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ABSTRACT

A MIXED METHODS EXAMINATION OF COLLEGE STUDENTS’ INTERCULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

by

Marie Kendall Brown

Chair: Patricia M. King

The extent to which college students acquire the knowledge, skills and awareness to behave in interculturally effective ways during college has direct implications for the quality of their citizenship in an increasingly diverse American society and interconnected world. This study sought to better understand the developmental mechanisms associated with achieving intercultural effectiveness and the nature of collegiate experiences that are effective in promoting this form of development for college students.

The theoretical basis for this study is constructive developmental and was informed by the human life span work of Kegan (1994), the college student development and self-authorship perspectives of Baxter Magolda (1999; 2001) and King and Baxter Magolda (2005), and by the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS; Bennett, 1986; 1993). The central research question that guided this study was: What student background characteristics and college diversity experiences promote college students’ intercultural development?
This mixed methods study used data from the pilot study of the Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education (WNSLAE), a cross-sectional study of 600 undergraduates from four institutions. A three-phase analytic plan was employed to explore students’ patterns of engagement in collegiate diversity experiences, students’ meaning making about their intercultural experiences, and connections between the quantitative and qualitative data.

Findings from this study demonstrate that many college students enter college with little diversity experience, and neither the racial composition of students’ high schools nor the percentage of an institution’s structural diversity were strong predictors of intercultural development. However, structural diversity played an important role with respect to the number and kinds of intercultural experiences reported by students who reported having a developmentally effective intercultural experience. Overall, the students in this study reported low levels of participation in the kinds of collegiate diversity experiences (e.g., diversity courses, service learning, and education abroad) that have been demonstrated to promote intercultural development. However, students who reported having had developmentally effective intercultural experiences utilized remarkably similar cognitive structures depending on their self-authorship orientation, and there were statistically significant differences in self-authorship levels relative to whether students reported having had developmentally effective intercultural experiences.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

American higher education has a long tradition of being a stage where an array of contemporary cultural conflicts based on shifting demographics have played out (Reich, 2002); these range from bilingualism in the age of industrialization at the turn of the 19th century, to Americanization and acculturation campaigns for immigrants in the 1920s, to McCarthyism and anti-communism in the 1940s, to Civil Rights and issues of equal access in the 1960s, to multiculturalism in the 1990s. In the 21st century, accommodating increasingly diverse student populations and understanding how to best prepare all students for meaningful post-graduation contribution in an increasingly diverse society and world is quickly becoming a fundamental role and function for American postsecondary institutions.

A Changing American Demographic Landscape

The United States is a nation characterized by complexity, heterogeneity, and groups bearing multiple social, cultural, and ethnic identities (Gurin et. al, 1999). While in the past Whites predominated in the United States, changing American demographics point to a shifting minority-majority landscape where current labels of race, ethnicity, and minority may have little meaning in the future (Kent & Mather, 2002; Riche, 2000). With a population of 288 million in 2002, the United States is projected to add nearly 140 million people by 2050, bringing the population total to 420 million and making its growth as fast as or faster than any other more developed country (Kent & Mather, 2002).
American population growth coincides with increasing diversity; the U.S Bureau of the Census has projected significant changes in the race and country of origin distribution of the United States over the next fifty years. Whereas minorities comprised 28% of the population in 1999, the U.S. Census Bureau projects that they will comprise 47% in 2050 (Riche, 2000). For example, while nearly three-quarters of the American population was non-Hispanic White\textsuperscript{1} in 1995, by 2050 this group will be declining in proportion from 74% of the population in 1995 to 53% in 2050 (Day, 1996; Riche, 2000). At the same time, the African American population is projected to nearly double in size during the same period and after 2016, more African Americans than White Non-Hispanics will be added to the population each year. The Hispanic population alone is projected to add more people to the United States every year after 2020 than all other racial and ethnic groups combined, becoming the second largest racial/ethnic group by 2010, and by 2030, the White non-Hispanic population will comprise less than half of the U.S. population under 18 years of age.

Immigration also contributes to the changing American demographic landscape. While immigration contributed to about one-third of the U.S. population growth in the

\textsuperscript{1} The designations of racial and ethnic groups in ways that eliminate racial or ethnic bias are critical components of social science research. However, it is difficult to select appropriate terminology to describe racially and ethnically diverse people as there is lack of consensus among researchers about which terms to use. Furthermore, name designations of racial/ethnic groups change over time, and even members of the same group may disagree about their preferred name. When reporting the findings of other researchers, I will use the race/ethnicity terms they use. In reporting my own findings related to the experience of color or racial discrimination, I will use color terms whenever possible (e.g., White, Black). When referring to ethnicity in the national context, I will use ethnic/national culture terms (e.g., Chinese American rather than Asian American; Cuban rather than Hispanic).
1980s and 1990s, between 2000 and 2001 alone, immigration contributed to about 40% of growth (Kent and Mather, 2002). These growing numbers of peoples of color and immigrants will contribute significantly to American racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity, while at the same time displacing non-Hispanic Whites from their long held position as the racial and ethnic majority.

In spite of this increasing racial and ethnic diversity, there is evidence to suggest that many Americans continue to live, work, and attend school in racially and ethnically segregated environments (AAC&U, 1995b; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002). As a group, college students tend to enter college with little experience interacting with culturally and ethnically diverse peers (Orfield, Bachmeier, James, & Elite, 1997) and lack ethnic and cultural awareness and understanding (Hurtado, Engberg, Ponjuan, & Landreman, 2002; Saddlemire, 1996). In addition, racially-motivated violence and micro-aggressions continue to occur on college campuses across the United States (Anonymous, 2002; 2005; Elfin & Burke, 1993; “Trial for Durham,” 2006). These realities point to continued structural inequalities, sociocultural divisions, and inadequate intergroup communication and understanding, all of which ultimately diminish the collective capacity of the United States at the dawn of the 21st century (Landreman, 2005).

Given changing American demographics and continued racial and ethnic tensions, especially during the college years and on campuses nationwide, there needs to be a developmentally effective approach to preparing college students to be successful in this increasingly diverse America. By preparing all students to interact across difference and to carry those skills with them into their post-graduation home and work environments, postsecondary institutions will meet their responsibility to prepare citizens for a
multicultural world and respond in a meaningful way to contemporary America’s shifting
demographic landscape.

*Preparing an Interculturally Effective Citizenry*

A core purpose of American higher education is the preparation of educated
citizens who understand and take responsibility for the multiple ways in which they are
connected to their neighborhoods and communities, their country, and other individuals
throughout the world. As such, American institutions of higher education are being called
upon to prepare globally responsible citizens who will engage effectively in increasingly
diverse home and work environments. In *Democratic Education in an Age of Difference*
(1997), Guarasci and Cornwall advocate embracing a new *multicentric* educational vision
that reflects the increasing ethnic and cultural diversity of American society. They call for
faculty, administrators, and educational policymakers to link undergraduate academic
development with the kind of citizenship education needed in a diverse and
interconnected world. This approach would promote college students’ understanding of
both difference and personal identity, while teaching them how to constructively bridge
the gaps between the two.

In a series of national reports and initiatives, the Association of American
Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) has called upon American higher education
institutions to produce graduates who are able to interact effectively with diverse others.
For example, the *American Commitment’s Initiative* (1995a) called for graduates who are
able to “live creatively with the multiplicity, ambiguity, and irreducible differences that
are the defining conditions of the contemporary world” (p. xxii). *Greater Expectations: A
New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College* (2002), an AAC&U national panel
report, recommended that all college students acquire a variety of skills and capacities, including several that address the value of developing intercultural effectiveness: the ability to understand and work in diverse groups, the ability to recognize interrelations within and across cross-cultural and global communities, and the ability to cultivate a deep respect for the complex identities of others, their histories, and their cultures.

Acquiring the ability to interact effectively with diverse others during the college years has long lasting implications for a diverse America. Gurin (1999) argues that racial diversity and student involvement in activities related to diversity have a direct and strong effect on learning and the ways students conduct themselves in later life:

Because students in late adolescence and early adulthood are at a critical stage of development, diversity (racial, economic, demographic, and cultural) is crucially important in enabling them to become conscious learners and critical thinkers, and in preparing them to become active participants in a democratic society. Universities are ideal institutions to foster such development. (p. 1)

Fortunately, many college and university presidents are embracing policies and practices that are designed to foster diversity on their campuses. In a recent *Chronicle of Higher Education* survey of 764 college and university presidents, respondents ranked “insufficient racial/ethnic diversity among faculty” and “lack of racial and ethnic diversity among students” among their greatest concerns (“Almanac Issue,” 2006). Nonetheless, it is unclear what methods these presidents are using to diversify their student and faculty populations, and how they are promoting learning and interactions across diversity on their respective campuses. Chang, Chang, and Ledesma (2005) argue that hiring and admissions practices alone are not enough to achieve the benefits associated with a racially diverse faculty and student body:

…all campuses, including those with open enrollment, must be intentional in finding ways to engage underrepresented students both academically and socially,
as well as to provide more opportunities for all students to interact freely, wisely, and responsibly with one another in formal and informal settings. Establishing a campus culture that facilitates engagement and interaction typically begins with interventions… (p. 15)

Thus, according to Chang et. al (2005), educational interventions such as intentional diversity experiences are critical for engaging both minority and majority students because they establish an engaging campus environment where students and faculty learn to productively interact across difference.

Because college students today and in the future come from diverse, yet still largely segregated, racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds, and because they will be entering increasingly diverse college and post-college work environments, there is a high need for higher education institutions to teach students to work effectively with diverse others. Thus, developing the ability to interact effectively across racial, ethnic, and cultural difference is a critical collegiate outcome for the 21st century. However, in order for higher education institutions to be effective in preparing their students for living and working in an increasingly diverse America, additional research is needed that explicitly links theoretical perspectives on intercultural development of college students with empirical research concerned with developmentally effective collegiate diversity experiences. This understanding will guide colleges and universities in creating and promoting those types of intentional educational experiences that best facilitate this development and thus prepare their graduates for responsible citizenship in an increasingly interconnected and global world. A number of scholars from a variety of disciplinary perspectives have begun to investigate how intercultural development occurs, and college student development researchers have examined collegiate experiences that promote intercultural effectiveness, yet these two approaches have not been explicitly
linked to the goal of preparing all college students to function effectively with diverse others.

Intercultural communication is a field of study devoted to understanding and addressing the practical problems encountered by individuals who live, work, and study with others from different cultural, ethnic, and religious backgrounds in order to reduce misunderstandings that may result from these differences. Intercultural communication researchers are concerned with understanding and improving effective communication across difference, and a number of scholars have focused on the developmental dimensions of intercultural communication. For example, Hammer, Gudykunst, and Wiseman (1978) have examined intercultural development as a function of an individual’s interpersonal effectiveness, the cultural perspective and knowledge an individual uses in interpreting and evaluating intercultural encounters. Bennett (1986; 1993) proposed a constructivist model of intercultural development in which he uses the term intercultural sensitivity to describe the different developmental stages that individuals use to construe and make meaning of cultural difference with increasing sophistication, moving from ethnocentrism to greater recognition and acceptance of difference. Thus, intercultural communication theory provides a framework for understanding individuals’ development in this domain.

College student development scholars are concerned with “the ways that a student grows, progresses, or increases his or her developmental capacities as a result of enrollment in an institution of higher education” (Rodgers, 1990, p. 27). In response to scholarship concerned with identifying those competencies and attributes associated with intercultural development, a growing body of student development research has focused
on the creation of testable models to describe intercultural (or multicultural) development during college. For example, Chávez, Guido-DiBrito, and Mallory (2003) proposed a holistic developmental framework for understanding individual diversity development based on six dimensions of “otherness” that include periods of unawareness, questioning and self-exploration, and integration. King and Baxter Magolda (2005), too, proposed a multi-dimensional developmental model of intercultural maturity in which a range of attributes are explicitly linked to development in the cognitive, interpersonal, and intrapersonal dimensions of human development. Both models of intercultural development locate the individual on a continuum of self-discovery in which increasingly complex meaning making about diverse others is associated with increasingly complex meaning making about self, and both provide suggestions for the types of personal attributes that are associated with intercultural development. These attributes include the following: complex understanding, sensitivity to others, a developed sense of self that is open to learning from others (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005), independent and collective ability to reflect on one’s thinking, feeling and behavior towards others, and the ability to consciously validate persons unlike oneself (Chávez, Guido-DiBrito, & Mallory, 2003).

While much work has been done to advance our understanding of the attributes, knowledge, and skills that promote intercultural development, many areas remain unexplored. For example, few studies explicitly link intercultural communication theory and research with college student development theory. And although both Chávez, Guido-DiBrito, and Mallory (2003) and King and Baxter Magolda’s (2005) models are grounded in empirically validated models of college student development, the nuances of development in this domain are as yet not well understood because neither model has
been empirically tested. Furthermore, due to the complexity of these models and their respective foci on individuals’ evolving constructions of themselves, others, and the world, few instruments are currently available that attend to the multidimensional nature of intercultural development. One instrument that is derived from a multidimensional theoretical foundation is the Intercultural Development Inventory (discussed below).

This section has provided an introduction to varying approaches for understanding intercultural development from the fields of intercultural communication and college student development, and has argued that additional research designed to more fully understand college students’ intercultural developmental capacity is necessary. The next section will provide an overview of some collegiate experiences that have been linked with intercultural development.

*Collegiate Experiences Related to Intercultural Development*

Educational researchers have found that certain curricular and co-curricular experiences promote racial and ethnic tolerance and greater multicultural understanding and therefore enhance college students’ ability to successfully interact across difference (Gurin, 1999; Hurtado, Engberg, & Ponjuan, 2003; Milem, 1992; Nelson Laird, 2003). In their review of college impact research conducted in the 1990s, Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) point to numerous studies that have documented positive attitudinal changes towards diverse others in students who have participated in experiences such as diversity courses (Astin, 1993; Gurin et. al, 1999; Sax & Astin, 1998); racial/ethnic or cultural awareness workshops (Antonio, 1998, 2000; Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn, & Terenzini, 1996); service learning (Gray et. al, 2000; 1999); education abroad (Bates,

Much of this research focuses on pre- and post-test measures of attitudinal change related to the importance of promoting racial understanding and openness to diversity (Antonio, 2000), more inclusive racial-ethnic attitudes (Astin, 1993; Astin & Antonio, 1999, 2000), understanding people from backgrounds different than one’s own (Gray et al., 2000; 1999), and an increased likelihood of seeing the world from another’s perspective (Bringle and Kremer, 1993; Green & Diehn, 1995). Many of these studies are limited, however, because they lack a developmental perspective and therefore cannot explicitly link attitudinal change to increased intercultural development and personal capacity to interact effectively in multicultural situations. Further, as King and Baxter Magolda (2005) note, relying solely on measuring attitudinal change as a proxy for intercultural competence is inadequate because it does not explain individuals’ underlying assumptions about difference, nor does it illuminate individuals’ enacted (vs. espoused) capacities for engaging with different others.

Viewed from a developmental perspective, the collegiate experiences introduced above (e.g., participation in diversity courses, racial/ethnic or cultural awareness workshops, service learning, education abroad, and intergroup dialogues) often share certain characteristics which could explain why they are effective in promoting the development of intercultural capacities, and therefore movement on the intercultural development continuum. For example, these experiences often provide students with a supportive environment in which to come in contact with cultural and racial differences, the opportunity to expand their awareness of and sensitivity to other forms of difference,
and optimally, the opportunity to use critical reflection to enhance their understanding of these experiences. Like the development they promote, these experiences are holistic in nature: they address student’s cognitive (meaning making about the world), interpersonal (meaning making about how the self relates to others), and intrapersonal (meaning making about self) growth, reflecting the lifespan development framework of Kegan (1994). That is, they simultaneously address multiple dimensions of growth. However, we do not yet understand the developmental mechanisms associated with those collegiate experiences that appear to promote intercultural development.

**Purpose of the Study**

In an increasingly interconnected and racially diverse world, there is a need to better understand how college students learn to act in interculturally effective ways. As such, the focus of this study is intercultural development among college students and the effect of specific collegiate experiences on that development. The purpose of this study is to understand both the developmental capacities of college students with respect to intercultural effectiveness, and the types of collegiate experiences that best facilitate its development.

**Statement of Significance**

This study will augment our understanding of the developmental capacities associated with effectively interacting with racially and ethnically diverse others. It will also identify what collegiate experiences are effective in promoting intercultural development, and will contribute to the body of higher education research concerned with the developmental considerations of achieving intercultural maturity in an increasingly diverse and interconnected 21st century world. This information will assist college
educators, education policy makers, and administrators in deciding which experiences and interventions to support for their ability to promote intercultural development in college students. Furthermore, this inquiry will contribute to the expanding body of mixed methods research as an alternative and viable research paradigm, useful for its ability to draw on the strengths and minimize the weaknesses of single-method approaches.

Organization of Work

This research study contains seven chapters. This chapter situated this study in the changing demographic context of 21st century America, noting the ways in which American higher education has been called upon to develop an informed citizenry that is responsive to the needs of society. The argument that more research is needed to understand both the development of college students with respect to intercultural development and the types of collegiate experiences that are purported to facilitate it was presented. Chapter Two provides an overview of the literature that informs this study, namely, a review of terminology related to intercultural development, a review of the human lifespan and college student development literature on this topic, an overview of the theoretical considerations from the field of intercultural communication, and a review of research concerned with those college experiences that are associated with intercultural development. Chapter Two concludes with a conceptual framework that integrates these various literature sources and which will serve as a guide for this inquiry. Chapter Three introduces the methodology for this study, including detailed sub-questions of the primary research questions, rationale for using a mixed methods approach, and a discussion of the instrumentation, data collection, institutional and
individual sampling information, instrumentation, and the analytic strategies for both the quantitative and qualitative portions of this study. Chapter Four presents quantitative findings related college students’ participation in collegiate diversity experiences and the role these experiences play in fostering intercultural development. Chapter Five offers an analysis of how students understand and interpret their significant collegiate diversity experiences. Chapter Six links and triangulates the study’s quantitative and qualitative data in order to further inform the overall research question. The final chapter, Chapter Seven, offers a discussion of findings, a developmental curriculum for promoting intercultural development in college students, implications for higher education and future research, and the conclusion.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This review is intended to organize, describe and critique literature that addresses the intercultural dimensions of college student development. It is situated within the cross-disciplinary field of multicultural education, and will be framed by theoretical perspectives from human lifespan development, college student development theory, and scholarship from the field of intercultural communication. I first offer a review of terminology related to intercultural development, as these vary by disciplinary perspective. I then introduce perspectives from late adolescent and adult development theorists on the nature of human development across a range of dimensions. These perspectives are used to situate a discussion on holistic models of college student development related to intercultural development. Next, I introduce intercultural communication as a field of study that has sought to better understand how intercultural development occurs, and describe a prevalent developmental model from the field. The chapter concludes with a review and discussion of college impact research concerned with those college experiences that are associated with promoting intercultural development. This includes evidence on the impact of structural diversity on promoting attitudinal change, a discussion of which collegiate diversity experiences promote attitudinal change, and an analysis of how a developmental framework could be employed to explain why certain diversity experiences promote intercultural development. The chapter concludes with a conceptual framework that applies a
developmental lens to synthesize the findings from these studies and to guide the research questions and methodology for this study, which is introduced in Chapter Three.

Understanding Intercultural Development

Human development as it relates to learning to effectively interact with different others is a topic that is complex, multifaceted, and cuts across a range of disciplines, from business, psychology, and sociology, to education, social work, and healthcare. Interaction with racially, culturally and/or ethnically diverse others is commonly characterized as cross-cultural, intercultural, and/or multicultural interaction (or a combination of the three). While similar, these terms carry different meanings and are used in a variety of ways in higher education and intercultural communication research. Analyzing the contributions of various approaches requires understanding the terminology, concepts, and major assumptions underlying each approach. For example, the following terms have been used to capture selected dimensions of intercultural development: intercultural sensitivity (M. Bennett, 1986; Chen, 1997; Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003), intercultural awareness (Chen, 1997), intercultural maturity (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005), intercultural effectiveness (Hammer, Gudykunst, & Wiseman, 1978; WNSLAE, 2006), intercultural and multicultural competence (Chen & Starosta, 1996; Moore & Ortiz, 1999, Pope & Reynolds, 1997, C. Bennett, 2001), intercultural competence (J. Bennett, 2006), intercultural communication competence (Arasaratnam & Doerfel, 2005), pluralistic orientation (Engberg, 2004), and individual diversity development (Chávez, Guido-Dibrito, & Mallory, 2003). The operational definitions for these terms vary in the extent to which certain knowledge, awareness, and skills are emphasized, and the extent to which a corresponding developmental process is
articulated. However, a growing body of scholarship from intercultural communication and human lifespan/college student development has begun to investigate and attempt to articulate the various dimensions and underlying assumptions of intercultural development.

One example of this scholarship is reflected in research from multicultural education, a field of study with an extensive research and theoretical foundation within the American cultural and educational context. Christine Bennett (2001) noted that the field of multicultural education originated in response to the American Civil Rights era and connotes aspirations for equal opportunity and social justice, and that these ideals eventually spread to encompass other minority groups, including women, Native Americans, Latinos, and homosexuals. Drawn from an extensive review of multicultural education research and scholarship, she created a typology for the various types of American multicultural theory, research, and practice that span over three decades and represent a range of disciplinary perspectives. The typology includes four “clusters” of multicultural research: curriculum reform, equity pedagogy, multicultural competence, and societal equity. The first cluster, curriculum reform, includes research that focuses on ways of transforming Anglo Eurocentric curriculum to include knowledge and perspectives that have been previously ignored or suppressed. Equity pedagogy, the second cluster, is concerned with achieving fair and equal opportunities for all children and youth, particularly ethnic minorities and the economically disadvantaged. The multicultural competence cluster includes research on the nature and/or development of individual competence in a multicultural society. Finally, the societal equity cluster encompasses research on the societal level that is concerned with social action and
reform whose goal is equitable access, participation and achievement in American social institutions.

The present review is situated within C. Bennett’s (2001) conceptualization of the *multicultural competence* cluster. Research from this cluster operates from the assumption that the reduction of racial and cultural prejudice is possible and desirable and that individuals can become multicultural (e.g., able to function comfortably in a different cultural milieu) without rejecting their familial worldview and identity (cf. Cross, 1991; O’Connor, 1997; Pope & Reynolds, 1997; Tatum, 1992). As such, a central focus of this body of research is the nature and development of individual competence in a multicultural society, especially that of college students. C. Bennett describes *multicultural competence* as a developmental construct that focuses on personal characteristics such as open-mindedness and lack of prejudice and knowledge about various cultural and ethnic groups. Multicultural competence also includes a sense of cultural consciousness, the recognition that one’s own culture and view of the world is not universally shared and differs from the world view held by members of different ethnic, cultural, and racial groups. It also involves the ability to interpret intentional communication as well as subtle unconscious cues, and to recognize that others have cultural styles that are different from one’s own culture. According to C. Bennett, individuals’ multicultural competence varies along a continuum of low to high and is shaped by the opportunities an individual has to learn about and experience both one’s own and diverse others’ cultural heritage.

Like multicultural education researchers, intercultural communication researchers have sought to understand human development as it relates to cultural self-awareness,
other-culture awareness, and various skills in intercultural perception, awareness, and communication competence (J. Bennett, 2006; Gudykunst & Hammer, 1983; Paige & Martin, 1983). However, unlike many American multicultural educators and researchers, intercultural communication scholars use the terms intercultural, multicultural, and cross-cultural interchangeably to describe broadly defined cultural differences that are not endemic to the United States, and their work commonly encompasses both domestic and international contexts (Landreman, 2003). The prefix “inter,” in particular, implies cultures interacting, and corresponds with an interconnected and global view of difference. Corresponding with this dynamic view of ethnic, racial, and cultural difference, I will hereafter use the term “intercultural” rather than multicultural or cross-cultural to describe interactions with individuals from a cultural, ethnic, or racial group different than one’s own.

Intercultural communication researchers also use a variety of terms to articulate the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to function effectively in a different cultural context. For example, Hammer, Gudykunst, and Wiseman (1978) use the term intercultural effectiveness to encompass the cultural perspective and knowledge an individual uses in interpreting and evaluating intercultural encounters. Milton Bennett (1986; 1993) uses the term intercultural sensitivity to describe the way people construe and make meaning of cultural difference and the varying kinds of experience that accompany these different constructions. By contrast, Janet Bennett (2006) uses the term intercultural competence to describe the ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in a variety of cultural contexts. She argues that intercultural competence requires knowledge (e.g., cultural self-awareness and culture-general and culture-specific
information), skills (e.g., relationship building and behavioral skills), and attitudes (e.g., curiosity, cognitive flexibility, motivation, and open mindedness). And, multicultural scholars Pope, Reynolds and Mueller (2004) propose a definition of *multicultural competence* that is both situated in the American socio-historical context as it relates to issues of race, gender, and ethnicity (e.g., multicultural) and a dynamic view of the spectrum of human difference (e.g., intercultural). They define multicultural competence as “awareness, knowledge, and skills that are needed to work effectively across cultural groups and to work with complex diversity issues” (p. xiv). Multicultural competence includes such multidimensional attributes as self-awareness, including an understanding of one’s underlying assumptions, values, attitudes, and beliefs; knowledge about alternate worldviews and cultural groups; and the ability to communicate across cultures and to behave in culturally sensitive ways.

In addition to offering ways to describe intercultural development, other research in this field has explored *how* intercultural development occurs, that is, articulating the developmental steps involved in achieving intercultural sensitivity, competence, effectiveness, and the like. For example, King and Baxter Magolda (2005) use the term *intercultural maturity* to describe the developmental capacity of college students to interact effectively with diverse others by acquiring such attributes and skills as sensitivity to others, understanding, and the ability to listen to and learn from others. They use a lifespan development perspective to argue that reaching intercultural maturity entails multidimensional growth and evolving complexity in the ways that individuals understand the world (cognitive dimension), themselves (intrapersonal dimension), and
their relationships with others (interpersonal dimension). They hypothesize that competency in all three dimensions is necessary for intercultural maturity.

Another group of college student development researchers, Chávez, Guido-DiBrito, and Mallory (2003), has focused on *individual diversity development* to describe a process of development that leads to increased valuing and validation of “those who are other” by recognizing that each individual is a unique blend of interacting identities. The process “is one of learning to be aware of, exploring, understanding, integrating, and valuing various types of otherness” (p. 457). The authors argue that learning to value different others involves cognitive, affective, and behavioral processes whereby individuals learn to consciously value the complex and integrated differences of others and themselves. According to Chávez et al., as individuals experience “otherness,” they progress through periods of unawareness, dual awareness, questioning and self-exploration, risk-taking, and eventually integration. At each stage, individuals make increasingly conscious and complex choices that enable them to better understand others.

Milton Bennett (1986; 1993) introduced one of the most persuasive models of intercultural development. He proposed the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) to describe how individuals’ dominant world view with respect to difference falls along an ethnocentric-ethnorelative continuum. Initial development is characterized by an egocentric and defensive view of one’s own culture as superior, whereas mature development is characterized by a complex worldview that integrates an awareness of multiple cultural perspectives. M. Bennett’s constructivist stage-based model of intercultural sensitivity articulates how developmental shifts in worldview allow individuals to think more complexly about difference, and therefore become more
effective at engaging different others. Accordingly, the DMIS illuminates the varying ways that individuals construe cultural differences (described in further detail below).

Clearly, scholars from a number of disciplines are concerned with describing, defining, and understanding the specific developmental milestones (i.e., the knowledge, skills, and awareness) involved in teaching individuals how to competently interact with others who are unlike themselves and do so by focusing on different dimensions. Yet, there is a lack of cross-germination of ideas between and among these varying disciplinary approaches and a lack of consensus about which pathways for intercultural development are most effective for college-aged students. The following sections will disaggregate these varying approaches by reviewing the theoretical foundations from research on late adolescent and adult lifespan development, college student development, and intercultural communication, as well as describing the salient features of a sample of intercultural development models and their application to college students.

_Late Adolescent and Adult Development and Self-Authorship_

In order to understand how intercultural development occurs, it is instructive to consider the work of Robert Kegan (1982; 1994), a leading lifespan development theorist whose holistic model describes how humans move through successively more complex constructs of mental organization that affect thinking, feeling, and relating to others. According to Kegan (1994), individuals progress through concrete, durable categories in childhood to “trans-system” structures that require reflection and high degrees of abstraction in adulthood. Kegan notes that development is evolutionary motion that focuses on the changes in the ways individuals distinguish between their sense of self and the environment. It is a lifelong process of differentiation and integration that is
facilitated through increasingly complex ways of construing oneself, one’s relationships, and one’s understanding of the world and funds of knowledge. As such, Kegan’s scholarship is holistic in nature and provides a way of looking at these three dimensions and how they interrelate. Kegan (1994) also introduced the concept of self-authorship, demonstrated complexity in interpreting and making sense of life experiences by drawing upon all three dimensions of development (cognitive, interpersonal, intrapersonal).

Baxter Magolda (1999) further elucidated this concept as “the ability to reflect upon one’s beliefs, organize one’s thoughts and feelings in the context of, but separate from, the thoughts and feelings of others, and literally make up one’s mind” (p. 6). As she so aptly points out, self-authorship is “a complicated phenomenon. It is simultaneously an ability to construct knowledge in a contextual world, an ability to construct an internal identity separate from external influences, and an ability to engage in relationships without losing one’s internal identity” (p. 12). This process of making sense of, interpreting, or construing one’s life experiences is commonly referred to as meaning making.

In this context, meaning making refers to the organization of one’s experiences based upon certain principles or assumptions that are characteristic of epistemic development, or development related to how an individual views and makes sense of knowledge claims (Baxter Magolda, 1993; King & Kitchener, 1994). One of the key organizing principles is that individuals interpret their experiences drawing upon their underlying assumptions, and that the nature and quality of those experiences affects what there is to interpret. Furthermore, the nature and extent of experience an individual has in a domain will influence what cognitive structures she or he has access to in order to
interpret a given event or experience, and therefore the nature and extent of meaning making. For example, if an individual has had limited contact with racially, ethnically, or culturally diverse others, it is less likely that she or he will be able to think complexly about the multicultural issues affecting their relationships. For individuals who have had contact with different others, and who reflect upon that contact, there is more opportunity to make meaning in more complex ways. This is exemplified in the words of a bicultural Cuban American student in Torres’ (2003) longitudinal study of Latino students’ identity development as she contrasted her high school and college experiences as a Hispanic student:

I have felt that I have been more segregated [in college] because when I was in high school, there weren’t many Hispanics, and so like I [being Cuban]…would be like “Yes, I am Cuban, and this is how we do things.” And here there are so many Hispanics, but most of them have grown up with both Hispanic parents, or in a Hispanic neighborhood, or in a Hispanic country, and so they are like very, very cultural, and I am like half and half, so sometimes I feel like an outsider in the Hispanic group, but then like I don’t want to be, because that is my culture, but I don’t speak fluent Spanish anymore, and they [other Latino students] do things different than I would. (p. 538)

While this student may have taken her ethnic identity for granted during high school, her experiences with other Hispanic students in college, especially as they contrasted to her prior life experiences, prompted her to define and thus make meaning about herself as a Cuban American in more nuanced and reflective ways.

The idea of “meaning making” is grounded in the concept of constructivism, a theoretical orientation and line of intellectual discourse that traces its origins to the work of Dewey (1933, 1938), Piaget (1950, 1957, 1971), and Vygotsky (1978), among others. Constructivism posits that how one understands reality is subjective, and that individuals use a subjective process of meaning making to construct knowledge and organize their
experiences through interactions with others and with the environment. This Piagetian approach to learning is called **constructive-developmentalism**, the notion that “humans actively construct their perspectives by interpreting their experiences (i.e., constructivism) and that these constructions form meaning making structures that evolve over time (i.e., developmentalism)” (Baxter Magolda & King, 2006, p. 9). Furthermore, individuals “evolve through qualitatively different eras of increasing complexity [with respect to knowledge construction] according to regular principles of stability and change” (Kegan, 1994, p. 199). This tradition emphasizes that transformations in how people construct meaning are viewed as a synergistic process involving the cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal domains.

A number of college student development researchers have applied a constructive developmental lens to help explain how college students construct their experiences, and how they develop across a range of dimensions as a result of these increasingly complex constructions. For example, Baxter Magolda (1992; 2001) conducted a 20-year longitudinal study that continues to follow an initial group of 101 first year college students in order to better understand learning and development from late adolescence and into adulthood. Figure 2.1 presents the conceptualization of findings related to participants’ “journey toward self-authorship” across the three dimensions. This journey comprises four phases that characterize the meaning making assumptions employed by individuals in the study: following formulas, crossroads, becoming the author of one’s life, and internal foundation. Considered together, these phases point to a constructive developmental pattern of increasingly complex constructions of how one makes sense of the world, one’s identity, and one’s relationships. The following section will provide a
brief overview of selected college student development theories that are informed by a constructive-developmental approach.

**Figure 2.1: Four Phases of the Journey Toward Self-Authorship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Following Formulas</th>
<th>Crossroads</th>
<th>Becoming the Author of One’s Life</th>
<th>Internal Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epistemological dimension: how do I know?</strong></td>
<td>Believe authority’s plans; how “you” know</td>
<td>Question plans; see need for own vision</td>
<td>Choose own beliefs; how “I” know in context of external knowledge claims</td>
<td>Grounded in internal belief system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrapersonal dimension: who am I?</strong></td>
<td>Define self through external others</td>
<td>Realize dilemma of external definition; see need for internal identity</td>
<td>Choose own values; identity in context of external forces</td>
<td>Grounded in internal coherent sense of self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal dimension: what relationships do I have with others?</strong></td>
<td>Act in relationships to acquire approval</td>
<td>Realize dilemma of focusing on external approval; see need to bring self to relationship</td>
<td>Act in relationships to be true to self, mutually negotiating how needs are met</td>
<td>Grounded in mutuality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Constructive-Developmentalism and College Student Development*

College students differ in how they construct and interpret their experiences (Strange, 1994). Understanding the underlying cognitive structures, especially as they relate to students’ understanding of the world, themselves, and their relationships with others, is a central focus of college student development scholarship that operates from a constructive-developmental perspective. Furthermore, this line of inquiry integrates the Piagetian notion that cognitive dissonance, as evidenced by dissatisfaction with one’s current meaning making patterns, promotes development though prompting first consideration and then integration of more complex cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal structures (Baxter Magolda & King, 2006). Theoretical perspectives that
exemplify this approach include Perry’s (1970) scheme of intellectual and ethical development, Kohlberg’s (1969) model of moral reasoning and development, Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule’s (1986/1997) work on women’s ways of knowing, Baxter Magolda’s (1992) constructivist conceptualization of epistemological reflection, and King and Kitchener’s (1994) reflective judgment model. Strange (1994) points out that these models share the following assumptions: (1) individuals progress through as sequence of hierarchical stages or positions, (2) each stage is characterized by qualitatively different assumptions about how the world functions with respect to a particular domain, and (3) early simplistic assumptions are gradually replaced by more advanced assumptions, especially as individuals seek and construct new meanings for the events and experiences in their lives. For example, Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986/1997) explored how women view the world of truth, knowledge, and authority. The authors used Perry’s (1970) work on intellectual development (one’s beliefs about the nature of knowledge and truth) as theoretical scaffolding as they came to believe “that women’s epistemological assumptions were central to their perceptions of themselves and their worlds” (Belenky et. al, 1997, p. xviii). The model describes how women’s views of their relation to knowledge and their conceptions of themselves as knowers develop as their perceptions of authority, their own inner voice, and their efficacy in receiving and creating knowledge change over time, and in response to life events.

Likewise, King and Kitchener’s (1994) Reflective Judgment Model is characterized by seven distinct but developmentally related stages, or sets of assumptions about the process of knowing (view of knowledge) and how it is acquired (justification of
beliefs). Each successive set of epistemological assumptions is characterized by a more complex and effective form of justification. The seven developmental stages may be broadly summarized into three levels (prereflective, quasi-reflective, and reflective thinking) that correspond with movement away from the view that knowledge is gained from authority or through firsthand observation, and towards the perspective that individuals can make judgments based on varying knowledge claims, and that these judgments can be reassessed as new information becomes available (King and Kitchener, 1994, 2002).

Thus, a constructivist-developmental perspective has been widely used in numerous theoretical models to explain how college student development is linked to increasingly complex constructions of knowledge, from epistemological assumptions about the nature of knowledge (King & Kitchener, 1994; Baxter Magolda, 1992), to gendered patterns of constructing knowledge and knowing (Baxter Magolda, 1992; Belenky et. al, 1997) to moral and ethical dilemmas (Kohlberg, 1969; Gilligan, 1982). More recently, some college student development scholars have applied a constructivist-developmental perspective to describing the connection between increasingly complex patterns of knowledge construction with respect to understanding different others and intercultural development (described in detail below).

The next section provides an overview of college student development research as it relates the multifaceted nature (i.e., cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal dimensions) of intercultural development.
College Student Development and the Dimensions of Intercultural Development

Using Kegan’s (1982; 1994) holistic and multidimensional self-authorship framework as an organizational lens, I will introduce selected college student development theories that address a particular dimension of development in order to demonstrate the nature of development within each dimension during college. Specifically, I will introduce theory and research that explores the cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal dimensions of college student development, noting that, according to Kegan (1994), development in all three dimensions is required for negotiating complex life tasks. I will then offer my thoughts about how these various perspectives enhance our understanding of intercultural development as a developmental process.

A central postsecondary educational outcome is gaining general intellectual or cognitive competencies and skills such as evaluating arguments and knowledge claims critically, processing new information efficiently, reasoning objectively, communicating effectively, and making reasonable decisions when confronted with incomplete information (AAC&U, 1995b; 2002). These competences and skills are described using a variety of terms that include critical thinking, reflective judgment, and epistemological development, and they differ in conceptual definition and in the types of problems or issues they address (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). In their review of the principal cognitive development theories of college student development (i.e., Perry, 1970; Belenky et. al, 1986; Baxter Magolda, 1992; King & Kitchener, 1994; and Kegan, 1994), Love and Guthrie (1999) provided a synthesis that attempts to address the points of intersection among the varied approaches. According to the authors, each theory contains
three main categories of epistemological views that reflect increasingly complex
cognitive development:

_Unequivocal knowers_ experience the world as ultimately known (or knowable) and
knowledge and truth as universal, certain, and dispensed by authorities. _Radical subjectivists_
begin to recognize uncertainty, which causes them to leave the certainty of unequivocal knowing without having developed the full capacity
to deal effectively with this transition… In order for the powerful transition to the
next category to occur, the “great accommodation” must take place. At this point,
the knower rejects the notion that all views have equal legitimacy and develops a
way to deal with the uncertainty of knowledge. _Generative knowers_ are
individuals experiencing ongoing development in a world accepted as ambiguous,
incompletely knowable, and complex. (p. 78, emphasis added)

Thus, college students at initial levels of cognitive development view the world in “black
and white” terms and rely on authorities (e.g., parents, professors, religious and political
leaders) to know what to believe. At the next levels of cognitive development, students
begin to recognize and accommodate the uncertain nature of knowledge. Finally,
individuals at the most advanced stages of cognitive development recognize the
complexity of knowledge and employ strategies that include critical inquiry and judging
evidence in context. While individual college students are unique, there are well-
established patterns to their cognitive development. And, as Fischer (1980) has noted,
students typically operate within a developmental range where the functional level is the
norm and optimal functioning occurs under supportive conditions. That is, there are
variations in students’ everyday functioning and developmental capacities and supportive
learning environments promote optimal functioning, a student’s best performance under
ideal conditions. Multicultural education that provides a supportive environment for
students can effectively foster development along any of these dimensions by
encouraging optimal functioning (Kitchener, Lynch, Fischer, & Wood, 1993).
Numerous college student development theories have examined the intrapersonal and interpersonal dimensions of college student development. The best known and longest standing of these is Chickering’s psychosocial student development theory (1963; Chickering & Reisser, 1993). Chickering and Reisser (1993) proposed seven vectors that “describe major highways for journeying toward individuation—the discovery and refinement of one’s unique way of being—and also toward communion with other individuals and groups, including the larger national and global society” (p. 34). These vectors include: developing competence, managing emotions, moving through autonomy toward interdependence, developing mature interpersonal relationships, establishing identity, developing purpose, and developing integrity. More recently, college student development researchers have sought to represent and better understand the circumstances and developmental pathways that characterize today’s diverse college student population, whether women (Josselson, 1987), African American students (Cross, 1971, 1991; Helms, 1990), international and ethnic student groups (Phinney, 1993; Kodama, McEwen, Liang & Lee, 2001; Torres, 1999, 2003), or gay and lesbian students (Abes & Jones, 2004).

Few college student development models are holistic as described by Kegan (1994). As a result, theoretical models often focus on one aspect of development in order to examine it in more depth and detail. Numerous examples exist in the college student development literature (cf. Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Cross, 1991; Helms, 1990; Kohlberg, 1969). However, considered together, these theoretical perspectives have implications for how intercultural effectiveness develops during college. The overriding theme for all of these models is movement away from dependence on authority, to a
period of questioning and uncertainty, towards an internally defined sense of self, individually chosen relationships based on interdependence, and an integrated and individualized view of the world constructed through introspection and examination of “the facts.” College students in initial stages of development are seeking answers about who they are, what they should believe, and the types of relationships they want to engage in. This intense period of self-exploration implies a willingness to interact with diverse others, but also the desire to be affirmed by authority figures for doing so.

Intermediate levels of intercultural development, those where students are questioning themselves and others, can be a particularly vulnerable time where students either continue to explore their identity, relationships and sense of the world, or where they retreat to the more familiar territory of like others. Throughout, intercultural development appears to be related to capacities for self-awareness, flexibility, open-mindedness, and perspective taking. Furthermore, these theories suggest that intercultural development involves integration between and among the three developmental dimensions. For example, cognitive development about intercultural issues is undoubtedly enhanced by opportunities for creating meaningful relationships across difference because “learning occurs in a social context and…one’s ability to interact effectively with others requires some level of cognitive ability (and vice versa)” (Love & Guthrie, 1999, p. 54).

