Chapter 7
Pre-Service Teachers and Study Abroad: A Reflective, Experiential Sojourn to Increase Intercultural Competence and Translate the Experience into Culturally Relevant Pedagogy

Kathleen M. Roller

Introduction

The study abroad literature provides evidence that academic sojourns abroad are a life-changing and impactful experience for undergraduates, often shifting ethnocentric thinking to ethno relative thinking and increasing intercultural competence (Anderson et al. 2006, p. 467; Paige et al. 2004, p. 245). Various studies have demonstrated that study abroad has the potential to be widely impactful, both on academic—knowledge and skill development—and non-academic learning outcomes—affective and attitudinal, developmental and self-awareness (Medina-Lopez Portillo 2004, p. 180; Paige et al. 2004, p. 254; Sutton and Rubin 2004, p. 66; Savicki et al. 2008, p. 113). In each study, researchers found that study abroad had a transformational effect on the student; resulting in a diversified worldview, better understanding of self and an acknowledgement of self-growth. Yet, the sojourns need to be related to the greater context of the student's life and the world in which he/she lives and works (Lutterman-Aguilar and Gingerich 2002, p. 49) for the learning to transcend the conclusion of the experience.

The study abroad research highlights the need for purposeful reflection and intentional curricular integration of intercultural learning outcomes for students to make meaning out of the experience. Without such purposefulness, students likely return without being able to articulate newly acquired transferrable skills (Selby 2008, p. 7); experiences abroad lack assessment and processing and are only viewed against the students' own cultural conditioning (Deardorff 2008, p. 37); and/or students view their time abroad as fragmented from their holistic undergraduate experience (Hovland and McTighe Musil 2009, p. 467). Thus, researchers advocate a theoretical framework of experiential, affective and transformational learning

K. M. Roller (✉)
Whittier College, Whittier, CA 90608, USA
e-mail: kmroller@hotmail.com

(Savicki et al. 2008, p. xiii) that stresses strategic and critical thinking, integrated cultural experiences and reflection that aligns learning outcomes with a study abroad experience (Braskamp et al. 2009, p. 113). Experiential learning in study abroad programs has been assumed but has not been designed for the vast majority of traditional study abroad programs.

The experience of being overseas has particular implications for future teachers, often an underrepresented group of study abroad participants. According to Institute of International Education (2011) Open Doors Report (2011), only 4.1 % of the total number of American students studying abroad (270, 604) were education majors. Emphasis on international education and intercultural competence has been lacking in teacher preparation programs; yet many affirm the need for teachers to be better prepared to work in culturally diverse K-12 classrooms (Cushner and Mahon 2002, p. 45; Mills and Ballantyne 2010, p. 447; Willard-Holt 2001, p. 505). Field-based experiences offer pre-service teachers the means to improve their understanding of students with diverse backgrounds. In addition, getting out of the classroom and into the environment to witness culture first-hand, gives teachers the ability to work directly with multicultural students more successfully and encourages a mindset of inclusion (Villegas and Lucas 2002, p. 27).

The need for teachers to be interculturally competent and prepared to teach in multicultural and diverse classrooms is critical, for in fewer than ten years, almost half (48 %) of the nation's K-12 school-age children will be students of color (Milner, Flowers, Moore, Jr., Moore III, Flowers, 63) or first-generation Americans born to immigrant parents. Nationally, the vast majority of those entering the teaching profession have not been exposed to multicultural environments (Merryfield 2000, p. 430; Cushner 2009, p. 152). It should not be presumed that minority race teachers are more culturally sensitive based solely on race or cultural background alone. Cultural sensitivity is a learned response to cultural difference and regardless of their own race, inexperienced pre-service educators may lack the capability to understand differences and commonalities of people outside their culture group. Thus, it is likely they will not understand the effect of globalization on the lives of their future students (Merryfield 2000, p. 430). Pre-service teachers may operate from a monocultural mindset rather than an intercultural mindset. This can manifest itself in the classroom as ethnocentrism and a reliance on cultural stereotypes and generalizations. Seeing cultural differences as obstacles positions the teacher to view minority students' learning as something difficult to achieve. Shifting pre-service teachers' mindsets to a more culturally sensitive and ethnorelative orientation challenges them to develop pedagogical strategies that encourages minority students' learning.

Cross-cultural experiences for pre-service teachers vary tremendously and often consist of home campus-based experiences (i.e. coursework or practicum in multicultural classrooms), semesters/faculty-led courses abroad (Willard-Holt 2001, p. 507), or in the most scaffolded cases, a teaching abroad practicum. A study conducted by Willard-Holt (2001) concluded that teachers who participated in international education opportunities became more globally aware and were then better equipped to instill this attitude in their own students. Specifically, the study noted

that teacher education programs should: (1) Encourage pre-service teachers to study abroad/teach abroad to increase their global competence; and (2) Ensure that the experience is reflected upon critically and purposefully if acquired global competence is to be transferred to the students under their tutelage in the K-12 classroom.

Recently, qualitative studies of pre-service teachers on study abroad programs or engaged in overseas teaching placements have relied on questionnaires and surveys to measure anecdotal personal and professional growth (Pence and Macgillivray (2008, p. 15; Willard-Holt 2001, p. 507; Cushner and Mahon 2002, p. 48). Previously, research had not been conducted with pre-service teachers on study abroad programs to assess intercultural competence along a developmental continuum via the use of a structured experiential-based curriculum.

This study investigated the level of intercultural competence achieved by a select group of pre-service teachers before and after participating in a developmental experiential course during a study abroad semester (Roller 2012, p. 1). The modular curriculum involved reflective journal writing, observations, interviews and other developmental exercises shaped by the developmental model of intercultural sensitivity (DMIS) theory (Bennett 1993, p. 24) and culturally relevant pedagogy theory (Ladson-Billings 1995, p. 467) The impact an overseas experiential education had on these pre-service teachers' capabilities to shift cultural perspective and their abilities to adapt to cultural commonalities and differences was measured using the validity-tested Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) developed by Hammer (2001, p. 475) and Bennett (1993, p. 25).

Ultimately, this study highlights the need for more education majors to study abroad and suggests Education faculty and international education professions should take an active and collaborative role in cultivating more participation. Education faculty are encouraged to design/structure purposeful and intentional developmental coursework as well as reflective journal assignments that run parallel to the students' sojourn experience. There is also a need for Education faculty to critically review their lock-step course curriculum so as to look for "pathways" that enable education majors to take better advantage of the benefits of study abroad. Opening up the curriculum to allow a semester abroad and encouraging pre-service teachers to engage in a critically reflective curriculum could have great impact on the pedagogy in our K-12 classrooms.

