

**Maximizing Study Abroad Through Language and Culture Strategies: Research on
Students, Study Abroad Program Professionals, and Language Instructors**

by

Andrew D. Cohen, R. Michael Paige,

Rachel L. Shively, Holly A. Emert, & Joseph G. Hoff

Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition

University of Minnesota

September 2005

Table of Contents

I.	Credits and Acknowledgments	7
II.	Background on the Research Team	8-9
III.	Abstract	10-14
IV.	Introduction to the Research Project and to the <i>Maximizing Study Abroad Guides</i>	15-20
V.	Review of the Literature	21-34
VI.	<i>Students' Guide Study</i>	35-214
	(Lead Author: Rachel L. Shively)	
	– Aims of the Study and Research Questions	35-37
	– Research Design	38-58
	– Sample	38-42
	– Treatment	42-43
	– Instrumentation	43-53
	– Data Collection Procedures	53-55
	– Data Analysis Procedures	55-58
	– Findings and Interpretations for Research Questions #1-#8	59-182
	– Research Question #1	59-70
	– Research Question #2	71-75
	– Research Question #3	76-104
	– Research Question #4	105-114
	– Research Question #5	115-157
	– Research Question #6	158-163
	– Research Question #7a	164-173
	– Research Question #7b	174
	– Research Question #8	175-182
	– Findings for Revising the <i>Students' Guide</i> (RQ #9)	183-189
	– Mini Case Study of One E Group Student: “Erica”	190-199
	– Summary of the Findings	200-202
	– Limitations of the Study	202-205
	– Discussion and Conclusions	205-211
	– Direction for Future Research	211-212

– Suggestions for Teaching a Course for Study Abroad Students Using the <i>Students' Guide</i>	213-214
VII. <i>Program Professionals' Guide Study</i> (Lead Author: Joseph G. Hoff)	215-240
– Aims of the Study and Research Questions	215-216
– Research Design	216-220
– Participants	216-217
– What the Program Professionals Were Asked to Do	217-219
– Instrumentation	219-220
– Data Collection Procedures	220
– Data Analysis Procedures	220
– Findings and Interpretations	221-232
– Findings for Revising the <i>Program Professionals' Guide</i>	232-235
– Summary of the Findings	236-237
– Limitations of the Study	237-238
– Discussion	238-239
– Conclusions	239
– Directions for Future Research	239-240
VIII. <i>Language Instructors' Guide Study</i> (Lead Author: Holly A. Emert)	241-310
– Aims of the Study and Research Questions	241-242
– Research Design	242-250
– Participants	242-244
– What the Language Instructors Were Asked to Do	244-245
– Instrumentation	245-248
– Data Collection Procedures	248-250
– Data Analysis Procedures	250
– Findings and Interpretations	251-293
– Findings for Revising the <i>Language Instructors' Guide</i>	294-298
– Summary of the Findings	299-302
– Limitations of the Study	302-303
– Discussion	303-308
– Conclusions	308

– Directions for Future Research	309
IX. References for the <i>Students’ Guide, Program Professionals’ Guide, and Language Instructors’ Guide Studies</i>	311-320
X. Appendices	321-416
a. Assignment Schedule of Reading in the Students’ Guide for E Group Students While Studying Abroad	321-322
b. <i>Background Questionnaire</i>	323-326
c. <i>Exit Language Contact Profile</i>	327-334
d. <i>Strategies Inventory for Learning Culture</i>	335-338
e. <i>Language Strategy Survey</i>	339-345
f. <i>Speech Act Measure</i>	346-385
g. Follow-up Interview Protocol	386
h. Categories for Semantic Formula and Supportive Move Coding of <i>Speech Act Measure</i>	387-389
i. <i>Speech Act Measure</i> French and Spanish Native Speaker Rating Criteria	390-394
j. <i>Exit Questionnaire for Study Abroad Advisors</i>	395-399
k. <i>Exit Questionnaire for On-Site Directors</i>	400-404
l. <i>Monthly Questions for Language Instructor Study Participants</i>	405-406
m. <i>Exit Questionnaire for Language Instructors</i>	407-409
n. Gillian’s Adaptation of ACT 19-21 Reading Strategy Use (Español 231: Exploración de temas culturales y estrategias de lectura)	410-411
o. Gillian’s Adaptation of DM 35 Exploring U.S. Culture (Español 231: Exploración de la cultura de EE.UU)	412
p. Elizabeth’s Activity: “Tell me who your friends are and I’ll tell you who you are”	413-414

Credits and Acknowledgements

First, a word about authorship. Graduate assistants on this three-year project, Rachel Shively, Joe Hoff, and Holly Emert each took the lead in writing a section of the report, and for that fine work, they are to be greatly acknowledged. Andrew Cohen and Michael Paige supervised the writing of the report, and contributed sections to it. In addition, Cohen did extensive editing of it.

The authors would like to express their thanks to a number of people who helped make this study possible at various points during the three years (2002-2005) in which it was carried out. First of all, the researchers would like to thank all of the research participants – the students, the study abroad professionals, and the language instructors – who, because of their dedication of time and energy, made this study possible.

The study benefited from the input of our IRSP research advisors – Barbara Freed (Carnegie Mellon University), Mitch Hammer (American University), and Bruce LaBrack (University of the Pacific). We thank them for their time and effort in helping us design the study and for holding us to high standards of excellence. In addition to the research advisors, we would like to recognize and thank Margaret Meagher for her well-informed and helpful advice and aide in designing and carrying out the language instructors' study and for her consulting work with the participating instructors.

A number of individuals assisted us with the participant recruitment, the data collection, and the data analysis phases of the research. We would like to thank the following study abroad advisors and the staff in their offices who assisted us in recruiting students for the research study: staff at the Learning Abroad Center at the University of Minnesota, especially Al Balkcum, Ann Hubbard at the University of St. Thomas, Katherine Yngve at Macalester College, Helena Kaufmann at Carleton College, Elaine Carter and Phyllis Van Buren at St. Cloud State University, Jo Beld and Patrick Quade at St. Olaf, and Vera Wenzel at the College of St. Catherine. Susan McMillan-Villar (University of Minnesota) and Patricia Mougel's (University of Minnesota) help with recruiting students for the validation of the strategies inventories and with finding Spanish and French native speakers for the pilot testing and rating of the *Speech Act Measure* was greatly appreciated. We also extend our thanks to Takuya Yoshida at Nagoya University for his work on the factor analysis of the two strategies inventories, and to the four native speakers of Spanish and two native speakers of French who did the taxing work of rating the pragmatic appropriateness of the hundreds of *Speech Act Measure* vignettes.

In addition, we would like to express our appreciation to all of the staff at CARLA for their assistance in many aspects of this project. In particular, we would like to thank Marlene Johnshoy for her work creating the research website and making online data collection possible, and Karin Larson, for her assistance with many aspects of the project, including the administration and organization of the study, and the recruitment of participants.

Finally, in addition to all of the people who contributed to this research, we would like to acknowledge the granting agency, the International Research and Studies Program (IRSP) at the U.S. Department of Education, for providing financial support for this study.

Background on the Research Team

Co-Principle Investigators

Andrew D. Cohen

Andrew D. Cohen is currently professor of applied linguistics in the English as a Second Language Department at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, where he received the Scholar of the College award for 2002-2005. With regard to his own experiences abroad, Cohen was an Experimenter in International Living to Bordeaux, France (summer of 1961), then a Peace Corps Volunteer in rural community development with the Aymara Indians on the High Plains of Bolivia (1965-67), and after teaching in the ESL Section of the English Department at the University of California, Los Angeles (1972-1975), he spent 17 years as a professor at the School of Education, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel. He has studied eleven foreign languages and keeps up seven. He has published articles on the learning, teaching, and assessment of a second language, on research methods, and on speech acts in pragmatics. His books include authored and edited volumes on bilingual education, language learning strategies, language assessment, and research methods. His latest book is a co-edited volume with Diana Boxer, *Studying speaking to inform second language learning* (Multilingual Matters, 2004). During the 2004-2005 academic year he was Visiting Professor at the Department of Applied Language Studies & Linguistics, University of Auckland, New Zealand.

R. Michael Paige

Dr. R. Michael Paige is Professor of International and Intercultural Education and Chair of the Department of Educational Policy and Administration (EdPA) at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis. Michael has worked as a professional international/intercultural educator for over 35 years in the private and public sectors, beginning with his service as a U.S. Peace Corps Volunteer English Teacher in Turkey (1965-1967). He has extensive experience as an intercultural trainer and training consultant having worked with Fortune 500 companies, universities in the U.S. and abroad, non-profit/community organizations, ministries of education, and public school districts. Over the course of his career, he has lived and worked in Turkey, Indonesia, Thailand, Philippines, Kenya, Hong Kong, Japan, and Australia. He was a Senior Fulbright Scholar at Kenyatta University in Nairobi, Kenya (1993-94), Visiting Professor at Nagoya University (2003-04), and Visiting Research Professor at the University of South Australia (2004). He is a certified *IDI* trainer/administrator and has also been on the faculty of the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication since 1979. For the previous six years, he directed the Culture and Language Project under the auspices of the Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA), which focused on how culture can be taught and how intercultural competence can be facilitated in second language courses at home and abroad. Michael has also edited *Education for the Intercultural Experience* (1993) and is the co-editor with Dale Lange of the newly released volume, *Culture as the core: Perspectives on culture in second language learning* (2003).

Research Assistants

Holly A. Emert

Holly has extensive experience as a foreign language educator (French, Spanish, English as a Foreign Language) and as an intercultural trainer both within the U.S. and abroad. Her teaching experience spans a period of over ten years at all levels K-16 (focusing on high school) and includes experience teaching English as a Foreign Language for one year each in the People's Republic of China and in France via the Fulbright Teacher Exchange Program. Her intercultural training work includes trainings in education, government, and other contexts, with particular emphasis on the *Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity* and the *Intercultural Development Inventory* (Hammer & Bennett, 2001). Holly is a certified IDI consultant. In addition to her work as an intercultural consultant, she is currently at the dissertation stage of her doctoral work in Comparative and International Development Education (CIDE) at the University of Minnesota, specializing in International and Intercultural Education. She holds a B.A. in French and International Relations as well as a MA in CIDE with a Human Resource Development Certificate.

Joseph G. Hoff

Joseph Hoff has over 18 years of experience in the international education field that includes the Assistant Directorship of Brown University's Office of International Programs. A study abroad student in Spain during his junior year in college, he has also taught English in Japan, interned at a small college in Switzerland and volunteered in Tanzania with extensive travel in Asia, Europe and Latin America. Joe is a certified *IDI* consultant. He recently received his Ph.D. from the Comparative and International Development Education (CIDE) program in the Educational Policy and Administration Department at the University of Minnesota. He holds an M.A. in International Administration from the School for International Training and a B.A. and a M.A. in Spanish from Saint Louis University.

Rachel L. Shively

Rachel's interest in study and travel abroad began with her own experience as a student in a year-long study abroad program in The Netherlands (1997-98). Then in 2001, she spent eight months living, working, and learning language and culture in Guatemala and Nicaragua. Since that time, she has also had the opportunity to travel and volunteer for shorter periods of time in several other countries in Africa, Latin America, and Europe. Rachel has taught English as a Second Language and Spanish as a Foreign Language courses in the U.S., and is currently pursuing a Ph.D. in Hispanic Linguistics at the University of Minnesota, with a focus on pragmatics and second language acquisition. She has a B.A. in Anthropology from the University of Arizona, Master's degrees in Adult Education and Hispanic Linguistics, and in addition to Spanish, she has studied Dutch, French, and Portuguese.

Abstract

This report describes three research studies conducted at the University of Minnesota focusing on students, study abroad program professionals, and language instructors. The overarching goal of the three studies combined was to field test the *Maximizing Study Abroad* series of three guidebooks for students, program professionals, and language instructors.

Students' Guide Study

The *Students' Guide* study was designed to field test the *Students' Guide* and to explore the impact of a curricular intervention on study abroad students' second language acquisition, intercultural development, language learning strategies, and culture learning strategies. The study utilized an experimental design in which the sample of undergraduate university students (N=86) was randomly assigned to the treatment/experimental (E) group (N=42) or the control (C) group (N=44). The students who participated in the study were all studying for one semester in French- or Spanish-speaking countries and had studied the target language (TL) (i.e., French or Spanish) for a minimum of 3 semesters prior to going abroad. The sample was made up of two cohorts of students, the first of which studied abroad during spring semester 2003 and the second during fall semester 2003.

A set of research instruments was administered to the students prior to and at the conclusion of their semester studying abroad. Two instruments were utilized to generate information about background variables: the pre-departure *Background Questionnaire* and the *Exit Language Contact Profile*, which was administered at the conclusion of their sojourn. Four instruments were employed to examine various aspects of language and culture learning: *Speech Act Measure*, *Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI)*, *Language Strategy Survey (LSS)*, and *Strategies Inventory for Learning Culture (SILC)*. The data set also included bi-weekly electronic journal entries from the E group and a *Follow-Up Interview Protocol*, which was used to interview a subsample of the E group several months after the students returned from study abroad.

The curricular invention – administered only to the E group students – consisted of a two-hour orientation to the curriculum and to learning speech acts, a copy of the *Maximizing Study Abroad Students' Guide*, and bi-weekly electronic journal assignments in which students reported on their use of the *Guide*, on their language and culture strategy use, and on their reactions to the *Guide*. C group students also participated in a semester-long study abroad program, but were not given the orientation or the *Guide* and did not complete the e-journal assignments.

While the findings suggest that the intervention did have a positive impact on the E group's language and culture, the **quantitative** evidence was not definitive enough to warrant making strong claims about the impact of the *Students' Guide*. The **qualitative** results, on the other hand, indicate that the *Guide* did have a very positive effect on students' study abroad experience, both language- and culture-wise. With regard to language acquisition, significant differences were found between the E and C groups' performance on the apologies and requests on the *Speech Act Measure*, with the E group gaining significantly more in rated pragmatic ability than the C group. One reason the E group may have received higher ratings is that the E

group students who were studying Spanish (N=33) became significantly more native-like in their use of polite verb forms in Spanish, whereas the C group did not have any significant gains in this area. Although a comparison of the E and C groups' intercultural sensitivity using the *Intercultural Development Inventory* did not yield any significant differences between the two groups, the qualitative data suggest that the *Students' Guide* did help the E group students to improve their intercultural skills.

With regard to language and culture strategy use, no significant differences were found between the E and C groups in terms of overall language strategy or culture strategy use on the *LSS* and the *SILC*, respectively. Nonetheless, some differences between the two groups were found on individual items of these two instruments. On the *LSS*, for example, it was found that the E group students increased their use of five speaking and listening strategy items from pre- to posttest more than the C group students. On the *SILC*, statistically significant differences between the E and C groups were found on five items, three of which were difficult to interpret and did not provide evidence for the effects of the treatment. However, on two items regarding the use of generalizations versus stereotypes and respecting communication styles, the E group students had higher scores as predicted.

This report also includes findings from analysis of the E and C groups combined. These findings show that the students in the combined sample gained in intercultural sensitivity on the *IDI*, gained in frequency of some, but not all, language and culture strategies, and improved their rated performance on the *Speech Act Measure* in all but one vignette (i.e., "Meeting friend") over the course of one semester studying abroad. With regard to language strategy use in particular, it was found that the combined sample gained in their use of listening and speaking strategies, but reduced their use of vocabulary learning and reading strategies from pretest to posttest.

Program Professionals' Guide Study

The purpose of this study was to field test the *Program Professionals Guide* (PPG) with a group of study abroad program professionals who used the PPG to help them prepare and implement pre-departure or on-site study abroad programming. The participants in the study included eight U.S.-based study abroad advisors from seven Minnesota and Wisconsin universities, one U.S. faculty member leading a group of students to Paris for one semester, and four in-country, on-site directors (one each from France, Ghana, India, and Spain). The participants were asked to attend an orientation provided by the researchers, to read through the PPG on their own, and to use one or more of the activities contained in the PPG in at least one or two study abroad programming events during fall 2003 or spring 2004. Participants were also encouraged to use the PPG materials in pre-departure and on-site one-on-one advising. Data collection consisted of journal reports and an exit questionnaire. In addition, follow-up interviews were conducted with four of the study abroad advisors. The exit questionnaires asked the participants to provide suggestions on revising the PPG to make it more useful and user-friendly for study abroad professionals.

Overall, the feedback from the program professionals about the PPG was positive. They found the PPG to be a comprehensive and useful resource for theory and practice about language and culture learning from a strategies-based perspective. The program professionals used the activities from the PPG in a variety of ways in their pre-departure orientations, on-site programming, and advising. In some cases, the participants integrated the material from the PPG

with other activities and information that they had used in previous years and in other cases, they used the PPG as “stand-alone” programming.