As a group, these student development theories share the notion of applicability and utility across a range of different content areas. This notion of applicability is salient when considering the application of cognitive development theory, for example, to the notion of intercultural development. For example, cognitively complex individuals may be more likely to take others’ perspectives and therefore may be better equipped to
communicate across difference. Alternately, individuals with a well-developed sense of self will not feel threatened by different others who may question assumptions about one’s worldview, morals, or values. Rather, a well-developed sense of self will promote authentic interactions based in mutuality and interdependence.

Models of Intercultural Development

People’s lives are complex and difficult to capture in their entirety, and as noted above, few college student development theories are holistic in nature. However, just as Weber (1998) points out that the cultural, social, political, religious, and economic systems of everyday life are intertwined and mutually dependent, so too are the facets of college students’ development. A multidimensional conception of development, drawn from the preceding theoretical models of college student development, is one way of better understanding college students’ intercultural development.

Two groups of college student development scholars have examined intercultural development from this multi-dimensional perspective. These include the theoretically derived intercultural maturity model of King and Baxter Magolda (2005), and the “practice-to-theory/theory-to-practice” individual diversity development model of Chávez, Guido-DiBrito, & Mallory (2003). Additionally, intercultural communication scholar and practitioner Milton Bennett (1993) proposed a model to describe the development of intercultural sensitivity. These holistic intercultural development models are described in detail below.

King and Baxter Magolda’s Model of Intercultural Maturity

Drawing upon constructive-developmental perspectives and Kegan’s (1994) notion of self-authorship, King and Baxter Magolda (2005) proposed a holistic
developmental framework that describes how college students at varying levels of cognitive, interpersonal, and intrapersonal development may approach meaning making with respect to intercultural topics. The authors use the term *intercultural maturity* to describe the developmental trajectory of college students’ intercultural development. They argue that colleges and universities are well suited to foster this development, and introduce the concept of intercultural maturity as both an intended collegiate outcome and a means of describing the characteristics, components, and limits of a developmental progression that describes college students’ assumptions about intercultural knowledge, skills, and awareness.

King and Baxter Magolda (2005) argue that college students’ interpretations of their interactions with diverse others are developmentally grounded in their capacity for reflection and meaning making. Possessing less complex cognitive, intrapersonal, or interpersonal skills (i.e., less sophisticated levels of self-authorship) may interfere with college students’ capacity for developing intercultural maturity. Thus, the authors hypothesize that the developmental ability that is foundational to viewing individuals from other racial, ethnic, and cultural groups positively is grounded in the same ability that undergirds one’s ability to regard interpersonal differences favorably:

The developmental complexity that allows a learner to understand and accept the general idea of difference from self without feeling threat to self enables a person to offer positive regard to others across many types of difference, such as race, ethnicity, social class, gender, sexual orientation, and religion. (p. 572)

College students develop their meaning making abilities over time. In the case of diversity experiences, King and Baxter Magolda argue that “seemingly separate strands of development (cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal) are interrelated as students develop intercultural maturity” (p. 586). Further, intercultural maturity is achieved
through attention to all three dimensions of development. For example, simply teaching students facts about different others (i.e., culture, history, language) is not sufficient for promoting intercultural development; neither is simply teaching desirable behaviors or skills. Rather, encouraging students to reflect upon their own experiences with different others and how they have made sense of those experiences and interactions may be a more effective approach. Reflection is the necessary precursor to meaning making, especially if it prompts students to think about themselves (Who am I as an American in my relationship with my Chinese roommate?), others (What is the nature of my relationship with him/her?), and what they know (What could explain why I find interacting with him/her to be challenging, exciting, uncomfortable, or unique?).

King and Baxter Magolda (2005) presented a three-by-three matrix that is their framework for describing the development of intercultural maturity. Drawn from existing theory and research on student development and intercultural competence, the framework (see Table 2.1) lists developmental dimensions (i.e., cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal) vertically and developmental level (i.e., initial, intermediate, and mature) horizontally. Increasingly complex meaning making is reflected by progression through the initial to intermediate and then mature levels of development in each of the three domains. The authors generated each of the three levels of intercultural development by mapping these onto existing theory about college student development in each domain. For example, many students enter college initially believing that their instructors are repositories for “the truth” and it is their job to glean the facts from them; authority is “right” and alternative perspectives are “wrong.” This approach is characteristic of initial cognitive development (discussed above). King and Baxter Magolda (2005) used this
understanding of cognitive development to propose that college students who regard knowledge in black-and-white terms are also likely to see diversity issues in similar terms, who might say the following: “My culture is right and other cultures are wrong, and my cultural practices and values are superior to others.”

Drawn from the cognitive development theories of Perry (1970), Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule (1986), Baxter Magolda (1992), King & Kitchener (1994), M. Bennett (1993), and Fischer (1980), King and Baxter Magolda (2005) hypothesize that initial development in the cognitive domain is characterized by resistance, naiveté, and a tendency to see knowledge claims and differing cultural perspectives in dualistic terms (i.e., as patently right or wrong). Intermediate development is characterized by increased awareness of other cultural perspectives and more reliance on one’s own efficacy in thinking about different others. Finally, mature development in the cognitive domain is characterized by the ability to consciously shift perspectives by taking into account multiple worldviews.

In the intrapersonal domain, King and Baxter Magolda (2005) draw upon the identity and racial/ethnic identity development work of Chickering and Reisser (1993), Josselson (1987), Cross (1991), Phinney (1990), and others, to hypothesize that initial intercultural development is characterized by a lack of awareness of both one’s own multidimensional social identity and that of others. Individuals at this level of development are unaware of and/or lack understanding about the multiple dimensions of difference such as gender, race, socioeconomic status, cultural background, sexual orientation, and disability. They rely on external others for choosing what to believe about difference and tend to feel threatened by different others. Intermediate level
intrapersonal development is characterized by self-exploration and an evolving sense of one’s own social identity. Individuals at this level of development begin to recognize other cultures and social identities as legitimate, but remain immersed in the safety of their dominant cultural milieu. Finally, mature intercultural development in the intrapersonal domain is characterized by the creation of an internal self-definition. Individuals at this level are comfortable and open to expressing internally-defined and integrated views and beliefs about social identity.

Drawn from an array of theoretical perspectives that focus on the development of interpersonal relationships in college and beyond (cf. Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Kohlberg, 1984; Gilligan, 1982; M. Bennett, 1993), King and Baxter Magolda (2005) proposed a continuum of interpersonal development as it relates to intercultural development. This dimension is concerned with how individuals develop the capacity “to construct and engage in relationships with others in ways that show respect for and understanding of the other’s perspectives and experiences, but are also true to one’s own beliefs and values” (p. 579). Development in this dimension is characterized by movement from a self-centered and individualistic perspective about one’s needs and role in relationships to an interdependent view of relationships as shaped by sociocultural influences. Initial development in the interpersonal domain is characterized by the need for social affirmation and dependent relationships with similar others. Individuals in this level of development may disregard the perspectives of different others in favor of the views of similar others. Intermediate intercultural development in the interpersonal domain is characterized by an increased willingness to interact with others who do not share the same social identity, and by a less judgmental attitude. Nonetheless, individuals
at this level remain dependent on significant others’ approval so may be less likely to pursue these interactions if not encouraged and supported in doing so. Finally, mature development in the interpersonal domain is characterized by the cultivation of interdependent relationships with different others. These relationships function through mutual appreciation for one’s own and others’ social, cultural, and ethnic differences. Consistent with theories of moral development (cf. Kohlberg, 1984), mature development is associated with action on behalf of, and in conjunction with, different others.

King and Baxter Magolda’s (2005) developmental model of intercultural maturity is compelling because of its rigorous grounding in existing theoretical models of college student development, and because of its attention to elucidating the multifaceted dimensions of intercultural development. It presumes a complex interplay between how individuals construct difference in the world, how they function in intercultural situations, and whether they make sense of themselves as cultural human beings. As such, this model is neither solely cognitive, intrapersonal, nor interpersonal, but rather, it is a holistic combination of all three dimensions. As noted above, individual college student development theories and research typically focus on one dimension at a time in order to facilitate examination in more depth and detail. Assessment measures, too, tend to target a dimension of choice. King and Baxter Magolda’s (2005) developmental model of intercultural maturity is relatively new and has not yet been empirically tested with college students. Effective assessment of intercultural development according to this model could prove to be problematic because intercultural maturity as defined here is likely predicated on whether students have had the opportunity for meaningful interaction across difference, their willingness and ability to disclose concomitant meaning making
patterns, and the practical challenges associated with adequately assessing multiple developmental dimensions.

Table 2.1: A Three-Dimensional Developmental Trajectory of Intercultural Maturity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain of Development and Related Theories</th>
<th>Initial Level of Development</th>
<th>Intermediate Level of Development</th>
<th>Mature Level of Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive</strong></td>
<td>Assumes knowledge is certain and categorizes knowledge claims as right and wrong; is naive about different cultural practices and values; resists challenges to one’s own beliefs and views differing cultural perspectives as wrong</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>Ability to consciously shift perspectives and behaviors into an alternative cultural worldview and to use multiple cultural frames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrapersonal</strong></td>
<td>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 identity yields externally defined beliefs that regulate interpretation of experiences and guide choices; difference is viewed as a threat to identity</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal</strong></td>
<td>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</td>
<td>Willingness to interact with diverse others and refrain from judgment; relies on independent relations in which multiple perspectives exist (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</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chávez, Guido-DiBrito, and Mallory’s Framework of Individual Diversity Development

Drawing from both lifespan development theory and personal experiences with multicultural education and training, Chávez, Guido-DiBrito, and Mallory (2003) proposed a framework to describe individual diversity development. The authors define individual diversity development as “cognitive, affective, and behavioral growth processes toward consciously valuing complex and integrated differences in others and ourselves” (p. 453). The framework is characterized as a constructivist approach to valuing difference that acknowledges that diversity development is a complex and often uncomfortable experience that can follow a variety of trajectories and developmental pathways. The authors generated the framework via a “practice-to-theory/theory-to-practice” methodology grounded in the notion that “practice is guided by theory, that theory can be created directly from practice, and that findings from practice can create theory” (p. 454). Further, they argue that institutions of higher education must learn to appreciate and value the varied backgrounds of all members. Therefore, they conceptualized the framework as one that addresses the development of not just college students, but also that of university faculty and staff.

The individual diversity development framework is informed by five theoretical perspectives. First, the authors draw upon Kegan’s (1994) notion of growth as the development of successively more complex organizing principles that are linked to an individual’s cognitive, affective, and behavioral “frameworks of development” and how they evolve into more complex notions of difference in oneself and others. Second, the authors reference the work of Kohlberg (1976), who emphasizes principled moral thinking and the development of successively more complex organizing principles, and
Gilligan (1977), and Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986), whose work on women’s ways of knowing explicated the relational nature of decision-making. Chávez et. al (2003) integrate these three perspectives into their framework by noting the importance of individual reflection and supportive relationships in exploring the world of diverse others:

Students, faculty, and staff in a higher education community value both connection and autonomy and seek growth when encouraged independently and collectively to reflect on their thinking, feeling, and behavior towards those they think of as other. (p. 456)

The framework is also informed by identity formation models and the notion that members of a multicultural society must first learn to recognize minority-dominant group dynamics, begin the process of questioning the values of groups with which one identifies, and, finally, begin to enact equitable societal norms and behaviors (D’Augelli, 1994). The framework further draws upon the work of Devine (1989), who explored the relationship between learned stereotypes and prejudiced response, and found that individuals have the ability to interrupt affect in order to consciously choose not to respond to different others with prejudicial behavior. Finally, the authors note the relevance of Maslow’s (1970) Hierarchy of Needs, which posits that internal and external influences, along with individual needs, affect diversity development. As needs change, so, too, do motivation and response patterns.

Chávez, DiBrito, and Mallory’s (2003) individual diversity development framework is based on the premise that, while the process of learning to value and choosing to validate different others is idiosyncratic to the individual, there are five common dimensions that vary on a continuum from unawareness, dual awareness, questioning and self-exploration, to risk-taking or other exploration, and finally
The authors note that these dimensions are “experienced at various ages, simultaneously, repeatedly, or not at all [and] within each dimension, individuals experience interactive cognitive, affective, and behavioral dynamics” (p. 458). An individual’s diversity development “portrait” is conceptualized as a pie chart with wedge-shaped pieces (See Figure 2.2). Each wedge represents one social identity status (e.g., gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, SES, religious affiliation). Within each wedge, individuals are located within a dimension of the diversity development continuum, reflecting the authors’ view of the multidimensional nature of development.

The first dimension in the individual diversity development framework, “Unawareness/Lack of Exposure to the Other,” is characterized by a lack of significant conscious contact or personal knowledge of otherness. Often, individuals in this dimension have not had any significant contact with or personal knowledge of different others. Individuals at this stage are either unaware that certain types of difference exist, or have not personally experienced difference. For this reason, individuals at this stage may lack feeling toward difference or may not consciously recognize or react to difference, even when experiencing it.

The second dimension, “Dualistic Awareness,” is characterized by a dualistic and egocentric framing of difference. Chávez et. al (2003) note that individuals in this dimension “perceive differences in a dualistic, unreflective way, automatically interpreting behaviors, values, priorities, and other characteristics as good or natural if they are similar to their own and bad or unnatural if they are different” (p. 460). Thus, individuals at this stage of development characterize differences in black and white terms traits that are dissimilar are viewed as bad, unnatural and wrong. Some consequences of
this polarized view may be an unexamined sense of superiority, avoidance of in-depth contact with different others, attempts to correct “wrong” behavior, or even the removal different others from one’s environment. In “Questioning/Self-Exploration,” the third dimension, individuals begin to move away from the dualistic perspective of the second dimension. Reflection about one’s own thoughts, feelings, and behaviors, especially as where traits that are similar to one’s own are viewed as good, natural, and right, while of they relate to different others, leads to the relativistic view that there is more than one definition of “right and wrong.” By-products of this period of self-exploration may be feelings of fear, imbalance or anger, alternating with feelings of excitement and hope. Yet, according to the authors, “like a ball poised on a hill that begins rolling, once individuals accept the possibility of relativism, it is difficult—if not impossible—to retreat to dualism” (p. 461).

The final two dimensions of Chávez et. al’s (2003) individual diversity development framework are “Risk Taking/Exploration of Otherness” (the fourth dimension) and “Integration” (the fifth dimension). The fourth dimension is characterized by proactive exploration of one’s own and others’ worldviews, self-reflection, risk-taking, and experimentation with aspects of other cultures. By its very nature, this dimension involves vulnerability and fear of rejection by those with whom one is closest and/or by different others one is trying to understand. “Integration,” the final dimension, is characterized by a nuanced view of one’s own and others’ identities as complex, multidimensional, and evolving. In this way, concepts of self and other are intertwined and “individuals are able to make choices [about] whether or not they can, with integrity, validate various types of otherness” (p. 463). The choice to validate the differences of
others is a consciously reflected one based on one’s sense of integrity and congruence with one’s sense of a diverse society. The authors note that the deeper an individual moves into integration, the more difficult it is to see different others in generalized terms. Chávez et. al’s (2003) individual diversity development framework was not empirically validated, per se. Rather, the authors illustrated how the framework is operationalized by providing a single "developmental snapshot" of one woman's diversity development. To do so, they interviewed a Mexican American student affairs staff member at a Research I institution several times during a six-month period and asked her to chart her own diversity development using their framework:

During the interviews [and charting process], it emerged that, of the identities she chose to reflect on, Ana [a pseudonym] was in a Risk Taking/Exploration of Otherness dimension in relation to some identities (extravertedness, femaleness, and gayness); was questioning and purposefully reflecting on her feelings, thoughts and behaviors toward persons with certain cultural/ethnic/national identities outside her own (e.g., African Americans, Asian Americans, and Mexican nationals); had a dualistic awareness of Catholics and emotionally expressive individuals (though she herself is emotionally expressive); and lacked awareness and experience with persons having disabilities and persons who are Jewish. (p. 464)

This finding demonstrates the multidimensional nature of diversity development: a given individual has reflected all five dimensions. So, while Chávez, Guido-Dibrito, and Mallory’s (2003) framework is primarily theoretical and offers an example from only one person’s life of how the framework could be operationalized, it demonstrates that constructions of difference are related to one’s experiences in a particular domain as well as opportunities for self-reflection. In this way, the framework is constructive-developmental and provides another perspective from which to understand intercultural development.
**Figure 2.2: A Framework of Individual Diversity Development**

**Integration/Validation**
- Making complex choices about validating others
  - **cognitive**: commitment/interest in self and other
  - **affective**: increased self-confidence
  - **behavioral**: develop culture of integrity.

**Risk Taking/Exploration of Otherness**
- Confront own perceptions about the other
  - **cognitive**: self-reflection paramount
  - **affective**: finds courage to take risk and change behavior toward the others
  - **behavioral**: confrontation manifests itself in ways external to the other

**Questioning/Self-Exploration**
- Questions perceptions of self and other
  - **cognitive**: moves from dualism to relativism
  - **affective**: experiences feelings that make one question own experience
  - **behavioral**: some conflict or meaningful encounter with the other

**Unawareness/Lack of Exposure To the Other**
- Lack of awareness of the other
  - **cognitive**: unaware that the other exists
  - **affective**: no feelings for the other
  - **behavioral**: does not recognize the other

**Dualistic Awareness**
- Awareness of the other
  - **cognitive**: dualism between good and bad, I am good; the other is bad/wrong/unnatural
  - **affective**: is egocentric and/or feels superior to the other, sees self as individual; not connected to anything
  - **behavioral**: aware that the other exists but does not validate, affirm, or become involved with

---


**Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity**

Intercultural communication is the study of face-to-face interaction between people whose cultures (e.g., learned and shared values, beliefs, and behaviors) are significantly different from one another (J. Bennett, 2006). It is a field of study devoted to understanding and addressing the practical problems encountered by individuals who live, work, and study with others from different cultural, ethnic, and religious
backgrounds. Also concerned with the challenges of the cross-cultural adaptation process, intercultural communication specialists were initially driven by the desire to rigorously study and understand adaptation “failures” and to contribute to psychological approaches that sought to predict cross-cultural success (M. Bennett, 1998). Intercultural communication researchers are concerned with understanding and improving effective communication through increased knowledge of cultural hallmarks (e.g., language, values, behavioral norms, etc.) and the assumption that attitudes towards members of a foreign culture play a critical role in influencing impressions and mutual understanding (Wiseman, Hammer, & Nishida, 1989). Because of its emphasis on improving the multicultural experience through coping with practical problems, fostering effective communication, and promoting cultural knowledge, perspectives from intercultural communication inform this study.

A number of communications scholars have examined intercultural development as a function of an individual’s _intercultural effectiveness_ (cf., Hammer, Gudykunst, & Wiseman, 1978). Such research suggests that intercultural effectiveness encompasses the _cultural perspective and knowledge_ an individual uses in interpreting and evaluating intercultural encounters. Thus, intercultural communication researchers use the term cross-cultural adaptation “in a broad and all-inclusive sense to refer to the complex process through which an individual acquires an increasing level of ‘fitness’ or ‘compatibility’ in the new cultural environment” (Kim & Gudykunst, 1987, p. 9). Therefore, the larger goal of intercultural communication is to understand the influence of culture on attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors in order to reduce misunderstandings that result from cultural differences (Liu, 2001).
A constructivist-developmental model of intercultural development was proposed by intercultural communication theorist Milton Bennett (1986, 1993). He proposed and uses the term *intercultural sensitivity* to describe the way people construe and make meaning of cultural difference and the varying kinds of experience that accompany these different constructions. His Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) is a stage-based model designed to organize and explain the development of increasing sophistication in individuals’ experience, comprehension, and navigation of cultural differences (J. Bennett, 1993; M. Bennett, 1986; 1993; J. Bennett and M. Bennett, 2004). According to M. Bennett (1993), the DMIS is:

phenomenological in the sense that it takes as paramount the meaning which is attached by people to phenomena…experience, in this view, is a function of the relationship a person forms with a phenomena—a relationship which is the product (or manifestation) of the attribution of meaning (p. 4).

The model describes how individuals accommodate cultural differences using increasingly complex constructions of reality and involves movement through cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions. It comprises six stages of development of which half are considered a part of the *ethnocentric* category, in which one’s own culture is experienced as central to reality, and half the *ethnorelative* category, in which one’s own culture is viewed in the context of other cultures (See Figure 2.3). While the model is linear in that there are initial, intermediate, and advanced stages, progression through the stages is not assumed to be one-way or permanent (M. Bennett, 1993).

The three stages within ethnocentrism are denial, defense, and minimization. In denial, one’s own culture is viewed as paramount. Therefore, consideration of other cultures is generally avoided through physical, social, and/or psychological barriers. As described by M. Bennett (2004), individuals in denial either neglect to notice cultural
differences, or think in terms of simplistic cultural categories. They are likely to be unconcerned with the impact of cultural difference in their lives. For those who are beginning to explore cultural differences, they may be unaware that they have a culture. Individuals in the denial stage may make statements like, “As long as we all speak the same language, there’s no problem,” or “diversity will never happen here.” Denial can be described in terms of isolation, where physical circumstances foster individuals’ denial of the existence of difference, or separation, where intentionally erected physical or social barriers are used to maintain a state of denial. While cases of complete isolation from cultural difference are rare in an increasingly global and interconnected world, examples of separation can be found in racially segregated education and housing patterns and in groups where economic, social, religious, political, and other types of barriers are enforced (M. Bennett, 1993).

The defense stage coincides with a growing awareness of cultural differences and is characterized by a defensive posture and a sense of feeling threatened by these differences. The defense stage can also be described in terms of denigration, in which the threat of difference is countered by being evaluated negatively, or superiority, in which one emphasizes the positive characteristics of one’s own cultural group. Thus, an individual’s worldview during defense is dualistic and characterized by us/Them distinctions. Individuals residing at this stage of the DMIS may say, “Traveling to other countries makes you appreciate how much better the U.S. is,” and “we could teach those people a lot of stuff.” An interesting variation of the defense stage is “reversal,” a phenomenon frequently encountered by long-term international sojourners. In reversal,
individuals may criticize their own culture at the same time they are celebrating another culture’s practices.

The final ethnocentric stage, minimization, reflects a tendency to view one’s own culture as universal or absolute. An individual in minimization views the world in normalized terms: all cultures as essentially similar to one’s own (e.g., “It’s a small world, after all!”). This stage is thus characterized by the assumption that we are similar in some universal context, whether physical or philosophical. Bennett (2004) notes that individuals in minimization tend to believe they are interculturally sensitive because they have moved beyond a sense of cultural bias. However, this perspective is actually a complex form of avoidance: if individuals believe that deep down everyone is alike, they preclude themselves from the challenging task of analyzing one’s own cultural patterns, understanding different others, and accommodating the discontinuities when necessary. Thus, while minimization may appear benign, it actually stems from a foreclosed worldview where avoiding or over-simplifying cultural difference is preferred to complex understanding of one’s own and other cultural norms, patterns, and behaviors.

The ethnorelative stages of the DMIS are acceptance (e.g., the recognition of cultural difference as inevitable and enjoyable), adaptation (e.g., the acquisition of intercultural communication skills to accommodate cultural difference), and integration (e.g., the creation of a coherent intercultural identity). These stages are characterized by the view that other cultures are equally complex relative to one another and that behaviors can be best understood within a cultural context (M. Bennett, 1993). In developmental terms, ethnoretivism represents a significant change in an individual’s meaning making about cultural difference:
In the ethnocentric states, difference is experienced as threatening, either explicitly (as in the stages of denial and defense) or implicitly (as in minimization), and actions taken from these stages are meant to counter the threat in various ways. The ethnorelative experience of difference is nonthreatening, since attempts are made to elaborate new categories rather than simply preserve existing ones. (p. 27)

Thus, rather than experiencing cultural difference as threatening (as is characteristic of ethnocentrism), those in the ethnorelative stages of the DMIS have constructed new cognitive categories that can be synthesized into a more holistic and integrated intercultural identity.

In Acceptance, the fourth stage, cultural difference is acknowledged, accepted, and respected; it is viewed as a necessary and favorable human condition (M. Bennett, 1993). Here, individuals are able to incorporate different cultural perspectives into their worldviews, which may result in intentional shifts in behaviors or attitudes that accommodate cultural differences. Two forms of development are common within acceptance, respect for cultural differences in behavior and respect for cultural differences in values. Respect for behavioral difference during the acceptance stage involves a deeper and more nuanced understanding regarding the ways in which verbal and nonverbal behaviors vary across cultures. Rather than naively believing that foreign languages are “simply different codes with which to communicate similar ideas,” for example, an individual in acceptance recognizes that languages shape reality and that nonverbal behaviors are culturally relative. Respect for value difference is characterized by cultural self-awareness and the perspective that one’s own worldview is a relative construct. According to M. Bennett (1993):

Intrinsic to this stage of development is a sense of process. Values and assumptions are not seen as things so much as they are perceived as manifestations of human creativity [therefore] valuing remains a process which
can be pursued in various ways. Other cultures’ different valuing is worthy of understanding and respect, but not necessarily agreement. (p. 30)

Thus, an important component of acceptance is the ability to respectfully judge cultural differences without feeling threatened by them.

Adaptation is characterized by an expanded and inclusive worldview such that individuals in this stage have achieved the skills that are appropriate for relating and communicating with people from other cultural groups. Unlike in ethnocentrism where adopting culturally relevant behaviors and skills is viewed as threatening, in adaptation, temporarily behaving in a way appropriate to a different culture is viewed positively as part of a “repertoire of cultural alternatives” (p. 32). Two phases, empathy (e.g., temporary cultural frame shifting for the purpose of communication) and pluralism (e.g., unintentional and/or permanent cultural frame shifting), are characteristic of the adaptation stage. According to M. Bennett (1993), while the state of adaptation is generally “good enough” for being effective in intercultural situations, the final stage of the DMIS is more characteristic of a “holistic, coherent sense of self that integrates multiple frames of reference” (p. 39).

The final stage of the DMIS is integration, the state in which one’s experience of self is expanded to include the movement in and out of different cultural worldviews (M. Bennett, 2004). These multiple internalized frames of reference can come in conflict and create a state of internal culture shock or a sense of cultural marginality (e.g., existence on the periphery of one or more cultures). Thus, integration is characterized by a dynamic and self-reflective process of constructing one’s intercultural identity.

In summary, the DMIS is a constructive-developmental model that is multidimensional because it describes the relationship between increasingly complex
cognitive, affective, and behavioral constructions and increased intercultural sensitivity.

Furthermore,

The DMIS is based on the assumption that as an individual’s experience of cultural difference becomes more complex and sophisticated, one’s competence in intercultural relations increases. Each stage indicates a particular cognitive structure that is expressed in certain kinds of attitudes and behavior related to cultural difference. By recognizing the underlying cognitive orientation toward cultural difference, predictions about behavior and attitudes can be made and education can be tailored to facilitate development into the next stage. (Hammer & M. Bennett, 1998, IDI Qualifying Seminar Training Manual).

Thus, the DMIS describes the developmental shifts associated with more complex cultural worldviews and has the potential to describe the kind of intercultural development that is the focus of this study. Further, the underlying theoretical structure of the model is supported with valid and reliable psychometric qualities (see Chapter Three, *The Intercultural Development Inventory* for further details).

**Figure 2.3: Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity**

Synthesis of Intercultural Models

In the previous sections, I have presented and described three models of intercultural development, the intercultural maturity model (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005), the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (M. Bennett, 1986, 1993), and the individual diversity development model (Chávez, Guido-DiBrito, & Mallory, 2003). These models are grounded in theory, practice, and a combination of both, respectively. As such, the authors present three alternative, but not entirely dissimilar, conceptions of the process of intercultural development. For example, all three models allude to a developmental continuum in which development is characterized first by a lack of awareness of and/or exposure to cultural difference, then dualistic awareness, a period of questioning and self-exploration leading to experimentation/exploration, then acceptance and adaptation, and finally, an integrated intercultural identity. Considered together, the three models describe an intercultural developmental pathway that is characterized by increasingly complex constructions of difference, but use different theoretical, disciplinary, and developmental approaches to do so. King and Baxter Magolda’s (2005) model of intercultural maturity development is holistic in that it is concerned with the integration of three domains of college students’ development that have traditionally been separated (cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal). This developmental approach based on the lifespan development model of Kegan (1994) and self-authorship scholarship of Baxter Magolda (1999; 2001) has the potential for great applicability across a range of developmental contexts. Given its focus on the underlying cognitive structures that characterize human development, the model of intercultural maturity development is a specific application of constructive developmental theory to
the domain of intercultural development. By contrast, Bennett’s (1986; 1993)
Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity is more explicitly bound to a particular
disciplinary perspective, intercultural communication. Whereas the model of intercultural
maturity is concerned with a triad of developmental domains, the DMIS explicitly
concerns itself with individuals’ primary orientations towards cultural differences. Thus,
one model begins with a multidimensional perspective of development and the other
begins with a contextualized developmental perspective. Chávez et. al’s (2003) individual
diversity development model is the most eclectic developmental model of the three. Less
tied to a particular disciplinary or theoretical perspective, the model operates from the
assumption that an individual’s understanding of his or her multiple social identities (e.g.,
gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation) has direct implications for the ways in which
he or she interacts with diverse others. In this way, the individual diversity model is most
directly tied to identity development and the term “holistic” is applied in the sense of
integrating one’s multiple social identities to act in interculturally appropriate ways by
becoming increasingly aware of the multifaceted identity construction of diverse others.
In the next section, I turn to a discussion of the role of institutional structural diversity
and specific collegiate diversity experiences purported to foster intercultural
development.

Structural Diversity and Collegiate Experiences Designed to Promote Intercultural
Development

This section presents an overview of college impact research and empirical
studies concerned with those collegiate diversity experiences that are associated with
promoting intercultural development. This discussion builds upon the previous sections
which argued that intercultural development is mediated by increasingly complex constructions of self, one’s relationships with different others, and one’s view of the world and how knowledge is constructed—all associated with the process of meaning making about one’s life experiences. Specifically, this section introduces the notion of the role of structural diversity in promoting intercultural development, and empirical findings from research on the following collegiate diversity experiences: diversity courses (Astin, 1993; Gurin et. al, 1999; Sax & Astin, 1998); racial/ethnic or cultural awareness workshops (Antonio, 1998, 2000; Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn, & Terenzini, 1996; Nelson Laird); service learning (Gray et. al, 2000; 1999); education abroad (Bates, 1997; Laubscher, 1994; Drew, Meyer, & Peregrine, 1996), and intergroup dialogues (Hurtado, 2001; Schoem & Hurtado, 2001; Zuniga, 2003).

**Structural Diversity**

An institution’s structural diversity is an important factor and condition for promoting college students’ intercultural development (Gurin, Hurtado, Dey, and Gurin, 2002). Structural diversity refers to the numerical representation of students and faculty of color on a particular campus (Hurtado et. al, 1999). A number of higher education researchers have argued that a diverse faculty, coupled with a diverse student body, can promote educational benefits such as enhanced critical thinking and problem solving skills, valuing of diverse perspectives, fostering civic engagement, and preparation for future jobs and careers (cf. Gurin, 1999; Gurin, Hurtado, Dey, & Gurin, 2002; Whitt, Chang, & Hakula, 2004). Consistent with Erikson’s (1946, 1956) conceptualization of a psychosocial moratorium during which young adults are free to experiment with different social roles before making permanent lifestyle commitments, Gurin et al. (2001) argue
that such a moratorium should involve confrontation with diversity and complexity and that structural diversity promotes such experimentation. A number of studies support this claim, for example, Chang (1996) found that as the structural diversity on a campus increased, White students were more likely to interact with other racial groups and discuss racial and ethnic issues. Antonio (1998, 2001) demonstrated that attending a multicultural campus resulted in more diverse friendship groups, which in turn influenced the frequency with which students interacted with diverse peers outside of their friendship group. A lack of structural diversity, on the other hand, was found to foster the exaggeration of differences among groups and increase group stereotyping (Kanter, 1977 as cited in Hurtado et. al, 1999).

Another line of inquiry that is related to structural diversity is research related to the benefits of interactions across race. This body of research originally investigated Allport’s (1954) “contact hypothesis,” the notion that prejudice is conditioned by the nature of the contact among individuals of different racial-ethnic groups and thus contact alone is not necessarily enough to bring about attitudinal change. According to Allport, the positive effects of intergroup contact occur only in situations marked by four specific conditions: equal group status within the situation, common goals, intergroup cooperation, and the support of authorities, law, or custom. Subsequent research has sought to both broaden and refine the application of the hypothesis and most studies report positive contact effects, even in situations lacking the key conditions (Pettigrew, 1998). Accordingly, most higher education studies have found a small but statistically significant direct relation between structural diversity and the benefits of interaction across race, even when controlling for student and institutional characteristics and other
college experiences (Chang, 2001; Gurin, 1999; Springer, 1996). Based on the above findings, this study will seek to further examine the connection between structural diversity and intercultural development.

*Collegiate Experiences Designed to Promote Intercultural Development*

While structural diversity is a necessary condition for promoting certain learning outcomes, optimal learning occurs when colleges and universities intentionally create diverse learning environments—contexts in which students are provided opportunities and experiences that engage students to interact across difference (Chang, 1996; Gurin et al., 2002). These campus facilitated diversity experiences represent students’ participation in curricular offerings that emphasize learning about diverse groups as well as their participation in co-curricular activities that provide structured opportunities for intergroup learning (Engberg, 2004). A number of studies have documented positive attitudinal changes towards diverse others in students who have participated in these kinds of collegiate experiences. Much of this research focuses on pre- and post-test measures of attitudinal change related to the importance of promoting racial understanding and openness to diversity (Antonio, 2000), more inclusive racial-ethnic attitudes (Astin, 1993; Astin & Antonio, 1999, 2000), understanding people from backgrounds different than one’s own (Gray et. al, 2000; 1999), and an increased likelihood of seeing the world from another’s perspective (Bringle and Kremer, 1993; Green & Diehn, 1995). The following sections will describe a number of these experiences and introduce research related to the role of these experiences in promoting intercultural development.
Diversity Courses. The term “diversity course” is used to describe courses that examine diversity in the content of the curriculum. Diversity courses may also include diversity in the method of instruction used, as well as in other aspects of the course (Nelson Laird, 2003). The term has also been used to include courses from areas such as multicultural education and women’s and ethnic studies, as well as to give a label to courses that meet an institution’s diversity requirements. Higher education institutions have increasingly adopted such diversity requirements; according to one national survey, approximately 62% of colleges and universities have or were in the process of developing a diversity requirement for their undergraduate students (Humphreys, 2000).

Corresponding with this increase in diversity courses, a number of studies have explored the impact of these classes. Chang (2002) examined the impact of a diversity course requirement on students’ prejudicial attitudes. Utilizing a cross-sectional design, fifteen courses that met the university diversity requirement criteria were selected and randomly assigned as either pretest only or posttest only. Students in the pretest group reported significantly higher levels of prejudice toward African Americans than did those in the posttest group.

Nelson Laird (2003) found that diversity course enrollment (compared to students who enrolled in a management course) positively predicted the quality of students’ interactions with their diverse peers and positively influenced commitment to social action engagement. Other research has found that the number of diversity courses taken is associated with increased tolerance and with more inclusive racial-ethnic attitudes over fours years of college (Astin & Antonio, 1999, 2000; Gurin, 1999; Hurtado, 2001; Sax &
Astin, 1998), and that the more diversity courses that are taken, the greater students’ attitudes shift (Chang, 1999b, 2000b; Palmer, 1999).

**Racial/Ethnic or Cultural Awareness Workshops.** Another type of collegiate diversity experience that is associated with promoting intercultural development is participation in racial/ethnic or cultural awareness workshops. According to Pascarella and Terenzini (2005), participants in racial-ethnic or cultural awareness workshops (compared with students who are not so enrolled) show heightened cultural awareness, increased tolerance for differences, acceptance of others from racial-ethnic backgrounds different from one’s own, increased commitment to promoting racial understanding, and openness to diversity broadly. In a multi-institution quasi-experimental, three-wave panel designed to assess attitudinal change over a three-year period, Springer, Palmer, Terenzini, Pascarella, and Nora (1996) assessed the effects of awareness programs on the attitudes of White students toward diversity on campus. The authors found that net of pre-college attitude and other covariates, participation in a racial or cultural awareness workshop had significant effects on students’ attitudes toward diversity on campus at the end of their second year of college. More importantly, no interaction effects were found, indicating that the effect of participation was general, leading to more favorable attitudes for men and women and for students in liberal and conservative majors.

**Service Learning.** Service learning is an educational philosophy and method of teaching, learning and reflecting based on the combination of academic coursework and community service (Kendall and Associates, 1990). Advocates of service learning believe that, when performed in a cross-cultural setting, this pedagogy encourages participants to have a greater appreciation of different cultural traditions and international understanding.
(Myers-Lipton, 1996). Using the pre- and post-test scores for three groups (a service learning group, a volunteer group, and a no service group), Myers-Lipton (1996) found that over two years, the service learning group showed larger increases in global concern than the two control groups. Furthermore, the changes between the experimental and control groups were moderate to strong for global concern and cultural respect.

Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, and Lee (2000) conducted a quantitative longitudinal study of a national sample of students at diverse colleges and universities and a qualitative study of students and faculty who participated in service learning with the goal of understanding more fully how service learning affects learning. The authors found that participation in service learning had significant positive effects on a variety of quantitative outcome measures, especially values, defined as commitment to promoting racial understanding and commitment to activism. According to the authors, “the positive effects of service can be explained in part by the fact that participation in service increases the likelihood that students will discuss their experiences with each other and that students receive emotional support from faculty” (p. iii).

In terms of qualitative findings, Astin et. al (2000) found that service learning facilitates an increased sense of personal efficacy, an increased awareness of the world and one’s personal values, increased engagement in the classroom experience, and a heightened sense of civic responsibility and personal effectiveness. The authors hypothesized that service learning experiences enhance student development because of its focus on reflection (such as that which occurs during discussions with peers and faculty, and written reflection in the form of journals and papers) as a means of connecting the service experience to the academic course material. Jones and Hill (2001)
used naturalistic inquiry to investigate how students come to understand diversity in the context of service learning. The authors found that the six service learning participants in their study came to a more complex understanding of diversity, had a greater awareness of stereotypes and assumptions, and a greater appreciation of diversity and multiple perspectives.

*Education Abroad.* Education abroad programs foster college students’ intercultural development by challenging them with alternative perspectives (Cornwell & Stoddard, 1999; Johnston & Edelstein, 1993; and Whortman, 2002). Despite wide variation in the kind, duration, location, objectives, substantive foci, and pedagogies of education abroad programs, a body of emerging research has sought to document a wide range of outcomes associated with participation. These include attitudinal outcomes such as greater empathy for others (Ryan & Twibell, 2000) and shifts in personal identity (Ortiz & Moore, 2001); increased appreciation of what it means to be different or a minority (Labuscher, 1994); increased likelihood of perceiving the members of other national groups in personal terms (Drew, Meyer, & Peregrine, 1996); decreased use of stereotypes and negative myths (Sachdev, 1997); and a greater sense of ethnorelativism, global mindedness, and self-efficacy (Juhasz & Walker, 1987; Rubin & Sutton, 2006).

Fernández (2006) examined the relationship between participation in a selected study-term abroad and the development of a global perspective, defined as “the ability to engage in critical self-reflection and to navigate an international setting while acting in culturally sensitive and informed ways” (p. 51). Her findings point to the importance of specific field experiences with host country nationals and interactions with peers and faculty for promoting intercultural development. While some believe that claims about
the benefits of education abroad are over-stated, a growing body of research demonstrates that participation has the potential to promote intercultural development. Ortiz and Moore (2001), for example, used focus groups to explore the factors that contribute to promoting study abroad participants’ intercultural competence. They argued that the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and cognitive transformations experienced by participants promoted expansions of worldview, the ability to interact in and negotiate difficult situations, and a greater sense of culture and its impact on individuals.

*Intergroup Dialogue.* Intergroup dialogue is a face-to-face facilitated conversation between members of two social identity groups (e.g., gender, race, sexual orientation, SES, religious affiliation) that strives to foster learning and understanding across difference (Zúñiga, 2003; Zúñiga, Nagda, & Sevig, 2002). Primary components of intergroup dialogue include direct conversation and exchange about contentious issues in a safe and supportive environment, active exploration of the dynamics of social privilege and oppression as it relates to membership in particular social identity groups, facilitation by two trained peer facilitators of the participating social identity groups, and the goal of promoting sustained communication, critical social awareness, and bridge building across difference. Key research findings about the benefits linked with participation in intergroup dialogue include:

… positive effects on cognitive outcomes such as knowledge about other groups and discrimination in society, stereotype and prejudice reduction, development of complex thinking, social awareness of self and others in systems of inequality, and increased understanding about the causes of conflict between social groups. Dialogue participation is also found to reduce anxiety about intergroup contact and to enhance skills related to communication across differences, conflict exploration, perspective taking, and comfort dealing with diversity. (Zúñiga, 2003, p. 15)
A number of research studies on intergroup dialogue have employed non-equivalent, matched control group research designs using first year students (Gurin et. al, 1999; Lopez, Gurin, & Nagda, 1998; Gurin, Nagda, & Lopez, 2004). According to Engberg (2004), these studies found consistent effects for both White students and students of color who participated in the dialogue, on outcomes such as heightened racial awareness, less divisiveness among different groups, and more support for affirmative action and multicultural programs. A series of studies conducted using undergraduate social work students at the University of Washington corroborated these findings (cf. Nagda, Kim, & Truelove, 2004; Nagda & Zúñiga, 2003), noting gains in social identity awareness and an increased understanding of the structural causes of inequality (Spencer & Nagda, 2002), increased knowledge of diverse groups and social inequalities, valuing of diverse perspectives, and recognition of the impact of social group membership (Nagda, Spearmon, & Holley, 1999).