Literature Review

Theoretical Frameworks: Intercultural Competence, Culturally Relevant Pedagogy and Experiential Learning

Intercultural competence, often synonymous with global awareness, global competence, intercultural sensitivity, global learning, global mindset, global citizenship and/or cultural learning, refers to a set of skills (cognitive, affective and behavioral)

that facilitates effective and appropriate interaction/behavior in a variety of cultural contexts (Bennett 2008, p. 16). Researchers have been working to define intercultural competence for decades, yet this study derived a working definition of intercultural competence from the work of Bennett.

Bennett (1993, p. 24) outlined a continuum model and theory of intercultural competency in developmental terms rather than specific behaviors. Bennett's definition of intercultural competency is, therefore, related to the ability to shift cultural perspective and adapt behavior to/within cultural contexts (Hammer 2009, p. 207). Using this definition, Bennett structured his *Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity* (DMIS) as six developmental sequences, moving from an ethnocentric vantage point to an ethnorelative point of view. With Bennett's contribution to the scholarship, the discussion of intercultural sensitivity shifted from the golden rule: do unto others as you would have done unto you; to the platinum rule: do unto others as they would wish to be treated (Olson and Kroeger 2001, p. 118).

The first three phases of the DMIS are ethnocentric (denial, defense and minimization) and the final three phases are ethnorelative (acceptance, adaptation and integration). Bennett defines ethnocentrism as the worldview of one's own vantage point, which is central to the person's reality. Bennett (1993) coined the term ethnorelativism as an appropriate complement to ethnocentrism (Bennett 1993, p. 46) and defines it as the understanding that culture and behavior are relative and can only be understood in context or contrast to one's own culture and behavior.

Bennett contends that when an individual moves along the spectrum from ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism, one identifies not only with different cultures, but also more deeply with him/herself. Therefore, appreciation of cultural difference is affective and combined with increased cognitive knowledge of differences (Bennett 1993, p. 47). While moving along Bennett's spectrum (from denial through to integration) and resolving the relevant issues inherent in each of the six orientations, individuals think cognitively about their interactions in relationship to what is appropriate to a particular culture. Metacognition is achieved when the individual construes different worldviews and adjusts cultural understanding at each stage on the continuum. Because one sees little regression to former orientations once the relevant issues are resolved, educational outcomes, measureable growth and student sophistication can be assessed by educators and administrators if curriculum is developed with these stage movements in mind.

From Bennett's constructionist framework of intercultural competency, he, Hammer and Wiseman developed the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) to measure people's orientations toward cultural differences (Hammer et al. 2003, p. 422; Hammer 2011, p. 475). Through extensive confirmatory factor analysis, the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) has been deemed appropriate to pinpoint the stage of a person's intercultural sensitivity along the DMIS continuum (Hammer et al. 2003, p. 439; Hammer 2011, p. 486; Paige 2003, p. 485). Recently, Hammer (2011, p. 475) updated the developmental progression model.

For the last 30 years, culturally relevant pedagogy has been introduced to preservice teachers as a pedagogical tool to use in diverse classrooms to improve student achievement and performance (Jordan Irvine 2009, p. 58; Gay 2002, p. 106;

Howard 2010, p. 43). The practice presumes that learning can take place across cultures. This pedagogy challenges social and hierarchical structures rather than ignores them. To achieve these aims, the culturally responsive teacher must engage in a number of strategies to help diverse students achieve. Culturally responsive teachers celebrate and affirm students' cultural backgrounds. As minority students are often told societal expectations for them are relatively low, the culturally responsive teacher must encourage students to have high personal expectations. The teacher and the student must work to "disprove" society. Learning must be contextualized and never isolated. Students should be recognized for the knowledge they bring to the learning community and recognized equally for their individual strengths. In legitimizing students' backgrounds and strengths, culturally responsive teachers make their students' experiences part of the "official" curriculum. In doing so, teachers and students challenge society's conventions and the status quo.

This study defined culturally relevant pedagogy and culturally responsive teachers by drawing on aspects of the work done by Ladson-Billings (1995, p. 469). An underlying tone of Ladson-Billing's definition is social justice: to develop students' abilities to perceive social inequalities and work to defuse and/or end them. Ladson-Billings (1995, p. 467) argued that culturally relevant teaching is distinguishable from other pedagogies due to teachers' conceptions regarding self and others, social relations and knowledge. Culturally responsive teachers with a deep understanding of social relations maintain open and communicative relationships with students. They view knowledge as something shared, recycled and constructed. They understand that knowledge is not static and must be viewed critically. They carefully guide students through critical reflection and assist students in understanding the difference between intellectual challenge and challenge of authority.

Culturally relevant pedagogy is not something pre-service teachers stumble into, thus a serious effort must be made to incorporate this pedagogy into teacher preparation programs. As Villegas and Lucas (2002, p. 27) conclude, adding a course or two on multiculturalism or urban education does not go far enough. The entire teacher preparation curricula must reinforce and expand pre-service teachers' beliefs about and attitudes toward culturally responsive teaching. Therefore, culturally relevant pedagogy cannot exist without prospective teachers engaging in a cognitive shift. Once the mental shift occurs and pre-service teachers turned full-time teachers engage in the instructional practice, constant efforts to evaluate effectiveness must be engaged. This necessitates extensive reflection on process, outcomes and achievements. Therefore, pre-service teachers must be given the preliminary tools to conduct this kind of reflection and introspection before full-time placement in the classroom.

I contend if the tenets of culturally relevant pedagogy are introduced within the framework of an overseas experience, sojourners must be given opportunities to reflect on how to incorporate it into their own thinking and practice. Much like the tenets of culturally relevant pedagogy espoused a half-century later, Dewey (1938, p. 28) stated that educational experiences must incorporate reflections upon students' own lives for real learning to take place. Dewey (1938) first introduced the idea of being transformed through reflection and experiential learning as a foil to

traditional, habitual, rote learning in his 1938 work entitled *Experience and Education.* He asserted that top-down, dogmatic education did not value the lived and shared experiences of pupils and teachers alike. Yet, Dewey (1938) recognized that all experiences and/or conditions are not, in and of themselves, educative. He states, "it is not enough to insist upon the necessity of experience, nor even of activity in experience. Everything depends upon the quality of the experience, which is had" (Dewey 1938, p. 16). Thus, Dewey (1938) believed that teachers should guide students through experiences that enhance their ability to make sense of their surroundings. Therefore, teachers are to engage students in reflective exercises as a means to have more experiences and make sense out of experience-gained knowledge. Dewey (1998, p. 42) concludes that what a learner "has learned in the way of knowledge and skill in one situation becomes an instrument of understanding and dealing effectively with the situations which follow".

