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My Study Abroad Journey

Colombia: 2012
Zambia: 2012-2016
India: 2018-2019
Preparing for ICL

■ Don’t do what I did in 2013!

■ Plan ahead:
  - Goals for students
  - Tools to be used
    ■ Qualitative:
      - Daily journals
      - Final reflective papers
      - Final videos
    ■ Quantitative:
      - Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI®)
      - Cultural Intelligence (CQ)
      - Public Affairs Scale
      - Attitudes, Skills, and Knowledge Short Scale (ASKS+)

■ Use resources at Purdue:
  - CILMAR
  - Center for Instructional Excellence (CIE)
ICL

Before, During and After
ICL: Before

February: Pre-IDI®

March: Group Debrief

March: Buddy communications

March-April: Individual debriefs

March-April: Activities

June: Field trips

June: Activities and discussions

June: Class presentations

June: Daily journals

June: Book discussions

February – April: Monthly

June (2 weeks): Daily
ICL: Before

Presentations
- About the country:
  - History
  - Geography
  - Wildlife
  - Economy
  - Government
  - Education
- Content/culture specific:
  - Community partners
  - Culture/religion/languages
  - Healthcare system
  - HIV/AIDS

Activities/Discussions
- IDI video
- Iceberg concept of culture
- TED talks
  - Danger of a single story
- Photo story telling
- Language practice
- Religion/ caste system
- Arranged marriages
- Child marriage
- Poverty
- Etc....
ICL: *During*

- Plan the SA program to be **immersive.** Important factors:
  - Design of program
  - Living in the community (not a fancy hotel)
  - Working in the community
  - Having hands-on experiences
  - Collaborating with local organizations
  - Involving students in teaching
  - Reflecting on experiences
    - Amerson, 2014 (Nursing)
- What we did:
  - Used a service learning model
  - Lived in basic lodgings
  - Visited/worked in the community
  - Participated in clinics
  - Worked with multiple organizations in two cities
  - Provided seminars to professionals
  - Nightly debriefings to discuss days events and daily journals
    - Not just visiting tourist attractions
Photos from India...
ICL: After

- Group de-briefing after return
  - Reverse culture shock
  - Explaining / describing experience to others
  - Awareness of SA vs. “humanitarian” work
Conclusion re: SA

■ Negative effects of SA on local community
  - *Increasing hardships on local community* (e.g. water shortage)
  - *Economic impacts: heightening economic disparities*
  - “Voluntourism reinforces the dominant paradigm that the poor of developing countries require the help of affluent westerners to induce development” (McGloin & Georgeou, 2016, pp1)

■ Emphasize importance of:
  - *Institutional and program leader support and preparation*
  - *Student and community preparation*
  - *Working with local professionals and community partners*
    ■ To develop sustainable long-term programs that minimize negative effects and have a positive impact on both the local community and the students studying abroad
SA DATA
Intercultural Development Inventory® (IDI)

Modified from the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS), M. Bennett, 1986
Table 2. IDI® descriptive statistics and paired sample t-tests for each group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 (n=12)</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (n=9)</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>97.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=10)</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>106.9*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Pre- and post-program group mean DO scores for the three groups of participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-IDI</th>
<th>Post-IDI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>94.17</td>
<td>94.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group E1</td>
<td>94.73</td>
<td>91.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group E2</td>
<td>83.67</td>
<td>97.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group E2</td>
<td>96.80</td>
<td>107.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93.76</td>
<td>106.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Difference | 95% CI for Mean Difference | r | df | Sig. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>-4.16, 11.56</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-14.00</td>
<td>-21.21, -6.79</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10.76</td>
<td>-19.26, -2.26</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.019*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-13.10</td>
<td>-20.68, -5.53</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.004*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = p < .05; ** = p < .01
India IDI® Individual Scores: 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 9</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>105.7*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .05
* = ≥ 7-point increase
India IDI® Individual Scores: 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 12</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>104.9*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<.005

* = ≥ 7-point increase

* = ≥ 7-point decrease
India IDI® Two Years Plus Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>9 (n=9)</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>105.7*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>12 (n=12)</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>104.9*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>19 (n=19)</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean difference between Pre and Post is significant (p<.005).
Conclusions re: ICL and SA

■ SA alone may not “automatically” increase intercultural competence

■ Intentional ICL activities embedded in the SA curriculum can increase intercultural competence
  – Mean group score increase = 13.55 points
  – Note that not every student’s score increased

■ Methods and activities used for intentional ICL appear to translate with different non-Western destination countries
  – Need to evaluate for Western countries
ICL ON CAMPUS
Moving ICL to Classroom on Campus 2019

- Nationwide ~11% of undergraduate students study abroad (Inside Higher Ed)

- Included ICL unit in 200 level introductory Audiology course
  - 3-week Massive Online Open Course (MOOC) on Diversity and Inclusion
  - Reflection papers each week
  - No individual debriefs

Funded by CILMAR Mini-grant
On-Campus IDI® 2019

2019 On-Campus

- **Intervention**
  - Pre: 87.5
  - Post: 98.8*

- **Control**
  - Pre: 86.9
  - Post: 86

Group score increased 11.3 points without individual debriefs/activities
On-Campus ICL: 2020

- Original goal:
  - Compare online MOOC activities from 2019 to three face-to-face events across campus
  - Reflections same as before
  - No individual debriefs

January: Pre-IDI®

Jan 30-Feb 24: Event 1

February 25-March 25: Event 2

Mar 26-Apr 13: Event 3

April: Post-IDI®
Transitioning ICL Online Mid-semester

- Modify at spring break:
  - Most students had only completed one face-to-face event
  - Focus more on converting course content online
  - All students said they would have internet access
- Changes made for ICL activities:
  - Event 2 = TED Talk (Danger of a single story)
  - Event 3 = Read a book by a “non-Western” author
    - Provided books I used for Zambia and India programs
    - Suggested free online sites for books
On-Campus IDI® 2020

2020 On-Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E (n=40)</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (n=39)</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical analysis not completed yet

Group score increased 9 points despite transition to remote learning.
Comparing SA and On-Campus ICL

Study Abroad

- Pre: Black
- Post: Yellow

On-Campus

- Pre: Black
- Post: Yellow

2014 2015 2016 2018 2019 Control

2019 2020 Control
Mean Comparisons

- Do students who study abroad tend to start with a higher score?
- Mean increases in group scores:
  - SA = 13.55 points
  - On-campus = 10.15 points
- Despite transition to remote learning
Conclusions

- ICL activities on campus can increase intercultural competence as measured by IDI® scores

- **Online activities can** increase intercultural competence as measured by IDI® scores
  - More thoughtful approaches for remote learning under less stressful circumstances
    - E.g. discussion boards

- Group score increases with on-campus learning appear to be slightly lower than with SA
  - Further investigation is needed

- For both SA and on-campus, not every student’s score increases
  - Further investigation is needed into other variables that affect ICL
Resources

- Links to blogs including student entries
  - SLHS in India blog: https://slhsinindia.wordpress.com/
  - SLHS in India Facebook page: https://www.facebook.com/slhsinindia
  - SLHS in Zambia blog: https://slhsinzambia.wordpress.com/

- CILMAR Mini-grant talk
  - https://mediaspace.itap.purdue.edu/media/Lata+Krishnan+2018+CILMAR+Minigrant+Presentation/1_09mcmtut
Thank you!