prepare them to teach culture. The instructor indicated that although teachers’ education programs highlight the importance of culture, these programs often do not train instructors on how to effectively teach culture.

Another professor stopped the interview to ask, “Is this intercultural sensitivity Big C or Little c?” I had to explain to them that intercultural sensitivity is beyond the Big C and Little C, as explained in the literature review in chapter two. This question reveals that the professor is still thinking about culture as “Big C or Little c,” which is an outdated topic in the realm of world language education. Teaching culture for four instructors did not go beyond “verbal explanation” and “showing a video.”
Level Appropriateness

A few instructors indicated that they think that the elementary level is not appropriate to teach culture and target intercultural sensitivity. One of the instructors even called it “level appropriateness.” Some instructors chose not to get deep in cultural topics and preferred just to “explain” the cultural note that is mentioned in the textbook at the end of each chapter for the same reason of “level appropriateness.” As mentioned in chapter two, knowledge of culture can, and should, take place even in the most elementary classes (Crozet & Liddicoat, 1999). Byram (1997) indicates that simple things used in elementary level of language classes, like greetings, body language and clothes, could be critical resources for cultivating and improving intercultural sensitivity. He mentions that the stories and the values behind things like greetings and clothes are highly conscious. If a language teacher uses the story behind these little details in the elementary level and its value in the target culture, this may better increase knowledge of the culture than just teaching words and greetings in the target language.

Reflection and First Language Use

As the literature review in chapter two indicates, using reflection is critical in the language classroom to improve students’ intercultural sensitivity. However, the literature, to the best of my knowledge, does not mention how those reflections should look and which language students should use to produce those reflections. The word reflections appeared in the data twice: first in the Language A class where the students had to write weekly reflection papers in English, and second in one of the other classes where the IDI score was slightly decreased at the end of the semester. In this class, the professor mentions that he could not use reflections because students were not advanced enough in the target language to write a reflection paper, and he could not ask them to do this in English as using English in the world language class is discouraged.
In world language education, there is a stigma that one should not use their first language in class. Based on twelve years of experience in the field of world languages education, I have observed that teachers feel pressured to discourage students from using their first language in class. The results of this study indicate that teachers should not feel this way and should in fact encourage elementary level students to reflect on the cultural differences in their first language, at least once a week, targeting the improvement of students’ cultural sensitivity. There is a huge debate in world language education about using the first language. However, reflections for the sake of improving intercultural sensitivity do not exist in this debate. It might be useful to revisit this debate keeping in mind that intercultural sensitivity is an objective need to be achieved. This may lead to encouraging language instructor to use first language in elementary levels targeting improving students’ intercultural sensitivity.

Systematically Going Beyond the Textbook

All instructors complained about textbook superficiality in covering cultural topics. This is both a “prefigured” and an “emergent” theme. It is a prefigured theme as it already exists in literature, and it is an emergent theme as this study takes it little further than it is in the literature. To explain, Young and Sachdev (2011) indicate that course materials usually ignore the cultural component that is needed to develop students’ intercultural sensitivity. They go on to add that even those textbooks who claim that they cover culture only cover superficial features. In addition, Bickley et al. (2014) and Young and Sachdev (2011) indicate that the major language standardized tests such as TOEFL or IELTS in English as a foreign language case do not include intercultural sensitivity which causes teachers to ignore it for the sake of other language skills students need to pass these tests.

What this dissertation adds to this theme is how language instructors deal with the superficiality of the textbook. The results indicate that not all the professors fully adhered to the
textbook as mentioned in chapter four. While some professors mostly adhere to the textbook and occasionally go beyond it whenever a cultural topic is broached in class, other professors systematically go beyond the textbook and ask students to do weekly reflective projects that do not exist in their readings.