All of the U.S.-based study abroad advisors reported that the PPG materials were used successfully in their pre-departure orientations and other programming. Three out of the four on-site directors reported successfully using the PPG materials. For example, the French program director was used the PPG to better sequence activities throughout the semester to match her students’ process of cultural adaptation. The participant who did not successfully integrate the PPG materials into her programming was the on-site resident director in India. She reported that very few of the materials in the PPG were new to her and that she was already using similar materials in her programming, thus, they were redundant. Finally, the faculty director reported that she had used the PPG materials successfully to help students focus on language and culture issues that they were experiencing in France.

The main challenge for study abroad advisors in integrating the PPG materials into their programming was a lack of available time to cover language and culture learning, since logistical concerns (e.g., health, safety) were expected to take priority. Another challenge expressed by one of the study abroad advisors was figuring out how to engage students with extensive international experience who felt that they were already language and culture experts. The on-site directors reported several challenges in using the materials in the PPG – for example, the fact that the materials were in English, not the target language, and that she was using the activities with students whose intercultural skills were quite varied. Participants also provided extensive feedback about revisions to the PPG. Examples of their comments included adding suggested time limits for the activities, adding more activities to the PPG, providing advice on how to facilitate the activities for groups of learners with varying language and culture experiences and abilities, and including advice for using the activities with different size groups of students.

Language Instructors’ Guide Study

This case study involved four experienced French and Spanish language instructors who used the *Language Instructors’ Guide* (LIG) to plan and teach a language course. As with the other two parts of the *Maximizing Study Abroad* research project, the primary goal of this study was to field test the LIG and to receive feedback from the instructors regarding usefulness of the LIG and how it could be improved.

Two of the participants were Spanish instructors at a large public university in Minnesota and the other two were instructors (one Spanish, one French) at a small private liberal arts college, also in Minnesota. All of the instructors were experienced language teachers; their years of experience ranged from 9 to 36, with a mean of 19 years of language teaching experience for all four instructors. Their participation in the study began in fall 2003 and involved attending an orientation session with the researchers, reading the LIG, and integrating activities from the LIG into the curriculum of one or more classes that they would teach during the following semester. All four instructors taught one or more classes using activities from the LIG during spring 2004. The classes taught were third-semester Spanish, Spanish for Health Care Professionals, and third-semester French. Four instruments were used in the study for the purposes of data collection: (1) monthly journals from each instructor based on reflection questions provided by the researchers, (2) two focus group interviews, one in the middle of spring 2004 and one at the end of that semester, (3) individual exit interviews, and (4) an exit questionnaire.

Considering the findings, overall, the instructors felt that the LIG was full of useful theoretical and practical information which enabled them to gain a greater understanding of language and culture learning concepts, especially with regard to strategies-based learning. They reported that the LIG also provided numerous activities to integrate language and culture for students in the classroom. Suggested areas for improvement included the need for further clarification and elaboration of language and culture learning principles, the addition of clearer descriptions of ways language instructors could adapt the materials for varied uses and contexts, the need to provide a framework of how the LIG fits into typical language learning curricular models, and the need to develop target language versions of the LIG materials as well as ancillary materials. Information also emerged from the study providing advice for other language instructors who use the LIG.

Introduction to the Research

The *Maximizing Study Abroad Through Language and Culture Strategies* research project was designed “to evaluate the effectiveness of newly developed language and culture strategy materials on the enhancement of study abroad students’ language competence and intercultural communication skills” (Cohen & Paige, 2001, p. 1). With an International Research and Studies Program (IRSP) grant from the U.S. Department of Education, over the course of three years, the research team examined the impact, effectiveness, and value of the three *Maximizing Study Abroad Guides* for three audiences: study abroad students, study abroad program professionals, and language instructors. This section provides the rationale for writing the *Guides* and the reasons for conducting this study.

The *Maximizing Study Abroad Guides*

The three *Maximizing Study Abroad Guides*¹ were originally developed in response to the perceived need for written materials that would explicitly address language and culture learning for study abroad participants. While study abroad has become a mainstay of U.S. higher education with over 160,000 students in programs abroad during 2002-2003 (International Institute of Education, 2004), the research evidence on language and culture learning is incomplete and somewhat contradictory. A literature review by Pelligrino (1998) and studies by Freed (1995), Miller and Ginsberg (1995), Segalowitz, Freed, Collentine, Lafford, Lazar, and Diaz-Campos (*Studies in Second Language Acquisition* Vol. 26(2), 2004), and Wilkinson (1998) suggest that language learning while abroad is not necessarily or in every respect advantageous compared to classroom learning at home. Given that potential opportunities to use the TL abound in the study abroad environment, these findings are somewhat counterintuitive. We hypothesized that part of the reason that study abroad students do not always make greater language gains than their stay-at-home peers is that study abroad students may not receive guidance about the strategies that they can use to maximize their language learning during study abroad. For example, language learning in study abroad can be inhibited by the “language myth” (Wilkinson, 1998) – that is, the misguided assumption that mere exposure to native speakers (NSs) in the host country will produce language gains. Students may also take the view that classroom learning is not as important as learning from interactions with NSs during the sojourn abroad and, as a result, miss out on valuable learning in the study abroad classroom (Miller & Ginsberg, 1995). We hypothesized that some, if not many, study abroad students also lack an

¹ Paige, R. M., Cohen, A. D., Kappler, B., Chi, J.C., & Lassegard, J. P. (2002). *Maximizing study abroad: A students' guide to strategies for language and culture learning and use*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.

Paige, R. M., Cohen, A. D., Kappler, B., Chi, J.C., & Lassegard, J. P. (2002). *Maximizing study abroad: A program professional's guide to strategies for language and culture learning and use*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.

Cohen, A. D., Paige, R. M., Kappler, B., Demmessie, M., Weaver, S. J., Chi, J.C., & Lassegard, J. P. (2003). *Maximizing study abroad: A language instructor's guide to strategies for language and culture learning and use*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.

understanding of language learning strategies and consequently do not usually have a strategic plan of action for enhancing their language ability while abroad.

With respect to study abroad and intercultural development, there is a sizable literature on intercultural training, some of the best known works being Landis, Bennett, and Bennett (2004), Fowler and Mumford (1995, 1999), Singeles (1998), Cushner and Brislin (1997), Kohls (2001), Landis and Bhagat (1996), Brislin and Yoshida (1994), and Paige (1993). While excellent in introducing students to cultural concepts and the processes of cultural adjustment and adaptation, these texts do not systematically identify, or prepare students to develop and use, culture learning strategies. The study abroad research literature has addressed intercultural learning, but in an inconsistent and at times inadequate manner. In addition, literature reviews by Sell (1983) and Stimpfl and Engberg (1997) indicated that numerous study abroad research studies have lacked a longitudinal design, valid and reliable instruments, an experimental approach, or appropriate sample size. Our examination of the literature has led to the same conclusions about these design problems. Moreover, while we found support for the hypothesis that study abroad positively influences intercultural development, much of the evidence has been in the form of student self-reports. It was not until recently (see Vande Berg, 2004) that research studies were published which utilized valid and reliable instruments such as the *Intercultural Development Inventory* (Hammer & Bennett, 1998, 2001).

Similar to the language learning situation, we hypothesized that students lack strategies for culture learning and do not have a coherent overall plan for learning the culture or developing intercultural communication skills. Hence they may not be gaining as much as they could from the study abroad experience. Paige and Kappler (1998), LaBrack (1993), and others have also pointed out that the study abroad field has been highly uneven in the level of support for language and culture learning available to students both at home in the form of pre-departure programs and courses as well as on site, where support for language and especially culture learning varies widely. Our overall goal therefore was to develop materials that would help study abroad students learn language and culture more effectively.

The *Maximizing Study Abroad* guidebook series consists of three volumes: *Students' Guide*, *Program Professionals' Guide*, and the *Language Instructors' Guide*. Each volume was designed with the same overall purpose – to prepare students to be more effective language and culture learners – but with different audiences in mind. Thus, the structure and content of the *Guides*, while similar, address the respective roles of the student, study abroad professional, and language instructor in this process. The *Students' Guide* addresses students directly and provides them with information regarding strategies that they can use in the field to make the most of their language and culture learning opportunities. It was designed to be used in a variety of ways, ranging from self-study with little or no external facilitation, to highly-facilitated pre-departure, on-site, and reentry courses where it would be used as the course text. The *Program Professionals' Guide* provides the professional study abroad person, at home or abroad, with background information about language and culture learning and includes the same exercises that are found in the *Students' Guide*, with added information on ways to facilitate those activities in a more interactive, in-person learning environment. The *Language Instructors' Guide* is also similar, but discusses how strategies for language and culture learning and use can be taught in the context of the language classroom. In our view, program professionals and language instructors play an important role in the life of the study abroad student. Our goal was to support them in their work with students by familiarizing them with the contents of the *Students' Guide*,

the foundational concepts and ideas we work with in language and culture learning, and approaches to use with the activities in the *Students' Guide*. For ease of use, both of the *Guides* for program professionals and language instructors are designed in an 8 ½" by 11" loose leaf format and materials can be taken out and photocopied. The *Students Guide* is a conventional, soft cover book that is small enough to be carried around easily, for example, in a student's backpack.

The *Guides* were written based on a set of assumptions and hypotheses about language and culture learning. First, the authors felt that much of the learning that occurs abroad is unguided or unscripted. In other words, it does not reflect deliberate, strategies-oriented learning on the part of sojourners. That issue – reflected to some degree in the literature – was a major reason why the *Guides* were written. Second, we thought that language and culture learning strategies could be taught and learned in a variety of ways, such as explicitly in the language classroom, via self-access by students to the *Students' Guide*, and through on-site facilitation by study abroad professionals. Language and culture strategies form the core content of the *Maximizing Study Abroad Guides* and are defined as “the conscious and semi-conscious thoughts and behaviors used by learners to improve their knowledge and use of a target language (TL) on the one hand, and their understanding and functional use of all that is culture on the other.” Third, it was hypothesized that language and culture learning could be enhanced if students became aware of the strategies that they could employ to both learn a new language and culture, as well as use what they had learned in daily communication and interaction with hosts. Fourth, we believed that written materials could convey language and culture learning concepts. Such materials could help students learn on their own, as well as support study abroad professionals and language instructors in preparing their students to be more effective language and culture learners.

Prior to writing the *Guides*, a discussion took place concerning the goals and objectives for this project. Out of those conversations arose a set of criteria that framed the task. First, the *Guides* were to be generalizable across study abroad sites, cultures, and languages. To accomplish this goal, in the *Guides* examples were provided from a variety of language and culture settings. Second, the *Guides* would emphasize a strategies-based approach to language and culture learning and use. Learning how to learn is the core competency being promoted by the *Guides*. Our view was that study abroad students were in learning environments with great potential for rich language and culture learning experiences and that the best tool that we could provide them was assistance in negotiating those environments as self-empowered learners. Third, the *Guides* would address all three phases of the study abroad experience (pre-departure, in-country, and reentry). The authors felt that each phase has different challenges and opportunities for students and that the *Guides* should focus on what would be most useful for students in these different phases as language and culture learners. At the concluding, reentry phase, for example, the assistance provided to students was on how to maintain and integrate their learning and experiences into their lives back at home. Fourth, the *Guides* were to assist three different groups involved in the study abroad language and culture learning process: students, program professionals, and language instructors. Here, the design principles were specifically to have integrative materials in the texts (such as core concepts and learning activities), as well as specialized materials for each target audience. Fifth, the *Guides* would be based on theory and research about language acquisition and intercultural competence. To accomplish this, we drew on the existing literature as well as on the experiences of the senior authors in conceptualizing and conducting research on these topics. Sixth, the *Guides* were to be

flexible in their application – they were designed to be used in a self-study format (*Students' Guide*), an orientation program, and a formal course.

The *Students' Guide* is effectively the core text in the series and it is organized as follows. Students are first introduced to the notion of learning strategies by taking three inventories that appear in the front of the book. The first of these is the *Learning Style Survey* (Cohen, Oxford, & Chi, 2002), an inventory which is intended to raise students' awareness about how they learn best, and also to encourage students to “style-stretch,” that is, to use a variety of learning styles to become a more effective language learner. The other two inventories are the *Language Strategy Survey* (Cohen, Oxford, & Chi, 2002) and the *Culture-Learning Strategies Inventory and Index* (Paige, Rong, Zheng, & Kappler, 2002), which ask students to self-assess their knowledge and use of language and culture strategies, respectively. The purpose of these last two inventories is two-fold: first, they are intended to raise students' awareness with regard to the frequency with which students use language and culture strategies; and second, they are intended to pique students' interest about the strategies contained in the *Students' Guide*.

Following these three inventories, the *Students' Guide* is then divided into two sections: culture and language. The culture section discusses nine sets of learning strategies that can be used during the three phases of study abroad. In the pre-departure phase, students learn about “Strategies for when I am in surroundings that are culturally different from what I am used to.” During the in-country phase, they learn about seven sets of strategies including: (1) “Strategies I (will likely) use to adjust to a new culture and cope with culture shock,” (2) “Strategies for dealing with difficult times in the new culture,” (3) “Strategies for making judgments about another culture,” (4) “Strategies to deal with different communication styles,” (5) “Strategies to understand non-verbal communication in another culture,” (6) “Strategies to interact with people in the host culture,” and (7) “Strategies to use with my homestay family.” The reentry phase includes a section on “Strategies I will use when I return home.”

The language section is structured primarily by skill (i.e., listening, learning vocabulary, speaking, reading, writing, and strategic use of translation), although each skill section is also organized into units based on the stages of study abroad: pre-departure, in-country, and post-study-abroad. Categories of strategies from each of the language skill areas are provided below:

Listening Strategies

- Strategies to increase my exposure to the TL.
- Strategies to become more familiar with the sounds in the TL.
- Strategies to prepare to listen to conversation.
- Strategies to listen to conversation in the TL.

Vocabulary Learning Strategies

- Strategies for when I do not understand some or most of what someone says in the TL.
- Strategies to learn new words.

- Strategies to review vocabulary.
- Strategies to recall vocabulary.
- Strategies to make use of new vocabulary.

Speaking Strategies

- Strategies to practice speaking.
- Strategies to engage in conversations.
- Strategies for when I can't think of a word or an expression.

Reading Strategies

- Strategies to improve my reading ability.
- Strategies for when words and grammatical structures are not understood.

Writing Strategies

- Strategies for basic writing.
- Strategies for writing an essay or academic paper.
- Strategies to use after writing a draft of an essay or paper

Translation Strategies

- Strategies for translation.
- Strategies for working directly in the TL.

While much of the content of the *Program Professionals' Guide* parallels that of the *Students' Guide*, it is accompanied by additional resources to assist the study abroad professional in integrating these materials into pre- and post-study abroad orientation and into on-site curricula. The theoretical and practical context of these materials is made explicit for study abroad professionals by providing them with explanations of the theories behind the materials, suggestions for which activities to use at different stages in the learning process, and tips for sequencing the materials for events with a variety of timeframes. The *Guide* also provides advice for using the materials in study abroad advising. As with the *Students' Guide*, the *Program Professionals' Guide* is relevant for pre-departure, in-country, and post-study-abroad contexts.

The third guide in the series, the *Language Instructors' Guide*, goes even further than the *Program Professionals' Guide* in providing a theoretical and practical framework for instructors to incorporate language and culture strategy training into the language curriculum. The *Guide* provides background information about language learning, student motivation, and styles- and

strategies-based instruction. It also presents theory about learning and teaching culture in the language classroom, and discusses a framework for both challenging and supporting students in their language and culture learning. The materials, again, target the study abroad environment but are equally relevant to students who are learning a language but who do not plan to study abroad. In addition to the materials from the *Students' Guide*, the *Instructors' Guide* also includes a number of additional strategies-based activities that can be used in language classrooms. All of the activities include tips for the language instructor regarding the purpose of the activity, as well as suggestions for effective facilitation of the activity with students.

Rationale for the Research Program

The fundamental purpose of this research program was to test the efficacy of the *Maximizing Study Abroad Guides* for students, program professionals, and language instructors. The *Students' Guide* was developed to support study abroad students in their efforts to learn the target language and culture by introducing them to specific language and culture learning strategies. With respect to student learning outcomes, the first theoretical proposition of the *Guides* was that strategies could be taught (in a self-access manner by the *Students' Guide* and through reflective e-journaling about how the *Students' Guide* was assisting their learning). The second assumption was that acquiring knowledge of strategies would enhance language learning and promote intercultural skills. In the absence of research, however, these remained untested hypotheses in the study abroad environment. Accordingly, a stringent experimental research design was developed that allowed us to examine strategy use, language acquisition, and intercultural development at two points in time and to compare students who used the *Guide* to those who did not.

