# Reconsidering Intercultural Competence Development through Study Abroad

**Lauren Collins**
University of Denver

The twenty-first century has seen swift and massive rise in the power of private enterprise, increasing interconnectedness between national economies, and far-reaching changes wrought by technology. Philosopher and social theorist Habermas (2001) described this new world as a post-national one, where cultural and geographic national identities are less relevant, and transnational identity more common. Assessing the changing labor force in this globalizing world starting in the 1950s, Drucker (1959; 1992) coined the term "knowledge worker," describing how labor in the United States shifted to a marketplace where workers must generate value through their minds instead of their bodies. Success in this new "knowledge economy" means that governments and private enterprise must find ways to employ workers who ensure they remain competitive and at the top of the value chain in the international political economy. Knowledge is now the key resource in this new society (Gilpin & Gilpin, 2000; Friedman, 2005).

Embedded within these socio-cultural changes, and as a leading industry in the United States that generates human capital, higher education is now tasked with producing the workforce able to succeed in an increasingly diverse and globalized economy (Duncan, 2011; Knight, 2004). Policymakers, companies, and higher education institutions are all calling for students to graduate with skills that can be used to navigate the global workplace (Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, 2005; IIE, 2016).The ability to lead diverse teams, navigate value-

based conflict, and achieve results is a requirement of the workplace today. At the same time, study abroad is seen as a tool for fostering a more peaceful world, re-making students into "global citizens" (Grunzweig & Rinehart, 2002; Hoffa & DePaul, 2010). The corresponding legitimizing argument is that after a study abroad experience, students return home more sensitive to and appreciative of cultural difference, allowing them to succeed in diverse work environments, become stewards of world peace and cultural understanding.

Proceeding on the good-faith assumption that study abroad can achieve these goals, almost all higher education institutions now have some type of study abroad offering (Twombly, Salisbury, Tumanut & Klute, 2012). By and large, the majority of the research literature suggests that study abroad participation positively impacts students. However, an overlooked and under-studied aspect of this trend is whether or not study abroad actually increases the ability of students to navigate difference on both a domestic and global scale, especially when they are often unable to do so in their own domestic campus context. This paper explores the question of what kinds of pedagogies cultivate student dispositions and attitudes conducive to engaging across difference. It challenges normative understandings of study abroad as *the* solution to developing student capacity to navigate difference and problematizes the framework under which U.S. higher education sending institutions often operate.

**Intercultural competence development**.

Commonly cited as a key learning outcome, intercultural skills are seen as one of the major areas in which students make gains during a study abroad program. What kind of an impact does study abroad have on the development of intercultural competence? One of the foundational understandings of how students are able to adapt to and engage with cultural difference is Bennett's (1986; 1993) model of intercultural sensitivity (DMIS). In the DMIS model students have "orientations toward cultural difference" that shape how they are able to understand cultures. Still, there is no single accepted vision of what constitutes intercultural skills. Spitzberg and Changnon (2009) found 300 separate definitions for the terminology alone. According to Hammer's et al. (2003) commonly cited definition, "the crux of the development of intercultural sensitivity is attaining the ability to construe (and thus experience) cultural difference in more complex ways," (p. 423). The connection between study abroad and the development of intercultural skills is also linked with the "contact hypothesis" (Twombly, Salisbury, Tumanut & Klute, 2012). In this theory, prejudice has the potential to decrease if people from different groups have sustained contact with one another, under conditions of equal status, intergroup cooperation, common goals, and are supported by social and institutional authorities (Allport, 1954). Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) reviewed

515 studies spanning fifty years of research and found that the contact theory held true.

There is extensive data that shows study abroad impacts students' intercultural awareness (Bennett, 1993; Brewer & Cunningham, 2009; Carlson, Burn, Useem, & Yachimowicz, 1990; Clarke, Flaherty, Wright, & McMillen, 2009). Seeking to understand to what extent intercultural skills are developed, Clarke, Flaherty, Wright, and McMillen (2009) looked at two groups of undergraduate business school students. One of these groups attended a semester of required coursework on their home campus, while the other group took similar courses in a study abroad program in Belgium taught by host-country faculty. Based on survey responses, the researchers found higher levels of open-mindedness in students who studied abroad compared to non-study abroad peers. Studies like these corroborate the belief that through study abroad students gain more positive impressions of other people and other cultures, as well as the ability to navigate difference successfully.

