University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

2015-5

The Development of Intercultural Maturity in Second Year College Students

Nicole A. Schuessler
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>

Digital USD Citation

Schuessler, Nicole A., "The Development of Intercultural Maturity in Second Year College Students" (2015). *Dissertations*. 6.
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/6>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERCULTURAL MATURITY IN SECOND YEAR
COLLEGE STUDENTS**

by

NICOLE A. SCHUESSLER

School of Leadership and Education Sciences

University of San Diego

May 2015

Dissertation Committee

Cheryl Getz, Ed.D.
Noriyuki Inoue, Ph.D.
Christopher Newman, Ph.D.

© Copyright by Nicole A. Schuessler

All Rights Reserved 2015

ABSTRACT

Globalization and the development of cultural competence have become increasingly important in our pluralistic society. The ability to effectively interact with, understand, and make meaning of our experiences in a global setting is a critical learning outcome in order to address the complex issues of society. Higher education associations have deemed intercultural competence as an important outcome for graduates and international education is often a key strategy to realizing this goal. Increasingly over the past ten years, the second-year of college stands out as being developmentally significant by higher education scholars and practitioners. As second-year students experience and question the complexity of the self and the world as they progress into adulthood, institutions of higher education have a responsibility to support and facilitate this process.

The purpose of this mixed-methods, quasi-experimental study was to investigate the development of intercultural maturity in second year college students -- both those who complete a short-term study abroad experience and those who remain on campus. Pre-test, post-test, and three-month follow-up post-test data were collected using the *Global Perspective Inventory (GPI)*. Using descriptive and inferential statistics, this study compared the changes in cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal development of the participants. The results demonstrated a statistically significant growth in intercultural maturity directly after the three-week study abroad program for the study abroad students. However, the three-month follow-up survey showed that students who studied abroad had the same mean score for intercultural maturity as the control group by the end of their second year in college. This research also examined which social

identities, campus involvement, and behaviors in college may be correlated to the development of intercultural maturity. Ethnicity, socio-economic status, parental education, and faculty-related engagement showed some level of significance, however, these factors were independent from the short-term study abroad program for second-year college students.

The results of this study contribute to the existing literature surrounding the development of cultural competence, the growing knowledge of second-year college student development, and short-term study abroad programs. This research also provides universities with an improved understanding of curricular and co-curricular efforts that aid in the development of intercultural maturity.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to the higher education professionals whose vocation has been to serve college students. We embark on this journey together to create a more just and compassionate global society.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I extend my sincerest gratitude to the many people who have supported me academically, professionally, and personally throughout my doctoral program. This journey has had many highs and lows and I have been very fortunate to have the love and support of my family, friends, and colleagues.

First, I would like to thank my dissertation committee. In addition to serving as my dissertation chair, Dr. Cheryl Getz has also served as my advisor throughout the program. Cheryl, your guidance and support has been unwavering. You helped steady me through the ups and downs and kept me on the path. I look forward to our continued work together. Many thanks to Dr. Nori Inoue and Dr. Christopher Newman for encouraging me intellectually particularly throughout the statistical analyses and reminding me “not to throw in the kitchen sink” when my curiosity about my research got ahead of me.

I am also grateful to many other members of the SOLES community who have influenced me throughout the program. Dr. Zachary Green and Dr. Terri Monroe – you have both had a profound impact on the person I am today and how I bring my True Self to this world. Dr. Fred Galloway – your sincere interest in my success truly helped me at several points when I was not sure where this research would lead. Dr. Robin McCoy, my fellow HKC, served as my statistical coach and provided me the motivation to keep going throughout the entire analyses of this dissertation. Robin – I could not have made it without you as my statistics sounding board. Dr. Paige Haber-Curran – thank you for being my dear friend and my go-to person for all advice throughout the entire Ph.D.

program. Dr. Karen Briggs – you have been my rock throughout the past five years.

Your friendship has been the greatest unexpected gift of this program.

I would not be where I am today without the love and support of my family.

Mum – thank you so much for always supporting me throughout every endeavor in my life. You love me throughout every wonderful high and the brunt of every low. Your excitement, patience, and encouragement kept me going when I needed it the most. As a first-generation college student, my father always encouraged me to continue with my education and always believed that I could accomplish this goal. This Ph.D. degree is for you Papa.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Purpose of the Study	6
Research Questions	7
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	8
College Student Development	9
Psychosocial College Student Development.....	10
Chickering's Theory of College Student Development.....	12
The Second Year of College for Students.....	16
Early research on the sophomore year.....	16
Sophomore slump.....	18
Chickering's theory and the second year of college.....	20
Achieving competence.....	20
Developing autonomy.....	21
Establishing identity.	22
Developing purpose.	22
Schaller's theory on the second year of college.	23
Random exploration.....	23

Focused exploration.....	24
Tentative choices.....	25
Commitment.....	25
Academics, social relationships and extracurricular activities.....	26
Intercultural Competence and Intercultural Maturity	30
Study Abroad	36
Length of Term Abroad.....	39
Short-term Study Abroad	44
Global Perspective Inventory Research.....	48
Conclusion	50
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	52
Research Design.....	52
Research Site and Participant Selection.....	53
Data Collection Procedures.....	55
Instrument.....	56
Cognitive	56
Intrapersonal.....	57
Interpersonal.....	57
Data Analysis Procedures	60
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS.....	62
Sample Demographics	63
Research Question One.....	68

Does Intercultural Maturity Develop by Participating in a three-week Study Abroad program?.....	68
Research Question Two	70
Does Intercultural Maturity Develop in second year college students who do not participate in a three-week study abroad program?	70
Research Question Three	71
How do SYE Abroad students compare to the control group?	71
Research Question Four	72
How Do Social Identities, Campus Involvement, and Behaviors in College Predict Changes in Intercultural Maturity?	72
Qualitative Responses	101
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION.....	111
Summary of Findings.....	112
Discussion of Findings.....	115
Second Year Study Abroad	115
Short-term Study Abroad	117
Educational Interventions While Abroad.....	120
Who Studies Abroad	121
Implications for Future Research and Practice	124
Limitations and Significance of the Study.....	127
Limitations	127
Significance.....	129

Conclusion	130
References.....	131
Appendix A: Global Perspective Inventory	143
Appendix B: Supplemental Questions.....	148
Appendix C: Email to Participants	150

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: A three-dimensional developmental trajectory of intercultural maturity	35
Table 2: Coefficient alpha reliabilities of the GPI scales	59
Table 3: Sample demographics	64
Table 4: Race/ethnicity demographics.....	65
Table 5: Comparison of SYE Abroad and SYE samples.....	67
Table 6: Number of respondents to GPI	68
Table 7: Descriptive statistics and paired samples <i>t</i> -tests: Intercultural maturity SYE Abroad.....	69
Table 8: Descriptive statistics and paired samples <i>t</i> -test: Cognitive, Intrapersonal, Interpersonal SYE Abroad.....	69
Table 9: Descriptive statistics and paired samples <i>t</i> -test: Intercultural maturity SYE	71
Table 10: Descriptive statistics and independent samples test: Intercultural maturity by group	72
Table 11: Descriptive statistics and paired samples test: Intercultural maturity	72
Table 12: Analysis of variance of demographics for SYE Abroad participants.....	74
Table 13: Analysis of variance of demographics for SYE participants.....	77
Table 14: Descriptive statistics for SYE Abroad and SYE students by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables.....	79
Table 15: Mixed-design ANOVA of tests within-subjects effects for SYE Abroad and SYE students by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables	79
Table 16: Mixed-design ANOVA of tests between-subjects effects for SYE Abroad and SYE students by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables	80
Table 17: Descriptive statistics for SYE Abroad students and gender by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables.....	81
Table 18: Mixed-design ANOVA of tests within-subjects effects for SYE Abroad students and gender by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables	81
Table 19: Mixed-design ANOVA of tests between-subjects effects for SYE Abroad students and gender by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables	82

Table 20: Descriptive statistics for SYE Abroad students and ethnicity by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables.....	83
Table 21: Mixed-design ANOVA of tests within-subjects effects for SYE Abroad students and ethnicity by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables...	83
Table 22: Mixed-design ANOVA of tests of between-subjects effects for SYE Abroad students and ethnicity by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables...	84
Table 23: Descriptive statistics for SYE Abroad students and socio-economic status by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables.....	85
Table 24: Mixed-design ANOVA of tests within-subjects effects for SYE Abroad students and socio-economic status by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables	85
Table 25: Mixed-design ANOVA of tests between-subjects effects for SYE Abroad students and socio-economic status by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables	86
Table 26: Descriptive statistics for SYE Abroad students and parental education by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables.....	87
Table 27: Mixed-design ANOVA of tests within-subjects effects for SYE Abroad students and parental education by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables	87
Table 28: Mixed-design ANOVA of tests between-subjects effects for SYE Abroad students and parental education by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables	88
Table 29: Descriptive statistics for SYE students and gender by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables	89
Table 30: Mixed-design ANOVA of tests within-subjects effects for SYE students and gender by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables.....	89
Table 31: Mixed-design ANOVA of tests between-subjects effects for SYE students and gender by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables.....	90

Table 32: Descriptive statistics for SYE students and ethnicity by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables.....	91
Table 33: Mixed-design ANOVA of tests within-subjects effects for SYE students and ethnicity by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables.....	91
Table 34: Mixed-design ANOVA of tests between-subjects effects for SYE students and ethnicity by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables.....	92
Table 35: Descriptive statistics for SYE students and socio-economic status by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables.....	93
Table 36: Mixed-design ANOVA of tests within-subjects effects for SYE students and socio-economic status by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables ..	93
Table 37: Mixed-design ANOVA of tests between-subjects effects for SYE students and socio-economic status by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables ..	94
Table 38: Descriptive statistics for SYE students and parental education by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables.....	95
Table 39: Mixed-design ANOVA of tests within-subjects effects for SYE students and parental education by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables	95
Table 40: Mixed-design ANOVA of tests between-subjects effects for SYE students and parental education by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables	96
Table 41: Analysis of variance for faculty-related engagement and intercultural maturity	98
Table 42: Model summary for faculty-related engagement and intercultural maturity....	98
Table 43: Model summary for faculty-related engagement and intercultural maturity between SYE Abroad and SYE groups	98
Table 44: Analysis of variance for cultural-related engagement and intercultural maturity	100
Table 45: Model summary for cultural-related engagement and intercultural maturity.	100
Table 46: Model summary for cultural-related engagement and intercultural maturity between SYE Abroad and SYE groups	101
Table 47: Sample demographics.....	102

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Globalization and the development of cultural competence have become increasingly important in our pluralistic society. The world is becoming more diverse, which has implications for trade and economic security, cross-cultural communication, and greater understanding of intercultural differences. The advancement of information technology transformed the world in business and industry, politics, and education. In a sense, the world has become smaller and the need to understand intercultural differences is greater.

The United States (U.S.), like many countries across the world has seen significant changes in the demographics of the population. As a nation, the U.S. is projected to become a majority-minority nation in 2043 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). The Caucasian or non-Hispanic White population will remain the largest single racial group, but it will no longer make up the majority of U.S. population and no group will make up a majority. Based on the 2010 Census, the Hispanic population is projected to more than double by 2060 with one in three U.S. residents being Hispanic. Similarly, the Asian population is also expected to more than double to 8.2 percent while the Black population will comprise 14.7 percent of the U.S. population. Those who identify as being of two or more races are projected to more than triple from 7.5 million to 26.7 million in 2060 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). With the changing demographics within the United States and the world, the impetus for a greater understanding of difference is relevant and timely.

One of the obvious places where such learning can occur is the university

environment. Developing intercultural competence among college students is particularly important because college students will enter a more diverse workforce and global society and will need highly developed skills and understanding of difference to be successful and contribute to complex national and international issues. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) has deemed intercultural competence as a key outcome and priority for institutions of higher education (2006). More specifically, AAC&U's *Greater Expectations* project determined global knowledge, ethical commitments to individual and social responsibility, and intercultural skills as key components for graduates who will work and live in a highly pluralistic world (2002). In addition, an increasing number of colleges and universities have included global learning in their institutions' mission statement. There is a general consensus among institutions of higher education that intercultural competence is an important learning outcome. However, this has also been an area where some institutions have fallen short and a gap exists (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2006). Derek Bok (2006) concludes that students receive "very little preparation either as citizens or as professionals for the international challenges that are likely to confront them" (2006, p. 233). Thus college graduates may leave our institutions unprepared to handle complex global issues.

The ability to effectively interact with, understand, and make meaning of our experiences in a global setting is critical in order to address the complex issues of society (Obst, Bhandari, & Witherell, 2007). In an increasingly pluralistic and interconnected world, we need to ask how people develop their minds, sense of self, and relationships with others with a global consciousness. Kegan's (1982, 1994) work on human

development introduced the theory that humans grow or develop in three domains: cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal. Based on Kegan's work, King and Baxter Magolda (2005) characterized the social-cultural development of college students that encompasses a global perspective as *intercultural maturity*. More specifically, they define *intercultural maturity* as “multi-dimensional and consisting of a range of attributes, including understanding (the cognitive dimension), sensitivity to others (the interpersonal dimension), and a sense of oneself that enables one to listen to and learn from others (the intrapersonal dimension)” (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005, p. 574).

Promoting human development among college students is a central focus for higher education professionals. And for the purposes of this study, *student development* is defined as “the ways that students progress or increase their developmental capabilities as a result of being enrolled in an institution of higher education” (Rodgers, 1990, p. 27). The two primary associations for student affairs professionals, NASPA and ACPA, also include intercultural competence as a key outcome in student learning and development. Traditional-aged college students are developmentally at a place where their values and beliefs are being formed and they are making decisions about how they want to be in the world.

Increasingly over the past ten years, the second year of college stands out as being developmentally significant by higher education scholars and practitioners. The sophomore year of college is understood to be a time when second-year students “struggle to establish themselves as individuals, find their passions and develop a personal worldview, determine what they want to get out of college, and establish short and long-term goals” (Tobolowsky & Serven, 2007, p. ix). Consequently, it seems clear

that the sophomore year, what is commonly called the second year experience (SYE), is an important developmental time to impact students' level of global and cultural understanding.

Higher education professionals recognize second year students have unique needs currently not being served. Sophomores feel “between” in all collegiate levels both concretely and abstractly (Biovin, Fountain & Baylis, 2000, p. 2) as they have transitioned into their institution and are no longer naïve about what college life entails yet they are not yet fully integrated into their major classes and many have not yet selected a career path, which may lead to dissatisfaction or disengagement (Biovin et al., 2000; Lemons & Richmond, 1987). Feelings of disillusionment may also arise as sophomore students' work through their personal identity from adolescence to adulthood (Biovin et al., 2000; Lemons & Richmond, 1987).

One way to begin to understand intercultural maturity in the second year of college is to research which programs impact the cognitive, interpersonal, and intrapersonal development of second year students. Since 2000, just two monographs (Schreiner & Pattengale, 2000; Tobolowsky & Cox, 2007) and one book (Hunter, Tobolowsky & Gardner, 2010) have examined the issues surrounding the sophomore year and institutional programs to support sophomores. While these publications offer some initial theories on second-year student developmental needs, the research has been limited to single campus studies and one large-scale survey.

Despite the increasing interest in SYE, many of the programmatic efforts that institutions have implemented have not been evaluated to measure their effectiveness to student developmental needs. Most of the publications only offer theoretical ideas to

enhance university services rather than comprehensive programs with proven results. Other than portions of the three earlier noted publications, there is virtually no empirical research about second-year students and the effectiveness of programs to serve them has not been established. One way to begin to understand second year students is to study the connection between second-year experience programs and the development of intercultural maturity. This union could be helpful to establish more intentional and effective programmatic efforts to better serve second-year students.

Statement of the Problem

We are currently at a time when numerous institutions across the nation are trying to improve the preparation of their graduates for a more diverse and global society (American Council on Education, 2002; Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2004, 2006). Institutions are looking to enhance their programmatic efforts to meet the learning outcomes of their universities. Often times, study abroad (both long and short-term experiences) is viewed as an important experiential learning program for students, particularly for the development of intercultural competence. Much of the research on study abroad has focused on long-term (semester or year-long) experiences. However, the field lacks substantial empirical research on the growing popularity of short-term study abroad programs. In addition, much attention has been devoted to researching the developmental needs in the first year and senior year of college, however, little attention has been given to the second year and third year of college students (Biovin et al., 2000; Gardner et al., 2010; National Resource Center, n.d., Tobolowsky & Cox, 2007).

As second-year students experience and question the complexity of the self and the world as they progress into adulthood, institutions of higher education have a responsibility to support and facilitate this process. With greater understanding of how students develop their intercultural maturity, university faculty, administrators, and students benefit from the knowledge gained in further research. Institutions cannot expect to have one program meet the needs of all students. Further research may uncover the need for new and different approaches to student learning and the development of intercultural maturity that may be influenced by year in school, various social identities, campus involvement, and behaviors in college (e.g., race, gender, socio-economic status, major, co-curricular involvement).

While many institutions are seeking to improve their current SYE programs, many colleges are still in early discussions of trying to develop initial SYE programs (Schreiner & Pattengale, 2000; Tobolowsky & Cox, 2007). With little empirical data on second year college student development, SYE programming, and short-term study abroad many institutions are left with few resources or proven results. Therefore, there is a need to further study the programmatic efforts involving the development of intercultural maturity of second year college students.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the development of intercultural maturity in second year college students—both those who complete a short-term study abroad experience called SYE (second year experience) Abroad and those who remain on campus. This study compared the gains or losses in growth of intercultural maturity of

the second year college student participants. This research also examined what factors may be correlated to the growth of intercultural maturity.

One of the principle goals of the SYE Abroad program is to engage in international education and promote global citizenship. Therefore, it is important to know if there are changes in students' intercultural maturity after they participate in SYE Abroad. If there is growth among those who do not participate in the program, what other factors (e.g., race, gender, socio-economic status, major, co-curricular involvement) help contribute to the growth of intercultural maturity in second year students. This information is critical in order to further promote the students' development and in particular, students' intercultural maturity.

Research Questions

The primary research questions for this study were as follows:

- To what extent does a three-week study abroad program cause the development of intercultural maturity of second year college students?
- To what extent does intercultural maturity develop in second year college students who do not participate in a three-week study abroad program?
- To what extent does the intercultural maturity of the study abroad students compare to those students who remained on campus?
- To what extent do social identities, campus involvement, and behaviors in college predict changes in cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal development?

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Colleges and universities have been called upon to promote international and cross-cultural knowledge and understanding (American Council on Education, 2002; Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2006). With this increased emphasis on internationalization in higher education, study abroad programs have been determined to be one way for students to gain knowledge and understanding of other cultures and provide a global education (Henthorne, Miller & Hudson, 2001; Kehl & Morris 2007). Study abroad participation has increased 43 percent since 2001-2002 and there has been a particular growth in short-term study abroad experiences (Institute of International Education, 2013). Much attention and research has been dedicated to investigating long-term study abroad; however, there is little accompanying research on the outcomes of the development of intercultural maturity in short-term study abroad programs.

The focus on globalization is couched within one of the overarching goals of higher education professionals-- to develop the *whole student* in order for students to reach their full potential and contribute to the betterment of society (American Council on Education, 1994). This goal is challenging in part due to a significant gap in the literature for each distinct developmental year in college. While there has been much research focused on the first year and senior year of college, there is currently a lack of empirical data that supports ways to effectively engage second year college students at a time when they may feel disillusioned about their college experience (Biovin et al., 2000; Lemons & Richmond, 1987). Colleges and universities cannot fulfill the aspirations of developing globally-minded leaders without supporting research and scholarship. Thus,

the purpose of this study is to contribute to the literature surrounding the development of intercultural maturity in second year college students.

In this chapter, I review the three areas of literature that guide this study and provide a context for exploring the relationship between the development of intercultural maturity in second year college students and short-term study abroad experiences. First, I examine the historical and current literature on college student development with a focus on the emerging literature on the second year of college. Next, I review the terminology associated with intercultural development and the literature related to intercultural maturity. In the final section of this chapter, I explore the research connected with the development of intercultural competence and study abroad experiences with a focus on short-term abroad programs.

College Student Development

Since the establishment of the first institution of higher education in the United States of America, Harvard University in 1636, scholars and practitioners have progressed in their understanding of college student development (Komives & Woodard, 1996). Human development during college is a complex and multidimensional progression from adolescence to young adulthood (Astin, 1993; Feldman & Newcomb, 1969; Evans, Forney, Guido, Patton & Renn, 2010; Komives & Woodard, 1996). For young people, this maturation process involves the development of self-identity, as well as cognitive and social development (Astin, 1993; Feldman & Newcomb, 1969; Evans et al., 2010; Komives & Woodard, 1996).

As noted in the first chapter for the purposes of this study, *student development* is defined as “the ways that students progress or increase their developmental capabilities as

a result of being enrolled in an institution of higher education” (Rodgers, 1990, p. 27).

The literature on student development has been grouped into several categories that include: psychosocial theory, cognitive-structural theory, typology theory and person-environment theory (Evans et al., 2010). Psychosocial development, most generally influenced by the work of Erikson (1959/1980), consists of sequential stages of development when biological maturation intersects with psychological development to change one’s thinking, feeling, behaving in relation to self and others. As students progress into young adulthood while in a new environment such as on a college campus or in a new culture, they will most likely be placed in new situations or with different people from themselves. Such opportunities provide students with instances to question or contemplate their own values or identities and how they interact with others. The negotiation with and between self and others is a critical aspect of psychosocial development (Erikson, 1959/1980; Kegan, 1994). For this study, attention will be given to the psychosocial development of second year college students as it closely aligns with the development of intercultural maturity.

Psychosocial College Student Development

Psychosocial theory examines the intrapersonal and interpersonal lives of individuals. Theorists note human development occurs over a lifespan and that thinking, feeling, behaving, and relating to oneself and others guides this development (Astin, 1993; Feldman & Newcomb, 1969; Evans et al., 2010; Kegan, 1994; Komives & Woodard, 1996). This area of study examines the content of development and the psychosocial issues people face at different points in their lifespan. How people define themselves, how they relate and their relationships with others, and what to do with their

lives are all such examples of these developmental tasks. These tasks are particularly poignant developmental areas for college students as they are beginning to more fully define themselves. Relative to college student development, psychosocial development theory has significantly broadened into multiple, more specific, identity models for example: women's identity development, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender (LGBT) identity, African-American identity, and other ethnic identity models (Forness, Guido, Patton & Renn, 2010; Komives & Woodard, 1996). Due to the limited amount of research on the second year of college, I narrow my focus to the overall college student identity development models and the work of Chickering (1969) and later Chickering and Reisser (1993).

In 1969, psychosocial theorist Chickering provided one of the first comprehensive models of college student development in his book *Education and Identity*. His original research spanned from 1959 to 1965. During this period of time, the majority of college students were white men; therefore his original work often times has limited applicability given the diversity of the current student population in higher education. Chickering and Reisser later addressed some of these concerns in the revised model in 1993.

In the second edition of the book, Chickering and Reisser incorporated new findings on gender, race, national origin as well as adult learners (1993). This version also addressed a greater range of options in the types of institutions (public/private, large/small, religious/secular) students may attend. The authors also cited the work of other scholars who described changes in societal conditions (1993). However, despite these revisions, many critics argue that Chickering and Reisser's model is too broad and does not address the complexities of specific student populations such as women,

students of color, and gay/lesbian/bisexual/transgender students (Evans et al., 2010). Nonetheless, Chickering's theory has served as a foundation for many college student identity development models that expand upon specific student population of interest (Astin, 1993; Feldman & Newcomb, 1969; Evans et al., 2010; Komives & Woodard, 1996).

Chickering's theory is empirically grounded and provides a comprehensive description of the psychosocial developmental tasks facing college students (1969, 1993). Overall, it has gained wide acceptance in the field due to its generalizability to the college student population. The theory has also been seen as effective in the development of programs at institutions of higher education (Evans et al., 2010). Given its influence and applicability to this research, I have selected Chickering's theory as the lens through which I review college student development and the second year experience.

Chickering's Theory of College Student Development

Chickering's theory of identity development consists of seven vectors that comprise the life journey toward individualization (Chickering, 1969; Chickering & Reisser, 1993). He theorized that a vector best describes the direction and magnitude of development. Students move through the vectors at different rates and the vectors may interact with each other. This process is not necessarily always sequential, although there is a level of complexity in which they build upon one another. However, as new situations or challenges arise for students, they may readdress vectors they had previously worked through, given the need to attend to new circumstances.

The first vector Chickering and Reisser discuss (1993) is *developing competence*. The authors liken this vector to a three-tined pitchfork. Developing a sense of

competence is considered the handle of the pitchfork and the three tines include intellectual competence (i.e. acquiring knowledge, critical thinking), physical and manual competence (i.e. wellness, recreation, the arts), and interpersonal competence (i.e. communication, working with others). One should be able to reasonably cope with situations and achieve goals within these three areas of competence while developing in this vector. *Developing competence* is one of the four vectors that have been theorized to closely relate to the developmental challenges of the sophomore year (Biovin et al., 2000; Lemons & Richmond, 1987; Schaller, 2005).