**Discussion and Critique**

Current studies of the impact of collegiate diversity experiences are limited because they often lack a developmental perspective and therefore cannot explicitly link attitudinal change to increased intercultural development and personal capacity to interact effectively in multicultural situations. Furthermore, as King and Baxter Magolda (2005) note, relying solely on measuring attitudinal change as a proxy for intercultural competence is inadequate because it does not explain individuals’ underlying assumptions about difference, nor does it illuminate individuals’ enacted (vs. espoused) capacities for engaging with different others. Thus, we do not yet understand the
developmental mechanisms associated with those collegiate experiences that appear to promote intercultural development.

Viewed from a developmental perspective, the collegiate experiences introduced above (i.e., participation in diversity courses, racial/ethnic or cultural awareness workshops, service learning, education abroad, and intergroup dialogues) often share certain characteristics that could explain why they are effective in promoting the development of intercultural capacities, and therefore movement on the intercultural development continuum. For example, these experiences often provide students with a supportive environment in which to come in contact with cultural and racial differences, the opportunity to expand their awareness of and sensitivity to other forms of difference, and optimally, the opportunity to use critical reflection to enhance their understanding of these experiences. Like the development they promote, these experiences are holistic in nature: they address student’s cognitive (meaning making about the world), interpersonal (meaning making about relations with others), and intrapersonal (meaning making about self) growth, reflecting the lifespan development framework of Kegan (1994). That is, they simultaneously address multiple dimensions of growth.

Discussion and Conceptual Framework

This review first discussed the intercultural dimensions of college student development by framing theoretical perspectives of intercultural development from scholars in human lifespan development, college student development theory, and intercultural communication. These perspectives were used to situate a discussion on holistic models of college student development related to intercultural development. Next, a review and discussion of college impact research concerned with those college
experiences that are associated with promoting intercultural development was offered. It included evidence on the impact of structural diversity in promoting attitudinal change, a discussion of which collegiate diversity experiences promote attitudinal change, and an analysis of how a developmental framework could be employed to explain why certain diversity experiences promote intercultural development. Now, I present the conceptual framework that will guide the research questions and methodology for this study.

This study is designed to examine intercultural development among college students and the effect of specific collegiate experiences on that development. Because I am proposing a mixed methods study, the conceptual framework represents the sequential analytic plan I employ (See Figure 2.4). In the quantitative phase of the study I control for background variables, structural diversity, and interactions with diverse others to separate student characteristics and prior experiences from collegiate diversity experiences. Doing allows me to determine the effect of these experiences on students’ intercultural development. Here, intercultural effectiveness is the dependent variable of interest. On the basis of the quantitative findings, I identify selected cases (for which there is qualitative data) for more in-depth analysis. In the qualitative phase, I examine the selected qualitative cases to better understand the constructive developmental process associated with intercultural development. Through examining the interview data about these students’ experiences, I investigate the developmental mechanisms associated with those collegiate experiences that appear to promote intercultural development. In Chapter Three, I describe in detail the methodology employed in this study.
Figure 2.4: Conceptual Framework for Examining Collegiate Experiences that Affect the Development of Intercultural Effectiveness
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the methodology that was used to investigate what background characteristics and higher education experiences affect how college students develop intercultural effectiveness. The chapter begins by elaborating upon the central research question presented in Chapter One, noting the sub-questions that are the focus of this study. Next, I provide an overview of mixed methods research and the rationale for using this approach in this study. I will then introduce the data collection methods, sample, and instrumentation used in this study and offer a description of the method or methods I employed in answering each sub-question. The chapter concludes with a discussion about the limitations of this study and a brief summary.

Research Questions

The principal research question that this study seeks to address is: *What background characteristics and higher education experiences affect how college students develop intercultural effectiveness?* A series of sub-questions have guided my inquiry:

1. What kinds of intercultural experiences do students report on the WNSLA student survey, and how are these experiences related to the way they deal with cultural differences (as measured by their IDI scores)? For example, do selected collegiate diversity experiences correspond with ethnocentric and ethnorelative ways of dealing with cultural differences?

2. Which student background characteristics, levels of institutional structural diversity, and collegiate experiences with diverse others predict college students’ IDI scores? That is, which background characteristics and collegiate experiences with diverse others are most influential in predicting college students’ IDI scores?
3. When college students select and describe their own significant collegiate experiences, how do they understand, interpret, and make meaning of such experiences that are intercultural in nature?

4. Are college students’ interpretations of these experiences related to their background characteristics or to given types of college diversity experiences?

5. Do students’ interpretations of these experiences differ by whether they use ethnocentric or ethnorelative ways of dealing with cultural differences (as measured by their scores on the IDI)?

Drawn from the extant literature and quantitative and qualitative analyses (described below), this inquiry is designed to expand our understanding of college students’ intercultural development, the background characteristics and diversity experiences that facilitate its development, and the meaning making constructions that characterize differing developmental levels.

*Mixed Methods Research*

In this study, I have employed a concurrent mixed methods research design in order to integrate the different but complementary data that have been collected on this topic (Creswell, 2003). Mixed methods data collection designs bring together the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative forms of research to compare, corroborate, and cross-validate results (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2006), and the intent in using this design was to bring together the differing strengths and non-overlapping weaknesses of quantitative data (e.g., large sample size, trends, generalization) with those of qualitative data (e.g., small N, details, in depth) (Patton, 1990).

Specifically, I have used a Triangulation Design (Creswell, Plano Clark, et. al, 2003). The purpose of this design is “to obtain different but complementary data on the same topic” (Morse, 1991, p. 122) to best understand the research problem. The
Triangulation Design involves giving equal weight to both quantitative and qualitative methods and “generally involves the concurrent, but separate, collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data so that the researcher may best understand the research problem” (Creswell & Plano, 2006, p. 65). In this way, different analytic methods are used in conjunction with one another to facilitate integrating the two types of data during the analysis.

A mixed methods research design allows for additional insights to be gained between and among the different levels of analysis and the production of a more comprehensive product than if a single research paradigm were employed (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). In the case of this study, it was unlikely that quantitative results alone would have fully captured college students’ constructivist assumptions about difference, so the qualitative data were consulted to help explain or build on the initial quantitative results. Furthermore, because human development is multidimensional, multifaceted, and complex, careful attention needs to be paid to assessing it. A single research approach would have been inadequate for attending to the nuances of these multiple dimensions. For example, although quantitative measures may establish that a student has participated in a certain type of collegiate diversity experience, it cannot describe the specific ways in which the student interpreted the experience, or the nuanced ways in which the experience affected the students’ understanding of herself, her relationships, and her worldview.

Sampling

The data for this study originate from the cross-sectional pilot study of the Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education (WNSLAE), a four-campus mixed
methods study designed to investigate critical factors that affect seven hypothesized outcomes of liberal arts education. The seven outcomes of interest in the WNSLAET study are: effective reasoning and problem solving, inclination to inquire and lifelong learning, integration of learning, well-being, leadership, moral character, and intercultural effectiveness. (For a description of the process and rationale for selecting these outcomes, see King, Kendall Brown, Lindsay, & VanHecke, 2007.) This latter outcome, intercultural effectiveness, is the focus of this study. Data collection was designed to gather information about study participants, their college experiences and the achievement of these outcomes.

The four WNSLAET pilot institutions included a southeastern regional comprehensive institution and three Midwestern institutions, including a large research institution, a liberal arts college, and a community college. The institutions had a large range in terms of the size of total enrollment: 1,300 (liberal arts college), 11,000 (comprehensive university), 14,000 (community college) and 40,000 (doctoral research university). Undergraduate minority enrollment varied from 10.5% of total undergraduate enrollment at the liberal arts college, to 18.2% at the community college, to 11.7% at the comprehensive university, to 34.9% doctoral research university. The institutions were selected based on convenience of location, relationship with the research team, and on their willingness to participate in the study. In order to provide the reader with a deeper understanding of each participating institution, additional information about the campuses (gathered from publicly available sources) is provided below.

The liberal arts college is a private four-year residential institution located in a mid-sized city several hours from two major metropolitan areas. The college offers more
than 40 majors at the bachelor’s and master’s level and one doctoral degree program. The institution prides itself on providing a personalized education; the average class size is 16 with a student/faculty ratio of 13:1. The vast majority of the college’s approximately 1,300 students are from in-state, although the college notes that there are representatives from most of the United States and 20 foreign countries.

The community college offers more than 100 career and college transfer programs, plus more than 1,000 non-credit courses that focus on topics from personal interest to workforce training. In addition to the main campus, eleven off-campus centers provide college credit, continuing education, and high school GED opportunities. The college has open enrollment and does not provide on-campus housing. More than 50% of students transfer to four-year colleges. Of the approximately 14,000 registered students, nearly 600 are international students who represent more than 90 different countries.

In the past decade, the regional public institution has been consistently ranked as one of the top public master’s institutions in the South by *U.S. News and World Report* and the *Princeton Review*. The institution offers more than 70 bachelor’s degree programs and nearly 30 graduate programs. Recently, a doctorate program was added. A growing study body is being accommodated by the construction of a number of new campus buildings, including three new classroom facilities, three new buildings to house specific departments, and the renovation of at least eight existing buildings. International experiences are encouraged through study abroad programs and language and culture studies on campus. In the recent past, the institution’s senior leadership convened a taskforce to author the first annual diversity report, a strategic planning document
designed to foster a campus climate of inclusion, identify new initiatives to reach
diversity goals, and address specific issues advanced by diversity advocates.

The doctoral research institution is consistently ranked as one of the top public
universities in the world. Over 200 degree programs are offered by 12 undergraduate
schools and colleges. The undergraduate student body is characterized as diverse with
24.2% of fall 2005 undergraduates identified as “minorities” (i.e., Black, Asian, Native
American, and Hispanic). Additionally, students hail from all 50 states (over one-third
are from out-of state) and over 80 foreign countries. The institution boasts over 900
student organizations and 25 intercollegiate athletic teams. The institution has a long
history of commitment to diversity initiatives. Recently, the institution’s president
established a diversity council to “assess, encourage, and celebrate” the number of
initiatives which include living learning communities, global education programs, and
social justice initiatives.

At each institution, the study subject pool consisted of random samples within
class levels (except at the community college which was split evenly between first year
and second-year students). The target population was all students attending the
participating institution; the final sample included a comparable number of students
across institutions. When necessary, underrepresented students (defined as African-
American, Hispanic and Native-American) were over-sampled to yield at least ten
percent of the sample at each class level at each institution.

Study participants completed a general demographic questionnaire via a paper-
and-pencil or online registration process. Participants then took part in a group
assessment in which they were given a college experiences questionnaire and a battery of
assessment instruments, including the Intercultural Development Inventory (described in detail below). The group assessment took approximately 60-80 minutes to complete. The assessment portion of the study was administered in spring, 2005, and was completed by 600 students. Students were compensated $50 for their participation in the group assessment. The distribution of the assessment sample (N=600) is listed in Table 3.1.

A sub-sample of first year and senior students was subsequently invited to participate in the interview portion of the study (described below). Eligible students were either first year or seniors (second-year students in the case of the community college) who had completed the assessment portion of the study and who had indicated on the assessment registration materials that they would be willing to participate in an interview. The goal was an interview sample of 50 students per campus, balanced by class year and gender. The interviews were collected in Winter 2005, when teams of interviewers visited each of the four participating institutions. Students who participated in the interviews were compensated an additional $30.

Interviews were collected from 174 students, including 113 (64.9%) first and second-year students, 60 (34.5%) seniors, 113 (64.9%) women, and 35 (20.1%) students of color. Recruitment efforts sought a sample balanced by gender and students of color were over-sampled to yield as diverse an interview sample as possible. No attempt was made to attend to the uneven ratio of female to male respondents in the assessment sample, and this ratio was also reflected in the interview sample. A series of independent samples t-test revealed that there were no statistically significant differences between the assessment sample and the interview sample on the outcome variables of interest. Further, a chi-square analysis was conducted to evaluate whether students from all four
study institutions were equally represented in the interview sample; this analysis revealed that there was not a systemic relationship, and all four institutions were equally represented in the interview sample. The distribution of the interview sample (N=174) is listed in Table 3.2.

The 174 WNSLAEE interview summaries (see section on \textit{Qualitative Analysis} later in this chapter for additional description) were then inspected for data related to students’ intercultural experiences. A total of 47 interviews were selected for additional analysis because they contained data related to significant intercultural experiences; hereafter, I will refer to this sub-sample as the “Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experiences Sample” (DEIE Sample). The distribution of this sample is listed in Table 3.3. In order to assess the correspondence between the interview sample and the DEIE sample, a chi-square analysis was conducted; this was done to determine whether there was a relationship between students’ self-authorship level and whether or not students described a developmentally effective intercultural experience. This analysis revealed a significant relationship, \((\chi^2(3) = 12.69, p =.005)\): those with more mature self-authorship orientations were more likely to report a DEIE. For example, 64% of participants in the interview sample possessed an external meaning making orientation compared to 45% in the DEIE sample. Although only 3% of participants in the interview sample had an early internal meaning making orientation, 13% of participants in the DEIE sample worked from this orientation. Additionally, women were more likely than men to have a DEIE \((\chi^2(1) = 3.84, p = .05)\) and seniors were more likely than first year students to be included in this group \((\chi^2(2) = 7.90, p < .02)\).
Table 3.1: WNSLAE Assessment Sample (N=600) by Gender, Race, and Class Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>199 (33.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>399 (66.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>600 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(U.S. Citizens)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>457 (85.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13 (2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/ Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 (.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Racial/Ethnic Group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial/Multiethnic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>541 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Non-U.S. Citizens)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18 (32.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African/Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 (10.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23 (41.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Racial/Ethnic Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial/Multiethnic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 3.2: WNSLAE Interview Sample (N=174) by Gender, Race, and Class Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Sophomore*</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61 (35.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>113 (64.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (%)</strong></td>
<td>97 (55.7%)</td>
<td>17 (9.8%)</td>
<td>60 (34.5%)</td>
<td>174 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong> (U.S. Citizens)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>120 (78.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 (6.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 (3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Racial/Ethnic Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial/Multiethnic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8 (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (%)</strong></td>
<td>89 (58.6%)</td>
<td>17 (11.2%)</td>
<td>45 (29.6%)</td>
<td>152 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong> (Non-U.S. Citizens)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9 (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 (23.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial/Multiethnic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (%)</strong></td>
<td>6 (28.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>14 (66.7%)</td>
<td>21 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All sophomores in the interview sample are second-year community college students
Table 3.3: Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experiences (DEIE) Sample (N=47) by Gender, Race, and Class Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Sophomore*</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (%)</strong></td>
<td>20 (42.5%)</td>
<td>3 (6.4%)</td>
<td>24 (51.1%)</td>
<td>47 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity (U.S. Citizens)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27 (71.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Racial/Ethnic Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (%)</strong></td>
<td>18 (47.4%)</td>
<td>3 (7.9%)</td>
<td>16 (42.1%)</td>
<td>38 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity (Non U.S. Citizens)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (%)</strong></td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (77.8%)</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All sophomores in the interview sample are second-year community college students
**Instrumentation**

This section provides an overview of the instruments used in the study. These include a 24-item general demographic survey, the WNSLAE Student Survey, the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), and in-depth interviews (henceforth referred to as the WNSLAE Interview). A detailed description of the IDI and WNSLAE Interview is provided below. A copy of each instrument (with the exception of the IDI, which is copyrighted and therefore not available for reproduction) is included in the appendices.

The WNSLAE Student Survey contains 45 items that measure a variety of aspects of students’ involvement in college, including curricular and co-curricular activities, diversity-related courses, the quantity and quality of classroom and informal interactions with faculty, staff, and diverse peers, and the relative importance that students place on a variety of activities such as raising a family, volunteering, promoting racial understanding, and making a lot of money. Selected items from this survey were used to assess students’ college diversity experiences. These items are listed in Table 4.

*The Intercultural Development Inventory*

The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) is a 50-item paper-and-pencil measure of intercultural sensitivity developed using the theoretical framework provided by the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS; Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003; see Chapter Two for a detailed description of the model). Paige, Jacobs-Cassuto, Yershova, and DeJaeghere (2003) conducted a psychometric analysis of the IDI on a sample of 353 high school students, college students, and instructors in foreign language, language and culture, and intercultural education courses. They used factor analysis to evaluate whether individual items loaded in a manner consistent with the six
DMIS stages. They found that items representing four of the IDI stages loaded with Cronbach α internal reliability coefficients of .80 and above. The remaining two stages, Acceptance and Behavioral Adaptation, had α coefficients of greater than .70. The authors concluded that the IDI is a reliable measure that has little or no desirability bias and reasonably approximates the DMIS.

Intercultural Development Inventory respondents are instructed to answer each of the IDI items based upon their initial reaction of agreement or disagreement with the overall content. According to the instructions, the items are statements that reflect a range of viewpoints toward cultural differences and respondents are instructed to consider IDI terms such as “our culture” or “my culture” in terms of the culture group(s) to which they feel they “belong” the most, and terms such as “other cultures” or “different cultures” in terms of the group(s) to which they feel they do not belong. The Likert-style response options include (1) Disagree, (2) Disagree somewhat more than agree, (3) Disagree some and agree some, (4) Agree somewhat more than disagree, and (5) Agree. Sample items include the following: “I do not feel I have a culture, “I can change my behavior to adapt to other cultures,” and “Too much cultural diversity is bound to lead to divisive conflict.”

The IDI is scored through proprietary software that is made available to all individuals who attend and complete the IDI Qualifying Seminar, a two-day training session offered by IDI authors Milton Bennett and Mitch Hammer through the Intercultural Communication Institute (www.intercultural.org). The present author attended this training seminar in June, 2005. After individual item responses are entered, the software generates a profile that corresponds to five scales that represent the different ethnocentric and ethnorelative stages of intercultural development. The profile shows the
distribution of resolved issues across the scale dimensions. An individual’s primary orientation to cultural differences is indicated by the Developmental Score and it is this score that was used in the present analysis. According to the Intercultural Development Inventory Manual (2005), IDI Developmental Scores range from a low of approximately 55 points to “145 or higher at the highest end” (p. 16). As an individual’s Developmental Score increases, he or she moves closer to viewing the world from an ethnorelative perspective. The IDI Developmental Scores and ranges were developed based on a sample of 766 respondents (IDI Manual, 2005). Conceptually, an IDI Developmental Score of 100 is the center of the Minimization orientation with 85 indicating the lower limit and 114 representing the upper limit.² Given a normal distribution, 68% of respondent scores will fall within this range. A Denial/Defense orientation towards cultural difference corresponds with an IDI Developmental Score ranging from 55 to 84 points with a score of 70 at its midpoint. Given a normal distribution, 15.8% of respondents will fall within this range. Finally, the Acceptance/Adaptation orientation corresponds with IDI Developmental Scores ranging from 115 to 145 or higher with 130 marking the midpoint of this orientation. Again, given a normal distribution, 15.8% of respondents will reflect this perspective. See Figure 3.1 for a visual representation the DMIS and corresponding IDI Developmental Scores.

Intercultural Development Inventory Qualifying Seminar attendees are trained to provide feedback in order to help individuals or groups consider how the IDI results could factor into their further intercultural development (Hammer & Bennett, 2005). Due

² Other authors have used different numbers to represent the various stages of the DMIS. For example, Anderson, Lawton, Rexeisen, and Hubbard (2006) noted the relationship between IDI scores and their relationship to the DMIS as follows: 55-69= Denial/Defense; 70-84=Reversal; 85-114=Minimization; 115-129=Acceptance; 130+=Encapsulated Marginality.
to the large sample in this research study, individual feedback was not supplied to study participants.

**Figure 3.1: IDI Developmental Scores in Relation to the DMIS when Normally Distributed**

![IDI Developmental Scores Diagram]


**In-Depth Interviews**

The in-depth interview protocol was designed specifically for the WNSLAE study by Baxter Magolda and King (2006) using a constructivist-developmental approach in order to elicit a clearer understanding of students’ meaning making about their college experiences. Specifically, the interview sought to assess the developmental foundations underlying students’ development across a range of seven liberal arts outcomes while also assessing their meaning making assumptions and level of self-authorship. Interviews were conducted using an approach that incorporated both the “informal conversation interview” and “the general interview guide” (Patton, 1990, in Upcraft & Schuh, 1996, p. 63). Specifically, interviewers followed a general interview protocol that asked students
to comment on the experiences they found meaningful during college. While there was continuity in that interviewers followed a general protocol for inquiring about students’ backgrounds, college experiences, and how they made sense of these things in tandem, the interviewers were deliberate in allowing the students’ responses to lead the interview (Baxter Magolda, 1999).

The framework used for the study incorporated the constructs of self-authorship, or the internal capacity to define one’s beliefs, identity, and social relations (Baxter Magolda, 2001; Kegan, 1994) as the developmental foundation for the liberal arts outcomes. For example, intercultural effectiveness requires the ability to use multiple cultural frames, security in one’s identity to openly engage challenges to one’s beliefs, and the capacity to engage in meaningful, interdependent relationships with diverse others that are grounded in an understanding and appreciation for human differences (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005).

The WNSLAE Interview was designed to gather background information from students that they saw as salient to their self-description, to learn about their significant collegiate experiences, and to assess students’ developmental level with respect to meaning making and self-authorship. To do this, the interview included three segments. The first segment was designed to build rapport and to assess students’ meaning making at the time of their college entrance. This was done by inviting the student to introduce him or herself by sharing basic background information (e.g., family, high school experience, and friends) and by elucidating any expectations for college (e.g., nature of the learning environment, relationships, involvement, and specific goals) and how the reality of college compared with those expectations. The second segment was designed to
access students’ meaningful experiences and how they made sense of them. Specifically, students were asked to describe their most significant, best, worst and/or most challenging college experiences. Interviewers used probe questions to draw out description, to learn why the experience(s) was important to the student and how the student “made sense” of the experience, and to elicit the student’s perspective about the overall effect of college thus far. Other questions in this segment sought to establish the nature of students’ support systems and how they dealt with difficult decisions and managing pressure.

Of particular significance to this inquiry, interviewees were specifically asked to select and describe an experience or experiences in which they encountered and interacted with people they perceived as different from themselves. Student reports of interactions across difference were not limited to this question, however. Additional probe questions were used to draw out students’ perceptions and sense making of the encounter or interaction, as well as any additional thoughts or ideas. Examples of possible probes include: “What have these interactions been like?” “How have you made sense of them?” and “What ideas have you gathered from these interactions?” The third and final segment of the interview was designed to explore how students were integrating the various facets of their collegiate experiences and to better understand how students’ collective experiences have shaped their thinking about themselves, their relationships with others, and what to believe. The interview concluded with the interviewer confirming that he/she had heard the key experiences that the student had deemed important, that the student had the opportunity to note any connections or themes among their experiences, and with an opportunity for the student to share any final thoughts or
observations. Each interview was digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim. The plan used for analyzing the interview data is described below in the section entitled Analytic Plan.

Survey Data Preparation

After the survey data were scanned, the WNSLAET research team then “cleaned” the data. For example, data were inspected for illogical responses (those that were out of the range of the assigned scale) and responses that could only be attributed to data entry error; these were then extracted and replaced with system missing values. On any variable, there was no more than 5% missing data. For those items for which there were missing data, the median item value was imputed.

Measures

This section describes the variables, items, and scales that were used in the quantitative component of this study. These variables are related to background characteristics, institutional structural diversity, collegiate experiences with diverse others, and informal interactions across race. Table 3.4 presents a summary of all these variables, including variable name, description, data source, and coding. It also provides the specific items that comprise the various scales as well as the related scale reliability coefficients.

Dependent Variable

The outcome variable of interest for this study is intercultural effectiveness as measured by the IDI developmental score. As noted previously, the IDI developmental score ranges from a low of approximately 55 to a high of more than 130 points. The WNSLAET assessment sample scores ranged from 54.41 to 129.03 (M = 89.97; SD =
14.78). These findings are reported in Table 3.5. Figures 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 provide histograms that illustrate the distribution of IDI developmental scores for the WNSLAE Assessment Sample, the WNSLAE Interview Sample, and Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experiences (DEIE) Sample. In all three cases the scores are roughly normally distributed.

**Figure 3.2: Frequency Distribution of IDI Developmental Scores for WNSLAE Assessment Sample**
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Figure 3.3: Frequency Distribution of IDI Developmental Scores for WNSLAE Interview Sample

![Graph showing frequency distribution of IDI Developmental Scores for WNSLAE Interview Sample with mean 90.68, standard deviation 15.159, and N=174.]

Figure 3.4: Frequency Distribution of IDI Developmental Scores for Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experiences Sample

![Graph showing frequency distribution of IDI Developmental Scores for Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experiences Sample with mean 95.17, standard deviation 13.908, and N=47.]
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Independent Variables

Corresponding to the literature review and conceptual framework presented in Chapter Two (Figure 2.4), there are four sets of independent variables in this study: background characteristics, structural diversity, diversity experiences measures (i.e., three diversity experiences items and three diversity experiences scales). Previous research on college impact (e.g., Astin, 1991, 1993; Engberg, 2004) has normalized the practice of controlling for students’ background characteristics and structural diversity as a means of recognizing the role that environmental factors play in influencing college student development. Student background characteristics include measures of gender, age, race, high school GPA, year in college, and level of similarity of one’s high school racial composition to oneself.

In order to better understand the impact of high school structural diversity on individual students, the independent variable "similarity of high school racial composition to oneself" was created by recoding the students’ self-reported high school racial composition\(^3\). Once recoded, the higher the value of this variable the more discrepant the high school environment was relative to the student's own racial background. So, if a student of color attended an "almost all White" high school, the number 5 indicates that the student’s high school racial composition was substantially different than the student. Likewise, if a student of color attended a school that was "almost all minority students," the low value indicates that racial composition of the high school was much more like the student. This approach normalizes the perspectives

\(^3\) The coding for high school racial composition was as follows: 1=Almost all White; 2=Mostly White Students; 3=Roughly half White students and half minority students; 4=Mostly minority students; 5=Almost all minority students. The dichotomous White/NonWhite dummy variable was coded as follows: 1=White, 0=NonWhite
of both racial groups relative to high school racial composition (e.g., for both groups, higher scores signify greater racial diversity relative to oneself). Collegiate structural diversity is measured by the percentage of undergraduate students of color (i.e., Black non-Hispanic, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, and Hispanic students) and non-resident aliens among enrolled students on a given campus. The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) was used to calculate collegiate structural diversity.

Participation in collegiate diversity experiences was measured by three diversity experiences items and three diversity experiences scales that were developed from WNSLAE Student Survey Items. The diversity experiences items focused on students’ participation in study abroad for academic credit (dichotomous, 0=No, 1=Yes), the number of courses with a community service component (ordinal scale, 1=0 Courses, 2=1 Course, 3=2 Courses, 4=3 Courses, 5=4 or more Courses), and frequency of attending a racial/cultural awareness workshop in the academic year (ordinal scale, 1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Occasionally, 4=Often, 5=Very Often).

The three diversity experiences scales contain items related to the frequency with which students have informal interactions with diverse others, the frequency with which they report having negative diversity interactions, and the number of diversity courses in which students have enrolled. More specifically, the “Informal Diversity Interactions Scale” contains 15 items related to students’ level of engagement in intercultural interactions, items related to frequency with which students had serious conversations with students, faculty, or student affairs staff of a different race or ethnicity, and frequency of engaging in conversations with individuals who possess different religious
beliefs and political opinions, or who have different personal values (see Table 3.4 for a full list of the items included in this scale). This scale also contains items related to frequency with which students had serious conversations about different lifestyles and customs, whether they have been encouraged to make contact with students from different economic, social, racial, or economic backgrounds than their own, and how frequently students have engaged with racially or ethnically diverse others in serious conversation about issues related to social justice or intergroup relations. Finally, the scale measures how often students have encountered diverse perspectives in the classroom or around campus, and whether students have made friends or shared personal feelings with someone of another race or from another country. For each item, respondents were asked to indicate their frequency of participation as measured on a 5-point ordinal scale (e.g., 1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Occasionally, 4=Often, 5=Very Often). The alpha reliability for this scale is robust at .92.

The “Frequency of Negative Diversity Interactions Scale” contains five items related to the frequency of intercultural interactions in which students have noted an uncomfortable emotional response. This includes feelings of having experienced prejudice, discrimination, and being silenced. It also includes intercultural interactions characterized as tense, hostile, hurtful, insulting, unresolved, and threatening. Item responses were scored on a five-point ordinal scale: 1=Very Often, 2=Often, 3=Sometimes, 4=Rarely, and 5=Never. The Combat’s alpha for this scale is .88.

The “Diversity-Related Courses Scale” contains three items and had an alpha reliability coefficient of .67. This scale measures the number of diversity courses students have taken related to diverse cultures and perspectives, women’s/gender studies, and
equity/social justice issues. Responses were scored on a five-point ordinal scale (1=0 Courses, 2=1 Course, 3=2 Courses, 4=3 Courses, and 5=4 or more Courses). See Table 3.4 for a description of all variables, items, and scales.

Finally, the “Intercultural Effect” variable is a dichotomous measure (1=Yes and 0=No) related to whether each of the 174 students who participated in the study’s in-depth interview described a Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experience (DEIE). See *Qualitative Analysis* (below, this chapter) for a detailed description of the process used to select these experiences. Consistent with the study’s conceptual framework (see Figure 2.4), this variable is intended to measure whether a student’s meaning making about an intercultural experience affected his or her intercultural development.
Table 3.4: Description of Variables, Items, and Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Development Inventory Developmental Score</td>
<td>IDI</td>
<td>Ranges from 55 to 130 where 100 is the mean of a normative sample with a SD of 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Demographic Survey</td>
<td>1=Male, 0=Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in 2005</td>
<td>Demographic Survey</td>
<td>Recoded: Last two digits of year of birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/NonWhite</td>
<td>Demographic Survey</td>
<td>Dummy coded: 0=NonWhite, 1=White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Grade Point Average</td>
<td>WNSLAE Student Survey</td>
<td>1=Below D (0.00-0.99), 2=D to C-(1.00-1.49), 3=C to C (1.50-1.99), 4=C to B-(2.00-2.49), 5=B to B (2.50-2.99), 6=B to A-(3.00-3.49), 7=A to A (3.50-4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in College</td>
<td>Institutional Records</td>
<td>1=Freshman, 2=Sophomore, 3=Junior, 4=Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity of High School Racial Composition to Oneself</td>
<td>WNSLAE Student Survey</td>
<td>Recoded High School Racial Composition where higher values now represent a different racial/ethnic composition than the student (White as referent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural Diversity (Percentage of Undergraduate Students of Color)</strong></td>
<td>Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)</td>
<td>1=10.5%, 2=11.7%, 3=18.2%, 4=34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity Experiences Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a study abroad program for academic credit</td>
<td>WNSLAET Student Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of courses with a community service component</td>
<td>WNSLAET Student Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of attending racial/cultural awareness workshops in the academic year</td>
<td>WNSLAET Student Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity Experiences Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Informal Diversity Interactions Scale (15-items, $\alpha = .92$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency with which you’ve had serious discussions with other students about different lifestyles and customs</td>
<td>WNSLAET Student Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency with which you’ve had serious discussions with other students about major social issues such as racial diversity, human rights, equality, or justice</td>
<td>WNSLAET Student Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency with which you’ve had serious discussions with students with different religious beliefs</td>
<td>WNSLAET Student Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency with which you’ve had serious discussions with students with different political opinions</td>
<td>WNSLAET Student Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency with which you’ve had serious discussions with students with different philosophy of life or personal values</td>
<td>WNSLAET Student Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency with which you’ve been encouraged to make contact with students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds</td>
<td>WNSLAET Student Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency with which you’ve had serious discussions with a faculty or student affairs staff whose political, social, or religious opinions were different from your own</td>
<td>WNSLAET Student Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency with which you have had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity</td>
<td>WNSLAET Student Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency with which you’ve encountered diverse perspectives in class discussions and/or assignments</td>
<td>WNSLAET Student Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=Yes, 0=No

1=0 Courses, 2=1 Course, 3=2 Courses, 4=3 Courses, 5=4 or more Courses

1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Occasionally, 4=Often, 5=Very Often
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency with which you’ve encountered diverse perspectives around campus</td>
<td>WNSLAE Student Survey</td>
<td>1=Very Often, 2=Often, 3=Sometimes, 4=Rarely, 5=Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency with which you’ve made friends with a student of another race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency with which you’ve made friends with a student from another country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency with which you’ve had discussions with someone of another race regarding intergroup relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency with which you’ve had meaningful and honest discussions with someone of another race about issues related to social justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency with which you’ve shared personal feelings and problems with someone of another race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Negative Diversity Interactions Scale (5-items, α = .88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency with which you’ve had guarded, cautious interactions with someone of another race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency with which you’ve felt silenced by prejudice and discrimination from sharing your own experiences with someone of another race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency with which you’ve had hurtful, unresolved interactions with someone of another race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency with which you’ve had tense, somewhat hostile interactions with someone of another race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency with which you’ve felt insulted or threatened based on race, national origin, values, or religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity-Related Courses Scale (3-items, α = .67)</td>
<td>WNSLAE Student Survey</td>
<td>1=0 Courses, 2=1 Course, 3=2 Courses, 4=3 Courses, 5=4 or more Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of courses on diverse cultures/perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of courses on women’s/gender studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of courses on equality/social justice issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Description</td>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning Making about Intercultural Experiences</td>
<td>Qualitative Analysis of WNSLAE Interviews</td>
<td>1=Yes, 0=No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptive Statistics

In order to respond to the questions above, descriptive statistics and frequencies were run to better understand the sample’s primary components as described in the conceptual framework: student background characteristics, level of institutional structural diversity, and students’ rates of participation in college diversity experiences. A five-point summary of the variables to be used in this study is provided in Table 3.5. The sample for this study is comprised of 397 women (66%) and 199 men (33%). Participants’ ages ranged from 19 to 61 years, with a mean age of 21.8 years (SD = 4.47). Most students reported attending high schools where White students comprised the majority of students: 71.4% of all students in the sample characterized the racial composition of their high school as either “almost all White students” or “mostly White students.”

By year in college, the survey sample was skewed towards the freshmen and sophomores with freshmen accounting for 33% of the sample, sophomores 30.3%, juniors 18.3%, and seniors 18.3%. Overall, students in this sample were academically successful in high school with 61.5% of students reporting having a high school grade point average of A- to A (3.50 to 4.00). In terms of structural diversity, a variable that may influence students’ opportunities for interactions across difference, 28.3% of the students in the sample attended college at an institution with 10.5% undergraduate students of color, 29.3% of the students attended an institution with 11.7% undergraduate students of color, 15.9% of the students attended college at an institution with 18.2% undergraduate students of color, and 26.5% of the students attended and institution with 34.9% students of color. Given the study’s conceptual framework and its relative
emphasis on the role of institutional structural diversity in the development of intercultural effectiveness, chi-square analysis revealed that students who participated in the in-depth interviews were not significantly different from the assessment sample in this regard. In other words, the number of students from a high or low structural diversity environment in the interview sample was proportional to the assessment sample thereby implying equivalence of exposure to collegiate diversity.

Table 3.5: Descriptive Statistics for Variables in Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDI Developmental Score (N=600)</td>
<td>89.97</td>
<td>14.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Background Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1=Male, 0=Female)</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in 2005</td>
<td>21.84</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/NonWhite (1=White, 0=NonWhite)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Grade Point Average&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in College (1=Freshman, 2=Sophomore, 3=Junior, 4=Senior)</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity of High School Racial Composition to Oneself&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural Diversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Undergraduate Minority Enrollment</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>10.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity Experiences Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad program for academic credit (1=Yes, 0=No)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of courses with a community service component&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending a racial/cultural awareness workshop in the academic year&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity Experiences Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Informal Diversity Interactions&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had serious discussions about different lifestyles and customs</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had serious discussions about major social issues such as racial diversity, human rights, equality, or justice</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had serious discussions with students with different religious beliefs</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had serious discussions with students with different political opinions</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had serious discussions with students with different philosophy of life or personal values</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been encouraged to make contact with students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had serious discussions with faculty/student affairs staff whose political, social, or religious opinions differ from one’s own</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Had serious conversations with student of a different race/ethnicity 3.20 1.24
Encountered diverse perspectives in class discussions and/or assignments 3.07 1.17
Encountered diverse perspectives around campus 3.71 1.14
Made friends with a student of another race 3.18 1.30
Made friends with student from another country 2.36 1.11
Had discussions with someone of another race regarding intergroup relations 2.42 1.10
Had meaningful and honest discussions with someone of another race about issues related to social justice 2.92 1.22
Shared personal feelings or problems with someone of another race 4.26 0.98

*Frequency of Negative Diversity Interactions*
Had guarded, cautious interactions with someone of another race 4.50 0.85
Felt silenced by prejudice and discrimination from sharing own experiences with someone of another race 4.52 0.87
Had hurtful, unresolved interactions with someone of another race 3.90 1.01
Had tense, somewhat hostile interactions with someone of another race 4.44 0.91
Felt insulted or threatened based on race, national origin, values, or religion 4.52 0.87

*Diversity-Related Courses*
Courses on diverse cultures/perspectives 1.64 0.89
Courses on women’s/gender issues 1.22 0.57
Courses on equity/social justice 1.49 0.80

Meaning Making about Intercultural Interactions
Intercultural Effect (1=Yes, 0=No) .08 .27

*1=Below D (0.00-0.99), 2=D to C- (1.00-1.49), 3=C- to C (1.50-1.99), 4=C to B- (2.00-2.49), 5=B- to B (2.50-2.99), 6=B to A- (3.00-3.49), 7=A- to A (3.50-4.00)
2=Almost all white students, 2=Mostly white students, 3=Roughly half white students and half minority students, 4=Mostly minority students, 5=Almost all minority students
3=0 Courses, 2=1 Course, 3=2 Courses, 4=3 Courses, 5=4 or More Courses
4=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Occasionally, 4=Often, 5=Very Often
5=Very Often, 2=Often, 3=Sometimes, 4=Rarely, 5=Never

Analytic Plan
This section introduces the three part analytic plan for this mixed methods study.

Analysis centers on those items from each instrument that focus on elements of interest to this study: students’ background characteristics and pre-college exposure to diverse others, selected collegiate activities and experiences, meaning making surrounding intercultural interactions (as elicited through the interviews), and espoused worldview regarding cultural and ethnic differences (as measured by the IDI Developmental Score).
Figure 3.5 presents a visual representation of the sequential and convergent explanatory data analysis plan that will guide this study.

Quantitative Analysis

In this component of the study, several quantitative analyses were conducted on the WNSLAE assessment sample (N=600). Using the entire assessment sample (rather than only the interview sample) provided greater statistical power. Further, as noted previously, a series of independent samples t-tests confirmed that the assessment sample and interview sample are not significantly different on the variables of interest to this study. First, students’ rates of participation in the college diversity experiences outlined in Chapter Two (i.e., diversity courses, racial/ethnic or cultural awareness workshops, service learning, and education abroad) were examined by running descriptive statistics and frequencies. Next, Pearson’s correlations were used to examine the extent to which the score on the diversity experiences scales relates to high school GPA, gender, race/ethnicity, year in college, high school racial composition, and level of structural diversity, and to determine whether students’ participation in these experiences is correlated with their IDI developmental scores. Corresponding to the conceptual framework presented at the end of Chapter Two (see Figure 2.4), ordinary least squares (OLS) multiple regression was used to predict the probability that students possessing certain background characteristics, who participate in certain collegiate diversity experiences, and who made meaning about their significant intercultural experiences will obtain IDI Developmental Scores that correspond with either ethnocentric or ethnorelative ways of dealing with difference (as hypothesized by the DMIS and as measured by the IDI).


Qualitative Analysis

During the qualitative analysis, a subset of the 174 WNSLAE interviews were analyzed to examine how students make meaning of their diversity experiences, and to evaluate whether students’ interpretations are related to certain background characteristics or to given types of college diversity experiences. See the box labeled “Qualitative Analysis” in Figure 3.5 for a visual representation of the overarching analytic framework for this study in general, and for this component in particular. The subset for the qualitative analysis comprised those summaries in which students discussed intercultural experiences that affected their learning and development. To arrive at the subset for qualitative analysis, all 174 WNSLAE interview summaries were reviewed.

Each interview summary contains four sections: a description of the individual student’s characteristics and background information (as shared by students at the time of the interview); a list and description of “Developmental Experiences” that have had an articulated developmental impact on the student; an assessment of the individual student’s overall meaning making orientation; and verbatim quotes that illustrate how the student thinks about, or makes meaning about, the world and what to believe (cognitive dimension), him/herself (intrapersonal dimension), and relationships with others (interpersonal dimension). “Developmental Experiences” are defined as collegiate and life experiences that had an articulated impact on students’ learning and development. These experiences positively affect the development of a mature capacity for knowing, being, or relating to others (King, in press). Not all reported experiences rose to the level of being developmentally effective. If a student-selected experience did not make a
difference in a student’s meaning making about themselves (intrapersonal dimension),
the nature of their relationships (interpersonal dimension), or how they know (cognitive
dimension), it was not chosen for further analysis. A total of 392 developmental
experiences were recorded across all 174 interview summaries. These were then reviewed
in order to identify those developmental experiences that were intercultural in nature.
More specifically, “Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experiences” are defined as
developmental experiences that center around interactions with culturally, racially, and/or
ethnically diverse others or associated ideas and knowledge. Developmentally effective
intercultural experiences, as defined here, do not include interactions with political,
religious, gender, SES, or regional (e.g., geographical) differences, or interactions with
others from a different sexual orientation, except where these differences are a salient part
of the intercultural (e.g., cultural, racial, and/or ethnic) experience. In the end, a total of
49 developmentally effective intercultural experiences were recorded across 47
summaries. These summaries comprise the data set for the qualitative analysis
component.