At the same time, there is a growing body of research in cross-cultural work that shows the ability of individuals to navigate difference is only possible when certain conditions are present. Ogden (2007) argues that students often start a study abroad program with the idea that it is going to be a transformational experience and are then unprepared when things are more difficult than expected. Although culture is not a monolithic fixed

component of any place, there are differences between students' home communities and their host communities that they are often not well equipped to manage. Without being properly prepared, encountering difference can lead to increased stereotypes rather than greater understanding (Ogden, 2007). Engle and Engle (2003) found that irrespective of study abroad models (length, design, location), students tended to create alternative environments that removed them from the immersive experience they were in, and limited their ability to make local friends. In a study of 16 study abroad students in Spain, Citron (2003) also found that the students created a "third-culture," whereby they failed to fully immerse into their host community.

Large-scale studies have also shown that intercultural skill development is not necessarily directly correlated with study abroad experience. In their 2012 survey of the field, Twombly, Salisbury, Tumanut and Klute detail how the Study Abroad Evaluation Project (SAEP) found that students who studied abroad not only had higher post study abroad scores on the international perspective assessment, but also had higher scores going into the experience. This means that international perspective was higher in the first place among students who studied abroad, likely impacting their higher scores at the end. They add that Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education that looked at 1593 students found students who studied abroad were more likely to enjoy contact with diverse people,

but this did not mean that they preferred diversity or appreciated other cultures (Twombly, Salisbury, Tumanut & Klute, 2012). This study also found no statistically significant effect on relativistic appreciation of cultural differences, or comfort with diversity, and that student involvement in domestic diversity programs actually impacted intercultural competency development more than study abroad experiences (Salisbury, 2011). The real deciding factor in what a student takes away from an intercultural experience is critical reflection and opportunities for cooperation (Brewer, 1996). In some cases students are better able to make meaningful connections across difference on their home campus as compared to on campuses with asymmetric power structures between study abroad and domestic students.

What all these studies suggest is that although study abroad has the potential to impact intercultural competence development positively, it is likely not the axiomatic transformational experience that many assume. Overall, existing research suggests that students who study abroad and show positive gains may very well do so because they are already positively predisposed to be open to intercultural learning in the first place. These individual level outcomes are also mediated by a variety of factors including student willingness to move beyond their comfort zone, curiosity that turns differences into opportunities, and openness to seeing from more than one perspective (LeBaron & Pillay, 2006).

**Integrated threat and social dominance theories.**

What is rarely discussed in the literature around intercultural competence development is how study abroad actually has the potential to *decrease* intercultural competence. This lack of critical inquiry is particularly problematic as the push to dramatically increase study abroad participation draws in students who do not have a predisposition to study abroad in the first place. Just because a student does have the predisposition to study abroad does not mean that their stereotypes and biases will be decreased through the experience. In fact, contact can instead reduce tolerance and understanding and a worsening of cross-cultural understanding.

The contact theory of study abroad is complicated by integrated threat and social dominance theories, which find that contact between two different groups of people does not reduce discrimination if negative conditions, such as one group's ignorance of or anxiety about another culture, are present that constrain interactions (Stephan & Stephan, 2004). Integrated threat is a perceived threat that leads to prejudice between social groups, whether or not someone is part of a majority or minority group in their society. Perceived threat includes all of the threats that members of a group believe they are experiencing, regardless of whether those threats actually exist. For example, people in the U.S. may feel that Spanish-speaking migrants are threatening their economic well-being even if in reality this group has no effect on their job opportunities. Still, their perception that their job security

is under threat can increase their levels of prejudice against Spanish-speaking people in their community. Studying attitudes to immigrants in Spain and Israel, Stephan et al. (1998) found that negative perceptions against people from different groups were attributable to perceived threats based on values, threats to one group's power and resources, anxiety around interactions, and negative stereotypes. Social dominance theory argues that it is a reality that certain groups exercise different forms of power over other groups, and that groups that have this power typically do not want to give it up.