Managing emotions, the second vector in Chickering's theory, is the ability to recognize and accept emotions (1969, 1993). This vector also includes the developmental capacity to appropriately express emotions in a responsible manner. This includes such emotions as anxiety, anger, and shame as well as caring and inspiration.

The developmental aspect of the third vector, *moving through autonomy toward interdependence*, involves increased emotional independence. Students have less need for continuous reassurance, affection, and approval from others (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). There is also a progression toward self-direction and greater problem-solving skills. This vector had been expanded from *developing autonomy* in the original theory by including greater emphasis on interdependence and an awareness of interconnectedness (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). Students better understand themselves as independent individuals who choose to connect with others. For sophomores in college, this is a significant developmental vector in recognizing a potentially different relationship with family members as they move toward independence yet may still rely

on family for emotional and financial support (Biovin, et al., 2000; Kennedy & Upcraft, 2010; Lemons & Richmond, 1987).

Chickering and Reisser (1993) also theorized that *developing mature interpersonal relationships* was an important task for young adults to establish. This fourth vector is most concerned with intercultural awareness and appreciation of differences as well as commonalities. Developing healthy and lasting intimate relationships with partners, close friends, and family is also associated with this phase. Vectors five and six of Chickering and Reisser's model have been used as the theoretical framework for much research on the developmental challenges that sophomores in college face (Biovin et al., 2000; Lemons & Richmond, 1987).

Establishing identity is a key vector in Chickering's (1969) college student identity development theory. This fifth vector builds upon each of the preceding vectors as students are developing a more clear sense of self-concept, comfort with self, self-acceptance, and an overall integration of self. This self-identification in the revised theory includes an acknowledgement of differences in gender, ethnicity, and sexual orientation. *Establishing identity* encompasses a secure integration of all aspects of people in their environment. Second year college students particularly struggle with establishing their identities and working to have congruent relationships with their values and identities. Friendships with peers become more important and second year students tend to want to separate further from parental influence. Feelings of confusion about who they are and their future and assuming responsibility for self and making their own decisions often feels overwhelming in the second year college (Biovin et al., 2000; Lemons & Richmond, 1987; Pattengale, 2000). The model has flexibility in its

understanding that the direction and magnitude of a vector differs by individuals.

Chickering and Reisser (1993) understood that people might revisit vectors again later in life and/or develop aspects of their identity earlier in life.

The sixth vector, *developing purpose*, focuses on students developing clear vocational goals, meaningful commitments to their personal interests as well as interpersonal commitments. Second year students may not have solidified a college major and feel pressure to progress with decisions about their future. For those who have selected majors, they are not necessarily taking classes within their major so they may have feelings of frustration regarding their academics (Biovin et al., 2000; Lemons & Richmond, 1987; Pattengale, 2000). Some second year college students have noted they do not get as much attention as in their first year of college and are not yet afforded the opportunities for leadership that may come in the junior and senior year of college (Pattengale, 2000). Chickering (1969) wrote “many young adults are all dressed up and don’t know where to go; they have energy but no destination (p. 15).” This quote is often cited in the literature to help summarize feelings of the second year of college (Biovin et al., 2000; Gohn, Swartz & Donnelly, 2001; Lemons & Richard, 1987; Vuong, Brown-Welty & Tracz, 2010). *Developing purpose* involves intentionality with making and staying with lifestyle decisions and goals, even if others may oppose those decisions and goals (Chickering & Reisser, 1993).

Developing integrity is the seventh and final vector in Chickering and Reisser’s theory (1993). Students at this level are focused on moving from a more rigid value perspective to one that is more *humanized* and includes a balance of their values along with the interests of others. Students establish and affirm their personal core values while

also understanding and accepting that these core values may differ from the values of others. The last aspect of development that occurs in this vector is congruence. Students identify with their values and take steps or actions that are congruent with those beliefs with authenticity and a balance to self and society.

The Second Year of College for Students

As students enter college, they are faced with a number of transitional issues. Typically, traditional-aged first-year students who are acclimating to a university campus culture encounter self-management issues if they live in campus residence halls and are adjusting to a higher level of academic responsibility (Biovin et al., 2000; Gardner et al., 2010; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Extensive research has been conducted and published on the first-year of college therefore the transitional issues of first-year students are anticipated by students, families, society, and the university (Biovin et al., 2000; Gardner et al., 2010). Typically, sophomores are expected to have successfully made these transitions and adjustments (Biovin et al., 2000). However, research on students in their second year of college indicates this assumption to be false. Second year college students often feel *invisible* on their campuses (Schreiner, & Pattengale, 2000). This year in college is plagued with struggles of students searching for their identity in their social and academic lives as well as finding their personal identities (Margolis, 1976; Lemons & Richard, 1987).

Early research on the sophomore year. Freedman (1956) was the first to divide college student development tasks into class years. He found that as women entered their sophomore year, many of their basic transitions to college had been reduced and there was a general adjustment into student culture. During the transition from first to second

year, the majority of the women in the study had less interest in men and other external social pressures; rather they wanted to instead associate most with their fellow female students.

Freedman (1956) also concluded that academic deficiencies that may have been present when the women entered college had leveled out. Student academic success was more a function of their intrinsic ability and motivation rather than actual skill competence. Freedman also found that by their sophomore year, students had declared their major and had made a true commitment to their field of study. He declared that sophomores are “industrious and enthusiastic about academic work” (p. 22). Freedman wrote, “Evidences of what has been called ‘sophomore slump’ are rare. Rather it appears that the inertia or disorganization implied by this term are more likely to occur in the second semester of the freshman year” (p. 22). This quote is particularly important to highlight because Freedman’s work has been misquoted and misinterpreted by authors over the years.

Freedman has often been cited as the person who coined the phrase *sophomore slump* and to have described sophomores as the least satisfied of all college students (Lemons & Richmond, 1987; Wilder, 1993; Tobolowsky, 2008). Yet as evidenced in the quote, when Freedman referred to *sophomore slump*, he was actually dispelling its concept. Since this time, the discussion about sophomore students has significantly changed and Freedman’s conclusions have not been upheld in other studies (Feldman & Newcomb, 1969; Furr & Gunnaway, 1982; Gansemener-Topf et al., 2007; Lemons & Richmond, 1987, Margolis, 1976).

Sophomore slump. Feldman and Newcomb (1969) sought to review and integrate the effects of colleges on the adaptation and development of students. In the fourth chapter of their book, *The Impact of College on Students*, the authors examined the sequence of development by college year. Feldman and Newcomb cite Freedman's work on student feelings of *inertia and disorganization* occurring in the second semester of freshman year rather than the sophomore year. This conclusion highlights some of the difficulties in separating developmental levels with preciseness, rather it should be seen as a more fluid progression (Rodgers, 1990). Feldman and Newcomb's review of published and unpublished work to date concluded that the *sophomore slump* or common sophomore feelings were boredom, apathy, and dissatisfaction with their institution.

However, Margolis (1976) reached another conclusion. Through his work in a university counseling center, Margolis states the feelings used to characterize the *sophomore slump* are "too stereotypical" and not descriptive of the components of adolescent development (p.133). The feelings, expectations, and competencies are misrepresented in the larger philosophical questions sophomores are contemplating about their individual self and how they relate to the world. Margolis criticized the use of the term *sophomore slump* as negative and not encouraging for natural and expected adolescent behaviors and existential questions of second year students. He states, "sophomores do slump" (p.136), as they experience and question the complexity of the self and the world as they progress into adulthood. Sophomores achieve their identity through this exploration and universities can help support the process (Margolis, 1976).

Margolis' (1976) article presented clinical observations and provided counseling strategies for practitioners in the field, but was not the report of a research study.

However, the interrelated areas he cites, *academic*, *social* and *self*, are themes that emerged in subsequent studies. For example, Schaller's (2005) study noted *academic* and *self* and Gansemener-Topf, Stern and Benjamin's (2007) phenomenological study cited *academic* and *social* as key areas in the development of sophomores. These studies will be further described later in this chapter.

Freedman (1956), Feldman and Newcomb (1969), and Margolis (1976) all reference the developmental transitions from freshman to sophomore year. The authors agree that sophomores are clarifying their intentions with academic pursuits, transitioning family dynamics into peer relationships, and making meaning with their personal self.

The work of Lemons and Richmond (1985, 1987) also described this transition and further clarified a description of the *sophomore slump*. Their conclusions were not based on empirical research, rather on anecdotal and practitioner experience. Lemons and Richmond stated the excitement and novelty of freshman year fades away as expectations for college academics and social lives become reality. Sophomores are not yet fully engaged in their academic major to necessarily feel part of their field or they may have feelings of doubt surrounding their major or career choice (Biovin et al., 2000; Lemons & Richmond, 1985, 1987). Lemons and Richmond (1985, 1987) further explain that the *sophomore slump* includes dissatisfaction with personal relationships. Second year students may question the genuineness of the friendships formed freshmen year, but feel the need to create solidarity in peer relationships as they evolve into more intimate relationships, as previously cited in Chickering's (1969, 1993) *developing mature interpersonal relationships* vector.

Lemons and Richmond (1985) were the first to include financial stress as an aspect of the *sophomore slump*. This may be correlated to the economic climate in the mid-eighties. Sophomores had a “heightened awareness of and concern for the financial aspects of one’s college education, such as tuition costs” (p.176). Students continue to cite similar concerns surrounding college loans and the financial return on investment of a college degree (Schaller, 2010). The potential stress of financial issues can also be coupled with sophomore maturation into adulthood. Second year students are trying to identify as independent individuals yet many still rely on family for financial support (Lemons & Richmond, 1987). These developmental tasks and transitions in academics, social groups or self-exploration are significant psychosocial developments in the second year of college (Gansemener-Topf et al., 2007; Margolis, 1987; Schaller, 2005).

Chickering’s theory and the second year of college. In 1987, Lemons and Richmond first correlated the issues surrounding the *sophomore slump* to Chickering’s (1969, 1993) model of college student development. Specifically, the authors apply the following four vectors to the developmental slump experienced by sophomores: *achieving competence, developing autonomy, establishing identity, and developing purpose*. Several years later Biovin et al. (2000) did follow up research interviews on the correlations Lemons and Richmond made to Chickering’s vectors and its application to the psychosocial development of second-year students with similar results that will be further discussed in the following section.

Achieving competence. This first vector is generally accomplished by first-year students when they leave home for college, generally succeed academically, and manage their day-to-day affairs as marked by persisting to the following academic year (Lemons

& Richmond, 1987). Second-year students are proficient at these tasks and therefore are searching for higher levels of competence. However, Lemons and Richmond (1987) stated that sophomores struggle with this vector because they “lack concrete criteria for success” (p.16) due to their perceived conflicting expectations from themselves, family, and peers. If sophomores do not feel adept or receive recognition for intellectual competence, physical/manual skill abilities and social/interpersonal competence, they may feel insecure and have lower self-esteem (Lemons & Richmond, 1987). This may outwardly be displayed as apathy, boredom, and disengagement, which have been noted as characteristics of the *sophomore slump* (Feldman & Newcomb, 1969; Tobolowsky & Serven, 2007).

Developing autonomy. The second vector Lemons and Richmond (1987) link to sophomore development is *developing autonomy*. Within this vector, there are several associations involved with emotional and instrumental independence, primarily with family/parents. This process begins when students leave for college, however, sophomores no longer need the continual approval or reassurance from family. Sophomores are gaining the “ability to cope and care for one’s self” (p.16).

For those students who have familial support, another common struggle with student and parental/familial relationships during college is financial. Second-year students are striving for autonomy, yet many are financially tied to their family during college. Many students cite feelings of guilt associated with the financial burden placed on families to finance their college education (Lemons & Richmond, 1987). This stress often leads to difficulty progressing developmentally, dropping out of school or transferring to less expensive institutions (Lemons & Richmond, 1987).

The final aspect of the *developing autonomy* vector, that Biovin and his research team explored is student interdependence. Sophomores strive to be integrated individuals functioning within the context of groups/communities and greater society as an end result of *developing autonomy* (Lemons & Richmond, 1987). However, they are in a different state of transition, especially in their personal confidence. Second-year students are experiencing changing levels of competence in their abilities as they attempt to manage multiple developmental levels moving toward adulthood (Biovin et al., 2000).

Establishing identity. The third vector that most directly relates to second year college student development, encompasses critical developmental tasks that impact all other vectors (Chickering, 1969 & 1993; Lemons & Richmond, 1987). As students investigate the multiple dimensions of self, they are resolving their inner self with whom they are or wish to be with others. This concept is connected to Erikson's (1959, 1980) identity formation question "*Who am I?*" Sophomores are in a state of "existential crisis" (Flanagan, 2007). This period of critical exploration of occupational, social, and political values helps to clarify and engage students while in college (Biovin et al., 2000). For instance, at institutions of higher education students are exposed to credible, alternative points of view; experience making choices for themselves; and achieve meaningful goals (Biovin et al., 2000). Establishing identity is occurring concurrently with other developmental tasks and therefore much is in flux for sophomore students (Lemons & Richmond, 1987).

Developing purpose. During the second year of college, students are expected to have declared a major and selected a career path. This vocational choice is closely related to Chickering's (1969, 1993) *developing purpose* vector and also includes

lifestyle choices linked to *establishing identity*. As discussed earlier in this study, sophomores feel pressure to have concrete life direction and this pressure can lead to stress and the others effects of the *sophomore slump* (Furr & Gunnaway, 1982; Lemons & Richmond, 1987). This developmental stage is complicated by pressure from parents, peers, faculty/advisors in addition to self-inflicted pressure to discover and determine personal values and live congruently as individuals (Lemons & Richmond, 1987). Lemons and Richmond (1987) conclude by stating the “*sophomore slump* is a period of developmental confusion” (p.18).

Schaller’s theory on the second year of college. “Standing on a fence” is the metaphor one sophomore college student noted to Schaller in her qualitative research study at a mid-size Catholic university (2005, p.19). Through focus groups and individual interviews of 19 traditional-aged second year students, Schaller asked the participants about spirituality, campus involvement, and home life. However, the sophomores most wanted to discuss three different areas: “how they viewed themselves; their relationships; and their academic experiences and decisions” (p.18). Schaller developed a four-stage model that described these prevalent sophomore life issues, which are discussed further in the next several paragraphs.

Random exploration. The first stage in this model is *random exploration* (Schaller, 2005, 2007). Schaller noted that first students feel a sense of excitement about their first year of college. Many first year students lacked self-reflection in their decisions about their lives due to feeling as though they had time to make life decisions. Rather than discerning their future, students spent time transitioning and getting accustomed to their new campus culture. In the sophomore year, students described an

awareness of impending choices they needed to make regarding their life and future, especially regarding their major and career (Schaller, 2005, 2007). A key goal within this stage is for second year students to become more engaged in their learning. Most participants had moved through this stage between the summer of their freshmen year to their sophomore year, but those in random exploration were moving toward commitment with one or more issues. As described in most developmental processes, there is not necessarily an abrupt closure to a stage, rather as new issues or choices emerge there is time for exploration and reflection (Schaller, 2005, 2007).

Focused exploration. The majority of the participants in this study were in the following stage of *focused exploration* (Schaller, 2005, 2007). This stage is best summarized with students working through levels of frustration with some of the choices they made in the previous stage. Sophomores are questioning their individual self and their current relationships that developed in the first year of college (Schaller, 2005, 2007). These developmental tasks are similar to Chickering's fifth vector, *establishing identity* (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Lemons & Richmond, 1987). Sophomores are trying to connect with their inner self while asking questions of themselves in relation to the external world by way of selecting an academic major (Schaller, 2005, 2007). Their decisions about their futures are deeply rooted in the exploration of this stage. Schaller (2005, 2007) ascertains that the longer or more thoroughly a student spends in *focused exploration* the more comprehensive their work on self becomes. Therefore they may not be as impacted by competing external forces (parents, peers, society) when making personal life decisions (Schaller, 2005, 2007).

Tentative choices. As second-year students accept a new level of responsibility in their lives and their futures become clear to them, they have entered *tentative choices* (Schaller, 2005, 2007). According to Schaller, students in this stage examine their options more fully and thoroughly and align their personal values when making decisions. The process of decision-making and internal congruence are what is most important for them rather than the outcome of the decision (Schaller, 2005, 2007). For instance, one participant had changed her major several times, but after this stage, she felt comfortable with her decision, excitement for her future and settled into academic rigor more purposefully (Schaller, 2005, 2007).

Commitment. Planning for the future with clear direction marks the final component, *commitment*, of this four-stage model (Schaller, 2005, 2007). College students in this stage no longer doubted their decisions and felt resolved with their choices (Schaller, 2005, 2007). This parallels the findings other psychosocial college student identity development models such as *developing autonomy* (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Lemons & Richmond, 1987). Similarly, as posited in other models, students who do not delve into depth in this stage may revisit it at a future time (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Lemons & Richmond, 1987; Schaller, 2005).

The second year of college is a time that continues to mark the period from which adolescents move into adulthood. Kegan (1994) describes this time as an egocentric period. Moving toward adulthood involves the development of decision-making for personal life choices as well as negotiating expectations of others (Kegan, 1994). Students in their sophomore year of college are in this stage of development. Schaller (2005) noted that the students in her study discussed the impact of turning twenty in

terms of how they began to view themselves as entering adulthood. The responsibility of making decisions regarding life after college became very apparent to them (Schaller, 2005). Second year students were beginning to listen to their internal voice and decipher what would be best for the future life they wished to lead. This is an important developmental time of making meaning with one's life (Kegan, 1994; Schaller, 2005).

Schaller's theory on second year student development continues to inform the field of higher education with the programmatic efforts in student affairs and student retention. The most obvious limitation of this study is its limited generalizability to second year college students relative to its small sample size (N=19) at one institution. Furthermore, there have been limited follow up studies to re-test the validity and reliability of Schaller's findings. To date, the only follow up studies focused on the second year experience were in 2007 by Gansemer-Topf, Stern and Benjamin's (2007) and another study by Stockenberg (2007). I will describe their research in the following section.

Academics, social relationships and extracurricular activities. *Academics, social relationships* and *extracurricular activities* continued to be themes that emerged in later research (Gansemer-Topf et al., 2007). Building on Schaller's (2005) work outlined in her four-stage model of sophomore psychosocial development, Gansemer-Topf, et al. (2007) conducted a phenomenological study of 55 second year students and 54 third-year students at a highly selective, small liberal arts college. The researchers specifically chose third year students to be part of their study in order to gain insights from their reflections of the year past (Gansemer-Topf et al., 2007).

Academic life was the first of the three interrelated experiences for second year students. Within this theme, multiple aspects surfaced from the focus groups. As the rigor of the academic programs increased, sophomores began doubting their own academic ability, similar to Chickering's (1969, 1993) *achieving competence* vector. Second year students noted declaring a major as a stressor. Some students felt that declaring a major was a permanent decision and this along with choosing an academic advisor, creating a four-year plan for classes, internships and potentially studying abroad created much pressure and anxiety for sophomores (Gansemer-Topf et al., 2007). One student noted he felt like he was planning the next 10 years of his life. Juniors in the study, in contrast, saw greater flexibility with declaring a major and understood that selecting a major was not necessarily narrowly defining all future career options (Gansemer-Topf et al., 2007).

Social relationships also began to shift in the second year of college (Chickering & Reisser, 1969, 1993; Gansemer-Topf et al., 2007; Schaller, 2005, 2007). Interactions with peers were focused on solidifying relationships with friendships and intimate relationships. Students also said that the quality of peer relationships increased in their second year (Gansemer-Topf et al., 2007). Relationships of convenience (i.e. freshmen residence hall floors) were replaced with relationships of choice when students chose whom they lived with or they shared similar interests or majors (Gansemer-Topf et al., 2007).

Third year students in the study reported that social relationships is their second year began to compete with other priorities such as academics, jobs, and extracurricular activities (Gansemer-Topf et al., 2007). This finding links to the final aspect of

Gansemer-Topf, Stern and Benjamin's results. Students reported that extracurricular activities shifted in their second year with the amount and quality of out of class activities. Some respondents noted their involvement in leadership increased due to a number of juniors studying abroad, whereas others felt as though they needed to cut back on their time in activities due to increased expectations in academics. One message that was consistent was the need for students to prioritize and make choices. Sophomores understood the need to balance extracurricular activities and academics because they "can't do it all" (Gansemer-Topf et al., 2007, p. 41).

Although the students described pressures and struggles with various facets of their academic life, social relationships, and extracurricular activities in their second year, some participants considered this their "most stable" year (Gansemer-Topf et al., 2007, p. 42). They noted the transitions of the first year from high school and the increased pressure in their third year and anticipations for their fourth years to think about life after college (Gansemer-Topf et al., 2007). Schaller (2005) found similar results with sophomore students who had an intended major early in their college careers.

Developing autonomy (Chickering & Reisser, 1993) or greater understanding of self appears to be linked to additional findings from the Gansemer-Topf et al. (2007) study. The concept "I have to do this myself" emerged when the researchers asked the students if they knew of university resources that could assist them with the pressures and struggles they had described as part of their sophomore year (Gansemer-Topf et al., 2007, p. 43). The participants were aware of the resources, however some acknowledged this was part of their maturation process and that they should "work it out" on their own (Gansemer-Topf et al., 2007, p. 43).

Similar results regarding academics, social relationships, and extracurricular activities were found in a concurrent study from another private, liberal arts college in the Rocky Mountain region (Stockenberg, 2007). A total of twenty-nine students (sophomores, juniors, and seniors) who served as faculty-chosen student mentors to first-year students completed a survey that was developed after data from earlier focus groups of 15 total students from the same sample population. Themes for second year students that emerged from these studies include: search for purpose and meaning; identity conflicts and formation; and commitment (to friends, groups, activities, academics; reduced motivation and apathy; Stockenberg, 2007).

Schreiner (2010) also discusses the importance of the campus environment for second year students. Faculty interaction, instructional effectiveness, intellectual growth, and advising students in their *focused exploration* stage in career and life goals were all deemed as important in second year student persistence and satisfaction at their institutions (Juillerat, 2000; Schaller, 2005; Schreiner, 2010). The importance of student-faculty interaction is well documented in higher education literature (Astin, 1993; Astin, 1999; Kuh et al., 2005; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Astin's (1993) work has continued to prove that student-faculty interaction positively correlates to college grade point average, degree attainment, graduating with honors, and enrollment in graduate or professional school. In addition, student-faculty interactions also aid students in overall intellectual and personal growth (Astin, 1993; Kuh et al., 2005; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005).

Campus involvement also positively impacts overall student satisfaction (Astin, 1993; Astin, 1999; Kuh et al., 2005; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005) and additional

research has specifically demonstrated this effect in second year college students (Schreiner, 2010). According to Astin, "*student involvement* refers to the quantity and quality of the physical and psychological energy that students invest in the college experience" (1999, p. 528). Involvement includes curricular and co-curricular activities, as well as interactions with faculty and university personnel. Student-student interaction is positively correlated with the number of hours spent with student clubs and organizations, attending cultural workshops and events, socializing with persons from different racial or ethnic groups, and attending religious services (Astin, 1993). The concept of involvement is also seen as "a critical element in the learning process" in relation to cognitive development (Astin, 1999, p. 526).

Sophomores feel "between" in all collegiate levels both concretely and abstractly (Biovin et al., 2000, p. 2). They have transitioned into their institution and are no longer naïve about what college life entails. Second-year students are not yet fully integrated into their major classes or have not yet selected a career path, which may lead to dissatisfaction or disengagement (Biovin et al., 2000; Lemons & Richmond, 1987). Feelings of disillusionment may also arise as sophomore students work through their personal identity from adolescents to adulthood (Biovin et al., 2000; Lemons & Richmond, 1987).

Intercultural Competence and Intercultural Maturity

Intercultural competence is known by many names and reaches across many disciplines of study including psychology, sociology, anthropology, business, and education. For over 30 years, scholars have tried to reach agreement on a definition of intercultural competence, but have failed to do so (Deardorff, 2006). Despite Deardorff's

(2006) efforts by conducting a Delphi technique study with leading scholars in the intercultural field, the group was unable to reach a consensus on the definition, components and assessment strategies for intercultural competence. The most applicable definition for institutional efforts encompassed “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” (Deardorff, 2006, p. 247). Another contributing theme that emerged when scholars attempted to define intercultural competence was “the ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations based on one’s intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes” (p. 247). One area the scholars in this study were able to agree upon is that intercultural competence can and should be measured.

The scholarship surrounding intercultural competence also has numerous theories and methods to measure the growth and development of intercultural competence (Bennett, Bennett & Landis, 2004; Deardorff, 2006; Hammer & Bennett, 2005; Hammer, Bennett & Wiseman, 2003; King & Baxter Magolda, 2005; Pope & Reynolds, 1997; Vande Berg, 2004). Given the breadth of research in this area, and the focus of this study, I narrow my focus to definitions, theories and methods of measurement that rests within the context of college student development in institutions of higher education. I also pay particular attention to instruments that have been utilized to measure growth within study abroad programs yet still have applicability to those students who do not participate in the study abroad experiences. Intercultural competence is one component of human development and is particularly emphasized in the field of higher education and in this study.