The process of discovery and re-discovery through experience and analysis has led contemporary theorists to frame the Dewey philosophy as a cyclical model. Building upon Dewey's "criteria of experience" and influenced by the work of Lewin (1952, p. 463), Kolb and Fry (1975, p. 33) conclude that experiential learning is based on a four-stage learning cycle. The learning, change and growth that takes place is facilitated by having a "here-and-now experience" (Kolb and Fry 1975, p. 33) and an opportunity to collect information (data and observations) about the experience to contextualize it (Kolb and Fry 1975, p. 33). Reflection is a key component of the process. Out of that reflection, conclusions drawn about the experience give the individual cause to act or re-act to modify behavior, action or thoughts.

Kolb and Fry (1975, p. 35) state that cognitive growth or shifts are best achieved in an environment where the individual feels "tensions and conflicts" between what was previously known and what is being experienced. New knowledge is generated when the individual is open and unbiased; able to reflect on and critically observe the phenomenea taking place; able to form new concepts that integrate the data into new hypothesis; and able to use the new knowledge to make decisions and problem solve. For the study abroad student, the cycle begins with the concrete experience of being in a foreign land. As the student encounters the environment, he/she has observations and reflections about not only the immediate surroundings, but the people in the environment and their interactions with it and to it. Following is the student's formation of abstract concepts and generalizations about his/her reactions and intrepretations of him/herself, the environment and the people, leading to the testing of those theories in new situations and scenarios.

Braskamp et al. (2009, p. 113) argue that education abroad in its current design and implementation may not adequately focus on students' metacognition. The researchers contend that international education professionals need to design more intentionally structured environments (formal didactic classroom instruction or experiences) that challenge students to engage in critical reflection and strategic thinking. Critical reflections upon learning and instructional guidance to transform that learning into action are especially important for pre-service teachers. Further, pre-service teachers who engage in a cognitive paradigm shift and modified thinking

as a result of a reflective experience are most successful in incorporating that learning into successful classroom pedagogies (Cushner, p. 151; Cushner and Mahon 2002, p. 55).

Research Questions

This study employed a mixed method approach to ascertain whether pre-service teachers' intercultural competency was enhanced through a study abroad semester in tandem with a purposeful, reflective, experiential curriculum in contrast to a group of students who studied abroad without the curriculum as well as a group who did not study abroad, yet took a culture class on the home campus. The study challenged the intervention participants to reflect upon how culturally relevant pedagogy could be infused into K-12 instructional practices. The following research questions drove the study:

- Question 1: What do pre- and post-semester abroad Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) survey results reveal about the intercultural competencies of the participants from each of the three groups?
  - Group A: Study abroad participants with curricular intervention.
  - Group B: Study abroad participants with no curricular intervention.
  - Group C: Home campus students who do not study abroad and do not receive curricular intervention.
- Question 2: What do the participants from Group A say are the effects of a reflective, experiential curriculum on their study abroad experience?
  - Did the curricular intervention positively or negatively impact the level of competence achieved by the pre-service teachers in contrast to the control groups?
- Question 3: How do the pre-service teachers from Group A anticipate translating their overseas experiences into culturally relevant pedagogy they can share with their K-12 students?

To answer these questions, I worked with 21 pre-service teachers enrolled as undergraduate students at five California State University campuses in close proximity to Los Angeles over the course of the fall 2011 semester and January and February of the spring 2012 semester. The participants were grouped accordingly and the names of the study volunteers in Group A were changed to pseudonyms to protect their anonymity:

Group assignment	Number of participants in group	CSU campuses represented within group
A (abroad with curriculum)	7	SDSU, CSUF, Cal Poly SLO
B (abroad without curriculum)	2	CSULB
C (remained home without curriculum)	12	CSUN

Methods

The transformative, concurrent mixed methods approach for this study afforded the opportunity to capitalize on the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative methodology. A quantitative, quasi-experimental approach allowed a statistical comparison of the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) scores of the pre- and post-semester abroad assessments to the other two participant groups. A qualitative approach unearthed rich details and descriptions of what the study abroad participants perceived to be the effects of the experiential-based curriculum and how they might use their learning in their forthcoming practice. The IDI was administered to all study participants, regardless of group, at the start and conclusion of the fall 2011 academic term. For Group A, the administration of the curriculum took place over the course of the fall 2011 semester, thus allowing an examination of how the study participants arrived at their reflective conclusions over time and the meanings they attached to their experiences.

The course curriculum involved reflective journal writing and engagement in culturally appropriate experiences shaped by experiential learning theory, intercultural competency theory and culturally relevant pedagogy theory. The curriculum was based on the "Principles of Good Practice" set forth by the National Society for Experiential Education: intention, authenticity, planning, clarity, monitoring and assessment, reflection, evaluation and acknowledgement (NSEE website: http://www.nsee.org/about_us.htm#sop) (Roller 2012, p. 8).

The purpose of the course was to increase students' intercultural competence: the ability to shift cultural perspective and adapt behavior to cultural differences and commonalities. Therefore, the curriculum was intentionally structured to follow progression along the DMIS continuum. Assuming that many of the study participants would be inexperienced in intercultural competence and the fact that the majority of individuals who have taken the IDI in the past tend to place on the left to middle side of the spectrum, ranging from denial to minimization, it was crucial for the design of the curriculum to move the participants closer to the ethno relative or intercultural mindset. Thus, developmental activities were designed to build on skills learned and interpreted in early weeks so as to challenge participants to move closer to acceptance/adaptation in later weeks.

At the beginning of the term, assignments were structured to challenge students to reflect on issues/characteristics/thought processes typical of denial, polarization and minimization orientations. As the semester progressed, fewer and fewer assignments focused on denial, polarization and minimization and moved into discussions of issues/characteristics/thought processes typical for those in acceptance or adaptation orientation. The participants were asked to complete three relatively short exercises per week. Some required journaling and personal reflection and some required students to find creative mediums to address the developmental task (take photos, write field observation notes, etc.). Periodically throughout the term, students were asked to read selected works on culturally relevant pedagogy or engage in culturally relevant developmental exercises. Throughout the semester abroad, participants from Group A responded in writing or other creative medium to the

questions/exercises and uploaded their responses to secure, private, uniquely iden-
tified week-specific folders on Box.net, an online data management and storage
system, corresponding to the appropriate week for each participant.

Outcomes

Experiential (read: reflective) learning during traditional, semester long study
abroad programs has not been designed for the majority of programs. As previously
noted, students need the opportunity to critically reflect upon and make meaning out
of their experiences (Braskamp et al. 2009, p. 113; Selby 2008, p. 8). Additionally,
the experiences need to be related to the greater context of the student's life and the
world in which he/she lives and works (Lutterman-Aguilar and Gingerich 2002,
p. 49). The learning, change and growth that takes place are facilitated by having a
"here-and-now experience" (Lutterman-Aguilar and Gingerich 2002, p. 33) and an
opportunity to collect information (data and observations) about the experience to
contextualize it (Kolb and Fry 1975, p. 34). Immediate reflection is a key compo-
nent of the process. Out of that reflection, conclusions drawn about the experience
give the individual cause to act or re-act to modify behavior, action or thoughts.
Thus, the individual engages in the plan-do-check-act learning cycle.