Training Programs

One of the instructors in this study indicated that they did not receive any training on how to teach culture. In addition, all the above themes point to the teachers. When teachers do not prioritize culture in language classes, do not know the best practice to teach culture, do not go beyond a sufficient textbook, and discourage their students from using their first language in class to reflect on cultural differences, this may cause the drop-in students IDI score. Also, the common factor among all themes is the language teacher. If this is true, this indicates that we have a burning need to investigate in-service and pre-service training programs. Teachers are the “key ‘brokers’ between theories of interculturality and their application to language learning” (Young & Sachdev, p. 84). Training teachers how to teach culture is one of the topics that rarely appeared in literature. Very few studies have been conducted on the ability of teachers to teach culture.

In a study that includes 78 European world language teachers specializing in Danish, English, Flemish, French, and German and aims to investigate their experience with intercultural sensitivity, Meyer (2007) indicates that although most of those teachers recognize the importance of intercultural sensitivity, they do not know how to teach it. They have never received any kind of training that qualifies them to integrate culture in their classes. In addition, in another study published in German and cited in Golub (2014), the author Breka (2012) indicates that two out of three world language teachers have never received any training on intercultural sensitivity development. The same conclusion is stated in Golub’s 2014 study. Golub confirms that the teachers in her study have a serious lack of training for integrating culture in their classes. When she
offered them a professional development training program, a significant difference was found in their practice and in their students’ level of intercultural sensitivity. Those studies conform to the findings of this dissertation which are discussed above.

**Summary of the Third Research Question**

Research question 3a is about understanding teachers’ approaches within cases. As the above discussion shows, culture is not one of four instructors’ priorities. Among those instructors for whom culture is not a priority, some instructors chose not to teach culture due to “level appropriateness,” some instructors did not know how to teach it, and others thought that presenting information through verbal explanation or showing videos was a sufficient method to teach culture. Furthermore, while only one instructor systematically went beyond the textbook, the other instructors in this study spontaneously *talked* about culture whenever it appeared in the textbook. The aim of this question was to generate themes that can be used comparatively to understand the differences between Language Class A and the other four classes.

Research question 3b is focused on explaining why some students’ scores decreased over the semester while other students’ scores in other world language classes went up. In other words, is the pedagogical approach of those instructors related to the decrease or the increase of the IDI score? A comparison between the best practice of teaching culture in the literature review and the pedagogical approach of the teachers could indicate such a relationship. To explain, in the literature review, reflections, comparisons, and critical thinking were identified as essential strategies in teaching culture in world language classes. In this study, of the five classes investigated, reflection activities took place in only one class, Language A, which was the only class that had a slight increase in the IDI score. Alternatively, in the other four classes, whose IDI scores went down, there was an absence of reflections, comparisons, and critical thinking.
Discussion of the Methodology

In this dissertation, one-group pretest-posttest design was used. Shadish et al. (2002) indicates that the most common threats to this design are history, testing, and maturation. They define history threat as “events occurring concurrently with treatment could cause the observed effect” (p. 55). To avoid the history threat, heritage students and international students are excluded from the study. Some of those students showed interest in participating. For the sake of equality and not to make them feel any kind of discrimination, they were allowed to take the IDI, but their results were excluded in the data analysis phase. “Heritage students” refer to those who are first or second generation immigrants. In addition, students who studied abroad and returned home within the last four months were excluded. Studies show that studying abroad has only a short term—specifically four months—impact on students’ intercultural sensitivity (Rexisen, 2013; Rexisen, Anderson, Lawton, & Hubbard, 2008).

Testing threat happens when the feedback of the pretest provokes participants to change their behavior or to change their response to the posttest (Shadish et al., 2002). To reduce the effect of this threat, feedback was not given to the students or to the teachers after the pretest; instead, the results were shared with the professors after the posttest.

In addition, as the study took place over approximately three months, natural changes may occur to the participants. Those changes may threaten the validity of the study. This threat is usually called maturation (Shadish et al., 2002). To reduce this threat, Shadish et al. (2002) suggests “ensuring that all groups are roughly of the same age so that their individual maturational status is about the same” (p. 57). In this study, I think the maturation threat is reduced because the age range of college students is usually narrow.
Some other threats may affect the validity of the design, such as evaluation apprehension. The IDI is believed to be designed in a way that reduces evaluation apprehension (Hammer et al., 2003).