Also overlooked in the array of research on intercultural learning are impacts on the intercultural competence of host communities, as well as effects of student's lack of intercultural competence on the communities in which they are living and studying. Their lack of intercultural competence is particularly problematic if you take integrated threat and social dominance theories into account, as host communities may emerge with greater stereotypes of American students through these interactions rather than greater understanding. Alsayyad (2011) shows that both tourists and marketers can manipulate and transform cultures in such a way that they do not resonate with a local population's own identity. Communities may change their behaviors simply to create a product that visitors want to consume. Bayles (2014) suggests the U.S. media has an almost omnipresent dominance that pervades media consumption habits worldwide, feeding both

envy of and prejudices against Americans. Bhabha (1994) offers up the possibility that this very transformation of identity can be understood as a form of post-colonialism, arguing that identity formation in colonialized locations happens through the interplay of need on the part of each to understand and to place one another. Under colonial rule by European nations, wealth was extracted from colonies to serve their own interests. This happened through conscription of labor and resource extraction, leaving in place legacies that mediate the structure of government, economics, and social strife that are present in those places today. There is an inherent tension between the desire to throw off the power of the colonizer, and to emulate what the colonizer is. Thus, by U.S. students being present in China for example, local students may feel the need to change their behavior or attitudes to be more socially accepted by foreign students. This area needs much more research and does not come up in any of the literature reviewed, aside from mention of students' encountering national or racial stereotypes of Americans.

Overall the demographics of study abroad participants have continued to diversify. In 2016-2017, 29.2% of students who studied abroad were non-white, but this is still a long way from reflecting the diversity of enrollment in U.S. higher education which hovers around 42% minority student enrollment. It is also important to note that students experience perceptions of their race and nationality differently depending on a range of

factors, particularly race and class. Savicki and Cooley (2011) argue that for the majority of White students who study abroad, American identity is likely one of their most salient identities. In their research they compared 59 study abroad students on a three-month program to 49 students who were in the U.S. taking a class focused on identity and culture issues that the study abroad students were likely to face. This study found that students who studied abroad experienced significant disruption in their American identity, while the students who did not study abroad experienced no change. A related under-analyzed area of individual development is the impact of harassment or stereotypes that minoritized students experience while abroad. The general body of research paints the student experience as positive, possibly because of the racial and gendered component of the majority of study abroad students being White and female. Landau and Moore (2001) found that African American students in Ghana experienced stereotypes based on their national identity that they did not expect to encounter, altering views of their own identity as they were faced with a new sense of American-ness.

What the above findings show is that the commonly accepted rationale in study abroad that simply by spending time immersed in difference students emerge more interculturally competent is complicated. It may happen for some students, but others may return with deeper prejudices than they held previously. At the same time, U.S. student presence in host

communities has the potential to negatively impact those very communities we assume U.S. students are benefiting from (Schroeder, 2009). Rarely mentioned are factors that can unintentionally have a *negative impact* on host community engagement. Although some research indicates that cohorts can allow for greater risk taking and engagement of students, the presence of cohorts can also make it harder for students to move outside of the group (Allen, 2010; Ogden, 2007). Barkin (2015) found that programs with a cohort model create "in-group socialization and bonding, with the setting becoming a backdrop to the in group experience". Citron & Kline (2001; 2002) describe how this can also happen in homestay situations when multiple students with similar backgrounds are placed together in the same household. The "shadow culture" that results further isolates the students from cultural contact with their host community, and cohorts hinder the ability for students to be confronted daily with different ways of seeing and doing.

Power differences, neoliberalism, and colonial legacies can also create barriers for meaningful interactions between U.S. students and host community members. Describing affluent, White study abroad students Ogden (2007) calls their behavior "colonial", arguing that U.S. study abroad students are ones who want the experience to take advantage of benefits like new perspectives and resume enhancers, but who are ill-equipped to handle any negative impacts from being in the host location. These students

resist immersion and prefer the company of other U.S. students. Often they have minimal financial concerns and take for granted the privileges they enjoy as residents of the U.S. In this situation, Pratt's (1992) concept of the "contact zone" is also important to consider. The term has been used mostly to look at spaces of colonial encounters, but applies to understanding what may happen in an education abroad. As Pratt describes, contact zones are places where people come together "often in highly asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination," (Pratt, 1992, p.7). Bruner (2005) finds an analogy in the study of tourism. He calls this the "tourist border-zone," where in the developing world there is the creation of a "cultural imaginary" that is performed by locals and tourists. Most U.S. scholars and travelers carry with them great economic and cultural power. Legacies of colonialism and racism are often experienced, but not well understood by U.S. study abroad students. There are still very real legacies and inequalities between students and their hosts, particularly in developing nation contexts.