Many scholars on human development use Kegan's work on lifespan development as a foundation in educational research and student development (Baxter Magolda, 1998, 2001, 2003; Bennett, 1993; Jones & McEwen, 2000; King & Baxter Magolda, 2005). Kegan's constructivist-developmental theory provides a holistic approach to human development (1982, 1994). Inspired by the work of Piaget (1964), Kegan's initial research focused on cognitive development, but soon integrated intrapersonal and interpersonal components to address the multiple dimensions of development. Kegan's model describes human development as moving through or evolving into more complex constructs of thinking, feeling, and relating to others (1982, 1994). He theorizes that these are lifelong tensions between differentiation and integration. Kegan's work provides a way of looking at the cognitive, intrapersonal and interpersonal dimensions and how they interconnect (1982, 1994).

Kegan's integrative approach to human development is foundational in student development theory and, not surprisingly, incorporates cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal development into what he named *self-authorship* (1994, p. 185). Self-authorship is the fourth stage of development according to Kegan and takes into account ones' ability to take responsibility and ownership of one's own authority and establish one's own values and beliefs (1994). Baxter Magolda went on to further study and expand upon Kegan's work and defined self-authorship as "the internal capacity to define one's beliefs, identity, and social relations" (Baxter Magolda, 2008, p. 269). Cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal development remained the three central components to Baxter Magolda's work.

King and Baxter Magolda (2005) argue that educators could be more effective in their programmatic efforts and the assessment of programs if they were to take a more holistic approach. By merely examining cognitive development, one may neglect the nuances that occur between domains or the depths at which one considers complex and multidimensional situations. The relationship between the three domains contributes to a holistic approach to development. King and Baxter Magolda maintain this stance with specific regard to intercultural development or *intercultural maturity* (p. 573). Drawing upon Kegan (1994) and Baxter Magolda's (1998, 2000, 2008) research on *self-authorship*, King and Baxter Magolda (2005) proposed a holistic approach to describe how college students at varying levels of cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal development make meaning from intercultural experiences. King and Baxter Magolda define *intercultural maturity* as "multi-dimensional and consisting of a range of attributes, including understanding (the cognitive dimension), sensitivity to others (the interpersonal dimension), and a sense of oneself that enables one to listen to and learn from others (the intrapersonal dimension)" (2005, p. 574).

King and Baxter Magolda (2005) were intentional with their choice of the word *maturity*. They describe making meaning as a developmental process of approaching, understanding, and acting with regard to intercultural issues (p. 574). They describe these intercultural skills as having the ability to demonstrate expertise in several realms including, "complex understanding of cultural differences (cognitive dimension), capacity to accept and not feel threatened by cultural difference (intrapersonal), and capacity to function interdependently with diverse others (interpersonal dimension)" (p. 574).

As in any developmental process, there are stages associated with levels of growth. King and Baxter Magolda use a 3 x 3 matrix to frame their model as shown in Table 2.1. Each of the three domains (cognitive, interpersonal, and intrapersonal) is associated with progressing levels of development (initial, intermediate, and mature). Each dimension of King and Baxter Magolda's model is grounded in previous research and theory from college student development and other disciplines. For example, in the *cognitive* domain the authors drew from the work of Perry (1968), Belenky and Clinchy, Goldberger and Tarule (1986), Baxter Magolda (1992), King and Kitchener (1994), M. Bennett (1993), and Fisher (1980). In the *intrapersonal* domain, the authors worked with the identity development theories of Chickering and Reisser (1993), Kegan (1994), Josselson, (1987), Cross (1991), Phinney (1990) amongst others. Finally, the *interpersonal* domain is grounded in the works of Chickering and Reisser (1993), Kegan, (1994), Kohlberg (1984), Gilligan, (1982), and Bennett (1993).

King and Baxter Magolda's (2005) theory captures the dynamic interplay between each of the domains. Rather than seeing cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal dimensions as separate entities, they stress the importance of the holistic combination of development. Their model is the foundational theory for the Global Perspective Inventory (GPI), an instrument that measures growth in intercultural maturity and has been used by over 170 institutions of higher education since 2008 (Global Perspective Inventory, 2013). This instrument will be discussed further in Chapter Three. Chickering and Braskamp (2009) (Braskamp is a co-author of the Global Perspective Inventory) discussed the applicability of Chickering's foundational psychosocial development of college students to their development of a global perspective.

Table 1

A three-dimensional developmental trajectory of intercultural maturity
(King & Baxter Magolda, 2005)

Domain of Development and Related Theories	Initial Level of Development	Intermediate Level of Development	Mature level of Development
Cognitive	Assumes knowledge is certain and categorizes knowledge claims as right or wrong; is naïve about different cultural practices and values; resists challenges to one's own beliefs and views differing cultural perspectives as wrong	Evolving awareness and acceptance of uncertainty and multiple perspectives; ability to shift from accepting authority's knowledge claims to personal processes for adopting knowledge claims	Ability to consciously shift perspectives and behaviors into an alternative cultural worldview and to use multiple cultural frames
Intrapersonal	Lack of awareness of one's own values and intersection of social (racial, class, ethnicity, sexual orientation) identity; lack of understanding of other cultures; externally defined beliefs that regulate interpretation of experiences and guide choices; difference is viewed as a threat to identity	Evolving sense of identity as distinct from external others' perceptions; tension between external and internal definitions prompts self-exploration of values, racial identity, beliefs; immersion in own culture; recognizes legitimacy of other cultures	Capacity to create an internal self that openly engages challenges to one's views and beliefs and that considers social identities (race, class, gender, etc.) in a global and national context; integrates aspects of self into one's identity
Interpersonal	Dependent relations with similar others is a primary source of identity and social affirmation; perspectives of different others are viewed as wrong; awareness of how social systems affect group norms and intergroup differences is lacking; view social problems egocentrically, no recognition of society as an organized entity	Willingness to interact with diverse others and refrain from judgment; relies on independent relations in which multiple perspectives exists (but are not coordinated); self is often overshadowed by need for others' approval. Begins to explore how social systems affect group norms and intergroup relations	Capacity to engage in meaningful, interdependent relationships with diverse others that are grounded in an understanding and appreciation for human differences; understanding of ways individual and community practices affect social systems; willing to work for the rights of others

The authors associate developing a global perspective to *moving through autonomy toward interdependence, establishing identity, developing purpose, and managing emotions*. The overall sentiment of the applicability of a global perspective to these vectors in young adult development is their increased interconnection in a global society. The need to consider one's "larger community" is beyond one's diverse national society, but rather is encompassing of all cultures, races, ethnicities, gender, sexual orientations, and religions and spirituality. The authors further postulate that approaching life with a global perspective, especially as we tackle complex social problems, "has become critical for effective contributions [to] purposes larger than our own self-interest" (p. 28).

Higher education professionals have been called by the academy to provide college students with opportunities to develop as young adults within our global society (American Council on Education, 2002; Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2006). Developing intercultural competence while in college is foundational in understanding globalization and the ways in which we address domestic and international issues in our increasingly intercultural world.

Study Abroad

As globalization and internationalization have a greater presence on university campuses, institutions continue to look for ways to promote and foster students to think, feel, and behave in ways that promote and honor our diverse and pluralistic society. Often times, a key strategy to realizing this goal is study abroad programs. Considerable research on study abroad and international higher education has contributed to significant increases in participation since the 1990s (Cushner & Karim, 2004; Lewin, 2009; Osfield

& Smith Terrel, 2009; Osfield & Associates, 2009; Institute of International Education, 2013). The days of the “junior year away” (Osfield & Smith Terrel, 2009) have since passed and the growth of semester programs and short-term study abroad programs has dramatically increased (Institute of International Education, 2009, 2013). The increase in short-term study abroad programs may best explained by the greater focus on globalization at institutions, the increasing costs of higher education, and impacted academic programs (Donnelly-Smith, 2009).

Engle and Engle (2004) cite seven key components of study abroad that define the type of experience: program duration; entry language competence of participants; extent to which target language is used in coursework on site; context of academic work; type of housing arrangements; provisions for guided cultural/experiential learning; and structured opportunities for students to reflect on their cultural experiences. However, the study abroad field has received mixed results regarding the factors that contribute to the growth of intercultural competence and global engagement abroad. This section of the literature review provides a brief overview of current statistics and foundational research on study abroad programs and focuses on short-term study abroad research and intercultural competence.

From research on study abroad participants, we know that women study abroad at higher rates than men (Institute of International Education, 2013). For the past 10 years, the Institute of International Education has consistently reported that women make up 65 percent of study abroad participants, while men make up 35 percent. There are also major differences in study abroad participation across races and ethnicities. White students participating in study abroad have ranged from comprising 83.7 percent to 76.4

percent over the past 10 years. While there has been an increase in study abroad participation amongst some students of color, the numbers remain relatively small. In overall study abroad programs, there has been approximately a two percent increase across Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (5.8 to 7.7 percent), Hispanic or Latino(a) (5.4 to 7.6), Black or African-American (3.5 to 5.3 percent), other races and ethnicities' remain even lower with multiracial students only reaching as high as 2.5 percent and American Indian or Alaska Native consistently remaining around 0.5 percent.

Short-term study abroad programs are experiences in which students are engaged in international travel for fewer than eight weeks and may include January and summer terms and other trips during an academic year (Donnelly-Smith, 2009). There is great variation within program content. Some short-term abroad experiences may be one week during spring break within a semester-long class or may involve a service or research component over six weeks with multiple sites or homestay visits with local families or a mix of any of the named components (Donnelly-Smith 2009).

Short-term study abroad programs are the most common type of study abroad experience among undergraduate students. While only comprising 3.3 percent of study abroad students in the 1996-1997 academic year (Donnelly-Smith, 2009), short-term study abroad programs accounted for 58.5 percent of study abroad in the 2011-2012 academic year (Institute of International Education, 2013). Despite this recent increase in participation, there is little formal research regarding the learning outcomes of short-term abroad programs (Donnelly-Smith, 2009; Kehl & Morris, 2007; Rowan-Kenyon & Niehaus, 2011).

Short-term study abroad programs have grown in popularity due in part to the increase in globalization and the emphasis placed on intercultural competence. Short-term experiences have less financial strain on students than semester-long or year long abroad programs. These shorter programs also allow students in more structured academic programs such as engineering or nursing to participate in an abroad experience (Donnelly-Smith, 2009). However, they are not without their own controversies. The following section provides an overview of the foundational research in study abroad programming and the differences research results have shown in the length of term (e.g. year, semester, less than eight weeks).

Length of Term Abroad

There are some faculty and professionals who do not believe that short-term study abroad experience provide enough opportunity for significant cultural engagement and that “longer is better” in regards to program duration (Dwyer, 2004; Donnelly-Smith, 2009; Engle & Engle, 2004; Kehl & Morris, 2007; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2006). One study conducted by Engle and Engle (2004) concluded that the benefits of being abroad required a full year of international experience and the critical period was half a year. The researchers examined American students who studied at the American University Center of Provence in France. They investigated how well students learned the French language and their intercultural sensitivity. Their study was prompted by trends they saw emerging in their students which included a decreasing level of pre-departure foreign language competence, shorter program terms, and an increased “comfort zone” for study abroad students (p. 221). Engle and Engle remarked, “it has become increasingly easy

for young American sojourners in foreign countries to live in a comfortably superficial and ultimately unchallenging relationship with their host cultures” (p. 221).

Engle and Engle’s (2004) study took place over the course of eight semesters and included 257 participants in a pre and post-test instrument on language acquisition and 187 participants taking the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) pre and post-test. The IDI measures cultural competence based on an ability to observe, respect, and adapt to cultural difference. The study concluded that direct and authentic contact with the host culture and skillful mentoring guides stimulates the experiential learning process. Engle and Engle (2004) concluded that longer program duration students made greater progress in cultural understanding and communication and the most growth occurred in the second semester of the experience. These findings have since been supported by several studies including Behrmd & Porzelt (2012), Dwyer (2004), Kehl and Morris (2007), Medina-Lopez-Portillo (2006) and Vande Berg, Connor-Linton, and Paige (2009). However, one study by Paige, Fry, Stallman, Josic and Jon (2009) found that duration of stay was not a significant factor relative to growth in cultural competence or global engagement.

Dwyer’s (2004) study with the Institute for International Education of Students (IES) sought to examine which study abroad program features (language, housing, duration of stay, and enrollment in foreign university courses) have the greatest longitudinal impact on intercultural competence. Of the 17,000 surveys distributed to former students who studied abroad with IES between the academic years of 1950-51 and 1999-00, 3,723 surveys were returned. Respondents were categorized by length of study abroad program (one year, one semester, or 6-7 weeks). The study found that full-year students appeared to have increased confidence in their linguistic abilities that also led to

learning more about other cultures or learning another language. Often cited outcomes from this study include strong results in study abroad participants achieving greater understanding of one's own cultural values and biases, continuing to be influenced in one's interactions with people from different cultures, and developing a more sophisticated way of looking at the world. These findings were particularly stronger for students who studied abroad for a full year (Dwyer, 2004).

Other noteworthy results from Dwyer's (2004) study include students studying abroad for a full academic year were more likely than those studying abroad for a semester or less to engage in international work and volunteer activities later in life. Regardless of length of time abroad, respondents reported increased self-confidence, tolerance of ambiguity, and maturation from their international study. In addition, approximately 90 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that studying abroad influenced them to seek out a greater diversity of friends and 95 percent reported that studying abroad has had a lasting impact on how they view the world.

Another study by Pedersen (2009) researched the differences amongst groups who both traveled internationally and did or did not receive integrated intercultural effectiveness diversity training (including cultural immersion, guided reflection, and intercultural coaching). Pedersen's results demonstrated that merely studying abroad was not enough to have demonstrated growth in intercultural effectiveness. This study showed no statistically significant differences between the group that went abroad and did not receive integrated intercultural training versus the control group that remained on campus with no international experience. Pedersen's (2009) findings are contrary to Paige et al. (2004), Vande Berg, Balkcum, Scheid, and Whalen (2004) and Vande Berg,

Connor-Linton and Paige's (2009) research with the Georgetown Consortium Project (2009). This project found that students who went abroad reported an increase in intercultural effectiveness compared to the non-study abroad students.

Additional findings from Pederson's study are contradictory to other research on study abroad participation. The differences in her research demonstrate that gender, involvement in work or extra-curricular activities, participation in family stay, whether they spoke a second language, whether they kept a journal, and their report of significant friendships did not relate to any changes in intercultural development. However, it is important to note that Pederson's study had a relatively small sample of 45 total participants (16 participants in each study abroad group, both with and without the integrated intercultural training, and 13 in the control group who remained on campus).

Paige, Cohen, and Shively's (2004) research identified significant differences in intercultural sensitivity between study abroad participants and those who did not study abroad. Using an instrument created by the research team and the *Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI)*, Paige, Cohen, and Shively's study included 86 students from seven different universities who traveled abroad to French or Spanish-speaking countries and they examined changes in intercultural sensitivity and language learning. Pre-test and post-test results demonstrated statistically significant increases intercultural sensitivity and decreases in all of the ethnocentrism scales measured. Overall, their study supports study abroad programs as having a positive effect of intercultural development.

Similarly, Vande Berg, Connor-Linton, Paige's (2009) work on the Georgetown Consortium Project found that study abroad participants made statistically significant greater gains in intercultural development than the non-study abroad students. The

Georgetown Consortium Project examined over 1100 study abroad participants from 61 different programs and used the *Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI)* pre-test and post-test survey. The control group had approximately 138 participants.

The Georgetown Consortium Project also examined the impact of living or traveling in another culture prior to studying abroad. This factor was determined not to be meaningfully associated with the development of intercultural competence. However, those who had never lived in another culture prior to being abroad had the lowest pre-test scores for intercultural competence and thus had the greatest gains in intercultural competence during the study abroad experience. Unfortunately, the study's sample size of short-term study abroad participants was too small to draw conclusions or comparisons of programs that were less than eight weeks in length (Vande Berg et al., 2009).

Rundstrom Williams' (2005) study examined the impact of study abroad on intercultural adaptability and intercultural sensitivity at Texas Christian University in 2002. Using the *Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory* and the *Intercultural Sensitivity Index*, a pre-test was given the semester prior to students studying abroad and students in a control group who remained on campus. The post-test was administered to both groups after the study abroad semester. A total of 96 students participated in the study with 44 study abroad students and 52 students in the control group. The results demonstrated a greater increase in both intercultural communication skills of adaptability and sensitivity in those students who studied abroad compared to those who remained on campus throughout the year. The following section examines research on short-term study programs, intercultural maturity, and research connected with the *Global Perspective Inventory (GPI)*.

Short-term Study Abroad

Much attention has been given to the study of year-long and semester-long study abroad programs. However, there has been little research done with short-term study abroad programs. One study at the University of Delaware by Chieffo and Griffiths (2004) sought to investigate the perceived and recalled global awareness of over 2,000 students in winter session programs in 2003 and 2004. For this study, global awareness was comprised of survey question items that included intercultural awareness, personal growth, global interdependence, and functional knowledge of world geography and language. Significant differences were found in all but five of the 21 items in the four categories. Some of the statistically significant items included “recently developed greater appreciation for arts, read article, watched TV show about how Americans are viewed, thought about differences between myself and people in other countries, and thought about a current issue important to people in a developing country, to name a few” (p. 170). Whereas, item questions that were not statistically significant between the groups were as follows: “know how foreign manufacturing affects prices, explain U.S. foreign policy to someone from another country, comfortable in understanding of U.S. trade relations, consciously withheld judgment on international event/issue, looked up a non-English word in dictionary” (p. 170). However, it was clear to the researchers, responses from the students who stayed on campus were much more focused on classroom learning as opposed to out-of-classroom learning from the students who traveled abroad.

The results of the Chieffo and Griffiths (2004) study revealed factors such as academic year, GPA, and major contributed to significant response differences between

the abroad and on-campus groups, while gender had no statistical impact. Chieffo and Griffiths also noted a difference in response rates to the single open-ended question in the pre-test and post-test survey. Of the 1,509 students abroad, 1,408 responded to the open-ended comments section, whereas of the 827 participants in the control group, only 473 left comments. Nearly half the responses were categorized as participants having greater knowledge/appreciation of another country or culture. It is important to note that the pre-test and post-test studies were not linked together by identification numbers and therefore only perceived changes in global awareness with aggregate numbers could be assessed. Overall, this study demonstrates these two short-term study abroad experiences had significant self-perceived impacts on students' intellectual and personal lives.

Other short-term study abroad research has demonstrated improvement in cross-cultural sensitivity. For example, Lawton, Rexeisen, and Hubbard (2006) study resulted in positive growth in cross-cultural sensitivity among 23 college seniors who traveled to England and Ireland for four weeks. Similarly, Nam (2011) found positive changes in worldviews and cultural sensitivity after studying two three-week study abroad programs in Thailand/Laos and the Netherlands. In another study with 87 participants across five different short-term abroad programs ranging from 9-14 days, Mapp (2012) found significant changes in cultural adaptability, with the greatest change in emotional resilience. Upon further analysis, the length of trip, whether the country was English-speaking, and the number of countries the participants had previously visited, had no significant impact on the results (Mapp, 2012).

A study conducted by Kehl and Morris (2008) looked at three private universities with similar mission statements and short term "island" study abroad programs (p. 67).

“Island” programs are considered self-contained academic abroad programs in which students take courses with other students from their home university. Often times, the faculty from the U.S. institution travels with and teaches their students at the host institution. This study used the Global Mindedness Scale developed by Hett (1993) and is comprised 30 Likert scale statements. The sample of 520 participants included students who studied abroad in a short-term program, semester long program, and students who planned on studying abroad in the near future who served as the control group.

The results of Kehl and Morris’ (2008) study concluded that there were no significant differences in global-mindedness between the students who studied abroad for the shorter duration and those who intended to study abroad. However, there were differences between the semester long study abroad students and those who planned on studying abroad in the near future with higher global-mindedness scores reported with the study abroad participants. This study also looked at demographic information of its participants. Kehl and Morris (2007) found participants who reported parents’ annual income to be above \$100,000 had significantly lower levels of global-mindedness in their study. Through investigating other demographic data provided by their study, Kehl and Morris (2008) reported men in their study had higher levels of global mindedness as compared to the women in the study. This finding is contradictory to past studies in which females had statistically significant higher means on global mindedness than males (Braskamp et al., 2011; Braskamp & Engberg, 2011; Hett, 1993; Zhai & Scheer, 2004).

Medina-Lopez-Portillo (2006) examined one short-term (seven weeks) summer study abroad program in Taxco, Mexico and a semester long (16 weeks) program in

Mexico City, Mexico. Medina-Lopez-Portillo was the faculty director for both programs. In a mixed methods study, she investigated how students reflected on themselves both as cultural beings in their own right, and as cultural beings in relation to a different culture.

Medina-Lopez-Portillo's study used the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) pre-test and post-test survey and either pre and post program in person interviews or questionnaires with 28 University of Maryland students who participated in the study. The results showed an increase in intercultural sensitivity in both groups and perceptions were changed and insights were gained about the Mexican culture and its people. However, the students in the longer duration program demonstrated a deeper understanding of the host culture and cultural differences. The author noted it appeared as though the students in the seven-week program became more nationalistic as opposed to the students in the longer-term program had a more negative attitude toward the United States. Similarly, most students in the shorter-term program focused on external and behavioral differences whereas the longer-term students commented on their own cultural perceptions and worldviews.

Medina-Lopez-Portillo's (2006) results are consistent with prior research (Dwyer 2004; Engle & Engle, 2004). However, her study also has limitations. This study has a relatively low sample size and the different locations and qualitative measurements may or may not have contributed to varying results. Students in the Taxco program were given questionnaires for their qualitative measurement whereas the Mexico City participants were interviewed by Medina-Lopez-Portillo. It is also possible the interviews could have been positively influenced since Medina-Lopez-Portillo also served as the faculty director for both programs.

Jones, Rowan-Kenyon, Ireland, Niehaus, and Skendall (2012) examined four distinct week-long immersion trips in which approximately 37 out of the 48 undergraduate students participated in the study. Two of the trips were domestic in the United States (New York City and Chicago) and two groups traveled internationally to Peru and the Czech Republic. This multisite case study used journals and semi-structured interviews for its data collection. Multiple themes emerged from the participants that included students feeling a sense of *getting out of the bubble* of their campus and entering new locations with people they did not know very well and confronting complex social issues as well as negotiating language barriers. *Personalization*, or making personal connections with the people from the locales as well as the personalizing the issues within the communities they visited had an impact on the participants. The final theme of *boundary crossing* into unfamiliar cultures and social issues helped the participants gain new perspectives and challenge stereotypes they had previous to the trip. Other findings included participants feeling as though they had a greater understanding of their own privileges as well as new views on world issues.

Global Perspective Inventory Research. The final section of this chapter discusses the development of the *Global Perspective Inventory (GPI)*, the research that has been conducted with the instrument, and the findings of the research to date. In 2008, Braskamp, Braskamp and Merrill studied 500 college students in more than 30 different semester-long study abroad programs (2011). Through the use of their instrument, the *Global Perspective Inventory (GPI)* that assesses growth in *intercultural maturity* using a pre-test and post-test survey, Braskamp et al. found gains of over 0.10 in all sub-scales (*knowing, knowledge, identity, affect, social responsibility, social interaction, well-being*

and *global citizenship*). The student *knowledge* sub-scale had the greatest gains at 0.31. The authors conclude that after studying abroad for one semester, their participants demonstrated greater confidence in approaching new situations, communication with people who are different from themselves, and less need for the continuous support from others. From a holistic perspective, these students had a better understanding of cultural differences and increased comfort in relating to others while also having a better understanding of who they are as individuals.

Over the years, other themes have developed from the data collected from the GPI instrument (Braskamp & Engberg, 2011). For example, women demonstrated more advanced levels of development across four of the six sub-scales. The largest differences were found in *social responsibility*, *knowing*, *social interaction* and *affect*, respectively. Mean differences in female participants were only slightly lower (0.02) in *identity* than males, but males had higher scores in *knowledge* (0.13) than females. Although differences across race were less consistent, Black and Hispanic student participants had higher developmental mean scores in intrapersonal and interpersonal domains across all four sub-scales. As traditional aged students progressed through their class year so did their mean scores in cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal domains. The largest positive change occurred between their first year of college and their second year of college. A final theme that emerged from Braskamp and Engberg's (2011) analysis is differences amongst institution type. Students at religiously affiliated universities had higher scores in *identity* and *social responsibility* and lower scores in the *knowing* sub-scale of the GPI.

Luchesi's (2014) dissertation research, which also examined the SYE Abroad program at the University of San Diego, investigated how growth in intercultural maturity may vary/differ from program year and international location. Her study examined GPI pre-test and post-test survey scores of 369 SYE Abroad participants from the first three years of the program's existence. The results of this study found growth in only the *knowledge* sub-scale of cognitive development and the *identity* sub-scale of intrapersonal development within the larger construct of intercultural maturity. Gender proved to be a significant factor in this study with females demonstrating greater levels of intercultural maturity. International location, year of the program, academic major, ethnicity, grade point average, parental education level, and previous study abroad experience had no statistically significant impact on the development of intercultural maturity.

Study abroad experiences take place for a variety of purposes and in a variety of contexts and student interest in studying abroad continues to grow. Study abroad is often used as the primary programmatic effort at universities to help develop intercultural competence. The mixed findings in study abroad research, and more specifically short-term experiences, provide a solid rationale for the need for further empirical studies to be done.