As noted above, one of the four components of each interview summary was an
assessment of each student’s overall meaning making orientation. During the
summarization phase of data analysis, each transcript was categorized into one of three
meaning making orientations that correspond with increasingly complex developmental
capacities associated with the journey towards self-authorship. “External” was the term
used for summaries where the majority of the transcript pointed to reliance on external
sources for how one should approach knowing, engaging in relationships, and forming a
sense of self. “Mixed” was the assessment term used in interview summaries to describe
students who had begun to question external sources and see the need for one’s own vision, internal identity, and bringing one’s authentic self to relationships (Baxter Magolda, 2001). And “Early Internal” was used to indicate a more firmly dominant internal voice. Students in this group still used external sources but mediated their influence by critical analysis (Baxter Magolda, personal communication, February 14, 2007). These overall meaning making assessments were used to group the DEIE sample by developmental level. Analysis was then conducted to assess how students at each developmental level made meaning about their intercultural experiences. Relevant passages were also culled to examine whether students’ interpretations of these experiences related to their background characteristics, institutional structural diversity, or to given types of college diversity experiences. These findings are reported in Chapter Five.

_Triangulation Analysis_

The triangulation analysis was designed to integrate the quantitative data and qualitative data in order to better understand the development of intercultural effectiveness in general, and in particular, the relationship between the IDI and the interview data. This was done by using IDI Developmental Scores to sort the DEIE sample with the goal of evaluating whether students’ interpretations of their intercultural experiences differ by whether they use ethnocentric or ethnorelative ways of dealing with cultural differences (See right hand portion of Figure 3.5). The 47 summaries of the Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experiences (DEIE) Sample were sorted by IDI Developmental Score. Corresponding with the IDI Developmental Score derivation and interpretation description provided by the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI)
Manual (2005), the 10 students who scored below 85 on the IDI were assigned to the “Low” group and the 6 students who scored above 115 were assigned to the “High” group. According to the manual, IDI Developmental scores of less than 85 points correspond with an ethnocentric Defense/Denial orientation towards cultural difference, and scores above 115 correspond with an ethnorelative Acceptance/Adaptation orientation toward cultural difference. In Chapter Six, I offer my analysis of how students in each of the two groups interpreted their intercultural experiences in order to examine how college students who use ethnocentric or ethnorelative ways of dealing with cultural difference interpret their intercultural interactions.

Table 3.6 presents the research sub-questions I identified at the beginning of this chapter and summarizes the analytic method(s) I will use in formulating a response.

**Table 3.6: Approaches to Analyses of Research Sub-Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Sub-Questions</th>
<th>Analytic Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What kinds of intercultural experiences do students report on the WNSLAE student survey, and how are these experiences related to the way they deal with cultural differences (as measured by their IDI scores)? For example, do selected collegiate diversity experiences correspond with ethnocentric and ethnorelative ways of dealing with cultural differences?</td>
<td><em>Quantitative Analysis</em> Descriptive Statistics, Frequencies, Pearson’s Correlations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which student background characteristics, levels of institutional structural diversity, and collegiate experiences with diverse others predict college students’ IDI scores? That is, which background characteristics and collegiate experiences with diverse others are most influential in predicting college students’ IDI scores?</td>
<td><em>Quantitative Analysis</em> Pearson’s Correlations, Ordinary Least Squares Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When college students select and describe their own significant collegiate experiences, how do they understand, interpret, and make meaning of such experiences that are intercultural in nature?</td>
<td><em>Qualitative Analysis</em> Self-Authorship Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are college students’ interpretations of these experiences related to their background characteristics or to given types of college diversity experiences?</td>
<td><em>Qualitative Analysis</em> Content Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Do students’ interpretations of these experiences differ by whether they use ethnocentric or ethnorelative ways of dealing with cultural differences (as measured by their scores on the IDI)? | **Triangulation Analysis**  
Hi/Low IDI and Meaning Making about Intercultural Developmental Experiences |
Participation in Collegiate Diversity Experiences

• Diversity Courses
• Racial/Ethnic or Cultural Awareness Workshops
• Service Learning
• Education Abroad
• Intergroup Dialogues
• Informal Diversity Interactions

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS (N=47)

Figure 3.5: Analytic Framework for Studying Background Characteristics and Collegiate Experiences that Affect How College Students Develop Intercultural Effectiveness
Limitations

As with all research, there are limitations to the conclusions and generalizations that can be drawn from this study. First, the data that inform this study were drawn from a pilot study of the Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education and the four study institutions were convenience sampled for their physical proximity to the research team. For this reason, two of the institutions were not only located in close physical propinquity to the research team, they also drew most of their students from the same racially homogenous local and regional vicinity. This sampling strategy may have produced less variability in response patterns than if all of the institutions were more geographically diverse relative to one another.

Next, while the institutions that participated in this study vary in terms of structural diversity, they are all predominantly White institutions. Even though underrepresented minority groups were over-sampled when the assessment sample was pulled at individual institutions, the assessment sample is unfortunately not large enough to perform meaningful within group analyses, especially in the quantitative phase. This is unfortunate and underscores the fact that over-sampling alone is not enough to assure that the perspectives of students of color are taken into account in higher education research.

This study is also somewhat limited by the fact that the survey instruments were designed to capture a broad range of collegiate experiences rather than focus specifically on students’ diversity experiences. For example, there were no specific items that measured students’ participation in intergroup dialogue experiences, white privilege or social justice awareness workshops, or other specifically designed diversity experiences. Thus, these specific types of diversity experiences are not included in my statistical
models and qualitative analyses, despite the growing body of research that documents their positive effect on student diversity outcomes.

Next, the WNSLAE Interview was not designed primarily for the purpose of assessing which collegiate experiences affect and promote intercultural development. Rather, the purpose of the interview was to trace how students develop on seven liberal arts outcomes and to assess meaning making and the self-authorship journey. While intercultural effectiveness of one of the outcomes of interest, the interview itself is organized to encourage interviewees to select those experiences that are most meaningful. Further, the protocol that guides the interview “is organized to ‘trigger’ responses relevant to [the study’s] overarching purpose but does not contain a structured set of questions for each outcome” (Baxter Magolda & King, 2006, p. 18). Thus, some interviews contained a wealth of data about particular collegiate diversity experiences and others contain very little, if any, data relevant to this outcome.

Additionally, the quality of the interview data was dependent on a number of factors such as the level of rapport between interviewer and interviewee, the interviewee’s willingness to self-disclose about difficult or sensitive issues, his or her ability to describe and make meaning about selected experiences in situ, and the interviewer’s proficiency at formulating the types of carefully constructed probe and follow-up questions that stimulate meaning making, and the social identity (e.g., gender, race, ethnicity, age) of the interviewer relative to the interviewee. In at least one case, the interviewee remarked that her comments were shaped by the fact that she and the interviewer were of the same race and that had this not been the case, she would have responded differently.
Finally, this is a cross-sectional study. As such, it is not possible to make causal inferences about development or other changes over time from the data. For example, it’s not possible to attribute gains on diversity outcomes to participation in collegiate diversity experiences, such as whether participation in a diversity course as a first year student has a lasting impact on how a graduating senior makes meaning about intercultural issues. However, the data for this study do provide a rich developmental snapshot of students’ collegiate diversity experiences across class levels in a way that will improve our understanding of the mechanisms associated with intercultural development.

Summary

In this chapter I presented the methodology that has been used to investigate what background characteristics and higher education experiences affect how college students develop intercultural effectiveness. By elaborating upon the central research question presented in Chapter One, noting the sub-questions that are the focus of this study, and offering an overview of mixed methods research and the rationale for its use in this study, I have framed the introduction of the data collection methods, sample, and instrumentation used in this study. Finally, by outlining the methodological limitations, I have laid the groundwork for the presentation of results in Chapters Four through Six and a discussion of findings in Chapter Seven.
CHAPTER 4

QUANTITATIVE PHASE RESULTS

In Chapter Two, a conceptual framework was presented to examine the student background characteristics and collegiate experiences associated with promoting intercultural development. This framework was constructed by drawing upon the research and theory of college student development and intercultural communication scholars whose work informed the literature review for this study. The framework (see Figure 2.4) posits that student background characteristics, institutional structural diversity, participation in collegiate diversity experiences, and how students make meaning about their intercultural interactions shape intercultural development. This chapter presents the results from quantitative analyses designed to answer the question: What background characteristics and higher education experiences affect how college students develop intercultural effectiveness? Specifically, this section will respond to the following research sub-questions:

1. What kinds of intercultural experiences do college students report on the diversity experiences survey, and how are these experiences related to the way students deal with cultural differences (as measured by their IDI scores)? For example, which collegiate diversity experiences correspond with ethnocentric and ethnorelative ways of dealing with cultural differences?

2. Which student background characteristics, levels of institutional structural diversity, and collegiate experiences with diverse others predict college students’ IDI scores? Moreover, are certain background characteristics or certain kinds of collegiate experiences with diverse others more influential than others in predicting college students’ IDI scores?
First, I present findings related to the frequency of students’ participation in collegiate diversity experiences as measured by their responses to the college experiences questionnaire. Next, I examine students’ IDI scores by background characteristics that correspond with the study’s analytic framework (see Figure 3.5). I then examine the relationships between the independent variables and IDI developmental score (see Table 3.4). Finally, I report regression results that identify factors affecting IDI developmental score.

**Frequency of Participation in Collegiate Diversity Experiences**

In spite of an increase in the numbers of diversity courses offered nationwide (Humphreys, 1997, 2000), a substantial number of students in the sample reported having taken no diversity courses (see Table 4.1). Diversity courses are defined as courses that focus on diverse cultures and perspectives, women’s and gender issues, and courses on equality and social justice, and courses with a community service component. The proportion of students reporting no such enrollment in this sample was 57%, 83%, and 65%, and 76%, respectively. For students who reported having enrolled in one diversity course, nearly twice as many students reported enrolling in a diversity course about diverse cultures and perspectives (29%) and those concerned with issues of equality and social justice (26%) than courses concerned with women’s and gender issues (14%) and those courses with a community service component (16%). Across all types of diversity courses, one fifth of respondents reported having taking two such courses, the most frequent of which were courses on diverse cultures and perspectives (10%).

Attending a racial or cultural awareness workshop during the academic year and participating in study abroad for academic credit were the least frequently reported types
of collegiate diversity experiences. One in four students (25%) reported having participated in a racial/cultural awareness workshop during the academic year. Only 6% of students reported having participated in study abroad for academic credit. Given the financial limitations often involved with participation in education abroad, it is not surprising that few students reported participation. However, many institutions offer students a number of opportunities for participation in racial and cultural awareness workshops. For this reason, it is interesting that more students didn’t report participation in this type of collegiate diversity experience.

Given the response rates above, a number of noteworthy patterns deserve mention. First, enrollment in courses with a community service component was reported more frequently (76%) than enrollment in courses that focused on issues of equality and social justice (65%). This finding is interesting because courses with a community service component are not “traditional” pedagogy, but the fact that students report enrollment in them could be a reflection of greater intentionality by institutions to introduce their students to experiences outside of the campus environment. Certainly, not all service learning experiences are targeted toward diversity issues. However, given that these findings reflect the diversity experiences of students at predominately White institutions, community service experiences could be particularly beneficial to students’ intercultural development. On the other hand, the fact that few students reported participation in racial/cultural awareness workshops (88% never or rarely participated) or courses about equality and social justice issues (91% took one course or fewer) could reflect a lack of exposure to issues of racial privilege and oppression and its effect on minority group members at these predominately White institutions.
In terms of students’ level of participation in informal collegiate diversity experiences (see Table 4.1), 41% of students reported having “serious conversations with someone with a different race/ethnicity” very often or often, while 29% reported doing so rarely or never. Over half of students reported making friends with a student of another race very often or often (59%); 15% of respondents reported make friends with students of another race rarely or never. In terms of making friends with a student from another country, 42% of students reported doing so often or very often, while 31% of students reported doing so rarely or never. When asked to rate the frequency with which they had encountered diverse perspectives around campus, 37% of students noted that they had done so often or very often, while 33% had encountered such perspectives rarely or never. Also, among informal interactions, 15% of students said that they had discussions with someone of another race regarding intergroup relations very often (5%) or often (10%), and 25% indicated that they had such discussions sometimes. Fully 60% of students reported that they had rarely or never discussed intergroup relations with someone of another race. In terms of discussing problems or feelings with someone of another race, 33% of respondents indicated that they did so often or very often, while 37% did so rarely or never.

These findings are provocative because not only do they suggest that college students who attend the same institution have very different experiences relative to forming friendships with diverse others, they also suggest that the extent to which students perceive the presence of diverse perspectives varies. The relatively high frequency with which students had serious conversations with individuals from a different race or ethnicity (41% said often or very often) and the frequency with which
they made friends with a student of another race or from another country (59% and 42% said often or very often, respectively) is noteworthy because it suggests that many students are actively engaging across difference even when their institutions are predominately White. At the same time, the fact that 60% of students reported that they had rarely or never discussed intergroup relations with someone of another race calls into question the nature of students’ engagement across difference. In other words, if students report having diverse friends but also report that they are not having discussions about complex topics such as intergroup relations, it is possible that they are not taking advantage of the unique opportunity for intercultural learning that such friendships offer. Finally, in terms of frequency of exposure to diverse perspectives on campus, there was a bifurcated response pattern with about one third of students reporting doing so often or very often and one third reporting rarely or never. This suggests a lack of uniformity in the way students experience the campus environment vis-à-vis diverse perspectives: different students at the same institution appear to attend to very different environmental cues relative to campus diversity.
Table 4.1: Frequency (by percent) of Participation in Collegiate Diversity Experiences (N=600)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity Experience</th>
<th>Number of Courses Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses on diverse cultures/perspectives</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses on women’s/gender issues</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses on equality and social justice</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses with a community service component</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Frequency of Attendance/Participation                      |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
|                                                            |  Never | Rarely | Occasionally | Often | Very Often |
| Attending racial/cultural awareness workshop in the academic year | 74.5% | 13.2% | 8.7% | 2.8% | .7% |
| Participated in study abroad program for credit          | 6.4%      | 93.0%   |
|                                                            |  Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Very Often |
| Had serious conversations with someone with a different race/ethnicity | 10.1% | 19.1% | 30.2% | 21.9% | 18.8% |
| Made friends with a student of another race              | 4.2%      | 10.6%   | 26.5%   | 27.6%  | 31.2%     |
| Made friends with a student from another country         | 12.4%     | 18.9%   | 27.1%   | 21.1%  | 20.4%     |
| Encountered diverse perspectives around campus           | 9.7%      | 23.5%   | 29.8%   | 24.5%  | 12.6%     |
| Had discussions with someone of another race regarding intergroup relations | 24.5% | 35.5% | 25.0% | 10.1% | 5.0% |
| Discussed problems or feelings with someone of another race | 15.1% | 22.1% | 30.0% | 21.6% | 11.2% |

IDI Developmental Scores and Selected Background Characteristics

In this section, findings related to the connection between students’ IDI developmental scores and selected student background characteristics are highlighted; see Table 4.2 for a breakdown of IDI scores by gender, race, and class year. Differences were
found by gender, race, and class level. Women scored significantly higher on the Intercultural Development Inventory than did men (M = 91.75 vs. M = 86.54), t(595) = 4.20, p < .001. This finding may reflect differences in socialization patterns that disparately encourage women more so than men to be sensitive, receptive, and empathetic. There was also a trend towards students of color scoring higher than White students on the IDI (M = 91.59 vs. M = 89.46; see Table 4.2), t(591) = 1.31, ns.

In addition, the mean IDI score for college seniors (M = 93.13) was higher than that for any other class level. This may reflect that fact that class year is related to additional exposure to collegiate influences. The scores of the seniors were significantly higher than the scores for the other three class levels. In order to ascertain whether the small decline in the scores of the sophomore students was related to the large number of community college students in the sophomore sample, this analysis was run excluding the community college students. This yielded the same pattern, suggesting that this drop occurred among sophomores in general, and was not attributable to the sophomores at the community college.
Table 4.2: IDI Developmental Scores by Selected Student Background Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86.54</td>
<td>14.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>91.75</td>
<td>14.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student of Color</td>
<td>91.59</td>
<td>16.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>89.46</td>
<td>14.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year (n=198)</td>
<td>89.70_{a,b}</td>
<td>15.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore (n=182)</td>
<td>88.60_{a}</td>
<td>14.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior (n=110)</td>
<td>89.73_{a,b}</td>
<td>15.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior (n=110)</td>
<td>93.13_{b}</td>
<td>13.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_{a,b} Common subscripts denote not significantly different from one another but significantly different than class year without the same subscript, $p<.10$

**Correlations**

A Pearson product-moment correlation was used to examine the relationships among the selected student background characteristics, measures of structural diversity, collegiate diversity experiences, and the outcome variable of interest, IDI developmental score (See Table 4.3). Most correlations between IDI developmental score and student characteristics were not significant. Specifically, IDI developmental score was not significantly related to race (White vs. Non-White), class year, age, high school GPA, or whether the racial/ethnic composition of one’s high school was different than one’s own racial/ethnic background. However, four of these correlations with the IDI were significant: gender, courses with a community service component, the diversity-related courses scale, and whether students reported a developmentally effective intercultural experience (DEIE). The IDI developmental score was most strongly correlated with gender, where women scored higher than men ($r = -.169, p < .001$), followed by number
of courses with a community service component ($r = .126, p < .01$), the intercultural effect variable ($r = .103, p < .01$), and number of diversity courses taken ($r = .087, p < .05$). It may be that women entered college with higher IDI scores, or engaged differently with their collegiate experiences, and therefore got more out of them that affected their intercultural effectiveness. They also corroborate the growing body of empirical research that attests to the power of service learning opportunities for promoting intercultural effectiveness. Further, these findings provide support for meaning making about one’s intercultural experiences as a factor that contributes to intercultural development.

Although IDI developmental scores were positively correlated to the number of diversity related courses taken, the correlation was small but significant ($r = .087, p < .05$). This suggests that diversity course enrollment is not by itself sufficient for promoting intercultural development. Rather, as with the finding on community service participation, additional interactions with diverse others outside of the protective campus “bubble” could prove more effective in fostering intercultural development. Such experiential learning opportunities involve some level of uncertainty because of the nature of the interacting with individuals who are not a part of the campus community (e.g., students, faculty, and staff) or established social networks (e.g., family and friends). Further, given that these community services experiences are explicitly linked with course enrollment (e.g., “courses that had a community service component connected to class work”), the nature of the experience is likely linked to intercultural development because of the support-challenge tasks that are required of students who participate in them. In the next section, I further explore the role that student background
characteristics, institutional structural diversity, participation in collegiate diversity experiences, and meaning making play in intercultural development.

Table 4.3: Correlations between IDI Developmental Score and Independent Variables: Student Background Characteristics, Structural Diversity, Diversity Related Experiences and Courses, and Intercultural Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>IDI Developmental Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Background Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (0=Female, 1=Male)</td>
<td>-.169***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in 2005</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/NonWhite (0=NonWhite, 1=White)</td>
<td>-.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td>-.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Year</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic Composition of HS Compared to Self</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Structural Diversity</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiate Diversity Experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad for academic credit</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses with a community service component</td>
<td>.126**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending racial/cultural workshop</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Diversity Interactions Scale</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Diversity Interactions Scale</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity-Related Courses Scale</td>
<td>.087*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Effect (Meaning Making about Intercultural Experiences)</td>
<td>.103**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05, **p ≤ .01, ***p ≤ .001 (2-tailed).

Regression Analyses

In this section, findings for the OLS multiple regression analyses are described and discussed. This analysis was conducted in order to answer the following sub-questions: Which student background characteristics, levels of collegiate structural diversity, and collegiate experiences with diverse others predict college students’ IDI scores? And, are certain background characteristics or certain kinds of collegiate experiences with diverse others more influential than others in predicting college
students’ IDI scores? In order to investigate whether there are differences between White
students and students of color relative to intercultural development, the regression
analysis was also run by race (e.g., White students and students of color). Results of the
regression analyses in four blocks are provided in Tables 4.4 through 4.6 (the three tables
present the regression analysis results for the Assessment Sample, White students only,
and students of color only, respectively).

*Student Background Characteristics*

Block 1 of the OLS multiple regression model examined the relationship between
student background characteristics and IDI developmental score. This model predicted
5% of the variance in IDI developmental scores for the assessment sample \(r^2 = .049, p \leq
.001\). High school GPA and class year were significant \(p \leq .05\), with gender having the
strongest and most significant relationship \((\beta = -.162, p \leq .001)\) with IDI score.
Specifically, women were more likely than men to have higher IDI developmental scores,
individuals with higher high school GPA’s tended to score lower on the IDI, and upper
level students tended to score higher than lower level students (e.g., college seniors
tended to score higher on the IDI than first-year students). As shown in Table 4.4, age,
race, and similarity of the racial composition of one’s high school to oneself were *not*
statistically significant in this model.

As noted previously, women may score higher than men on the IDI due to
differential socialization patterns that privilege interpersonal and communication skill
development and thereby contribute to enhanced intercultural development. The finding
that class year is linked to higher IDI scores is likely related to the broader educational
impact of the collegiate experience: as students acquire more intercultural experiences,
intercultural sensitivity increases. The finding that students with higher high school GPA’s tended to perform less well on the IDI is perplexing but may be partially explained by segregated educational practices (Kozol, 2005) in which high performing students have less experience interacting with diverse peers and therefore less opportunity to practice and develop intercultural competencies.

In order to explore whether there were differential effects of background characteristics on the intercultural development of White students and students of color, the same Block 1 regression analysis was conducted for each group. For White students, the same pattern of results found in the aggregated analysis was obtained here: the three independent variables (gender, high school GPA, and class year) remained significant (see Table 4.5). By contrast, for students of color, none of the Block 1 student characteristics variables were significant, likely due to the small size of the sub-group, as shown in Table 4.6.

*Structural Diversity*

In Block 2, undergraduate structural diversity was added to the regression analysis (Table 4.4). The same demographic measures remained significant as in Block 1 (i.e., gender, high school GPA, and class year). The overall variance of IDI developmental scores predicted by Model 2 did not change with the addition of the structural diversity variable ($r^2 = .050$ for both). This finding suggests that by itself, the numerical representation of racial/ethnic diversity within the undergraduate student body does not enhance students’ intercultural development. Accordingly, it was important to examine the referent for evaluating structural diversity, including both the perspective of strict numerical representation and the perspective of whether one’s own background is
dominant in that institution. In order to determine whether the structural diversity of one’s institution relative to one’s oneself had a differential effect on the intercultural development of White students and students of color, the analyses were conducted separately for each group (see Table 4.5). As with Model 1, there were not significant differences between the assessment sample and White sample (e.g., gender, high school GPA, and class year remained significant). Similarly, for the non-White group, no student background variables were significant. Again, it is assumed that this is a function of the small size of the sub-group.

**Collegiate Diversity Experiences**

In the third model, six collegiate diversity experience measures were introduced into the regression, and this yielded a modest increase (from 5% to 7%) in the variance explained ($r^2 = .073, p \leq .001$). Only gender ($\beta = -.143, p \leq .001$) and high school GPA ($\beta = -.130, p \leq .01$) remained significant predictors of IDI performance. For the first time, class year was not significant. This finding is noteworthy because it suggests that collegiate diversity experiences, not class year, are driving intercultural development. In other words, all things being equal, once diversity experiences are added to the model, development once associated with class year is suppressed by the addition of collegiate diversity experiences.

In this model, level of structural diversity remained insignificant. Of the collegiate diversity experiences and scales introduced into this model, two were significant at the .05 level. Participation in courses with a community service component had a significant and positive relationship with IDI developmental score ($\beta = .100, p \leq .05$). The frequency of negative diversity interactions scale (five items related to intercultural interactions
characterized by students as tense, hostile, hurtful, insulting, or unresolved) was also significant ($\beta = .093, p \leq .05$).

Considered together, these results suggest that participation in diversity-related courses or workshops is not by itself enough to promote intercultural development in college students. Rather, some combination of meaningful engagement with diverse others such as through community service explicitly connected to coursework, and an accompanying uncomfortable emotional response (such as discomfort, feeling tense, silenced, guarded, or even hurt) were associated with higher IDI developmental scores.

These regressions were also run separately by race. The White student sub-group regression analysis for this block produced some provocative results relative to the similarity of one’s high school racial composition to oneself measure and the diversity-related courses measure (see Table 4.5). In this model, similarity of one’s high school racial composition to oneself and enrollment in diversity-related courses were found to be significant predictors of intercultural development ($\beta = .097, p \leq .05$ and $\beta = .099, p \leq .05$, respectively); both types of experiences played a role in predicting intercultural development of White students, as measured by the IDI. This was not the case in the sub-group regression analysis, suggesting differential effects of high school racial composition and diversity course enrollment for White students than for students of color. As majority group members, White students may benefit more from pre-college exposure to diverse others and diversity course enrollment once in college because of the ways in which both experiences challenge assumptions about majority group status.
Intercultural Effect: Meaning Making about Intercultural Experiences

The final block of the regression analysis examined the impact of students’ Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experiences (DEIE’s) on intercultural development. In other words, this block was designed to investigate whether there was a difference between students who reported having a DEIE in their interviews and those who did not participate in the interviews, or who did but for whom a DEIE was not identified. For the assessment sample, gender and high school GPA remained significant. As with the previous model, however, class year was not significant, suggesting that collegiate diversity experiences suppress what at first appeared to be the influence of class year on intercultural development. Participation in a course with a community service component and reporting negative responses to a diversity interaction remained statistically significant. Not only was having reported a DEIE statistically significant ($\beta = .081, p \leq .05$) in this model, doing so also increased the overall variance explained (from .073 to .079). Considering that only 47 of 600 study participants were included in the DEIE sample, this finding suggests that the practice of thinking critically about one’s intercultural experiences (e.g., their impact on how one makes sense of the world, one’s relationships, and one’s own identity) is linked with intercultural development. Similar variance gains were reported in both the White and non-White sub-group analyses, although neither was significant (see Tables 4.5 and 4.6)

Discussion

Students enter college with a wide range of skills and prior experiences, and the same experiences have different effects on students depending on readiness, interest, and developmental level (Baxter Magolda et. al, 2007). Nonetheless, if students don’t have
collegiate diversity experiences, they will not reap the benefits. It is therefore telling that
the students in this study (whether first years or seniors) reported having participated in
an average of only about one formal collegiate diversity experience. Next, this study
found that, in most cases, neither the racial composition of students’ high schools nor the
percentage of an institution’s structural diversity were strong predictor of students’
intercultural development. Despite the fact that the range for the percentage of
undergraduate minorities enrolled at the four institutions was relatively large (from
10.5% to 34.9%), it is important to reiterate that there are only four institutions in the
sample. Accordingly, the finding about the non-significant role of structural diversity in
predicting intercultural development should not be overstated. Nonetheless, it would
seem logical that structural diversity alone does not promote this kind of development
(cf. Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002). Rather, further exploration of mediating
factors such as the nature of meaningful interactions across difference in both formal and
informal contexts (and the likelihood that some of these meaningful interactions “feel”
uncomfortable for students) is needed.

This analysis also found that courses with a community service component were
particularly effective in promoting intercultural development, as were experiences in
which students who interacted with diverse others noted an uncomfortable emotional
response. Both findings suggest that intercultural development is promoted when
students’ familiar ways of thinking, acting, and responding were disrupted. For White
students, especially, pre-college exposure to diverse others and enrollment in diversity-
related courses in college appears to foster development by introducing them to other
forms of diversity. The notion that development is fostered by some combination of
challenge and support is well-documented in the college student development literature (cf. Strange, 1994). The above findings seem to further endorse and corroborate the role of engaging college students in challenging, yet supportive, experiences across difference as a means of fostering intercultural development, as well as the importance of careful reflection upon these experiences. Given the collegiate context, curricular support in the form of widespread and intentional service learning and community service course offerings and co-curricular support in the form of a campus environment that actively promotes engagement across difference and intentional reflection activities would appear to be especially important for fostering intercultural development.

The linear regression in four blocks predicted 8% of the variance on the outcome variable of intercultural effectiveness. However, given the study’s cross-sectional design and concomitant lack of a pretest, it is not entirely unexpected. It is possible that the model’s explanatory power would have been greater had there been more variance in students’ pre-college experiences with diversity, a wider range of ages represented in the sample, and a broader range of scores on the Intercultural Development Inventory.

In the next chapter, I approach the data from a qualitative perspective in order to further illuminate the quantitative results presented here. By “drilling down” through individual level interview data, it is anticipated that a more nuanced understanding of students’ intercultural development in relation to their background characteristics, institutional structural diversity, and engagement in collegiate diversity experiences will emerge.
Table 4.4: Effects of Student Background Characteristics, Structural Diversity, and College Diversity Experiences on IDI Developmental Score for the Assessment Sample (n=600)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Block 1: Student Background Characteristics</th>
<th>Block 2: Structural Diversity</th>
<th>Block 3: Collegiate Diversity Experiences</th>
<th>Block 4: Intercultural Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-.162***</td>
<td>-.163***</td>
<td>-.143***</td>
<td>-.137***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in 2005</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td>-.113*</td>
<td>-.115**</td>
<td>-.130**</td>
<td>-.131**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Year</td>
<td>.097*</td>
<td>.097*</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity of High School Racial Composition to Oneself</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad for Academic Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses with a Community Service Component</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending a Racial/Cultural Awareness Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Diversity Experiences Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Diversity Experiences Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity-Related Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.081*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Block 1</th>
<th>Block 2</th>
<th>Block 3</th>
<th>Block 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.049***</td>
<td>.049***</td>
<td>.073***</td>
<td>.079***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in R²</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p≤.05, **p≤.01, ***p≤.001

Note: All coefficients are standardized Betas
Table 4.5: Effects of Student Background Characteristics, Structural Diversity, and College Diversity Experiences on IDI Developmental Score for White Students (n=476)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Block 1: Student Background Characteristics</th>
<th>Block 2: Structural Diversity</th>
<th>Block 3: Collegiate Diversity Experiences</th>
<th>Block 4: Intercultural Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-.168***</td>
<td>-.170***</td>
<td>-.152***</td>
<td>-.147***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in 2005</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td>-.100*</td>
<td>-.103*</td>
<td>-.133**</td>
<td>-.133**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Year</td>
<td>.111*</td>
<td>.113*</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity of High School Racial Composition to Oneself</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.097*</td>
<td>.097*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad for Academic Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses with a Community Service Component</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.101*</td>
<td>.102*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending a Racial/Cultural Awareness Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Diversity Experiences Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Diversity Experiences Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity-Related Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.099*</td>
<td>.097*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| R²                                                        | .054***                                     | .054***                      | .090***                                  | .097***                      |
| Change in R²                                              | .054                                       | .000                         | .036                                     | .007                         |

*p ≤ .05, **p ≤ .01, ***p ≤ .001

*Note: All coefficients are standardized Betas*
Table 4.6: Effects of Student Background Characteristics, Structural Diversity, and College Diversity Experiences on IDI Developmental Score for Students of Color (n=117)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Block 1: Student Background Characteristics</th>
<th>Block 2: Structural Diversity</th>
<th>Block 3: Collegiate Diversity Experiences</th>
<th>Block 4: Intercultural Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>-.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in 2005</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>-.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>-.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Year</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity of High School Racial Composition to Oneself</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Diversity</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad for Academic Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses with a Community Service Component</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending a Racial/Cultural Awareness Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Diversity Experiences Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>-.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Diversity Experiences Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity-Related Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Change in R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block 1</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 2</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 3</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 4</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p≤.05, **p≤.01, ***p≤.001

Note: All coefficients are standardized Betas
CHAPTER 5

QUALITATIVE RESULTS: HOW COLLEGE STUDENTS MAKE SENSE OF THEIR INTERCULTURAL INTERACTIONS

Chapter Four presented the quantitative results of this mixed methods examination of college students’ intercultural development. In this chapter, I present qualitative findings related to how college students make sense of their intercultural experiences. More specifically, I will be addressing those elements of the conceptual framework (Figure 2.4) associated with students’ meaning making constructions surrounding their collegiate diversity experiences by responding to the following research sub-questions:

6. When college students select and describe their own significant collegiate experiences, how do they understand, interpret, and make meaning of such experiences that are intercultural in nature?

7. Are college students’ interpretations of these experiences related to their background characteristics or to given types of college diversity experiences?

In order to respond to the above questions, I first reviewed all developmentally effective experiences reported by the 174 students who participated in the interview component of the WNSLAE study in order to select those developmental experiences that were intercultural in nature (see Chapter Three for a description of the WNSLAE interview sample). As noted earlier, intercultural developmental experiences are defined as collegiate and life experiences that center around interactions with culturally, racially, and/or ethnically diverse others or associated ideas and knowledge and that have an
articulated impact on students’ learning and development in one or more of the three dimensions. A total of 47 students reported developmentally effective experiences that were intercultural in nature. Because two students reported more than one developmentally effective intercultural experience, the total of number of experiences were identified among the 47 students is 49. Students’ descriptions of these experiences comprise the data analyzed for the research sub-questions identified above.

It’s important to note here that not every intercultural experience that students reported as significant rose to the level of developmentally effective intercultural experience. For example, if a student indicated that having an international roommate was his or her most significant college experience but did not offer evidence that the experience contributed to developmental growth in any of the three dimensions, the experience did not meet the criteria for inclusion in this study. Moreover, if the extent of a student’s narrative included only general descriptors such as “cool,” “great,” and “interesting,” the experience – at least as described to the interviewer – did not meet the minimum criteria for inclusion in this study.

Tables 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 provide an overview of the developmentally effective intercultural experiences identified by students in the Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experiences Sample by offering the pseudonym of each student along a brief description of the student-identified intercultural experience that was coded as developmentally effective, and a note about its developmental impact. Each table reflects a specific developmental meaning making orientation (e.g., external, mixed, early internal). As noted previously, the DEIE sample is primarily divided between first year students and seniors (43% vs. 51%) with three sophomores (6%). The sample is skewed
by gender with 36 females (77%) and 11 (23%) males. In terms of racial composition, 75% of students identified as White and 25% as non-White (see Table 3.3).

Meaning Making about Intercultural Experiences

In order to evaluate students’ meaning making about their intercultural experiences, the DEIE sample was separated into three groups corresponding with the developmental meaning making assessment assigned to each interview summary (i.e., external, mixed, internal; see Chapter Three for a description of this process). In terms of primary meaning making orientation across all three developmental domains (cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal), 21 (45%) students exhibited external meaning making, 20 (43%) mixed, and 6 (13%) early internal.

Each group of the summaries was then reviewed in order to gain a sense of how students in each of the three groups interpreted their intercultural interactions. Despite the wide range of self-selected developmentally effective intercultural experiences identified by students, a number of trends emerged among the descriptions; these are discussed below. In the following sections, content rich examples are provided to show how students at different self-authorship levels made meaning about their intercultural experiences. The examples were selected because, considered together, they provide sufficient detail and contextual information to illustrate the differences in meaning making orientation among the three groups.

In the following section, a brief description of external meaning making orientation is provided, followed by a number of content rich examples and associated analysis. The section concludes with a summary of how students with an external meaning making orientation made meaning about their intercultural experiences.
External Orientations toward Intercultural Experiences

Externally defined individuals rely on outside sources and authorities for understanding the foundation of their identity, their interactions and relationships with others, and how they understand the basis for their beliefs and belief systems. They are also likely to see complex issues in black and white terms, categorize differing knowledge claims as right and wrong, rely upon external sources for interpreting their experiences and interactions, and defer to similar others for social affirmation (Baxter Magolda, 2001; Kegan, 1994). The following examples illustrate how students who used an external meaning making orientation interpreted their intercultural experiences (see Table 5.1).

Faith, a first year student from a racially homogenous African American community, described the experience of being the only African American student in her English class. In the excerpt below, she notes how her initial feeling of fear was quickly replaced by a feeling of comfort and openness:

Faith: My first year here, I can say that in my English class I was the only African American in there. But surprising to me, I felt so comfortable in the class. It’s like, everybody treated me so good that it was like, okay. My first day I was kind of scared. My second day, I was like, “Oh, forget this [fear]. I love this class.” I mean, it’s like, the kids are, the students around me, they used to talk to me like it was nothing… they were so open about what they talked about that I didn’t have the choice but to be open about what I wanted to talk about, so. It’s like, I mean, we talked about [everything] from politics to race. If we felt a certain way, we just expressed it.

As this quote illustrates, Faith followed the lead of her peers in how she engaged with the class (e.g., “they were so open … that I didn’t have the choice but to be open”). As an African American student who operated from an external meaning making orientation,
Faith found the intercultural interactions she had with her White peers to be positive because their openness enabled her to be open.

In the next quote, Linda, a White senior, describes her most significant collegiate experience: traveling to Mexico for nine days (“I” indicates Interviewer).

Linda: It really opened my eyes to a completely different culture, everyone down there was genuine and very open to, I don’t know if it was American influence or just our way of thinking, ‘cause everybody came up to me and say “How do you say this?” They’d ask me in Spanish and I’d tell them in English. And just being able to integrate myself with a different culture and see what they see or act how they act is something that’s just, I don’t know if it would be a culture shock but it’s just mind boggling in a way. ‘Cause you’re not, in the United States you’re not really influenced by any other culture. I mean, you have segregated ones [in some places] where nobody either goes or they stay on their side of town. And [in Mexico], it’s just everywhere.

I: You mentioned that you found the people in Mexico to be really genuine. I’m wondering if you could tell me how you define that?

Linda: Um, well they were very friendly. Everybody would say “Hello,” “How are you doing,” “Have a great day.” They didn’t look down upon us in any form or fashion because of what we were wearing or because we could only speak English or could only speak Spanish and even though they got frustrated with us they were still nice.

I: And for you that’s different?

Linda: Yeah that’s definitely different especially in the United States, walking around here, people are kinda grumpy and most of the time not very nice and nobody smiles anymore, or says “Have a great day,” you know, or “Thank you,” thank you is a great thing, or turning on a blinker, that’s even a better thing. In Mexico, they keep their blinker on if they want to stay in the left lane and keep on going. But here ah-uh [signifying no]. And I didn’t even see a single wreck in Mexico, not one.

As this excerpt illustrates, traveling to Mexico was an eye opening and surprising experience for Linda because, for the first time, she was immersed in a different cultural environment. She alludes to the fact that in the U.S. she can choose not to interact with different others (e.g., those who “stay on their side of town”); in Mexico she had no
choice but to be influenced by another culture. She makes meaning about the many differences she observed in black and white terms. For example, she judges Mexican culture positively and her own culture negatively (e.g., Mexicans are genuine, friendly, and open; Americans are closed, grumpy, and judgmental). This dichotomous thinking reflects a cognitively simple orientation because Linda leaves little room for other, more nuanced interpretations of others or of her experiences, both in the U.S. and in Mexico. She does not consider alternative explanations for what she has witnessed, opting instead to apply a Pollyanna-like perspective to her experience.

The intercultural experience of having a Swedish roommate as a sophomore was highly significant for Kelly, a bi-racial (White and Latina) senior. She noted that she is typically resistant to learning about other cultures and to having different others “force” their cultures on her because she doesn’t care if they know her culture:

Kelly: I don’t wanna sound racist or anything ‘cause I’m not, but it’s… people forcing their cultures on me. I don’t care. Ya know, I’m glad that you’re Chinese but you don’t have to tell me about it ‘cause I’m not gonna tell you about it. I think that’s why I’d be so bad in politics is ‘cause I could care less what you think. And I’m not gonna tell you what I think. So let’s move on.

This comment illustrates how Kelly thinks about culturally different others: she is uninterested and therefore lacks the patience to hear others’ perspectives or to share her own. Fortunately, this perspective changed when she was assigned a Swedish roommate her sophomore year. Kelly notes that she “always cares” what others think and so she was motivated to meet others’ expectations by taking on the role of host and tour guide (e.g., “I felt like I had to…”) by introducing her new roommate to the college and “what to do, what not to do, who to stay away from.” Kelly’s external meaning making orientation about the intercultural experience is also illustrated in the following excerpt:
I: How do you think your relationship with [your Swedish roommate] has changed you?

Kelly: She definitely brought out a… thrill-seeking side of me because she would, she really didn’t care what anyone thought and I always care what people think. She walked around campus wearing the weirdest stuff. And in Sweden it was cool but here was just like, are you kidding me? Ya know and she didn’t care. She was comfortable. She was used to doing it. And it was just like ya know, this is really cool. It was that cool thing again. She was cool and I was like “and I’m her roommate and that’s cool.”

Rather than avoid her carefree roommate who wore “weird” clothes, Kelly began to define herself through association with her, noting the benefits of the relationship in a self-serving way (being considered cool by merit of being her roommate). Nonetheless, she became more interested in and aware of cultural differences, and she expanded the stated boundaries of her comfort zone. Interestingly, Kelly later ventured abroad to visit her former roommate in Sweden.

A third example of how a student with an external orientation made meaning about her intercultural interactions is provided in comments made by Nikki, a White first year student. Nikki noted that she “hated Spanish in high school,” and was resistant to participating in a collegiate Hispanic-themed learning community and its related service learning requirement. She had a change of heart after volunteering as an ESL teacher at an elementary school. She notes that she was initially “really upset” about “getting stuck” in the learning community when her first choice option of philosophy filled up. Through working with Hispanic children, she has become more sensitive to and knowledgeable about Hispanic culture:

Nikki: I feel like that’s helped me a lot because like before whenever I’d go to Wal-Mart or something at home, they’d say “all the Mexicans” and all that and that sounds really bad but- and then I came here and I learned “Hispanics” is the politically correct terms and stuff like that. Now like, I have a greater
understanding of their culture because I had to take a lot of classes about Hispanics and things like that.

Consistent with an external orientation, Nikki is concerned about learning the “correct” way to talk about culturally different others. However, she does not describe the basis for either term, which would indicate a deeper cognitive understanding. Nonetheless, she noted that one of her expectations for college was to meet a lot of “different” people and while so far she “likes” diversity, she notes a downside:

Nikki: It’s good at times and then there are times when I just wish that I could just umm have everybody the same. Like I really like diversity, but then there are times that you just want to be with people that are just like you and you can just relate to them.