The experiential curriculum used in this study, developed using a constructivist
teaching/learning approach, was designed to give students an opportunity to react
to their immediate environment and emotions within the context of their overseas
experience. The exercises were intentionally structured to present "here-and-now"
moments for reflection and analysis. As evidenced by the student responses pre-
sented, the Group A participants attempted to make meaning out of their experi-
ences and situate that meaning within the context of their lives and future career
endeavors.

Responses the Group A participants submitted to address "what are the effects of
a reflective experiential curriculum on your study abroad experience" are evidence
of how the students began to resolve the typical deficiencies found in study abroad
programs and contextualize their learning. The study volunteers articulated connec-
tions not only to host culture values, beliefs and practices, but began to understand
how those cultural norms might influence their lives and future professional en-
deavors. The participants' responses to the curriculum and the focus group sessions
provided preliminary evidence that they were *beginning* to acquire skills needed
to express their learning and translate that new knowledge into culturally sensitive
behaviors and mindsets.

Responses to the Curriculum

Throughout the fall 2011 term, the Group A participants moved through exercis-
es aligned with the orientations along the Developmental Model of Intercultural

Sensitivity (DMIS) continuum and began to address or in some cases resolve the relevant issues inherent in each of the five orientations. The reflections presented suggest the Group A participants not only began to identify with their host culture, but also learned a great deal about themselves.

Marcus, a Group A participant, specifically addressed the impact the curriculum had on his experience in contrast to a previous semester abroad without the curriculum:

> I spent a semester abroad already so I am able to compare and contrast the two experiences (with and without the curriculum). I have to say, I wish I had this curriculum the first semester I went abroad, because I feel like I attained 3 times as much from this experience than what I had before. It allowed me to take even more of initiative to get more out of this short time abroad.

He went on to use an elaborate metaphor to describe the learning he achieved as a result of being engaged in the curriculum:

> I suppose it was like drinking a wine with a wine connoisseur that is able to point out all the subtleties to take notice of. The connoisseur in this case of course being the curriculum and the participants being the ones enjoying the wine.

In summation of his experience with the curriculum and to perhaps provide a satisfying response to the researcher, Marcus submitted the following:

> There are definitely some classes out there in which you can work really hard, or even breeze by with and gain absolutely nothing from, this was definitely not the case in which I'm VERY grateful for…On I side note, I really do want to say thank you for such a well prepared experience, when I say I received a lot from your curriculum, I really did.

During a post-sojourn focus group session, Marcus noted it was likely his roommates and friends on his study abroad program also benefitted from the curriculum. He said he would often share the assignments with his roommates and friends and ask them to join him to complete the assignments. He noted:

> That was really tricky about this study because you can actually have these little like groups to do the assignment with you and you're like bonding with the other people and the other people are getting more from their study abroad experience as well so yeah, my friends… the times when I had to go out…That's really cool.

While not an anticipated outcome of the study, the evidence provided that a curriculum could influence secondary (periphery) participants is worthy of note and could be considered in future research.

Ava, another Group A participant, wrote about the time and energy she put into doing the weekly assignments and noted that she enjoyed doing so. Like Marcus, she could have been providing a satisfying response to the researcher when she wrote: "…every answer was sincere and taken seriously…I used these assignments for my personal gain." She went on to discuss the process of completing the assignments and how it was beneficial to her:

> I started to look at things differently whether it was taking a moment to just sit and observe the difference in the way people do life or taking time to tell owners of my favorite place how much they meant to me and taking a picture with them. I felt like I had an excuse to talk to my professors, starting discussions about certain issues. These assignments really

gave me a better perspective on what I was doing in [host country]. I really enjoyed doing these assignments and I am grateful to them for making me think deeper.

Not unlike Ava, Joaquin was able to understand the developmental intentionality of the weekly assignments and wrote about the benefit he gained from doing the experiential tasks:

…as time went by and I focused more on the assignments I realized that the assignments were promoting me to do and see things in the city that I may not have done. For example there were many cultural tasks such as visiting museums or churches, things that had it not been for the assignments I would not have had much desire to see them. But since I had to do that assignment I got to know the city and the people from an observational perspective. It was a sort of chain reaction in that the more effort I put into the assignments, the more I was able to personally benefit.

Joaquin, a third Group A participant, addressed the preconceived notions of culture he had prior to starting the semester and engaging in the curriculum: "The generalizations that I had previously formed about other countries were not negative per say but after actually spending time around different people, I discovered that they were off base, regardless if they were positive or not." Similarly to Marcus, during the post-sojourn focus group session, Joaquin said he talked to his roommates about the curricular assignments and often invited them to participate:

Yeah, both of my roommates knew about it and I'd say that like 90% of the assignments I did where I had to go out into the city, 90% of the time they were with me so I guess they pretty much experienced the exact same thing as me. Like watching for things…they were right there with me so they maybe they were learning as much as I did this semester.

Because one sees little regression to former orientations once the relevant issues are resolved, the findings suggest slight growth and student sophistication were achieved over the course of the semester. As evidenced by the findings, some of the Group A participants reverted to monocultural mindset skills and coping mechanisms when pushed too hard to move past what was comfortable. This finding indicates that the participants had not yet resolved the preceding orientation issues to move forward. It is important to note that intercultural competence is developmental. As the Group A participants were only engaged in three developmental exercises per week, it is improbable to conclude that growth and sophistication were solely due to the semester- long curriculum or that all past orientation issues would be resolved in the span of four months. Yet, some advancement in thinking was recorded and beginning to root. Thus, it can be concluded that with further curricular exposure and engagement in reflection, the participants are likely to see further sophistication and advancement beyond their original developmental orientations.

Anticipated Translation into Culturally Relevant Pedagogy in Future Classroom

Once the mental shift occurs and pre-service teachers turned full-time teachers engage in the culturally relevant instructional practice, constant efforts to evaluate

effectiveness must be engaged. This necessitates extensive reflection on process, outcomes and achievements. As Howard (2010, p. 118) notes, "it requires opening oneself up to critical inspection, harsh criticisms, and…having to listen to the un-flattering assessment of one's own actions". Therefore, pre-service teachers must be given the tools to conduct this kind of reflection and introspection *before* full-time placement in the classroom.