**Limitation of the Design**

One of the major gaps found in the literature review in chapter two was the lack of random sample and experimental design studies. Unfortunately, this gap exists in this study as well. Due to administrative and practical reasons, doing an experimental design was not possible.

In addition, one important gap discussed in chapter two was the mono-method bias. Many studies use only one tool to measure students’ intercultural sensitivity. Unfortunately, this dissertation had the same gap. It was planned to interview the students immediately after the second administration of the IDI. I already contacted the students but got no responses as this was the last week of the semester and students were busy with the finals. I contacted fourteen students again at the beginning of the second semester but only two responded and the time gap between the time they responded and the second administration of the IDI was about two months, which may affect the quality of the data. Therefore, I had to depend only on the IDI as the major and only way to measure students’ intercultural sensitivity.

In addition, the absence of a comparison or control group is an important limitation of the study. As already discussed, the average IDI score among COLA students decreased after one semester of WL study. However, if the WL student scores had been compared to non-COLA student scores, for example, perhaps the small observed decrease in IDI scores among COLA students would, in fact, represent improvement, i.e. less decrease, in intercultural sensitivity relative to a comparison sample group (i.e. non-COLA students, etc.). The decrease in average IDI scores might have been larger among students from other programs or among students not enrolled in WL classes, had they been compared with WL students. Therefore, perhaps if compared to a control
group of non-WL students, the world language classes might have succeeded in limiting the decrease of their students’ IDI scores.

**Limitation of the Sample**

The sample of this study had a critical limitation that did not allow for answering the second research question, related to the relationship between intercultural sensitivity and the number of language courses students had taken. Although the 71 participants included students from different class standings (30 freshmen, 16 sophomores, 15 juniors, and 10 seniors), only six students took two or more language courses, including the course they took the IDI in. This limited variation in number of world language classes taken did not allow for addressing the second question adequately.

**Limitations of the IDI**

Despite the fact that there are many studies that argue for the validity and reliability of the IDI (for example, Fantin, 2009; Greenholtz, 2003; Hammer, 2014; Hammer, 1999; Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003; Paige et al., 2003; Zhang, 2014), it could be argued that it has some limitations. Those limitations are: 1) conflict of interest, 2) commodification of the IDI and its excessive cost, 3) changing the phases of DMIS on which it is built and mixing critical thinking and the Reversal phase, and 4) mixing the Minimizing phase and Synthetic Universalism.

1) Conflict of Interest

First, when it comes to the statistical analysis and psychometric testing, the vast majority of the studies that argue for the validity of the IDI depend on works by Dr. Mitchell Hammer as a single author (for example: *Additional cross-cultural validity testing of the Intercultural Development Inventory*, 2011) or as a coauthor (for example: *Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory*, 2003). The fact that Dr. Hammer is the owner of the IDI LLC for-profit company which runs the IDI and reaps the financial benefits raises conflict of interest concerns, which is not acknowledged in any of those works. Also of concern is the integrity
and credibility of the statistical analysis and psychometric testing. What increased those doubts is that no one can validate or test the IDI against any other instrument, as one must be licensed to use the IDI. To be licensed, one must attend a seminar to be a Qualified Administrator (QA) of the IDI. The IDI legal agreement states that the QA can use the IDI for “…basic research purposes, excluding any and all use of the IDI® for purposes of validating, testing, or otherwise empirically supporting the development or use of other measures that purport to assess intercultural or cultural competence or sensitivity” (IDI License Agreement, 2013, p. 3). This elevated level of secrecy and the idea that no one can test the IDI or criticize it sheds many doubts about it. Although the IDI is a valid tool the fact that no one can test or doubt the process is cause for concern.

2) Commodification of the IDI and its Excessive Cost

This leads to what is the second limitation of the IDI, which is its commercialization. In addition to the fees one pays to be licensed to use the IDI and to be a “qualifying administrator” to use the tool, there are additional fees that should be paid per student or participant that takes the assessment. In addition, not every institution can afford paying the fees and commodification of the tool may harm the progress of our knowledge of intercultural sensitivity. Indeed “commercial motives may lead to a higher level of secrecy than would otherwise be the case, and thus could slow down the overall advance of science” (Radder, 2010, p. 14). As a scientific community, we cannot build on the IDI and develop it simply because of its excessive secrecy and commodification.