As the above quotes illustrate, Nikki has not yet resolved her feelings about diversity and its value. On the one hand, she has found satisfaction meeting and interacting with different others in college and has learned important cultural knowledge from her classes and ESL volunteering. On the other hand, she admits that sometimes she wishes that everyone was “the same” as she is because it is easier for her to relate to like others. Nikki’s mixed feelings about diversity exemplify her dualistic meaning making orientation: relationships with similar others minimize ambiguity and allow her preferred worldview (e.g., those who are “like” her and those who are diverse) to remain unchallenged.

Finally, Carrie, a White senior nursing major, describes feeling enlightened by learning about different cultural practices as part of her “Cultural Aspects of Healthcare” course:

Carrie: We actually had some Jehovah Witnesses come in and explain, like, their views about not being able to take blood…we’ve talked about, um, we just read about Korean Americans and Haitian Americans, so just like their different cultures and how you can insult them just by, you know, going in and invading
their personal space, or eye contact and, just like things you would normally not think about because, you know, you’re just so used to like hugging people and, you just don’t think about. Now it’s really like opened my eyes to think like, wow.

I: So, like, where do you go with that, like, what do you?

Carrie: You’re more self-conscious, more self-aware of just, everything that you do because you don’t know how it could affect somebody else.

As this excerpt illustrates, learning about different cultural practices has helped Carrie to be a more self-aware nursing student. Rather than acting on impulse, she has begun to consider that her actions may be interpreted negatively by culturally different others. Although she doesn’t appear to have examined her assumptions about cultural behaviors and the basis for them, Carrie’s comments reflect an initial sensitivity to alternate perspectives.

As these five examples illustrate, students who operate from an external orientation share a number of similarities in the ways they made meaning about their intercultural interactions. They experienced uncertainty and a sense of discomfort at the prospect of engaging with different others and these feelings were sometimes masked by avoidance or claims of disinterest. They viewed cultural differences simplistically, tending to judge them as purely good or purely bad. They didn’t examine their own culture (beliefs, assumptions, and values) in depth and appeared to be unaware that they, too, have a culture. Students with this orientation relied upon authority such as faculty, staff, and administration for cues about how they should approach these interactions. When presented with the opportunity to engage in sustained and meaningful interactions with diverse others (e.g., Kelly with her Swedish roommates, Nikki with her ESL students), students with an external orientation began to value and defer to the intercultural knowledge of their diverse peers as that of authority.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experience(s)†</th>
<th>Developmental Effect of Intercultural Experience(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Having African American peers</td>
<td>Gained awareness of and sensitivity to diverse others' perspectives and considers them in making decisions (e.g., what rap music she will listen to in the locker room)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Being exposed to different perspectives and problem solving approaches by working with Mexican classmates on class projects</td>
<td>Began to learn about and consider others' perspectives and recognize that others' approaches might be &quot;better&quot; than her own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie</td>
<td>Learning about different cultural practices in her &quot;Cultural Aspects of Healthcare&quot; class in her nursing major</td>
<td>Became more self-aware and began to consider and be sensitive to alternate perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Volunteering for two years as an English teacher at a Latin Community center</td>
<td>Gained experience interacting with diverse others and improved her Spanish skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>(pre-college) Traveling to Switzerland with family during high school</td>
<td>Gained new perspectives that opened broadened cultural worldview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Feeling comfortable as the sole African American student in her college English class</td>
<td>Gained confidence in expressing her own ideas and opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi*</td>
<td>Working closely with an African American peer on course project</td>
<td>Began to know her peer both as an individual and as a proud representative of her racial and cultural heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilona</td>
<td>Meeting people from different countries and regions (e.g., France, Saudi Arabia, the Middle East)</td>
<td>Learned about different lifestyles and became more empathetic to diverse others' perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>Engaging with French and Indian peers about how beliefs, politics, and religion differ</td>
<td>Learned about and began to understand multiple perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenn</td>
<td>Participating in a study term in New York City exposed her to diversity and situations where she was a racial minority</td>
<td>Gained awareness about diversity and questioned racial stereotypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Taking a Middle East cultures class</td>
<td>Increased her interest in the Iraq War by learning &quot;what's going on&quot; and that it does affect her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanisha</td>
<td>Taking a &quot;Perceptions of Social Justice&quot; class that explored the Korean American experience</td>
<td>Learned historical basis of racism and a new dualism (e.g., some professors teach history &quot;as it is&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Learning about different cultural practices in her &quot;required&quot; oral communications class</td>
<td>Began to consider the multiple ways that miscommunication can occur and gained confidence interacting with diverse others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Having a Swedish roommate as a sophomore</td>
<td>Became more interested in and aware of cultural differences and expanded the stated boundaries of her interpersonal comfort zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristy</td>
<td>Learning about the life experiences of an African American peer in a small poetry class</td>
<td>Gained insights into the experience of encountering racial stereotypes as a person of color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee*</td>
<td>Participating in AIESEC, a student organization whose objective is to promote international awareness through cultural exchange</td>
<td>Connected to diverse others and received support for taking risks in meeting culturally different others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Traveling to Mexico for 9 days to visit her sister</td>
<td>Exposure to a different culture &quot;opened&quot; her eyes to different perspectives and increased her desire to have further intercultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym</td>
<td>Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experience(s)†</td>
<td>Developmental Effect of Intercultural Experience(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Befriending a Muslim woman</td>
<td>Gained exposure to a different culture and a new perspective about her own culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>Taking a &quot;Gender and Law&quot; class with African American peers</td>
<td>Exposure to diversity resulted in uncertainty and awkwardness about how to respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikki</td>
<td>Teaching English to Hispanic elementary school students</td>
<td>Gained greater cultural awareness such as learning how to be politically correct by using the term &quot;Hispanic&quot; rather than &quot;Mexican&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Living in the International House at college</td>
<td>Gained awareness of and respect for different cultural perspectives and became an ally for international students through involvement with the international student organization on campus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes international student or Green Card holder
† Multiple intercultural experiences attributed to a single student are separated by a semi-colon

**Mixed Orientations toward Intercultural Experiences**

Twenty students (43%) in the DEIE sample demonstrated a mixed meaning making orientation. That is, these students are beginning to take responsibility for making up their own minds and trusting their own judgments by taking a more active role in internally constructing their identities, their relationships, and examining the basis for their beliefs and assumptions. Students with a mixed meaning making orientation are moving forward in the journey towards self-authorship by recognizing that knowledge is not absolute but relative. They also begin to realize that relying on external definitions limits their ability to create authentic identities and relationships. And, they begin to cultivate relationships that are less focused on obtaining external approval and more focused on mutual respect and authenticity (Baxter Magolda, 2001). The following examples demonstrate how students who operate from a mixed orientation made meaning about their intercultural experiences. As with the prior set of examples, these were also selected because they are content rich exemplars that provide insight into the cognitive,
intrapersonal, and interpersonal dimensions of student meaning making around intercultural experiences (see Table 5.2).

Being exposed to a racially diverse college environment has prompted Alyssa, a White senior, to question her prior assumptions about race issues. While most people in her small, racially homogenous hometown (mostly White with some Native Americans) oppose race-conscious admissions policies, in college she has begun to explore her own beliefs and to talk with others about theirs. In the excerpt below, Alyssa responds to being asked about the impact of being exposed to racial and ethnic diversity in college:

Alyssa: Let’s see...how has it impacted me? I think, I think it’s given me a better perspective on things, in terms of like racial issues. Because like, like affirmative action is definitely like a hot button issue [at this college]... in my hometown most people disagree with it. You know, they think affirmative action is wrong; it’s bad and stuff. But here, it’s a lot more interesting to talk about it because I think I have a better appreciation for what’s actually involved. I don’t usually disagree with it as much as I did before. Like I thought I was right, but [being at college] helps me to realize that a lot of the decisions I thought I knew about, I probably didn’t know nearly so well about. Because like I’m not so sure I think it’s the worst thing, like I’m not sure that I agree with it you know, but like I definitely don’t think it should go away just yet. Or if they’re gonna take it away, that there’s something that replace it, which is like a huge change in viewpoint from where I was before. So that’s kinda of um, one way it’s impacted me about um, a better understanding of what people are going through.

As the excerpt above illustrates, Alyssa is beginning to recognize the complexity inherent in a decision to support or oppose affirmative action policies. She has begun to question affirmative action rather than simply disagree with it as she did previously (and as most individuals in her hometown continue to do). Through exposure to diverse others and their perspectives, she has acquired a more nuanced understanding of the issues involved. Furthermore, engaging in these types of discussions on a campus where the issue of affirmative action is a “hot button topic” has allowed Alyssa to explore her own perspectives.
Alyssa has experienced intercultural topics in other ways as well. As a woman in a predominately male discipline, she has found herself to be part of a minority group and has further questioned her prior assumptions about diversity issues. In the next passage, she reflects upon her earlier negative reactions to the Native American farm club in her hometown and comes to understand the role of such groups in a new way:

Alyssa: And in terms of academics like, I was, I mean I always used to hate the fact that there was like, that Native American farm club in my hometown, like Native American groups, but there’s the White group, you know it’s kinda like reverse, like a racism to some degree because you know [having a] White group is bad, you know and stuff. And now like being in just, a minority in terms of like sex in [my] department, we formed like an undergraduate women’s group. I guess I understand what [minority groups] are doing. It’s not like, not to exclude people, it’s just to help people who feel um, excluded, I mean unintentionally, like not part of things, feel more as if this is the place where they belong, you know. And so I feel like um, to some degree the [college] culture helped me modify my views.

Whereas previously Alyssa hated the idea of having minority groups in her hometown, by becoming a gender minority in her department, she came to understand the role that such organizations play and thus came to view them as a legitimate source of support for underrepresented groups. Alyssa questioned her previous unexamined assumptions about complex diversity issues. Through her interactions with diverse others and as a member of a gender minority, she began to see and accept multiple perspectives in this context.

Mia, a White first year, first-generation student describes an unsettling experience where a Nigerian friend was discriminated against on the basis of her skin color. While Mia had had previous discussions with the friend about racially motivated discriminatory behavior, she had greeted the claims with some skepticism, thinking that perhaps they were overstated. However, in a public debate prior to the 2004 presidential election, Mia’s friend was singled out and asked if she supported presidential candidate John
Kerry simply because of her race. In this excerpt, Mia describes the incident and her reaction:

Mia: They asked for a couple Republicans and a couple Democrats and why we felt the way we did. If it had to do with the health policies or things like that and [my Nigerian friend] got up and spoke on behalf of the Democrats with me and she came from a pretty poor family as well so we could kind of relate to Democrats, I think, more than Republicans. And she was speaking about that and somebody raised their hand and they said, “Oh, so you support John Kerry because you’re Black?” And I just like had never- I mean I could tell she just felt slapped in the face and she’s like, “No, that has nothing to do with it, it’s [because of] my economic standing.” But I just felt like that person had not been listening to a word that she said and just like the assumption just kind of shocked me because it was something that never would have occurred to me in a 100 years to think that that’s why she supported someone was because of her race.

The insensitive question distracted from the friend’s perspective on the political issues by disregarding the complexity of her political views and essentializing her race. The experience opened Mia’s eyes to others’ biased assumptions about racially different others and legitimized her friends’ experiences as a student of color who experienced discrimination:

Mia: She had talked to me a lot about feeling, not necessarily here but just throughout life, just feeling kind of discriminated against or feeling like an outsider. And I think for that moment, I felt like one with her or I completely saw what she [had] meant. Sometimes before that I kind of wondered if it was just, you know, if people were trying and she just wasn’t you know close to them or just had different values and that kind of kept them apart. But just like for that moment I just, I saw that she was hurt and what that meant to her. So that was one of those experiences with, with a different culture that- you know when someone said that I was just shocked honestly. So, not that they weren’t willing to say that but that they thought that, so…

Here, Mia was able to briefly put herself in the shoes of her Nigerian friend by empathizing with her feelings of hurt. In direct response to the troubling incident, Mia became active with her school’s multicultural affairs organization. In the next excerpt,
she describes her participation in a forum where she was the only White student who participated in a discussion about intercultural issues:

Mia: You know, a lot of people had incidents [like my friend] had and I think that surprised me and it was- I was also the only White person in that discussion and it was kind of hard because I felt like, you know, they weren’t talking about me per se but I kind of felt bad that, that, you know, I guess Caucasian people had done that to them. Umm, so it, it just became very, very important to me to be more understanding or to not be a representation of that stereotype.

As the above quotes illustrate, listening to the discriminatory experiences of other students of color was difficult for Mia because she felt bad that other White individuals would engage in discriminatory behavior. At the same time, however, she was able to make “object” the behaviors of racially similar others by recognizing that she was not like them. This ability to consciously select and adhere to one’s identity and values is emblematic of a mixed meaning making orientation. For Mia, doing so in conjunction with learning about how students of color experienced discrimination by White students strengthened her resolve to be a socially aware and interculturally sensitive ally.

Luis, a senior international student from Latin America with a privileged upbringing, describes the unusual experience of being “labeled” as some combination of minority, international student, Mexican, and Latino within the American cultural context. He notes that he sees himself as more similar to Americans because most people in his home country are very poor in comparison. His experience in the U.S. has meant that he has had to confront some uncomfortable notions about his privilege. Prior to coming to the U.S., he says, he anticipated that “international student” would become his most salient social identity. However, he was not prepared to be “confused with” being a Mexican, a term he recognizes as derogatory in certain contexts. As he notes, “A lot of Latinos face the issue of being called Mexicans and then as soon as you’re Mexican,
you’re stereotyped.” In the following excerpt, he describes differences between American and Latin American cultural norms, especially the use of “Mexican” as derogatory and stereotypical and the inadequacy of the term “Latino/a.”

Luis: I’ve felt something that I’ve never felt before, as well, when I’m here: being confused with being a Mexican when, you know, we don’t see ourselves as that, obviously. And being labeled under this huge, general group of Hispanic when, you know, in Latin America we don’t even use that term. And, it’s just something that I, I wasn’t aware of. I thought that I would feel more comfortable, like before I came here I thought, I thought about this a little bit because I know there would be those tensions a little bit but I thought I would remain with an international student label and I was more comfortable with that than being, say, a minority, or like that.

I: So, you’re uncomfortable being perceived as a minority and you’re more comfortable being perceived as an international student?

Luis: No, I wouldn’t say I’m comfortable… it’s mostly like Latino immigrant population here so, I, I am part of that minority and I don’t feel uncomfortable about it. It’s just something that I didn’t expect when I came here…

The above passage illustrates both Luis’ evolving sense of identity and his mixed meaning making orientation: he experiences tension between an affirmed self-definition of “international student” (which he is comfortable with) and others’ labeling of him as Mexican (an erroneous label he perceives as connoting low SES) and/or Latino (a term that is at once limited and overly broad, but which he accepts in the American cultural context). This tension between internal and external definitions prompted him to further explore his values and beliefs regarding his identity. He notes that he engages with like others, his “network of Latin American friends,” to explore the complex nexus of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and cultural identity. However, he has not yet created an integrated sense of self; this liminal and unresolved state is emblematic of a mixed meaning making orientation.
Another senior, Matt, attended a predominantly White high school and had little previous exposure to diversity. In the following excerpt, Matt describes how coming to college broadened his perspective about diversity as more than a dichotomous, Black/White construct.

I: What surprised you most [about college]?

Matt: The lack of majority-minority diversity and I’ll explain this: I would like to say that the better part of the general population of America, you have your Whites as your majority and you have your Blacks at the minority. That’s what you’re told about all the time in the media, in books you hear about the Civil Rights struggle, just all that stuff. And then I came to college and, you know, the African American population here is so little but you have all these Southeast Asians, different Europeans, like Eastern Europeans rather than Western Europeans. And they make up such a huge percentage of the people here that you realize it’s not just White and Black. It’s not just White and Black at all. That was one of the surprising things ‘cause that’s what I thought it was. I thought that was the main idea of racism, you know, racism and ethnic differences as White/Black. And when you come here, you realize that wasn’t it at all.

This excerpt illustrates how Matt’s prior dualistic assumptions about difference were challenged by exposure to increased structural diversity at college. His growing awareness about multiple forms of difference caused him to question what he had been taught in school and by the media, namely the practice of presenting complex issues in simplistic terms. Through his experience at college, he began to expand his worldview by questioning what he had been taught and by actively seeking out multiple perspectives. As he notes, “I just like to learn about everything [because] I know it’s not just two-sided.” Likewise, Matt’s interactions with diverse others in college forced him to question his prior stereotypes. Below, he describes the experience of having his stereotypes challenged when he came to college:

Matt: Going to this White high school, hearing all these stereotypes about people of other races, expecting it because you’ve been told nothing else your entire life up until the age of eighteen. Going out there [to college]. Meeting these people
[different others] for the first time at a party with other friends. Still having these expectations about ‘em, these stereotypes about ‘em, treating ‘em that way until months later after all the experiences you’ve had with ‘em, you realize there’s nothing different at all. It’s based on how you’re raised, not on how you look. Like there are stereotypes based on being raised. I agree with that still and I don’t think that’s false at all. I think that’s a true statement, but it’s not based on genetically who you are, what you look like, anything like that.

This quote illustrates how Matt’s stereotypes were challenged because of his ongoing interactions with diverse others. He notes that he initially relied upon stereotypes for information about how he should treat diverse others. However, after having extended interactions with diverse peers, he re-evaluated his stereotypes. Through cultivating friendships with diverse others, in which he came to know them as individuals, he came to the conclusion that racial stereotypes are erroneous and perpetuated through how individuals are raised. This conclusion was reinforced when his parents, who themselves were inexperienced with difference, visited him on campus and met his African American friends. In the following excerpt, Matt describes his mother’s reaction and his accompanying sense of unrestrained gratification at the validation of his newfound awareness about the perpetuation of racial stereotypes:

I: Are there any particular interactions that you can think of that were either particularly important or symbolic of your interactions with people different than you?

Matt: Uh huh, the first time I did the Rocky Horror Picture Show and my parents showed up. I introduced them to all my friends at the time ‘cause they didn’t know ‘em. And I had two Black friends. And my Mom took me aside after meeting them and she said, “I’m so glad you have colored friends.” When my Mom said that, I thought it was hilarious (laughs), it was absolutely funny and I hadn’t treated them [my friends] any differently whatsoever, you know.

I: So what was funny about the comment?

Matt: It’s funny because she was expecting them to be different. She was. And I was, too, until I met them, you know.
As the above excerpts demonstrate, Matt is beginning to question and evaluate the basis for the limited perspectives he was exposed to growing up. Namely, he was raised in a racially homogenous community by parents who themselves had little experience with difference and with grandparents whom he characterizes as openly racist. Observing his mother’s response to his interracial friends (“she was expecting them to be different”) validated his insights about why he came to college carrying the racial stereotypes he did and how these stereotypes ultimately hamper intergroup relations.

The four examples above illustrate a number of themes in how students who operate from a mixed orientation make meaning about their intercultural interactions. These students begin to question previously unexamined assumptions by exploring their own beliefs and talking with others about theirs. Their dualistic assumptions are challenged and they begin to acquire a more nuanced understanding of complex issues. Students who operate from this orientation begin to expand their worldview by seeking out and beginning to accept multiple perspectives. They practiced perspective taking and reflection. They also explored their own values and beliefs and begin to select which ones they will adhere to when challenged. And, they began to generate their own conclusions after evaluating the basis for knowledge claims.

**Table 5.2: Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experiences and Developmental Effects for Students with Mixed Meaning Making Orientations (n=20)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experience(s)†</th>
<th>Developmental Effect of Intercultural Experience(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alyssa</td>
<td>Engaging with diverse others and exploring own views about affirmative action</td>
<td>Gained deeper appreciation for &quot;minority&quot; issues and developed an interest in social justice issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Attending a Predominately White Institution (PWI) where White students have touched her curly hair</td>
<td>Experiences frustration and lack of understanding about White students' behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Experiencing discrimination as a student of color at a PWI</td>
<td>Prompted a great deal of reflection about own cultural identity and sense of belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>(pre-college) Living in Cuba with military family</td>
<td>Gained awareness about others' life situations and promoted desire to learn more about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym</td>
<td>Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experience(s)†</td>
<td>Developmental Effect of Intercultural Experience(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridget</td>
<td>(pre-college) Traveling cross-country with her truck driver father in the summer</td>
<td>Gained exposure to new places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney*</td>
<td>Becoming aware of differences in how national media organizations present current events</td>
<td>Recognized that the media manipulates its viewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Working at an L.A. rescue mission the summer after her freshman year</td>
<td>Gained awareness of social justice issues and the impact of social systems on individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Reading provocative non-fiction essays and exploring own and diverse others’ perspectives in composition class</td>
<td>Figured out own beliefs based on &quot;more valid facts&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary</td>
<td>(pre-college) Attending a predominately White high school where she dated interracially; Taking a “Psychology of Racial Differences” class in college</td>
<td>Learned that not everyone is against her as a biracial person; Gained new perspectives about race issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Participating in internship in Hong Kong and returning to a Japanese roommate</td>
<td>Gained deeper perspective about American culture, greater empathy for the international student experience, the desire to interact with culturally diverse others and gain awareness of others’ perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiweon*</td>
<td>Interacting with individuals from different racial groups, especially African Americans</td>
<td>Has learned that difference is not always negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Having conversations about discrimination with African American peers</td>
<td>Became more comfortable around different others although she still admits to being afraid of &quot;saying something that's going to offend them without meaning to&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis*</td>
<td>Interacting with Americans in the American cultural context</td>
<td>Promoted exploration of own socio-cultural identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Encountering internationals students speaking their own language in the dorms as a freshman</td>
<td>Experienced frustration then tolerance (&quot;if I had gone somewhere and studied abroad, I would be that person.&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Being exposed to multiple forms of diversity (e.g., racial, ethnic, and cultural)</td>
<td>Caused him to question his stereotypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia</td>
<td>Witnessing discriminatory behavior towards a Nigerian friend</td>
<td>Gained empathy for the experience of persons of color and became active as an ally to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael*</td>
<td>Observing a slower paced work culture during international research internship</td>
<td>Recognized that U.S. work standard isn't universal and caused him to take time to slow down and enjoy himself more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean*</td>
<td>Having conversations with African American students about affirmative action; Taking a range of diversity classes such as Women’s Studies and LGBT Studies</td>
<td>Helped him understand and gain respect for diverse others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Having a roommate from Vietnam</td>
<td>Opened her eyes to cultural similarities and differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia</td>
<td>Taking a &quot;Racism and Prejudice&quot; course; Being involved in an interracial relationship</td>
<td>Gained exposure to multiple perspectives, an understanding of racism and stereotypes, and the desire to educate others about these issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes international student or Green Card holder
† Multiple intercultural experiences attributed to a single student are separated by a semi-colon
Early Internal Orientations toward Intercultural Experiences

Only 6 (13%) of the students who made meaning using this orientation also described developmentally effective experiences that were intercultural in nature (see Table 5.3). The hallmark of an early internal orientation is the conscious selection of one’s values and beliefs, one’s identity, and one’s relationships in the context of myriad external forces (e.g., the media, peer groups, authority figures, and religious teachings). Individuals who operate from this orientation recognize complexity and are not immobilized by it. Rather, they demonstrate the capacity to “make object” complex issues by consciously shifting perspectives, integrating new information, constructing an authentic self, and engaging in relationships characterized by mutuality and interdependence (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005).

Because of the few examples of this meaning making orientation in the present sample, a single rich exemplar of a student with an early internal orientation who articulated her own process of intercultural development in college is presented and described below. In the space of the interview, this student both constructed her own journey vis-à-vis her understanding of her own identity, her relationships with diverse others, and her understanding of the basis for knowledge claims while simultaneously describing her progression from an external orientation (prior to college), to a mixed orientation (early college), to an early internal orientation (the final years of college). Given this study’s larger goal of understanding the developmental mechanisms involved with intercultural development, this student’s story of intercultural development during college is presented below.
Summer, a White senior from a racially mixed (White and Hispanic) community in Southern Florida, noted that while growing up she never considered her community to be diverse. Her unexamined assumptions were challenged when she was asked to complete a survey about the racial composition of her high school during her first year of college. In the following excerpt, she describes the “weird” sensation of being exposed to the notion that her hometown was indeed diverse:

I: If you take your home experience and look back at it entering college, how did the experience of being around so many Hispanics, or being in a diverse environment affect you or affect your ideas about diversity?

Summer: It’s really interesting because in South Florida, like Caucasians and Hispanics, it’s not diversity; it’s just how everyone is. Like, I didn’t think of it as diverse. I thought it was really funny because at some point my freshman year, I had to take some survey of, you know, “How many minority friends do you have? What was the [racial/ethnic] composition of your high school?” And then, all of sudden, they listed the minorities as Hispanic. I never thought of Hispanics as the minority. Like, it’s really weird for me to say that, you know, two of my best friends are a minority. It just didn’t feel that way.

This excerpt illustrates Summer’s initial lack of awareness about the social construct of diversity as applied to the demographic composition of her hometown. She took for granted the co-existence of Whites and Hispanics as normative, going so far as to be unaware of its existence (e.g., “It’s not diversity; it’s just how everyone is”). This perspective reflects the external orientation she initially operated from: her diverse upbringing was like everyone else’s and was therefore unexamined. Herein lay the source of her initial surprise when confronted with an alternative viewpoint.

Summer proceeded to explain the conflict she experienced between her college’s promotion of its diverse student body and her own observations about how diverse students did not seem to interact with one another. Given her desire to cultivate diverse relationships in college, she began to question the effect of the institution’s structural
diversity when individuals segregated themselves into “disparate” racial, ethnic, and cultural groups.

Summer: A lot of minority groups on campus are very exclusive and cliquey… It’s really nice for there to actually be diversity but the fact is, all the White kids hang out together, and all the Latinos hang out together and speak Spanish together. I don’t speak Spanish fluently [so] I couldn’t be a part of it… That’s a real problem that, like, everyone’s trying to go around promoting diversity but really it’s just a bunch of disparate groups in one place together. It’s rare that you see people of different ethnicities and races actually being friends or having diverse groups of friends, or whatever. I think that was a really hard transition for me: I was seeking out diversity and actually, in some ways, finding the opposite…

It’s kind of like all this diversity for what? You know like (sighs) I don’t know, it’s just, it’s very superficial. You sit in the dorm cafeterias and people [have] already grouped themselves. You sit in the union or you walk up to people in the union and it’s, you see a group of Black guys and girls standing together in a group talking, and then you see the Asians standing together and talking… it just, I don’t know. It really gets to me. I hate that.

The above comments reflect Summer’s dissatisfaction with the lack of integration between and among the diverse student population on her campus. She wanted to be able to engage with her diverse peers yet felt thwarted by the exclusionary social dynamics she encountered. Summer experienced conflict between the college’s claims about diversity and her experiences. Her concomitant questioning of authority is emblematic of a mixed meaning making orientation.

In the next excerpt, Summer explains how she was able to actualize her own vision for the types of diverse intercultural relationships she wanted to cultivate in college (“I was seeking out diversity”). She describes how she “changed” her perspective from being disappointed with the groups of segregated students she encountered to finding pathways for meeting and befriending diverse others. Through her involvement in
AIESEC\(^4\), an international organization that seeks to increase cultural exchange among college students, she was able to learn new ways of bringing diverse others together:

I: Have you thought about ways to change [your dissatisfaction with the lack of campus integration]?

Summer: Yeah, it’s really important to me and that’s one of the ways I’ve changed is simply being involved in AIESEC and um, really doing recruiting through word of mouth, through different people in our organization so that we have a Latino girl that has really recruited in her Latino sorority and in the Latino frats she knows. So we bring in people through word of mouth from that direction. And then we have lots of students from Hong Kong and like they go through the Hong Kong Student Association and we get more. And so, really the best way to do it is just by word of mouth through different people, having people come together… At the same time, there needs to be some motivation to expand beyond your little clique to become involved.

The above passage illustrates how Summer’s thinking about intercultural interactions has evolved. Rather than be unaware of cultural differences or simply accept the claims of her institution about its structural diversity (it is “supposed to be diverse”), she has begun to act differently by taking the initiative to reach out to diverse others. She has learned how to work with the diverse groups on campus to find other like-minded individuals. In the excerpt below, Summer describes why joining AIESEC has been one of her most positive collegiate experiences:

Summer: It was a chance to finally be in that diverse group [of students]…as much as I believe in the work that we were doing and all that, like I was really passionate about that and that was very important, it also at a very social level, was just really nice because it was kind of like I finally got to become friends with a lot of different people that had different backgrounds and really have that experience that I want to have of meeting people that had come from different places and knew different things and where I was actually different and could share some things with them. Being surrounded by people like me, there’s nothing new I can offer.

\(^4\) AIESEC is the French acronym for Association Internationale des Étudiants en Sciences Économiques et Commerciales
Thus, for Summer, given her early internal orientation, developing and implementing her own vision and values about the importance of having meaningful intercultural exchanges in college was central to her meaning making. Furthermore, an emphasis on learning and sharing multiple perspectives enabled friendships with diverse others where all parties are free to give and receive cultural knowledge.

In this section, I have provided a number of examples to describe how students with different meaning making orientations interpret their collegiate diversity experiences. Although the content of the experiences differed greatly, the underlying cognitive structure that students employed was remarkably similar in each group. Students with an external orientation viewed intercultural differences in a cognitively simple way. For them, intercultural experiences provided initial exposure to different others and cultural knowledge. Students with a mixed orientation began to question external formulas as they gained greater exposure to and experience with diverse others and ideas. And, students with early internal meaning making orientations begin to embrace a more nuanced and relativistic perspective of their intercultural experiences. I will discuss these findings and their implications for practice and future research in Chapter Seven.

### Table 5.3: Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experiences and Developmental Effects for Students with Early Internal Meaning Making Orientations (n=6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experience(s)</th>
<th>Developmental Effect of Intercultural Experience(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Participating in study abroad in England</td>
<td>Helped her gain new insights about her own and other cultures (e.g., values, lifestyles, friends, communication, educational and political systems) and embrace a &quot;global focus&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damon</td>
<td>(pre-college) Best friend in secondary school was African American</td>
<td>Deeply affected his thinking and broadened his perspective about different others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin*</td>
<td>(pre-college) Moved to U.S. from South Africa as a child</td>
<td>Feels that his upbringing has given him a broader cultural perspective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Katrina
Encountering racism both at home (from her step-father) and at college (from a professor)
Recognized that she cannot control other peoples' opinions

Monique*
Interacting with diverse others
Has become more culturally and socially aware and has learned to "get out of my comfort zone"

Summer
Participating in AIESEC, a student organization whose objective is to promote international awareness through cultural exchange
Provided the opportunity to be a part of a diverse peer group who shared her passion for cultural exchange

* Denotes international student or Green Card holder

Role of Student Characteristics and Types of Collegiate Diversity Experiences in Meaning Making about Intercultural Experiences

The conceptual framework guiding this study (see Chapter Two, Figure 2.4) included factors related to student background characteristics and type of collegiate diversity experiences. The purpose of this section is to describe how these factors were related to students’ meaning making about intercultural experiences. In order to respond to this question, the interview summaries were reviewed to assess which of these elements students noted as relevant to their meaning making about their intercultural experiences. Here, I present and discuss those elements of the conceptual framework that arose as salient to students’ meaning making about developmentally effective intercultural experiences. Again, this analysis is based on the Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experiences (DEIE) sample, which is comprised only of those students whose descriptions of their intercultural experiences met the criteria for being developmentally effective, meaning that the experience promoted learning and development about the world and knowledge, relationships, and/or identity.

Appendix D presents the gender, race, and class year of students in the DEIE sample, along with additional background characteristics that individual students mentioned as salient to their meaning making about their intercultural experiences. For
example, if a student’s most significant experience in college was interacting with diverse others, he may have chosen to note the racial composition of his or her home state or hometown in the context of making meaning about why interacting with diverse others in college was significant. Since the racial composition of his home state or hometown was a salient component in the meaning making process, it was recorded in the table as a student-selected background characteristic. Likewise, if a student described her collegiate study abroad experience in developmental terms, background characteristics that factored into her interpretation of the experience were also noted. Below, I report findings related to the role of students’ background characteristics in their understanding of their intercultural experiences. If a particular background characteristic was not a part of the study’s conceptual framework but was mentioned at least twice, I have also included it here.

**Self-Selected Student Background Characteristics**

Students in the Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experiences (DEIE) sample made meaning about developmentally effective intercultural experiences in a variety of ways and selected a number of different background characteristics to contextualize their interpretations. While some students mentioned background characteristics included in this study’s quantitative analysis, many selected other background characteristics that were not explicated in the study’s conceptual framework (see Figure 3.2). According to the interview summaries for the sample, high school GPA, college year, and gender all played a negligible role in students’ meaning making about their intercultural experiences given that few students mentioned these background characteristics in the context of their meaning making. While students occasionally
mentioned that they performed well academically in high school, this did not emerge as central to their interpretations. College class year did play a role for some upper level students as they described how they interacted with diverse others in their first year or two of college versus how these interactions changed once they became more proactive in cultivating diverse friendships or once they had responsibilities or activities that brought them in closer contact with different others. For example, Sean noted how, during his first two years, he socialized primarily with other international students. Finding that it was difficult to meet Americans, he opted to move to a diverse co-op his junior year and joined AIESEC, a student organization that promotes cultural exchange.

Other college seniors such as Luis and Justin reflected upon how they had changed since their first year or two of college by more explicitly cultivating relationships grounded in shared values and beliefs than racial, cultural, or ethnic similarities. Gender seemed to be more salient for the women in the sample than for the men. As a woman in a predominately male discipline, Summer’s gender played a central role in how she came to understand and empathize with other minority groups and Jiweon, an international student, was shocked to learn about the existence of stereotypes of Asian women as subservient and eroticized.

By contrast with other background characteristics that were marginally influential, race was a salient component of students’ meaning making about their intercultural experiences, particularly for students of color. For example, Faith described her experience as the sole African American student in her English class, Amanda noted her frustration when White students expressed interest in her curly hair by touching it, Angela experienced racial discrimination while shopping with another student of color,
and Hillary noted that she often felt uncomfortable in her own skin. Unlike students of color, White students were more likely to interpret their intercultural experiences as a function of the level of diversity they had experienced in their communities and schools rather than as a function of their race (see below). As majority group members, their race was less salient and their intercultural interactions were interpreted from this normalized perspective. Interestingly, even when White students found themselves in situations where they were in the racial minority, their perspectives remained ethnocentric. For example, during her study term in New York City, Jenn rode the subway where she found it “neat to see different people and not stare at them.” This sense of majority group ethnocentrism manifested itself in an interesting way for Sean, a Korean international student who encountered an African American student studying Korean in the library. He was so astounded that he initiated a conversation with the student, noting that “It [was] like me studying, I don’t know, Swahili, you know?” Thus, for students accustomed to majority group status, interactions with diverse others began with different assumptions and therefore resulted in different interpretations about the relative salience of race.

Given the well-documented connection between racial composition of educational and community environments and decreasing trends in schooling desegregation nationwide (Kozol, 2005; Orfield, 2001), it’s not surprising that students’ interpretations of their intercultural experiences included contextual information about the racial composition of their high schools, hometowns, and even their home states and countries. In fact, 19 of the 47 students in the sample (40%) used some combination of this information as a salient frame of reference for their own cultural understanding (e.g., some students evoked more than one context). More specifically, 13 students (28%) made
meaning of their intercultural experiences using the racial composition of their high schools as a point of reference (see Appendix D). For example, Faith noted that there were few White students at her high school, Nikki noted that her high school was “one-third White, one-third African American and one-third Native American,” Catherine judged her school district to be “pretty diverse… more diverse than [for] a lot of people,” and Lynn noted that “I did not have any diversity in my high school. We were – it was all White.”

Likewise, 14 (30%) students described the racial composition of their home towns in the context of their interpretations. Amy noted that her hometown was “completely all White people” and that “race isn’t a big issue [there].” Heidi noted that her community was “99% Caucasian” and Alyssa noted that racial composition of her hometown was White and Native American with “one African American family and that’s it.” Some students even pointed out the racial and ethnic composition of their home states or countries. Jenn characterized her home state as “one of the Whitest places around” and Jiweon noted that in Korea “everybody is like, not even Asian, just Korean, Korean.” Given the lack of intercultural diversity typically associated with rural areas, it is perhaps not surprising that the size of one’s hometown was especially salient to students who came from “small towns.” Additionally, six white students from homogenous communities talked about being from a small town in the context of their meaning making about their intercultural experiences.

In this section, I have described the background characteristics that students in the DEIE sample selected as contextual references for their descriptions of their developmentally effective intercultural experiences. This discussion corresponded with
the conceptual framework presented in Chapter Three (see the lower left hand corner of Figure 3.5). Next, I move to a discussion of students’ perspectives on institutional structural diversity.

Perspectives on Institutional Structural Diversity

Student perceptions of the structural diversity of their institutions constituted a prevalent component of students’ meaning making about their intercultural interactions: 15 (32%) students commented on this during their interview. Furthermore, of the 49 developmentally effective intercultural experiences in the DEIE sample, 20 experiences involved interactions in both formal and informal college settings which occurred simply because racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse peers were a part of the campus community. Students’ impressions varied greatly from a sense that their institution was overwhelmingly diverse (Natalie, a White student) to an acute sense of being culturally, racially, and ethnically isolated (Angela, a student of color). Overwhelmingly, students’ perceptions were a function of their racial, cultural, and ethnic identity vis-à-vis their predominately white institutions. Of the 13 Non-White students in the sample, only three did not mention this in conjunction with their meaning making. Of the 34 White students in the sample, 14 students mentioned their institution’s structural diversity, whether to note that it was insufficient (Ellen), to register disappointment in the lack of interaction across “disparate racial groups” (Katrina and Summer), or to critique their own inability to be proactive in cultivating relationships across difference (Kristy). Nonetheless, Lynn noted that structural diversity was positive for her because “it can’t really hide itself… you’re kind of forced to deal with it.” Thus, the numbers of students across all racial
groups who noted this information is noteworthy and suggests that college students actively attend to this dimension of their collegiate experience.

**Self-Selected Collegiate Diversity Experiences**

Students in the DEIE sample described a wide range of collegiate diversity experiences. These are presented thematically below. Of those experiences that met the criterion of being developmentally effective, many of the experiences were consistent with those noted in the study’s conceptual framework, but students in this sample also noted other experiences. Table 5.4 presents the full range of experiences that were noted at least twice by students in the DEIE sample; this table is organized to correspond with the study’s conceptual framework (see Figure 2.4). A column is also provided to indicate “Other Collegiate Diversity Experiences” (those not included in the conceptual framework or quantitative model). The number of times each diversity experience was noted is indicated in the column heading. Taken together, the table demonstrates the wide variety of diversity experiences that students identified as meaningful and the range of contexts, both formal and informal, in which these experiences occurred. The most frequently mentioned type of diversity experience was informal interactions across difference: this was a salient part of 24 students’ developmentally effective intercultural interactions. The nature of these diversity experiences with respect to the institutional context is also noteworthy: 22 of the experiences were related to institutional structural diversity. In other words, these experiences occurred in the context of interactions between students from different racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds.

In terms of diversity experiences that were a part of the study’s conceptual framework, no student in the sample mentioned participation in a racial or cultural
awareness workshop. However, eight students described and interpreted experiences in their diversity courses. These courses varied widely in focus from courses about diverse cultures and perspectives (e.g., Middle Eastern Cultures, Cultural Aspects of Healthcare), women’s and gender issues (Gender and Law, Women’s Studies, LGBT Studies), and equality and social justice (e.g., Perceptions of Social Justice, Psychology of Racial Differences, and Racism and Prejudice). Three students were explicit in noting that they “had to” take the courses because doing so was “required” to fulfill a diversity or major requirement. Additionally, two students mentioned service learning (e.g., participation in community service as a component of an academic course) as the context for their meaning making: Ellen volunteered at a Latin Community Center and Nikki taught English to Hispanic children (both students began their work as part of their service learning coursework).

International experiences, in the form of study abroad programs, sightseeing, and as a consequence of parents’ work, were common among all students in this sample. As noted in Chapter Three, 9 students (over a quarter of the DEIE sample) identified themselves as either international students or Green Card holders. Additionally, Catherine, Emily, Jessica, Ben, and Michael participated in formal study abroad/international internship programs. Both Ben and Stephanie lived internationally with their military families. International travel for pleasure provided the meaning making context for Ethan (Switzerland), Kelly (Sweden), and Linda (Mexico).

In terms of experiences that occurred in social settings, students described a variety of interactions with diverse others. In terms of intimate relationships, five students had engaged in interracial dating relationships (Hillary, Jiweon, Luis, Mia, and Sylvia)
and two students described having a best friend of another racial/ethnic background (Summer and Damon). Four women (Kelly, Stephanie, Jessica, and Shannon) noted that having international students for roommates was significant, and four men (Ethan, Justin, Luis, and Sean) used the experience of living in a “diverse” residence hall or co-op as the context for their meaning making. Simply meeting and conversing with diverse others about everyday cultural differences and contemporary issues was noted by Ilona (who met students from the Middle East and Western Europe), Isabel (who engaged with students from India and France), Lisa (who befriended a Muslim woman in her apartment complex), Alyssa and Sean (who explored other’s perspectives about affirmative action), Jiweon (a Korean international student who befriended African American students), and Kay (who discussed discrimination with African American peers).

Six students described negative diverse interactions in which feeling uncomfortable or unsettled was a salient component of the exchange. For example, Lynn described feeling frustrated when she found herself surrounded by international students speaking their own language in the elevators. Amanda was confused and angry when White students expressed interested in her curly hair. Mia was shocked by the insensitive questions posed by a White student to her Nigerian friend. Jiweon described how American classmates insensitively refer to her as “Asian girl.” And, Stephanie reported her shock when an Australian student used derogatory language in talking to African American students in their residence hall.