In the first few paragraphs of her final essay, Becky, a Group A participant, spent a significant amount of time highlighting the differences she witnessed in her host country's education system. She linked her perceptions to ways she would approach her pedagogy. She detailed the recent influx of immigrants into the host country and speculated why differences might exist, "[Host country] has not needed to address the multicultural issue because before there were so many immigrants coming into the country, they were all pretty much homogenous." She went on to describe how beneficial it was to be in a country that is adapting to heterogeneous classrooms:

> …made me realize that you cannot treat all your students the same way regardless of their race, gender, ethnicity, etc. All children have their own way of learning material and by treating all your students the same way because you think that you are being equal and not discriminating will hurt the children…I was able to see with my own eyes what happens when a child is not taught the level material or when the teacher does not really try to teach the material in a different way. I will definitely think of this when having to work with a child who does not understand the material being taught. I do not want to leave any of my students behind…

Therefore, being in the host country gave her a different vantage point that will benefit her:

> I think that coming to [host country] where multicultural classrooms are seen more and more was a real learning experience…I will be able to look at the different ways the [host culture] education system works and handles multiculturalism in the classroom. I would also be able to bring back some of the techniques or methods they use to create a multicul-tural classroom that may not have been used in the United States.

In addition to the immigration discussion, Becky wrote about language acquisition and how English-language learners in her future classroom might feel. Her response demonstrates empathy, a skill associated with the adaptation orientation:

> Because I was not able to understand or speak my host country's language very well I got to experience what it felt like for a child who was learning English as a second language…being able to experience what it felt like to not be able to understand what everyone is say-ing really made me realize how frustrating and hard it must be fore a immigrant child who does not know the English language.

As a result of this acknowledgement, she provided an example of how she planned to integrate that lesson learned into her future classroom practices:

> I plan to incorporate my study abroad experience in my future classroom by being more accommodating of the students I am teaching. Children who come from different cultural backgrounds may view certain things differently than I would…because I will be having students from all kinds of cultural backgrounds, one of the many things that may be differ-ent for them may be the way I present/teach my material in class…One thing I could relate with the students could be teaching style…

Becky's responses highlight that committing to culturally relevant pedagogy is a lifelong process (Howard 2010, p. xx), one that requires dedication to reflection, acknowledgment of difference and celebration of similarities.

In the final essay, Marcus detailed his own naïveté and prior misperceptions about culturally relevant pedagogy. After each self-reflective statement, he outlined how he plans to approach his teaching practice. Within the first few paragraphs of the essay, he outlined the new perspectives he gained as a result of engaging in the semester-long curriculum:

> Having time to self-reflect after all these experiences and being able to gain a better awareness of my perceptions and philosophies of teaching through this course, I have most certainly changed…I have gained awareness of possible arrogances that I've now been able to spot in a few teachers and in educational institutes.

He acknowledged, "My awareness of cultural differences or even how home cultures truly affect a person and their learning styles, has affectively brought a whole new importance on particular aspects of teaching." It is plausible Marcus was providing an answer that can be perceived as favorable for the write-up of the study or vying for researcher satisfaction with his progress, when he summarized the paragraphs by saying: "Being strengthened in Culturally Responsive Teaching and other ideas we gained from this course, I couldn't imagine not having these tools in the process to be the type of educator I hope to someday be."

In the second part of his response, Marcus noted the importance of culturally responsive teaching and acknowledged his previous naïveté, "Culture is HUGE when it comes to teaching, more than I would have previously expected, one size most definitely does not fit all for teaching a mixed cultural class as has been apparent over this semester." While not prompted to do so, he referenced readings as well as a YouTube video from earlier weeks' assignments and wrote about the responsibilities he feels teachers have to multicultural classrooms:

> …it is an educator's duty to build curiosity and awareness of other cultures as it is to overcome the barriers to make the effort. Having learned about the knowledge construction process as an educator and combining that with culture awareness is a much-needed combination for any teacher. These competencies further combat racisms or ethnocentrism that is ever prevalent…I realize now, how much of a disservice it is to not take these steps as an educator for the upcoming generations…

Marcus concluded his final essay response by reiterating how engaging in the curriculum has modified his thinking about teaching and helped him personally:

> Before this curriculum and after, I definitely had two opposing teaching philosophies. Now with the material and writings I achieved many new insights and revelations about teaching and I am greatly appreciative for them. It definitely helped me focus on the subtleties of the culture, my feelings and possible lessons I would have possibly overlooked. [As a result,] I have signed up to do another semester abroad to further my experience and lessons learned.

His final statement outlines how he plans to use his learning in his future classroom:

> I do know that the formation that occurred here will stick with me and how I will take on future endeavors has been further formed during this experience. The only task in which I will be able to incorporate this is would be in my teaching within the US, and being able to speak for experiences rather than theory.

From the findings, it can only be postulated that these pre-service teachers have *begun* to make that cognitive shift and were provided with preliminary tools needed to conduct on-going reflection. Although the participants' responses can be classified as naïve and in need of further shaping and refinement, the foundation for enacting an advocacy stance within a diverse classroom has been laid. Evidence about how the participants internalized their learning and anticipate using their study abroad experience to shape their future pedagogical practices was presented. It is assumed that intercultural skills and culturally sensitive pedagogical tools can be translated into practice in the participants' future classrooms. Further research would be required to authenticate that assumption.

Statistical Tests

The profile produced upon completion of the IDI v3 survey presents information about a participant's perceived orientations, his/her developmental orientations and the gap between the two. The Perceived Orientation (PO) is the location along the developmental continuum where an individual placed him/herself. The Developmental Orientation (DO) is the location along the continuum as assessed by the IDI. The Orientation Gap (OG) is the difference between the Perceived and Developmental scores. A gap score of seven points or higher indicates a significant misalignment between perception and development. The larger the gap, the greater the spread between what an individual thought of him/herself and what the IDI assessed. A Perceived Orientation score that is seven points or higher than the Developmental Orientation score suggests that the individual *overestimated* his/her intercultural competence. A Developmental Orientation Score that is seven points or higher than the Perceived Orientation score indicates that that individual *underestimated* his/her intercultural competence. None of the participants in this study underestimated their intercultural competence. All of the participants overestimated their intercultural competence by a margin greater than seven points.

A paired sample t-test was used to calculate difference among the pre- and post-semester Perceived and Developmental Orientation and Orientation Gap results for each unique group (A, B and C). Following the paired sample t-tests, the ANOVA statistical test was used to measure changes between the pre- and post-semester IDI scores among all three groups. The ANOVA statistical test was used to calculate for differences in pre- and post- semester IDI Perceived and Developmental Orientation and Orientation Gap scores to see if the experiential curricular intervention had a statistically significant impact on the participants from Group A versus the participants in the control groups (B and C). The ANOVA can calculate the ratio of the actual difference to the difference expected due to chance alone.

There are several limitations of the study that deserve attention. First, the sample size of each of the groups was small ($n = 21$) and not representative of all pre-service teachers in California State University programs. A larger sample would need to be assembled to draw definitive conclusions and to make generalizations. Future research should consider this limitation and work to convene a larger group of participants.