3) Changing the Phases of DMIS and Mixing Critical Thinking and the Reversal Phase

The third limitation is that the IDI is not fully based on Bennett’s DMIS; instead, it is modified from the DMIS. This modification led to two problems, one of which was losing two phases from the DMIS. As Table 11 illustrates, the defense phase in the DMIS is replaced by polarization, while integration is simply removed. The IDI defines polarization as “a judgmental orientation that views cultural differences in terms of ‘us’ and ‘them’” (IDI Personal Report, p. 4). The polarization phase is divided into two different orientations: defense, which is “an uncritical
view toward one’s own cultural values and practices and an overly critical view toward other cultural values and practices,” and reversal, which is “an overly critical orientation toward one’s own cultural values and practices and an uncritical view toward other cultural values and practices” (IDI Personal Report, p. 4). I think the problem with the Polarization orientation is that it does not distinguish between critical thinking and Reversal orientation. The IDI report defines reversal orientation as “an overly critical orientation toward one’s own cultural values and practices and an uncritical view toward other cultural values and practices” (IDI individual report p. 4). Certainly, reversal orientation is viewed as undesired orientation in the IDI as it falls under the ethnocentric stage. However, there is nothing wrong with being critical about one’s own cultural. Critical thinking about one’s life and own culture has been advocated by many philosophers since Plato said his famous quote “the unexamined life is not worth living.”

Table 11. IDI phases vs DMIS phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DMIS</th>
<th>Denial</th>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>Minimization</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Adaptation</th>
<th>Integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDI</td>
<td>Denial</td>
<td><em>Polarization</em></td>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Not tested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those whom IDI may place at reversal phase, which is an undesired orientation, may just excel at critical thinking which is a highly encouraged skill in any sound, free, democratic society. Although this was not tested, I expect those who have a high level of critical thinking might be placed at reversal phase if they take the IDI.

4) Mixing the Minimizing Phase and Synthetic Universalism

The last limitation levied against the IDI is related to the minimization phase. Dougherty et al. (2003) indicates that both DMIS and the IDI do not distinguish between minimizing and synthetic universalism. They state that:
"Minimizing" universalism, as characterized by the DMIS, collapses the other into the self, leading to the experience of one’s own perspective as universal. "Synthetic" universalism, on the other hand, is integrative. It leaves one able to recognize the significance, richness, and uniqueness of other cultures.

They argue that the IDI integrates "synthetic" universalism in the minimization orientation. According to Dougherty et al. (2003), synthetic universalism is one of the goals of a liberal arts education; but integrating it in the minimization phase is “a significant limitation of the IDI with respect to our understanding of the aims of a liberal arts education.”

Despite these limitations, the IDI still has a lot of promise. Although most works that conducted the statistical analysis and psychometric testing have some possible conflicts of interest, all of the articles are published in blind peer-reviewed journals (the International Journal of Intercultural Relations), which may refute those doubts. As for merging critical thinking with defense orientation, there is no study that actually confirms this expectation.

**Limitations of the DMIS**

One critique that applies to both Bennett’s DMIS and Hammer’s IDI is that both ignore the importance and the impact of cultural intersubjectivity. The DMIS and the IDI are built on a premise that an individual’s mindset is driven by his/her objective reality and isolated from the dynamic social context that the individual is interacting with. In social psychology, intersubjective perceptions refer to “shared perceptions of the psychological characteristics that are widespread within a culture” (Chi-Yue et al., 2010, p. 482). According to the cultural intersubjectivity theory, those shared cultural and social perceptions could be what shapes an individual’s mindset and locates them in a certain phase on the DMIS and/or on the IDI, not one’s personal values and beliefs. According to Wan (2012), “it is people’s representations of the culture that is driving the tendencies rather than their personal characteristics” (p. 115). One of the assumptions of the
intersubjective theory is that people tend to act and behave not according to their own beliefs and values, but according to the widely accepted values in their own culture, even if this contradicts one’s own personal values (Chi-Yue et al., 2010; Wan, 2012).