Conversation and research around study abroad primarily focuses on U.S. students, and not on the communities in which these students are situated. Study abroad is tightly tied to the idea of coming to know another culture, but this is a real challenge when relations between students and community members are unequal. Power distance (Hofstede et al., 1991) plays a critical role in study abroad experience that is almost entirely unexplored in the literature around learning outcomes, but is one of the

factors at play in what is occurring.  The reality is that some nation states have more power (economic, cultural, political, military) than others, and this power is extended to some degree to their citizens, without their even having to know that they carry it (Gilpin & Gilpin, 2000). Power distance also matters from a cultural perspective, as students may be located in cultural contexts where power distance within culture is extraordinarily important. Short term travel (including study abroad) by Westerners is directly and indirectly a cause of change in less developed parts of the world. Simply through spending money in a community, unequal power relationships emerge between hosts and guest both through economic exchange, as well as in the exchange of knowledge. Bruner (2005) argues that divides between cultures are heightened through this inequity, particularly in locations where there are large differences in wealth and power between locals and visitors. These realities all play a role both in what students learn, as well as what their impact is on the communities they become a part of, even for a short time.

**Implications for pedagogy and practice**.

Rodman and Merrill (2010) describe factors that influence student learning as macro and mezzo level influencers on study abroad programs. At the macro-level are social, economic, and political factors. At the mezzo level are impacts on higher education like demographic changes, increasing tuition costs, and the push for measurable learning outcomes. They argue

that program design is a result of how all these factors interact.  It is difficult to precisely pinpoint how individual students will succeed in a program. Simply studying abroad does not automatically instill particular learning outcomes and competencies. While there might be structures in place during study abroad programs for students to reflect on their experiences, once the programs have concluded, students are often left to their own devices to understand and negotiate the meaning of their study abroad experiences. How to create meaningful connections rests on student capacity to engage, host community interest in engaging deeply with U.S. students, and intentional educational interventions.

VandeBerg, Paige and Lou (2012) posit that three major paradigms inform how study abroad programs are designed. They call these "master narratives". These are: a positivist narrative, with the European Grand Tour as the model, a relativist narrative centered on the idea that all cultures are equal and that a shared humanity is more important than any differences, an experiential/constructivist narrative where students create their worlds both individually and with others, and that learning occurs primarily through exchanges with other people. These three paradigms have different pedagogical tools. In the case of programs with a positivistic orientation, students learn from an external world that is stable and different. The focus is often on language acquisition, bolstering academic learning on the home campus, and training students in cultural norms, with an embedded

understanding that not all cultures are equal. Success in these programs is measured through grades and academic achievement. In the relativist frame, students learn through immersion. Goals include developing a sense of common humanity, and pedagogical focus is on helping students navigate these differences. Success is measured by transformation. In the experiential or constructivist model, learning happens through cultural mentoring and immersion, centering on the understanding that students are learning and creating the world as they experience it. Pedagogy focuses on meaningful interactions, interdisciplinary, and intercultural learning. Success is measured through the ability of students to shift their cultural perspective and adapt behavior to other cultural contexts. None of these designs contain components that include measurements of success looking at impact on the host community, or how host community members experience these pedagogical tools, tools which are actually dependent on their engagement in the process.

Too often it is assumed that students will become interculturally competent simply by being in another place. Ultimately impact rests on the student's ability to engage in self-directed learning and the presence of intentional pedagogy. Students learn significantly more when there are educational interventions that deliberately prepare them to engage in intercultural learning (Barkin, 2015).  It takes effort and intentional curriculum to prepare students to become more self-reflective, culturally

self-aware, and be able to articulate how they "know what they know". These "frame shifts" at the core of intercultural competence development require active engagement by learners. Belenky and Stanton (2000) argue that the key to these shifts is reflective discourse and that this "works best when participants are well informed, free from coercion, listen actively, have equal opportunities to participate, and take a critical stance toward established cultural norms or viewpoints" (p. 71). Perspective taking and intercultural "frame shifts" require deep reflection on the learning process guided by experienced educators. The conditions necessary to develop intercultural skills are a supportive environment and opportunity to go beyond the surface (Kauffmann et al., 1992).