A related hypothesis was that study abroad program professionals and language instructors could play an important role in supporting student learning by utilizing materials from the *Program Professionals' Guide* or the *Language Instructors' Guide* respectively. Two parallel studies were thus conducted with these groups. Program professionals were asked to incorporate materials from the *Program Professionals' Guide* into their pre-departure orientations and on-site programming. Similarly, language instructors were asked to utilize materials from the *Language Instructors' Guide* in their regular instruction. A research design was developed whereby the two groups developed study plans, tried them out, and then commented on their value, effectiveness in achieving student learning goals, ease of use, and so forth. The results from the study were intended to provide, among other things, feedback to the authors of the *Guides* as to how to make them as effective as possible as tools for enhancing language and culture learning in study abroad.

Review of the Literature: *Students' Guide Study*

Language Learning in Study Abroad

Until recently, the best compendium of studies on language gains in study abroad was that edited by Freed (1995). That volume had suggested that the impact of study abroad on language proficiency was at best mixed and at worst perhaps dubious. More recent research of a highly fine-tuned and rigorous nature has provided new insights with regard to language development during study abroad. For example, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* devoted volume 26 (2) (2004) to reports of recent research on language gain in study abroad. Likewise, *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad* devoted volume 10 (2004) to the assessment of study abroad learning, which included a set of articles with a focus on language gains. Results from some of these studies and others will be briefly reviewed below. We will consider studies on the length of study abroad, on comparisons between study abroad and at-home instruction, on the impact of study abroad on specific language skills, on the nature of host country language programs, and on student language support for study abroad.

The Duration of the Study Abroad Period

The research literature on study abroad seems to abound with pre-post studies indicating at least some language gain as a result of being abroad for as short a period as six weeks. So, overseas experiences do seem to have a pay off. However, there appears to be a paucity of studies which report on systematic interventions aimed at enhancing the language experiences of study abroaders. Rather, the available studies seem to end with a recommendation for an intervention. For example, Allen and Herron (2003) followed 25 undergraduate students on a six-week study abroad program to France in a quasi-experimental study with a comparison group of non-study abroad students. They found significant rated gains in both speaking and listening to French, along with a reported decrease in anxiety. Nonetheless, their findings with regard to critical incidents in the use or non-use of French suggested to them the value of a pre-study abroad intervention to help reduce language anxiety.

A study looking at an even shorter period of duration (three weeks) investigated, among other things, the issue of language activation in a short-term study abroad experience for 384 Japanese speakers in an English-speaking environment (Australia) (Woodman, 1998). The theoretical distinction was made in the study between language activation and language acquisition. This is a useful distinction to make because sometimes what is construed as language acquisition in a study abroad context is actually the activation of language knowledge that was gained previously, but had later become dormant. The findings revealed a statistically significant change in student English language proficiency, even for so short a period. Linguistic change was found to occur on a number of measures within identifiable temporal periods, with the minimal period being identified as approximately one week. Complementing these language measures, Woodman reports that teacher and student perceptions corroborated the finding of increased language comprehension and production, as well as increased comfort in language use and a commensurate increase in student language production across the program. These "early" increases in production were interpreted as providing support for language activation. In other

words, the students were relatively advanced in their English and simply needed to have that knowledge activated rather than to learn the language material for the first time.

While the above studies would suggest that short periods abroad can yield success in language gain, a large-scale study of some 25,000 students of foreign language in the UK and six other European countries (12,477 French, 3,824 German, 2,462 Spanish, 550 Russian) found that more time spent in residence abroad meant greater gains in language proficiency (Coleman, 1996, p. 88). This finding is more intuitively salient, especially when looking at gains in pragmatic ability (to be discussed below).

Comparison of Study Abroad with “At-Home” Programs

We note that the study abroad literature tends to abound with studies which compare study abroad students to others who do not go on study abroad (i.e., “at home”). Other more recent research is now teasing out those areas that study abroad seems to contribute to in comparison with programs back home.

One recent study compared a group studying Spanish for a semester in Spain to a group receiving classroom instruction in Spanish at a U.S. university (Collentine, 2004). The results indicated that while the university context back home facilitated more development on discrete grammatical and lexical features (verbs and subordinate conjunctions), quantitative discourse analyses of the corpus revealed that the study abroad group achieved better narrative ability and could produce language that was more semantically dense. In other words, they could tell a story a little better and could get their point across more effectively. These results were attributed to the sociolinguistic pressures they were under in their French study abroad context.

Another in the line of research comparing study abroad with at-home students yielded highly positive results for the impact of study abroad on speaking, at least with regard to conversational ability (Lafford, 1995). The 29 study abroad students were compared with 13 at-home students. According to Lafford, the findings revealed that the students who studied abroad were clearly better conversationalists than their at-home counterparts. They apparently had a broader repertoire of communicative strategies, and a better understanding of social, psychological, cultural, and linguistic components that lead to appropriate use of language. They brought more original information and questions to the situation, and they were better able to maintain and expand on the conversation. They were also more aware of the need to open and close a conversation appropriately and made better use of fillers, connectors, and backchannel signals when speaking to their interlocutors. In addition, they produced more words in the conversations and corrected their own mistakes more often. Furthermore, they felt more comfortable explaining their needs and motivation for questions, and were better able to negotiate meaning through comprehension checks.

Since research had compared the study abroad experience with stateside study but without discriminating between regular study or immersion study in the latter, Freed, Segalowitz, and Dewey (2004) made this three-way comparison with regard to French. They compared the acquisition of various dimensions of fluency by 28 students of French studying in three different learning contexts: formal language classrooms in an at-home institution, an intensive summer immersion program, and a study abroad setting. The only noteworthy progress was made by the immersion group students, who made significant gains in oral performance in terms of the total

number of words spoken, in length of the longest conversational turn, in rate of speech, and in speech fluidity based on a composite of fluidity measures. The study abroad group did not do as well and only outscored the regular at-home students in one area, speech fluidity. Perhaps to be expected, the study abroad group reported using significantly more English in out-of-class activities than the immersion group, where a premium was put on their extensive use of French.

The Impact of Study Abroad on Specific Language Skill Areas

In an effort to update the literature on language gain through study abroad, Freed (1999) considered what was known six years ago about language learning and study abroad, looking both at language learning as measured and defined by test scores and at acquisition of linguistic forms (fluency, discrete structural forms, lexical items, literacy skills, communicative strategies and variables related to sociolinguistic usage – drawing on studies from her 1995 edited volume). In her conclusions, she stressed the need to improve the oral-aural skills of study abroad students. Freed added, “Student perceptions of their experiences have taught us that their interactions with NSs may be far less intense and frequent than was once assumed and that the so-called ‘immersion’ into the native speech environment may be far from what was once taken for granted” (p. 19). She offered a host of programmatic questions relating to the organization of the program, policy issues, and the context of language learning and applied linguistic issues. She also offered a list of theoretical questions focusing on the relationship of language learning in a study abroad context and second language (L2) acquisition.

In looking just at the effect of study abroad on the accuracy of pronunciation, a study by Diaz-Campos (2004) did not find any significant difference between the pronunciation gains of those in study abroad versus those who studied Spanish at a university in the U.S. Other factors, such as the course level at which study began and years of formal language instruction, general oral proficiency, and reported use of Spanish before the semester and during the semester, did contribute to differences between students in that study.

In a recent study of speaking gains, Segalowitz and Freed (2004) compared the at-home context with the study abroad one, with a focus on the impact of the two distinct contexts for language learning on certain indices of oral performance. The sample consisted of 40 NSs of English studying Spanish for one semester. The results showed that, in some respects, learners in the study abroad context made greater gains in fluency and in overall oral proficiency as compared with learners in the at-home context. There were also, however, significant interaction effects and correlational patterns indicating complex relationships between oral proficiency, cognitive abilities, and language contact. The researchers viewed these interactions as helping to explain the extensive variation in learning outcomes that they encountered in the study.

In a study focusing just on gains in reading proficiency, Dewey (2004) compared the reading experiences of 15 students of Japanese in a controlled immersion context in a U.S. university and 15 study abroad students in a more open context. His intuition told him that students studying abroad in Japan gain certain kinds of sensitivity to reading that surpass those of students who study Stateside. His findings were that while those who went abroad felt more confident reading in Japanese than did those who studied at home, they were not significantly better in free recall or in vocabulary knowledge. He attributed these somewhat disappointing findings to the variability in gain scores on the reading measures among the study abroad

students, as well as to the variability of their contact with language and culture outside of class. The results of this study highlight the difficulties in doing controlled research with a study abroad group. In addition, the researcher felt it was necessary to design research measures that were more sensitive to the context.

The Nature of the Host Country Language Programs

A challenge in doing research on study abroad programs is that they differ so greatly in terms of their make up, in terms of where the students reside, the language they receive their instruction in, the extent of their actual immersion within the host community language in terms of their language use, and so forth. One important variable in this equation is the nature of the TL instruction that the students receive once they are on-site. A study by Brecht and Robinson (1995) provided a window into this important area. They looked at the experience of students in Russia and collected their data in three ways – from observations, in-class and out-of-class interviews with students, and student diaries, which took the form of both narrative and oral journals. Seven students also kept notebooks in which they noted any specific connections between their in-class and out-of-class learning over the course of the semester. The researchers found a wide range of reactions to the program, especially in terms of the classroom portion of their study. While some students said that classes (teaching elements such as grammar) were useful, others said that the classes were “a waste of time” or “not up to my expectations.” These diverse student opinions are fully consistent with the learning style preference literature which would predict that some students would welcome a focus on grammar, while many others would not. Thus, it was only a subsample of students who indicated pleasure at noticing grammatical formations in natural settings that were learned earlier in class and at getting constructive feedback from instructors about grammatical forms or vocabulary that they needed to use in particular situations.

Student Language Support for Study Abroad

On the basis of a large-scale review of literature on language learning in study abroad in about 20 countries, Pelligrino (1998) reported mixed results in study abroad. She noted that a language myth seemed to abound among study abroad students that study abroad would ultimately and inevitably lead to language acquisition – a perception that she felt could lead them to be rather casual about language learning. In addition, Pelligrino reported that students were seen to view language academically, that is, as a static linguistic system with rules and one way of communicating, and hence were not alert to learning the subtle nuances and variations of language use that could be gained from everyday exposure. Her conclusion was that students were very often not properly equipped to make the most of their time spent in a study abroad program.

Consistent with Pelligrino’s findings was that of Ife (2000), who conducted a survey of over 100 university students who had studied abroad in one of numerous foreign universities throughout the world. He was interested in the language learner strategies that they employed. His conclusion was that university students are not proactive enough in taking the most advantage of the study abroad environment. The author advocated that students access his

“Travel Activity Pack” (which included language learner strategies taken from Oxford, 1990) to assist them in being more proactive about language learning during study abroad.

In a descriptive study of language strategy use, Adams (2000) set out to determine whether study abroad helped students from Brigham Young University’s (BYU) foreign language classes to become better language learners. Eighty-nine students in six different programs, as well as a smaller control group of French 202 students on BYU campus, completed Oxford’s *Strategy Inventory for Language Learning* (SILL) both before and after their study abroad experience. While study abroad was not found to automatically increase students’ use of language learning strategies, students who did increase their strategy use seemed to be more successful in improving their language proficiency as well, especially in listening. A study such as this one would underscore the assertion that left to their own devices, students do not automatically develop a robust repertoire of language learner strategies to enhance their study abroad experience. Rather, they need to have their strategy repertoire enhanced in a rather explicit manner.

Discussion

Given the multiplicity of variables involved in study abroad itself, it would appear valuable to make comparisons of students who are **all** on study abroad, comparing, for example, the differences in the outcomes depending on the prior orientation and continuing support they have or have not received with the purpose of enhancing their experience. Such an approach would seem beneficial since there is now sufficient research evidence to suggest that there are deficiencies in terms of the language background students have when departing for study abroad and gaps in their knowledge about what to do when they experience language difficulties.

The Intersection of Language and Culture in Study Abroad

In many ways, the learning of the target community’s culture is crucial in learning how to use the language appropriately (and vice versa), since the learning of language and culture intersect in a myriad of ways (see Klein & Cohen, 2003, for more on the intersection of language and culture). While it is possible to know a TL and be quite uninformed about the culture in which that language is spoken, and vice versa, the combination of both linguistic and cultural knowledge is critical for carrying out some activities effectively, such as that of performing a speech function or *speech act*, such as making a request. In order to be effective in making a request, students need to know not only the appropriate words for what they want to request, but they also need to have a sense of the cultural norms regarding the making of a request in that given situation (e.g., the relative age, status, role relationships, and gender of the interlocutors). Members of a given sociocultural speech community, for example, have acquired knowledge about what is considered suitable timing for a particular request, the persons to whom the request could be directed, as well as how formal or informal a request should be.

Given the challenge of learning how to be pragmatically appropriate, study abroad is an inviting context within which to investigate such learning since the potential exists for noticeable linguistic gains. In the study abroad context, learners are, in principle, exposed to appropriate pragmatic behavior on a daily basis. They also have NSs of the TL to turn to as resource people

if they have questions about how to perform certain speech acts. What does the research literature show with regard to the acquisition of pragmatics in study abroad?

Let us first take a look at a study conducted with Europeans doing study abroad elsewhere in Europe since Americans often voice the sentiment that Europeans are better at “picking up” second languages than is the typical American. The study in point was conducted with 33 Irish learners of German, studying abroad for a full year in Germany (Barron, 2003). Their performance in offers and requests was compared with that of 34 Native German speakers, using as a baseline for English the responses of 53 Native Irish English speakers. With this group of Irish learners of German, their L2 pragmatic competence (knowledge and ability) did improve over time while living in Germany, mostly in terms of discourse structure, increased use of routinized formulas, and increased use of internal mitigation of requests. For example, there was a reported decrease in L1 transfer into German of some incorrect, literally translated utterances such as “I wonder...” (requests) and “Are you sure?” and an increase in the use of L2-like routinized phrases, which led to greater fluency. There was also an increased use of syntactic and lexical downgraders (e.g., conditional clauses), instead of relying mostly on “please.”

Despite the progress, learners’ pragmatic competency remained below that of German native-speaker norms. Sometimes learners did not use L2-like routinized phrases in a pragmatically appropriate manner. For example, learners continued to use an inappropriate speech act-specific strategy such as *minimization* of a request (i.e., “no problem”) instead of the pragmatically appropriate strategy of displaying *appreciation* in refusing the offer (Barron, 2003, p. 244). Some learners were found to reject using target-like speech act strategies because they felt politeness strategies were more of a question of individual personality rather than of social norms (p. 247). Also, some pragmatic elements were apparently not acquired by learners until very late in their year abroad. Therefore, it seemed that the longer the time spent abroad, the more pragmatic competence a learner acquired (p. 255).

Looking now at Australian high school students studying in Japan, Marriot (1995) explored the extent to which eight such students in an exchange program acquired the norms of politeness. Data were collected by multiple means: (1) a pre-exchange oral proficiency interview, (2) a learning strategies inventory (also used to raise awareness about how to go about learning a foreign language), (3) a diary the students kept while in Japan about their daily learning experiences, (4) a post-exchange oral interview with a discourse section about experiences in Japan, a task describing a picture, and a role play, (5) the replaying of the videotaped interview for introspective interview in English, and (6) a short written task in Japanese and interview in English about their experiences. The author noted that part of the complexity of learning the politeness norms in question (honorifics) is the variation of registers in Japanese and the difficulty involved with discerning which style is appropriate when and with whom. The plain or *da* style is used primarily within families and among good friends, the polite/formal style or *desu-masu* style is used in out-group situations (such as between adults who are not particularly close or from students to teachers), and the deferential or *gozaimasu* style is used in very formal situations. These styles represent intentional pragmatic decisions, and a misuse of style can be seen as an insult or lack of linguistic competence.

Marriot found that the learners (even the beginners) were competent in handling polite formulaic expressions (greetings and closings), but that they were least successful in acquiring the selection and use of the honorific style. For example, the students switched to the *da* (plain)

style too often since this was the form they were most exposed to, both in exchanges with host family members and friends, and even in exchanges with higher-status professors who would use these forms to lower-status students (with the expected response to be more formal in deference to the professor). The results of the study showed that limited competency in politeness forms could be achieved in an exchange program, but that complete acquisition of these forms would be unlikely unless the nonnative speakers (NNS) were provided with supplemental private instruction.

Looking now at research on pragmatic acquisition among U.S. study abroad students, there are only two longitudinal studies, one with learners of French and the other with learners of Spanish. Hoffman-Hicks (2000) looked at the acquisition of pragmatic competence by fourteen college-student learners of French in a study abroad program in France. The pragmatic skills of fourteen study abroad students from Indiana University in performing greetings, leave-taking, and compliments were elicited through a production questionnaire on three occasions over a period of sixteen months. Ten students of French who did not participate in the study abroad program served as a control group. French baseline data was also collected from 25 NSs of French. The analysis revealed that the learners did exhibit pragmatic development over time but that this development was often slight and limited in scope. The findings became more significant, however, when compared with the results of the nonnative control group, who did not demonstrate even this limited development. With regard to leave taking, the study abroad students – if lacking the appropriate routines – would end up saying more than natives would, and thus would appear verbose (p. 257). With regard to compliments, they did not learn how to deflect or minimize the effect of compliments, as the French would (pp. 257-258).