There are several practical implications of the cultural intersubjective theory that could be used to critique Bennett’s DMIS. For example, individuals’ perceptions of their surrounding culture and what they mistakenly think to be common beliefs can change individuals’ behaviors, even if these changes contradict their own values. This phenomenon is known as “pluralistic ignorance,” which is defined as “a psychological state characterized by the belief that one's private attitudes and judgments are different from those of others, even though one's public behavior is identical” (Prentice & Miller 1993, p. 44). Another implication is the “malleability of cultural influence” (Chi-Yue et al., 2010), which means that individuals’ behaviors largely get influenced by contextual, situational contingencies. An example of the malleability of cultural influence is a study conducted in Japan, where researchers found that Japanese subjects preferred to conform with the majority because it was perceived as a cultural norm in Japan. However, this preference of conform to the majority vanished after it was made clear that there were no social consequences for subjects’ actions, (Yamagishi, Hashimoto, & Schug, 2008 cited in Chi-Yue et al., 2010).

Bennett’s DMIS and Hammer’s IDI do not take intersubjective theory and its implications into consideration. An individual who seems to judge cultural differences in Polarization phase could actually pretend that they are in this phase due to pluralistic ignorance or the malleability of cultural influence. In closed societies where ethnocentrism is the norm, individuals could secretly deny ethnocentrism, but choose to behave as if they are ethnocentric in order to conform to perceived social and cultural norms, even if such actions contradict personal beliefs and values. In addition, an individual might be located in a certain phase according to the DMIS, while actually being in a completely different phase if the situational contingencies were to change.
Huebner on the DMIS and IDI

On many occasions, I was asked what Huebner would say about the DMIS and the IDI. First, as for the DMIS, as mentioned in the literature review, Huebner argues that there are four forms of human encounters could happen: Denial, Submission, Domination and Freedom. Those modes of encounters are discussed and defined in chapter two. It could be argued that the first three “forms of encounters” are parallel to Bennett’s Ethnocentrism. While Bennett’s Ethnocentrism means that one is locked in his own reality as the only reality and considers his truth to be the truth, in Huebner’s first three encounters, one ignores the existence of others, and if the person recognizes the existence of those who are different, one tries to either dominate or submit to that other. Huebner’s “encounters of denial, submission and domination may be negatively valued as unhealthy or neurotic meetings, for in them man fails to accept his solitude, or gives it up, and in so doing sacrifices his freedom or that of his fellow man” (Huebner, 1963, p. 76). In addition, the “freedom” in Huebner’s modes of encounters might be parallel Bennett’s ethnorelativism. Freedom as a mode of human encounters, for Huebner, is the ability to converse with the other, to be open to be influenced by the other, which is parallel to ethnorelativism on Bennett’s DMIS. Table 12 summarizes the possible similarity between Bennett’s DMIS and Huebner’s four forms of social encounters. Therefore, it could be argued that Huebner might welcome Bennett’s DMIS as it is so similar to his four forms of the social encounters.

Table 12: Bennett’s DMIS vs Huebner’s four forms of social encounters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Huebner's encounters</th>
<th>Denial</th>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Domination</th>
<th>Freedom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bennett’s DMIS</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>Ethnorelativism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As for the commodification of the IDI, Huebner recognizes in different writings the importance of money in making educational change (For example *Facilitating Change as the Responsibility of the Supervisor*). He even blames the curriculum workers for not thinking about money when they talk about change. He says “the curriculum specialist has failed to give adequate attention to these financial or economic considerations. No curriculum textbook considers the problem of curriculum change from an economic viewpoint” (1966, p. 162). He gave a few suggestions to overcome the financial obstacle of change in his time. He mentions that the wise investment in educational materials can lead to a profound change. As for our time, and dealing with a tool to measure students’ intercultural sensitivity as a curriculum material, it seems that investing time and effort to create a new open-source tool would be a good, wise investment.