We must also interrogate what is meant by global citizenship and intercultural competence. Are we looking to teach a social justice-oriented definition of global citizenship or one of corporate-value laden global citizenship connected to the idealized image of the knowledge worker? This is a question that needs to be wrestled with by study aboard scholars who have mostly not engaged in this discourse. Are we seeking to develop students who are able to successfully and respectfully navigate difference or are we instead seeking to construct knowledge workers who can use the cultural and social capital gained through a study abroad experience to enrich their own careers and their home country's economy? Are we

enacting a neoliberal agenda via "global citizenship"? Is the development of intercultural competence serving a public good or a capitalist regime?

Practitioners must be particularly attentive to visiting developing country contexts out of a desire to provide students with a "transformational" experience. Often U.S. students have little exposure to living in places where infrastructure, economic opportunity, and medical care are not as developed as in the U.S. or Western Europe. An experience walking the streets of Delhi or rural Peru is often experienced with a certain degree of shock, which faculty and institutions may view as being more "transformational" than when students are in a country that is more similar to the U.S. Un-critiqued is the question of whether this is really "transformational" or is instead just a reflection of the privilege and lack of experience of these students to pervasive global economic inequities and cultural difference. Despite the overwhelming research showing that it takes a long time and intentional engagement to learn "invisible culture", programs sometimes often operate as if it really is possible for students to emerge with a deep understanding of place and context through short programs of surface level engagement with community residents.

Finally, we must critically examine how study abroad impacts host communities in a post-colonial world. Rather than focusing on increasing the number of students, scholars and practitioners should perhaps instead focus on how to create programs that are equivalently impactful for host

communities. We must ask what kinds of pedagogies cultivate student dispositions and attitudes conducive to engaging across difference. Perhaps we should focus on teaching students humility and the value of different ways of being and knowing. This can be done through modeling for students critical reflexivity that acknowledges our own power and privilege as temporary visitors and questions our assumptions and ways of thinking and being (Hartman et al. 2018).  This kind of pedagogy requires a high level of trust among learners and teachers as well as a willingness to be humble, even vulnerable, through the emotional and intellectual labor required to critically interrogate our own place in the world.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Alsayyad, N. (2001). *Consuming tradition/manufacturing heritage: Global norms and urban*

    *forms in an age of tourism*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Barkin, G. (2015). In the absence of language: Modeling a transformative, short-term abroad

    experience. *Teaching Anthropology,* 4, 51-64.

Bayles, M. (2014). *Through a screen darkly: Popular culture, public diplomacy, and America's*

    *image abroad*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Belenky, M., & Stanton, A. (2000) Inequality, development and connected knowing. In J.

    Mezirow, & Associates, (Eds.), *Learning as transformation: Critical*

    *perspectives on a theory in progress* (pp. 71102). San Francisco, CA:

    Jossey-Bass.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Brewer, E., and Cunningham, K. (2009). *Integrating study abroad into the curriculum*. Sterling,

    VA: Stylus.

Bruner, E. (2005). *Culture on tour: Ethnographies of travel*. Chicago: University of Chicago

Press.

Brewer, M. B. (1996). When contact is not enough: Social identity and intergroup cooperation.

*International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20, 291-303.

Carlson, J., Burn, B., Useem, J., and Yachimovicz, D. (1990). *Study abroad: The experience of*

*American undergraduates*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Citron, J. L. & Kline, R. (2001). From experience to experiential education: Taking study abroad

outside the comfort zone. *International Educator*, 10 (4), 18–26.

Citron, J. L. & Kline, R. (2002). U.S. students abroad: Host culture integration or third culture

formation. In W. Grünzweig & N. Rinehart (Eds.) *Rockin' in Red Square: Critical Approaches to International Education in the Age of Cyber-culture.* Munster, Germany: Lit Verlag.

Clarke, I., Flaherty, T. B., Wright, N. D., and McMillen, R. M. (2009). Student intercultural

proficiency from study abroad programs. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 31(2), 173–181.

Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program. (2005).*Global*

*competence & national need: one million Americans studying abroad*.
Final Report from the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study
Abroad Fellowship Program, Washington, DC.

Duncan, A. (2011). *Improving human capital in a competitive world --*
*Education reform in the*
*U.S*. U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved 10/2/2016 from
http://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/improving-human-capital-
competitive-world-education-reform-us

Drucker, P. F. (1959). *Landmarks of tomorrow*. New York, NY: Harper.

Drucker, P.F. (1992). The New Society of Organizations. *Harvard Business*
*Review*, Sept-Oct.