Conclusion

Despite the increased emphasis on the importance on globalization in higher education, there is a lack of empirical research on some of the emerging topics and programs in the field. College student development theorists have an expansive amount of research on the impact of the entire collegiate experience, yet there is not consistent

attention given to each year in college. A few researchers have offered some initial theories into the second year of college, but there has been little follow up to explore these small, single-campus studies.

A similar situation exists in the literature on intercultural maturity. There is a vast amount of research on the many names and forms of intercultural competence, but the field lacks consistent findings on the ways to most effectively help cultivate its development. And finally, despite the fact that short-term study abroad programs now make up the majority of college student international experiences, there remains a gap in the literature regarding the effectiveness of these programs.

It is evident our pluralistic society needs interculturally competent leaders. After reviewing the literature, the increase in short-term study abroad and the lack of empirical data demonstrates a clear need to study the development of intercultural maturity in second year students. This study contributes to the literature through an evaluation of a targeted second year college student short-term abroad program and the development of intercultural maturity.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a mixed methods, quasi-experimental design and focused on the development of intercultural maturity of college sophomores at the University of San Diego (USD). The research questions that guided this study investigated: (1) To what extent does a three-week study abroad program cause development of intercultural maturity of second year college students? (2) To what extent does intercultural maturity develop in second year college students who do not participate in a three-week study abroad program? (3) To what extent does the intercultural maturity of the study abroad students compare to those students who remained on campus? (4) To what extent do social identities, campus involvement, and behaviors in college predict changes in cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal development?

This chapter begins with a description of the research design followed by a description of the research site and how the participants were selected for this study. An outline of the data collection and analysis procedures is explained and includes a description of the survey instrument, its scales, and the qualitative survey questions.

Research Design

In order to gain insight into the research questions, all USD second year college students were given the opportunity to participate in this study. In an effort to measure the extent of any changes in intercultural maturity, this study gathered data at three distinct points in time using the *Global Perspective Inventory* (GPI). The GPI instrument is discussed later in this chapter. A pre-test, post-test, and three-month follow up post-test survey was emailed to all second year students at the relative beginning, middle, and

end of their second academic year of university. Quantitative and qualitative analysis was conducted in order to measure any changes in cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal development and any factors that correlated to changes in intercultural maturity.

This study is quasi-experimental due to the nature of its non-equivalent groups (Schutt, 2012). Students were not randomly assigned to groups, rather second year students self-selected to participate or not participate in the SYE Abroad program. Another factor for the quasi-experimental classification in this pre-test and post-test design, with the SYE Abroad program being in the independent variable or “treatment” is that I cannot say for certain that the SYE Abroad program caused any potential change in intercultural maturity (Schutt, 2012). While trying to control for this situation by utilizing the post-test directly after the completion of the program and using a second follow up measure, other factors may contribute to participants’ intercultural maturity. These factors and others are discussed in a later section in this chapter.

Research Site and Participant Selection

The University of San Diego (USD) is a small, private Catholic institution located in the Southwestern region of the United States. The University was engaged in its fourth year of a program in which approximately 130 university sophomores per year travel abroad during the university’s three-week winter session. In this initiative, dubbed the *Second Year Experience Abroad (SYE Abroad)* program, students enroll in a general education class and travel with university faculty and staff and engage in curricular and co-curricular experiences together while abroad. The SYE Abroad program was developed at USD in 2011 and is currently the only program of its type being offered to

second year students at an institution in the United States. Most participants are members of the majority culture within the United States and have many privileges, including, but not limited to, attending a private and relatively expensive higher education institution.

All second-year USD students are eligible to apply for the SYE Abroad program. The three-credit academic course, co-curricular program events and housing are included in the program package and are offered at the same tuition rate as a three-credit course taken on the USD campus, however, the cost of travel, meals, and incidentals represent additional expenses for the student participants. Financial aid for students is available for SYE Abroad just as it is for on-campus courses. Despite the availability of financial aid, the additional expenses associated with participating in SYE Abroad may have an impact on who is able to participate in the SYE Abroad program.

A purposeful sampling strategy was used in this study (Fowler, 2009). This study solicited all USD second year students in the 2013-2014 academic year. Both SYE Abroad and non-SYE Abroad second year students (SYE) were asked to participate in order to compare the potential impact of the SYE Abroad experience and social identities and personal behaviors factors that may or may not correlate to the development of intercultural maturity.

Since the SYE Abroad program began in 2011, the University of San Diego has used the *Global Perspective Inventory* (GPI) to assess this program and its impact on participants. The SYE Abroad January 2014 participants were invited to complete the pre-test and post-test surveys by the USD International Center staff as part of their participation in the SYE Abroad program. For the purpose of this study, I solicited the SYE students (all other USD second year students) via email to participate in this

research. Incentives (set number of raffle prizes randomly selected) were awarded to SYE participants who completed the pre-test and post-test. Toward the end of the 2013-2014 academic year (April 2014), I solicited all second year student participants (SYE Abroad and SYE students) to take the three-month follow up post-test. The set of four qualitative questions accompanied the three-month follow up post-test survey. A second set of raffle prize incentives (randomly selected) were given to participants in the three-month follow up post-test.

Data Collection Procedures

In order to gain a general understanding of the development of intercultural maturity of second year college students, a pre-test, post-test, and three-month follow up post-test survey that included four qualitative questions was administered. In doing so, I gained an understanding of student experiences and how the students were changed by their SYE Abroad participation and general experience in their second year of college.

An online pre-test survey was emailed to all second year USD students in early October 2013. The International Center staff emailed the SYE Abroad students and I emailed the SYE students. The post-test survey was emailed to SYE Abroad participants and SYE pre-test respondents in late January 2014 following the conclusion of the SYE Abroad program. This time was chosen in order to capture any immediate changes in intercultural maturity after the SYE Abroad program and to measure any growth within the control group of SYE students. In April 2014, I emailed the three-month follow up post-test survey to all second year student participants who completed the pre-test survey. The three-month follow up post-test was used to identify any longer term growth in intercultural maturity or any decline that may have occurred without continued

engagement for SYE Abroad students. A secondary purpose of the final survey was to highlight other factors that may contribute to the development of intercultural maturity within the second year of college for USD students. The results offered insights and information related to SYE Abroad program.

Instrument

The instrument used in this study, the *Global Perspective Inventory (GPI)*, was developed in 2007 by authors Braskamp, Braskamp, Carter, and Engberg (2011). Since then, the instrument has undergone several revisions with the latest version released in the summer of 2011. The authors designed the instrument with a holistic approach to human developmental and considered the theoretical perspectives of King and Baxter Magolda's *intercultural maturity* and intercultural communication in its construction. As noted in the previous chapters, King and Baxter Magolda's theory is based on the work of Kegan (1994) and his identification of three major domains of human development: cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal. These three major domains of the GPI instrument each have two sub-scales. The cognitive domain is comprised of the sub-scales *knowing* and *knowledge*; the intrapersonal domain consists of *identity* and *affect*; the interpersonal dimension is composed of *social responsibility* and *social interactions* (Braskamp et al., 2011). In the sections that follow, I use the authors' definitions of the scales and sub-scales.

Cognitive. The authors of the GPI defined cognitive development as one's knowledge and understanding of what is true and important. The cognitive domain is comprised of the sub-scales *knowing* and *knowledge*. *Knowing* is the degree of complexity of one's view of the importance of cultural context in judging what is

important to know and value; *knowledge* is the degree of understanding and awareness of various cultures and their impact on our global society and level of proficiency in more than one language.

Intrapersonal. The second domain, intrapersonal development, focuses on one becoming more aware of and integrating one's personal values and self-identity into one's personhood. The intrapersonal domain consists of *identity* and *affect* sub-scales. *Identity* is the level of awareness of one's unique identity and degree of acceptance of one's ethnic, racial, and gender dimensions of identity. *Affect* is the level of respect for and acceptance of cultural perspectives different from one's own and degree of emotional confidence when living in complex situations.

Interpersonal. The final domain that the GPI measures is interpersonal development. Interpersonal development is centered on one's willingness to interact with persons with different social norms and cultural backgrounds, acceptance of others, and being comfortable when relating to others. It includes being able to view others differently; and relating to others in terms of moving from dependency to independence to interdependence, which is considered as the most mature perspective in effectively living in a global society. The two sub-scales that compose this domain are *social responsibility* and *social interactions*. *Social responsibility* is defined as the level of interdependence and social concern for others. *Social interactions* are the degree of engagement with others who are different from oneself and degree of cultural sensitivity living in pluralistic settings.

The GPI instrument (Appendix A) is comprised of 75 items; 58 Likert scale responses, 17 closed-ended questions that include some demographic questions such as

gender, ethnicity, major, parental education level, grade point average (GPA). The majority of Likert-style response options include (1) Strongly Agree (2) Agree (3) Neutral (4) Disagree (5) Strongly Disagree. Sample items include “When I notice cultural differences, my culture tends to have the better approach,” “I understand the reasons and causes of conflict among nations of different cultures,” and “I do not feel threatened emotionally when presented with multiple perspectives.” Survey questions are written in both affirmative and negative format in order to assist with the reliability of responses.

Since 2008, over 170 institutions of higher education have utilized the GPI on their campuses with over 80,000 student participants (Global Perspectives Inventory, 2013). Test-retest reliability was conducted for groups of students who traveled abroad for different lengths of time (i.e. one semester, three weeks). The sub-scale test-retest reliabilities for three-week abroad programs ranged from 0.49 to 0.81 with an average score of 0.71. Statistical analyses on the GPI instrument were conducted using the coefficient alpha to measure internal consistency. Based on 5,350 undergraduate students from 46 institutions, the internal consistency of the six sub-scales range from 0.63 to 0.77. Four of the six sub-scale alpha coefficients are considered “good” ($0.7 \leq \alpha 0.9$) within social science research and all sub-scales fall within an “acceptable” ($0.6 \leq \alpha 0.7$) range (Hinkle et al., 2003). Summaries of the coefficient alpha reliabilities are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Coefficient alpha reliabilities of the GPI scales (Braskamp et al., 2011)

Scale	Coefficient Alpha
Cognitive – Knowing	.63
Cognitive – Knowledge	.77
Intrapersonal – Identity	.72
Intrapersonal – Affect	.66
Interpersonal – Social Responsibility	.71
Interpersonal – Social Interaction	.74

In addition to the GPI instrument, supplemental quantitative and qualitative questions were asked of the participants in the online survey (Appendix B). The first set of questions related to the specific type(s) of co-curricular activities they are involved with on campus (e.g. athletics, student government, theater) and their level of involvement (participated, active member, leadership role). The second set of questions asked how many times the student has traveled internationally, where they traveled, with whom they traveled with, and the purpose of their travel. The four open-ended qualitative questions asked participants to reflect on their experiences with difference and how they felt they had changed during their sophomore year of college. The qualitative questions were as follows: (1) Think about a time when you encountered a person different from you. Please describe the event and why it was significant to you. (2) Has your perception of others changed during your sophomore year in college, and if so, in what ways? (3) In what ways (if any) have your beliefs and values changed this

academic year? (4) What are the biggest global issues we face? How can they be addressed? These questions helped in determining important factors that relate to growth or loss in the development of intercultural maturity.

Data Analysis Procedures

In order to answer the research questions for this study, I analyzed the data in four marked phases. To answer research questions (1) To what extent does a three-week study abroad program cause development of intercultural maturity of second year college students? and, (2) To what extent does intercultural maturity develop in second year college students who do not participate in a three-week study abroad program, I used paired samples *t*-tests to provide descriptive statistics to compare the average scores of the cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal scales and sub-scales from the pre-test, post-test, and three-month follow up post-test phases of the study. The data from these three points in time, prior to SYE Abroad, directly after the program in late January, and near the conclusion of their second year in college, assisted in determining if growth in intercultural maturity occurred and if growth continued after the conclusion of the three-week program or within their second year of college for those remaining on campus.

Next, to address research question (3) To what extent, if at all, do these two groups compare, inferential statistical analysis were conducted. I used independent samples tests to compare the means in intercultural maturity of the SYE Abroad students with the SYE participants; these were conducted at the $p = .05$ level of statistical significance. The sub-scales range in the number of questions that comprise their measurements from four to seven questions across the five-point scale in the GPI

instrument. Therefore, I used an average score (calculated by summing the scores and dividing by the number of questions) in the sub-scales to compare means.

To gain insight into the fourth and final research question (4) To what extent do social identities, campus involvement, and behaviors in college predict changes in cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal development, two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and a mixed-design ANOVA were utilized. The change in intercultural maturity was the dependent variable and student social identities, campus involvement, and behaviors in college were the independent variables. The first step in analysis was to determine whether the SYE Abroad program had a significant effect on each of the dependent variables. The second phase of analysis focused on how the multiple sets of variables (social identities, campus involvement, and behaviors in college) can predict each of the dependent variables. More specifically, I investigated how such examples of gender, race and ethnicity, socio-economic status, and parental education is associated with change in intercultural maturity. In order to measure campus involvement and behaviors in college, I grouped four survey questions regarding student-faculty interactions and relationship to create a variable named *faculty-related engagement* to determine any predictive relationships with growth in intercultural maturity. A similar process was administered for survey items related to campus involvement named *cultural-related engagement* using ten Global Perspective Inventory questions. The following chapter presents the results of this research study.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to examine the development of intercultural maturity in second year college students—both those who completed a short-term study abroad experience called SYE Abroad and those who remained on campus. Four research questions guided this study at the University of San Diego: (1) To what extent does a three-week study abroad program cause development of intercultural maturity of second year college students? (2) To what extent does intercultural maturity develop in second year college students who do not participate in a three-week study abroad program? (3) To what extent does the intercultural maturity of the study abroad students compare to those students who remained on campus? (4) To what extent do social identities, campus involvement, and behaviors in college predict changes in cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal development?

Using a quasi-experimental mixed methods approach, I analyzed quantitative data of more than 240 student participants from three surveys and qualitative data of 17 participants from open-ended responses from three-month follow post-test surveys. This chapter presents the results of the research in six sections. The first section describes the sample participants and provides the descriptive statistics of those who participated in the study. Next, I report the findings of each of the four research questions in sequential order. The first set of results is for the SYE Abroad participants followed by a section dedicated to the findings for the SYE students (control group). The third research question compares the results of the SYE Abroad participants to the SYE/control group students. The final research question examines which factors impact intercultural

maturity for the overall participant group (SYE Abroad and SYE) and then examines whether the SYE Abroad program is a contributing factor for intercultural maturity for different social identities or behaviors in college. The chapter concludes with the results of the qualitative responses.

Sample Demographics

A summary of the demographical data of the 243 participants in this study is presented in Table 3. Gender, race and ethnicity, major, and acceptance of the Federal Pell Grant (used as an indicator of socio-economic status), the number of times participants had traveled internationally are displayed in the table. All participants are second-year college students at the University of San Diego and are an average age of 19 years old. The undergraduate population at USD is approximately 55 percent women and 45 percent men as shown in Table 4. The respondents for this study over-represents women at 69 percent. A further breakdown of the sample population demonstrates that the Second Year Experience Abroad (SYE Abroad) participants are represented at 63 percent women as shown in Table 5. According to the Institute of International Education, the national study abroad population is approximately 65 percent women (2013) which is fairly representative of the sample population.

Table 3

Sample demographics (n = 243)

Demographic		Number of Students	Percentage
Gender	Male	75	31%
	Female	168	69%
Race/Ethnicity	White	152	62.6%
	Hispanic or Latino	37	15.2%
	Multiple Ethnicities	26	10.8%
	Asian/Pacific Islander	19	7.8%
	Black	6	2.5%
	Prefer Not to Respond	3	1.2%
Major	Business & Law	79	32.5%
	Science & Math	41	16.9%
	Behavioral Sciences	36	14.8%
	Communication	19	7.8%
	Engineering	19	7.8%
	Health, Medical	18	7.4%
	Arts & Humanities	14	5.8%
	Other	11	4.5%
	Education	6	2.5%
Pell Grant	Did Not Accept	200	82.3%
	Did Accept	43	17.7%

Table 4

Race/ethnicity demographics (United States Census Bureau, 2013; University of San Diego, 2014)

Race/Ethnicity Category	United States (2013)	USD (Fall 2013)	Sample
Hispanic/Latino	17%	19%	15.2%
Black or African American	13%	3%	2.5%
American Indian	1%	< 1%	Not Specified
Asian/ Pacific Islander	5%	6%	7.8
White	62%	55%	62.6%
Multiple Ethnicities	2%	6%	10.8%
Unknown/Decline to State	Not Specified	5%	1.2%

The University of San Diego's undergraduate population (Fall 2013) is approximately 55 percent White as demonstrated in Table 4. Of the 243 respondents to this study, 62.6 percent White, however, the SYE Abroad participants are 72.6 percent White. Over the past ten years, national averages for study abroad students have ranged between 76 to 84 percent White (Institute of International Education, 2013). The participants in this study are more representative of the national population and the national study abroad programs than it is of the University of San Diego demographics.

Table 5 compares the sample demographics of the SYE Abroad students to the SYE students (control group). A two-sided Pearson chi-square statistic was run in order to determine any significant demographic characteristic differences between the two sample groups. As demonstrated in Table 5, race/ethnicity and acceptance of the Federal Pell Grant were shown to be statistically significant (0.01 and 0.00 respectively).

Therefore, the SYE Abroad sample and the SYE sample (control group) do not match one another in terms of race/ethnicity and socio-economic status. More specifically, there are more students of color and more students who accepted Federal Pell Grants in the SYE sample than in the SYE Abroad sample.

The Federal Pell Grant Program, which provides need-based grants to low-income students, was used as the indicator for socio-economic status in this study. Pell Grant recipients account for approximately 13 percent of USD's population and are represented at 17.7 percent of the sample population. However, only 3 of the 83 respondents of this question in the SYE Abroad program or 3.6 percent accepted Federal Pell grants. The Pell Grant population is underrepresented in the SYE Abroad participants in this study. The underrepresentation of this population may be in part to do the actual or perceived cost of studying abroad.

The *Global Perspective Inventory (GPI)* was administered to both the Second Year Experience Abroad (SYE Abroad) and second year experience college students (SYE/control group) at approximately three different points in their second year of college. The three surveys were administered at approximately the beginning of the academic year (prior to the abroad trip), mid-point of the academic year (conclusion of the abroad trip), and the end of the academic year (approximately three months after the abroad trip). A total of 857 second year college students were invited to participate in the survey; 132 SYE Abroad participants and 725 SYE students. Out of the 243 survey participants who completed the pre-test (28 percent response rate), only 91 completed the post-test and three-month follow up post-test, 110 completed the post-test, and 42 completed the three-month follow up post-test as demonstrated in Table 6.

Table 5

Comparison of SYE Abroad and SYE samples

Demographic		SYE Abroad		SYE		Chi-Square
		n	%	n	%	
Gender	Male	31	37	44	28	.14
	Female	53	63	115	72	
Race/Ethnicity	White	61	73	91	57	.01**
	Hispanic or Latino	7	8	30	19	
	Multiple Ethnicities	8	9.5	18	11	
	Asian/Pacific Islander	3	3.5	16	10	
	Black	2	3.5	4	2.5	
	Prefer Not to Respond	3	3.5	0	0	
Major	Business & Law	35	42	44	28	.26
	Science & Math	9	11	32	20	
	Behavioral Sciences	11	13	25	16	
	Communication	7	8	12	7.5	
	Engineering	3	4	16	10	
	Health, Medical	7	8	11	7	
	Arts & Humanities	6	7	8	5	
	Other	4	5	7	4	
	Education	2	2	4	2.5	
Pell Grant	Did Not Accept	80	95	120	75	.000***
	Did Accept	3	5	40	25	
Parental Education	Less than H.S.	0	0	7	5	.06
	H.S. Graduate	5	6	21	13	
	Some College	10	12	29	18	
	College Degree	30	37	48	30	
	Some Graduate	3	3	3	2	
	Graduate Degree	35	42	32	32	
Number	0 times	0	0	11	12	.26
International Travel	1 time	5	13	19	20	
	2 times	6	16	10	10	
	3 times	6	16	10	10	
	4 times	3	8	8	8	
	5 or more times	18	47	38	40	

Note. ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table 6

Number of respondents to GPI

GPI Test	SYE Abroad	SYE	Total
Pre-test, Post-test & 3-month post-test	26	65	91
Pre-test & Post-test	46	64	110
Pre-test & 3-month post-test	12	30	42

Research Question One

Does Intercultural Maturity Develop by Participating in a three-week Study Abroad program?

In order to address the first research question in this study, (1) to what extent does a three-week study abroad program cause development of intercultural maturity of second year college student, paired sample *t*-tests were conducted to compare the means of the overall growth in intercultural maturity of the SYE Abroad participants. Pre-test scores measuring intercultural maturity were compared to post-test scores that were collected directly after the three week study abroad program (intervention) and compared again with the means from the three-month follow up post-test.

As demonstrated in Table 7, a statistically significant level (at the $p < .05$ level) of development in intercultural maturity was found among the college students who participated in the three-week Second Year Experience Abroad (SYE Abroad) in the post-test survey that occurred immediately upon their return from the three-week abroad experience. The average mean increased from 3.50 to 3.56 among the 72 SYE Abroad students who completed the pre-test and post-test. However, there was no statistically significant difference in the level of growth in intercultural maturity for the 38 participants who completed the three-month follow up post-test at the $p < .05$ level.

Paired samples *t*-tests were also conducted for the cognitive (COG), intrapersonal (TRA), and interpersonal (TER) sub-scales. Statistically significant differences were found in the pre-test and post-test scores for the cognitive and interpersonal sub-scales as shown in Table 8. There were no statistically significant changes in the intrapersonal sub-scale or in any of the sub-scales between the pre-test and three-month follow up post-test or the post-test and three-month follow up post-test.

Table 7

Descriptive statistics and paired samples t-test: Intercultural maturity SYE Abroad

SYE Abroad IM	N	M	SD	df	Sig.
Pre-test	72	3.50	.28	71	.03*
Post-test	72	3.56	.26		
Pre-test	38	3.48	.25	37	.30
3 month post-test	38	3.51	.22		
Post-test	26	3.57	.22	25	.26
3 month post-test	26	3.53	.18		

Note. * $p < .05$

Table 8

Descriptive statistics and paired samples t-test: Cognitive, Intrapersonal, Interpersonal SYE Abroad

SYE Abroad	N	M	SD	df	Sig.
COG Pre-test	72	3.13	.39	71	.03*
COG Post-test	72	3.22	.33		
TRA Pre-test	72	3.88	.32	71	.72
TRA Post-test	72	3.90	.31		
TER Pre-test	72	3.43	.34	71	.02*
TER Post-test	72	3.50	.35		

Note. * $p < .05$

Research Question Two

Does Intercultural Maturity Develop in second year college students who do not participate in a three-week study abroad program?

To address the second research question, to what extent does intercultural maturity develop in second year college students who do not participate in a three-week study abroad program, paired samples *t*-test were performed. Among the SYE students (control group), there were no statistical mean differences found in their level of development in intercultural maturity at the $p < .05$ level. Based on the self-reporting scores of the 129 participants who completed the pre-test and post-test and the 95 participants who completed the pre-test and three month follow up post test that was administered toward the end of the second year of college (shown in Table 9). In fact, the mean averages for the participants slightly decreased from 3.53 to 3.51 in the post-test survey (late January) and to 3.52 in the three-month follow up post-test survey. Overall, there was no statistically significant change in the intercultural maturity for students who did not study abroad in their second year of college. Paired samples *t*-tests were also conducted for the cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal sub-scales, however no statistical significance was found within the individual sub-scales.

Table 9

Descriptive statistics and paired samples t-test: Intercultural maturity SYE (control group)

SYE IM	N	M	SD	df	Sig.
Pre-test	129	3.53	.28	128	.40
Post-test	129	3.51	.29		
Pre-test	95	3.52	.27	94	.95
3 month post-test	95	3.52	.27		
Post-test	65	3.50	.25	64	.84
3 month post-test	65	3.50	.25		

Note. $p < .05$

Research Question Three

How do SYE Abroad students compare to the control group?

The central research question that drives this study is whether a three-week study abroad program effects the development of intercultural maturity in second year college students. Thus far, the independent group results from the students that received the intervention (study abroad) and the control group (students who remained on campus) has demonstrated only a slight increase in intercultural maturity for the SYE Abroad students immediately after the international experience. This next section compares the results of the SYE Abroad students to the SYE college students who did not participate in the short-term study abroad experience.

Independent samples tests were conducted to compare the means of the sample population within their respective groups of SYE Abroad participants and the control group (SYE). As shown in Table 10, there is no statistical difference between the participants level of intercultural maturity at the $p < .05$ level.

Table 10

Descriptive statistics and independent samples test: Intercultural maturity by group

GPI	Group								
	SYE Abroad			SYE			95% CI	df	Sig.
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N			
Pre-test	3.50	.28	84	3.51	.28	159	-.09, .06	241	.78
Post-test	3.56	.26	72	3.51	.29	129	-.03, .13	199	.33
3 month post-test	3.52	.28	38	3.52	.28	95	-.10, .10	131	.22

Note. $p < .05$

As a follow up, a paired samples test (shown in Table 11) showed a significant correlation between pre-test and post-test scores as well as pre-test and 3-month follow up post-test scores in intercultural maturity. This analysis demonstrates a positive correlation or similarity in responses and therefore no change in the development of intercultural maturity.