**Implications and Recommendation**

This study raises a red flag about what happens on campus and in world language classes. As we are living in a world that has been in a great need for intercultural sensitivity, liberal arts education and world language classes are believed to be the best way to meet that need, as stated in chapter two. However, spending a semester on campus, in a college of liberal arts and taking a world language class does not seem to be so influential in improving students’ intercultural sensitivity. According to the IDI, participants in this study, on average, were at the cusp of the Minimization phase at the beginning of the semester. At the end of the semester, the average score moved down to place them in the Polarization phase. Being at Polarization is so alarming, not to mention it happened after spending a semester in COLA that includes taking a world language class. The IDI defines Polarization as “a judgmental orientation that views cultural differences in terms of “us” and “them”. The danger of the Polarization phase is discussed in detail in chapter two.
Eighteen years ago, Ross Steele wrote “what has been traditionally called culture can no longer be an add-on at the end of the language lesson but has to be reconceptualized within the framework of intercultural communicative sensitivity and integrated into the organizing principle of the curriculum” (Steele, 2000, p. 193). Unfortunately, it seems that what Steele wrote 18 years ago did not change. The results of this study indicate that culture in most cases is still treated as “an add-on at the end of the language lesson.” Attending world language classes does not necessarily mean an automatic improvement in students’ intercultural sensitivity. Those results support a few other studies that raise the same claim, that attending world language classes does not automatically increase intercultural sensitivity (Šenjug, 2008) and the claim “that cultural aspects are not given sufficient attention in world language teaching” (Golub, 2014, p. 78).

Practice Implications

1. Language classes should be designed in a way that target improving intercultural sensitivity. The new paradigm, the intercultural approach, which started in the 1990s, should be activated in curriculum design and in classrooms. In addition, the results of this study support the claim that even if some language teachers may recognize the importance of culture and intercultural sensitivity, they lack the ability of teaching it (Golub, 2014; Languages and Cultures in Europe, 2007). Teachers should receive more in-service and pre-service training on how to shift from the communicative approach to the intercultural approach, to shift from just teaching the four skills to also teaching peace, tolerance and acceptance.

2. As for elementary levels, world language instructors should be encouraged to assign students to do a lot of reflections and comparisons in students’ first language.
3. As mentioned in chapter two, Deardorff (2016) recommends that any study that investigates intercultural sensitivity should be a part of a bigger development plan, which means that the institution in which this study was conducted should use this study to improve its’ students’ intercultural sensitivity. Diversity and inclusive excellence are elements of the University of New Hampshire’s current strategic plan. However, the results of this study raise some doubts about the feasibility of achieving this goal if things stay as they are. The study sheds some light on possible solutions to this problem.

4. Pre-services and in-service training should be provided by professional development training programs where teachers can learn the importance of teaching culture and how to teach it. The same recommendation is stated in Mayer’s (2007) report where the author recommends to “improve initial teacher education to give greater emphasis to intercultural competence and its development” (p. 11). Actually, it could be argued that there is a considerable stress on the importance of teachers’ preparation programs as the “first step” for the development of students’ intercultural sensitivity (Bickley, Rossiter, & Abbott, 2014). Teachers should recognize that teaching culture is a priority and it is possible in the elementary level, even if students will produce reflections on the cultural differences in their first language.

5. Deeper course materials should be designed. The course textbook designers and the teachers should go beyond teaching language as just vocabulary and grammar. In addition, even if the textbook is superficial, teachers should be encouraged to go beyond the textbook. Teachers should be encouraged to realize that adherence to the textbook is a mean, not a goal.

Research Recommendation

1. It might be helpful for educational institutions to know how many language courses are needed in order to make progress in students’ intercultural sensitivity. Investigating the relationship between the number of world language classes a student took and their level of
intercultural sensitivity was one of this project’s aims. However, due to the limited variation in the number of world language classes taken, this aim was not achieved. Hence, such investigation is recommended for future research.

2. Further research is needed to assess pre-services and in-service teachers’ preparation programs to investigate the ability of those programs in terms of being able to produce language teachers who know the importance of teaching culture and how to effectively teach it.