In the preceding paragraphs, I have described students’ self-selected background characteristics, their perceptions regarding institutional structural diversity, and the various types of collegiate contexts that elicited meaning making. While there was strong
alignment between the study’s conceptual framework and the qualitative findings, additional collegiate diversity experiences that emerged as developmentally significant included living in diverse residence halls and/or having international roommates, dating interracially, completing service work through one’s church, a domestic study term in a racially diverse location, and participation in AIESEC, a student organization designed to foster cultural exchange. I will discuss these qualitative findings and their implications for practice and future research in Chapter Seven. First, I will address the sixth and final research sub-question in Chapter Six by comparing the quantitative and qualitative assessments related to DEIE sample students’ orientations to cultural difference (as indicated by students’ IDI developmental scores and interview data).
Table 5.4: Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experiences in Relation to Pre-College Diversity Experiences, Structural Diversity, and Diversity Experiences for the Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experiences Sample (by Gender)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experience(s)† in Conceptual Framework</th>
<th>Pre-College Diversity Experiences (n=6)</th>
<th>Related to Level of Structural Diversity (n=22)</th>
<th>Formal and Informal Diversity Experiences (n=55)</th>
<th>Other Collegiate Diversity Experiences (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females (n=38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyssa</td>
<td>Engaging with diverse others and exploring own views about affirmative action</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Attending a Predominately White Institution (PWI) where White students have touched her curly hair</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Having African American peers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Experiencing discrimination as a student of color at a PWI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Being exposed to different perspectives and problem solving approaches by working with Mexican classmates on class projects (pre-college) Traveling cross-country with her truck driver father in the summers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridget</td>
<td>(pre-college) Traveling cross-country with her truck driver father in the summers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie</td>
<td>Learning about different cultural practices in her &quot;Cultural Aspects of Healthcare&quot; class in her nursing major</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Participating in study abroad in England</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney*</td>
<td>Becoming aware of differences in how national media organizations present current events</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym</td>
<td>Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experience(s)† in Conceptual Framework</td>
<td>Pre-College Diversity Experiences (n=6)</td>
<td>Related to Level of Structural Diversity (n=22)</td>
<td>Formal and Informal Diversity Experiences (n=55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Volunteering for two years as an English teacher at a Latin Community center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Related to Level of Structural Diversity (n=22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Working at an L.A. rescue mission the summer after her freshman year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Feeling comfortable as the sole African American student in her college English class</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Reading provocative non-fiction essays and exploring own and diverse others' perspectives in composition class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi*</td>
<td>Working closely with an African American peer on course project</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary</td>
<td>(pre-college) Attending a predominately White high school where she dated interracially; Taking a &quot;Psychology of Racial Differences&quot; class in college</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilona</td>
<td>Meeting peers from different countries and regions (e.g., France, Saudi Arabia, the Middle East)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>Engaging with French and Indian peers about how beliefs, politics, and religion differ</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenn</td>
<td>Participating in a study term in New York City exposed her to diversity and situations where she was a racial minority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym</td>
<td>Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experience(s)† in Conceptual Framework</td>
<td>Pre-College Diversity Experiences (n=6)</td>
<td>Related to Level of Structural Diversity (n=22)</td>
<td>Formal and Informal Diversity Experiences (n=55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Participating in internship in Hong Kong and returning to a Japanese roommate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study Abroad (n=9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Diversity Related Courses (n=8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Community Service Courses (n=2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal Interactions Across Difference (n=24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Diversity Interactions (n=6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Collegiate Diversity Experiences (n=6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiweon*</td>
<td>Interacting with students from different racial groups, especially African Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Taking a Middle East cultures class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanisha</td>
<td>Taking a &quot;Perceptions of Social Justice&quot; class that explored the Korean American experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Learning about different cultural practices in her &quot;required&quot; oral communications class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrina</td>
<td>Encountering racism both at home (from her step-father) and at college (from a professor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Having conversations about discrimination with African American peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Having a Swedish roommate as a sophomore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristy</td>
<td>Learning about the life experiences of an African American peer in a small poetry class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Traveling to Mexico for 9 days to visit her sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Befriending a Muslim woman in her apartment complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Developmentally effective intercultural experiences are those that are rated as having a significant impact on the individual's understanding of diversity and inclusion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experience(s)† in Conceptual Framework</th>
<th>Pre-College Diversity Experiences (n=6)</th>
<th>Related to Level of Structural Diversity (n=22)</th>
<th>Study Abroad (n=9)</th>
<th>Diversity Related Courses (n=8)</th>
<th>Community Service Courses (n=2)</th>
<th>Informal Interactions Across Difference (n=24)</th>
<th>Negative Diversity Interactions (n=6)</th>
<th>Other Collegiate Diversity Experiences (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Encountering internationals students speaking their own language in the dorms as a freshman</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia</td>
<td>Witnessing discriminatory behavior towards a Nigerian friend</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique*</td>
<td>Interacting with diverse peers</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>Taking a &quot;Gender and Law&quot; class with African American peers</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikki</td>
<td>Teaching English to Hispanic elementary school students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Having a roommate from Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Living in the International House at college</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Participating in AIESEC, a student organization whose objective is to promote international awareness through cultural exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia</td>
<td>Taking a &quot;Racism and Prejudice&quot; course; Being involved in an interracial relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Males (n=9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experience(s)† in Conceptual Framework</th>
<th>Pre-College Diversity Experiences (n=6)</th>
<th>Related to Level of Structural Diversity (n=22)</th>
<th>Study Abroad (n=9)</th>
<th>Diversity Related Courses (n=8)</th>
<th>Community Service Courses (n=2)</th>
<th>Informal Interactions Across Difference (n=24)</th>
<th>Negative Diversity Interactions (n=6)</th>
<th>Other Collegiate Diversity Experiences (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>(pre-college) Living in Cuba with military family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damon</td>
<td>(pre-college) Best friend in secondary school was African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>(pre-college) Traveling to Switzerland with family during high school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experience(s)† in Conceptual Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experience(s)† in Conceptual Framework</th>
<th>Pre-College Diversity Experiences (n=6)</th>
<th>Related to Level of Structural Diversity (n=22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justin*</td>
<td>(pre-college) Moved to U.S. from South Africa as a child</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee*</td>
<td>Participating in AIESEC, a student organization whose objective is to promote international awareness through cultural exchange</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis*</td>
<td>Interacting with Americans in the American cultural context</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Being exposed to multiple forms of diversity (e.g., racial, ethnic, and cultural) on campus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael*</td>
<td>Observing a slower paced work culture during international research internship</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean*</td>
<td>Having conversations with African American students about affirmative action; Taking a range of diversity classes such as Women’s Studies and LGBT Studies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Formal and Informal Diversity Experiences (n=55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Study Abroad (n=9)</th>
<th>Diversity Related Courses (n=8)</th>
<th>Community Service Courses (n=2)</th>
<th>Informal Interactions Across Difference (n=24)</th>
<th>Negative Diversity Interactions (n=6)</th>
<th>Other Collegiate Diversity Experiences (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justin*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes international student or Green Card holder

† Multiple intercultural experiences attributed to a single student are separated by a semi-colon; no student described participation in a cultural awareness workshop; the numbers in parentheses indicate the number of students whose developmentally effective intercultural experiences were of this type.
CHAPTER 6

COMPARISON OF QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENTS

In this chapter, I report findings related to the comparison between the quantitative data obtained from the WNSLAE Assessment (specifically, students’ IDI Developmental Scores) and the interview data obtained from the DEIE sample (specifically, the developmentally effective intercultural experiences). This chapter seeks to link these two sources of data, noting how they similarly and differently inform the overall research question: *What background characteristics and higher education experiences affect how college students develop intercultural effectiveness?* The sub-question that this chapter seeks to address is:

Do students’ interpretations of their intercultural experiences differ by whether they use ethnocentric or ethnorelative ways of dealing with cultural differences (as measured by their scores on the IDI)?

To answer this question, I compared the responses of two subgroups of students from the DEIE sample, those with an ethnocentric orientation and those with an ethnorelative orientation towards cultural difference; these two groups were determined based on their developmental scores on the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI). First, I present examples from the interviews in order to illustrate the DMIS stages that correspond with these subgroups. Next, I describe the two subgroups’ developmentally effective intercultural experiences and the developmental effects of these experiences. The chapter concludes with a discussion about the variability of overall meaning making orientation
within each subgroup and some reflections about the process of examining the linkages between the two data sources that inform this study.

Table 6.1 presents the IDI Developmental Scores (ordered from lowest to highest) of the 10 students in the ethnocentric subgroup and the 6 students in the ethnorelative subgroup, their overall meaning making orientation (based upon the entire interview transcript), my assessment of DMIS level (based upon students’ descriptions of their developmentally effective intercultural experiences), and a brief description of the overall effect of each student’s developmentally effective intercultural experience. See Chapter Three for a description of the process used to select these experiences.

Table 6.1: Ethnocentric and Ethnorelative Subgroup Comparisons: IDI Developmental Scores, Overall Meaning Making Orientation, DEIE's and Developmental Effects by DMIS Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>IDI Developmental Score</th>
<th>Overall Meaning Making Orientation</th>
<th>Estimated DMIS Level of DEIEs</th>
<th>Developmental Effect(s) †</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentric Subgroup (n=10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>(1) Exposure to diversity resulted in uncertainty and awkwardness about how to respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>69.03</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>(1) Experienced frustration and lack of understanding about White students' behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>69.64</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>(2) Gained new perspectives that opened broadened cultural worldview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>79.02</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Reversal</td>
<td>(2) Gained new insights about her own and other cultures (e.g., values, lifestyles, friends, communication, educational and political systems) and embraced a &quot;global focus&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>79.70</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>(1), (4) Prompted a great deal of reflection about own cultural identity and sense of belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristy</td>
<td>80.43</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>(2) Gained insights about how people of color experience racism and racial stereotyping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>80.48</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>(2), (3) Gained awareness of and respect for different cultural perspectives and became an ally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for international students through involvement with the international student organization on campus
(1), (2) Learned that difference is not always negative
(2) Gained awareness about diversity and questioned racial stereotypes
(3) Gained awareness of and sensitivity to diverse others’ perspectives and considers them in making decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jiweon*</td>
<td>82.83</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Denial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenn</td>
<td>83.83</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Denial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>84.04</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Denial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi*</td>
<td>115.37</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>115.56</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>117.78</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin*</td>
<td>118.78</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanish</td>
<td>118.91</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee*</td>
<td>129.03</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnorelative Subgroup (n=6)

- Heidi* (115.37) External Acceptance: (5) Began to know her peer both as an individual and as a proud representative of her racial and cultural heritage; recognition of multiple dimensions of identity
- Isabel (115.56) External Acceptance: (5), (7) Learned about and began to understand multiple perspectives
- Emily (117.78) Mixed Acceptance: (6), (7) Gained awareness of social justice issues and the impact of social systems on individuals: recognized the influence of sociocultural structures
- Justin* (118.78) Internal Acceptance: (5), (7) Feels that his upbringing has given him a broader cultural perspective: recognized that others didn’t have the benefit of the same experiences he did
- Kanisha (118.91) External Acceptance: (6), (7) Learned historical basis of racism and a new dualism (e.g., some professors teach history “as it is”): Exposure to other forms of racism allowed her to recognize racism in relativistic terms
- Lee* (129.03) External Acceptance: (7) Connected to diverse others and received support for taking risks in meeting culturally different others, Felt supported by engaging with like-minded diverse others

* Denotes international student or Green Card holder
† Numbers in parenthesis reflect the Developmental Effect categories: (1) Feelings of uncertainty and discomfort fostered reflection, (2) Self-consciously considered one’s own social identity, (3) Gained awareness about diverse others’ perspectives, (4) Considered how diverse others perceive one’s actions and behaviors, (5) Exhibited a more nuanced understanding of diverse peers’ cultural heritage (6) Began to embrace marginalized perspectives as legitimate, (7) Demonstrated willingness to independently pursue intercultural experiences and knowledge.
How Ethnocentric Students Describe Intercultural Experiences

As noted in Chapter Two, individuals who have an ethnocentric orientation towards cultural differences possess a worldview in which their own culture is “central to reality in some way” (Hammer & Bennett, 2001). Consequently, they may express disinterest in cultural difference and/or an unconscious avoidance of diverse others. The ethnocentric subgroup includes all students from the DEIE sample who had IDI scores of less than 85 points. According to the Hammer and Bennett (2005), scores in this range correspond with the denial and defense stages of the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS). Ten of the 47 students in the interview sample (21%) had IDI scores in this range and thus are presumed to operate from this orientation. The following examples were taken from students’ interview summaries and illustrate the DMIS stages of denial and defense. These examples were selected because they clearly expressed the DMIS stages. Given the small size of the ethnocentric and ethnorelative subgroups, these examples should not be taken as reflective of the racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds of the assessment sample presented and described in Chapter Three.

The first stage of the DMIS, denial, is characterized by avoidance of culturally different others through the use of physical, social, and/or psychological barriers. According to Bennett (1993), this orientation is increasingly rare in a global and interconnected world, although “semblances of the position can be maintained through either the isolation of physical circumstances or by the separation created by intentional physical and social barriers” (p. 10). Of the 10 students in the ethnocentric subgroup, Jiweon, a Korean international student, best articulated the denial orientation. As a
member of a racially homogeneous society, both physical and social circumstances fostered her denial of the existence of difference: “When I grew up in Korea, I never thought about racism. Everybody is Korean, everybody is like, not even Asian, just Korean, Korean” (for other denial examples, see Kristy, Jenn, and Amy who also came from highly segregated backgrounds; descriptions of this are included in Appendix D). Jiweon noted that she was initially shocked and surprised by the racial differences she encountered in the United States. Her denial orientation continued after her arrival as she made conscious decisions to separate herself from diverse others, especially African Americans: “I came here and I saw black people and I tried to avoid them… I’d make a wrong turn to avoid black people.” Furthermore, she was initially unable to discriminate among diverse others, “I couldn’t distinguish their faces, you know what I mean? Like for me, they all looked Black.” As this quote illustrates, Jiweon initially utilized overly broad categories for difference that made it difficult for her to discriminate between racially different others. Such category systems are common among individuals operating from a denial orientation (Bennett, 1993).

Defense, the second stage of the DMIS, is associated with a growing awareness of cultural difference that is characterized by a defensive posture and a sense of feeling threatened by these differences. Cultural difference is experienced in a polarized and dualistic way (e.g., “us versus them”). Individuals who operate from this cultural worldview seek to protect their identity and self-esteem by surrounding themselves with like others. Here, three examples of students’ defense orientation towards cultural difference are offered. Of the 10 students in the ethnocentric subgroup, these examples
were selected because they best represent this orientation (for another example of a defense orientation, see Natalie).

In the following two examples, the sense of threat that Amanda and Angela, two students of color, are experiencing in their interactions with their racially and culturally different peers at their predominately white institutions is palpable. In the following excerpt, Amanda describes the disturbing experience of having different others scrutinize her hair:

Amanda: My hair is curly, so if I let it dry, I get a little ‘fro and I straighten it and I hate it when people are like, “Can I touch your hair?” Because people, they don’t do that back home. It feels like… I don’t know. It disturbs me. It’s so hard because I’ve never had that, I’ve never went through that. I’m like, “I don’t understand.” I don’t like it when people touch my hair.

The unchecked curiosity of Amanda’s naïve White peers resulted in a thoughtless invasion of her personal space. Amanda’s visceral response to the incident is fueled by her perception of the incident as disturbing, emblematic of a defense orientation towards cultural difference. Fortunately, Amanda finds support in like others who assist her in coping. She notes that it is “easier to go to” her African American peers because they “back her up” by validating her feelings of frustration. Her actions in this regard further reflect her defense orientation. Authors Hammer and Bennett (2005) note that members of non-dominant groups are likely to “manifest Defense as protection of identity” (p. 37) by seeking the support of like others and resisting social integration.

Angela, a Chinese American student who grew up in a racially diverse community, also exhibits a defense orientation towards cultural differences. As a student of color at a predominately white institution, she is struggling with culture shock (“it’s still like I’m living in a different world… kind of like living in a giant dream”). She
resents the scrutiny she experiences from other individuals (both at the institution and in the community). She has noticed that she and other students of color get “a lot of stares.” She notes that she has considered transferring to a more diverse college where there would be more students who are not “so different” and it would be “a smaller jump” culturally. Further, she argues, a more diverse institution would provide the amenities that would make her feel more comfortable (“they’ve got seaweed”) and individuals who would be less judgmental of her (“nobody [would] tell me I’m disgusting when I eat seaweed.”) This interpretation of others’ comments about her eating habits reflects Angela’s sense of threat to personal and cultural identity; this perception is a function of her defensive orientation towards culturally different others.

In the final defense example, Catherine, a White student, demonstrates “reversal,” a phenomenon commonly encountered by “people in the throes of their first positive experience with another culture” (Hammer & Bennett, 2005, p. 15). In reversal, individuals may criticize their own culture at the same time they are celebrating another culture’s practices. In her interview, Catherine effusively described her “mind boggling” study abroad experience in England (“it’s made a total change of my life”). She noted that she gained a “global focus” and a broader perspective about her own culture and the ways that “culture really does affect me.” Although the above comments provided evidence for the developmental impact of the experience, her overall worldview points to a dualistic construction of cultural differences. In the following excerpt, Catherine notes that she wants to move to England because she likes English culture “better” than U.S. culture:
Catherine: I’ve learned that I do want to move there [to England], and I do like that culture better. America is very self-contained… a lot of American ideology stays within itself. It doesn’t look towards the globe, and as much as it embraces diversity, it kind of whitewashes it, too, in a lot of ways. England embraces diversity a lot more. The best example of it is they consider their flag to be offensive because it expresses Englishness as being better than any other culture that lives within the country. And I think it’s kind of crazy (laughs) but it makes sense [and] that’s their view. I don’t see that in America as much.

Additionally, Catherine enumerates the numerous ways in which English higher education is superior to U.S. higher education (e.g., it was less stressful, she was able to read what she wanted for classes, there was more emphasis on writing, her grades were dependent on a single paper). As with her assessment of English culture, Catherine concludes that she likes the English education system “better” than the U.S. system. This polarized view reflects a reversal orientation.

Despite the fact that the WNSLAE Interview (Baxter Magolda & King, 2007) was not designed specifically for the purpose of assessing students’ intercultural sensitivity, the four examples above were readily located within the interview transcripts of the ethnocentric subgroup. Creating a safe interview space and inviting students to reflect upon their interactions provided ample evidence for understanding students’ general orientation towards intercultural difference. Further, as the examples illustrate, students in the ethnocentric subgroup described their intercultural experiences in ways that were congruent with the defense and denial stages of the DMIS, the two stages predicted by their IDI developmental scores. Thus, the DMIS provided a useful framework for understanding why students constructed their intercultural experiences in the ways they did.
Given that there are only 10 students in the ethnocentric subgroup and 4 of these are students of color, it is interesting that three of the four most concise examples of the DMIS stages were described by students of color. One possible explanation could be that students of color, as minority group members, are more accustomed to talking about intercultural interactions than are their White peers. For these students, seeking respite with like others seemed to provide a safe environment in which they were able to construct their intercultural experiences in more cognitively complex ways by making them “object” (e.g., getting out of the experience in order to reflect upon it): Jiweon sought the guidance of other Korean students, Amanda relished the support of her African American peers, and Angela befriended other students of color and spent hours on the phone with her mother. Additionally, each student in this subgroup had had little prior experience interacting with diverse others and the experience of doing so in college triggered heightened emotional responses ranging from surprise, shock, frustration, and disbelief on the one hand, to an exaggerated sensation of intercultural understanding on the other. Educational implications for promoting the intercultural development of students who operate from an ethnocentric orientation will be discussed in Chapter Seven. In the next section, I will present examples from students in the ethnorelative subgroup, to further illustrate the connection between DMIS stage and IDI developmental score.

How Ethnorelative Students Describe Intercultural Experiences

Individuals who have an ethnorelative orientation towards cultural differences possess a fundamentally different mindset towards cultural difference than do individuals with an ethnocentric orientation. Rather than operating from the assumption that their
culture is central to reality (as in ethnocentrism), individuals with this orientation recognize that their culture is “one among many viable constructions of reality” (p. 15). Furthermore, rather than experiencing difference as threatening (as in denial and defense), individuals with an ethnorelative orientation embrace the notion that differences in behavior and values, for example, are a function of one’s cultural context. In addition, understanding culture involves understanding one’s own culture in relation to other cultures and vice versa.

The ethnorelative subgroup includes all students from the DEIE sample who had IDI scores of more than 115 points. According to the Hammer and Bennett (2005), IDI developmental scores between 115 and 130 correspond with the acceptance stage of the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS). Six of the 47 (13%) students in the DEIE sample had IDI scores in this range. Of these, three students were international students (Heidi and Lee) or green card holders (Justin).

In acceptance, an individual has crossed the ethnocentrism-ethnorelativism divide. A fundamental component of acceptance is the ability to respectfully judge cultural differences without feeling threatened by them. Whereas in previous stages individuals may notice superficial differences in verbal and nonverbal behavior, in acceptance, individuals embrace the notion that these differences are indicators of profound cultural differences that are worthy of respect (Bennett, 1993). In this stage of the DMIS, individuals regard cultural differences as a necessary component of humankind and therefore differences, first in behavior and later in values, come to be
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5 No student in the Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experiences sample scored higher than 130 points on the IDI.
acknowledged and accepted. The following three examples illustrate particularly well both the behavioral and value relativism associated with this stage. (For another example of acceptance, see Emily).

Lee, a first year international student from Hong Kong, aspired to live in a foreign country so that he could “learn about cultural acceptance” and know about “other peoples’ perspectives.” In describing his desire to know different others, he says that he has learned that “chances in college won’t find you. You have to find the chances yourself.” Accordingly, he has made a conscious effort to move beyond the comfort of co-national peer groups by seeking out opportunities to meet and befriend Americans. In the following excerpt, he describes his encounters with some of the “very outgoing” American women in his residence hall:

Lee: There are lots of girls at the end of the hallway [who] are very outgoing. To me, they are too outgoing. They are very noisy until 2 or 3 or 4 even. They speak loudly in the hallway, they laugh loudly. And umm, well, I don’t really like (pause), I don’t hate them ‘cause maybe it’s American culture. But, it’s like, I don’t feel like I can communicate with them. It’s like the things they [do] aren’t suitable for me. I remember on one Thursday they had a gathering with the RA at the end of the corridor and I just walked by and saw them. Then I went there because I don’t want to hide in my room. They were having a storytelling… they were reading books for children, like “One day Mr. Piggy went to the market…” And I was just like, “What the hell? I’m just like, come on.” Eventually, I just said, “Oh, I’m sorry, I got some homework to do” and I just left. And they said, “Come and join us again next week, we’re going to have it again.”

Here, Lee surmises that the women’s verbal behavior (e.g., laughing and talking loudly, making noise in the hallway, retelling nursery rhymes) was culturally appropriate (“maybe it’s American culture”). In other words, he recognizes alternative cultural behavior. Moreover, despite his calculated effort to participate in their gathering (“I don’t want to hide in my room”), he ultimately found his hall mates’ playful activity
uninteresting and so excused himself. In the following quote, he describes how he came to make sense of the episode:

Lee: At first, I just, I have been thinking, should I accept their interest, or what? But I just figured out the problem is not with me. It’s like, if you’re going abroad, you want to meet more people [but] you have to understand that not all people will be your friends [because] there are really some people that can’t communicate with you. That’s a fact and I accepted it because I have a couple of other friends who are Americans living in other hallways and we are pretty close friends. So, I figured out it is not MY problem.

As the quote above illustrates, Lee recognized that not every interaction with Americans would lead to friendship (“not all people will be your friends”). And, he did not take the encounter personally by feeling defensive, threatened, or hurt (“I just figured the problem is not with me”). Congruent with an ethnorelative orientation, Lee accepted that there were some cultural behaviors he would dislike and others he was not yet able to make sense of given incomplete cultural knowledge. His ability to view his interactions in relativistic terms (“I have a couple of other friends who are Americans living in other hallways and we are pretty close friends”) further demonstrates his acceptance stage orientation towards cultural differences.

In the next examples, two students (Justin and Isabel) describe their recognition of alternative cultural behaviors and values. Justin, a White senior who was raised in Africa until the age of 10, describes how he is construing differences between the cultural behaviors and values he was raised with and those of the American college students with whom he is now coming into contact:

Justin: I grew up with a different set of different cultural values and just an entirely different way of life. That was innate, ingrained in me. And coming to a school of so many people, most of whom are American, you know, they, most Americans have their own way of life, which I am sort of now integrating into my own way of life. So I’m sort of this mix of the two and it’s interesting because it
gives me different cultural perspectives. I guess I have an open mind because I’ve been forced to do that by the transition of coming to America.

I: Can you give me any examples of cultural differences or things that you noticed that were surprising to you maybe?

Justin: Some of the cultural differences are subtle and could just be the way someone expresses themselves or the way someone speaks. But, um, I tend to find that there’s less cultural open-mindedness amongst certain groups of Americans.

As the excerpt above illustrates, Justin has begun to construct himself as an individual who is a “mix” of two cultures. Rather than “integrating” American behaviors and values wholesale, he critiques the paucity of “cultural open-mindedness amongst certain groups of Americans.” In the next passage, he describes an experience his freshman year when he was confronted with the racist and parochial attitudes of two of his American peers:

Justin: My freshman year I was living in the dorm and I went to use the vending machine and there was, you know, there was this Black kid using the vending machine and I made conversation with him, and struck up a great friendship with him, and I’m still friends with him to this day. He’s from Nigeria.

[Then I] went back to my hall and a couple of my friends, not my friends, but I guess a couple of guys who were living in the hall had seen that little interaction and were absolutely baffled and dumbfounded that I exerted energy to even talk to the guy and not just stand in line and get my snack and whatnot. It helped me understand the kinds of people I want to be around and don’t want to be around. And that’s why I’m not really in touch with those two guys today.

Justin did not share his American peers’ ethnocentric preference for limiting their interactions to racially similar others. Unlike them, he was comfortable making conversation and cultivating a friendship across difference. Furthermore, the incident prompted him to reflect upon “the kinds of people I want to be around and don’t want to be around.” As Justin also points out, “I didn’t approach [my peers] with any sort of resistance or um, you know, any selective bias as to who I was going to associate myself
with.” His acceptance of others’ worldviews, but not indiscriminate agreement or preference, is indicative of an acceptance orientation.

Isabel, a White first year student, represents the final example of an acceptance orientation. Prior to college, she had little exposure to diverse others and in her interview she describes a number of collegiate experiences that have contributed to her evolving intercultural sensitivity, specifically her acceptance of culturally diverse others. In the following quote, she describes how she approaches the conversations she has with two peers, one from India and one from the Middle East:

Isabel: We just sit down, we talk, and we hear the different things that come from it. Because we have different beliefs, different cultures. And we actually share those different beliefs, different cultures. Like politics, we can sit down and have a very interesting discussion on our views on politics… I’ve learned more about how like the government systems work, and like the different areas.

Isabel approaches these informal interactions openly and with a sense of curiosity that is a function of her understanding that each person will contribute different perspectives that reflect different cultural belief systems. In the next quote, Isabel describes how she experiences (e.g., makes sense of) these cultural differences:

Isabel: It’s interesting to see how their views and everything are a bit different than ours.

I: And how do you make sense of those differences?

Isabel: How do I make sense out of ‘em? Oh. I just, ya know, I try to figure them out. See how, you know, kind of like, I kind of put it like I’m in their shoes type of thing, which makes me see things from a different point of view, and I can make sense of it a lot easier. And so I get a better understanding of [their] way of life, how [they] lived before [they] came to the United States.
As the above excerpt illustrates, Isabel experiences the conversations in ethnorelative terms: her peers’ perspectives are viable thus, in order to best understand them, she actively tries to see things from their point of view (e.g., put herself “in their shoes”).

Below, Isabel further describes her evolving ethnorelative consciousness:

Isabel: Seeing the differences was really actually shocking. I really learned a lot more about other countries besides America. And it’s just like seeing how they think of things. You know, as an American you really don’t think of something how somebody else does, you realize that. After they, you know, argue their point of view, you really realize that.

Unlike students in earlier stages of intercultural development, Isabel isn’t threatened by these alternative perspectives. Rather, she genuinely appreciates and values them. In the excerpt below, Isabel describes the “very deep” discussions about religion she has with a Hindi peer:

Isabel: We have very deep discussions on what we believe. And, you know, our beliefs aren’t the same and I think that’s where we can get more from somebody else.

I: What do you take away from those discussions?

Isabel: Basically how she feels, exactly what she believes. I understand it [more] each time we talk about it, which really helps me. She’ll say, “Sit and think about this. See what you think about it.” And, well, I’ll go home and I’ll think about it for a day. Then I’ll come back and ask “Is this what you mean, or is this?” You know, trying to understand it more. And she does the same thing with me and Christianity.

I’m a very firm believer in the Christian religion where Jesus dies on the cross for us and that’s how we’re saved. All of that. She doesn’t completely believe in all that. She has her own different beliefs. And, it’s like, so we just sit and we talk about different religions, you know, see where, how we are. It’s just, like, cool! I didn’t know really all that much about her religion when I first came into it. I’ve actually learned a lot more about it. Actually, I understand more about why they do some of the things they do.
Isabel values her conversations across difference because they allow her to articulate what she believes and learn about what others believe. Because others’ beliefs aren’t the same as hers, she is able to “get more” from the process of sharing. She is not threatened by these conversations and, when it comes to the topic of religion, she firmly holds her beliefs. Yet, she acknowledges that her peers’ beliefs are also valid. In fact, the conversations broaden to include other religions, too. In this way, the conversations are not simply an examination of one religious perspective. Rather, they become multidimensional and allow the participants to construct what Bennett (2005) refers to as “culture-general frameworks [that] allow systematic contrasts of behavior and values between cultures” (p. 22). In these ways, Isabel provides another example of an acceptance orientation towards cultural differences: she is curious about different cultures and respectful of the many differences in values and beliefs she encounters. Furthermore, she isn’t foreclosed on the idea that one cultural perspective is better than another.

In the three examples above, Lee, Justin, and Isabel illustrate how individuals who operate from an acceptance orientation approach their intercultural experiences. As a group, these students had had more prior experience interacting with diverse others and described their intercultural experiences in greater detail than did students in the ethnocentric subgroup. Rather than viewing their experiences simplistically or attending to heightened emotional responses (as did students in the ethnocentric subgroup), they engaged in ongoing reflection about them: What kinds of relationships do I want to be involved in (interpersonal dimension)? What is the basis for my beliefs (cognitive dimension)? What is the basis for diverse others’ beliefs (cognitive dimension)? How do I make sense of what different others think and believe (cognitive dimension)? Who am I
in these intercultural interactions (intrapersonal dimension)? This holistic process of reflection seemed to be linked with the ability to construe their intercultural experiences in more complex ways. Furthermore, unlike the ethnocentric examples in the previous section, these students accepted racial, ethnic, and cultural differences as a natural and expected part of their daily lives. As such, they were not threatened by difference and were proactive in meeting and befriending diverse others. They valued their interactions across difference not only for the cultural knowledge they gained, but also because these interactions provide the opportunity to better understand their own cultural behaviors, values, and beliefs. And, as all three students’ experiences indicate, although they did not agree with all of the differences they observed, they remained respectful of them. In these ways, these examples illustrate how ethnocentric and ethnorelative students approach their intercultural experiences and how these differences are consistent with the stages predicted by the DMIS.

The examples above provide corroborating evidence for the DMIS by aligning students’ interpretations of their intercultural experiences with the primary developmental tasks to be resolved by individuals residing in denial and defense. According to Bennett (2004), the “main issues to be resolved at Denial is the tendency to avoid noticing or confronting cultural difference…the resolution of Denial issues allows the creation of simple categories for particular cultures” (p. 64). And, the resolution of Defense issues “involves recognizing the common humanity of people of other cultures” (p. 66). Students began to confront cultural differences by experiencing ongoing exposure to diverse others (e.g., study or travel abroad or in racially diverse settings, living with international peers). They began to create simple categories for particular cultures by
attending classes in which they heard about the lived experiences of diverse others. For example, Kristy saw that an African American peer was reflective and articulate and Natalie recognized that controversial issues were important to her African American classmates. Further, students in this group began to recognize the common humanity of people of other cultures (e.g., Stephanie’s experience living in the international house and witnessing other cultural practices, Jenn’s experience commuting with racially diverse others in NYC, Catherine’s experience hearing others talk about diversity issues in the UK). In these ways, the DMIS provided a useful organizing framework for understanding ethnocentric students’ descriptions of their developmentally effective interactions with diverse others.

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, the examples in this section were chosen to illustrate the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity. These seven examples were selected because the verbatim quotes in the transcripts were particularly rich vis-à-vis students’ descriptions about their experiences of cultural difference. The transcripts from the remaining nine students in the ethnocentric-ethnorelative subgroups also reflected the stage-related thinking characteristic of the DMIS. However, not all interviews lent themselves equally well to being selected to illustrate the DMIS. For reasons ranging from repeated interviewer interruptions that affected the overall flow of the conversation to students providing insufficient contextual information about the interaction or stopping short of a conclusion, the decision not to include examples from all students in the subgroup was more a critique of interviewer idiosyncrasies and the broad scope of the WNSLAE interview protocol than a reflection on the DMIS as a useful and accurate model of the stages of intercultural development. In the next section,
patterns of developmental effects among the two subgroups will be examined in order to better understand the developmental mechanisms involved in promoting intercultural development.

*Effects of Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experiences for Ethnocentric Students*

What impact do meaningful intercultural interactions have on students at varying stages of development? In this section, I present and describe the developmental effect themes for the ten students in the ethnocentric subgroup (see Table 6.1). To identify these themes, I first reviewed the list of developmental effects for the students’ developmentally effective intercultural interactions (see Table 5.1). Next, I evaluated the group of summaries, noting thematic consistencies across effects. For students with an ethnocentric orientation towards difference, the following four effect themes relative to their developmentally effective intercultural interactions were noted: (1) Used feelings of uncertainty and discomfort to foster reflection; (2) Considered one’s own social identity; (3) Gained awareness about diverse others’ perspectives; and (4) Considered how diverse others may perceive one’s actions and behaviors. Below, I offer examples of each developmental effect theme as experienced by students in the ethnocentric subgroup.

Reflection born out of feelings of uncertainty and discomfort encapsulates the first thematic category of effects associated with ethnocentric students’ developmentally effective intercultural experiences. Natalie, Amanda, Angela, and Jiweon all noted experiencing feelings of discomfort and uncertainty about how to respond to diverse others. For example, Natalie’s developmentally effective intercultural experience involved a diversity class about Gender and Law in which the “black girls” *liked* to talk about “really controversial issues.” She noted that she found it difficult to listen to her
African American peers’ perspectives and seemed unsure about how to engage with them. Rather than speak up, Natalie came away from the experience questioning her own actions towards diverse others. She wondered: “Am I a racist? I mean…I don’t think so at all but maybe by my actions… I don’t know, you know?” This feeling of uncertainty mediated the effect of heightened self-reflexivity. In other words, feeling uncertain about how to engage her peers of color caused Natalie to question her own actions and attitudes relative to diverse others.

A second effect theme for students in the ethnocentric subgroup involved self-conscious appraisal of one’s distinct social identity. Angela, for example, found it difficult to relate to peers who came from backgrounds different from her own. Whereas many of her White “Germanic” peers grew up in rural areas, she is a Hong Kong Chinese immigrant raised on the West Coast. Because she has little knowledge of country life, she was unsure how to engage her peers without sounding “snobby”:

Angela: The people I’m around with sometimes, it’s just… I’m so different from them that it’s hard for them to relate to me. So when I tell them stories, sometimes they think I’m being snobby or something because they don’t understand. ‘Cause I’m different. I’m coming from a lot different perspective.

Noting their reactions to her stories, Angela recognized that she is different and that she has come from “a lot different perspective” than many of her White “Germanic” peers.

When asked to consider what she has learned about herself through her interactions with her racially diverse peers, Angela reflected:

Angela: For the most part I learned that I wasn’t this different before. I think that I’m a lot more unique than I ever thought I was here, though I am not really sure if that’s because I’m here, or because that’s really who I am. When I came here… physical things about me were differences now. And so it wasn’t even just the way I dressed and everything. It’s just who I am: the fact that I’m short, the fact
that I am Chinese, the fact that I can speak a different language that nobody can understand when I am talking on the phone with my Mom. That sort of thing.

As a Chinese American woman at a predominately white institution, Angela found it difficult and uncomfortable to interact with peers different from herself. However, because she was one of a few Chinese American students at her institution, Angela was confronted with a cultural transition and intercultural interactions that prompted her to reflect more deeply about her own identity and what it means to be Chinese American. This reflection caused her to affirm her cultural identity and to begin the process of exploring it more fully through coursework and language study.

A third developmental effect for students in this subgroup involved gaining awareness about diverse others’ perspectives. For example, Kristy, a White student, described a poetry class of twenty students in which she learned about the experience of encountering racial stereotypes through the poetry of an African American peer. She found it “informative” and thought-provoking to hear his poetry:

Kristy: He wrote a poem about stereotypes and it was basically kind of listing off all the different stereotypes of what someone might perceive as a black guy walking down the road. Well, maybe he’s this, or maybe he’s that, you know, things like that. But he made it, he has a very lyrical way with his writings so he always has lots and lots of sounds in there so it ended up kind of sounding like a rap and he kind of intertwined that in there, too, to make it like, you know, “I’m not that guy” and “Who I am,” that sort of thing. It was good. I thought it was really good. It made you think, yeah, I guess everybody always comes up with a stereotype even if you don’t want to [and] you’re not trying to.

As the above excerpt illustrates, hearing her peer’s perspective prompted Kristy to reflect upon the prevalence of racial stereotypes and the way “everybody comes up with” stereotypes even when they’re “not trying to.” The experience caused Kristy to consider the ways she, too, unconsciously generated stereotypes about diverse others. This
example illustrates how hearing the perspectives of diverse peers can foster self-reflection and greater sensitivity to the experiences of others.

The final effect theme involves considering how diverse others may perceive one’s actions and behaviors. Like other students in the ethnocentric subgroup, Amy grew up in a racially segregated community where there wasn’t opportunity to meet people from other racial or ethnic backgrounds (e.g., her town was composed of “completely all White people”). She noted that interacting with different others helped her to take into account how “they” feel. In the following quote, Amy describes how she began to consider how African American students might respond to racially derogative language in her selection of rap music:

Amy: I mean, you are wondering if the colored kid in the locker room is going to care if you put on a rap CD that is using the “N word”… just kind of thinking about how they’d react if you were playing a CD with that word. Does that bother them?

By considering whether the “colored kid” in the locker room will care about the lyrics in the music she plays, Amy demonstrates the final developmental effect theme for this subgroup.

Given that there are only ten students in the ethnocentric subgroup, additional research is needed to further validate these findings, and to examine the extent to which these developmental effects can be generalized to other ethnocentric individuals. However, considered together, these effects lay the groundwork for better understanding the developmental trajectory for students who operate from an ethnocentric worldview. For these individuals, simply noting and reflecting upon feelings of discomfort and uncertainty was important, as was understanding one’s one social identity vis-à-vis
diverse others, listening to diverse others’ experiences and perspectives, and considering one’s own behaviors and how others may perceive them. These developmental effects could point to the need to educate individuals at the initial stages of intercultural development about such topics as managing the emotional responses associated with interactions across difference, understanding the multiple facets of one’s social identity, listening and perspective taking skills, and enhancing self-awareness in intercultural situations. In Chapter Seven, I further discuss the implications of these experiences and associated developmental effects for promoting college students’ intercultural development.

**Effects of Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experiences for Ethnorelative Students**

In this section, I describe the developmental elements of the intercultural experiences and effects noted by the six students in the ethnorelative subgroup. As noted above, these students had more prior experience interacting with diverse others than did their ethnocentric peers. Accordingly, they were able to describe and make meaning about a greater array of intercultural interactions. Using the same process described above, I identified themes across developmental effects for the six students in the ethnorelative subgroup: these students (1) Exhibited a nuanced understanding of diverse others’ cultural heritage; (2) Began to embrace marginalized perspectives as legitimate; and (3) Demonstrated willingness to independently pursue intercultural experiences and knowledge. Examples of each theme category are provided below.

The first thematic category of effects for this subgroup involved demonstrating a nuanced understanding of diverse others’ cultural heritage. In the following example,
Heidi, a White student, described the experience of learning about an African American peer’s unique family background and sense of pride about her cultural identity:

Heidi: She has this great sense of independence and like, almost heritage… We worked together and it was just her entire mindset was just really cool. Like, her Mom was the first African American WOMAN to work in this welding company. And it was just, you know, she was so proud… So, a sense of pride in her culture and her family as well…

Heidi’s intercultural interactions allowed her to move beyond a superficial classification of diverse others to a more nuanced understanding of the sources of her classmate’s cultural pride (e.g., achieving integration into a profession traditionally segregated by race and sex). Likewise, rather than describing the experience of initial exposure to diverse others, students in this group were able to engage in sustained conversations on cognitively complex topics. These conversations covered a range of topics such as belief systems and values, religion (see Isabel, above), differences in upbringing and life histories (as just described by Heidi), and opinions about ill-structured problems such as current affairs, social justice issues and affirmative action, and international politics.