The second longitudinal study of pragmatic development in study abroad was conducted by Rodríguez (2001), who compared eleven study abroad students with the same number of students in an at-home Spanish language classroom with regard to their perceptions of requests. Learner and native-speaker (NS) data were collected using a judgment task and a retrospective verbal report interview. Although both groups were closer to the NS judgments after the semester of study, no significant differences were found between the two groups. The investigator found, for example, that both groups showed some pragmatic development over time in their perception that it was appropriate to make requests as questions and inappropriate to use *necesito* ('I need'). So even more so than in the case of the Hoffman-Hicks study, the group that studied abroad did not come out better in their perceptions of Spanish requests than those who stayed home and studied Spanish.

While not study abroad research, a study by Overfield (1994) helps to shed light on why American college students of foreign language may actually resist sounding too native-like pragmatically in their use of the target language. In her study of the pragmatic performance of 11 English-speaking learners of Spanish at the University of Pittsburgh, as compared to that of seven native Spanish-speaking informants, she found that learners of Spanish in most cases used similar speech-act specific strategies in performing apologies in both their L1 and L2, strategies that differed from those used by Spanish NSs. The researcher, however, did not interpret these speech patterns as strictly a result of negative transfer from English L1. Rather, she suggested that “students may believe it is less necessary to perform the rituals of politeness to maintain the social fabric in a language that is not their ‘own’ and that only ‘foreigners’ truly speak” (p. 55). Hence, pragmatic failure may not always be L1 transfer, but rather may reflect a certain resistance to sounding too native-like. More recent investigation of learners’ resistance to

performing according to native norms was undertaken involving learners of Japanese (Ishihara, 2005a). The researcher found that the learners were sometimes unwilling to accommodate to certain L2 pragmatic use (e.g., use of honorific language or gender-specific forms in L2 Japanese) until they began to understand the cultural reasoning behind it, even though they were extensively exposed to the L2 culture. Other learners may continue to resist following certain L2 pragmatic norms – even when they **do** understand the cultural reasoning behind those norms – for reasons such as deeply-held personal belief systems (DuFon, 1999; Ishihara, 2005b).

Discussion

Barron (2003) argues that even spending a full year abroad, learners may not have enough access to meaningful interactions with NSs (even in the host family) to be able to get the input that could help acquire pragmatic norms, and furthermore, study abroad students often hang out with other L1 peers (p. 70). The results from the Hoffman-Hicks and the Rodríguez studies would also paint a discouraging picture of the limited nature of pragmatic development if study abroad students are essentially left to sort out pragmatic matters on their own. Given that study abroad students do not usually have much language and culture preparation before going abroad but rather tend to receive just logistical information, Barron would advocate giving students guidance on learning about culture and becoming aware of pragmatics **prior** to going abroad.

This review of the pragmatics literature on study abroad would suggest the value of enhancing students' awareness of the fact that they probably will not be able to just transfer their native language and culture approaches to performing a given speech act over into the host country situation. And especially in high-stakes situations, the appropriate use of a request, an apology, or even “just” extending thanks may make a difference between obtaining the desired results in that speech community or not.

Culture Learning in Study Abroad

The culture learning component of the *Maximizing Study Abroad Guides*, and subsequent research project, drew primarily upon the intercultural literature, both theoretical and empirical, which has expanded greatly from its origins in the 1950s. We reviewed those literatures in order to solidly anchor the three *Maximizing Study Abroad Guides* upon a strong conceptual and empirical foundation. What we discovered during the three years spent writing the *Guides* was that the literature provided important guidance in many areas, but was incomplete in others. This part of the report describes and characterizes the literature.

The Content of Intercultural Education and Training

One of our major goals in our analysis of the intercultural literature was to identify the key concepts regarding culture and intercultural experiences, in order to design the topics around which we would organize the culture section of the *Guides*. Fortunately, there is a rich

intercultural training literature, which reflects an agreed upon knowledge base regarding the elements of culture, as well as the practical knowledge resulting from decades of intercultural training experience among professional practitioners. The best known and most important works in the field are the three *Handbook of Intercultural Training* volumes (Landis & Brislin, 1983; Landis & Bhagat, 1996; Landis, Bennett, & Bennett, 2004). These edited volumes have guided trainers by presenting state-of-the-art theories, research, and accounts of practice. Culture has been defined and the major culture concepts have been presented in one or another of these volumes.

There are many works in the field of a more practical nature that the authors also drew upon in order to decide on the culture content (as well as some of the activities) in the *Guides*. Some of the best known and most popular are the works by Craig Storti (1994, 1998, 2001a, 2001b). Storti has written books for a variety of audiences, including sojourners who are about to go abroad, returnees from abroad, and persons who are encountering cultural differences in various settings. The authors found his writings to be useful as we went about formulating our content template. Robert Kohls' (2001) classic work, *The Survival Kit for Overseas Living*, served as a benchmark given its long publication history and great popularity. The Intercultural Communication Institute annually sponsors the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication and publishes the workbooks from its various seminars; the workbook on intercultural training design (Bennett & Paige, 2004) includes materials about the content of intercultural training programs.

There is also a substantial intercultural communication literature that helped identify and specify the culture elements to be included in the *Guides*. Some of the most important works from that field are Ting-Toomey (1994), Gudykunst, Ting-Toomey, and Nishida (1996), Ting-Toomey and Oetzel (2001), and Gudykunst (2004).

The field of cross-cultural psychology has made substantive theoretical and research contributions to intercultural education and training for decades. The concepts presented in *Intercultural Interactions* (Cushner & Brislin, 1996) and *The Psychology of Culture Shock* (Ward, Bochner, & Furnham, 2001) were also useful in the development of the *Guides*.

After much study, the authors decided upon a content structure for the culture section of the *Guides* consisting of nine categories deemed relevant for study abroad students: (1) Adapting to culturally different surroundings, (2) Culture shock/coping strategies, (3) Interpreting and making sense of culture, (4) Communicating across cultures, (5) Communication styles, (6) Non-verbal communication, (7) Interacting with culturally different people, (8) Homestay strategies, and (9) Reentry strategies.

Intercultural Training Pedagogy and Culture Learning: Principles for *Maximizing Study Abroad*

Given that the authors were writing a book designed to support and enhance students' culture learning while abroad, it was essential to review the intercultural literature on how culture learning is viewed and taught. Our assumption was that strategies-based teaching and learning in the intercultural field have not been developed to the degree that it has been in language education. At the same time, the intercultural training field has generated important culture learning principles and approaches. The work of David Kolb (1984) on learning styles

has been very influential with respect to culture learning. Kolb theorizes that effective learning involves experience, reflection, conceptualization, and experimentation. Learners are encouraged to approach culture by utilizing a learning cycle that involves participation in the culture, by means of concrete experience and active experimentation, and making sense of those experiences by means of reflective observation and abstract conceptualization. Drawing upon Kolb, *Maximizing Study Abroad* recognizes that study abroad students are submersed in culture, but may not have the intercultural frames of reference or opportunities for guided reflection to make sense out of their experiences. Accordingly, the *Students' Guide* provides key concepts to help students understand these experiences, activities they can use to explore culture, and suggestions for strategies they can employ to learn culture. In effect, we are utilizing the *principle of the learning cycle*.

Harrison and Hopkins' (1967) classic critique of didactic intercultural training turned the training field on its head and made a compelling case for experiential learning. Experiential learning is today an agreed upon component in intercultural education and training. For us, this translated into the *principle of interactive learning*, in other words, making the *Guides* learning tools that would engage the learner as much as possible. We sought to accomplish this goal by including numerous learning activities.

The third was the *principle of guided reflection*. This concept has been a key element of the intercultural training process from the early, seminal works of Gochenour (1977) and Pusch (1979) – who wrote about training design and training activities – to the more recent pedagogical writings of Fowler and Mumford (1995, 1998), Singeles (1998), Brislin and Yoshida (1994), Cushner and Brislin (1996), Paige (1993) and Kolb (1984). Our working hypothesis was that while study abroad students are bombarded with intercultural experiences daily, they do not necessarily have systematic opportunities nor the skills and knowledge to reflect upon and make sense of those experiences. This principle was applied to the *Guides* through the inclusion of concepts that would provide frames of reference for understanding culture and intercultural encounters and learning activities that asked students to reflect on the experiences they were having and draw upon those conceptual frames in their reflections.

The metacognitive concept of “learning how to learn” (Hughes-Weiner, 1985) has long been a part of intercultural training philosophy (Wight and Hammons, 1970), but has not been systematically explicated in a manner that links key intercultural concepts to specific learning strategies. Our goal was to support learning by connecting a strategies approach to known intercultural concepts and processes.

Review of the Literature: *Program Professionals' Guide* Study

Curricular Issues with Program Professionals

There are many variables that affect the development of intercultural competence through study abroad. One of the variables cited as in need of change and improvement is intercultural training either in pre-departure or on-site formats (Larsen, 2002). One of the reasons that students do not always achieve the benefits of study abroad may be their lack of prior training for an intercultural experience (Martin, 1989). A major report on the study abroad field by Carlson,

Burn, Useem, and Yachimowicz (1990) states that study abroad programming should include the “careful preparation and orientation of students for study abroad so that cross-cultural differences, dissimilar approaches to teaching...and inadequate foreign language skills do not impede the Americans’ international learning” (p. 121). To understand how other cultures differ, study abroad students need to understand their own cultural baggage through intercultural training first, in order to be aware of how culture affects one’s perspective (Kohls, 1998). In addition, cross-cultural training should assist learners in overcoming cross-cultural obstacles, become more effective in cross-cultural situations, and cope with any stress experienced from cross-cultural encounters (Brislin & Yoshida, 1994). Brislin and Yoshida maintain that the result of cross-cultural training is the acquisition of knowledge about the informal guidelines that make certain behaviors appropriate in cultures.

A primary assumption of the current study is that through a strategies-approach to learning culture and language, students’ culture-general learning skills can be enhanced. Another assumption is that by teaching culture-general learning skills, study abroad students will be able to use the strategies in any culture worldwide. Furthermore, by providing training that teaches students to learn how to learn about a new culture, we are “teaching strategies to enable sojourners to become independent cross-cultural learners” (Juffer, 1993, p. 202). A final assumption follows Bennett (1993) in positing that intercultural training assists individuals in progressing along the continuum of the ethnocentric to the ethnorelative worldviews.

There are a variety of models for pre-departure and on-site intercultural training that study abroad programs follow, which run the gamut from one-hour orientations to credit-bearing courses (Summerfield, Sibley, & Stellmaker, 1997). The type of orientation training delivered to students is dependent on many variables including the level of intercultural knowledge of the administrators facilitating the training and the perceptions of the importance of intercultural training held by the international education and the university community as a whole. The status of study abroad on campuses in the U.S. has recently changed with the growth in the number of students studying abroad each year. However, instead of mainstreaming study abroad into the curriculum of the university, Brown (2000) notes that study abroad programs have remained marginal to regular university activities and therefore, the expertise to develop successful programming has not been attained. Mestenhauser (1998) questions the expertise of international education administrators as well as the university administrators who make decisions regarding the development of international education programs.

In addition, Mestenhauser (1998) argues that study abroad should not be considered separate from internationalization initiatives and therefore should reflect the developmental level of internationalization of a specific institution: internationalization of higher education “is the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution” (Knight & De Wit, 1997). According to Mestenhauser (1998), internationalization of the university curriculum has three content levels: introductory, intermediate, and advanced. Training may be at the introductory level where study abroad programs focus only on providing students with the basic knowledge of the host culture. At the intermediate level, programs may focus on helping students “develop cognitive skills that allow them to understand different cultures, and to integrate the differences they observe into what they already know” (p. 3). Also at the intermediate level, intercultural communication classes should be incorporated into the curriculum offered. The advanced level, being even more complex, attempts to develop complex global skills and requires major educational reform. In a related

article, Mestenhauser (2000) notes that there is a “knowledge gap” in international education in terms of what an organization knows and needs to know. Given that many universities’ perceptions of international education are found at the introductory level of internationalization because of a knowledge gap, in most study abroad programs little importance is placed on teaching intercultural communication concepts or the culture and language learning strategies needed for gaining intercultural competence.

A larger influence on the current state of study abroad which affects the quality of programming is globalization and its impact on the internationalization of higher education. The context of globalization means that societies and their economies are becoming more and more interconnected, a situation which calls for individuals in those societies to be prepared to interact effectively with people from other cultures. At the same time, the internationalization of higher education is being driven by market needs (Altbach, 2002). The number and variety of study abroad programs continues to increase, along with the number of study abroad students themselves (IIE, 2003). At the same time, there appears to be less of a focus on the quality of programs that would allow for the attainment of a truly international perspective (McCabe, 2001). As such, a tension arises between creating programs and trainings that help students attain intercultural competence that meets the needs of globalization and creates quality programming that allows for learning to occur and the desire to send large numbers of students abroad.

The idea that the study abroad experience **in and of itself** will bring about better international understanding and develop appropriate intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes in students is being challenged by studies that prove otherwise and call for effective preparation and training of students. Laubscher’s (1994) study of out-of-classroom learning in study abroad is one of the first studies which focused on the process that generates the outcomes rather than on the outcomes themselves. The study concluded with a call for a more systematic approach to teaching cross-cultural skills to achieve greater success in out-of-classroom learning. Bacon (2002) questions the legitimacy of a one-time pre-departure or on-site orientation for study abroad students in her case study of the cultural adaptation learning process of a British student in Mexico. She maintains that “mere competence in an area is not sufficient to guarantee success, minimizing the usefulness of a better orientation or more background information” (p. 645). Instead, Bacon calls for a way for study abroad students to talk about or write about critical incidents as they happen while abroad and therefore analyze their initial responses, learning more and more about the culture and language in the process. Lundy Dobbert (1998) adds a twist to this concept with her statement concerning the fact that not all individuals have the natural propensity to be able to adjust to a different culture successfully. Therefore, she asserts that, “The university’s job is to prepare students and faculty prior to their [sojourns abroad]” (p. 65). La Brack (1993) states that the field now realizes “Just how much more effective and relevant the overseas experience can be made by providing participants a well-designed orientation prior to immersion” (p.242). Thus, recent research suggests that simply sending students on study abroad is not enough, but that providing students with the skills and strategies to get the most out of experiences abroad may be a more effective path towards the desired outcome of greater intercultural competence.

Martin (1989) described an attempt by the University of Minnesota to overcome the lack of preparation and reflection needed to develop intercultural competence, by enacting a full curriculum around the study abroad experience with the establishment of a “Foreign Studies

Minor.” In order to receive a Foreign Studies Minor, students had to enroll in both a pre-departure and reentry intercultural communications course, had to study abroad for six weeks or more, and had to take additional courses in language and area studies related to the host culture. As Martin (1989) stated, it is difficult to evaluate a pre-departure course since the outcomes of the course will not be assessable until after the students return from study abroad. Instead, in this curricular effort, the University of Minnesota evaluated the course after students’ reentry to the U.S. Anecdotal information showed that the students who took the pre-departure course felt very well prepared. Martin argued that pre-departure orientation may not necessarily relieve the anxiety of sojourners as understanding the complexities of living in a different culture may actually cause a raised level of anxiety, but that overall, “those with pre-departure training are more successful sojourners” (Weaver, 1986; as cited in Martin, 1989, p. 257).

Of current note are new developments at higher education institutions around the U.S. to provide more formalized pre-departure and reentry orientations. Institutions that offer reentry courses to their students are highlighted on the St. Mary’s College (2005) Center for Women’s Intercultural Leadership website. In addition, the University of the Pacific (2004) created an intercultural training resource entitled “What’s up with Culture?” which offers “support and enhances a student’s ability to make successful cultural adjustments both before going overseas and upon returning home from studying abroad” (2004, p. 1). These different resources now available in the field highlight the development of more formalized ways to assist study abroad students in maximizing culture learning during the study abroad experience.

The *Maximizing Study Abroad Program Professionals’ Guide* fits into these recent initiatives to provide study abroad students with greater language and culture support prior to, during, and after a study abroad experience. The *Guide* is intended to assist those study abroad program professionals in incorporating language and culture learning – targeted for the study abroad experience – through a strategies-based approach.