Engle, J., & Engle, L. (2002). Neither international nor educative: Study
abroad in the time of
globalization. In W. Grünzweig and N. Rinehart (Eds.), *Rockin' in Red*
*Square: Study Abroad in a New Global Century Critical approaches to*
*international education in the time of cyberculture* (pp. 25–40).
Munster, Germany: Lit Verlag.

Engle, L., & Engle, J. (2003). Study abroad levels: Toward a classification of
program types.
*Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 9,* 1–20.

Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: a brief history of the twenty-first*
*century*. New York:

Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Gilpin, R., & Gilpin, J. M. (2000). *The challenge of global capitalism: the world economy in the 21st century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Grünzweig, W., & Rinehart, N. (2002). International understanding and global interdependence: Towards a critique of international education. In W. Grünzweig *Rockin' in Red Square: Critical approaches to international education in the age of cyberculture*. Münster: LIT Verlag.

Habermas, J. (2001). *The post national constellation: political essays*. MIT Press.

Bennett, M. J. (1986). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. R.M. Paige (Ed.), *Cross-cultural orientation: New conceptualizations and applications*, University Press of America, New York (1986), 27–70.

Hammer, M., Bennett, M., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27*, 421-443.

Hoffa, W. (2007). *A history of U.S. study abroad: Beginnings to 1965.* Carlisle, PA: Forum on

Education Abroad.

Hoffa, W., and DePaul, S. (2010). *A history of U.S. study abroad: 1965–present.* Carlisle, PA:

Forum on Education Abroad.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (1991). *Cultures and organizations.* London,

England: McGraw-Hill.

Kauffmann, N, Martin, J., Weaver, H., and Weaver, J. (1992). *Students abroad:  strangers at*

*home. Education for a global society*. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press, Inc.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal*

*of Studies in International Education*, 8, 5-31.

Moore, D. & Landau, J. (2001). Towards reconciliation in the motherland: race, class,

nationality, gender, and the complexities of American student

presence at the University  of Ghana, Legon. *Frontiers: The*

*Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 7.*

LeBaron, M. & Pillay, V. (2006). Conflict across cultures: A unique experience of bridging

differences. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Lewin, R., ed. (2009). *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: higher education*

   *and the quest for global citizenship*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Moore, D. & Landau, J. (2001). Towards reconciliation in the motherland: race, class,

   nationality, gender, and the complexities of American student

   presence at the University  of Ghana, Legon. *Frontiers: The*

   *Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 7.*

Ogden, A. (2007). The view from the veranda: Understanding today's colonial student.

   *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 15*, 2-20.

Pettigrew, T. F., and Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory.

   *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90,* 751–783.

Pratt, M. L. (1992). *Imperial eyes: Travel writing and transculturation*. London, England:

   Routledge.

Rodman, R., and Merrill, M. (2010). Unlocking study abroad potential: Design models, methods

   and masters. In Hoffa, W. and DePaul, S. *A History of US Study*

   *Abroad: 1965-Present,* pp.199-251). Carlisle, PA: The Forum on

   Education Abroad.

Salisbury, M. H. (2011). *The effect of study abroad on intercultural competence among*

   *Undergraduate college students* (Doctoral dissertation). University of

   Iowa, Iowa City. Retrieved January 12, 2018, from

   search.proquest.com/pqdtft/docview/879830525/1386CAD9FD04C036

   A47/1?accountid514556.

Savicki, V. & Cooley, E. (2011). American identity in study abroad students: Contrasts, changes,

   correlates. *Journal of College Student Development*, 52(3), 339-349.

   doi:10.1353/csd.2011.0035.

Schroeder, K., Wood, C., Galiardi, S. & Koehn, J.. (2009). First, do

   no harm: ideas for mitigating negative community impacts of short-term study

   abroad. *Journal of Geography* 108 (3): 141-147.

Spitzberg, B. H., & Changnon, G. (2009). Conceptualizing intercultural competence. In D. K.

   Deardorff (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of intercultural communication,* pp. 2-52.

   Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Twombly, S. B., Salisbury, M. H., Tumanut, S. D., & Klute, P. (2012). Special issue: study

abroad in a new global century--renewing the promise, refining the purpose. *Ashe Higher Education Report, 38,* 4, 1-152.

VandeBerg, R., Paige, M., and Lou, K. (2012). *Student learning abroad: What our students are learning, what they're not, and what we can do about it*. Sterling: Stylus Publishing, LLC.