3. There is a burning need to design a new open-access tool that is as valid as the IDI to measure and assess intercultural sensitivity. The cost of the IDI is high and unaffordable in many occasions. The secrecy of the IDI prevents the scientific community of developing a better understanding of intercultural sensitivity.

4. Further research is needed to investigate the possible correlation between the Reversal phase on the IDI, and critical thinking skills as discussed in the IDI limitation section.

5. Chapter two in this dissertation critically reviewed the literature and found a few gaps. Further studies may be needed to fill those gaps. For example, the review of the theoretical literature indicated that in any conversation about intercultural sensitivity, there is a complete absence of scholars and traditions outside of the Western world in this conversation. Further studies may be needed to see what the “other,” who could be in this case Islam, Buddhism or any other different culture thinks about intercultural sensitivity. Furthermore, the review of the empirical studies indicated that there is a need for more experimental studies that focus on the correlation between world language education and intercultural sensitivity.

6. Some instructors in this study indicated that one semester of world language education is not enough to improve students’ intercultural sensitivity. There is no research, to the best of my knowledge, about how much time is needed to achieve this goal. Longitudinal studies that
track the changes of students’ intercultural sensitivity over a period of time would help to address this point.

7. As the level of adherence to the textbook and participating in co-curricular activities proved to have an effect on students’ intercultural sensitivity, future studies could be designed to explore the correlation between how closely teachers adhere to textbooks and their students’ level of intercultural sensitivity.

8. Further studies, preferably experimental, are needed to investigate the impact of reflections, in students’ first language, on the improvement of students’ intercultural sensitivity.
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CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION IN A RESEARCH STUDY

RESEARCHER AND TITLE OF STUDY
My name is Islam Karkour and I am a graduate student in Education at the University of New Hampshire. This study is entitled “Intercultural Sensitivity and Foreign language Education.”

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY?
The purpose of this study is to investigate students’ level of intercultural sensitivity and if there is a relationship between intercultural sensitivity and foreign language education. The expected number of participants is between 80 to 100 students and four professors from four language classes.

WHAT DOES YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY INVOLVE?
As you are a professor, you will have an interview at the end of the semester asking about your perceptions of the intercultural sensitivity in UNH foreign language classes. The interview will take about 30 minutes and will be recorded on the researcher’s laptop and will be deleted after the research is complete.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS OF PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY?
Participation in this study is expected to present minimal risk to you.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE BENEFITS OF PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY?
While there is no likely direct benefit to you from participating in the interview, the UNH language department will benefit from knowing how the language classes are doing in developing intercultural sensitivity as it has been recognized one of the expected outcomes of studying foreign languages.

WILL YOU RECEIVE ANY COMPENSATION FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY?
There is no compensation for participating in this study.

DO YOU HAVE TO TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?
Your consent to participate in this research is entirely voluntary. If you refuse to participate, you will not experience any penalty or negative consequences.

CAN YOU WITHDRAW FROM THIS STUDY?
If you consent to participate in this study, you may refuse to answer any question and/or stop your participation in the study at any time without any penalty or negative consequences.

HOW WILL THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF YOUR RECORDS BE PROTECTED?

I seek to maintain the confidentiality of all data and records associated with your participation in this research.

There are, however, rare instances when I am required to share personally-identifiable information (e.g., according to policy, contract, regulation). For example, in response to a complaint about the research, officials at the University of New Hampshire and/or regulatory and oversight government agencies may access research data.

In addition, the Languages, Literature, and Cultures (LLC) department will have an access to the overall results of the IDI of the whole groups, not the individual result of each person.

To help protect the confidentiality of your information pseudonyms for all participants will be used. Data are stored on the researcher’s computer that is secured and password protected and on Box, which is encrypted and backed-up.

Only my dissertation advisor, my assistant and I will have access to the data. The data will be used in publications and presented at local and national conferences. At the end of the study, all audio files of the interviews will be deleted.