STUDENTS' GUIDE STUDY

Aims of the Study and Research Questions

This study is a response to a felt need to better prepare study abroad students to be effective language and culture learners during study abroad and, in addition, a response to a lack of research assessing the effects of curricular interventions in study abroad – especially those emphasizing language and culture strategies. Within this broad framework, the primary aims of this study were the following:

- To measure empirically the impact of a language and culture strategy intervention on study abroad students' target language pragmatic competency and intercultural sensitivity, and
- To get feedback from study abroad students about the perceived usefulness of the *Students' Guide*, and suggestions about how the *Guide* could be improved to better meet students' needs during study abroad.

In addition to these two primary aims, the study also had three secondary aims: first, to examine the conceptualization and measurement of language and culture strategies in study abroad; second, to measure empirically the impact of one semester of study abroad on the entire sample, regardless of the treatment; and third, to examine possible correlations between gains in language skills, gains in intercultural sensitivity, gains in strategy use, and degree of contact with the target language and culture during the semester abroad. Thus, the study has five separate aims, each of which is reflected by one or more of the research questions listed below. To assist the reader in understanding why we asked these particular research questions, each question is followed by a short rationale statement.

Research Questions

1. *How do study abroad students receiving a language and culture strategy intervention compare to those who do not with respect to intercultural sensitivity, reported culture strategy use, reported language strategy use, and speech act performance?*

Rationale: This question relates to one of the two primary aims of the study, namely it asks whether the language and culture strategy intervention had any impact on students' language and intercultural skills.

2. *How do students compare on intercultural sensitivity, culture strategy use, language strategy use, and speech act performance before and after one semester studying abroad?*

Rationale: Although it was not our primary interest to investigate the impact of study abroad **in and of itself** on students' language and intercultural skills, because we had collected data from the experimental and the control groups for the purposes of answering the first research question, we had the opportunity to combine the two groups into one. This combined sample could then be used as a means to examine the impact of study abroad itself on students' learning of language and culture. In the field of intercultural education, in particular, there is need for research evaluating the impact of study abroad on students' culture learning – especially from the perspective of a strategies-based approach to culture learning, which is absent in the field – as well as for research examining the interaction between learning language and culture in study abroad. The researchers felt that this study could provide insights into these areas and, as a result, this research question was included.

3. *Are gains in speech act performance related to prior language and culture experience, demographic variables, reported language and culture strategy use, or study abroad language contact variables?*

Rationale: Our interest in asking this research question was to investigate whether the variables of prior language and culture experience, demographic variables, reported language and culture strategy use, or study abroad language contact variables could help explain differences between students with regard to their speech act performance. Of primary interest were differences between the E and C groups, although an analysis of differences in the combined sample (E and C combined) was also included as a means to examine how the variables mentioned above impact learning in study abroad in general. Again, an investigation of how study abroad is related to language learning is needed, hence we took advantage of this data to provide this needed analysis.

4. *Are gains in intercultural sensitivity related to prior language and culture experience, demographic variables, reported language and culture strategy use, or study abroad language contact variables?*

Rationale: Our interest in asking this research question was to investigate whether the variables of prior language and culture experience, demographic variables, reported language and culture strategy use, or study abroad language contact variables could help explain differences between students with regard to their gains in intercultural sensitivity. Of primary interest were differences between the E and C groups, although an analysis of differences in the combined sample (E and C combined) was also included as a means to examine how the variables mentioned above impact learning in study abroad in general.

5. *Do students become more native-like in their use of semantic formulas to perform apologies and requests? How do the E and C groups compare with regard to the use of semantic formulas?*

Rationale: The purpose of this research question was to investigate differences in performance on speech acts between the E and C groups using a quantitative analysis of semantic formulas.

6. *What insights does a qualitative analysis of the Speech Act Measure data provide with respect to students' speech act performance in Spanish?*

Rationale: The purpose of this question was to qualitatively examine students' performance on speech acts and to look at qualitative differences between the E and C groups and between students' pre- and posttest responses. This analysis was limited to the Spanish data due to the fact that the Spanish students constituted more than three-fourths of the sample.

- 7a. *To what extent do study abroad students report using strategies described in the Students' Guide in order to effectively learn the target language and culture? With regard to the strategies that they use, how do they use them?*

Rationale: This question was included in order to find out which language and culture strategies from the *Guide* that students were using and, more specifically, how they were using those strategies. We hoped to get detailed insights into language and culture strategy use in study abroad and the role of the *Guide* in that strategy use.

- 7b. *In which contexts do study abroad students use the strategies in the Students' Guide in order to effectively learn the target language and culture?*

Rationale: Not only did we want to know which strategies students used and how they used them, but also the contexts in which they used them, such as with the host family and with host country friends.

8. *What are students' perceptions about the usefulness of the Students' Guide for the study abroad experience?*

Rationale: This research question relates to one of the primary aims of this study, namely whether students felt that reading the *Guide* was a useful way to help them improve their language and culture learning during study abroad.

9. *What suggestions do students have for revising the Students' Guide?*

Rationale: The primary purpose of this study was to field test the *Students' Guide* with the intention of making it meet study abroad students' needs more effectively, hence, this research question.

Research Design

Sample

The student sample consisted of 86 students from seven Minnesota colleges and universities who had signed up to participate in a study abroad program located in a Spanish- or French-speaking country and who had studied Spanish or French for a minimum of three semesters, or the equivalent, prior to study abroad. The number of students from each university is listed below:

Table 1: Number of Students from the Colleges and Universities Represented in the Study

University	Number	% of Sample
University of Minnesota	41	48%
Macalester College	23	27%
University of Saint Thomas	7	8%
Carlton College	6	7%
College of Saint Catherine	4	5%
Saint Olaf College	3	3%
Saint Cloud State University	2	2%
Total	86	100%

With regard to the differences between each of the seven institutions represented in the study, it should be noted that at Carlton College and at Saint Olaf College, over 60% of students study abroad, while at the University of Minnesota only about 5% of the student body studies abroad annually. Macalester College also has a high percentage of students who study abroad (approximately 60% in 2003-2004). The disparity between schools may be explained by the greater availability of financial support and a greater emphasis on study abroad as a part of the undergraduate experience at some of these private institutions (i.e., Carlton, Macalester, St. Olaf).

Initially the research team had wanted to have a national sample, with students from universities in different parts of the U.S., but a national sample was judged to be logistically too difficult, and therefore, sampling was limited to Minnesota. In addition, because the *Students' Guide* is, in theory, culture- and language-general, the team had wanted to recruit participants planning to study abroad in a wide variety of countries. However, the sample was limited to students planning to study abroad in a Spanish- or French-speaking country primarily because those programs have the greatest numbers of students, but also because the researchers were planning to assess participants' TL ability and limiting the sample to two languages was logistically more feasible in terms of developing a measure of TL language ability.

The initial plan was to have just one group of student participants studying abroad during spring semester 2003. Recruitment for this group was conducted through most of the fall of 2002. However, the researchers were not able to reach the projected sample size of 150 participants studying abroad in spring 2003, and only 42 study abroad students participated during spring 2003. Part of the reason why recruitment was difficult may have been due to the fact that the overall number of students studying abroad had been down since the fall of 2001 and the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center. Because of the lower-than-expected sample size, the researchers decided to recruit another group of students who would be studying abroad in fall 2003. Thus, the sample included two cohorts:

- Cohort A: N=42, studied abroad during spring 2003
- Cohort B: N=44, studied abroad during fall 2003

Once selected for participation in the study, students in both cohorts were randomly assigned to the control (C) or the experimental (E) group. In cohort A there were 21 students in both the E and C groups. In cohort B there were originally 23 students in the E group and 23 students in the C group, but two students dropped out of the E group before the end of the study. The final sample size including both cohorts of students was N=86.

Table 2 (on the following page) shows selected demographic characteristics of the students in the sample. As can be seen, females outnumbered males, Spanish language students were more numerous than those studying French, sophomores and juniors were in the majority, the E and C groups were approximately equal, and the students were studying in one of 13 different Spanish or French speaking countries. In those 13 countries, students were located in 32 different cities.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of the Sample

Variable	Values	Number	% of Sample
E and C groups	E group	42	49%
	C group	44	51%
Gender	Female	67	78%
	Male	19	22%
Language Studied Abroad	French	19	22%
	Spanish	67	78%
Year Rank in School	Freshman	4	5%
	Sophomore	32	37%
	Junior	41	48%
	Senior	9	10%
Countries	Spain	38	44%
	France	17	20%
	Mexico	6	7%
	Chile	6	7%
	Argentina	4	5%
	Costa Rica	4	5%
	Ecuador	3	4%
	Guatemala	2	2%
	Cuba	2	2%
	Cameroon	1	1%
	Panama	1	1%
	Senegal	1	1%
	Dominican Republic	1	1%
Total Sample		86	100%

Students in the sample were in a variety of types of study abroad programs. Twenty-nine students (34%) were directly enrolled in foreign universities, 25 (29%) were in “island” programs (i.e., programs in which students go to a site with other students from their home university), seven (8%) were in field study programs, and the remaining 25 (29%) were in various programs such as the Council for International Educational Exchange (CIEE) program.

Students’ living situations during study abroad also varied, although living with a host family was the predominant type in our sample. Sixty-four students (74%) lived with a host family, 14 (16%) lived in a student dormitory, 13 (15%) lived in a private apartment or house with roommates, and one (1%) lived in a private apartment or house alone. Of those who lived in a student dormitory, six (43%) reported that NSs of the TL also lived there. Three students (23%) who lived in a private apartment or house with other people reported having at least one roommate who was a NS of the TL.

Thirty-eight different academic majors were represented in the sample including such diverse fields as Marketing, Chemistry, Psychology, and Music. Forty percent of the sample listed the TL (Spanish or French) as their major or as one of their majors.

With regard to language background, English was the native language of 82 students, while the remaining four listed Bosnian, Russian, Hmong, and French respectively as their mother tongues. The French speaker was studying abroad in a Spanish-speaking country. The average length of formal study of the TL for the combined sample was 6.1 years, with a range of 1.5 to 13.5 years. The E and C groups were evenly matched in terms of average length of formal study of the TL (6.0 and 6.1 years, respectively). Sixty-six percent of the sample reported never having studied another foreign language other than the TL, while 34% of the sample had previously studied one or more languages in addition to the TL.

Looking at the international experience of the sample prior to study abroad, all but one student in the sample reported having spent their “formative” years living primarily in North America. One student reported growing up in Eastern Europe. With regard to experience living in other cultures, Table 3 below shows the length of time students reported living outside their home culture. As can be seen, 82% of the sample had spent from no time to less than three months in another culture. Perhaps surprisingly, 14% of the sample reported having lived for one to ten years in another culture prior to this study abroad sojourn.

Table 3: Amount of previous experience living in another culture

Amount of time living in another culture	Number	Percent
Never	32	37%
Less than 3 months	39	45%
3-6 months	3	4%
1-2 years	6	7%
3-5 years	3	4%
6-10 years	1	1%
Over 10 years	2	2%

N=86

Finally, both the E group and the C group students were remunerated for their participation in this study. The E group received a higher payment than the C group due to their greater investment of time and effort in the research.

Secondary Samples

In addition to the study abroad students, four NSs of French (2 from France, 1 from Burkina Faso, 1 from Canada) and 12 NSs of Spanish (two from Argentina, two from Colombia, two from Costa Rica, one from Ecuador, one from Honduras, two from Mexico, one from Peru, one from Spain) provided NS baseline data on the *Speech Act Measure*. All of the French and Spanish NSs were living in Minnesota at the time of data collection.

In an attempt to validate two of the instruments used in the study, the *Language Strategy Survey (LSS)* and the *Strategies Inventory for Learning Culture (SILC)*, students at the University of Minnesota enrolled in French and Spanish language courses were recruited to complete one of these two measures. During the fall semester of 2003, 300 students completed the *LSS* and 277 students filled out the *SILC*. Students in French and Spanish language courses were chosen because that population was thought to be somewhat similar to the study abroad students who participated in this study.

Treatment

The intervention entailed having the E group students read the *Students' Guide*, to attend a pre-departure orientation to the *Guide*, and to submit seven electronic journal entries (e-journals) in which they commented on the *Guide*. With regard to the first component of the treatment, the *Guide*, students were assigned to read a section of the book each week throughout their semester abroad (see the Assignment Schedule in Appendix A). The reading assignments were organized in a sequence that the researchers felt would best fit students' experiences in the host country. For example, students were asked to read several pre-departure sections of the *Guide* prior to leaving the U.S.

The second component of the treatment was a two-hour-long pre-departure orientation to the research, the *Students' Guide*, and to the learning of speech acts, which was conducted by at

least one of the Principal Investigators (PIs) and all three research assistants (RAs). The E group orientation session was held on the same day as the data collection session, in the afternoon, after lunch. The majority of students participated in a large group session with their cohort peers, but seven students received the orientation in a one-on-one or small group setting with the research assistants because they were unable to attend the large group session. The researchers began the orientation by describing the organization of the *Guide* and the expectations and procedures for submitting e-journal entries. Next, students were asked to do one of the culture learning activities contained in the *Guide* in order to get a feel for the content of the book. Students then participated in approximately one hour of presentation, discussion, and hands-on activities relating to learning how to perform speech acts. The rationale for including speech acts in the orientation was threefold: first, it is easy to demonstrate the intersection between language and culture using speech acts as an example; second, students are likely to have to perform a variety of speech acts in the study abroad environment, and have likely received very little prior guidance on how to learn to do so effectively; and third, the speech acts of requesting and apologizing are singled out for attention in the *Students' Guide*. Finally, students were asked to meet in small groups with the RA to whom they were assigned. It was felt that having a more personal encounter with their assigned RA would help create rapport between the research team and the students and would give students a sense of personal responsibility to fulfill their participation in the study.

The third part of the treatment was student e-journaling. Although e-journaling was intended primarily as means for data collection, the fact that E group students – but not the C group – were required to write reflective entries about their study abroad experience and their use of the *Guide* and, in some instances, participated in back-and-forth email exchanges with the RAs, meant that these regularly-occurring interactive events became an integral and important part of the treatment. As mentioned earlier, E group students submitted a total of seven e-journal entries, at biweekly intervals, to one of the RAs. Each week in their e-journals, students responded to a series of questions (see below).

The C group students did not receive either the *Students' Guide* or the pre-departure orientation to the *Guide*, nor did they participate in e-journaling with the researchers. The only information the C group received was the logistical details about their participation in the research project. Furthermore, the researchers requested that even if C group students had access to the *Students' Guide* during their semester abroad (e.g., because they knew someone who owned a copy), they were not read it for the duration of the research project. C group students were promised a copy of the *Guide* **after** they had completed their participation in the study.

Instrumentation

Data for the study were gathered using a variety of instruments including inventories, surveys, e-journals, and interviews. Two demographic questionnaires were constructed by the research team, the *Background Questionnaire* and the *Exit Language Contact Profile*. The former was administered prior to the students' departure and the latter was administered at the conclusion of the semester abroad. The two demographic instruments were used in this study to examine the relationship first between background characteristics and our learning outcomes and second, between in-country language experiences and language gain. We anticipated that the students would have different language and intercultural backgrounds, and that they would also

be exposed to language and culture in very different ways while abroad. Having this information would allow us to analyze learning, controlling for background, as well as correlating learning with the students' characteristics and experiences.

The four learning outcomes – intercultural sensitivity, culture learning strategies, language learning strategies, and language gain – were measured by the following instruments, respectively: *Intercultural Development Inventory*, *Strategies Inventory for Learning Culture*, *Language Strategy Survey*, and *Speech Act Measure of Language Gain*. Each of these instruments is discussed individually below. E-journals and follow-up interviews were included as a means to qualitatively assess E group students' use of language and culture strategies, as well as their perceptions about the *Guide*. All of the instruments are described individually below.

Instruments

- *Background Questionnaire*
- *Exit Language Contact Profile*
- *Intercultural Development Inventory* (Hammer & Bennett, 1998, 2001)
- *Strategies Inventory for Learning Culture* (Paige, Rong, Zhang, Kappler, Hoff, & Emert, 2002)
- *Language Strategy Survey* (Cohen, Oxford, & Chi, 2001)
- *Speech Act Measure of Language Gain* (Cohen & Shively, 2002)
- Bi-weekly Electronic Journal Entries (E Group only)
- Follow-up Interview Protocol (E Group only)

Background Questionnaire

Two self-report questionnaires were constructed by the research team: the *Background Questionnaire* and the *Exit Language Contact Profile*. Both of these surveys were based in part on instruments developed by Freed, Dewey, Segalowitz, and Halter (2004). The first of these, the *Background Questionnaire* (see Appendix B), was administered to students prior to their departure for study abroad, and queried students about demographic information such as age, gender, and academic major, as well as about their language backgrounds. With regard to language, students were asked to identify their native and dominant language(s), the language(s) that they used with their parents, and the length of time they had formally studied the TL and at which educational levels, as well as to rate their ability in the target language, and to report on whether they had studied additional languages, and if so, in what contexts, and for how long. A detailed panorama of students' language backgrounds was included because variables such as length of study of the TL have been shown to correlate significantly with proficiency gains in study abroad (Díaz-Campos, 2004; Coleman, 1996; Juhasz & Walker, 1987; Engle & Engle, 2004).