Table 11

Descriptive statistics and paired samples test: Intercultural maturity

IM	N	M	SD	Correlation	Sig.
Pre-test: Post-test	200	3.51	.28	.63	.000***
Pre-test: 3 month post-	133	3.50	.26	.71	.000***

Note. *** $p < .001$

Research Question Four

How Do Social Identities, Campus Involvement, and Behaviors in College Predict Changes in Intercultural Maturity?

To address the fourth and final research question in this study, to what extent do social identities, campus involvement, and behaviors in college predict changes in cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal development a number of statistical methods

were conducted to determine which factors may be predictive. Two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were conducted for the SYE Abroad participants and the SYE students/control in order to determine whether gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status (utilizing Federal Pell Grant status), and parental education were factors related to the development of intercultural maturity (see Table 12). The results of the two-way ANOVA for the SYE Abroad participants demonstrated no statistical significance with respect to gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status (as measured by Federal Pell Grant status), or by parental education level with the means for intercultural maturity (pre-test, post-test, or three-month follow up post-test).

Table 12

Analysis of variance of participant demographics for SYE Abroad participants

Demographic Survey		Source	df	SS	MS	F	Sig.
Gender	Pre-test	Between Groups	1	.24	.24	3.18	.08
		Within Groups	82	6.28	.08		
		Total	83	6.52			
	Post-test	Between Groups	1	.19	.19	2.87	.09
		Within Groups	70	4.67	.07		
		Total	71	4.86			
	3 month post-test	Between Groups	1	.00	.00	.06	.80
		Within Groups	36	1.84	.05		
		Total	37	1.85			
Ethnicity	Pre-test	Between Groups	1	.06	.06	.75	.39
		Within Groups	82	6.46	.08		
		Total	83	6.52			
	Post-test	Between Groups	1	.02	.02	2.84	.60
		Within Groups	70	4.84	.07		
		Total	71	4.86			
	3 month post-test	Between Groups	1	.03	.03	.56	.46
		Within Groups	36	1.82	.05		
		Total	37	1.85			
Pell Grant	Pre-test	Between Groups	1	.02	.02	.19	.66
		Within Groups	82	6.51	.08		
		Total	83	6.52			
	Post-test	Between Groups	1	.04	.04	.59	.44
		Within Groups	70	4.82	.04		
		Total	71	4.86			
	3 month post-test	Between Groups	1	.02	.02	.41	.53
		Within Groups	36	1.83	.05		
		Total	37	1.85			

Parental Education	Pre-test	Between Groups	1	.01	.01	.07	.79
		Within Groups	82	6.51	.08		
		Total	83	6.52			
	Post-test	Between Groups	1	.01	.01	.15	.70
		Within Groups	70	4.85	.07		
		Total	71	4.86			
	3 month post-test	Between Groups	1	.00	.00	.09	.77
		Within Groups	36	1.84	.05		
		Total	37	1.85			

Note. $p < .05$

The next step in these analyses examined the results for the SYE students who did not study abroad (control group). The two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed significance in some of the variables (see Table 13). Student grouping (SYE) and personal characteristics (gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status, parental education) were the independent variables and intercultural maturity was the dependent variable. Gender did not demonstrate a significant difference in relation to intercultural maturity with the SYE participants. However, statistical significance ($p < .05$) was found in the post-test results between students of color and White SYE participants. The mean score of intercultural maturity for students of color was 3.57 (SD = 0.27) while White students had mean scores of 3.46 (SD = 0.29). There was no statistical significance between the groups in the pre-test or three month follow up post-test.

Similarly, statistical significance ($p < .05$) was found in the post-test results for the control group in the intercultural maturity means scores. Federal Pell grant recipients' means were 3.60 (SD = 0.25) while students who were not eligible or did not receive Federal Pell grant funding had mean scores of 3.47 (SD = 0.29) on the intercultural maturity scale. Thus, students who received Pell funding had an overall

higher mean score for intercultural maturity than the students who did not receive Pell funding in the post-test surveys. There was no statistical significance in the pre-test or three month follow up post-test.

Respondents were initially asked to indicate parental educational level into one of five categories (high school graduate, some college, college degree, some graduate work, graduate degree). In order to increase the power of the small sample sizes within each of the five possible responses, the parental education variable was re-coded into two variables: those with less than a bachelor's degree and those with a bachelor's or more education. After this adjustment, parental education demonstrated statistically significant ($p < .05$) results. Among the SYE students/control group, the pre-test mean scores for intercultural maturity for students whose parents earned less than a bachelor's degree was 3.58 (SD = 0.25) while those students whose parents earned a bachelor's degree or more education had a mean score of 3.48 (SD = 0.29). Similarly, the mean scores in the post-test survey were 3.58 (SD = 0.23) and 3.47 (SD = 0.31) respectively. Table 4.11 displays the two-way ANOVA results for gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status (utilizing Federal Pell Grant status), and parental education among the SYE students.

Table 13

Analysis of variance of participant demographics for SYE participants

Demographic	Survey	Source	df	SS	MS	F	Sig.
Gender	Pre-test	Between Groups	1	.17	.17	2.20	.14
		Within Groups	157	11.99	.08		
		Total	158	12.16			
	Post-test	Between Groups	1	.01	.01	.12	.73
		Within Groups	127	10.67	.08		
		Total	128	10.68			
	3 month post-test	Between Groups	1	.24	.24	3.16	.08
		Within Groups	93	7.04	.08		
		Total	94	7.28			
Ethnicity	Pre-test	Between Groups	1	.22	.22	2.83	.09
		Within Groups	157	11.99	.08		
		Total	158	12.16			
	Post-test	Between Groups	1	.37	.37	4.60	.03*
		Within Groups	127	10.31	.08		
		Total	128	10.68			
	3 month post-test	Between Groups	1	.20	.20	2.60	.11
		Within Groups	93	7.08	.08		
		Total	94	7.28			
Pell Grant	Pre-test	Between Groups	1	.21	.22	2.84	.09
		Within Groups	157	11.95	.08		
		Total	158	12.16			
	Post-test	Between Groups	1	.42	.42	5.19	.02*
		Within Groups	127	10.26	.08		
		Total	128	10.68			
	3 month post-test	Between Groups	1	.28	.28	3.73	.06
		Within Groups	93	6.99	.08		
		Total	94	7.28			

Parental Education	Pre-test	Between Groups	1	.36	.36	4.83	.03*
		Within Groups	157	11.80	.08		
		Total	158	12.16			
	Post-test	Between Groups	1	.39	.39	4.81	.03*
		Within Groups	127	10.29	.08		
		Total	128	10.68			
	3 month post-test	Between Groups	1	.07	.07	.93	.34
		Within Groups	93	7.20	.08		
		Total	94	7.28			

Note. $p < .05$

To further analyze the results from this study with regard to the fourth research question, a mixed-design analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. The SYE Abroad students and SYE students were the independent variables in the first 2 x 2 mixed-design ANOVA and the difference between the pre-test and post-test results for the cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables were the dependent variables. The results of the descriptive statistics and repeated measures ANOVAs and are displayed in Tables 14 through 16. There was a significant difference in the mean scores for change in the cognitive variable between the SYE Abroad students and the SYE students as demonstrated in Table 15. The SYE Abroad students had a statistically significant ($p < .05$) increase in their cognitive mean scores as compared to the SYE students.

Table 14

Descriptive statistics for SYE Abroad and SYE students by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Variable	Survey	SYE Abroad			SYE		
		M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Cognitive	Pre-test	3.13	.39	72	3.17	.36	129
	Post-test	3.22	.33	72	3.16	.39	129
Intrapersonal	Pre-test	3.88	.32	72	3.89	.32	129
	Post-test	3.90	.31	72	3.86	.33	129
Interpersonal	Pre-test	3.42	.34	72	3.47	.38	129
	Post-test	3.50	.35	72	3.46	.38	129

Note. $p < .05$

Table 15

Mixed-design ANOVA of tests within-subjects effects for SYE Abroad and SYE students by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Source		Type III SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
SYEA.SYE.Cognitive	Sphericity	.17	1	.17	3.10	.08
	Assumed					
SYEA.SYE.Cognitive* SYEA.SYE	Sphericity	.23	1	.23	4.20	.04*
	Assumed					
Error (SYEA.SYE.Cognitive)	Sphericity	11.13	199	.06		
	Assumed					
SYEA.SYE. Intrapersonal	Sphericity	.01	1	.01	.25	.62
	Assumed					
SYEA.SYE. Intrapersonal* SYEA.SYE	Sphericity	.04	1	.04	1.20	.27
	Assumed					
Error (SYEA.SYE. Intrapersonal)	Sphericity	7.19	199	.04		
	Assumed					
SYEA.SYE. Interpersonal	Sphericity	.09	1	.09	1.43	.23
	Assumed					
SYEA.SYE. Interpersonal* SYEA.SYE	Sphericity	.19	1	.19	2.98	.09
	Assumed					
Error (SYEA.SYE. Interpersonal)	Sphericity	12.32	199	.06		
	Assumed					

Note. $p < .05^*$

Table 16

Mixed-design ANOVA of tests between-subjects effects for SYE Abroad and SYE students by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Source		Type III SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Cognitive	Intercept	3716.62	1	3716.62	16838.76	.00
	SYEA.SYE	.01	1	.01	.05	.82
	Error	43.92	199	.22		
Intrapersonal	Intercept	5574.70	1	5574.70	32615.04	.00
	SYEA.SYE	.03	1	.03	.15	.70
	Error	34.01	199	.17		
Interpersonal	Intercept	4436.89	1	4436.89	20934.84	.00
	SYEA.SYE	.00	1	.00	.00	.98
	Error	42.18	100	.21		

Note. $p < .05$

In order to further examine the social identities of the SYE Abroad students, additional mixed-design ANOVAs were performed. Gender, ethnicity (White students or persons of color), socio-economic status (as measured by acceptance of the Federal Pell Grant), parental education (less than bachelor's degree or bachelors' degree or more) were the independent variables and the difference in the pre-test and post-test scores for the cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal sub-scales of intercultural maturity were the dependent variables.

Table 17 displays the descriptive statistics for the SYE Abroad students by gender and the pre-test and post-test scores for the cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal sub-scales. Gender had a small effect size among this group of participants. The within-subjects effect for gender was not statistically significant, however the between-subjects effect was statistically significant within the cognitive variable as displayed in Table 18 and Table 19.

Table 17

Descriptive statistics for SYE Abroad students and gender by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Variable	Survey	Male			Female		
		M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Cognitive	Pre-test	3.28	.36	28	3.03	.38	44
	Post-test	3.35	.32	28	3.14	.31	44
Intrapersonal	Pre-test	3.92	.37	28	3.85	.28	44
	Post-test	3.94	.30	28	3.87	.32	44
Interpersonal	Pre-test	3.50	.35	28	3.38	.32	44
	Post-test	3.54	.33	28	3.48	.35	44

Note. $p < .05$

Table 18

Mixed-design ANOVA of tests within-subjects effects for SYE Abroad students and gender by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Source		Type III SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
SYEA.Cognitive.Gender	Sphericity	.27	1	.27	4.10	.05
	Assumed					
SYEA.Cognitive.Gender*	Sphericity	.02	1	.02	.35	.56
	Assumed					
Error (SYEA.Cognitive.Gender)	Sphericity	4.53	70	.06		
	Assumed					
SYEA.Intrapersonal.Gender	Sphericity	.00	1	.00	.11	.74
	Assumed					
SYEA.Intrapersonal.Gender*	Sphericity	.00	1	.00	.01	.92
	Assumed					
Error (SYEA.Intrapersonal.Gender)	Sphericity	2.67	70	.04		
	Assumed					
SYEA.Interpersonal.Gender	Sphericity	.16	1	.16	4.14	.04
	Assumed					
SYEA.Interpersonal.Gender*	Sphericity	.04	1	.04	.95	.33
	Assumed					
Error (SYEA.Interpersonal.Gender)	Sphericity	2.70	70	.04		
	Assumed					

Note. $p < .05^*$

Table 19

Mixed-design ANOVA of tests between-subjects effects for SYE Abroad students and gender by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Source		Type III SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Cognitive	Intercept	1403.53	1	1403.53	8172.34	.00
	SYEA.Gender	1.81	1	.181	10.53	.00*
	Error	12.02	70	.17		
Intrapersonal	Intercept	2081.05	1	2081.05	12748.46	.00
	SYEA.Gender	.15	1	.15	.95	.33
	Error	11.43	70	.16		
Interpersonal	Intercept	1652.35	1	1652.35	8386.65	.00
	SYEA.Gender	.31	1	.31	1.57	.21
	Error	13.79	70	.20		

Note. $p < .05^*$

Ethnicity within the SYE Abroad students was the next social identity measured with the mixed-design ANOVA. Table 20 displays the descriptive statistics for the SYE Abroad students by White students and students of color. The sample size for persons of color within the SYE Abroad group is a smaller sample of 17 participants. Table 21 and Table 22 show the results of the repeated measures ANOVA for the SYE Abroad students by ethnicity. Ethnicity was not a statistically significant factor in this group of SYE Abroad participants.

Table 20

Descriptive statistics for SYE Abroad students and ethnicity by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Variable	Survey	White			Person of Color		
		M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Cognitive	Pre-test	3.11	.40	55	3.18	.35	17
	Post-test	3.22	.34	55	3.24	.30	17
Intrapersonal	Pre-test	3.89	.32	55	3.88	.33	17
	Post-test	3.90	.32	55	3.87	.32	17
Interpersonal	Pre-test	3.40	.34	55	3.51	.31	17
	Post-test	3.47	.35	55	3.61	.34	17

Note. $p < .05$

Table 21

Mixed-design ANOVA of tests within-subjects effects for SYE Abroad students and ethnicity by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Source		Type III SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
SYEA.Cognitive.Ethnicity	Sphericity	.17	1	.17	2.56	.11
	Assumed					
SYEA.Cognitive.Ethnicity*	Sphericity	.02	1	.02	.27	.60
Ethnicity	Assumed					
Error	Sphericity	4.53	70	.06		
(SYEA.Cognitive.Ethnicity)	Assumed					
SYEA.Intrapersonal.Ethnicity	Sphericity	.00	1	.00	.01	.94
	Assumed					
SYEA.Intrapersonal.Ethnicity*	Sphericity	.01	1	.01	.19	.67
Ethnicity	Assumed					
Error	Sphericity	2.67	70	.04		
(SYEA.Intrapersonal.Ethnicity)	Assumed					
SYEA.Interpersonal.Ethnicity	Sphericity	.18	1	.18	4.62	.04
	Assumed					
SYEA.Interpersonal.Ethnicity*	Sphericity	.01	1	.01	.14	.71
Ethnicity	Assumed					
Error	Sphericity	2.70	70	.04		
(SYEA.Interpersonal.Ethnicity)	Assumed					

Note. $p < .05^*$

Table 22

Mixed-design ANOVA of tests between-subjects effects for SYE Abroad students and ethnicity by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Source		Type III	df	MS	F	Sig.
Cognitive	Intercept	1055.53	1	1055.53	5360.06	.00
	SYEA.Ethnicity	.05	1	.05	.23	.63
	Error	13.78	70	.20		
Intrapersonal	Intercept	1568.85	1	1568.85	9491.42	.00
	SYEA.Ethnicity	.01	1	.01	.07	.79
	Error	11.58	70	.17		
Interpersonal	Intercept	1271.80	1	1271.80	6526.31	.00
	SYEA.Ethnicity	.46	1	.46	2.36	.13
	Error	13.64	70	.20		

Note. $p < .05^*$

The SYE Abroad participants were also analyzed to determine if socio-economic status, as measured by acceptance of the Federal Pell Grant, was a significant variable in the change in the mean scores for the cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal subscales of intercultural maturity. Table 23 displays the descriptive statistics for the SYE Abroad students by those who accepted the Federal Pell Grant and those who did not. The sample size for those who accepted the Pell Grant within the SYE Abroad group is a small sample of three participants. Table 24 and Table 25 display the results of the repeated measures ANOVA for the SYE Abroad students. Socio-economic status was not a statistically significant factor in this group of SYE Abroad participants; however, it is difficult to draw conclusive results with such a small number of participants.

Table 23

Descriptive statistics for SYE Abroad students and socio-economic status by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Variable	Survey	Did Not Accept Pell			Did Accept Pell		
		M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Cognitive	Pre-test	3.14	.38	69	2.89	.58	3
	Post-test	3.24	.33	69	2.89	.17	3
Intrapersonal	Pre-test	3.89	.32	69	3.79	.42	3
	Post-test	3.90	.32	69	3.77	.28	3
Interpersonal	Pre-test	3.42	.34	69	3.52	.26	3
	Post-test	3.50	.36	69	3.59	.06	3

Note. $p < .05$

Table 24

Mixed-design ANOVA of tests within-subjects effects for SYE Abroad students and socio-economic status by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Source		Type III SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
SYEA.Cognitive.SES	Sphericity	.01	1	.01	.21	.65
	Assumed					
SYEA.Cognitive.SES*SES	Sphericity	.01	1	.01	.21	.65
	Assumed					
Error (SYEA.Cognitive.SES)	Sphericity	4.54	70	.06		
	Assumed					
SYEA.Intrapersonal.SES	Sphericity	.00	1	.00	.01	.94
	Assumed					
SYEA.Intrapersonal.SES*SES	Sphericity	.00	1	.00	.06	.81
	Assumed					
Error (SYEA.Intrapersonal.SES)	Sphericity	2.66	70	.04		
	Assumed					
SYEA.Interpersonal.SES	Sphericity	.03	1	.03	.82	.37
	Assumed					
SYEA.Interpersonal.SES*SES	Sphericity	.00	1	.00	.00	.99
	Assumed					
Error (SYEA.Interpersonal.SES)	Sphericity	2.74	70	.04		
	Assumed					

Note. $p < .05$

Table 25

Mixed-design ANOVA of tests between-subjects effects for SYE Abroad students and socio-economic status by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Source		Type III SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Cognitive	Intercept	212.41	1	212.41	1116.95	.00
	SYEA.SES	.52	1	2.72	2.72	.10
	Error	13.31	70	.19		
Intrapersonal	Intercept	339.01	1	339.01	2062.30	.00
	SYEA.SES	.08	1	.08	.46	.50
	Error	11.51	70	.16		
Interpersonal	Intercept	282.98	1	282.98	1410.08	.00
	SYEA.SES	.05	1	.05	.26	.61
	Error	14.05	70	.20		

Note. $p < .05$

Parental education was the last social identity category in which the SYE Abroad participants were measured for any statistical significant differences between the pre-test and post-test scores with the mixed-design ANOVA. Parental education was grouped in two categories: parents with less than a bachelor's degree and parents with a bachelor's degree or more education. Table 26 displays the descriptive statistics for the SYE Abroad participants. As noted in Table 26, SYE Abroad students whose parents earned less than a bachelor's degree is relatively small at 13 participants. Table 27 and Table 28 demonstrate the results of the repeated measures ANOVA for the SYE Abroad students. Parental education was not a statistically significant factor in this group of SYE Abroad participants.

Table 26

Descriptive statistics for SYE Abroad students and parental education by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Variable	Survey	Less than Bachelor's			Bachelor's or more		
		M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Cognitive	Pre-test	3.11	.38	13	3.13	.39	59
	Post-test	3.15	.35	13	3.24	.32	59
Intrapersonal	Pre-test	3.86	.27	13	3.89	.33	59
	Post-test	3.84	.25	13	3.91	.33	59
Interpersonal	Pre-test	3.46	.36	13	3.42	.34	59
	Post-test	3.54	.39	13	3.49	.34	59

Note. $p < .05$

Table 27

Mixed-design ANOVA of tests within-subjects effects for SYE Abroad students and parental education by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Source		Type III SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
SYEA.Cognitive.PAREDU	Sphericity	.11	1	.11	.172	.19
	Assumed					
SYEA.Cognitive.PAREDU*	Sphericity	.02	1	.02	.38	.54
PAREDU	Assumed					
Error	Sphericity	4.53	70	.06		
(SYEA.Cognitive.PAREDU)	Assumed					
SYEA.Intrapersonal.PAREDU	Sphericity	.00	1	.00	.00	.96
	Assumed					
SYEA.Intrapersonal.PAREDU*	Sphericity	.01	1	.01	.26	.61
PAREDU	Assumed					
Error	Sphericity	2.66	70	.04		
(SYEA.Intrapersonal.PAREDU)	Assumed					
SYEA.Interpersonal.PAREDU	Sphericity	.14	1	.14	3.44	.07
	Assumed					
SYEA.Interpersonal.PAREDU*	Sphericity	.00	1	.00	.02	.89
PAREDU	Assumed					
Error	Sphericity	2.74	70	.04		
(SYEA.Interpersonal.PAREDU)	Assumed					

Note. $p < .05$

Table 28

Mixed-design ANOVA of tests between-subjects effects for SYE Abroad students and parental education by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Source		Type III SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Cognitive	Intercept	849.74	1	849.74	4324.15	.00
	SYEA.PAREDU	.07	1	.07	.38	.54
	Error	13.76	70	.20		
Intrapersonal	Intercept	1280.44	1	1280.44	7777.01	.00
	SYEA.PAREDU	.05	1	.05	.30	.59
	Error	11.53	70	.17		
Interpersonal	Intercept	1031.80	1	1031.80	5141.16	.00
	SYEA.PAREDU	.05	1	.05	.26	.61
	Error	14.05	70	.20		

Note. $p < .05$

The mixed-design ANOVA was also conducted for the SYE students (control group) in order to determine if social identities (gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status, parental education) were predictors of growth in intercultural maturity. The social identities were the independent variables and difference between the pre-test and post-test scores for the cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal sub-scales were the dependent variables.

Table 29 shows the descriptive statistics of the SYE students and their mean scores for the pre-test and post-test results of the cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal sub-scales by gender. The results of the 2 x 2 mixed ANOVA are presented in Table 30 and Table 31. There was a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) between the change in the pre-test and post-test mean scores for the SYE male students and female SYE students. The intrapersonal mean scores decreased for male SYE students from 3.92 (SD = 0.31) to 3.81 (SD = 0.28) as shown in Table 29 and Table 30.

Table 29

Descriptive statistics for SYE students and gender by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Variable	Survey	Male			Female		
		M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Cognitive	Pre-test	3.23	.31	35	3.15	.37	94
	Post-test	3.24	.27	35	3.13	.43	94
Intrapersonal	Pre-test	3.92	.31	35	3.88	.32	94
	Post-test	3.81	.28	35	3.87	.34	94
Interpersonal	Pre-test	3.48	.47	35	3.47	.35	94
	Post-test	3.47	.42	35	3.45	.37	94

Note. $p < .05$

Table 30

Mixed-design ANOVA of tests within-subjects effects for SYE students and gender by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Source		Type III SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
SYE.Cognitive.Gender	Sphericity	.00	1	.007	.00	.97
	Assumed					
SYE.Cognitive.Gender*	Sphericity	.01	1	.01	.17	.68
	Assumed					
Error (SYE.Cognitive.Gender)	Sphericity	6.57	127	.05		
	Assumed					
SYE.Intrapersonal.Gender	Sphericity	.16	1	.16	4.67	.03
	Assumed					
SYE.Intrapersonal.Gender*	Sphericity	.15	1	.15	4.27	.04*
	Assumed					
Error (SYE.Intrapersonal.Gender)	Sphericity	4.38	127	.03		
	Assumed					
SYE.Interpersonal.Gender	Sphericity	.01	1	.01	.09	.77
	Assumed					
SYE.Interpersonal.Gender*	Sphericity	.00	1	.00	.02	.89
	Assumed					
Error (SYE.Interpersonal.Gender)	Sphericity	9.58	127	.07		
	Assumed					

Note. $p < .05^*$

Table 31

Mixed-design ANOVA of tests between-subjects effects for SYE students and gender by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Source		Type III SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Cognitive	Intercept	2072.15	1	2072.15	8881.80	.00
	SYE.Gender	.46	1	.146	1.99	.16
	Error	29.63	127	.23		
Intrapersonal	Intercept	3061.42	1	3061.42	17333.95	.00
	SYE.Gender	.00	1	.00	.01	.91
	Error	22.43	127	.18		
Interpersonal	Intercept	2453.31	1	2453.31	11100.20	.00
	SYE.Gender	.01	1	.01	.03	.87
	Error	28.07	127	.22		

Note. $p < .05$

Ethnicity within the SYE students was the next social identity measured with the mixed-design ANOVA. Table 32 displays the descriptive statistics for the SYE students by White students and students of color. Table 33 and Table 34 show the results of the repeated measures ANOVA for the SYE students by ethnicity. The between-subjects effect for ethnicity was a statistically significant factor in this group of SYE participants for the cognitive and interpersonal variables.