A second effect category for students in the ethnorelative subgroup involved embracing alternative perspectives as legitimate. For example, though volunteering at a rescue mission on L.A.’s skid row Emily, a White senior, began to recognize the influence of institutionalized racism on the people of color who accessed the rescue mission’s services:

Emily: Part of it is just being aware, you know, thinking about it. Um, (pause) just sort of the, yeah, being aware, especially systems, things in systems that it’s you know, nobody, there’s not that many people, individuals, who just say “All Blacks are stupid.” That doesn’t happen anymore. But, for the most part, I realize there’s exceptions to that. But um, that things are built in because of historical reasons and sort of being aware of that… and being able to admit that ‘cause you just sort of don’t want to admit that anything’s wrong on that wide of a scale.
As the above quote illustrates, Emily was beginning to understand that individuals at the rescue mission were not solely responsible for their situations (as she believed previously). Rather, she was beginning to see that they were victims of a system that differentially treats the poor and people of color. Likewise, Kanisha, a first year African American student, has felt intellectually stimulated by a social justice class that focuses in Korean American’s experiences in the United States. The course opened her eyes to the stories of other minority groups’ struggles with racism:

Kanisha: The class is the most awesomest class ever and I’m so glad they offer it. I think that everybody needs to take a class like this because they teach you history as it is. Like, who knew that racism stemmed from all this different stuff? I just think that the way that we’ve been taught in K-12 is so tainted compared with how history actually occurred, like the whole Native Americans being shipped out West. [In K-12] they kind of blurred out why that happened. [In class] we just talk about race and how race has affected our lives, who we are, our racial identities, and how we view other people… it’s just been really enlightening. It kind of shook me up a little bit.

Kanisha was enthusiastic about her “enlightening” social justice class because it allowed her to recognize that other racial groups besides African Americans were the victims of racism and that not all perspectives are represented in a secondary school curriculum she identified as “tainted.” In these ways, a developmental effect for ethnorelative students Kanisha and Heidi was the recognition of the experiences of marginalized groups.

Finally, students in the ethnorelative group demonstrated willingness to independently pursue intercultural experiences and knowledge. As noted previously, Justin actively engaged in conversation with a Nigerian peer as a first year student, Isabel enjoyed her informal conversations with her French and Indian peers, international
student Lee was proactive in seeking out American friends, and Kanisha’s diversity class sparked the desire to independently explore social justice issues:

Kanisha: I’m going to go home, read some journals, and find out more about what’s going on… health disparity, racism, all those because there’s a lot of things out there that I didn’t know were out there. There’s a lot of online resources that I can access. Because I have a wider interest than my [major] allows, I have to supplement my own education with my interest…

As the above excerpt illustrates, Kanisha, like other students in the ethnorelative subgroup, was not satisfied relying on peers, authority figures, and the limited curriculum of her major to find out “what’s going on.” Rather, she was internally motivated to find answers and supplement her learning.

In this section and the previous one, I have described the effect themes of the interculturally effective experiences described by students in the ethnocentric and ethnorelative subgroups and provided examples of each theme from the interview transcripts. Given the small size of the two subgroups, I do not want to overstate the implications of these effect themes for understanding how college students in general develop intercultural effectiveness. However, the effect themes described above illuminate a central mechanism of intercultural development: *how students interpret their intercultural experiences leads them to learn different lessons from the experiences.* These different interpretations and associated lessons constitute the intercultural development continuum. For students in the ethnocentric subgroup, interpretations of intercultural experiences focused on reflections about feelings in polarized ways (e.g., discomfort and uncertainty), increasing awareness of one’s unique and multifaceted social identity, and beginning awareness of diverse others’ perspectives and behaviors. Students in the ethnorelative subgroup, on the other hand, interpreted their intercultural
experiences by drawing upon multiple experiences across multiple contexts and by integrating their knowledge about diverse others’ social, cultural, economic, and political backgrounds. For these students, interpretation of intercultural experiences was increasingly connected to awareness of alternative and marginalized perspectives. As students developed increasingly complex and nuanced understandings about the lived experiences of diverse others, they became more proactive in pursuing intercultural experiences and knowledge. And, students in this group were less concerned with the centrality of their own cultural worldview and more interested in proactively learning from the varied perspectives and life experiences of diverse others.

In the next section, I will further explore the mechanisms of intercultural development by examining linkages between the meaning making levels of the self-authorship framework and the developmental stages of the DMIS.

*Linking DMIS Orientation and Meaning Making about Developmentally Effective Intercultural Interactions*

In this chapter and the previous chapter I have analyzed the qualitative data from two constructive developmental perspectives: a) students’ interpretations about their developmentally effective intercultural interactions from the perspective of external, mixed, and initial self-authorship orientations (see Chapter Five); and b) intercultural sensitivity utilizing IDI developmental scores as a measure of stage development on the DMIS (present Chapter). Strong examples reflecting each perspective were readily identified in the qualitative data, but other findings (i.e., those in Table 6.1) indicate that there is not a perfect 1:1 relationship between the two measures. Below, I offer some thoughts about the variability between these two measures.
I begin with a short review of the two instruments used to measure these constructs, the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) and the WNSLAET Interview. As noted in Chapter Three, the Intercultural Development Inventory is a 50-item paper-and-pencil measure of intercultural sensitivity. The items represent a range of viewpoints towards cultural differences and respondents are asked to indicate their level of agreement with the overall content of each item using Likert-style response options. Sample items include the following: “I do not feel I have a culture,” “I can change my behavior to adapt to other cultures,” and “Too much cultural diversity is bound to lead to divisive conflict.” The in-depth WNSLAET Interview, on the other hand, is a semi-structured interview that is designed to elicit a clearer understanding of students’ meaning making about their college experiences; self-authorship level is used as the developmental foundation underlying seven liberal arts outcomes, including intercultural effectiveness. The format is that of an “informal conversation interview” (Patton, 1990) guided by a general interview protocol that seeks to elicit the collegiate experiences that college students have found to be meaningful. Sample questions include the following: “I’d like to focus specifically on the experiences you’ve had that you think have affected you most. What has been your most significant experience so far?” and “Have you had interactions with people whom you perceive as different than you? If so, tell me about them.” Thus, the format of the two measures is different: the IDI provides a pre-determined series of statements for respondents to read and respond to whereas the WNSLAET Interview invites individual respondents to actively draw upon their own experiences in constructing their answers.
Another difference between the IDI and in-depth interview is that they place different cognitive demands on respondents: the IDI involves recognition tasks and the in-depth interview involves production tasks. From a developmental perspective, recognition tasks are associated with the leading edge of development since the ability to recognize and prefer more advanced arguments precedes the ability to produce them (King, 1990). In other words, although students may recognize those IDI items that are more “interculturally sensitive,” they may not yet possess the developmental maturity to interpret their reactions and to explain their behavior in interculturally effective ways. For this reason, one would expect that students could earn higher scores on the IDI before they evidenced higher order meaning making. This could explain the variability among meaning making orientations represented by the 6 students in the ethnorelative subgroup (e.g., 4 external, 1 mixed, and 1 internal). That is, although they could recognize and prefer higher stage IDI items, most could not produce higher stage reflections in the interviews.

It is also plausible that the two measures, while similar in constructive developmental approach, are not measuring the same construct, or the same aspects of the larger construct. As noted above, the IDI is concerned with assessing respondents’ perspectives with respect to cultural differences, while the WNSLAE interview is concerned with eliciting individuals’ constructivist assumptions by inviting them to actively engage in making meaning about a broad range of collegiate experiences. As a result, a drawback of using the WNSLAE Interview to assess intercultural development is that it was designed to assess a wide range of learning outcomes, not particularly
intercultural effectiveness. Although both yielded informative data about intercultural effectiveness, each focused on different aspects of this outcome.

Another possible explanation for the variability between meaning making orientation and IDI Developmental score could be the lack of specificity about the analytic categories used for meaning making assessment. Recall that students in this study were assigned to one of three meaning making orientations (external, mixed, and early internal) based upon their overall interview transcript. Given the complexity of human development, a three-tiered developmental continuum that gives only a gross indication of developmental level may be inadequate. This may have contributed to the finding that all three meaning making orientations were represented in both the ethnocentric and ethnorelative subgroups.

In conclusion, the lack of congruence between the measure of meaning making orientation and DMIS stage is likely associated with the different developmental demands made of respondents, the limited ability of the assessment of meaning making to discern fine gradations in development, and the different aspects of intercultural effectiveness each was designed to measure. Considered together, the variability in findings reflects the complexity associated with measuring intercultural effectiveness. Nonetheless, this study yielded persuasive qualitative evidence for each developmental model. Thus, while the variability across measures is provocative, the overall study findings reflect the complexity of the relationship and intimates new possibilities for measuring college students’ intercultural development, a topic I address in Chapter Seven.
CHAPTER 7

DISCUSSION

Despite the fact that the United States is more demographically diverse than ever, most Americans continue to reside in racially, ethnically, and culturally segregated communities (AAC&U, 1995b; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002). For many young people, attending college provides the opportunity for their first significant exposure to others who are different than themselves. The college years represent a powerful period of self exploration during which students begin to establish themselves in the adult world through seeking meaning, purpose, and professional skills - often while living away from their families, friends, communities, and established support networks for the first time. Accordingly, the college environment influences students’ intercultural development in a number of important intellectual, social, and intrapersonal ways. Further, the extent to which college students acquire the knowledge, skills and awareness to behave in interculturally effective ways post-college has direct implications for the quality of their citizenship in an increasingly diverse American society and interconnected world (Gurin, 1999). For this reason, I argue that theory-based, empirically tested, and developmentally effective practices, programs, and experiences that facilitate intercultural development and prepare graduates for responsible citizenship in an increasingly global world are an important part of today’s college education.
This study sought to better understand the developmental tasks associated with achieving intercultural effectiveness and the nature of collegiate experiences that are effective in promoting this form of development. The conceptual framework that guided this study posited that intercultural development is fostered by some combination of students’ background characteristics and pre-college exposure to diverse others, institutional structural diversity, participation in collegiate diversity experiences, and concomitant meaning making about these contexts and events. For this reason, the framework also considered how variability in individual meaning making capacities could influence the achievement of this outcome. The central research question this study addressed was: *What student background characteristics and college diversity experiences promote college students’ intercultural development?*

**Summary of Conceptual Framework and Methods**

The theoretical basis for this study is constructive developmental. Specifically, it is concerned with understanding individuals’ evolving constructions of themselves, their relationships with others, and epistemological assumptions in relation to their intercultural experiences. The study was informed by the human life span work of Kegan (1994), the college student development perspectives of Baxter Magolda (1999; 2001) and King and Baxter Magolda (2005), and the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) by intercultural communication practitioner Milton Bennett (1986; 1993). The study’s literature review integrated these varying perspectives and subsequent analytic procedures were guided by these scholars’ developmental models in order to better understand the nature of college students’ intercultural development.
This study utilized a mixed methods approach because of its capacity for illuminating both patterns in college students’ curricular and co-curricular engagement in diversity experiences and individual-level insights about students’ interpretations of these experiences. Moreover, the use of both quantitative and qualitative data is useful because each has strengths and weaknesses relative to understanding students’ intercultural development: quantitative data offer systematic and uniform information about a range of demographic characteristics, institutional structural diversity, and involvement in a range of collegiate diversity experiences, and qualitative data provide deeper insight to individual students’ stories and the nuances of their meaning making constructions about their intercultural experiences.

In order to illuminate the developmental progression involved in achieving intercultural effectiveness and the various ways that students’ background characteristics, institutional structural diversity, and collegiate diversity experiences shape this development, a three-phase analytic plan was employed. In the first phase, quantitative methods were employed to explore students’ patterns of engagement in collegiate diversity experiences such as intercultural awareness workshops, study abroad, and diversity courses. Correlations were conducted to examine the relationship between participation in these experiences, student background characteristics, and measures of intercultural sensitivity as indicated by students’ scores on the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI). Lastly, an ordinary least squares logistic regression using students’ IDI developmental scores as the dependent variable in four blocks was run to illuminate how individual components of the conceptual framework (i.e., student background characteristics, institutional structural diversity, participation in collegiate diversity
experiences, meaning making about intercultural experiences) affected students’ intercultural development.

In the next phase of the study, a sub-sample of in-depth interviews was selected for analysis. These interviews contained students’ descriptions of developmentally effective intercultural experiences. These were defined as experiences that had an articulated impact on at least one of three domains of development: cognitive (the ways that individuals understand knowledge and its construction), interpersonal (the ways that individuals understand their relationships), and intrapersonal (the ways that individuals understand their identity). Interview summaries were organized by overall meaning making orientation (i.e., initial, mixed and early internal) and patterns in how students in each orientation interpreted their intercultural interactions were noted. Also in this phase, students’ meaning making was explored in relation to self-selected background characteristics and institutional structural diversity. Then, a matrix of students’ developmentally effective intercultural experiences in relation to the study’s initial conceptual framework was created; this may be found in Table 5.4.

The third phase of this study involved an inquiry into the connections between the quantitative data (in the form of students’ developmental scores on the IDI) and qualitative data (in the form of high and low IDI scorers’ descriptions of their developmentally effective intercultural interactions). For this phase of data analysis, two subgroups (one ethnocentric and one ethnorelative) were selected and responses from these groups were examined in relation to their corresponding stages of Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS). Finally, the relationship between self-authorship levels and orientations towards cultural differences was explored.
Considered together, the three phases of this study illuminate the student background characteristics, elements of structural diversity, and collegiate diversity experiences that contribute to intercultural effectiveness. Moreover, the combination of phases allowed for an in-depth examination of how college students interpret their intercultural experiences.

Discussion of Findings

In this section, I discuss the study’s primary findings, organized by the major elements of the conceptual framework that guided this study. Given the mixed methods approach employed in the study, findings from both the quantitative and qualitative phases of the study are discussed concurrently below as a means of further triangulating the findings from these two research paradigms, noting both places in which the two approaches are aligned and complement each other and where they occasionally contradict one another.

Effects of Student Background Characteristics on Intercultural Development

The role of upbringing and socialization were clearly visible in these results. In the qualitative analysis, pre-college experiences such as growing up in small, racially homogenous communities, having little prior exposure to diverse others, and traveling or living abroad shaped and influenced how these students experienced college. Findings from this study are consistent with those of other studies showing that many students from all racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds enter college with very little experience interacting with diverse others (Orfield, Bachmeier, James, & Elite, 1997). Of the six student background characteristic independent variables included in the quantitative phase of this study (i.e., gender, age, White/Non-White, high school GPA,
class level, and similarity of high school racial composition to oneself), gender was the only variable that was significantly correlated with IDI developmental score ($r = -.169, p < .001$; see Table 4.3). Gender was also a significant predictor in all four blocks of the regression analysis ($p \leq .001$; see Table 4.4). Furthermore, women in the assessment sample scored significantly higher than men, and students of color scored significantly higher than White students on the IDI. It is conceivable that both women and students of color enter college with higher levels of intercultural sensitivity. For women, developmental differences could be associated with differential patterns of socialization that emphasize listening, caring, and empathy. For students of color, these differences could be associated with the experience of being a non-majority group member in American society. A provocative finding of the sub-group analysis provides further evidence for this last idea: in the regression analysis for White students (see Table 4.5), whether students attended a more racially diverse high school became a significant predictor of intercultural development in college. This finding suggests that White students benefit more from pre-college exposure to diverse peers than do students of color, likely because of the ways such experiences frame students’ assumptions about race. That is, White students who attend diverse high schools may be more accustomed to racial differences and therefore more prepared to benefit from diversity experiences in college.

The findings of this study also suggest that both women and students of color reap different intercultural benefits from the college experience. For example, while women comprised 65% of the interview sample, they accounted for 77% of the developmentally effective intercultural experiences (DEIE) sample. Likewise, students of color comprised
21% of the interview sample but 29% of the DEIE sample (as shown in Tables 3.2 and 3.3). Although additional longitudinal research with controls for entering level is necessary for causal inference, the finding is significant because it suggests a relationship between students’ gender and race or ethnicity and gains in intercultural effectiveness.

Findings from the qualitative analysis provided additional insights into the role of pre-college socialization on students’ intercultural development: at least two students (Justin and Jiweon) described their own parents’ parochial and even racist attitudes and the negative effect that this had on their expectations for interacting with diverse others in college, and few students acknowledged learning tolerance, open-mindedness, and valuing of diverse perspectives as a part of their pre-college learning. This finding may be interpreted in light of educational research that indicates that many U.S. college students lack ethnic and cultural awareness and understanding (Hurtado, Engberg, Ponjuan, & Landreman, 2002; Saddlemire, 1996). It is possible that children lack such knowledge because their parents also lack it, or because they did not acquire intercultural skills during secondary school. For example, children whose parents function at higher levels of intercultural sensitivity are likely to profit from their parents’ knowledge and skills by learning habits of mind and everyday behaviors (such as intercultural awareness and understanding, ongoing relationships with diverse others). And, children who learn to interact comfortably with diverse peers as a fundamental component of their secondary schooling are likely to benefit from these skills in college and beyond.

In the interviews, a number of students noted that they had been raised in racially segregated communities, high schools, and even states and countries (see Ilona and Jiweon’s stories for examples of this), and students hailing from small towns noted the
dearth of diversity experience that is characteristic of such communities. When asked to introduce themselves and to describe their significant collegiate experiences, college students from both homogeneous and heterogeneous backgrounds who noted significant intercultural experiences often referenced the structural diversity of their communities and secondary schools. Many more students commented on the dearth of structural diversity than its prevalence (see Appendix D for examples). Findings such as these are consistent with research such as that conducted by Kozol (2005) and Orfield (2001) that points to a pattern of increasingly segregated community and educational environments, despite compelling evidence pointing to large scale demographic shifts towards an increasingly diverse American society (Kent & Mather, 2002).

Of the 47 DEIE sample group members, only two students indicated having had close friendships across difference prior to college, but in both cases, the friendships were cited as relevant to how these students approached and made sense of diversity issues in college. Given the relatively high level of intimacy that such formative friendships suggest, it may be that college students who had pre-college friendships with diverse others enter college with higher levels of intercultural sensitivity than peers who enter without this experience. Likewise, students who reported international experiences during secondary school, whether traveling for pleasure, living abroad with their military families, or participating in study abroad experiences, noted a heightened sense of intercultural awareness. In these ways, significant pre-college exposure to diversity (especially for majority group students) appears to enable a readiness for deeper consideration of intercultural issues once enrolled in college.
Overall, this study’s findings about the effects of students’ background characteristics on intercultural development in college underscore the fact that many students enter college with little experience interacting with diverse others in meaningful ways, and that students from racially homogenous backgrounds, as well as men from all racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds, are likely to require more support when engaging with diverse others in college.

*Effects of Structural Diversity on Intercultural Development*

In the quantitative analysis, institutional structural diversity was not a significant predictor of students’ intercultural development in any of the four blocks of the OLS regression model. In the qualitative analysis, however, students in the DEIE sample regularly commented upon the structural diversity that they encountered in college, and this information was used to frame their meaning making about their intercultural experiences. At first glance, the quantitative and qualitative findings with respect to the effects of structural diversity on college students’ intercultural development may appear inconsistent or contradictory. However, the two analytic approaches inform one another and illuminate the complexity involved in understanding how individual intercultural development is shaped by the presence of diverse others. Specifically, neither the racial composition of students’ high schools nor the percentage of an institution’s structural diversity was a strong predictor of students’ level of intercultural development in the quantitative analysis. Given a growing body of research that points to the role of structural diversity in promoting diversity outcomes (Antonio, 1998, 2001; Chang, 1996), this finding is surprising. However, a number of educational researchers argue that the presence of racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse students is not by itself enough to
promote intercultural development (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002). Rather, careful consideration must be paid to the overall campus racial climate and level of support for students with respect to having increased interactions and involvement with diverse students, both within and outside of the classroom (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1999). Since the quantitative component of this study did not include measures of institutional racial climate and level of institutional support provided to students with respect to their diversity involvement, it was not possible to assess the impact of these important variables. Including these variables might have increased the explained variance in the regression model and certainly suggests pathways for future research (as noted below).

What *is* compelling in the structural diversity findings is its role in enabling developmentally effective intercultural experiences. That is, as reported in the interviews of students in the DEIE sample, nearly half of the developmentally effective intercultural experiences occurred within the context of racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse peers interacting with one another. Specifically, among the 49 intercultural experiences in which students reported greater cognitive, interpersonal, or intrapersonal insight, 22 directly involved an interaction with a diverse college peer or peers (see Table 5.4). Simply put, interactions with diverse peers are more likely to take place when there is higher structural diversity, and such interactions provide powerful contexts for intercultural growth.

In order to understand the impact of structural diversity on college students’ intercultural development, it is important to also consider the different ways that students attend to the diversity around them. As a group, students in the DEIE Sample commonly
commented on the structural diversity of their pre-college communities and schools, and many students noted the structural diversity of their college or university (see Appendix A for examples). While some students attached little significance to the racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity of their campus, others reflected at length about what they observed. Consider Angela, the Chinese American student described in Chapter Six: she was engaged in serious reflection about her cultural identity and the experience of being “different.” It is possible that such in-depth reflection would have occurred if she had attended an institution where there were more students “like her.” However, some aspect of considering both students “like her” and “not like her” prompted the type of deeply introspective reflection that led her to create a more complex cognitive framework that took both perspectives into account. It appears that structural diversity plays at least two roles in regard to intercultural development. First, if one simply considers enrollment patterns, campuses with higher structural diversity can offer more opportunities to interact with diverse others generally, and with peers specifically. Second, structural diversity provides a context for intercultural experiences and ideally the impetus to reflect on one’s own identity as a cultural person. Thus, observing and reflecting upon structural diversity seems to be linked to having developmentally effective intercultural experiences and therefore to intercultural development.

Finally, the qualitative findings with respect to the effect of structural diversity on intercultural development also provided support for Allport’s (1954) “contact hypothesis,” which outlined four conditions necessary for positive effects of intergroup contact: equal group status, common goals, intergroup cooperation, and support from authority. Translated to the collegiate context, DEIE’s such as those noted by the 22
students above regularly fulfilled two or more of the four conditions necessary for positive effects related to diverse interactions: they involved direct interactions between diverse peers (both inside and outside of the classroom), common goals (such as academic success or participation in student organizations of shared interest), opportunities for intergroup cooperation (such as working together on class projects or negotiating a shared living situation), and support of authority (such as having institutional leadership with respect to diversity issues or an instructor who created an inclusive classroom learning environment). This finding provides support for the importance of actively enhancing campus racial/ethnic climates as a means of promoting students’ intercultural development (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1998).

Therefore, although the quantitative analysis for this study indicated that structural diversity does not directly influence intercultural development, the qualitative analysis paints a different picture. When students described DEIE’s, they often noted pre-college and collegiate structural diversity. Developmentally effective intercultural experiences often involved direct interactions with diverse peers, who were linked to institutional structural diversity by merit of their enrollment. Last, having a critical mass of diverse peers on campus and in the classroom (e.g., Allport’s “equal group status”) has the potential to establish all four conditions for positive effects due to intergroup interactions, and therefore enhance intercultural learning.

Effects of Collegiate Diversity Experiences on Intercultural Development

Many collegiate experiences have been demonstrated to foster intercultural development; these include participation in diversity courses, service learning, racial and ethnic or cultural awareness workshops, education abroad, and intergroup dialogue
In this study, these types of experiences were more often developmentally effective when they: a) offered sustained exposure to diverse others, whether on- or off-campus; b) provided institutional support in the form of regular class meetings; c) equipped students with increased awareness about diverse others’ cultural practices, beliefs, and values; and d) incorporated meaningful reflection that provided students with the opportunity to grapple with complex intercultural issues. However, in the quantitative phase of the study, well over half of students reported no participation in these kinds of experiences (see Table 4.1). If students are not participating in diversity classes and experiences during college, they will not benefit from the intercultural learning that such experiences have been demonstrated to promote.

Among diversity experiences, having taken a course with a community service component played an influential role in students’ intercultural development: the 16% of students who participated in community service earned significantly higher IDI developmental scores than those who did not do so. Further, taking a course with a community service component was found to be a significant predictor in the regression analysis (see Table 4.4). Both community service and education abroad expose participants to diverse others outside of the campus environment. Such experiences may have been effective in fostering intercultural development because of the uncertainty inherent in interacting with individuals who are not a part of the campus community (e.g., students, faculty, and staff) or established social networks (e.g., family and friends), and because these experiences present students with problems that are outside of the immediate collegiate context.
The quantitative findings also show that experiencing an uncomfortable emotional response (such as discomfort, feeling tense, silenced, guarded, or even hurt) was associated with higher IDI scores and was a significant predictor in the regression analysis. These findings suggest that collegiate diversity experiences are most effective when they interrupt students’ familiar ways of thinking, acting, and responding. In the case of experiencing an uncomfortable response in conjunction with a diversity experience, doing so may have disrupted students’ unexamined patterns of thinking and prompted them to evaluate their grounding assumptions, therefore stimulating development in cognitive complexity as described in several models of cognitive development (Baxter Magolda, 1992; Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986; Kegan, 1994; Kitchener & King, 1994). Certainly, having a negative emotional response to a diversity experience is a challenging and unpleasant outcome. For this reason, extra support on the part of faculty, staff, and administrators is required in order to help students understand the response and its causes so as to learn from it. This point is discussed in more detail below.

The Piagetian learning approach of constructive developmentalism asserts that how individuals make sense of their experiences is related to the number and types of experiences they have to draw upon. Providing college students with intercultural experiences offers a rich meaning making context, learning about diverse others’ cultural backgrounds provides new knowledge, and providing opportunities for meaningful reflection activities promotes the development of increasingly complex cognitive structures. Considered from the perspective of the DMIS, collegiate diversity experiences provide students with the opportunity to reframe ethnocentric orientations towards
cultural differences. Thus, collegiate diversity experiences provide an important stimulus for the transformations of mind that underlie human intercultural development. Developmental differences in how students in this study made sense of their intercultural experiences are discussed below.

*Interpretations of Intercultural Experiences*

Students enter college with a wide range of skills and prior experiences, and the same experiences have different effects on students depending on their readiness, interest, and developmental level (Baxter Magolda et. al, 2007). The quantitative findings demonstrated that having identified a DEIE in the WNSLAE Interview was linked to higher levels of intercultural development (IDI scores); in addition, it was a significant predictor in the regression analysis. Furthermore, students’ primary meaning making orientations provided the overarching cognitive framework that guided how they interpreted their intercultural interactions. A central finding from the quantitative portion of this study was that students with more mature self-authorship orientations were more likely to report a developmentally effective intercultural experience. This finding suggests that students who use higher self-authorship learn more from their intercultural interactions. Students who have undergone the transformations of mind that accompany the increased cognitive complexity associated with self-authorship may be more willing to reexamine their views and assumptions regarding intercultural issues and be more open to learning from them. A second interpretation is that having intercultural experiences may promote the development of self-authorship. In other words, intercultural experiences may promote the cognitive dissonance that forces students to reconsider previously held assumptions and, by so doing, facilitate the transformations of mind and
worldview associated with the development of self-authorship. Given the distinctive differences in students’ meaning making about their intercultural experiences by developmental level, I next demonstrate how different types of dissonance are associated with different developmental levels.

*External Orientations and Ethnocentric Subgroup.* A key characteristic among the responses of externally defined students was that exposure to new and different cultural practices and perspectives provided an important stimulus for engaging in intercultural interactions. Such exposure also seemed to foster intrapersonal development in the form of self-awareness and an increased willingness to engage with different others. Gaining basic cross-cultural knowledge was highly valued by students with this meaning making orientation because it instilled a sense of understanding about why diverse others behave the way they do. Having this knowledge also prompted externally defined students to consider their *own* behavior and therefore begin to practice perspective taking skills.

Additionally, knowledge acquisition was important to externally defined students because it bolstered their comfort and confidence levels and the sense that they were open-minded and aware of others’ perspectives. Students who operated from an external orientation shared a number of similarities in the ways they made meaning about their intercultural interactions. As a group, they experienced uncertainty and a sense of discomfort at the prospect of engaging with different others and these ethnocentric feelings were sometimes masked by avoidance or claims of disinterest. They viewed cultural differences simplistically, judging them as purely good or purely bad. They didn’t examine their own culture (beliefs, assumptions, and values) in depth and seemed unaware that they, too, have a culture (Tatum, 1992). Students with this orientation relied
upon authority such as parents, religious leaders, faculty, and university administration for cues about how they should approach these interactions. Considered together, these findings reiterate the importance of developmentally appropriate intercultural programming for college students. Students at initial levels of intercultural development require basic tools (e.g., skills, awareness, and knowledge) with which to communicate and interact across difference, and support in taking risks to do so. Having these tools, and feeling confident about using them, is an important building block for their further intercultural development.

Mixed Orientations. Students who operated from a mixed orientation began to question previously unexamined assumptions by exploring their own beliefs and talking with others about their beliefs. Their dualistic assumptions were challenged and they began to acquire a more nuanced understanding of complex intercultural issues. Students who operated from this orientation began to expand their worldviews by seeking out and beginning to accept multiple perspectives. They practiced perspective taking and reflection. They also explored their own values and beliefs and were beginning to select which ones they would adhere to when challenged. In intercultural contexts, they began to generate their own conclusions after evaluating the basis for knowledge claims. Overall, students who operated from a mixed meaning making orientation were more comfortable than externally oriented students in taking risks where intercultural experiences were concerned. Finally, students who operated from this orientation found that being challenged to explore their own assumptions when interacting across difference was especially important for fostering their intercultural development.
Early Internal Orientations and Ethnorelative Subgroup. One limitation of this study was the dearth of study participants who operated from an early internal self-authorship and who possessed an ethnorelative worldview. Despite the small size of this subgroup, distinctive approaches were apparent among this small (n=6) sub-sample compared to the others. These students specifically commented on and had begun to actualize their own vision for the types of relationships they wanted to cultivate, took the initiative to reach out to diverse others, and actively sought out other individuals who also valued difference. Unlike students with external and mixed self-authorship orientations, students with an early internal orientation were actively implementing their own vision and values about having meaningful intercultural exchanges in college. Furthermore, their emphasis on learning and sharing multiple perspectives enabled them to have friendships with diverse others where all parties were invited to give and receive cultural knowledge. Thus, these students had internalized values about the importance of cultivating relationships with diverse others.

This section has described the study’s qualitative findings relative to the characteristics of meaning making that students at different self-authorship orientations demonstrated. Below, I build on the characteristics of each developmental level to provide suggestions for ways in which higher education institutions can utilize these findings to promote students’ intercultural development.

Educational Implications for Promoting Intercultural Development

Many educational researchers argue that higher education institutions must be intentional in providing more opportunities for intercultural interaction (cf. Chang, Chang, and Lesdesma, 2005; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1998). This
would require creating campus cultures that facilitate engagement and interaction through meaningful interventions. It is not sufficient to simply put diverse college students together with the expectation that intercultural development will occur. Rather, a scaffolding of challenge and support within intentional programming that directly addresses students’ developmental level is needed.

In order to effectively foster students’ intercultural development, this study’s findings point to the need for higher education institutions to implement a network of intercultural programs that are comprehensive, integrated, and sustained. Comprehensive programs are those that are a central part of the collegiate experience for all students, regardless of race, ethnicity, or cultural background. This study pointed to the fact that students from many different kinds of backgrounds (e.g., international students, African American students, White students, Asian American students, students from racially homogenous backgrounds, students from racially mixed backgrounds) benefited from collegiate diversity experiences. Integrated programs provide students with the opportunity to make meaning across different learning and environmental contexts. This study demonstrated that students with more advanced intercultural capacities learned by integrating a range of diversity experiences from different contexts. That is, having a range of significant intercultural experiences and demonstrating the ability to integrate these experiences was associated with intercultural learning. Recall Summer, the White college senior from a racially mixed community. She drew upon her pre-college experiences with diverse others, observations of the lack of integration among the diverse student populations on her campus, her own interactions with diverse student organizations, and her membership in the international student organization AIESEC to
inform her interpretations. Similarly, Justin, the White senior who was raised in South Africa until the age of six, drew upon his formative experiences abroad, his experiences within the American context, and his residence hall-based interactions with White American peers and a Nigerian international student to promote reflection about his own intercultural identity. Similarly, sustained programs recognize that students at all grade levels benefit from collegiate diversity experiences. Although the DEIE sample was not selected by class level, half of the students were first or second year students and half were seniors; this distribution is consistent with how the interview sample was selected and shows that students across educational levels benefited from intercultural interventions. For all of these reasons, opportunities for intercultural learning should be abundant, integrated, and easily accessible to all students, irrespective of class year.

Kegan (1994) recounted how developmental theorist William Perry utilized the metaphor of a bridge to elucidate the how developmental education occurs:

Perry understood that if developmental education is a matter of collaboratively building a “consciousness bridge,” then the bridge builder must have an equal respect for both ends, creating a firm foundation on both sides of the chasm students will traverse. Firmly anchoring the bridge on one end by welcoming rather than disdaining “the way they understand,”… Perry then invited his students to join him in constructing what they would only gradually come to see was a bridge they could choose to walk on. (p. 279)

Likewise, in order to best prepare their graduates for active participation in an increasingly diverse society, higher education faculty and administrators should both welcome the ways in which college students currently understand their intercultural experiences, as well as join them in constructing more interculturally effective selves. For this reason, educators will benefit from understanding the mechanisms of intercultural development, recognizing why certain collegiate diversity experiences facilitate
intercultural development, and applying this knowledge to the programs, experiences, and curricular enhancements they support and implement.

The findings from this study also point to ways educators can implement developmentally sequenced curricula and interventions to promote intercultural effectiveness. Developmentally sequenced curricula respect and take into account developmental differences when framing learning goals. In such curricula, the achievement of an earlier goal lays the groundwork for the next goal. The challenges associated with the achievement of a goal at an earlier level of development become a source of support in the achievement of a goal at the successive level. This type of developmentally sequenced curriculum has been proposed previously in the form of an interdisciplinary writing curriculum (Haynes, 2007), a sustainability-themed learning community (Bekken & Marie, 2007), and a residential citizenship curriculum (Kerr & Tweedy, 2006).

Based on the findings of this study, I offer a curriculum for promoting intercultural effectiveness that addresses students at various phases of development in both meaning making orientation and DMIS stage. My curriculum was developed by synthesizing the DEIE effects for each of the 47 DEIE students (see Tables 5.1 through 5.3) with the seven effect themes identified as part of the triangulation analysis conducted in Chapter Six (see Table 6.1). Drawn from these findings, Table 7.1 lists learning goals that promote intercultural development; these are organized into three categories of awareness, knowledge, and skills, a framework used previously by Pope, Reynolds, and Mueller (2004) to describe the tenets of multicultural competence for student affairs.
practitioners. Adapting their definition to a more general audience than student affairs in higher education yields the following definitions:

*Multicultural awareness* includes an understanding of one's values, beliefs, attitudes, and assumptions and the influences they have on one's work with students who are culturally different. *Multicultural knowledge* includes knowledge of the dynamics of oppression … as well as information (history, traditions, values, and customs) about many cultures. … *Multicultural skills* … include a range of abilities needed … to create and maintain multicultural campus environments: communicating effectively across cultures, expanding one's cross-cultural interactions, developing … programs and policies that are culturally sensitive and appropriate, rebounding from inevitable cultural mistakes, and incorporating new and previous learning in new situations. (p. 216; italics added)

The arrangement of learning goals into these categories involved a series of judgment calls since the nature of intercultural awareness, knowledge, and skills are closely intertwined. Nonetheless, it is hoped that these goal categories will prove useful to practitioners selecting among possible goals for their intercultural programming.

Each of the learning goals in Table 7.1 also corresponds with beginning, intermediate or advanced levels of intercultural development. More specifically, the first (beginning) level of the curriculum is applicable to students who operate from Denial and Defense orientations towards cultural difference, as well as to students who utilize external meaning making. These students tend to lack awareness about the social construct of diversity and feel uncertainty and a sense of discomfort in diverse cultural situations. They often lack experience interacting across difference and may express concern about the ability to talk with diverse others without being called “a racist.” In general, students at this level view cultural differences simplistically and hold unexamined assumptions about their own culture. Interventions that would be appropriate for fostering beginning level students’ intercultural development would be those that
offer safe spaces for students to acknowledge and explore feelings associated with talking about/interacting with diverse others (e.g., intergroup dialogue), those that provide opportunities and contexts in which students can safely examine assumptions about cultural behaviors and the basis for them with diverse others (e.g., living learning communities designed for this purpose), and those that offer opportunities for students to gain knowledge and awareness about diverse others and their cultural practices (e.g., diversity courses). Such interventions allow students to overcome their Defense/Denial orientations towards cultural difference by providing intercultural awareness, knowledge, and skills that challenge their ethnocentric worldviews and expose them to ethnorelative perspectives.

The second (intermediate) level of the curriculum is applicable to students in Minimization and to students who utilize mixed meaning making. These students over-simplify cultural differences and therefore lack sensitivity for the experiences of diverse others. Because they view cultural differences simplistically, they may fail to recognize diverse perspectives on important issues. For example, they may exhibit skepticism about the existence of discrimination and hold unexamined assumptions about their own privilege. They tend to rely upon stereotypes for information about diverse others and are unable to distinguish cultural differences within racial and ethnic groups (e.g., Hispanic vs. Mexican, Asian vs. Asian American vs. Chinese American). Interventions that would be appropriate for fostering intermediate students’ intercultural development would be those that strengthen intergroup relations by offering opportunities for ongoing, meaningful interactions with diverse others (e.g., group projects that identify members’ unique life stories, service learning opportunities in culturally diverse milieu), those that
provide multiple safe opportunities for students to challenge stereotypes/engage in 
discussion about complex intercultural topics (e.g., current issues discussions), and those 
that promote exploration of students’ multiple social identities (e.g., diversity courses that 
include this component). These types of interventions promote students’ development by 
providing pathways for these students to overcome their tendency to over-simplify 
complex intercultural issues, thereby moving them beyond an intermediate level of 
intercultural development.

The third level of the curriculum (advanced) is applicable to students in 
Acceptance and to students who utilize early internal meaning making. These students 
embrace an ethnorelative cultural perspective and are able to talk about diversity issues 
and acknowledge their own biases. They actively draw upon prior experiences interacting 
across difference. They exhibit the desire to cultivate diverse relationships in which each 
participant’s values and beliefs are respected. Interventions that would be appropriate for 
fostering advanced students’ intercultural development would be those that provide 
opportunities for students to “put themselves in someone else’s shoes” (e.g., international 
educational exchanges), those that establish diverse work groups with shared goals (e.g., 
service learning opportunities), and those that provide opportunities and multiple 
pathways for sustained conversations about cognitively complex topics (e.g., 
coordinating a discussion following a guest speaker, current issues discussions about 
global warming or U.S. foreign policy). These types of interventions promote 
intercultural development for advanced students by providing deeper, more immersive 
intercultural experiences that enhance and solidify students’ ethnorelative worldviews.
The sequencing of the curriculum’s learning goals lays the groundwork for successive developmental steps. For example, students at initial levels of development need to recognize their own and others’ social identities in order to better understand how these dynamics affect their intercultural interactions (e.g., how one’s race, culture, and ethnicity factors into one’s interactions across difference). Gaining this knowledge allows them to gain confidence in intercultural situations and therefore prepares them for engaging more successfully with diverse others. Similarly, students at intermediate levels of development are likely to minimize or over-simplify intercultural differences rather than undertake the challenging task of analyzing cultural patterns in order to better understand different others. For this reason, an important intermediate learning goal is attending to cultural differences and comparing one’s ideas, beliefs, and cultural assumptions with those of diverse others. As students achieve these learning goals, they become increasingly comfortable and proficient in intercultural situations and more prepared to independently pursue intercultural experiences, a learning goal for students at advanced levels.

Next, I demonstrate how the curriculum can be used to promote intercultural development by using representative examples from this study. One intercultural competency for beginning students listed in the Beginning Level column of Table 7.1 is “learn to identify social identities that exist in modern society.” Consider Nikki, the White first year student who operated from an external meaning making orientation and who had little prior experience interacting with diverse others. Through participation in a Hispanic-themed learning community and completing a service learning requirement in which she volunteered as an elementary school English language teacher, she became
more knowledgeable about Hispanic culture by learning to distinguish between the nationality term “Mexican” and the ethnicity term “Hispanic.” Her intercultural development was facilitated by participation in a culturally-themed living learning community and a service learning opportunity in which she had ongoing contact with diverse others. Both types of interventions have specific features (such as the opportunity for knowledge acquisition about diverse others and their cultural practices, a supportive themed teaching and learning environment, and working directly with diverse others) that explain why they were effective for promoting Nikki’s intercultural development, and why they would likewise be effective for other students at beginning levels of intercultural development.

For students in Minimization and for those who have a mixed meaning making orientation, one important intercultural learning goal listed in the Intermediate Level column of Table 7.1 is the ability to “actively seek out and consider multiple perspectives when learning about intercultural issues.” Recall Mia, the White first year, first-generation student who learned to differentiate her own values and beliefs as different from those of a White peer who behaved inappropriately in his questioning of her Nigerian friend in a public debate. This learning goal was achieved through three campus-facilitated interventions: a public debate about current issues, participation in her department’s multicultural affairs organization, and a forum discussion focused on intercultural topics. These interventions were effective for Mia because she was beginning to explore her underlying assumptions about difference. By actively engaging in conversations about complex topics, she was able to acquire a better understanding of her own and diverse others’ perspectives, and to grapple with the complexity inherent to
intercultural issues (e.g., stereotyping and discrimination, social inequality, power and privilege).

Finally, recall Lee, the first year international student from Hong Kong who aspired to live in a foreign country so that he could “learn about cultural acceptance” and who made a conscious effort to move beyond the comfort of co-national peer groups by seeking out opportunities to meet and befriend Americans. His internally generated learning goal of cultivating relationships across difference was one he actively sought to realize. Through formal collegiate diversity experiences such as study abroad and participation in AIESEC, his intercultural development was fostered. These types of interventions are developmentally appropriate for students at this level of development because they involve sustained interactions that allow participants to cultivate diverse relationships, and because they permit a deep level of cognitive, interpersonal and intrapersonal engagement with a diverse culture.

For all students, developmentally sequenced programming has the potential to promote development because, as noted previously, students’ interpretations of diversity experiences are a reflection of the level of cognitive complexity employed in making sense of them. Further, as learning goals become increasingly demanding, they are accompanied by increasingly demanding interventions. Clearly, not all interventions are alike and not equally suited to all developmental levels. For example, an intergroup dialogue experience in which students explore their intersecting social identities would likely be more appropriate for students at beginning levels of development, while a dialogue experience that explores racial discrimination would be more appropriate for intermediate students, simply because students first must acquire awareness and
knowledge in order to competently discuss their own identity and experiences before they are challenged to grapple with more complex social issues. Thus, intentional sequencing takes into account both the focus of the learning goals and the nature of the interventions and lays the groundwork for the next developmental step. For this reason, students at all levels of intercultural development have much to gain from well-designed, intentional, and developmentally appropriate interventions.