WHOM TO CONTACT IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS STUDY

If you have any questions pertaining to the research you can contact me, Islam Karkour, at islam.karkour@unh.edu to discuss them; you may also contact my project advisor Dr.Paula Salvio at pmsalvio@gmail.com

If you have questions about your rights as a research subject you can contact Dr. Julie Simpson in UNH Research Integrity Services, 603-862-2003 or Julie.simpson@unh.edu to discuss them.

I, ________________________________ CONSENT/AGREE to participate in this research study

_________________________________ ________________________________
Signature of Subject Date
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CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION IN A RESEARCH STUDY

RESEARCHER AND TITLE OF STUDY

My name is Islam Karkour and I am a graduate student in Education at the University of New Hampshire. This study is entitled “Intercultural Sensitivity and Foreign language Education.”

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY?

The purpose of this study is to investigate students’ level of intercultural sensitivity and if there is a relationship between intercultural sensitivity and foreign language education. The expected number of participants is between 80 to 100 students and five professors from five language classes.

WHAT DOES YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY INVOLVE?

All of the participants need to be at least 18 years of age to participate in the study. Participants will take Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) twice. Once at the beginning and once at the end of the semester. IDI is a widely recognized online instrument designed to assess intercultural sensitivity. IDI is famous for having a high level of credibility and validity in academic research. The IDI is a 50-item questionnaire and expected to take approximately 15-30 minutes to complete. The researcher will take your email to generate a username and password and send them to you via email with the login link and instructions. At the end of the semester and shortly after the second administration of the IDI, some students will be contacted to be interviewed by the researcher. The interview may take about 30 minutes to discuss the students’ perception of the intercultural sensitivity. The interviews will be recorded and saved on the researcher's laptop.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS OF PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY?

Participation in this study is expected to present minimal risk to you.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE BENEFITS OF PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY?

Students may benefit from the opportunity to engage in self-reflection and conversation in the interview process. Students will be aware of their level of intercultural sensitivity as defined and measured by the IDI. In addition, IDI automatically generate a personal development plan students can use if they are interested in developing their intercultural sensitively.

WILL YOU RECEIVE ANY COMPENSATION FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY?

There is no compensation for participating in this study.
DO YOU HAVE TO TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

Your consent to participate in this research is entirely voluntary. If you refuse to participate, you will not experience any penalty or negative consequences. Participation will not affect a student’s grade in the class.

CAN YOU WITHDRAW FROM THIS STUDY?

If you consent to participate in this study, you may refuse to answer any question and/or stop your participation in the study at any time without any penalty or negative consequences.

HOW WILL THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF YOUR RECORDS BE PROTECTED?

I seek to maintain the confidentiality of all data and records associated with your participation in this research.

There are, however, rare instances when I am required to share personally-identifiable information (e.g., according to policy, contract, regulation). For example, in response to a complaint about the research, officials at the University of New Hampshire and/or regulatory and oversight government agencies may access research data.

In addition, the Languages, Literature, and Cultures (LLC) department will have an access to the overall results of the IDI of the whole groups, not the individual result of each person.

Further, any communication via the Internet poses minimal risk of a breach of confidentiality.

To help protect the confidentiality of your information pseudonyms for all participants will be used. Data are stored on the researcher’s computer that is secured and password protected and on Box, which is encrypted and backed-up.

Only my dissertation advisor, my assistant and I will have access to the data. The data will be used in publications and presented at local and national conferences. At the end of the study, all audio files of the interviews will be deleted. The data from the IDI will still be saved on the IDI website.

WHOM TO CONTACT IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS STUDY

If you have any questions pertaining to the research you can contact me, Islam Karkour, at islam.karkour@unh.edu to discuss them; you may also contact my project adviser Dr. Paula Salvio at pmsalvio@gmail.com.

If you have questions about your rights as a research subject you can contact Dr. Julie Simpson in UNH Research Integrity Services, 603-862-2003 or julie.simpson@unh.edu to discuss them.
I, ________________ CONSENT/AGREE to participate in this research study

__________________________________________  ________________________
Signature of Subject                        Date