Paired Sample t-Test

While the data in Table 7.1 outline positive trending change in the direction of an intercultural mindset for the Group A participants, the paired sample t-test run between the pre- and post-semester Group A Perceived and Developmental Orientations and Orientation Gap (Table 7.2) resulted in no statistically significant change because 0.107 (PO) and 0.167 (DO) and 0.283 (OG) are greater than 0.05 (Table 7.2). Similarly, the Group B perceived and developmental orientation and orientation gap data highlights no significant statistical change because 0.448 (PO), 0.513 (DO) and 0.566 (OG) are greater than 0.05. Finally, while the data in Table 7.1 highlight change between pre- and post-semester Group C Perceived and Developmental Orientations and Orientation Gap trending in a positive direction toward an intercultural mindset, the data presented in Table 7.2 indicated no statistically significant change because 0.342 (PO), 0.596 (DO) and 0.841 (OG) are greater than 0.05.

ANOVA Statistical Tests

The ANOVA test was run to calculate for difference in pre- and post-semester PO, DO and OG Group scores to examine if the experiential curricular intervention had a statistically significant impact on the participants in Group A versus the participants in the control groups. If statistically significant difference was noted, it could be assumed that the experiential curricular intervention had made an impact and that the change between the pre- and post-semester results was not due to chance alone.

As noted in Table 7.3, the statistical significance of the PO (0.684), the DO (0.783) and the OG (0.806) is greater than 0.05, thus it cannot be stated that the experiential curriculum had a statistically significant impact on Group A in contrast to the control groups.

As evidenced in Table 7.4, no statistical significance exists when the groups are reviewed against one another because in every case, the statistical significance (1.0) is greater than 0.05.

Group A: Study Abroad Participants with the Experiential Curriculum Pre-and Post-Semester Individual IDI Profiles

While the data presented in Tables 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4 highlight no statistical significance in pre- and post-semester intercultural competency development as measured by the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) when viewed as collective groups and between groups, it is important to highlight the individual pre- and post-semester scores of the participants in Group A to supplement the qualitative data presented.

Table 7.5 depicts the pre- and post-semester Perceived and Developmental Orientation and Orientation Gap scores of the Group A participants. The data is

Table 7.1 Group pre-semester perceived orientation, developmental orientation and orientation gap scores

Group	n		Pre-PO	Post-PO	Pre/Post PO Δ	Pre-DO	Post-DO	Pre/Post DO Δ	Pre-OG	Post-OG	Pre/Post OG Δ
A	7	Score	119.91	121.90	+1.99	85.15	89.27	+4.12	34.76	32.63	−2.13
		Mean	119.9914	121.8971		85.1529	89.1529		34.7586	32.6257	
		Std. Deviation	3.75903	3.66257		10.07142	9.25888		6.45150	5.8482	
B	2	Score	122.88	121.48	−1.40	90.81	87.98	−2.83	32.07	33.50	+1.43
		Mean	122.8750	121.4800		90.8100	87.9850		32.0650	33.4950	
		Std. Deviation	7.84181	6.16597		22.93854	18.77369		15.0967	12.6077	
C	12	Score	118.16	119.86	+1.70	85.90	88.12	+2.22	32.25	31.74	−0.51
		Mean	118.1567	119.8625		85.9017	88.1183		33.0714	32.2047	
		Std. Deviation	8.57057	5.87198		22.06259	16.93306		11.3590	9.4650	

Table 7.2 Paired samples test: groups A, B, C pre- and post-semester perceived orientation, developmental orientation and orientation gap

Group	n		Pre/post PO	Pre/post PO Sig. (2-tailed)	Pre/post DO	Pre/post DO Sig. (2-tailed)	Pre/post OG	Pre/post OG Sig. (2-tailed)
A	7	Mean	−1.98571	0.107	−4.11857	0.167	2.13285	0.283
		Std. Deviation	2.77367		6.93678		4.78751	
B	2	Mean	1.39500	0.448	2.82500	0.513	−1.43000	0.566
		Std. Deviation	1.67584		2.94500		2.48901	
C	12	Mean	−1.70583	0.342	−2.21667	0.596	.510833	0.841
		Std. Deviation	5.94874		14.04686		8.60252	

Table 7.3 ANOVA: tests of within-subject effects groups A, B and C

Measure	Type III sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
PO	9.461	2	4.730	0.389	0.684
DO	37.830	2	18.915	0.275	0.763
OG	11.646	2	5.823	0.219	0.806

Table 7.4 One-way ANOVA multiple comparisons of differences between pre- and post-semester perceived and developmental orientation and orientation gap scores

Difference	Group		Mean	Std. error	Sig.
Post PO—Pre PO	Group A	Group B	3.38071	3.95615	1.0
		Group C	0.27988	2.3466	1.0
Post PO—Pre PO	Group B	Group A	−3.38071	3.95615	1.0
		Group C	−3.10083	3.75684	1.0
Post PO—Pre PO	Group C	Group A	−0.27988	2.34667	1.0
		Group B	3.10083	3.76854	1.0
Post DO—Pre DO	Group A	Group B	6.94357	9.40463	1.0
		Group C	1.90190	5.57855	1.0
Post DO—Pre DO	Group B	Group C	−6.94357	9.40463	1.0
		Group C	−5.04167	8.95865	1.0
Post DO—Pre DO	Group C	Group A	−1.90190	5.57855	1.0
		Group B	5.04167	8.95865	1.0
Post OG—Pre OG	Group A	Group B	−3.56286	5.84855	1.0
		Group C	−1.62202	3.46919	1.0
Post OG—Pre OG	Group B	Group A	3.56286	5.84855	1.0
		Group C	1.94083	5.57121	1.0
Post OG—Pre OG	Group C	Group A	1.62202	3.46919	1.0
		Group B	−1.94083	5.57121	1.0

presented to highlight where along the DMIS continuum the student placed her/himself (Perceived Orientation-PO) and where the IDI placed the student (Developmental Orientation-DO). The gaps between the two scores, Orientation Gap (OG) are presented in the final column.

The data in Table 7.6 represents the Group A individual Perceived Orientation (PO) pre-/post- semester scores, the Developmental Orientation (DO) pre-/post-semester scores and the Orientation Gap (OG) pre-/post-semester scores. Just as in Table 7.1, the difference between the pre-/post-semester scores is indicated in the Δ columns. A positive value in the PO Δ and DO Δ columns indicates movement along the continuum in the direction of an intercultural mindset as perceived by the individual (PO Δ) and the IDI (DO Δ). A negative value in the PO Δ and DO Δ columns indicates a regression along the continuum toward a monocultural mindset. A positive value the in the OG Δ column represents a widening of the Orientation Gap and a negative value signifies a closing of the gap.