Exit Language Contact Profile

The second questionnaire, the *Exit Language Contact Profile* (see Appendix C), was administered to students near the end of their semester abroad. This survey sought information

about students' study abroad language learning experiences, overseas living arrangements, study abroad programs, and types of classes taken. This instrument was included in the study in recognition of the fact that "study abroad" does not represent a uniform experience. Therefore, students were asked detailed questions about who they spoke the TL with and for how long, who their friends were (i.e., TL NSs or other study abroad students), who they lived with (e.g., host family, dormitory), and who they took classes with (i.e., other study abroad students, host country students, or a combination of both). In addition, students reported the types of extracurricular activities that they participated in, the type of program they were on (e.g., "island," direct enrollment, field study), and re-assessed their TL abilities. E group students were also asked to report on a five-point scale whether they would recommend the *Students' Guide* to a friend about to participate in study abroad.

Intercultural Development Inventory

The *Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI)* was used to measure the students' intercultural development. The selection of the *IDI* as the best instrument to be used for this purpose was based on several considerations. First, we wanted an instrument that had a strong theoretical foundation. In this regard, the *IDI* was the logical choice, being based on the well-known Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) (Bennett, 1993). While other intercultural instruments exist – Paige (2004) describes 35 "intercultural instruments" – many of them focus on cultural identity, value orientations, intercultural traits, and other concepts that we did not feel were relevant or appropriate for measuring the broader concept of intercultural sensitivity. Second, we wanted to use an instrument with demonstrated validity and reliability and the *IDI* had been subjected to extensive instrument validation procedures (Paige, 2003a, 2003b; Paige, Jacobs-Cassuto, Yershova, & DeJaeghere, 2003; Hammer, Bennett, and Wiseman, 2003). Paige (2004) in his review of the *IDI* states that, "both the original 60-item and the current 50-item versions possess sound internal consistency reliability" (99). In addition, "There is strong evidence of the *IDI*'s construct validity." (99). Third, we wanted to employ an instrument that was being used in research and had an established research literature. The *IDI* again met this test (cf. Paige, 2003b; Vande Berg, 2004).

Returning to the theoretical basis of the *IDI*, Bennett's (1993) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity conceptualized intercultural sensitivity as a developmental phenomenon consisting of six alternative intercultural worldviews, three of which are *ethnocentric* (Denial, Defense, and Minimization) and three of which are *ethnorelative* (Acceptance, Adaptation, and Integration). Intercultural experience can theoretically bring about worldview shifts to incorporate new ways of perceiving and making meaning out of cultural difference, as has been demonstrated empirically (Paige, 2003a, 2003b; Vande Berg, 2004). In the DMIS, the ethnocentric worldviews begin with Denial, where difference is avoided and ignored. A Defense worldview emerges when difference can no longer be ignored. In Defense, difference is threatening and is resisted, as represented by polarized thinking into "we – they" categories. Reversal is a subset of Defense and is characterized by the shift of cultural identity from one's original cultural reference group to another; however, the polarization continues though the referent groups are now reversed. Minimization is the position that similarities are more important than differences, which serves as a perceptual screen for being able to encounter difference more comfortably. Although the existence of culture is recognized as valid and different from one's native culture, which reduces the threat level characterized by Defense, the

experience with culture is limited such that only surface differences tend to be recognized and acknowledged.

In the three ethnorelative worldviews, cultures are now seen in their own context, not necessarily as better or worse than one another. New principles inform Acceptance: that human beings are all cultural and operate within diverse cultural contexts, that culture is a major organizing influence in our lives, and that cultural differences are important. Adaptation is the worldview that involves the development of cognitive and behavioral skills necessary for functioning successfully in another culture. Integration refers to the worldview orientation persons integrate two or more cultural frames of reference into their worldview; rather than being defined by culture, they become constructors of it.

The *IDI*, a 50-item instrument, measures Denial and Defense (DD) together, Reversal (R), Minimization (M), Acceptance and Adaptation (AA) combined, and the Encapsulated Marginality (EM) form of Integration (where there are conflicting views of the plurality of one's cultural identity). The *IDI* also measures overall intercultural sensitivity, referred to as the Developmental Score (DS).

Considering its theoretical soundness and empirical reliability and validity, the *IDI* was clearly the best choice for an instrument to measure students' intercultural sensitivity; however, some issues about its use have been raised. For example, one on-site study abroad professional reported to the researchers that in her experience, if students are already aware of the theoretical underpinnings of the *IDI* – i.e., Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity – then they may be able to “psych out” the *IDI* and receive a more intercultural sensitive score than is really the case. Her observation was that some students who scored as intercultural sensitive on the *IDI* (i.e., ethnorelative) did not exhibit behaviors that demonstrated that level of sensitivity. Because the *Guide* talks about the Bennett model underlying the *IDI*, this concern represents a possible limitation of using the *IDI* in this study. This concern remains anecdotal, however, and more studies must be conducted to establish its validity. Engle and Engle (2004) also suggest that short-term stays abroad do not adequately trigger gains on the *IDI*; gains are best obtained when an individual has spent at least one year abroad. This concern is relevant for the current study as the student participants were abroad for only four months. Another professional in the language education field expressed the view that the *IDI* was not fine-tuned enough to pick up the kinds of incremental cultural changes that occur within short periods such as in study abroad (Tony Liddicoat, Personal Communication, October 18, 2004).

Strategies Inventory for Learning Culture

In order to examine culture strategy use, the *Strategies Inventory for Learning Culture* (*SILC*) (Paige, Rong, Zhang, Kappler, Hoff, and Emert, 2002) (see Appendix D) was administered to students pre- and post-study abroad. The *SILC* was originally created as a self-assessment tool for the *Students' Guide*, but was modified for use as a research instrument in this study. It consists of 52 items conceptually organized into the nine culture learning categories used in the *Guide*: adapting to culturally different surroundings, culture shock/coping strategies, interpreting culture, communicating across cultures, communication styles, non-verbal communication, interacting with culturally different people, homestay strategies, and reentry strategies. Students were asked to indicate how often they used a particular strategy using a

four-point response format ranging from “very often” to “seldom.” They also had the option to indicate that a particular strategy was “not applicable” to them.

Language Strategy Survey

The *Language Strategy Survey (LSS)* (Cohen, Oxford, & Chi, 2001) (see Appendix E) was also created for the *Students' Guide* and revised by the researchers for this study. The measure consists of 89 language strategy items in six language skill areas: listening, speaking, vocabulary, reading, writing, and translation. Included in these skill areas are both strategies for language **use** and strategies for language **learning**. The former strategy-type refers to strategies that one employs while actually speaking, listening, reading, or writing in a L2. An example is the listening strategy, “*I use the speakers' tone of voice as a clue to the meaning of what they are saying.*” The latter strategy-type refers to strategies one uses to learn a target language, such as “*I review words periodically so I don't forget them.*” The *LSS* builds on a significant body of previous research into language learning and use strategies, for example, that done by Rebecca Oxford (1990). Finally, on this instrument, students were asked to indicate the frequency with which they use each of the language strategies, employing the same response format as that described above for the *SILC*.

In order to validate the *Strategies Inventory for Learning Culture (SILC)* and the *Language Strategy Survey (LSS)*, both instruments were administered to a sample of University of Minnesota students in Spanish and French classes (N=277 for the *SILC*; N=300 for the *LSS*; N=577 total) who were not currently studying abroad. The data were subjected to exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses.

With regard to the *SILC*, the exploratory factor analysis generated a five-factor model of culture learning that corresponded well with the original conceptual structure of the instrument while reducing the complexity of the model from nine to five factors. Confirmatory factor analysis indicated that this model represented a sound fit with the data (Goodness of Fit Index = .92; RMSEA = .04; chi square ÷ df = 1.41) according to criteria established by Jöreskog and Sörbom (1984), Browne and Cudeck (1989), and Hammer *et al.* (2003). The five *SILC* scales also possessed good internal consistency with the exception of the Culture Shock/Coping Strategies scale: Interpreting Culture ($\alpha = .84$), Nonverbal Communication ($\alpha = .86$), Homestay Strategies ($\alpha = .86$), Culture Shock/Coping Strategies ($\alpha = .72$), and Reentry Strategies ($\alpha = .86$). The five-factor *SILC* model and samples items from the instrument are presented below:

SILC Five-Factor Model

Factor I. Interpreting Culture

- Item 17. *I analyze things that happen to me in another culture from as many perspectives as I can.*
- Item 20. *I refrain from making quick interpretations about another culture.*

Factor II. Non-Verbal Communication

- Item 32. *I learn about the ways in which people from another culture use non-verbal communication.*
- Item 35. *I practice using a variety of different nonverbal communication patterns.*

Factor III. Homestay Strategies

- Item 44. *I get permission before bringing someone home.*
- Item 46. *I teach games common in my own country to my homestay family.*

Factor IV. Culture Shock/Coping Strategies

- Item 10. *I treat moments of culture shock as learning experiences, for example by writing about them in my journal.*
- Item 11. *I use a variety of coping strategies when I feel like I have culture shock overload.*

Factor V. Reentry Strategies

- Item 47. *I find a group of people who have had similar experiences to talk to and share experiences*
- Item 50. *I volunteer for work related to the other culture, for example with international students at a local university.*

Exploratory factor analyses with the *LSS* produced a five-factor model that was a reasonable approximation of the original skill-based conceptual structure of the instrument. Confirmatory factor analysis demonstrated that the model represented a fair, if not robust, fit with the data (GFI=.75; RMSEA=.06; chi square ÷ df=2.01). The five factors and sample items are presented in Figure 3 below. The factors and their reliability coefficients are: Learning Structure and Vocabulary ($\alpha=.85$), Speaking ($\alpha=.77$), Listening ($\alpha=.83$), Reading ($\alpha=.67$), and Asking for Clarification ($\alpha=.79$). Examples of the items included in each of the five *LSS* factors are provided below:

LSS Five-Factor ModelFactor I. Learning Structure and Vocabulary

- Item 37. *I go over new words often when I first learn them to help me remember them.*
- Item 66. *I plan out in advance how I'm going to read the text, monitor to see how I'm doing, and then check to see how much I understand.*

Factor II. Speaking

- Item 48. *I regularly seek out opportunities to talk with native speakers (of the target language).*
- Item 56. *I figure out and model native speakers' language patterns when requesting, apologizing, or complaining.*

Factor III. Listening

- Item 10. *I predict what the other person is going to say based on what has been said so far.*
- Item 26. *I watch speakers' gestures and general body language to help me figure out the meaning of what they are saying.*

Factor IV. Reading

- Item 69. *I pay attention to the organization of the text, especially headings and subheadings.*
- Item 70. *I make ongoing summaries of the reading either in my mind or in the margins of the text.*

Factor V. Asking for Clarification

- Item 20. *I ask speakers to repeat what they said if it wasn't clear to me.*
- Item 22. *I ask speakers to slow down if they are speaking too fast.*

The results from the factor analyses conducted on the *SILC* and the *LSS* indicated that both instruments are reasonably valid and reliable measures of reported language strategy use and culture strategy use, respectively.

Speech Act Measure of Language Gain

In order to assess students' pragmatic ability prior to and after study abroad, the *Speech Act Measure of Language Gain* (Cohen & Shively, 2002) (see Appendix F) was developed by the researchers. The *Speech Act Measure* constitutes an indirect assessment of spoken language in the form of a multiple-rejoinder discourse completion task (DCT). The *Speech Act Measure* included a total of ten DCTs, five each of the speech acts of apologizing and requesting. DCTs are a data collection tool consisting first, of a short description of a social situation in which the testtaker is prompted to perform a particular speech act and second, of a "conversation" between the testtaker and another person in the target language. In this case, the multiple-rejoinder approach is utilized, calling for the respondent to fill in the blanks of a dialogue which includes two to four responses from an interlocutor. The multiple-rejoinder approach was used for several reasons: (1) more data can be obtained from respondents as they must respond to several conversational turns; (2) it may better reflect the conversational turn-taking found in natural speech; (3) its use simplifies the rater's task in that the rejoinders limit the range of possible appropriate responses by the testtaker (see Cohen & Shively, 2002/2003 for a more in-depth discussion of multiple rejoinders).

In addition, because factors such as social status, social distance, and degree of severity (apologies) or degree of imposition (requests) can affect the kind of language that is pragmatically appropriate in a speech act, such factors are identified in the description of the vignette. An example of a multiple-rejoinder DCT is shown below.

Example apology vignette from the *Speech Act Measure* (English prototype version):

You promise to meet your close friend from the host community, Sofia, in order to help her study for an important English literature exam. She has been really kind about helping you with your learning of Spanish. You agree to meet her outside the library, but you arrive 45 minutes late for the meeting.

Sofia (annoyed): Hey, where've you been?! I've been waiting here for over an hour!

You:

Sofia: Oh, really? Well, I was about to give up and go inside to study on my own.

You:

Sofia: I mean ... I was even worried something happened to you.

You:

Apart from the multiple rejoinder structure of the *Speech Act Measure*, each vignette was also designed to capture social and situational variation, given that speech act behavior has been shown to vary based on the social situation and the characteristics of the individuals involved in the interaction. Three primary variables were used to provide a set of varied vignettes: social status, social distance, and severity of the infraction (apologies) or degree of imposition of the request. Refer to the list below for a description of the social status and social distance of the interlocutors in each vignette. Although degree of severity and degree of imposition may be perceived differently by each individual and perhaps in different cultures, we attempted to vary severity/imposition in the ten vignettes in the *Speech Act Measure*.

An English-language prototype of the *Speech Act Measure* with 18 vignettes was developed first. The prototype was then translated into French and two dialects of the Spanish – Peninsular Spanish (i.e., Spain) and “Latin American” Spanish – by one NS from France, Spain, and Colombia, respectively. Although we used two versions of the Spanish-language *Speech Act Measure* in order to partially capture dialect variation, it is important to point out that what we are calling “Latin American” Spanish does not in fact exist; each of the 20 Spanish-speaking countries in the region referred to as “Latin America” has a distinct dialect and a unique set of pragmatic norms with regards to speech acts – not to mention the fact that significant variation within each country based on region, social class, and ethnic group may exist as well. Our grouping of the dialects of Spanish spoken in Latin America into one version of the *Speech Act Measure* was a result of logistical concerns, given that the sample included students who were studying abroad in nine different countries in that region.

The instrument underwent pilot testing with native Spanish and French speakers as a means for evaluating the appropriateness of the speech act situations and the language used by the interlocutors in those situations, and to examine which vignettes provided the richest language data in order to narrow the original 18 vignettes down to 10. The NS pilot data were analyzed for overall richness as well as use of *semantic formulas* (see the Data Analysis Procedures section for a definition), and the 10 vignettes which make up the final version of the *Speech Act Measure* were chosen. The piloting also provided an opportunity to collect Spanish and French NS baseline data from which to compare students’ responses.

In addition, the instrument was pilot-tested with six learners of Spanish or French who were NSs of English in order to ensure that the written directions, vignette descriptions, and the format of the measure were easy to understand and functioned for the purposes that they were intended.

Appendix F includes copies of all of the versions of the *Speech Act Measure* that were employed in this study. For the purposes of the narrative, we have given each of the vignettes a shortened name to facilitate their referencing in the text. The following list includes the names that are assigned to each vignette in the *Speech Act Measure* and a brief description of each.

Description of the Apology and Request Vignettes in the *Speech Act Measure*

<u>Vignette Number and Title</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Relative Social Status of Hearer</u>	<u>Degree of Social Distance</u>
APOLOGIES			
(1) "Spill wine"	At the home of a host country friend, a student apologizes to his/her friend's mother for spilling wine on the tablecloth during dinner.	Older person	High
(3) "Friend's book"	A student apologizes to a host country acquaintance for having lost a valuable book that the acquaintance had lent him/her.	Peer	Mid
(5) "Babysitting spill"	A student apologizes to a 13-year-old boy for spilling juice on his homework while in the role of his babysitter.	Younger person	Mid
(7) "Meeting friend"	A student apologizes to a host country friend for being late to a planned study meeting.	Peer	Low
(9) "Prof meeting"	A student apologizes for missing a scheduled meeting – for the second time – with a "distinguished" professor.	Professor	Mid
REQUESTS			
(2) "Slower speech"	A student requests that the professor speak more slowly in class because s/he can't understand him/her.	Professor	Mid
(4) "Airplane seat"	Upon boarding an overseas flight, a student requests that the passenger in the adjacent seat switch places with his/her friend so they can sit together.	Older person	High
(6) "Paper extension"	A student requests that the professor give him/her an extension on a paper so that s/he can visit friends for the weekend.	Professor	Mid
(8) "Less food"	A student requests that the host mother give him/her less food for dinner because the portions are too large.	Older person	Low
(10) "Leaving for school"	A student requests that his/her 15-year-old host family sibling get up earlier so that they can walk to school together without the student arriving late.	Younger person	Low

As with any instrument, there are always the plusses and minuses associated with its use. With regard to discourse completion production questionnaires, such as the multiple-rejoinder DCT used in this study, they constitute at best an **indirect** measure of pragmatic ability in speaking and also an **elicited** measure as well. This means that the data may represent the respondents' impressions as to what they would say, rather than what they actually would say in such a situation. As the pendulum has swung back to naturally-occurring data, the focus these days is on the collection of naturally-occurring data, such as through corpora studies (see

Koester, 2002; Golato, 2003; Holmes, 2003; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2003). The corpus approach works well when there is time and no need to obtain data on specific speech acts performed in specific situations under specific conditions.