Table 7.1: Developmentally Sequenced Learning Goals for Promoting Intercultural Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intercultural Competency</th>
<th>Developmental Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness:</strong> Understanding one’s values, beliefs, attitudes, and assumptions and the effect they have on one’s interactions with diverse others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize and identify one's beliefs and assumptions about interacting with diverse others</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect upon one’s own experiences interacting with diverse others in order to explore underlying assumptions about the nature of the interaction</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become aware of how one’s behaviors and attitudes are interpreted by diverse others</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe one’s own and diverse others’ social identities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulate how and why one has selected the values and beliefs he or she has</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn to distinguish one’s own values and behaviors from those of interculturally similar others</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize multiple forms of diversity in everyday life</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize one’s own and others’ underlying assumptions and beliefs about diversity issues</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge:</strong> Information about the history, traditions, values, and customs of racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn to identify social identities that exist in modern society</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire categories for multiple racial, ethnic, and cultural groups</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge about diverse others and their cultural practices</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulate the historical basis for diversity terms</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate an informed understanding about complex intercultural issues</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Competency</td>
<td>Developmental Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills:</strong> The range of abilities that college students require to function effectively in intercultural situations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain experience interacting with diverse others</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice culturally appropriate behavior</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the basis for one’s perspectives about diversity issues</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend to one’s values and attitudes when interacting with diverse others</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare ideas, beliefs, and cultural assumptions with diverse others</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively seek out and consider multiple perspectives when learning about intercultural issues</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate ability to work comfortably within diverse groups</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop one’s own vision for cultivating relationships across difference</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate the ability to articulate and question one’s own values and beliefs when challenged</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate a nuanced understanding of diverse others’ cultural heritage and marginalized perspectives</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independently pursue intercultural experiences and knowledge</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulate the complexity inherent in many social issues</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the curriculum presented above emanates from research conducted with college students, it is important to note that promoting intercultural development should not be a learning goal only for students. College faculty, staff, and student affairs professionals play an important role in creating safe and supportive curricular and co-curricular spaces for students to engage in interactions across difference. Like so many White Americans, they may have had little personal experience with diversity and intercultural issues. For this reason, institutional resources would be well spent on training faculty and student affairs administrators in multicultural facilitation and conflict resolution skills. Consider Ellen, the first year student who was the only African
American student in her English class; she had a meaningful and developmentally effective intercultural experience because her instructor created and managed an inclusive learning environment where all students felt safe expressing their thoughts, opinions, and life experiences. Would this opportunity for significant intercultural learning have been missed if Ellen’s instructor was unprepared or ill-equipped to handle complex intercultural issues in the classroom? Reflective educational institutions should support the intercultural development of all members.

Higher education institutions need to carefully consider the effectiveness of the intercultural programs and initiatives they offer. Findings from the quantitative phase of this study indicated that collegiate diversity experiences such as participation in ethnic and cultural awareness workshops during the academic year or study abroad for academic credit had little to no impact on students’ intercultural development and therefore may not be having the intended effect on participants. In order to be more successful, cultural awareness workshops could be more explicitly linked to a diversity programming framework, making explicit their connection to institutional goals relative to intercultural effectiveness. Findings from the qualitative phase of this research indicated that education abroad opportunities enhance intercultural development. Unfortunately, such programs are often limited to students who have the financial resources to participate in them (only 6% of the quantitative sample). A number of on-campus programs and interventions had similar and powerful developmental effects on students in this study; these included roommate assignments that paired domestic students with international roommates, intergroup dialogue experiences, and diversity classes with limited enrollment and/or that invited students from multiple racial, ethnic, and cultural
backgrounds to share their personal stories and insights. There are many ways to promote intercultural learning and institutions should carefully consider whether intended learning outcomes are being achieved with existing programs, and whether other opportunities exist within the campus (as in the case of pairing domestic students with international roommates), or through collaborations with nearby communities (as in the case of diversity-focused service learning).

Through considering the ways in which institutional programming promotes an inclusive learning environment, educators can further translate this study’s findings into practice. The interventions suggested above are grounded in a rich college student development literature and educators are encouraged to take advantage of the available resources as they implement and enhance their own intercultural programming (see Appendix E for a list of selected resources).

In order to promote students’ intercultural development in preparation for active participation in an increasingly diverse society and world, current and future programming should consider the developmental sequence and interventions articulated here because of their attention to developmental differences in how students interpret their intercultural experiences, and because of how the achievement of earlier learning goals paves the way for the achievement of successive goals, thereby fostering intercultural development. Further, the interventions suggested above provide a framework for institutional programming that is attentive to these developmental differences.
Future Research

This study has provided a wealth of insights into the nature and characteristics of college students’ intercultural development and the types of collegiate diversity experiences that promote it. By employing a mixed methods approach, it has linked quantitative and qualitative data to create a nuanced picture of the role that pre-college experiences, institutional structural diversity, collegiate diversity experiences, and students’ interpretations play in the achievement of intercultural effectiveness. As with all research, this study and its findings prompts a new set of questions for further exploration. Given this study’s findings, I offer the following suggestions for future research.

In light of the discussion above, future research should examine the effect of structural diversity at other, more diverse institutions as well as at other predominately White institutions in an attempt to better understand the impact of structural diversity on students’ intercultural development. Other institutional characteristics should also be examined, such as whether students at institutions with a stated commitment to promoting intercultural development perform better on measures such as the IDI, the impact of international students, the location of the institution (e.g., urban vs. suburban vs. rural), and the percentage of non-native English speakers. Furthermore, gaining additional background information about individual students, such as about the racial composition not only of their high schools, but of their home towns, home states and countries and the relative importance of this information to respondents, students’ previous international experiences, and the racial and ethnic composition of their friendship groups could also provide a better sense of students’ entering characteristics.
and their relative level of comfort and experience interacting across difference prior to entering college.

Future research should also further explore existing campus diversity programming (both curricular and co-curricular) and its impact on students. What do students learn from formal collegiate diversity experiences, and how is their intercultural development affected by this learning? This study found that a number of collegiate experiences such as diversity courses and multicultural awareness workshops played a small role in students’ intercultural development. By contrast, informal interactions across difference proved to be powerful learning experiences. It would be helpful to better understand what it is about such experiences that allowed students to explore the boundaries of their comfort zones, and to come away from the experience with a broadened intercultural perspective. Additional research could also explore why exposing college students to forms of community-based experiential learning appear to be effective in promoting intercultural development along with the characteristics of negative interactions in which students retrench, regress, or embrace negative views of difference (cf. Jones & Hill, 2001).

The data gathered from the WNSLAE Interview about intercultural interactions were rich; additional research could further analyze the nuances of development in this domain. For example, additional research using a self-authorship interview protocol that focused specifically on intercultural interactions would provide a more focused opportunity to “drill down” with students who exhibit more advanced meaning making about these experiences. In the qualitative phase of this study, stringent criteria were used to select intercultural experiences for further analysis. More specifically, the DEIE
sample was selected because each student articulated having had a developmentally effective intercultural experience (DEIE). The selection criteria for this study precluded an analysis of whether those students not selected (N=126) also described interactions with diverse peers and faculty, if they remarked upon the structural diversity of their hometowns and collegiate institutions, and if they made meaning about these types of interactions in different ways than their DEIE sample peers (N=47). Therefore, additional research about the quality and quantity of all students’ diverse interactions is needed in order to further understand the role of background characteristics, structural diversity, collegiate diversity experiences, and meaning making on intercultural development.

Additionally, students who reported having developmentally effective interactions with people from other social classes, religious backgrounds, political viewpoints, and sexual orientations were not included in the analysis. It is logical to assume that these interactions also have the potential to promote the types of cognitive, interpersonal, and intrapersonal development that are associated with intercultural effectiveness. Therefore, future research could employ a broader definition of interactions across difference and therefore include these types of interactions as well. Additional research on other types of interactions across difference could provide deeper insights into the intercultural development of those students for whom cross-cultural interactions are not salient.

Certainly, the possibilities for future research are vast. Hopefully, this study will improve understanding about how intercultural development occurs in collegiate settings and be a significant contribution to the growing body of literature concerned with understanding and promoting intercultural effectiveness as an intended collegiate outcome in the 21st century.
Conclusion

Intercultural effectiveness is a complex collegiate outcome, and understanding its development in collegiate settings requires complex conceptual and analytic tools. Further, since human development is complex and multifaceted, no one model can capture all aspects of how individuals think and why they choose to act as they do. This study offers compelling evidence to illuminate how intercultural development occurs and how selected background characteristics, elements of structural diversity, and collegiate diversity experiences foster intercultural effectiveness. Each of the two theoretical perspectives that informed this study, self-authorship and the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, provided useful lenses for examining students’ experiences. Other educational and social science researchers are encouraged to use these and other perspectives to deepen our understanding of this outcome and how college students develop the capacities associated with it. Educators at higher education institutions are invited to use these findings to implement developmentally effective programs that foster their students’ intercultural development.
APPENDICES
Appendix A: Student Survey

1. Name (Last, First, M.I.)

2. Date of birth

3. Your sex
   Male   Female

4. What is your race/ethnicity? (Mark all that apply.)
   Caucasian/White
   African American/Black
   American Indian/Alaskan Native
   Asian
   Latino/Hispanic (e.g., Mexican American/Chicano, Puerto Rican, Cuban)
   Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
   Other

5. What is your current classification?
   Freshman/first year   Senior
   Sophomore            Unclassified
   Junior

6. How many total credit hours will you have completed by the end of this academic year?
   6 or fewer   41-60   101-120
   7-20        61-80   121-140
   21-40       81-100  More than 140

7. What have most of your college grades been up to now?
   A-to A (3.5-4.0)
   B to A- (3.0-3.49)
   B- to B (2.50-2.99)
   C to B- (2.00-2.49)
   C- to C (1.50-1.99)
   D to C- (1.00-1.49)
   Below D (0.00-0.99)
   I have not yet established a Grade Point Average.

8. Excluding college courses taken while in high school, were you enrolled at another higher education institution prior to entering this one?
   Yes   No

9. What is your current citizenship status?
   U.S. citizen
   U.S. resident (Green Card holder)
   International student
   Other
10. Is English your native language?
   - Yes
   - No

11. What is the highest level of education that each of your parents/guardians completed? (Mark one box per column.)

   **Mother/Guardian**  
   - Did not finish high school
   - High school graduate/GED
   - Attended college but did not receive degree
   - Vocational/technical certificate or diploma
   - Associate or other 2-year degree
   - Bachelor’s or other 4-year degree
   - Master’s degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)
   - Law (J.D.)
   - Doctorate (Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D.)

   **Father/Guardian**  
   - Did not finish high school
   - High school graduate/GED
   - Attended college but did not receive degree
   - Vocational/technical certificate or diploma
   - Associate or other 2-year degree
   - Bachelor’s or other 4-year degree
   - Master’s degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)
   - Law (J.D.)
   - Doctorate (Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D.)

12. On the enclosed *List of Occupations* are codes for various occupations. For each of your parents/guardians, select the code that best reflects their current occupation. (Write only one code for each parent/guardian.)

   - **Mother/Guardian**
   - **Father/Guardian**

13. Household Income (same response set for a. and b.)

   a. If you were considered a dependent for tax purposes by your parents/guardians for the most recent year, what is your best estimate of your parents'/guardians' total annual income? (Mark only one and skip to 14.)

   b. If you were not considered a dependent for the most recent year, what is your best estimate of your total annual income? (Mark only one.)

   - Less than $10,000  - $50,000-$59,999
   - $10,000-$14,999  - $60,000-$74,999
   - $15,000-$19,999  - $75,000-$99,999
   - $20,000-$24,999  - $100,000-$149,999
   - $25,000-$29,999  - $150,000-$199,999
   - $30,000-$39,999  - $200,000-$249,999
   - $40,000-$49,999  - $250,000 or more
   - Not applicable

14. How many brothers and sisters do you have?

   - 0
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4 or more
   - 5
15. How many children under age 21 are dependent on you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>More than three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How would you characterize your political views?

- Far left
- Liberal
- Middle-of-the-road
- Conservative
- Far right

17. What was your overall high school Grade Point Average (GPA)? (Mark one box only.)

- A- to A (3.50-4.00)
- B to A- (3.00-3.49)
- B- to B (2.50-2.99)
- C to B- (2.00-2.49)
- C- to C (1.50-1.99)
- D to C- (1.00-1.49)
- Below D (0.00-0.99)

18. During your last year in high school, how often did you engage in each of the following activities? (Response set: Very Often, Often, Occasionally, Rarely, Never)

- Studying/doing homework by yourself
- Studying/doing homework with friends
- Socializing with friends
- Talking with teachers outside of class
- Working for pay
- Community service/volunteer work
- Exercising/sports
- Participating in extra-curricular activities (student government, student clubs, etc.)
- Using the Internet for research or homework
- Reading for pleasure

19. During high school, how many years of each of the following subjects did you complete? Round to the closest half-year. (Response set: half-year, 1 year, 1 ½ years, 2 years, 2 ½ years, 3 years, 3 ½ years, 4 years or more, none.)

- English/Language arts
- Math
- Science
- Social studies/History
- Foreign language
- Computer science
- Arts and/or Music
20. How would you describe the racial composition of the high school you last attended? (Check only one.)

- Almost all white students
- Mostly white students
- Roughly half white students and half minority students
- Mostly minority students
- Almost all minority students

21. What were your scores on the SAT and/or ACT?

- SAT Verbal
- SAT Math
- ACT Composite

22. Was this college your… (Mark only one.)

- First choice?
- Second choice?
- Third choice?
- Other?

23. Intended/actual undergraduate major

Choose a code from the List of College Majors and Occupational Choices that indicates your actual or expected undergraduate major.
(Response set provided by ACT List of College Major and Occupational Choices insert)

24. Intended/expected career

Choose a code from the List of College Majors and Occupational Choices that indicates the occupational field of your expected career.
(Response set provided by ACT List of College Major and Occupational Choices insert)

25. How committed are you to this career choice? (Mark only one.)

- Strongly committed
- Committed
- Moderately committed
- Minimally committed
- Not at all committed

26. What is the highest academic degree you intend to earn in your lifetime?

- Vocational/technical certificate or diploma
- Associate (A.A. or equivalent)
- Bachelor’s degree (B.A., B.S., etc.)
- Master’s degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)
- Law (J.D.)
- Doctorate (Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D.)
27. Expectations for financial aid

(a) Have you received and/or are you now receiving financial aid (e.g., loans, scholarships, grants, work study)?

| Yes | No |
---|---|

(b) In the future, will you need financial aid (e.g., loans, scholarships, grants, work study) to complete college?

| Yes | No |
---|---|

28. How important to you personally is each of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a. Becoming accomplished in one of the performing arts (acting, dancing, singing, etc.)
b. Obtaining recognition from my colleagues for contributions to my field of expertise
c. Influencing the political structure
d. Influencing social values
e. Raising a family
f. Having administrative responsibility for the work of others
g. Helping others who are in difficulty
h. Making a theoretical contribution to science
i. Writing original works (poems, novels, short stories, etc.)
j. Creating artistic work (painting, sculpture, film, etc.)
k. Becoming successful in a business of my own
l. Becoming involved in activities that preserve and enrich the environment
m. Developing a meaningful philosophy of life
n. Volunteering in my community
o. Helping to promote racial understanding
p. Keeping up to date with political affairs
q. Becoming a community leader
r. Integrating spirituality into my life
s. Improving my understanding of other countries and cultures
t. Working to find a cure for a disease or illness
u. Making a lot of money
v. Working in a prestigious occupation
w. Becoming passionate about or committed to my occupation

COLLEGE EXPERIENCES

29. Which of the following best describes where you are currently living while attending college?

- Residence hall or other campus housing (not a fraternity or sorority)
- Fraternity or sorority house
- Off campus residence (house, apartment, etc.) within 3 miles of the institution
- Off campus residence (house, apartment, etc.) more than 3 miles from the institution

30. Overall, how satisfied are you with the education you are receiving at this college?

- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Very Dissatisfied

31. During the current semester about how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week...?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
<th>26-30</th>
<th>More than 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>More than 360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Working on campus for pay?

b. Working off campus for pay?

c. Participating in co-curricular activities other than intramural or intercollegiate sports (student organizations or government, campus publications, social fraternity or sorority, arts and/or music organizations, etc.)?

d. Reading for pleasure (unassigned books, magazines, newspapers, the internet, etc.)?

e. Participating in community service or other volunteer activities not related to a class?
College Activities

32. Below are some activities in which students often participate while in college. Indicate if you have or have not had each experience during your time at this college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Participated in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Participated in a living-learning community where your residence was connected to an academic program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Belonged to a fraternity or sorority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Held a leadership position in a student club, campus organization, residence hall, or fraternity/sorority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Been a member of an honors college or honors program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Participated in intercollegiate football or basketball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Participated in an intercollegiate sport other than football or basketball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Worked on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Served as a resident assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>Served as a peer educator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>Served as a student orientation leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>Participated in an internship or co-op experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>Participated in a leadership-training program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>Participated in a seminar designed specifically for first year students (e.g., First Year Seminar)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o.</td>
<td>Participated in a seminar designed specifically for seniors (e.g., Senior Capstone)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.</td>
<td>Participated in a study abroad program for academic credit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Indicate the number of courses or activities in which you have participated or taken part during this academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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a. Courses focusing on diverse cultures and perspectives (e.g., Black Studies, Latino Studies)

b. Courses focusing on women’s/gender studies

c. Courses focusing on issues of equality or social justice

d. Courses that had a community service component connected to class work

e. Courses taught by more than one instructor, each from a different department

f. Student clubs or campus organizations

g. Student clubs or campus organizations in which you have held a leadership position

34. How often have you engaged in each of the following activities during this academic year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Attended a debate or lecture on a current political/social issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Participated in intramural sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Participated in a racial or cultural awareness workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Participated in activities that helped you explore career options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. Student-Faculty Contact

Below are statements about your contact and interactions with faculty. Indicate your level of agreement/disagreement with each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. My nonclassroom interactions with faculty have had a positive influence on my personal growth, values, and attitudes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. My nonclassroom interactions with faculty have had a positive influence on my intellectual growth and interest in ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. My nonclassroom interactions with faculty have had a positive influence on my career goals and aspirations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Since coming to this institution, I have developed a close, personal relationship with at least one faculty member.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I am satisfied with the opportunities to meet and interact informally with faculty members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Active Learning

36.

Below are statements about experiences you may have had in class. Indicate how often you have experienced each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Faculty ask challenging questions in class.

b. Faculty’s questions in class ask me to show how a particular course concept could be applied to an actual problem or situation.

c. Faculty’s questions in class ask me to point out any fallacies in basic ideas, principles, or points of view presented in the course.

d. Faculty’s questions in class ask me to argue for or against a particular point of view.

e. Faculty challenge my ideas in class.

f. Students challenge each other’s ideas in class.

g. I worked harder than I thought I would to meet a faculty’s standards or expectations.

Perceptions of Faculty Interest in Teaching and Student Development

37.

Below are statements about your views of the faculty’s interest in teaching and students. Indicate your level of agreement/disagreement with each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Most faculty with whom I have had contact are genuinely interested in students.

b. Most faculty with whom I have had contact are interested in helping students grow in more than just academic areas.

c. Most faculty with whom I have had contact are outstanding teachers.

d. Most faculty with whom I have had contact are genuinely interested in teaching.

e. Most faculty with whom I have had contact are willing to spend time outside of class to discuss issues of interest and importance to students.

Student-Faculty Interaction

38.

How frequently have you interacted with faculty members as described below?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Discussed grades or assignments
b. Discussed ideas from your reading or classes

c. Talked about career plans

d. Worked on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student life activities, etc.)

39.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How frequently have you interacted with student affairs professionals (residence hall staff, career counselor, student union or campus activities staff, etc.) as described below?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cooperative Learning

40.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below are statements about learning cooperatively with other students on academic matters. Indicate how often you do each.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effective Teaching

41.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below are statements about faculty skill/clarity as well as preparation and organization in teaching. For the most part, taking into consideration all of the faculty you’ve interacted with at this institution, how often have you experienced each?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Faculty give clear explanations.
b. Faculty make good use of examples and illustrations to explain difficult points.
c. Faculty effectively review and summarize the material.
d. Faculty interpret abstract ideas and theories clearly.
e. Presentation of material is well organized.
f. Faculty are well prepared for class.
g. Class time is used effectively.
h. Course goals and requirements are clearly explained.
i. Faculty have a good command of what they are teaching.

Prompt Feedback

42.
Below are statements about receiving feedback from faculty about your learning in the classroom. How often have you experienced each?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a. Faculty inform me of my level of performance in the class.
b. Faculty check to see if I have learned the material well before going on to new material.
c. Faculty provide timely written feedback on my performance (my papers, projects, etc.).
d. Faculty provide timely oral feedback on my performance (my papers, projects, student conferences, comments in class, etc.).

Diversity-Related Experiences

43.

How often have you had the following experiences while attending this college?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a. Had serious conversations with students of a race or ethnicity different from my own
b. Had diverse perspectives (different race, religious, gender, or political beliefs) included in class discussions and/or assignments
c. Encountered diverse perspectives in other places around campus (administrative offices, public forums, etc.)
d. Made friends with a student whose race was different from yours

e. Made friends with a student from another country

f. Had serious discussions with other students about different lifestyles and customs

g. Had serious discussions with other students about major social issues such as racial diversity, human rights, equality, and justice

h. Had serious discussions with students whose religious beliefs were different from your own

i. Had serious discussions with students whose political opinions were different from your own

j. Had serious discussions with students whose philosophy of life or personal values were different from your own

k. Been encouraged to make contact with students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds

l. Had serious discussions with faculty or student affairs staff whose political, social, or religious opinions were different from your own

| 44. How often have you had the following interactions with diverse students (i.e., students differing from you in race, national origin, values, religion, etc.) while attending this college? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Very Often | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never |
| a. Had discussions regarding intergroup relations |
| b. Had meaningful and honest discussions about issues related to social justice |
| c. Shared personal feelings and problems |
| d. Had guarded, cautious interactions |
| e. Felt silenced from sharing my own experiences by prejudice and discrimination |
| f. Had hurtful, unresolved interactions |
| g. Had tense, somewhat hostile interactions |
| h. Felt insulted or threatened based on my race or ethnicity |
High Expectations/Academic Challenge

45. During this academic year, approximately how many hours per week have you spent preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, rehearsing, and other activities related to your academic program)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>0 hrs</th>
<th>1-5 hrs</th>
<th>6-10 hrs</th>
<th>11-15 hrs</th>
<th>More than 30 hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>16-20 hrs</td>
<td>21-25 hrs</td>
<td>26-30 hrs</td>
<td>More than 30 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. During this academic year, how many times have you done each of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Between 1 and 4 times</th>
<th>Between 5 and 10 times</th>
<th>Between 11 and 20 times</th>
<th>More than 20 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Read assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Written papers or reports of 20 pages or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Written papers or reports of between 5 and 19 pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Completed essay examinations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. The statements below describe activities often emphasized in courses. Mark the response that best fits the frequency with which your coursework has emphasized these activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Analyzing the basic element of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Making my own judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48. Indicate your level of agreement/disagreement with each of the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
a. Students on this campus spend significant amounts of time studying and on academic work.

b. Academic work is challenging and requires your best intellectual effort.

49.

Below are descriptions of the types of exams or assignments you may have had at this college. Indicate how often you experienced each.

Exams or assignments require me to…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Write essays and/or solve problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Use course content to address a problem not presented in the course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Compare or contrast topics or ideas from a course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Point out the strengths and weaknesses of a particular argument or point of view</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Argue for or against a particular point of view and defend my argument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50.

How often, at this college, have you had the experiences described below?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Made a class presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Used an electronic medium (listserv, chat group, Internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Completed an independent project for a class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Disagreed with faculty during class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Used e-mail to communicate with faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supportive Environment

51.

How much emphasis does your college place on…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quite</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>a Bit</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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a. Providing the support you need to help you succeed academically?

b. Helping you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)?

c. Providing the support you need to thrive socially?

52.

Circle the response that best describes groups of people at your institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Other Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendly, Supportive,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available, Helpful,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. Staff and Administrative Personnel (e.g., residence hall staff, career counselors, academic advisors, registrar, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helpful, Considerate,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Influential Interactions with Peers

53.

Below are statements about experiences you may have had with other students at this college. Indicate your level of agreement/disagreement with each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Since coming to this institution, I have developed close personal relationships with other students.

b. The student friendships I have developed at this institution have been personally satisfying.

c. My interpersonal relationships with other students have had a positive influence on my personal growth, attitudes, and values.

d. My interpersonal relationships with other students have had a positive influence on my intellectual growth and interest in ideas.

e. It has been difficult for me to meet and make friends with other students.

f. Few of the students I know would be willing to listen to me and help me if I had a personal problem.

g. Most students at this institution have values and attitudes different from my own.
## Integrative Experiences

### 54.

How often have you participated in each of the following activities while attending this college?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a. Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas and information from various sources  
b. Put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions  
c. Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with students, family members, co-workers, etc., outside of your classes

### 55.

Indicate the extent to which you agree/disagree with each of the following statements about your experiences at this college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a. Courses have helped me to understand the historical, political, and social connections of past events.  
b. Courses have helped me to see the connections between my intended career and its broad effect on society.  
c. My out-of-class experiences have helped me to connect what I have learned in the classroom with life events.  
d. My out-of-class experiences have helped me to translate knowledge and understanding from the classroom into action.  
e. My out-of-class experiences have had a positive influence on my intellectual growth and interest in ideas.  
f. My out-of-class experiences have had a positive influence on my personal growth, attitudes, and values.
**Appendix B: WNSLAE Interview Protocol**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction to the Interview:</th>
<th>Review the Consent form and ensure he/she consents to both the participation and audio recording.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Provide student a written description of the study and provide a copy of a consent form that you sign; collect the one that student signed | Highlight:  
☑ Your role as the interviewer  
☑ Voluntary participation, they can refuse to answer or end interview at any time  
☑ Confidentiality  
☑ 90 minute time commitment (confirm interview end time)  
☑ Opportunity for questions at the end  
☑ How interview will be used and by whom  
☑ Confirm the process of payment |
| “I will reintroduce the study to you but before we begin there is a consent form that I would like to review with you and, if you are willing to participate, I need you to sign.” | e.g., “Our purpose in meeting today is to learn about you & your experiences in college so that we can better understand how students learn. Because every student is different and brings a unique perspective and set of experiences we believe it is important to hear about your experiences from your point of view.”  
e.g., “You have randomly selected from a list of students…” |
| Reintroduce the study verbally and why they have been chosen as a participant | e.g., “Specifically we will ask you to talk about your experiences, I will provide the structure but I will let you steer the conversation. I will begin by asking a little bit about you and your background, your expectations coming to college and of [INSTITUTION] in particular. I’d like to hear about your specific experiences since coming to college. Overall I will want to hear how you make sense of all you are experiencing and learning…” |
| Provide an overview of the organization of the questions | |
| It would help me to know a little about you. Tell me about your background and what brought you to [institution]. | Possible Probes:  
- Tell me about your high school experience – what was it like?  
- Tell me about your family.  
- Tell me about your friends.  
- What did you tell people here to introduce yourself when you arrived?  
- How did you decide to come to [institution]? [what were the other options, advantages/disadvantages of options, how did this one win out]  
- Tell me about any goals you have for this year [try to draw out both academic and personal goals]. |
| --- | --- |
| Let’s talk about your expectations coming to college in general and to [institution] in particular. What did you expect it to be like to be a college student here? | Possible Probes:  
- What did you expect [or hope] the learning environment to be like?  
- What did you expect would go well for you and what would be challenging in your courses?  
- What kind of relationships did you expect [or hope] to build with other students? With faculty?  
- How did you expect [or hope] you would grow or change coming to college?  
- In what ways did you expect [or hope] to get involved in campus activities? |
| I’m interested in your perspective on how the reality of college compares with your expectations! Let’s talk about areas in which your experience matches your expectations and areas in which it does not. [Note: it may be artificial to separate expectations and reality – you won’t need this if the interviewee already addressed it] | Possible Probes:  
- Using what the interviewee offered re expectations, return to each one asking to what degree experience matches [i.e., you said you expected classes to be pretty hard – what is your sense of that so far?] Draw out why the person sees it this way and what it means to her/him.  
- What is it like to be a student at this institution? What is it like to be a [race, ethnicity, gender] student at this institution [if person raised these dynamics]?  
- What has surprised you most? Draw out the description, why it was surprising, how the person is making sense of it. |
| Other possibilities: |  |
## Making Sense of Educational Experiences Segment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Basic Foundation:</strong> 3 dimensions by 7 outcomes chart</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Means to Access:</strong> meaningful experiences and how students made meaning of them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Multiple Ways to Approach:** | **Framework** for drawing out the dimensions and outcomes:  
- Describe the experience  
- Why was it important?  
- How did you make sense of it?  
- How did it affect you? |

| Our conversation so far has given me some context to understand you, your prior experiences and your initial expectations of college. Let’s focus in specifically on the experiences you’ve had that you think have affected you most. What has been your *most significant experience* so far? | **Framework** for drawing out the dimensions and outcomes:  
- Describe the experience  
- Why was it important?  
- How did you make sense of it?  
- How did it affect you? |

| Tell me about your *best experience*; worst experience | **Framework** |

| Tell me about some of the *challenges* you’ve encountered | **Framework:** also inquire about challenges in other dimensions if response is uni-dimensional |

| Who/what are your *support systems*? Tell me about them. | Probes: when you need support, where do you find it? Who do you go to for help? Who do you trust to help when something important is on your mind? |

| Usually college is a place where you *encounter people who differ from you* because of different backgrounds, beliefs, preferences, values, personalities, etc. Have you had interactions with people who you perceive as different than you? If so, tell me about them. | What have these interactions been like?  
How have you made sense of them? What ideas have you gathered from these interactions? |

| Have you had to face any *difficult decisions*? | **Framework:** also inquire about decisions in other dimensions if response is uni-dimensional |

| Often college students report feeling *pressure* from multiple directions – pressure to study and succeed academically, pressure to belong socially, pressure re: family or work obligations, pressure to participate in campus activities, pressure to figure out career directions. Have you encountered any of these pressures? | If so, describe, how did you handle it, why, how did it affect you. |

| Has there been any time that what you wanted and what others wanted from you *conflicted*? | If so, what was that like? How did you handle it? |

<p>| Have you been in a situation where you struggled with doing the right thing? | If so, describe, how did you handle it, why, how did it affect you? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do you think coming to college, to [institution] has <strong>affected you?</strong></th>
<th>What do you think prompted this? How do you feel about it? Draw out possible challenges to beliefs, sense of self, relationships.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there <em>any experiences you want to share</em> that I haven’t given you the opportunity to talk about?</td>
<td>If so, explore.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Integration of Learning Segment

| **Basic Foundation:** access Integration of Learning outcome and synthesize the students’ experience as shared in the interview |  |
| **Means to Access:** how your collective experiences are shaping your thinking about what to believe, yourself, and relations with others |  |
| **Multiple Ways to Approach** |  |
| **Integration of Learning** | Possible Probes: |

- How do they shape your thinking about college? Your goals here?
- How do they shape your relations with others?
- How do they shape how you see yourself?

You’ve talked about some of your important experiences [such as x, y, z] and what they’ve meant to you. Let’s talk for a few minutes about how you are *putting all this together.* How do these collective experiences, and the way you’ve interpreted them, shape who you are right now?

It would help us to understand a little more *specifically* how you think you will *use insights* from these aspects of your college experience in everyday life.

- What are the key insights you are taking away from these experiences?
- Where did these key insights come from?
- How are you evaluating these insights?
- Do any of these conflict? If so, how are you thinking about that?
- How do you anticipate using these insights?

### Summary and Conclusion

We have about [x] minutes left and I’d like to be sure I have the key points you think are important. Thinking about your overall experience, what did you *gain* from college this year? How did your first year in college shape you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the <em>consequences/implications of</em></th>
<th>Draw out meaning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your first college year for how you think about things? For how you see yourself? For how you relate to others?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have any <em>issues</em> emerged from this year’s experiences that you feel you need to explore?</td>
<td>Describe, why is this important, how do you anticipate you will explore this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| How has your first year experience helped you with where you would like to be *next year*? | Possible Probes:  
  - How has it shaped your goals?  
  - How has it shaped your view of yourself?  
  - How has it shaped how you learn? |
| Are there any *other observations* you would like to share? | Draw out description and meaning. |
Appendix C: Correlation Matrix Between and Among Independent and Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IDI Score</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age in 2005</th>
<th>White / Non-White</th>
<th>HS GPA</th>
<th>Class Year</th>
<th>HS Race and Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDI Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.169***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in 2005</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White / Non-White</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS GPA</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.337***</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Year</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.234***</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.115**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Race and Self</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>-.316***</td>
<td>.091*</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Diversity</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-.255***</td>
<td>.148***</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.274***</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>.126**</td>
<td>-.140***</td>
<td>.088*</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.170***</td>
<td>-.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Awareness</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.285***</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.151***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.245***</td>
<td>-.137***</td>
<td>.251***</td>
<td>.139***</td>
<td>.121**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.264***</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>-.105**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Courses</td>
<td>.087*</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-.166***</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.196***</td>
<td>-.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Effect</td>
<td>.103*</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.097*</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.101*</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05, **p ≤ .01, ***p ≤ .001 (2-tailed).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IDI Score</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age in 2005</th>
<th>White / Non-White</th>
<th>HS GPA</th>
<th>Class Year</th>
<th>HS Race and Self</th>
<th>Structural Diversity</th>
<th>Study Abroad</th>
<th>Community Service</th>
<th>Racial Awareness Workshop</th>
<th>Informal Diversity Experiences</th>
<th>Negative Diversity Experiences</th>
<th>Diversity Courses</th>
<th>Intercultural Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDI Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White / Non-White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Race and Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>-.115**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Awareness Workshop</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.148***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Diversity</td>
<td>.103*</td>
<td>.126**</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.350***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Diversity</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.097*</td>
<td>-.169***</td>
<td>-.283***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Courses</td>
<td>.107**</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.298***</td>
<td>.291***</td>
<td>.221***</td>
<td>-.236***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Effect</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.104*</td>
<td>.118**</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05, **p ≤ .01, ***p ≤ .001 (2-tailed).
Appendix D: Developmentally Effective Intercultural Experiences (DEIE) Sample Pseudonyms, Gender, Race, Class Year, Student-Selected Background Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Class Year</th>
<th>Student-Selected Background Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alyssa</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Comes from a middle class family in a small town that was White and Native American (&quot;one African American family and that's it&quot;); Major is in a male-dominated field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Black/ Native American</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Hometown is racially diverse and she has little prior experience with individuals from predominately white backgrounds; Relies on other students of color for support and guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Hometown is &quot;completely all White people&quot; and &quot;race isn't a big issue [there];&quot; Has not had the opportunity to meet diverse others prior to college; Comments on the lack of structural diversity at college but does acknowledge that there is some.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Second generation Hong Kong Chinese from a racially diverse area where &quot;I wasn't this different before;&quot; Aspects of her cultural identity that she took for granted feel &quot;magnified&quot; now; Anticipated that she would be different as a student of color at a PWI but has been shocked by the limited diversity and lack of awareness about cultural difference she has encountered at college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Non-traditional part-time student with teenage children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>First generation college student; Family's move to Cuba was student's first international experience; Sparked interest in international affairs major; Studied abroad in Western Europe and North Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridget</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>First generation college student from a rural, racially homogenous farming community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Attended a private high school and had little interaction with diverse others; Attending a community college for summer school opened her eyes to other forms of diversity (e.g., age, SES, ethnicity).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>High school district was &quot;pretty diverse… more [diverse] than [it was for] a lot of people;&quot; Learned to be open-minded and respectful of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney*</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>&quot;I love to talk with people who disagree with me…I have different opinions [than the students in my classes] and I think my teachers like it.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Class Year</td>
<td>Student-Selected Background Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damon</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Came from a small town that was a &quot;very close minded, narrow place;&quot; Recognizes college's efforts to actively recruit diverse students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Inherited parents' open-mindedness; Laments lack of racial diversity on college campus; Primary exposure to diverse others has occurred off-campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Attended a large &quot;somewhat diverse&quot; suburban high school; Also studied abroad in Western Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Views difference in college primarily in geographic terms (e.g., the U.S. region where one grew up); College residence hall had &quot;every race, people from all different backgrounds and everyone pretty much gets along.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Grew up in a religiously conservative African American community; Few White students in her high school; Being a student of color at a PWI is central to her college experience but she &quot;took it one day at a time and got used to it&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>First generation college student; Grew up in a small town (population 500) where people &quot;have their opinions and they're not willing to change;&quot; Liberal arts classes have given her a better understanding of different others' behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi*</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Grew up in a community that was &quot;99% Caucasian middle class,&quot; Immediate peer group lacks cultural diversity; Meeting diverse others in college has been &quot;just awesome&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White/African American</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>&quot;I grew up in a very White town;&quot; Attended a predominately White high school; Grew up feeling very uncomfortable in her own skin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilona</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Characterizes home state as racially homogenous (White)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>First generation college student; Single parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenn</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Home state is &quot;one of the Whitest places around,&quot; high school peer group and liberal college environment have encouraged her to be more open-minded and worldly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Originally from a small town; Influenced to pursue study abroad by sister (who participated with her)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiweon*</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>No prior experience with racial and cultural differences in her home country; Doesn't feel she is close to White students but has positive relationships with students from other races; Had dated African Americans;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Class Year</td>
<td>Student-Selected Background Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Shocked to learn that there are &quot;many&quot; stereotypes about Asian women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin*</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>First generation college student; Class was taken to fulfill a diversity requirement (&quot;It's not a class that I would normally take.&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanisha</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Valued living in a diverse residence hall; Has found that &quot;certain groups&quot; of Americans are closed to other cultures Took course because she &quot;had to&quot; in order to fulfill requirements; Finds class to be &quot;pretty diverse&quot; racially but overall there aren't &quot;that many Black people&quot; on campus; Being African American and from out-of-state, she characterizes herself as &quot;a minority of a minority of a minority&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>From a small town; Commutes to college from one hour away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrina</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White/African American</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Has been disappointed by the lack of integration among diverse peer groups at college; Feels that some individuals are unwelcoming to other races States that &quot;diversity is something that interests me a lot;&quot; Has racially and religiously diverse friends in college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>She finds it &quot;annoying&quot; that &quot;everybody&quot; at her college is from the same state; Later traveled to Sweden to visit roommate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White/Latino</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>First generation college student with little prior exposure to diverse others; Comments on her lack of interaction across difference in college (&quot;I haven't had any bad experiences, just a lack of. I don't think I've really encountered or even talked to anyone of Asian descent or not even Hispanic.&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristy</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Wanted to live in a foreign country in order to learn cultural acceptance and about the perspectives of diverse others; Initially spent most of his time with co-nationals but recently has begun taking more risks meeting culturally different others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee*</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Grew up in &quot;a very integrated city;&quot; Views difference primarily in terms of major and participation in Greek life; Spent four weeks in Belize mentoring students in her major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>First generation college student from a small town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Privileged Latin American upbringing; Lived in a diverse (e.g., race, (dis)abilities, majors, geography) residential hall as a freshman; Dating a White student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Luis*     | Male   | Latino          | Senior     | "I did not have any diversity in my high school. We were - it was all White;" Structural diversity is good because then "it
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Class Year</th>
<th>Student-Selected Background Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Attended a predominately White high school; Structural diversity at college promoted awareness about other kinds of diversity beyond Black and White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>First generation student from an economically disadvantaged background; High school was racially homogenous with &quot;maybe two black students in my whole school; Feels more comfortable with cultural (rather than racial) difference; Dating an Asian student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael*</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Internships in U.S. and abroad allowed him to compare work life and culture (e.g., environment, attitudes, pace, hours worked), Feels he is more open-minded towards different others than peers who didn't attend college; Able to make friends &quot;with anybody&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique*</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Born in Western Europe; Exposed to significant diversity growing up; Most of her friends are White and she finds it difficult to relate to African Americans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Given diverse campus environment, student feels like a minority for the first time in her life; Wonders &quot;Am I a racist?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikki</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Grew up in a diverse community; Her high school was &quot;one-third White, one-third African American, and one-third Native American&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean*</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Attended high school with high-achieving college bound Asian American students; Feels that college students segregate themselves into ethnic groups; Socialized primarily with other Asian students his first two years of college; Gained exposure to diverse others by living in a co-op and by being open to new experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Attended a public high school and was academically &quot;ahead of&quot; the majority of students; Wanted an international roommate so she could find out about other cultures and because she believes an international roommate will be more patient and tolerant than an American roommate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Black/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Biracial student who had previous experience living internationally with military family; Small size of International House promotes intercultural interactions: Experienced shock when Australian student used derogatory language towards African American students in the house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Class Year</td>
<td>Student-Selected Background Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Grew up in a community with both Whites and Hispanics but did not view it as diverse; Best friends in high school were Hispanic; Has been disappointed by the limited interaction across the &quot;disparate&quot; racial groups in college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Has previous experience dating interracially; Comments on lack of structural diversity of class (African American professor and only one student of color) noting that “it hasn't really affected&quot; the learning environment except when questions are posed that would better be answered by African American students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p Denotes international student or Green Card holder*
Appendix E: Resources to Inform Intercultural Programming

Diversity Programming


Intergroup Dialogue


Service Learning


Education Abroad


Reflection Activities


Diversity Courses


International Peer Programs

Living Learning Communities


Theme Year Activities


Conversation Partner Programs


Involvement with Campus Diversity

Internships
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