Table 32

Descriptive statistics for SYE students and ethnicity by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Variable	Survey	White			Person of Color		
		M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Cognitive	Pre-test	3.12	.36	72	3.23	.36	57
	Post-test	3.08	.38	72	3.26	.40	57
Intrapersonal	Pre-test	3.90	.34	72	3.89	.31	57
	Post-test	3.86	.35	72	3.86	.35	57
Interpersonal	Pre-test	3.42	.41	72	3.53	.34	57
	Post-test	3.38	.36	72	3.55	.39	57

Note. $p < .05$

Table 33

Mixed-design ANOVA of tests within-subjects effects for SYE students and ethnicity by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Source		Type III SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
SYE.Cognitive.Ethnicity	Sphericity Assumed	.00	1	.00	.01	.91
SYE.Cognitive.Ethnicity* Ethnicity	Sphericity Assumed	.07	1	.07	1.42	.23
Error (SYE.Cognitive.Ethnicity)	Sphericity Assumed	6.50	127	.05		
SYE.Intrapersonal.Ethnicity	Sphericity Assumed	.06	1	.06	1.75	.19
SYE.Intrapersonal.Ethnicity* Ethnicity	Sphericity Assumed	.00	1	.00	.01	.90
Error (SYE.Intrapersonal.Ethnicity)	Sphericity Assumed	4.52	127	.04		
SYE.Interpersonal.Ethnicity	Sphericity Assumed	.01	1	.01	.09	.76
SYE.Interpersonal.Ethnicity* Ethnicity	Sphericity Assumed	.05	1	.05	.67	.42
Error (SYE.Interpersonal.Ethnicity)	Sphericity Assumed	9.53	127	.08		

Note. $p < .05$

Table 34

Mixed-design ANOVA of tests between-subjects effects for SYE students and ethnicity by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Source		Type III SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Cognitive	Intercept	2563.25	1	2563.25	11325.51	.00
	SYE.Ethnicity	1.35	1	1.35	5.96	.02*
	Error	28.73	127	.23		
Intrapersonal	Intercept	3820.97	1	3820.97	21635.67	.00
	SYE.Ethnicity	.00	1	.00	.02	.89
	Error	22.43	127	.18		
Interpersonal	Intercept	3070.23	1	3070.23	14527.76	.00
	SYE.Ethnicity	1.24	1	1.24	5.85	.02*
	Error	26.84	127	.21		

Note. $p < .05^*$

Similarly, the SYE participants were analyzed to determine if socio-economic status, as measured by acceptance of the Federal Pell Grant, was a significant variable in their mean scores for the three sub-scales of intercultural maturity. Table 35 displays the descriptive statistics for the SYE students by those who did and did not accept the Federal Pell Grant. Table 36 and Table 37 display the results of the repeated measures ANOVA for the SYE students for the cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables. Socio-economic status was not a statistically significant factor in this sample of SYE students.

Table 35

Descriptive statistics for SYE students and socio-economic status by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Variable	Survey	Did Not Accept Pell			Did Accept Pell		
		M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Cognitive	Pre-test	3.14	.36	94	3.24	.35	35
	Post-test	3.12	.42	94	3.27	.31	35
Intrapersonal	Pre-test	3.89	.33	94	3.89	.31	35
	Post-test	3.83	.33	94	3.94	.30	35
Interpersonal	Pre-test	3.46	.41	94	3.51	.29	35
	Post-test	3.43	.39	94	3.54	.35	35

Note. $p < .05$

Table 36

Mixed-design ANOVA of tests within-subjects effects for SYE students and socio-economic status by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Source		Type III SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
SYE.Cognitive.SES	Sphericity	.00	1	.00	.01	.94
	Assumed					
SYE.Cognitive.SES*SES	Sphericity	.02	1	.02	.45	.51
	Assumed					
Error	Sphericity	6.55	127	.05		
(SYE.Cognitive.SES)	Assumed					
SYE.Intrapersonal.SES	Sphericity	.00	1	.00	.11	.74
	Assumed					
SYE.Intrapersonal.SES*SES	Sphericity	.13	1	.13	3.74	.06
	Assumed					
Error	Sphericity	4.40	127	.04		
(SYE.Intrapersonal.SES)	Assumed					
SYE.Interpersonal.SES	Sphericity	.00	1	.00	.00	.99
	Assumed					
SYE.Interpersonal.SES*SES	Sphericity	.04	1	.04	.57	.45
	Assumed					
Error	Sphericity	9.54	127	.08		
(SYE.Interpersonal.SES)	Assumed					

Note. $p < .05^*$

Table 37

Mixed-design ANOVA of tests between-subjects effects for SYE students and socioeconomic status by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Source		Type III SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Cognitive	Intercept	2081.39	1	2081.39	9028.38	.00
	SYE.SES	.82	1	.82	3.53	.06
	Error	29.28	127	.23		
Intrapersonal	Intercept	3085.99	1	3085.99	17622.26	.00
	SYE.SES	.19	1	.19	1.10	.30
	Error	22.24	127	.18		
Interpersonal	Intercept	2476.63	1	2476.63	11344.35	.00
	SYE.SES	.35	1	.35	1.60	.21
	Error	27.73	127	.22		

Note. $p < .05^*$

Parental education (less than a bachelor's degree or bachelor's degree or more education) for the SYE participants was the final social identity that was measured with a mixed-design ANOVA. Table 38 displays the descriptive statistics of the SYE students and mean scores for pre-test and post-test results of the cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal sub-scales by parental education. The results of the 2 x 2 mixed ANOVA are presented in Table 39 and Table 40. There was a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) between the difference in the pre-test and post-test mean scores on the intrapersonal sub-scale for the SYE students whose parents earned less than a bachelor's degree and those with a bachelor's degree or more. SYE participants with parents earning less than a bachelor's degree had statistically significant higher intrapersonal mean scores than SYE students whose parents earned a bachelor's degree or more.

Table 38

Descriptive statistics for SYE students and parental education by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Variable	Survey	Less than Bachelor's			Bachelor's or more		
		M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Cognitive	Pre-test	3.25	.30	48	3.12	.38	81
	Post-test	3.22	.31	48	3.13	.44	81
Intrapersonal	Pre-test	3.91	.24	48	3.87	.36	81
	Post-test	3.96	.26	48	3.80	.35	81
Interpersonal	Pre-test	3.53	.40	48	3.44	.37	81
	Post-test	3.51	.38	48	3.43	.38	81

Note. $p < .05$

Table 39

Mixed-design ANOVA of tests within-subjects effects for SYE students and parental education by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Source		Type III SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
SYE.Cognitive.PAREDU	Sphericity	.01	1	.01	.14	.71
	Assumed					
SYE.Cognitive.PAREDU*	Sphericity	.01	1	.01	.27	.61
PAREDU	Assumed					
Error	Sphericity	6.56	127	.05		
(SYE.Cognitive.PAREDU)	Assumed					
SYE.Intrapersonal.PAREDU	Sphericity	.02	1	.02	.53	.47
	Assumed					
SYE.Intrapersonal.PAREDU*	Sphericity	.20	1	.20	5.50	.02*
PAREDU	Assumed					
Error	Sphericity	4.34	127	.03		
(SYE.Intrapersonal.PAREDU)	Assumed					
SYE.Interpersonal.PAREDU	Sphericity	.01	1	.01	.16	.69
	Assumed					
SYE.Interpersonal.PAREDU*	Sphericity	.00	1	.00	.00	.96
PAREDU	Assumed					
Error	Sphericity	9.58	127	.08		
(SYE.Interpersonal.PAREDU)	Assumed					

Note. $p < .05^*$

Table 40

Mixed-design ANOVA of tests between-subjects effects for SYE students and parental education by cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal variables

Source		Type III SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Cognitive	Intercept	2436.73	1	2436.73	10534.37	.00
	SYE.PAREDU	.72	1	.72	3.10	.08
	Error	29.38	127	.23		
Intrapersonal	Intercept	3644.45	1	3644.45	21196.11	.00
	SYE.PAREDU	.60	1	.60	3.47	.07
	Error	21.84	127	.17		
Interpersonal	Intercept	2914.48	1	2914.48	13420.38	.00
	SYE.PAREDU	.50	1	.50	2.28	.13
	Error	27.58	127	.22		

Note. $p < .05$

The final aspect of research question four seeks to determine in *behaviors in college* predict changes in intercultural maturity. In order to measure the variable deemed *behaviors in college*, I grouped several of the questions from the *Global Perspective Inventory (GPI)* into related categories. The responses were rated using a Likert-style scale from *Never* to *Very Often* and coded from 0 to 5. Two sub-groups were created based on literature that connects faculty and academic engagement with overall college student success and development (Kuh et al., 2005; Kuh, 2008), as well as research with a specific focus on second year college students (Gansemer-Topf et al., 2007; Schaller, 2005, 2007) as discussed in Chapter Two and Three.

The first sub-group incorporated was named *faculty-related engagement* and included the following questions from the survey instrument:

Q51. Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class.

Q52. Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member.

Q53. The faculty challenged students' views and perspectives on a topic during class.

Q54. The faculty presented issues and problems in class from different cultural perspectives.

To calculate a score for the *faculty-related engagement* variable, I added the scores to the four questions (noted above) and divided by four to reach an average score for each participant. An analysis of variance was conducted for all participants (both SYE Abroad and SYE) to determine significance between intercultural maturity and *faculty-related engagement*. Table 41 presents significant findings between these variables at the $p < .05$ level for all three measure of the GPI instrument. The R Square score (0.14) for *faculty-related engagement* indicates that model explained 14 percent of the variation in the average intercultural maturity scores as demonstrated in Table 42. While *faculty-related engagement* proved to be a statistically significant difference amongst all the participants in this study, further analysis demonstrated the short-term study abroad program (SYE Abroad/intervention) did not demonstrate any statistical difference between the groups (shown in Table 43).

Table 41

Analysis of variance for faculty-related engagement and intercultural maturity

GPI	Model	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Pre-test	Regression	2.74	1	2.74	41.33	.000***
	Residual	15.96	241	.07		
	Total	18.70	242			
Post-test	Regression	1.84	1	1.84	26.38	.000***
	Residual	8.90	128	.07		
	Total	10.74	129			
3 month post-test	Regression	.86	1	.86	13.65	.000***
	Residual	8.26	131	.06		
	Total	9.12	132			

Note. ***p < .001

Table 42

Model summary for faculty-related engagement and intercultural maturity

GPI	R	R Square	Adjusted	Std. Error of the
Pre-test	.38	.15	.14	.26
Post-test	.41	.17	.16	.26
3 month post-test	.30	.09	.09	.25

Table 43

Model summary for faculty-related engagement and intercultural maturity between SYE Abroad and SYE groups

GPI	Beta In	T	Sig.	Partial
Pre-test	.08	1.42	.16	.09
Post-test	-.07	-.90	.37	-.08
3 month post-test	.09	1.04	.30	.09

Note. p < .05

To capture the second and final grouping of questions to measure *behaviors in college*, the sub-group *cultural-related engagement* was created and included the following questions from the survey instrument:

Q55. Participated in events or activities sponsored by groups reflecting your own cultural heritage.

Q56. Participated in events or activities sponsored by groups reflecting your own cultural heritage different from your own.

Q57. Participated in religious or spiritual activities.

Q58. Participated in leadership programs that stress collaboration and teamwork.

Q59. Participated in community service activities.

Q60. Attended a lecture/workshop/campus discussion on international/global issues.

Q61. Read a newspaper or news magazine (online or in print).

Q62. Watched news programs on television.

Q63. Followed an international event/crisis (e.g. through newspaper, social media, or other media sources).

Q64. Discussed current events with other students.

The questions noted above were also coded from 0 to 5 and used a scale from *Never* to *Very Often*. To determine the average score for *cultural-related engagement*, the same method was used as it was for *faculty-related engagement*. The responses to each of the eight questions were summed and divided by eight to create an average score for the variable. An analysis of variance was conducted to determine significance between intercultural maturity and *cultural-related engagement*. Table 44 shows

significant findings between these variables at the $p < .05$ level for the pre-test, post-test, and three-month follow up post-test for all survey respondents (SYE Abroad and SYE).

The R Square score (0.18) for *cultural-related engagement* indicates that model explained 18 percent of the variation in the average intercultural maturity scores as demonstrated in Table 45. *Cultural-related engagement* yielded similar results as *faculty-related engagement* relative to the SYE Abroad experience. No statistical difference was found between the groups that traveled internationally for three weeks (SYEA) versus the control group (SYE). The results are displayed in Table 46.

Table 44

Analysis of variance for cultural-related engagement and intercultural maturity

GPI	Model	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Pre-test	Regression	3.33	1	3.33	52.18	.000***
	Residual	15.37	241	.07		
	Total	18.70	242			
Post-test	Regression	2.23	1	2.23	34.67	.000***
	Residual	8.45	128	.07		
	Total	10.74	129			
3 month post-test	Regression	2.21	1	2.21	41.99	.000***
	Residual	6.91	131	.05		
	Total	9.12	132			

Note. *** $p < .001$

Table 45

Model summary for cultural-related engagement and intercultural maturity

GPI	R	R Square	Adjusted R	Std. Error of the
Pre-test	.42	.18	.18	.25
Post-test	.46	.21	.21	.26
3 month post-test	.49	.24	.24	.23

Table 46

Model summary for cultural-related engagement and intercultural maturity between SYE

Abroad and SYE groups

GPI	Beta In	T	Sig.	Partial
Pre-test	.07	1.19	.24	.08
Post-test	-.10	-1.23	.22	-.11
3 month post-test	.06	.73	.47	.06

Note. $p < .05$

Qualitative Responses

The final section of this chapter explores the results of the qualitative component of this mixed methods study. First, I provide a brief overview of the demographics of the sample population followed by a summary of the results. The qualitative portion was intended to gain greater depth and understanding of the research questions by adding richness to the quantitative analyses. The qualitative questions were administered at the same time as the three-month follow up post-test survey (late April). The set of four open-ended questions were as follows: (1) Think about a time when you encountered a person different from you. Please describe the event and why it was significant to you. (2) Has your perception of others changed during your sophomore year in college, and if so, in what ways? (3) In what ways (if any) have your beliefs and values changed this academic year? (4) What are the biggest global issues we face? How can they be addressed?

A total of seventeen students who completed the pre-test and either the post-test or three-month follow up post-test or both responded to the qualitative portion of this study. This smaller sample population is not representative of the overall sample

population in terms of gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status (as measured by Pell Grant acceptance), or SYE Abroad participation as demonstrated in Table 47. For example, only three of the seventeen respondents to the qualitative questions participated in the SYE Abroad program (17.5%) compared to the overall sample population that accounted for 84 of the 243 participants (35%).

Table 47

Sample demographics (n = 17)

Demographic		Number of Students	Percentage
Group	SYE Abroad	3	17.5%
	SYE	14	82.5%
Gender	Male	4	24%
	Female	13	76%
Race/Ethnicity	White	8	47%
	Hispanic or Latino	3	17.5%
	Multiple Ethnicities	3	17.5%
	Asian/Pacific Islander	1	6%
	Black	1	6%
	Prefer Not to Respond	1	6%
Pell Grant	Did Not Accept	15	88%
	Did Accept	2	12%

The open-ended qualitative responses were reviewed to find any comparisons or contrasts in the responses. The data was then coded for similar responses and grouped accordingly. Themes emerged from the grouped responses and the results are presented in the following section.

The first qualitative question asked (1) Think about a time when you encountered a person different from you. Please describe the event and why it was significant to you. This question yielded a variety of responses which included experiences the participants

had since coming to college as well immersive personal experiences while others could not distinguish significance amongst any particular encounters. It is interesting to note that none of the SYE Abroad participants mentioned their recent three-week study abroad program.

Six of the seventeen respondents reported experiences they found to be significant since they arrived to college. Several included meeting and becoming friends with people of different ethnicities in their residence halls and during orientation. One participant described how her views and knowledge about gay rights changed after learning more about the issues after one of her roommates came out/told her that she was gay. This participant shared how her roommate was very different from any of her other friends. She disclosed that she was “largely ignorant of the ideas, terminology, and issues” surrounding the gay community. She credits this relationship and introduction to differences in challenging her beliefs or ignorance and changing how she views people and the gay community.

A second participant wrote about the impact of having a speaker of Native American descent come to one of her classes. The guest speaker spoke several times in her class about this person's experience as a Native and she found this exposure to be eye opening to the native culture and “how interesting a different culture can be.” Another participant shared her experience of getting to know one of the women on her residence hall floor who was from the Philippines. She spoke about developing a friendship, learning about the many differences from their backgrounds, and also finding commonalities amongst their cultures. This participant characterized her relationship

with her floor-mate as giving them both an opportunity to learn from each other and making themselves better people.

Four of the participants discussed experiences that I would characterize as immersive or personally interactive experiences with people different from themselves. One respondent wrote about the significant culture shock she experienced while visiting Morocco, Africa. And another spoke about feeding the homeless on Skid Row in Los Angeles, California. One female second year college student spoke about how volunteering for the Special Olympics (organization for people with intellectual or physical disabilities) had a significant impact on her during high school and how this helped shape her perspective on life.

The responses noted above speak to a theme of immersive experiences and relationships with people different from themselves. Exposure to difference coupled with the willingness for self-exploration appears to be an underlying theme in some of the responses to the first qualitative questions.

A final grouping of five responses had a general sentiment of all people being the same and being human beings. For example, one male respondent who preferred not to disclose his race/ethnicity seemed to represent the overall sentiment of the five respondents and he wrote, "I view all people as the same. No one is different or the same. Everyone is their own human." These respondents did not cite any particular instance of interactions with those different from themselves. Rather, some noted that they treated everyone the same, that every person has a story, and what is most important is how that person made this participant feel.

Results for the next qualitative question, (2) Has your perception of others changed during your sophomore year in college, and if so, in what ways, included affirmative responses from 16 of the 17 participants who felt their perspectives had changed this academic year. One of the female SYE Abroad students described believing that only Caucasian people on USD's campus were only friendly toward other Caucasian people and were not open to learning about other cultures. Her perception changed and she now believes that some of her Caucasian peers were interested in other people's cultures and creating diversity on campus.

Only four of the 16 respondents were able to provide specific examples of demonstrated change. Others included discussions in classes, for example, one male cited, "In my Race and Ethnicity course we go much deeper into the idea of race, more than the typical surface scratching. Learning about these difficulties that other people have and that I will never have to deal with has been eye opening." This response also speaks to the emerging theme of self-exploration and a willingness to engage with others in greater depths.

Other respondents noted they felt a general sense of being more open to people being different from themselves and allowing for beliefs different than their own. Some spoke about learning how to step out of their "comfort zone" in their second year of college. One participant shared that since coming to college she has been exposed to many more people whom are different than her. She believes this has helped open her eyes further to societal and cultural differences and believes people "can still collaborate and work well together despite those [differences]." A different participant went on to share that she had noticed that many of her peers were wrapped up in social norms and

were “unable to step outside of themselves and notice things around them.” On one level these responses speak to the recognition of legitimizing different cultures, however the brevity of responses and lack of concrete examples provides little depth for further analysis.

Three participants cited negative changes to their perceptions of others. One woman believed she is more skeptical of others and another woman cited being let down by a professor and some peers during her sophomore year (further details were not provided), which she believed, had a negative impact toward others. Another woman wrote that she had not changed in her second academic year at USD. She noted that she changed a lot in high school due to volunteer experiences and that she no longer volunteers in college. One participant noted that he did not feel the changes in his perceptions had to do with being in college, but rather the changes were a result of getting older and more mature.

The next open-ended question asked participants (3) In what ways (if any) have your beliefs and values changed this academic year. Seven students thought their beliefs and values have strengthened during the academic year, while eight participants felt they experienced no significant change in their values. One participant shared how he was uncertain if he had changed and wrote, “I am not quite sure if they [beliefs and values] have or not, still trying to figure out who I am.”

Of those participants who noted changes in their beliefs and values, three cited a stronger religious faith to help guide them. One woman noted that Christian faith helped value the idea of “being present and listening.” This respondent went on to share that “I don't have to have all the answers or have it all together, it is more important to be with

people and spend my time hearing their stories.” Another participant felt as though she had become more dedicated to her Catholic faith. She shared that she is still in the process of learning about other religions and she has “acquired a more accepting view about beliefs and cultures different from my own.”

One participant responded that she believed her moral values and beliefs had broadened that academic year due to meeting different people from different cultures and backgrounds at the university. She shared that she found it “harder for me to choose a side because I’m always thinking how can one person be right and the other person wrong.” Her words capture her struggle wrestling with the notion of multiple truths and perspectives as her awareness and acceptance of differences begins to develop.

Another female respondent to the third qualitative question discussed how her perception of feminism changed in a positive manner after participating in a retreat hosted by USD’s Women’s Center. This second year student now considers herself a feminist and wrote, “In all honesty, before then [Empower Retreat] I was under the impression that feminists were basically men haters. I have come to see that this is just a stereotype. Most feminists just want to be treated equally. I am in accordance with that and I strive to fight for equality.”

The final qualitative questions asked participants: (4) What are the biggest global issues we face? How can they be addressed? These questions solicited a wide range of responses and most respondents did not articulate clear ways of addressing the issues. Discrimination, racism, and sexism were top issues for four participants and the environment was named on three occasions. Other issues included poverty, homelessness, and hunger. One woman noted global healthcare and education as the

biggest issues, “These issues need to be addressed on a large-scale and start with education and empowerment of the youth.”

Two participants listed greed, individualism, and selfishness as their top global concerns. One male participant believes “Greed is taught. To un-teach this is difficult, but we may need to show that having material wealth is not the only thing that matters.” A final global issue raised by one female participant was the “kidnapping of young children, especially girls who are then sold into sex slavery. This issues recently came to everyone's attention is when an Islamic militant group's kidnapping of 276 girls. We need to start raising as much awareness as possible by posting on social media sites and bringing it up in everyday conversations.”

The qualitative component of this study provided some context to the mentality and perceptions of a few USD second year college students regarding their experiences with people who are different from themselves, their perceptions of their own development over the course of their academic year, and thoughts on the primary issues of global concern. However, their responses only offer a mere glimpse into their level of development in intercultural maturity. One theme that emerged from the qualitative responses of this study is the concept of exposure and the role immersive experiences and relationships play in the formation and development of intercultural maturity. Exposure to difference coupled with the willingness for self-exploration may lead to the ability to recognize multiple perspectives. Since the SYEA Abroad students did not make mention of the three-week international experience in their responses, it is difficult to draw any conclusive results from participation in the program. Perhaps any growth the students in this study had in intercultural maturity have be simply been of a result of being in an

institution of higher education in which they are exposed to people who are different from themselves.

Summary of Findings

This study focused heavily on quantitative measures to answer the four research questions. Overall, the results of the quantitative portion have demonstrated that the three-week study abroad program, that was specifically designed to focus on second year college students, did not yield statistically significant results in the development of intercultural maturity over the course of their second year of college. The SYE Abroad students demonstrated a mean score increase of 0.06 (3.50 to 3.56) in intercultural maturity immediately upon return from the abroad experience (post-test), however this increase was not sustained. As demonstrated in Table 9, the pre-test mean scores for the SYE Abroad students was 3.50 and the three-month follow up post-test mean score for this group was 3.52. The control group (SYE), whom did not participate in the international program, had intercultural maturity pre-test mean scores of 3.51 and concluded their second year of college with mean scores of 3.52, the same result as those who participated in SYE Abroad.

The results from the fourth research question further demarcate the lack of impact the SYE Abroad program had on the development of intercultural maturity. Faculty-related engagement accounted for approximately 14 percent of the variation in scores for intercultural maturity and cultural-related engagement accounted for 18 percent of the variation in scores for intercultural maturity for all participants in the study. SYE Abroad participation had no significant effect on either of these variables. While the qualitative portion of this study had low participation, it is interesting to note that of the three SYE

Abroad students who completed the qualitative component, none of them mentioned their recent study abroad experience. The concept of exposure to difference, the role immersive experiences and relationships, and personal willingness to engage in self-exploration began to emerge in the qualitative portion of this research. The results of this study will be further reviewed and discussed in Chapter Five, which also includes implications for future research and practice.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Despite the need for college graduates to have developed skills and knowledge in intercultural competence and the recent growth in participation of short-term study abroad programs, little empirical research exists to demonstrate if short-term study abroad programs assist in the development of intercultural maturity. Furthermore, there is increased interest from higher education professionals in providing further assistance to second year college students who find themselves struggling with feelings of disillusionment and disengagement with their college experience (Biovin et al., 2000; Lemons & Richmond, 1987). The central focus of this research is how second year college students make meaning (cognitive domain), how they define their self (intrapersonal domain), and how they relate to others (interpersonal domain) in terms of intercultural maturity. This mixed-methods, quasi-experimental study investigated whether or not a three-week study abroad program, specifically designed for and only offered to second year college students at the University of San Diego, impacted student development in intercultural maturity.

The *Global Perspectives Inventory (GPI)* survey was administered three times (approximate beginning, middle, and end of the academic year) over the course of the second year of college to students who participated in a program named Second Year Experience Abroad (SYE Abroad) and to those did not travel abroad to serve as the control group. Surveys were sent to all USD second year students (857) and a total of 243 students participated in the quantitative portion of the study and of those participants, 17 responded to the open-ended qualitative questions that were administered in the final

three-month follow up post-test portion of the research. The research questions that guided this study included: (1) To what extent does a three-week study abroad program cause development of intercultural maturity of second year college students? (2) To what extent does intercultural maturity develop in second year college students who do not participate in a three-week study abroad program? (3) To what extent does the intercultural maturity of the study abroad students compare to those students who remained on campus? (4) To what extent do social identities, campus involvement, and behaviors in college predict changes in cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal development?