If, on the other hand, time is of the essence and it is not feasible to collect oral data, a multiple-rejoinder DCT has some real advantages for researchers. While the weakness in this is that they do not represent actual data, the strength is that ideally (if adequate time and clear instructions are provided), their responses represent the respondents' best efforts at demonstrating their ability to perform speech acts at the given moment. Undoubtedly, there is a need to fine-tune the speech act and the conditions under which it is performed.

In the case of this study, the written format enabled the researchers to collect a large amount of data in an efficient manner. In addition, it was possible to collect the data via the internet in the posttest (see Data Collection Procedures below for an explanation). It was also considered imperative that we collect the speech act data immediately before or after the students' semester abroad concluded (within a two week window), so as to be able to make valid comparisons between students based on data collected at a similar point in time. (The collection of natural data can take weeks or even months.) Furthermore, the need for online posttest administration and the limitations in resources did not allow for oral data to be collected, such as by means of elicited role-plays.

Furthermore, because the data were elicited using the same instrument from all students, both pre- and posttest, the results between students and between students' pretest and the posttest could easily be compared. In addition, this method of data collection allowed the researcher to control for sociolinguistic variables such as age and status of the interlocutor, as well as the degree of imposition (requests) and the severity of the infraction (apologies). In contrast, data collected in natural settings do not lend themselves to easy comparisons between different individuals and between different points in time, due to the highly contextualized nature of natural data. Thus, although data collected in natural contexts or by means of oral role-plays may have been a more valid measure of students' speech act performance, use of such methods was not practical given the constraints of this research project. For those reasons, the DCT was selected as the most appropriate data collection instrument for speech acts in this study.

E-journals

In addition to these more quantitative measures, electronic journals (e-journals) and interviews were also used as data sources for the study, allowing a means for triangulating the information provided by the students in the study. As mentioned above, the E group students were given weekly reading assignments from the *Guide* and asked to comment on those readings in their e-journal entries on a biweekly basis. They were also asked to talk about their language and culture learning experiences, to include examples of ways in which they used the strategies contained in the *Guide*, and to share any critical incidents that they encountered on-site. The following are the questions that they were asked:

- What were your impressions of the readings in the assigned section?
- What were your impressions of the activities? Please comment on each of the activities.

- What types of language and culture strategies are you using in order to deal with the host country language and culture (for example, listening for key words in a conversation, explaining cross-cultural experiences to family and friends back home, etc.; see pages 16-28 in the *Guide* for lists of strategies)?
- What are the contexts and situations in which you use these language and culture strategies (for example, eating dinner with your host family, talking with your language partner, etc.)?
- How have the readings and activities related to your study abroad experience? Please give examples with explanations.
- Is there anything else you would like to tell us?

Follow-up Interview Protocol

The final data source was generated by one-on-one follow-up interviews with E group students administered by the research assistants on the study. The interviews were semi-structured, approximately one hour in length, and utilized the *Follow-Up Interview Protocol* developed for this study (see Appendix G). The *Protocol* included eleven questions regarding the following: (1) the parts of the *Guide* that they found the most and least helpful; (2) their perceptions as to whether their language and intercultural skills improved during study abroad and, if so, how; (3) whether the *Guide* played any role in this improvement; (4) whether they had used the language and culture strategies contained in the *Guide* to assist with reentry to the U.S. and, if so, how; and (5) their suggestions on how the *Guide* could be improved.

Data Collection Procedures

The study had a pretest-posttest design; therefore, data were collected prior to students' departure for study abroad and again near the end of their semester abroad. Data were collected from cohort A in December 2002 (pretest) and in May 2003 (posttest), and from cohort B in April or May 2003 (pretest) and in December 2003 (posttest). Note that the dates of data collection for both groups may have inadvertently resulted in differences between the two cohorts. That is, for cohort B, the time lapse between the pretest and the posttest was longer (7-8 months) than that for cohort A (4 months). Due to the fact that many cohort B participants were not going to be available for an in-person orientation during the summer prior to their fall departure for study abroad, it was logistically necessary that data be collected before the end of the spring 2003 semester. Another factor that differentiated the two cohorts was the fact that students going abroad in the fall (cohort B) were on average one semester younger than the spring semester study abroad students (cohort A). Fortunately, random selection was used in determining who received the intervention, so any differences between the two cohorts would have presumably been equally distributed between the E and C group students.

For the pretest, all students (E and C groups) completed the *Background Questionnaire*, *IDI*, *SILC*, *LSS*, and *Speech Act Measure* (in that order) during a four-hour in-person session which took place in Minnesota on the dates mentioned above. The data collection took place in the morning, and when students were through filling out the measures, lunch was provided. C group students left the orientation after lunch. After the lunch break, E group students came back for the afternoon orientation to the research, the *Guide*, and the speech act training.

Although most students attended a large-group data collection session (i.e., 30-40 students), there was a total of seven students who had conflicts with the date and time of the large group session, but were still interested in participating. In order to accommodate these students, one-on-one or small group data collection and research orientation sessions with the research assistants were offered, both for E and C group students. Students who attended the individual and small group sessions filled out the instruments in the same order as the large group, and as with the large group session, C group students left after completing the measures and receiving instructions about their participation in the research. E group students in the small group and individual sessions remained in the room and received the same orientation to the research, to the *Students' Guide*, and to speech acts as large-group attendees had received.

Overall, the pretest data collection both in the small and large groups went smoothly. There was one case, however, in which a student attending a one-on-one orientation session was accidentally given the speech act training (see the Treatment section) before filling out the *Speech Act Measure*, which may have had an impact on responses to the pretest.

For the posttest, all students completed the *Exit Language Contact Profile*, *IDI*, *SILC*, *LSS*, and *Speech Act Measure* on a website created for the study near the end of their semester abroad. During the in-person session, students were told that the posttest data collection would take place online. Thus, as the end of the semester approached, the RAs wrote to the students to remind them to complete the online instruments during the last couple of weeks of their study abroad program. Students went to the website individually, completed the measures online, and submitted their data to the researchers electronically. Use of a website to collect the posttest data was an outgrowth of the logistical concern that not all students would be coming back to Minnesota immediately after their semester abroad. Although most students submitted their posttest instruments via the website in a timely fashion, some students did not finish immediately. In those cases, the RAs continued to remind students to finish the online measures by sending reminders via email.

Data from the final two instruments – the e-journals and interviews – were collected separately. E-journals were submitted at biweekly intervals over the course of the semester abroad by the E group students, resulting in seven entries for each student. Students would submit their e-journals to their assigned RA via a website created for the study, after which time the RAs could retrieve and respond to students' e-journals through a secure web-based database. When students did not submit their e-journals by the assigned due date, the RAs would remind students about the assignment via email. In all but two cases, E group students submitted all of their e-journals during their semester abroad, although not always by the assigned due date. In one case, a student did not submit her last three e-journals until six months after she returned to the U.S. In another case, a student never submitted the last couple of e-journals, even though she was contacted a number of times by one of the RAs.

One-on-one follow-up interviews with a subsample of E group students were conducted three-to-five months after students had returned from study abroad. The RA that had been assigned to the student contacted the student, set up the interview time and place (i.e., university campus), and conducted the interview using the questions from the *Follow-up Interview Protocol*. The interviews were tape-recorded. Ten students from each of the two cohorts were selected primarily on the basis of the "richness" of their e-journal entries, but diversity of opinion about the *Guide* (e.g., some students who really liked it, some who were not as enthusiastic), the university at which they were studying, and gender were also taken into consideration in order to

have an interview subsample that was as representative of the study population as possible. All follow-up interviews were then transcribed by the RAs.

Data Analysis Procedures

A number of procedures were used to analyze the data collected in this study. In the case of the *SILC*, *LSS*, *Entrance Questionnaire*, and *Exit Language Contact Profile*, the computer software SPSS was used to produce descriptive statistics, correlations, and statistically significant differences between groups for the data from these measures. Apart from performing tests of correlation with the other measures (which was also done with SPSS), analysis of the *IDI* data required an instrument-specific computer software program called *The Intercultural Development Inventory, Version 2.3*.

Speech Act Measure of Language Gain

Data from the *Speech Act Measure* were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. First, the researchers developed a series of rating criteria to be used by the French and Spanish NSs to assess students' pragmatic ability on each of the request and apology vignettes (see Appendix I). The following rating criteria were used for apologies:

Native Speaker Speech Act Measure Rating Criteria

- Criterion 1: How successful the apology was overall (“Overall Success”), based on the native speaker’s gut intuition about how they would feel if they were the hearer in that situation.
- Criterion 2A: The degree of formality the vignette situation required (three choices: formal, somewhat formal, informal).
- Criterion 2B: The fit between the student’s choice of vocabulary and the level of formality required in the vignette.
- Criterion 2C: The fit between the student’s choice of verb tense/inflection and the level of formality required in the vignette.
- Criterion 2D: The appropriateness of the use of the second person subject pronoun (i.e., *tu/vous* in French and *vos/tú/usted* in Spanish) for the vignette.

For requests, the above criteria were used in addition to four other criteria:

- Criterion 3A: The level of directness that the student demonstrated (three choices: direct, somewhat direct, indirect).
- Criterion 3B: The appropriateness of the student’s level of directness.
- Criterion 4A: The level of politeness that the student demonstrated (three choices: polite, somewhat polite, impolite).
- Criterion 4B: The appropriateness of the student’s level of politeness.

For each of these criteria, the raters evaluated each student's performance on a five-point scale. In addition, raters were asked to provide a brief description of why they chose the rating that they did for each criterion.

A total of six NSs of French and Spanish were hired to evaluate the *Speech Act Measure* data using the rating criteria described above. Two raters from France (both female) both rated all of the French student data; two raters from Spain (one male, one female) rated the Peninsular Spanish student data; and two raters from Latin America (both female; Mexico and El Salvador) rated the Latin American Spanish student data. Thus, each student's data was rated two times, once by each one of the raters for that language or dialect (i.e., French, Peninsular Spanish, Latin American Spanish). In addition, the *Speech Act Measure* was rated "blindly" by the French and Spanish NSs, therefore the raters did not know who the student was or whether a response was from a student's pretest or posttest.

Prior to rating the student *Speech Act Measure* data, French and Spanish NS raters participated in a two-hour training and calibration session with one or two of the researchers. Each language/dialect rater pair participated in a session together; that is, three separate sessions were held: one for the French raters, one for the Peninsular Spanish raters, and one for the Latin American Spanish raters. The sessions each began with a brief explanation of the project. Next, the researchers went over the rating criteria for both apologies and requests with the raters. Raters were asked to look over several examples of the NS baseline data that was collected using the *Speech Act Measure* in order to give them an idea of the range of what NSs do on the same measure. Finally, the raters were asked to use the rating criteria to evaluate two sample student apologies and two sample student requests². All the raters first went through each sample vignette by themselves and marked their scores on the rating sheet. Next, the two raters compared their ratings and if the responses were different, the raters discussed why they had rated the way they did; they then came to a consensus about how they would rate the samples. During the session, the raters also asked the researcher(s) questions to clarify the rating process.

After the French and Spanish NSs finished the ratings, students' scores were entered into SPSS by the researchers. Pre-post gain scores were calculated for each of the rating criteria and these scores were then correlated with the other variables in the study. In order to calculate each student's gain scores on the measure, the scores from each of the two raters were averaged to create the final gain scores.

In addition, the researchers also coded and quantified the use of *semantic formulas* in the apology and request vignettes in the *Speech Act Measure* by both the students as well as by the NSs in the pilot tests. *Semantic formulas* are defined as strategies within a speech act set that if used alone or in combination with other strategies within that set, serve as the speech act and include examples such as an "apology expression" (e.g., "sorry," "*disculpa*," "*desoleé*"), a "promise of non-recurrence" (e.g., "It's not going to happen again."), and an expression of "Appreciation" (e.g., "It would be great if..."). Appendix H provides a list of the semantic formulas coded for both the apologies and requests. For apologies, five semantic formulas were used to code the data: "apology expression," "acknowledgement of responsibility," "explanation," "offer of repair," "promise of non-recurrence." In addition, the supportive move

² Sample data for the Spanish native speaker raters were taken from the pool of data that they were not in charge of rating for this study. Thus, for example, the Latin American raters got sample data from the Peninsular Spanish student data and vice versa. The French NS raters used NNS data from the pilot tests that had been administered.

“intensification” was also coded. Semantic formulas and supportive moves have been found to be important to the content of apologies in various languages (Olshtain & Cohen, 1983). For requests, the head act semantic formulas and supportive moves used for coding were taken originally from Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989) and include 26 different categories (see Appendix H for a full list). The head act in this study was the utterance in the speech act negotiation which has the illocutionary force of a request. The supportive moves included those semantic formulas which typically serve to help make the request polite and to soften the head act. These request formulas have been used since the publication of that work to code requests in a number of languages, including Spanish (see, for example, LePair, 1996; Mir, 1993).

The semantic formulas and supportive moves employed in each vignette were coded and entered into SPSS, allowing the researchers to correlate students’ use of these semantic formulas with their rated scores on the *Speech Act Measure*, as well as to compare the students’ use of semantic formulas and supportive moves to that of the French and Spanish NSs. It should be noted that in some cases it was very easy to identify a particular word or utterance as expressing a particular semantic formula or supportive move – those cases might be said to be prototypical examples of each category. In other cases, however, it was not easily apparent what the speaker’s intention was in using a particular word or utterance, which would be the more marginal examples of a specific semantic formula.

In addition to the quantitative ratings, members of the research team also examined the French and Spanish NS raters’ comments to obtain a more qualitative perspective on students’ pragmatic competence. Trends found in the raters’ comments were recorded and analyzed.

E-journals and Follow-up Interviews

In order to code the e-journal data, the RAs first read through all of their students’ entries and noted down “emergent themes” from the data. Then, the three RAs on the project met and discussed the themes they had each found. These themes were developed into categories that would be used to code the data. In addition to the emergent themes, the RAs added categories to the list that reflected the research questions of the study. A final list of thirteen categories was created and used to code all of the student e-journals. Finally, coded e-journal data was entered into a spreadsheet. The categories used for the e-journal data are listed below:

E-journal Data Coding Categories

1. Language strategy use.
2. Culture strategy use or reflection on culture issues.
3. The *Guide* helped the student better understand and/or analyze his/her own study abroad experiences.
4. Critical incidents which relate to the *Guide*.
5. The *Guide* helped the student deal with a difficult time.
6. Suggestions for improvements to the *Guide*.
7. Things the student did not like about the *Guide*.
8. Critical incidents that do not mention the *Guide* or where the *Guide* does not help the student interpret the situation.

9. The *Guide* made the student aware of and/or affirmed the importance of language and culture strategies that s/he was *already* using.
10. The *Guide* was useful in *reminding* the student about language and culture strategies that s/he knew, but might not have remembered to use.
11. The student observed the speech act behavior of TL NSs.
12. The *Guide* made the student be more proactive about his/her language and culture learning.

With the exception of (7) in the list above, all of the e-journal coding categories were also used to code the follow-up interview data. However, an additional 20 categories were added for the interview data coding which were based on the questions included in the *Follow-up Interview Protocol*. These additional categories are listed below:

Additional Follow-up Interview Coding Categories

1. Culture section the student liked.
2. Culture section the student did not like.
3. Language the section the student liked.
4. Language the section the student did not like.
5. The *Guide* influenced the student's interactions with TL NSs - culture-wise.
6. The *Guide* influenced the student's interactions with TL NSs - language-wise.
7. The *Guide* helped the student improve his/her intercultural skills.
8. The *Guide* did not help the student improve his/her intercultural skills.
9. The *Guide* helped the student improve his/her language skills.
10. The *Guide* did not help the student improve his/her language skills.
11. Student has not used the *Guide* since reentry to maintain intercultural skills.
12. Student has used the *Guide* since reentry to maintain intercultural skills.
13. Student has not used the *Guide* since reentry to maintain language skills.
14. Student has used the *Guide* since reentry to maintain language skills.
15. The *Guide* provided the student with insights into being a U.S. American.
16. The *Guide* did not provide the student with insights into being U.S. American.
17. The extent to which the student feels s/he will use the *Guide* in the future.
18. The *Guide* gave the student the language to be able to express cultural concepts.
19. Other important comments.
20. The *Guide* helped student with the reentry process.