In summary, five of the seven Group A participants (Becky, Ava, Marcus, Derek and Olivia) demonstrated positive movement along the continuum, toward a more intercultural mindset as indicated by their post-semester Perceived and Developmental

Table 7.5 Individual pre-and post-semester perceived orientation, developmental orientation and orientation gap scores for group A

Group A participant	DO/PO	Denial 55–70	Polariza-tion 71–85	Minimi-zation 86–115	Accep-tance 116–130	Adaptation 131–145	Orientation gap
Olivia	PO_{Pre}				124.19		26.92_{Pre}
	DO_{Pre}			97.27			
	PO_{Post}				127.72		20.95_{Post}
	DO_{Post}			106.77			
Derek	PO_{Pre}			114.61_{Cusp}			45.28_{Pre}
	DO_{Pre}	69.33_{Cusp}					
	PO_{Post}			115.20			40.07_{Post}
	DO_{Post}		75.13				
Noelle	PO_{Pre}				123.19		32.13_{Pre}
	DO_{Pre}			91.06			
	PO_{Post}				122.29		34.55_{Post}
	DO_{Post}			87.74			
Joaquin	PO_{Pre}				123.65		28.75_{Pre}
	DO_{Pre}			94.90			
	PO_{Post}				121.96		34.65_{Post}
	DO_{Post}			87.31			
Marcus	PO_{Pre}				117.28		34.29_{Pre}
	DO_{Pre}		82.99_{Cusp}				
	PO_{Post}				122.80		33.44_{Post}
	DO_{Post}			98.36			
Ava	PO_{Pre}				117.50		40.59_{Pre}
	DO_{Pre}		76.91				
	PO_{Post}				122.22		33.92_{Post}
	DO_{Post}			88.30			
Becky	PO_{Pre}				118.96		35.35_{Pre}
	DO_{Pre}		83.61_{Cusp}				
	PO_{Post}				121.09		30.80_{Post}
	DO_{Post}			90.29			

Table 7.6 Group A pre- and post-semester IDI scores and change

Group	Name	PO pre	PO post	PO Δ	DO pre	DO post	DO Δ	OG pre	OG post	OG Δ
A	Olivia	124.19	127.72	+3.53	97.27	106.77	+9.50	26.92	20.95	−5.97
A	Derek	114.61	115.20	+0.59	69.33	75.13	+5.80	45.28	40.07	−5.21
A	Noelle	123.19	122.29	−0.90	91.06	87.74	−3.32	32.13	34.55	+2.42
A	Joaquin	123.65	121.96	−1.69	94.90	87.31	−7.59	28.75	34.65	+5.90
A	Marcus	117.28	122.80	+5.52	82.99	89.36	+6.37	34.29	33.44	−0.85
A	Ava	117.50	122.22	+4.72	76.91	88.30	+11.39	40.59	33.92	−6.67
A	Becky	118.96	121.09	+2.13	83.61	90.29	+6.68	35.35	30.80	−4.55

change scores (Table 7.6). While the remaining two Group A participants (Noelle and Joaquin) not only rated themselves lower on the continuum as evidenced by their negative change scores in the Perceived Orientation change column, their IDI assessed Developmental Orientation scores in the post-test were also less than their original scores (Table 7.6). While the quantitative data indicates positive growth for only five of the seven, all of the Group A participants articulated some level of personal growth and recognition of new professional tools to be used in their forthcoming practice in their qualitative journal responses.

Discussion and Implications for Practice

When the goal is to *shift* the thinking of pre-service teachers from monocultural to intercultural, evidence found through this study provides some degree of support for an intentional, experiential curriculum designed to align with the principles of intercultural competency development and culturally relevant pedagogy conducted during a semester-long overseas experience. The findings from this study affirm that if pre-service teachers participate in study abroad programs with an intentional curriculum designed to encourage reflection upon culture and pedagogy, individual pre-service teachers *can* become better equipped to work with diverse students in their classrooms.

Therefore, a new model for educating our future teachers must be considered. The "pathway model" represents a significant shift in the current paradigm for educating future teachers. Incorporated within the model are critical points for assessing intercultural competence using the IDI and culturally responsive teacher self-efficacy using the Culturally Responsive Teacher Self-Efficacy scale designed by Siwatu (2006, p. 1088); feedback sessions to understand and interpret the results of the intercultural competence and self-efficacy assessments; signature courses aligned with intercultural competency acquisition, instruction in the principles associated with culturally relevant pedagogy, teaching and motivational strategies for diverse classrooms, etc.; a pre-departure orientation program; experience in a cultural setting with a reflective curriculum (overseas or domestic); a practicum/student teaching experience; and finally completion of teacher certification/licensure requirements (Roller 2012, pp. 151–152).

Each stage of the pathway model is developmental and based on the preceding learning, ultimately leading to an ability to demonstrate intercultural competence and pedagogical practices associated with culturally responsive teaching. Throughout the pathway, students are encouraged to "capture their learning" at various points by submitting coursework, their IDI assessments and profiles, reflections and practicum supervisor notes to an e-portfolio. The e-portfolio thus serves as a repository for demonstrations of learning and an area to be reviewed and examined at multiple points throughout the progression toward certification by both the faculty and the pre-service teacher.

The success of the model hinges on the collaborative efforts of the student, education faculty and study abroad professionals. As the pathway model calls for the inclusion of an overseas experience (or in specially approved cases, an experience

in a cultural setting close to the home campus) education faculty and the professionals in the international education office must work together to provide sojourn experiences appropriate for the student and the desired learning outcomes. To achieve the aims of the model, open communication and extensive cross training are necessary. The study abroad professionals must have an understanding of the goals of the model and work with education faculty to provide appropriate overseas placements. The education faculty must have an understanding of the study abroad application process, pre-departure preparation and re-entry issues. If the model is operationalized, all faculty and study abroad professionals associated with the education of the future teachers will need to be trained in the theoretical underpinnings, administration and interpretation of the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI).

I contend that international education professionals need to design more intentionally structured environments (formal didactic classroom instruction or experiences) that challenge the growing number of study abroad students to engage in critical reflection, strategic thinking and practical application of lessons learned. While the curriculum used in this study was designed for pre-service teachers, study abroad professionals can adapt/amend the curriculum and associated learning outcomes to meet the needs of any undergraduate student, majoring in any field of study.

The design and implementation of a purposeful, experiential curriculum for study abroad participants is an undertaking to be done in the spirit of collaboration. Faculty, study abroad professionals, administration, and curriculum review boards must work together to establish the learning objectives for the course that relate to the broader context of the degree achieved. Careful assessment of study abroad student learning, in line with undergraduate courses of study, department student learning outcomes and institutional mission must be part of the equation.

Facilitation of student learning in the overseas environment is key if intercultural competency acquisition is to take place. We have seen through the evidence provided in this study and other research, that intercultural learning does not take place to a great extent through mere exposure to the cultural environment. Therefore, cultural mentoring along with assessment is imperative for the achievement of student growth and development.