Detailed findings of the results of the research questions are discussed in Chapter Four. In this chapter, I provide a brief summary of the results of the research followed by a detailed discussion of the findings and how it relates to the literature in the field. Next, I offer the limitations of the study and consider some of the implications for further research and practice before closing with the significance of the research.

Summary of Findings

As presented in Chapter Four, this study found that the three-week study abroad program designed specifically for second year college students had little to no statistically significant findings on the development of intercultural maturity. The only statistically significant change in level of intercultural maturity occurred for the SYE Abroad students occurred immediately upon their return from the international experience in late January 2014. The SYE Abroad students demonstrated a mean score increase from average pre-test scores of 3.50 to average post-test scores of 3.56 for a 0.06 mean increase in intercultural maturity. However, the SYE Abroad participants average mean scores

decreased to 3.52 after the three-month follow up post-test for an overall increase of 0.02 in intercultural maturity after a seven month period since taking the pre-test, which was not a statistically significant difference.

My second research question sought to determine whether the students who did not participate in the international experience demonstrated any increase in intercultural maturity over the course of their academic year. The control group (SYE students) had average mean scores of 3.51 in the pre-test, 3.51 in the post-test, and 3.52 in the three-month follow up post-test. These results demonstrate no statistically significant changes in intercultural maturity for this population.

The third research question in this study investigated any comparisons that could be drawn from the SYE Abroad students and the SYE control group. Independent samples tests revealed no statistically significant differences between the two populations. In fact, both groups began their second year of college with relatively similar pre-test scores of 3.50 for the SYE Abroad students and 3.51 for the SYE control group and both had average mean scores of 3.52 for intercultural maturity at the conclusion of the academic year.

The final research question examined to what extent social identities, campus involvement, and behaviors in college predict changes in intercultural maturity. SYE Abroad participants demonstrated no statistical significance with respect to gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status (as measured by Federal Pell Grant status), or by parental education level with the means for intercultural maturity (pre-test, post-test, or three-month follow up post-test). While the SYE control group students did show some varying levels of significance in relation to these same factors. Statistical significance (p

< .05) was found in the post-test results between students of color and White SYE participants and for students accepting Federal Pell Grant awards (as a measure of socioeconomic status). However, there was no statistical significance between the groups in the pre-test or three-month follow up post-test for students of color and White SYE participants and for students accepting Federal Pell Grant awards. Parental educational level (those with less than a bachelor's degree and those with a bachelor's degree or more education) had statistically significant differences in the pre-test and post-test results, but not in the three-month follow up post-test. Gender did not demonstrate a significant difference in relation to intercultural maturity with the SYE participants. Variables for faculty-related engagement and cultural-related engagement proved to be statistically significant factors for intercultural maturity, however, SYE Abroad participation did not demonstrate statistically significant differences within those factors.

The qualitative component of this study had a low participation rate of only 17 respondents to the open-ended questions from the 243 study participants (7 percent response rate). There were no distinguishable results between the responses of the SYE Abroad participants and the SYE control group participants. It is also interesting that none of the three SYE Abroad students mentioned the three-week study abroad program that they participated in three months prior to receiving the survey for this portion of the study. A theme of exposure to difference, the role immersive experiences and relationships, and personal willingness to engage in self-exploration began to emerge from a mix of respondents from the SYE Abroad students and the SYE control group. With this brief summary of the research findings, I next provide to a detailed discussion of these results and implications for future research and practice.

Discussion of Findings

The SYE Abroad program was specifically designed to meet some of the developmental needs of second year college students as they work through feeling in “between” pivotal points in their college experience (Biovin, Fountain & Baylis, 2000, p. 2). As fully discussed in Chapter Two, most second year college students have successfully transitioned through their first year of college, yet many are disillusioned that the attention and special services they had received in that first year are no longer present (Biovin et al., 2000; Lemons & Richmond, 1987). If they have selected a major, they are not yet fully engaged in classes within that intended major. And for those who are unsure of which major or career they wish to declare, they feel as though they are behind from their peers and a sense of disorganization ensues (Biovin et al., 2000; Lemons & Richmond, 1987; Pattengale, 2000). Second year college students also find themselves struggling to establish their own identities and who they wish to become in college and as adults (Biovin et al., 2000; Gansemener-Topf et al., 2007; Lemons & Richmond, 1987; Margolis, 1987; Schaller, 2005).

Second Year Study Abroad

Study abroad programs have demonstrated results in the development of cultural competence and personal identity development (Dwyer, 2004; Young 2004). Many of the learning outcomes associated with study abroad resonate with the issues second year college students face. In fact, Schaller (2005), Sutton and Leslie (2010), and Tobolowsky and Cox (2007) discuss the impact that study abroad programs can specifically have on second year college students. Schaller (2005) cites sophomore study abroad programs as a strategy to assist second year college students in the *focused exploration* stage of

developmental theory. Sutton and Leslie (2010) discuss the importance that exposure to different cultures has on personal identity and interpersonal development on second year students. This exposure inevitably invokes contemplation about one's own culture and meaning within a larger global context. Tobolowsky and Cox's publication highlights institutional case studies and also notes study abroad as an example of "educationally purposeful activities" (2007, p. 98). Many of the publications noted above are promising, however, more research needs to be conducted to determine how to most successfully implement the programs. While the recommendations are grounded in theory, only further research will help measure whether they are truly effective in practice.

As evidenced in this research study, the SYE Abroad program did not prove to have a longer-term impact on the development of intercultural maturity. Students who participated in the three-week international experience had a statistically significant increase in intercultural maturity (cognitive and interpersonal sub-scales) immediately upon their return to the United States, however, within three months of their return, they completed their second year of college at the same level of intercultural maturity as their peers who did not travel abroad in the program specifically designed for sophomores. Perhaps the lack of difference in end mean scores is simply a matter of participants returning to their campus lives and no longer having the immediate experience of being abroad to consider or understand the intersections of difference, therefore not having experienced true growth while abroad. The lack of sustained growth in intercultural maturity for this group of students may be more prevalent with this generation or their particularly stage in development from adolescence to young adulthood.

Luchesi's (2014) dissertation research also examined the SYE Abroad program at USD. Her study found growth in the cognitive and intrapersonal sub-scales within the larger construct of intercultural maturity among SYE Abroad participants. However, this study did not have a control group to measure its finding against and only included the *Global Perspective Inventory (GPI)* pre-test and post-test. The current study demonstrated similar results to Luchesi's work, however the decline in average mean scores for intercultural maturity in the three-month follow up post-test leads one to consider whether the overall educational intervention of the SYE Abroad program has a lasting impact on the development of intercultural maturity.

The results of this study have particularly troubling findings given the time and resources expended on this specialized program for second year college students. One of the specified learning objectives of the SYE Abroad program is "developing global citizenship attitudes, skills, and behaviors" while another is "supporting student development through experiential learning opportunities and reflection." Given the results of this study and Luchesi's study, USD may want to review and reconsider new ways to reach the learning objectives of the SYE Abroad program. Perhaps the program can integrate experiential components that have greater impact of sustained developmental growth such as greater integration with members of the host country, opportunities for students to explore the destinations on their own, and engage in current social issues the country may be facing.

Short-term Study Abroad

The lack of statistically significant difference in intercultural maturity in this study raises many questions to consider about the structure of the program, the students

who elect (and/or can afford) to participate, and the need for empirical research to be conducted to ensure successful implementation of theory to practice. Kehl and Morris' (2008) research demonstrated no statistically significant differences between those students who participated in a short-term study abroad program and those students who intended to study abroad in the future. The results of Kehl and Morris' study and the results of this research study help raise the question of whether openness and willingness to learn about other cultures is merely enough to incite engagement with intercultural curiosity and growth. Perhaps the shared characteristic among the SYE Abroad participants and the SYE students who elected to participate in this study is their interest in exploring cultural differences.

Kehl and Morris' study also found that students who participated in "island" programs did not demonstrate changes in global mindedness. The SYE Abroad is considered an "island" program in that it is a self-contained program that is taught by USD faculty members, students live and take classes strictly with other USD students. Most often, the SYE Abroad participants have planned cultural excursions together as a group. It is up to the personal willingness and volition of the USD student to engage with people from the host country. Exposure to different cultures may not be enough to invoke personal growth. Perhaps only engagement and interaction with persons and cultures different from your own supports the growth of intercultural maturity. Dwyer (2004) found that program characteristics that included language, housing options with host country members, duration of stay, and enrollment in the foreign university courses were determining factors in sustained growth in cultural competence. Engle and Engle's (2004) longitudinal study also concluded that direct and authentic contact with the host

culture and skillful mentoring guides stimulates the experiential learning process.

Similarly, Jones et al.'s case study (2012) of week-long immersion trips (both domestic and international) demonstrated that length of term abroad was not the determining factor for students to make meaning from travel, rather immersing oneself into the culture of the host country or city had the most impact.

The results of this research also support the literature that study abroad programs that have a greater length of time in international countries supports significant cultural engagement and development (Behrnd & Porzelt, 2012; Dwyer, 2004; Donnelly-Smith, 2009; Engle & Engle, 2004; Kehl & Morris, 2007; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2006; Vande Berg et al., 2009). Students in the longer duration programs have demonstrated a deeper understanding of the host culture and cultural differences as measured through both quantitative and qualitative studies.

Pedersen's (2009) research also has some commonalities with the findings in this study. Cultural immersion, guided reflection, and intercultural coaching proved to be the significant factors in Pedersen's study. Her research found no statistically significant differences between the group of undergraduate students who went abroad and did not receive integrated intercultural training versus the control group that remained on campus with no international experience. However, some of Pedersen's other findings were contradictory to the current research study. Pedersen's work found that involvement in work or extra-curricular activities and report of significant friendships did not relate to any changes in intercultural development.

One of the biggest contributions this study provides to the literature on short-term study abroad is the need for further longitudinal research. Other longitudinal studies in

the study abroad field have measured semester or yearly abroad programs (Dwyer, 2004; Engle & Engle, 2004). Most of the research on short-term experiences that have demonstrated growth in cultural competence were measured shortly upon the return from the international experience (Kehl & Morris, 2007; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2006). This study found a statistically significant increase in intercultural maturity immediately upon return from the SYE Abroad program, however those results were not sustained by the end of the semester with the three-month follow up post-test. In addition, the SYE Abroad participants concluded their second year of college at the same mean score of intercultural maturity as those students who remained on campus.

Educational Interventions While Abroad

The results of this study also calls into question the type of educational interventions the SYE Abroad participants receive that may impact the results of their development of intercultural maturity. Prior research on short-term study abroad conducted by Pedersen (2009) found no difference between the study abroad participants who did not receive an integrated intercultural training versus the control group that remained on campus with no international experience. Perhaps the current educational interventions SYE Abroad participants receive do not sufficiently provide opportunities for intercultural growth. The findings from this research and Pedersen's (2009) results are contrary to Paige et al. (2004), Vande Berg, Balkcum, Scheid, and Whalen (2004) and Vande Berg, Connor-Linton and Paige's (2009) research with the Georgetown Consortium Project (2009) in that these projects found that students who went on short-term study abroad programs reported an increase in intercultural effectiveness compared to the non-study abroad students.

Faculty-related and Cultural-related Engagement

The variables developed to capture faculty-related engagement and cultural-related engagement for this study is consistent with the results from previous studies. Relationships with faculty and involvement in campus life with co-curricular activities have extensive research demonstrating their positive impact on overall intellectual and personal growth, student satisfaction, persistence toward graduation, and higher grade point averages (Astin, 1993; Astin, 1999; Kuh et al., 2005; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). It was somewhat surprising that the SYE Abroad program did not prove to play a significant role in the further development with relationships with faculty members and involvement in co-curricular engagement. USD faculty teach the academic courses in the SYE Abroad program and co-curricular activities are typically associated with academic courses and also include excursions to culturally relevant places in the international location. The SYE Abroad program is grounded in theory and practice, yet the growth of intercultural maturity did not prove to be statistically significant in this study at the conclusion of the participants' second year of college.

Who Studies Abroad

It is difficult to draw conclusive implications from the mixed results of this study's participants relative to their personal social identities, campus involvement, and behaviors in college. There is little prior research that exists which examines these characteristics and behaviors. One of the overarching reasons for this lack of empirical data on differences of personal social identities in study abroad programs may be due to the overrepresentation of females and White students in study abroad. The Institute of International Education (2013) report national averages of 65 percent female study

abroad participants and also report a range from 76 to 84 percent for White students over the past ten years. The underrepresentation of men and students of color calls for further research into why certain populations are either more drawn to study abroad opportunities and/or what barriers, real and perceived, may exist that produces this incongruent discrepancy. There is a clear lack of cross-cultural representation in study abroad programs and these programs do not mirror the population of those who are enrolled in institutions of higher education.

The findings of the fourth research question in this study involving personal social identities, campus involvement, and behaviors in college as they relate to intercultural maturity were somewhat conflicting. Gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status (as measured by acceptance of Federal Pell Grant), and parental education level were not significant factors in SYE Abroad participation as they relate to growth in intercultural maturity.

Gender was not a defining social identity for change in intercultural maturity for both SYE Abroad participants or SYE students. This finding is not in line with past studies that looked at both short-term and long-term study abroad participation in which females had statistically significant higher means on global mindedness than males (Braskamp et al., 2011; Braskamp & Engberg, 2011; Hett, 1993; Luchesi, 2014; Zhai & Scheer, 2004). However, this study did have statistically significant findings among the SYE students/control group between the pre-test and post-test results for ethnicity and socio-economic status, but not statistically significant in the three-month follow up post-test. One possible explanation for these findings may be a result of the SYE students returning home during the semester break and January intersession term (and not

traveling internationally in the SYE Abroad program). Perhaps being surrounded by family with the same ethnicity and socio-economic status and living area impacted their responses to the post-test survey. The pre-test and three-month follow up post-test were conducted after the students had been on USD's predominantly White campus for some duration of time.

Parental education levels proved to be statistically significant in both the pre-test and post-test for the SYE students/control group. Results of this study found that participants whose parents did not earn a bachelor's degree had higher mean scores ($M=3.58$) for intercultural maturity than those whose parents had a bachelor's or graduate degree ($M=3.48$). This is an area of research that has not yet been explored in other studies on study abroad (short-term or long-term). The implications of this finding may be in the mere appreciation that first-generation college students may have for all the learning opportunities that higher education affords to students.

The very small response rate to the qualitative portion of this study was disappointing and contrary to another study that examined short-term study abroad programs with control groups. Chieffo and Griffiths (2004) specifically noted a difference in response rates to their single open-ended question in the pre-test and post-test survey of students who studied abroad over a five-week winter session and those who remained on campus. Students who studied abroad had a much higher response rate to the post-test survey and qualitative questions (1,408 out of 1,509 or 93 percent) compared to those who did not travel internationally (473 out of 827 or 57 percent). Chieffo and Griffiths also remarked that the students who studied abroad had greater knowledge/appreciation of another country or culture. It is worth noting that Chieffo and

Griffiths' study did not link responses with identification numbers and therefore changes in global awareness or qualitative responses cannot be directly linked to individuals, only to the aggregate of respondents.

The SYE Abroad participants in this study did not mention their study abroad program in the qualitative section and did not have any particularly differentiating responses from the SYE students. The lack of interest in noting the SYE Abroad experience may be due to not feeling any impact or change from the SYE Abroad program. The low response rate, particularly from SYE Abroad students (3 out of 17) and the lack of reference to their recent international experience in addition to no evidence of a lasting impact on intercultural maturity has implications for how the SYE Abroad program could be improved in the future.

A theme that emerged from the qualitative responses of this study is the concept of exposure and the role immersive experiences and relationships play in the formation and development of intercultural maturity. Exposure to difference coupled with the willingness for self-exploration may lead to the ability to recognize multiple perspectives. This initial theme from the qualitative responses is promising for future programs. In the following section, I explore the implications for future research and practice.

Implications for Future Research and Practice

After a thorough analysis of the data and a discussion of the results of this mixed methods study, I have several recommendations for further research in this area of study and implications for practice. The first recommendation is a general call for more research in the area of short-term study abroad programs. With short-term study abroad programs accounting for over 58 percent of study abroad in the 2011-2012 academic year

(Institute of International Education, 2013), there is an inherent obligation to determine the effectiveness of these programs. Future studies could include both quantitative and qualitative measure prior to the international departure, during the study abroad program, immediately upon return from the experience, and a long term follow up assessment. Interesting results may emerge if a follow up study is conducted for the participants as they near graduation from USD. As demonstrated in this study, a control group serves as an important role in calibrating overall results to measure program effectiveness.

The University of San Diego is a Catholic institution and further research could examine other Catholic institutions, religiously affiliated colleges, and/or secular universities. USD also sponsors programs to other locations that have an immersion focus to the experience. For example, USD currently sends students to Jamaica, El Salvador, and domestically to New Orleans, Louisiana. Comparing the intercultural maturity of second year college students from the immersion programs to the SYE Abroad participants could reveal interesting findings on program effectiveness.

Luchesi's (2014) dissertation study suggested that the academic courses and the applicability to the international location appeared to have some impact on student experience. For example, students enrolled in courses on Catholic Theology in Florence, Italy, World Religions in Hong Kong, and Ethics in Seville, Spain cited the course connections as having an impact on the development of intercultural maturity. Results were inconclusive as to whether it was the academic course content or the faculty members' engagement and teaching ability that made the greatest contribution to student learning. There are many factors that prove to be difficult to measure in a single study, therefore future research could capture some of these other factors noted that have yet to

studied and would contribute to the understanding of the development of intercultural maturity within the context of study abroad.

Another area for future research and practice would be to determine the effectiveness of the “island” program. While developing a strong sense of group cohesion and camaraderie amongst USD students serves an important role in student retention, perhaps more programmatic efforts could be implemented that have students intentionally and authentically interact with people from the host countries. Island programs may inhibit the level of growth in cultural competence by providing too much comfort while traveling abroad and not creating enough challenge or discourse for greater development to occur.

In its current state, the SYE Abroad program incorporates some of the best practices for second year college students in study abroad programs. Among them, Sutton and Leslie (2010) recommend developing faculty-led programs and creating opportunities for sustained reflection and analysis, which are part of the SYE Abroad program, however, statistically significant results have yet to emerge. USD should consider integrating additional educational interventions such as built in engagement with the host community and experiences that strengthen student competence and active learning. Programs in which students are led by USD staff from one site to another do not encourage authentic interactions or relationships (Sutton & Leslie, 2010). Sutton and Leslie also recommend a thorough reentry program. Intentional dialogue and reflection abroad and upon return may assist students in their continued development in cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal competence.

Self-reflection and self-awareness of one's own racial and ethnic identity, gender identity, and socio-economic status amongst others, is a critical step in human development and intercultural maturity (Kegan, 1994; King & Baxter Magolda, 2005; Ortiz & Rhoads, 2000). Examining one's self can be a pivotal time in recognizing one's privileges, including attending an institution of higher education, and can create moments of dissonance that can lead to an enhanced self development and multicultural competence (Kegan, 1994; King & Baxter Magolda, 2005; Ortiz & Rhoads, 2000).

Limitations and Significance of the Study

Limitations

Social science research by its very nature has limitations and this study is no exception. The development of intercultural maturity is as dynamic and complex as the people we study. Our lives are culturally constructed and how we know what we know is generated by our lived experiences. When researching the development of intercultural maturity among college students, it is probable that not every important question is asked on the GPI instrument. In addition, not all second year students at USD participated in this mixed methods study. Therefore, this particular research study offers only limited generalizability of the experience of second year students at USD and also offers some limited generalizability to other private Catholic universities.

This study also researched participants during a time in which they are already transitioning from adolescence to young adulthood. Therefore, one cannot say for certain that any changes in intercultural maturity are a direct result of the SYE Abroad program. College students are part of an educational setting and may be receiving multiple stimuli in classrooms, residence halls, or from their friends and family that may be consciously

or subconsciously impacting their intercultural maturity. It may be difficult to narrow down the variety of factors that play a role in student experiences abroad and on campus, therefore students need to rely heavily on their conscious recollection of events and make educated reflections on the variety of factors that impacted their experiences.

Self-selection bias is an issue to take into account when considering the generalizability of the results. As noted earlier in this study, USD is a relatively expensive (tuition over \$40,000 per academic year), private Catholic university which has implications for who can afford and who wishes to attend the university. The cost of the SYE Abroad program creates another self-selection bias at the outset. Although a significant portion of the program is covered at the same rate of an academic course on campus, the cost of the international flights, meals, and other incidentals are a direct out of pocket expense. In addition, many college students work during the year and semester breaks and there are implications for loss of potential earnings.

A final self-selection matter to note is that USD is currently a top ranked university in its classification for study abroad, with over 70 percent of undergraduate students involved in university sponsored international travel (Institute for International Education, 2012). Students who choose to attend this university and participate in SYE Abroad may be more curious about world travel and experiencing different cultures. Perhaps interest in enhancing intercultural maturity is more highly developed in USD students and more specifically, those who elected to participate in this study.

The *Global Perspective Inventory (GPI)* instrument also has some limitations to its measurement of intercultural maturity. Two of the sub-scales, cognitive-knowing and intrapersonal-affect have coefficient alpha of less than 0.7. The coefficient alphas fall

within an “acceptable” ($0.6 \leq \alpha 0.7$) range, however, social science research considers a “good” coefficient alpha between the $0.7 \leq \alpha 0.9$ range (Hinkle et al., 2003). This presents a statistical limitation on these two sub-scales that may have an impact on the results of this study.

Self-reporting data also tends to pose limitations. Often times participants may respond to questions in how they *wish* to see themselves rather than a true representation (Barker, Pistrang & Elliott, 2002). Overrepresenting or underrepresenting one’s actual thoughts or behaviors can cause misalignment or misrepresentation in data results.

Significance

The University of San Diego directly benefits from this study. With greater understanding of how students develop intercultural maturity, other university faculty, administrators and students benefit from the knowledge gained in this study. In addition, the field of higher education and international education has an enhanced understanding of programs that may further develop intercultural maturity of second year college students. The results of this study help fill the current gap in knowledge and understanding of this population with empirical data and generally advance this area of study for future research.

The objective of this study was to increase the understanding of how college students make meaning of cultural experiences, develop greater intercultural maturity, and evaluate which social identities, campus involvement, and behaviors in college impact intercultural maturity. By more fully understanding the experiences of SYE Abroad participants and SYE students, student learning can be enhanced and the

opportunity to develop greater intercultural maturity could positively influence our students, university campuses, and global society.

Conclusion

The development of intercultural maturity is critical for college graduates as they live in an ever-increasingly pluralistic society. Current and future societal issues demand that we approach solutions from a global perspective. The mission of the University of San Diego speaks directly to “creating a diverse and inclusive community, and preparing leaders dedicated to ethical conduct and compassionate service.” As I reflect on my life’s purpose and my passion for the field of higher education, one of the seven themes of Catholic Social Teaching most resonates with me – solidarity. For me, the growth of intercultural maturity is an important and lifelong process of understanding and appreciation of cultural difference in order to create a more just global society. Saint John Paul II wrote in *Sollicitudo rei socialis* (1987), “We are all one family in the world. Building a community that empowers everyone to attain their full potential through each of us respecting each other's dignity, rights and responsibilities makes the world a better place to live.”

References

- American Council on Education. (1994). The student personnel point of view. In A.L. Rentz (Ed.), *Student affairs: A profession's heritage* (American College Personnel Association Media Publications No. 40, 2nd ed., pp. 66-77). Lanham, MD: University Press of America. (Original work published 1937)
- American Council on Education. (2002). *Beyond September 11: A comprehensive national policy on international education*. Retrieved from http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/pdf/2002_beyond_911.pdf
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2002). *Greater expectations: A new vision for learning as a nation goes to college*. Washington, D.C.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2004). *Taking responsibility for the quality of the baccalaureate degree*. Washington, D.C.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2006). *Assessing global learning: Matching good intentions with good practice*. Washington, D.C.: C.T. Musil.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college?: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of college student personnel*, 40(5), 518-529.
- Barker, C., Pistrang, N., & Elliott, R. (2002). *Research methods in clinical psychology*. London: Wiley.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (1998). Developing self-authorship in young adult life. *Journal of College Student Development*, 39(2), 143-156.

- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2001). *Making their own way: Narratives for transforming higher education to promote self-development*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2003). Identity and learning: Student affairs' role in transforming higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(1), 231-247.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2008). Three elements of self-authorship. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49(4), 269-284.
- Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of people, families, and communities*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bennett, J. M. (2009). Cultivating intercultural competence: A process perspective. In D.K. Deardorff (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 121-140). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Biovin, M., Fountain, G. A., & Baylis, B. (2000). Meeting the challenges of the sophomore year. In L. A. Schreiner & J. Pattengale (Eds.), *Visible solutions for invisible students: Helping sophomores succeed* (Monograph No. 31, pp. 1-17). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience & Students in Transition.
- Bok, D. (2006). *Our underachieving colleges: A candid look at how much students learn and why they should be learning more*. Princeton University Press.
- Braskamp, L. A., Braskamp, D. C., Merrill, K. C., & Engberg, M. (2011). Global perspective inventory (GPI): Its purpose, construction, potential uses, and psychometric characteristics. Chicago: Global Perspective Institute. Retrieved from <http://gpi.central.edu>

- Braskamp, L. A. & Engberg, M. E. (2011). How colleges can influence the development of a global perspective. *Liberal Education*, 97(3), 34-39.
- Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chickering, A. W. & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chieffo, L., & Griffiths, L. (2004). Large-scale assessment of student attitudes after a short-term study abroad program. *Frontiers: The interdisciplinary journal of study abroad*, 10, 165-177.
- Cushner, K. & Karim, A. U. (2004). Study abroad at the university level. In D. Landis, J. M. Bennett & M. J. Bennett (Eds.), *Handbook of Intercultural Training* (3rd ed.; pp. 289-308). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Deardorff, D. K. (2006). The identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(3), 241-266.
- Donnelly-Smith, L. (2009). Global learning through short-term study abroad. *Peer Review: Emerging Trends and Key Debates in Undergraduate Education*, 11(4), 12-15.
- Dwyer, M. (2004). More is better: The impact of study abroad program duration. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 151-163.
- Engle, L., & Engle, J. (2003). Study abroad levels: Toward a classification of program types. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 9(1), 1-20.

- Engle, L., & Engle, J. (2004). Assessing language acquisition and intercultural sensitivity development in relation to study abroad program design. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 219-236.
- Fowler, F. J. Jr. (2009). *Survey Research Methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Freedman, M. B. (1956). The passage through college. *Journal of Social Issues*, 12(4), 13-27.
- Furr, S. & Gannaway, L. (1982). Easing the sophomore slump: A student development approach. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 23(4), 340-341.
- Erickson, E. H. (1980). *Identity and the life cycle*. New York: Norton. (Original work published 1959).
- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F. M., Patton, L. D. & Renn, K. A. (2010). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Feldman, K. A. & Newcomb, T. M. (1969). *The impact of colleges upon their students*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.
- Gansemer-Topf, A. M. & Stern, J. M. & Benjamin, M. (2007). Examining the experiences of second-year students at a private liberal arts college. In B.F. Toblowlowsky & B.E. Cox (Eds.), *Shedding light on sophomores: An exploration of the second college year* (Monograph No. 47, pp. 1-11). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience & Students in Transition.
- Global Perspective Inventory (n.d.). Information and documents. Retrieved from <https://gpi.central.edu>

- Gohn, L., Swartz, J., & Donnelly, S. (2001). A case study of second year student persistence. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 2(4), 271-294.
- Hammer, M. R., & Bennett, M. J. (2005). *The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) Manual*. Portland, OR: The Intercultural Communication Institute.
- Hammer, M. R., Bennett, M. J., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27(4), 421-443.
- Henthorne, T.L., Miller, M. M. & Hudson, T. W. (2001). Building and restoring successful study abroad programs: A “hands on” approach. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 12(4), 49–62.
- Hett, E. J. (1993). *The development of an instrument to measure global-mindedness*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego.
- Hinkle, D. E., Wiersman, W. & Jurs, S. G. (2003). *Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences* (5th ed.). Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Hunter, M. S., Tobolowsky, B. F., & Gardner, J. N. (Eds.). (2010). *Helping sophomores succeed: Understanding and improving the second-year experience*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Institute of International Education. (2006). Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data/US-Study-Abroad/Leading-Institutions-by-Undergraduate-Participation/2009-10>
- Institute of International Education. (2011). Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data/US-Study-Abroad/Leading-Institutions-by-Undergraduate-Participation/2009-10>

- Institute of International Education. (2013). "Profile of U.S. Study Abroad Students, 2001/02-2011/12." *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/opendoors>
- Jones, S. R., & McEwen, M. K. (2000). A conceptual model of multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 41(4), 405-413.
- Jones, S. R., Rowan-Kenyon, H. T., Ireland, S. M. Y., Niehaus, E., & Skendall, K. C. (2012). The meaning students make as participants in short-term immersion programs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 53(2), 201-220.
- Juillerat, S. (2000). Assessing the expectations and satisfaction of sophomores. In L. A. Schreiner & J. Pattengale (Eds.), *Visible solutions for invisible students: Helping sophomores succeed* (Monograph No. 31, pp. 19-29). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience & Students in Transition.
- Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kehl, K., & Morris, J. (2007). Differences in global-mindedness between short-term and semester-long study abroad participants at selected private universities. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 15, 67-79.
- Kennedy, K., & Upcraft, M.U. (2010). Keys to student success. In M.S. Hunter, B.F. Tobolowsky & J.N. Garnder (Eds.), *Helping sophomores succeed: Understanding and improving the second-year experience*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- King, P. & Baxter Magolda, M. (2005). A developmental model of intercultural maturity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(6), 571-592.
- Komives, S. R. & Woodard, D. B. (Eds.). (1996). *Student Services: A Handbook for the Profession* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, G. D. (2008). *Excerpt from "High-Impact Educational Practices: What They Are, Who Has Access to Them, and Why They Matter"*. Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. J. (2005). *Assessing conditions to enhance educational effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. J. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Landis, D., Bennett, M. J., Bennett, & J. M. (Eds.). (2003). *Handbook of intercultural training* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Lemons, L. J. & Richmond, D. R. (1987). A developmental perspective of sophomore slump. *NASPA Journal*, 24(3), 15-19.
- Lewin, R. Transforming the Study Abroad Experience into a Collective Priority. *Peer Review*, 11(4), 8-11.
- Luchesi, J. (2014). *Study abroad as a multifaceted approach to supporting college sophomores: Creating optimal environments to promote intercultural maturity* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://0search.proquest.com.sally.sandiego.edu/pqdtft/docview/1544442546/4B884AF3A AEB40F2PQ/1?accountid=14742>

- Mapp, S. C. (2012). Effect of short-term study abroad programs on students' cultural adaptability. *Journal of Social Work Education, 48*(4), 727-737.
- Margolis, G. (1976). Unslumping our sophomores: Some critical observations and strategies. *American College Health Association, 25*, 133-136.
- Medina-Lopez-Portillo, A. (2004). Intercultural learning assessment: The link between program duration and the development of intercultural sensitivity. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 10*, 179-199.
- National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition (n.d.) Mission statement. Retrieved from <http://www.sc.edu/fye/center/index.html>.
- Nam, K. (2011). *Intercultural development in the short-term study abroad context: A comparative case study analysis of global seminars in Asia (Thailand and Laos) and in Europe (Netherlands)* (Doctoral dissertation. University of Minnesota). Retrieved from <http://purl.umxi.edu/104702>
- Obst, D., Bhandari, R., & Whereell, S. (2007). *Current trends in U.S. study abroad and the impact of strategic diversity initiatives*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- Ortiz, A. M., & Rhoads, R. A. (2000). Deconstructing Whiteness as part of a multicultural educational framework: From theory to practice. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(1), 81-93.
- Osfield, K. J. (2009). *Internationalization of Student Affairs and Service: An Emerging Global Perspective*. Washington, D.C.: NASPA.

- Osfield, K. J. & Smith Terrel, P. (2009). Internationalization in higher education and student affairs. In G.S. McClellan, J. Stringer, and Associates (Eds.), *The Handbook of Student Affairs Administration* (3rd ed.; pp. 120-143). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Paige, R. M., Cohen, A. D., & Shively, R. L. (2004). Assessing the Impact of a Strategies-Based Curriculum on Language and Culture Learning Abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 253-276.
- Paige, R. M., Fry, G. W., Stallman, E., Josic, J., and Jon., J. E. (2009). Study abroad for global engagement: Results that inform research and policy agendas. Presented at the Forum on Education Abroad Conference in Portland, OR.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students* (Vol. 2). K. A. Feldman (Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Pattengale, J. (2000). Policies and practices to enhance sophomore success. In L. A. Schreiner & J. Pattengale (Eds.), *Visible solutions for invisible students: Helping sophomores succeed* (Monograph No. 31, pp. 1-17). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience & Students in Transition.
- Paul II, P. J. (1987). Sollicitudo rei socialis. *Encyclical letter*, nn, 29, 46.
- Pedersen, P. J. (2009). Teaching towards an ethnorelative worldview through psychology study abroad. *Intercultural Education*, 20, 73-86.
- Pope, R. L., & Reynolds, A. L. (1997). Student affairs core competencies: Integrating multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. *Journal of College Student Development*, 38(3), 266-277.

- Rexeisen, R. J., Anderson, P. H., Lawton, L., & Hubbard, A. C. (2008). Study abroad and intercultural development: A longitudinal study. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 17, 1-20.
- Rodgers, R. F. (1990). Recent theories and research underlying student development. In D. Creamer & Associates, *College Student Development: Theory and practice for the 1990s* (pp. 27-79). Alexandria, VA: American College Student Personnel Association.
- Rowan-Kenyon, H. T. & Niehaus, E. K. (2011). One year later: The influence of short-term study abroad experiences on students. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 48(2), 213-228.
- Schaller, M. A. (2005). Wandering and wondering: Traversing the uneven of the second year. *About Campus*, 10(3), 17-24.
- Schreiner, L. A. & Pattengale, J. (Eds.). (2000). *Visible solutions for invisible students: Helping sophomores succeed* (Monograph No. 31). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.
- Schutt, R. K. (2012). *Investigating the social world: The process and practice of research*. (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Sutton, S. B., & Leslie, S. L., (2010). The potential of study abroad in the sophomore year. In M.S. Hunter, B. F. Tobolowsky, & J. N. Gardner (Eds.). *Helping sophomores succeed: Understanding and improving the second-year experience* (pp. 163-176). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First Year Experience and Students in Transition.

Stockenberg, J. T. (2007). The sophomore jump program at Colorado College. In B. F.

Tobolowsky & B. E. Cox (Eds.), *Shedding light on sophomores: An exploration of the second college year* (Monograph No. 47, pp. 63-73). Columbia, SC:

University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience & Students in Transition.

Tobolowsky, B. F., & Cox, B. E. (2007). *Shedding light on sophomores: An exploration of the second college year* (Monograph No. 47). Columbia, SC: University of

South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience & Students in Transition.

Tobolowsky, B. F., and Serven, S. S. (2007). Introduction. In B. F. Tobolowsky & B. E.

Cox (Eds.), *Shedding light on sophomores: An exploration of the second college year* (Monograph No. 47, pp. 1-11). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina,

National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience & Students in Transition.

University of San Diego. (February 22, 2004). University mission statement. Retrieved from <http://www.sandiego.edu/about/mission-and-vision.php>

University of San Diego. (October 22, 2014). Retrieved from

<http://www.sandiego.edu/facts/quick/2013/ethnicity.php>

United Nations News Centre. (June 13, 2013). *News*. Retrieved from

<http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=45165#.Uj40QBbIXj1>

United States Census Bureau. (December 12, 2012). *Newsroom*. Retrieved from

<http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/population/cb12-243.html>

United States Census Bureau. (December 26, 2014). Retrieved from

<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/00000.html>

Vande Berg, M. J., Balkcum, A., Scheid, M., & Whalen, B. J. (2004). The Georgetown University Consortium Project: A Report at the Halfway Mark. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 101-116.

Vande Berg, M., Connor-Linton, J., & Paige, R. M. (2009). The Georgetown Consortium Project: Interventions for learning abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 18, 1-75.

Vuong, M., Brown-Welty, S., & Tracz, S. (2010). The effects of self-efficacy on academic success of first-generation college sophomore students. *Journal of college student development*, 51(1), 50-64.

Williams, T. R. (2005). Exploring the impact of study abroad on students' intercultural communication skills: Adaptability and sensitivity. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9(4), 356-371.

Young, D. (2008). Persistence at a liberal arts university and participation in study abroad program. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 15(1), 93-11.

Zhai, L. & Scheer, S. D. (2004). Global perspectives and attitudes toward cultural diversity among summer agricultural students at the Ohio State University. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 45(2), 39-51.

Appendix A
Global Perspective Inventory (GPI)

Global Perspective Inventory
General Student Form 2013–2014

You have been invited to respond to the Global Perspective Inventory. You should be able to complete the survey in 15-20 minutes.

Participation is voluntary. There are no foreseeable risks involved in responding to this survey beyond those experienced in everyday life. By completing the GPI, you are agreeing to participate in research. You are free to stop responding at any time. Confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology used and to the extent allowed by law. No absolute guarantees can be made regarding the confidentiality of electronic data. You will not be identified in anything written about this study.

If you have questions about this survey, please contact us through our website address, gpi.central.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a participant you may contact please contact Central College, Institutional Review Board, Dr. Keith Jones, Campus Mailbox 0109, 812 University, Pella, IA 50219; phone: (641)628-5182.

Please enter the four-digit Access Code provided to you here ____ (If applicable)

INSTRUCTIONS: There is no time limit, but try to respond to each statement as quickly as possible. There are no right or wrong answers, only responses that are right for you. You must complete every item for your responses to count. Thank you for your cooperation.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. When I notice cultural differences, my culture tends to have the better approach.	SA	A	N	D	SD
2. I have a definite purpose in my life.	SA	A	N	D	SD
3. I can explain my personal values to people who are different from me.	SA	A	N	D	SD
4. Most of my friends are from my own ethnic background.	SA	A	N	D	SD
5. I think of my life in terms of giving back to society.	SA	A	N	D	SD
6. Some people have a culture and others do not.	SA	A	N	D	SD
7. In different settings what is right and wrong is simple to determine.	SA	A	N	D	SD
8. I am informed of current issues that impact international relations.	SA	A	N	D	SD
9. I know who I am as a person.	SA	A	N	D	SD
10. I feel threatened around people from backgrounds very different from my own.	SA	A	N	D	SD
11. I often get out of my comfort zone to better understand myself.	SA	A	N	D	SD
12. I am willing to defend my own views when they differ from others	SA	A	N	D	SD
13. I understand the reasons and causes of conflict among nations of different cultures.	SA	A	N	D	SD
14. I work for the rights of others.	SA	A	N	D	SD
15. I see myself as a global citizen.	SA	A	N	D	SD
16. I take into account different perspectives before drawing conclusions about the world around me.	SA	A	N	D	SD
17. I understand how various cultures of this world interact socially.	SA	A	N	D	SD
18. I put my beliefs into action by standing up for my principles.	SA	A	N	D	SD
19. I consider different cultural perspectives when evaluating global problems.	SA	A	N	D	SD
20. I rely primarily on authorities to determine what is true in the world	SA	A	N	D	SD
21. I know how to analyze the basic characteristics of a culture.	SA	A	N	D	SD
22. I am sensitive to those who are discriminated against.	SA	A	N	D	SD
23. I do not feel threatened emotionally when presented with multiple perspectives.	SA	A	N	D	SD
24. I frequently interact with people from a race/ethnic group different from my own	SA	A	N	D	SD
25. I am accepting of people with different religious and spiritual traditions.	SA	A	N	D	SD
26. I put the needs of others above my own personal wants.	SA	A	N	D	SD
27. I can discuss cultural differences from an informed perspective.	SA	A	N	D	SD
28. I am developing a meaningful philosophy of life.	SA	A	N	D	SD
29. I intentionally involve people from many cultural backgrounds in my life.	SA	A	N	D	SD
30. I rarely question what I have been taught about the world around me	SA	A	N	D	SD
31. I enjoy when my friends from other cultures teach me about our cultural differences.	SA	A	N	D	SD
32. I consciously behave in terms of making a difference.	SA	A	N	D	SD
33. I am open to people who strive to live lives very different from my own life style.	SA	A	N	D	SD
34. Volunteering is not an important priority in my life.	SA	A	N	D	SD
35. I frequently interact with people from a country different from my own.	SA	A	N	D	SD

36. My age in years, (e.g., 21) __ _

37. My gender is

- a. Female
- b. Male
- c. Other

38. Select the one that best describes your current status.

- a. American student at an American college/university
- b. Non-American student at an American college/university
- c. Other

If answered "b" to item 38, also respond to 38a and 38b

38a. How long have you lived in the United States? _____ years
[fill-in-the-blank numeric]

38b. What is your country of origin? _____ [fill-in-the-blank alpha]

39. Select the one ethnic identity that best describes you:

- a. Multiple Ethnicities
- b. African/African American/ Black
- c. Asian/Pacific Islander
- d. European/White
- e. Hispanic/Latino
- f. Native American
- g. I prefer not to respond

40. My status at the college/university in which I am enrolled.

- a. Freshman
- b. Sophomore
- c. Junior
- d. Senior
- e. Graduate student
- f. Faculty
- g. Administration/staff
- h. Other

41. My major field of study is (mark only one)

- a. Agriculture and natural resources
- b. Arts and humanities
- c. Business and Law
- d. Communications and Journalism
- e. Education and Social Work
- f. Engineering
- g. Health and Medical Professions
- h. Physical and Biological Sciences and Math
- i. Social and Behavioral Sciences
- j. Other

42. What was the highest level of formal education for either of your parents?
- Less than high school _____
 - High school graduate _____
 - Some college, but less than a BA, BS degree ____
 - College degree _____
 - Some Graduate school _____
 - Graduate degree (Masters, Doctorate, MD, etc.) ____
43. Are you a transfer student at the college or university where you are enrolled?
- Yes
 - No
 - Not Applicable
44. What is your average grade earned in college?
- A or A+ ____ A-- ____ B+ ____ B ____ C ____ D ____

Since coming to college, how many courses have you taken in the areas listed below.

45. Multicultural course addressing issues of race, ethnicity, gender, class, religion, or sexual orientation	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
46. Foreign language course	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
47. World history course	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
48. Service learning course	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
49. Course focused on significant global/international issues and problems	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
50. Course that includes opportunities for intensive dialogue among students with different backgrounds and beliefs	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more

Since coming to college, how often have you experienced the following with your faculty:

51. Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
52. Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
53. The faculty challenged students' views and perspectives on a topic during class.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
54. The faculty presented issues and problems in class from different cultural perspectives.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often

Since coming to college, how often have you participated in the following?

55. Participated in events or activities sponsored by groups reflecting your own cultural heritage	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
56. Participated in events or activities sponsored by groups reflecting a cultural heritage different from your own	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
57. Participated in religious or spiritual activities	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
58. Participated in leadership programs that stress collaboration and team work	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
59. Participated in community service activities	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
60. Attended a lecture/workshop/campus discussion on international/global issues	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
61. Read a newspaper or news magazine (online or in print)	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
62. Watched news programs on television	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
63. Followed an international event/crisis (e.g., through newspaper, social media, or other media source)	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
64. Discussed current events with other students	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often

65. Have you ever participated in a living-learning program with a global/international theme?
- Yes
 - No
66. **Prior to this semester or quarter**, how many quarters/semesters have you studied abroad?
- None
 - Short term – summer session, January term
 - One term
 - Two terms
 - More than two terms

67. I have a strong sense of affiliation with my college/university.	SA	A	N	D	SD
68. I feel that my college/university community honors diversity and internationalism.	SA	A	N	D	SD
69. I understand the mission of my college/university.	SA	A	N	D	SD
70. I am both challenged and supported at my college/university.	SA	A	N	D	SD
71. I have been encouraged to develop my strengths and talents at my college/university.	SA	A	N	D	SD
72. I feel I am a part of a close and supportive community of colleagues and friends.	SA	A	N	D	SD

73. (optional) Provide your ID number here _____

Appendix B Supplemental Questions

Since coming to USD, have you participated in any of the following college activity groups? In which groups were you an active member? In which groups did you play a leadership role? (Check all that apply.)

	Did Not Participate	Participated	Active Member	Leadership Role
Clubs/organizations in my Major/Minor	☐	☐	☐	☐
Clubs/organizations not in my Major/Minor	☐	☐	☐	☐
Club sports	☐	☐	☐	☐
Cultural organizations	☐	☐	☐	☐
Employment on-campus	☐	☐	☐	☐
Employment off-campus	☐	☐	☐	☐
Fraternities or sororities	☐	☐	☐	☐
Honor societies	☐	☐	☐	☐
Intercollegiate Athletics	☐	☐	☐	☐
Media groups – radio, television, newspaper	☐	☐	☐	☐
Music/Theater groups	☐	☐	☐	☐
Political groups	☐	☐	☐	☐
Preceptorial Assistant	☐	☐	☐	☐
Programming/Social Activities	☐	☐	☐	☐
Religious organizations	☐	☐	☐	☐
Resident Assistant	☐	☐	☐	☐
Social Action groups	☐	☐	☐	☐
Student Government	☐	☐	☐	☐
Social organizations	☐	☐	☐	☐
Volunteer/Community Service group	☐	☐	☐	☐

How many times, if ever, have you traveled internationally (including family vacation, school, religious organization)?

- ☐ 0, I have never traveled internationally
- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4
- ☐ 5 or more

If you have traveled internationally, where have you traveled? Select all continents that apply.

- ☐ Africa
- ☐ Antarctica
- ☐ Asia
- ☐ Australia
- ☐ Europe
- ☐ North America
- ☐ South America

If you have traveled internationally, what was the purpose of your trip? Select all that apply.

- ☐ Vacation with family
- ☐ Vacation with friends
- ☐ Service trip
- ☐ Educational trip (organized by a school or organization)
- ☐ Other

Qualitative Questions

Please respond to the following four questions in the space provided:

Think about a time when you encountered a person different from you. Please describe the event and why it was significant to you.

Has your perception of others changed during your sophomore year in college, and if so in what ways?

In what ways (if any) have your beliefs and values changed this academic year?

What are the biggest global issues we face? How can they be addressed?

Appendix C

Email to Participants

Dear [*Student Name*],

My name is Nicki Schuessler and I am a doctoral student here at USD. As part of my academic studies, I am conducting a research study about college sophomores. The purpose of the study is to better understand the experiences of USD sophomore students. As a fellow student, I would really appreciate if you could help me in my academic pursuits.

By completing the surveys, you will be entered to **win an iPad mini, Disneyland tickets, movie tickets or USD Campus Cash cards.**

Information about this Study:

This study consists of doing a pre-test and post-test survey (end of January). The survey takes approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. Please click on the link below that takes you directly to the survey.

To complete this survey,

- Please go to <https://gpi.central.edu>
- 2. Click on “**Complete It!**” tab at the top of the website page.
- 3. When asked for the four-digit access code, use: **8381**.
- 4. Then proceed to respond to the items, which include a few biographical questions.

Please complete the survey by November 6, 2013. By completing the inventory, you agree to participate in this project.

Please contact me at nschuessler@san Diego.edu if you have any questions or concerns.

Confidentiality

All personal data about the participants in the study will be confidential. All data collected from you will be coded with a number or pseudonym (fake name). All notes and materials used in this study will remain in a locked file cabinet for five years and I am the only individual with access to this cabinet.

Participation is Voluntary

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You can decide at any time to stop participating.

Potential Benefits

You will be entered into a raffle to win an iPad mini, Disneyland tickets, movie tickets, and USD Campus Cash for participating in this study. In addition, you will also indirectly benefit by knowing that you helped researchers better understand the USD sophomore-year student experience. This information could help inform university leaders who are committed to supporting the student experience. Additionally, some people enjoy sharing their experiences and may find they learn something about themselves.

Potential Risks

Sometimes when people are asked to think about their feelings, they feel sad or anxious. If you would like to talk to someone about your feelings at any time, you can call toll-free, 24 hours a day:

San Diego Mental Health Hotline at 1-800-479-3339

USD Counseling Center at 619-260-4655 or after hours through Public Safety at 619-260-7777

Questions?

If you have any questions or would like to speak with someone about this research study, please contact me or my faculty advisor, Dr. Cheryl Getz. Our contact information is at the end of this email.

Thank you for your consideration. I hope you will choose to participate in this important study. Your perspective is important and valuable to this research.

Sincerely,

Nicki Schuessler
(619) 260-4796
nschuessler@sandiego.edu

Cheryl Getz
(619) 260-4289
cgetz@sandiego.edu

Institutional Review Board Project Action Summary

Action Date: September 3, 2014

Note: Approval expires one year after this date.

Type: ☐ New Full Review ☐ New Expedited Review ☒ Continuation Review ☐ Exempt Review
☐ Modification

Action: ☒ Approved ☐ Approved Pending Modification ☐ Not Approved

Project Number: 2013-09-016

Researcher(s): Nicole Schuessler Doc SOLES

Dr. Cheryl Getz Fac SOLES

Project Title: Development of Intercultural Maturity in Second Year Students

Note: We send IRB correspondence regarding student research to the faculty advisor, who bears the ultimate responsibility for the conduct of the research. We request that the faculty advisor share this correspondence with the student researcher.

Modifications Required or Reasons for Non-Approval

None

The next deadline for submitting project proposals to the Provost's Office for full review is N/A. You may submit a project proposal for expedited review at any time.

Dr. Thomas R. Herrinton
Administrator, Institutional Review Board
University of San Diego
herrinton@san Diego.edu
5998 Alcalá Park
San Diego, California 92110-2492

Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost
Hughes Administration Center, Room 214
5998 Alcalá Park, San Diego, CA 92110-2492
Phone (619) 260-4553 • Fax (619) 260-2210 • www.sandiego.edu