References

Allen H, Herron C. A mixed-methodology investigation of the linguistic and affective outcomes of summer study abroad. Foreign Lang Annu. 2003;36 3:370–85.

Anderson PH, et al. Short-term study abroad and intercultural sensitivity: a pilot study. Int J Intercult Relat. 2006;30:457–69.

Au Kathryn H, Kawakami AJ. Cultural congruence in instruction. In: Hollins ER, King JE, Hayman WC, editors. Teaching diverse populations: formulating a knowledge base. Albany: State University of New York; 1994.

Bennett JM. On becoming a global soul: a path to engagement during study abroad. In: Savicki V, editor. Developing intercultural competence and transformation: theory, research and application in international education. Sterling: Stylus; 2008. pp. 13–31.

Bennett MJ. Towards ethnorelativism: a developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In: Page RM, editor. Education for the intercultural experience. Yarmouth: Intercultural Press; 1993. pp. 21–71.

Boutte GS, Edward Hill L. African American communities: implications for culturally relevant teaching. New Educator 2006;2.4:311–29.

Bradfeld-Kreider P. Mediated cultural immersion and antiracism: an opportunity for monocultural preservice teachers to begin the dialog. Multicult Perspect. 1999;1 2:29–32.

Braskamp LA, Braskamp DC, Merrill KC. Assessing programs in global learning and development of students with education abroad experiences. Front: Interdiscip J Study Abroad. 2009;18 Fall:101–18.

Bronfenbrenner U, Harding J, Gallwey M. The measurement of skill in social perception. In: Mc-Clelland DC, et al., editors. Talent and society: new perspectives in the identification of talent. Princeton: Van Nostrand; 1958.

Callen B. Cross-cultural capability: the student diary as a research tool. In: Killick D, Parry M, editors. Languages for cross-cultural capability. Leeds: Leeds Metropolitan University; 1999. pp. 241–8.

Cushner K. The role of study abroad in preparing globally responsible teachers. In: Lewin R., editor. The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: higher education and the quest for global citizenship. New York: Routledge; 2009. pp. 151–69.

Cushner K, Mahon J. Overseas student teaching: affecting personal, professional, and global competencies in an age of globalization. J Stud Int Educ. 2002;6 44:44–58.

Deardorff DK. Intercultural competence: a definition, model and implications for education abroad. In: Savicki V, editor. Developing intercultural competence and transformation: theory, research and application in international education. Sterling: Stylus; 2008. pp. 32–52.

Dewey J. Education and experience. New York: Simon and Schuster; 1938.

Dewey J. Experience and education: the 60th anniversary edition. West Lafayette: Kappa Delta Pi; 1998.

Gay G. Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. J Teach Educ. 2002;53:106–16.

Hammer MR. The intercultural development inventory. In: Moodian MA, editor. Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence. Thousand Oaks: Sage; 2009. pp. 203–18.

Hammer MR. Additional cross-cultural validity testing of the intercultural development inventory. Int J Intercult Relat. 2011;35:474–87.

Hammer MR, Bennett MJ, Wiseman R. Measuring intercultural sensitivity: the intercultural development inventory. Int J Intercult Relat. 2003;27:421–43.

Hovland K, McTighe Musil C. It takes a curriculum. In: Lewin R, editor. The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: higher education and the quest for global citizenship. New York: Routledge; 2009. pp. 466–84.

Howard TC. Why race and culture matter in schools: closing the achievement gap in America's classrooms. New York: Teachers College Press; 2010.

Institute of International Education. (2011). Fields of Study of U.S. Study Abroad Students, 1999/00–2008/09. Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange. http://www.iie.org/opendoors.

Jordan Irvine J. Culturally relevant pedagogy. Teach Tolerance. 2009;36 Fall:57–61.

Kolb DA, Fry R. Towards an applied theory of experiential learning. In: Cooper CL, editor. Theories of group processes. London: Wiley; 1975.

Ladson-Billings G. Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. Am Educ Res J. 1995;32 3:465–91.

Lewin K. Group decisions and social change. Read Soc Psychol. 1952;459–73.

Lutterman-Aguilar A, Gingerich O. Experiential pedagogy for study abroad: educating for global citizenship. Front: Interdiscip J Study Abroad. 2002;8 Winter:41–82.

Medina-Lopez Portillo A. Intercultural learning assessment: the link between program duration and the development of intercultural sensitivity. Front: Interdiscip J Study Abroad. 2004;10 Fall:179–99.

Merryfield MM. Why aren't teachers being prepared to teach for diversity, equity and global inter-connectedness? A study of lived experiences in the making of multicultural and global educators. Teach Teach Educ. 2000;16:429–43.

Mills C, Ballantyne J. Pre-service teachers' dispositions towards diversity: arguing for a developmental hierarachy of change. Teach Teach Educ. 2010;26:447–54.

National Society for Experiential Education. 2010. Web. November 14, 2010.

Olson Cl, Kroeger KR. Global competency and intercultural sensitivity. J Stud Int Educ. 2001;5:116–37.

Open Doors. Report on international educational exchange. New York: Institute for International Education; 2011.

Paige RM, Cohen AD, Shively RL. Assessing the impact of a strategies-based curriculum on language and culture learning abroad. Front: Interdiscip J Study Abroad. 2004;10 Fall:253–76.

Paige RM, et al. Assessing intercultural sensitivity: an emperical analysis of the Hammer and Bennett intercultural development inventory. Int J Intercult Relat. 2003;27:467–86.

Pence HM, Macgillivray Ian K. The impact of an international field experience on preservice-teachers. Teach Teach Educ. 2008;24:14–25.

Roller KM. Pre-service teachers and study abroad: a reflective, experiential sojourn to increase intercultural competence and translate the experience into culturally relevant pedagogy. Dissertation. Los Angeles: University of California; 2012.

Savicki V, Binder F, Heller L. Contrasts and changes in potential and actual psychological intercultural adjustment. In: Savicki V, editor. Developing intercultural competence and transformation: theory, research and application in international education. Sterling: Stylus; 2008. pp. 111–27.

Selby R. Designing transformation in international edcuation. In: Savicki V, editor. Developing intercultural competencies and transformation: theory, research, and application in international education. Sterling: Stylus; 2008. pp. 1–10.

Siwatu KO. Preservice teachers' culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy and outcome expectancy beliefs. Teach Teach Educ. 2006;23:1086–101.

Sutton RC, Rubin DL. The Glossari project: initial findings from a system-wide research initiative on study abroad learning outcomes. Front: Interdiscip J Study Abroad. 2004;Summer:85–102.

Villegas AM, Lucas T. Preparing culturally responsive teachers: rethinking the curriculum. J Teach Educ. 2002;53;1:20–32.

Willard-Holt C. The impact of a short-term international experience for preservice teachers. Teach Teach Educ. 2001;17:505–17.