As with the e-journals, each RA went through interview transcripts and coded the data into these 32 categories. The data were then entered into a spreadsheet.

Findings and Interpretations

As mentioned previously, the primary purpose of this research was two-fold: to empirically measure the impact of an educational intervention on study abroad students and to obtain student feedback about the *Students' Guide* – the principle part of the treatment – in order to make revisions to its content. As such, we have decided to report the findings in two sections paralleling these two primary aims. First, the findings for research questions #1-7 dealing with language and culture strategies and the development of speech act ability will be presented, and then the findings for questions #8 and #9, dealing with reactions to the *Students' Guide* and suggestions for revisions will be presented.

Findings for Research Questions #1 through #8

Research Question (1): How do study abroad students receiving a language and culture strategy intervention compare to those who do not with respect to intercultural sensitivity, reported culture strategy use, reported language strategy use, and speech act performance?

Intercultural Sensitivity

As described above, intercultural sensitivity was measured in the study using the *Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI)*. Using one-way analysis of variance and chi square analysis to compare the *IDI* change scores of the E and C groups, there were no statistically significant differences between the two groups, neither on overall intercultural sensitivity nor on any of the individual *IDI* scales. Individual item analysis revealed that only two of the 50 items had change scores in which the difference between E and C groups was statistically significant. These results suggest that the intervention of the *Students' Guide*, pre-departure orientation, and e-journaling did not have a greater impact on E group students' intercultural sensitivity than it did on their C group peers. Nonetheless, this finding is inconsistent with what most E group students reported in their e-journals and in the follow-up interviews, namely that they felt that the *Guide* helped them improve their intercultural skills. Indeed, E group students' descriptions of their experiences abroad (in their e-journals and follow-up interviews) were consistent with greater intercultural understanding and awareness of cultural difference. A possible explanation for the lack of quantitative differences between the E and the C group was that the *IDI* is not nuanced enough to pick up the subtle differences between the two groups that are reflected in the E group journal entries. Secondly, the four-month period of the sojourn was perhaps not long enough for differences on the *IDI* to manifest themselves. Another explanation is that study abroad, of and by itself, has such a powerful impact on the sojourners' intercultural development that it overwhelms the impact of other variables, regardless of the amount or type of predeparture preparation and on-site support for culture learning.

Table 4: IDI Pretest-Posttest Mean Results by Developmental Score and Subscales

	E group Pretest Mean	E group Posttest Mean	E group pre- post change scores	C group Pretest Mean	C group Posttest Mean	C group pre- post change scores
DS (Overall Score)	100.98	104.80	3.82	97.24	102.33	5.09
DD	1.51	1.47	-.04	1.50	1.45	-.05
R	2.19	2.04	-.15	2.36	2.10	-.26
M	3.04	3.00	-.04	3.22	3.22	-.00
AA	3.41	3.63	.22	3.38	3.65	.27
EM	2.07	1.99	-.08	1.98	1.88	-.10

E group, N=42; C group, N=44

Culture Strategy Use

In order to compare the E and C groups' use of culture strategies, an independent samples *t*-test was then run on the mean gain scores for both groups. No statistically significant differences were found between the E and C groups on any of the five *SILC* scales. Item analysis showed that the E and C groups were equally divided across the 52 items in terms of their respective gains in frequency of strategy use. However, on five individual items, presented in Table 5 on the following page, the E and C group gain score differences were statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level or better. In the case of item #2, both groups gained, but the C group had the greater increase. Item #5 shows a gain for the E group, a difference that may be due to the fact that the *Guide* has a section that gives a number of pointers on how to avoid stereotyping another culture (including one's own culture) when describing it. Similarly, the *Guide* provides considerable information about communicating across cultures, which may explain the finding on item #31 in favor of the E group. The results on items #25 and #49 showing gains for the C group and a slight decrease for the E group are harder to interpret. One interpretation is that the findings reflect more the nature of the cross-cultural experiences that all the study abroad students had in their overseas venues and during reentry than it does exposure to the material about the cross-cultural dimension in the *Guide*.

Table 5: Descriptions of *SILC* items with differences between the E and C groups showing a statistical significance at the $p < .05$ level

Item #	<i>SILC</i> Item Description	E group mean gain	C group mean gain	<i>p</i> value
2	I figure out what cultural values might be involved when I encounter a conflict or something goes wrong. (Interpreting Culture)	.10	.43	.06
5	I counter stereotypes others use about people from my country by using generalizations and cultural values instead. (Interpreting Culture)	.64	.14	.06
25	I build relations with local people by finding opportunities to spend time with them. (Communication)	-.05	.48	.05
31	I respect the way people from another culture express themselves. (Communication)	.14	-.20	.03
49	I take a class that will help me keep up with the other culture. (Reentry)	-.40	.36	.05

N=86

Language Strategy Use

As was found for the *SILC* results, when the E and C groups are compared, there were no statistically significant differences between the two groups when the *LSS* items were grouped using either the five-factor model or the original six skill areas. As shown in Table 6, however, eight individual items on the *LSS* were found to show differences in reported strategy use between the E and C groups with statistical significance near or better than $p < .05$. The two Listening items (#9 and #13) are about specific aspects of the language such as NS pronunciation and sentence stress. The E group increase may be attributable to the *Guide*, since it familiarizes students with these features of language and encourages students to pay attention to them.

Table 6: Descriptions of LSS items with differences between the E and C groups showing a statistical significance near or below $p=.05$

Item #	LSS Item Description	E group mean gain	C group mean gain	<i>p</i> value
9	I pay special attention to specific aspects of the language; for example, the way the speaker pronounces certain sounds. (Listening)	.10	-.36	.05
13	I listen for word and sentence stress to see what native speakers emphasize when they speak. (Listening)	.31	-.11	.03
27	I pay attention to the structure of the new word. (Vocabulary)	-.17	.25	.06
28	I break the words into parts that I can identify. (Vocabulary)	-.40	.02	.05
36	I use flash cards in a systematic way to learn new words. (Vocabulary)	-.14	-.64	.04
52	I ask questions as a way to be involved in the conversation. (Speaking)	.38	-.07	.02
61	I use gestures as a way to try and get my meaning across. (Speaking)	.07	-.34	.05
88	I try to understand what has been heard or read without translating it word-for-word into my own language. (Translation)	.57	.07	.02

N=86

The three Vocabulary items (#27, #28 and #36) all showed E group declines in frequency of use, a finding that occurred for the combined sample on the LSS Vocabulary scale as well. One explanation may be that the increased exposure to language in the study abroad environment, where words were being acquired more naturally in a rich context, meant that there was less need to use word attack skills in learning vocabulary.

In terms of speaking strategies, items #52 (being actively involved in TL conversations) and #61 (using gestures to convey meaning) show E group gains compared to the C group decreases. This difference between the groups may reflect the fact that the *Guide* advises students to be actively involved in both of these strategies.

Looking at the last item in which the E group gained more than the C group, on item #88 (a Translation strategy item) the E group reported using word-for-word translation less frequently than the C group. This difference may be an outgrowth of the treatment, since the *Guide* advises students not to depend entirely on such word-to-word translations. Finally, there were two LSS items in which the C group gained more than the E group, namely items #27 and #28, both of which have to do with learning vocabulary.

The fact that the E group did not report using more strategies overall than the C group on either the LSS or the SILC is contrary to what was expected. It was expected that exposure to the language and culture strategies in the *Guide* would have encouraged the E group to use those

strategies more than their C-group peers who did not have the *Guide*. This finding may indicate that the *Guide* simply did not help students increase the frequency of their use of strategies. At the same time, the student e-journals and follow-up interviews showed an overwhelmingly positive response to the *Guide*. One of the underlying premises of the *Guide* is that students may unconsciously use language and culture strategies during their study abroad experience, but that they may not be conscious of their use in a way that makes their overall approach to study abroad strategic. After all, one of the main purposes of the *Guide* is to raise students' awareness about the strategies they do use and to have them evaluate whether those strategies are effective for them and if they are not, to have them try out new strategies. In fact, a number of students commented in the e-journals and follow-up interviews that the *Guide* made them more aware of strategies they were already using and encouraged them to evaluate which strategies were working for them and which were not.

We could argue that an increase in language and culture strategy use across the board may not actually be a desirable outcome of the *Guide*. It is possible that decreased use of certain strategies simply reflects the fact that E group students were becoming more strategic about which strategies would maximize their learning in the study abroad environment – an awareness about being strategic in their learning which they would have acquired through reading the *Guide*. Perhaps this explanation can shed light on the significant differences between the E and C groups on individual items on the *LSS*. While the C group had greater increases in the use of “word attack,” vocabulary learning strategies, the E group had greater increases in the use of “online” listening and speaking strategies. What is unique about the study abroad environment, in comparison with studying a foreign language at home, is the potential to converse with NSs of the TL. Although ideally we would have liked the E group to have used all of the language strategies more frequently, data from the e-journals and follow-up interviews suggest that this may not be realistic for many study abroad students due to time constraints. Many E group students reported that they were so busy during study abroad that they did not have as much time as they would have wished to focus on improving their language and culture skills. Therefore, under a time crunch, the E group students may have chosen those strategies that best maximized what the study abroad environment has to offer (i.e., listening and speaking strategies).

Speech Act Performance

As described, on Criterion 1 (see description in *Data Analysis* section) NSs of French and Spanish rated the overall success of students' performance on each of the apology and request vignettes on the *Speech Act Measure* on a scale from one (not successful) to five (very successful), indicating how pragmatically appropriate the student was on each vignette. The ratings from each of the rater pairs (i.e., Peninsular Spanish raters, Latin American Spanish raters, and French raters) were averaged for each vignette. A mean score for the combined sample was obtained for each vignette and for the measure as a whole (i.e., sum of the scores on all vignettes).

In order to compare the E and the C groups' performance on the *Speech Act Measure*, first a gain score (i.e., posttest score minus pretest score) was calculated for each vignette as well as for a combined score for the entire measure (i.e., the sum of the gain scores on all ten

vignettes), for seven of the nine criteria described above³. Next, the mean gain scores for each group on each of the rating criteria and for each of the vignettes as well for the combined score were submitted to an independent samples *t*-test. Table 7 below displays only the results in which the difference between the E and C groups' raw mean gain scores was found to be statistically significant.

³ Note that two of the criteria (2A and 3A) were not used to run these correlations due to the nature of those criteria.

Table 7: *Speech Act Measure* Ratings: Statistically Significant Differences Between the E and C Groups (Using Raw Mean Gain Scores)

		VIGNETTES												
		Entire Measure	All Apologies	All Requests	Professor			Older person			Peer		Younger Person	
					Slower speech (2)	Paper extension (6)	Prof meeting (9)	Spill wine (1)	Airplane seat (4)	Less food,(8)	Friend's book (3)	Meeting friend (7)	Babysitting spill (5)	Leaving for school (10)
Speech Act Measure Rating Criteria	Criterion 1 (overall success of the apology or request)					E .56* C .01								
	Criterion 2B (fit between choice of vocabulary and formality level)					E .37* C -.08								
	Criteria 2C (fit between choice of verb tense/inflection and formality level)													
	Criterion 2D (fit between subject pronoun and formality level)													
	Criterion 3B (appropriateness of the level of directness)			E 2.38* C 1.09										
	Criterion 4A (level of politeness)													
	Criterion 4B (appropriateness of the level of politeness)													

N=86 * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

As can be seen in Table 7, the only statistically significant difference between the E and C groups on Criterion 1 (“Overall Success”) was found for the “Prof meeting,” in which the E group gains significantly more than the C group. For Criterion 2B, the E group also gained more in their pragmatic appropriateness for their use of vocabulary than the C group. Finally, a significant difference between the two groups was found for Criterion 3B; the E group increased more than the C group in the appropriateness of their level of directness on the five requests combined.

Not shown in Table 7 is the mean score on the entire *Speech Act Measure* for Criterion 1 (“Overall Success”). Although the E group gained more than the C group on Criterion 1 for the entire measure (mean gain scores: E=3.94, C=2.34; standard deviations: E=4.32, C=4.57), the difference between the scores of the two groups was not found to be statistically significant. Although the group means appear different, the standard deviations for both groups were high, pointing to the fact that both groups were heterogeneous with regard to their speech act performance.

A statistically significant difference was found between the E and C groups’ performance on Criterion 1 (“Overall Success”) for the entire measure. However, when individual scores on the entire *Speech Act Measure* were grouped into the following 3 categories: (1) Did worse on the posttest (i.e., negative gain score), (2) No change (i.e., gain score of zero), (3) Gained from pre- to posttest (i.e., positive gain score). Using these categories, it was found that the E group gained more than the C group on the combined score of ten vignettes (i.e., score on the entire instrument), and that this difference was statistically significant. The mean gain scores when using these categories to group students were: E = .74*, C = .41 ($p < .05$). Table 8 shows the frequencies within each of these three categories for the two groups. In terms of zero gain and positive gain, the two groups had similar distributions, and the majority of students in both groups gained from pre- to posttest. The primary difference between the two groups is that many more C group students (N=12) than E group students (N=4) did worse in the posttest compared to the pretest (i.e., they had a negative gain score).

Table 8: *Speech Act Measure* ratings: E and C Group Gain Scores for Criterion 1 (“Overall Success”) on the Entire Measure Grouped into Three Categories

Gain on Criterion 1 for Score on the Entire Measure	E group	C group	Total
Lost points from pre- to posttest (negative gain)	4	12	16
Did not gain or lose points (zero gain)	3	2	5
Gained points from pre- to posttest (positive gain)	35	30	65
Total	42	44	86

Considering that the three significant differences in the raw mean gain scores (Table 8) between the E and C groups all showed greater improvements for the E group, and that the mean gain scores on the entire measure point to greater improvement on the part of the E group, there seems to be evidence for a positive impact of the intervention. That is, students who received the

intervention seem to have been able to improve their speech act performance more than students who did not receive the intervention.

Another pattern found in the *Speech Act Measure* data is worth mentioning. The E and C group raw scores (i.e., not the scores grouped into the three categories “loss,” “no change,” and “gain”) were also grouped into two categories based on study abroad region. The two regions used to group students were “Europe” (France, Spain) and “Latin America” (Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico, Panama). Because there were only two students who studied on the African continent, those two students were left out of this analysis.

The results in Table 9 show that for scores on Criterion 1 (“Overall Success”) on the measure as a whole, and on the “Slower speech,” “Prof meeting,” and “Friend’s book” vignettes, E group students studying in Europe gained significantly more from the pretest to the posttest than did C group students studying in Europe. In addition, the E group had a significantly higher gain on specific vignettes on several other rating criteria, as shown below.

In contrast, as Table 10 shows, there was only one statistically significant difference between the rated gain scores of the E and C group students who studied in Latin America: the E group gained significantly more than the C group on “Prof meeting” for Criterion 2C. No other scores revealed significant differences between the two groups.

These findings may suggest that the intervention had more of an impact on students who studied in Europe than on those who studied abroad in Latin America. Although this finding is difficult to interpret, several possible explanations are hypothesized here nonetheless. First of all, a distinct possibility is that “Latin America” is not a valid category of analysis given that the nine countries included in this group have different dialects and pragmatic norms, not to mention different sociohistorical and economic situations. Thus, one possible explanation is that due to variation among regions, the category “Latin America” is not very meaningful and should be discarded.

A second possibility is that the *Guide* is biased towards the European study abroad experience in some way. A small amount of evidence that could possibly support this explanation was found in the qualitative data. One student who studied in Guatemala suggested that *Guide* be revised to include more information specific to non-European countries. In addition, a study abroad professional from India who used the *Guide* with her students commented that the *Guide* does not contain enough specific information about third world countries.

Third, it is possible that in Latin America students had a deeply different immersion experience that lessened the effects of the *Guide*. What this difference might stem from, however, is not immediately evident. It seems unlikely that students studying abroad in Latin America encountered greater cultural differences than did their peers in Europe, as there are significant cultural differences between the U.S. and all of these countries. Perhaps the most salient difference between the two countries in Europe and many, if not most, of the countries in Latin America has to do with the greater degree of economic inequality found in the societies of the latter. However, the impact that the economic status of a country or region would have on the effect of the *Students’ Guide* on speech act performance is questionable.

In addition, the reader is reminded that while the sample included a robust number of students in Spain, there were only a few students in each Latin American country. Consequently, there are significant limitations in interpreting findings on pragmatics for a given Latin American country.

Finally, it was suggested to the researchers that perhaps the fact that the two Latin American raters came from different countries (El Salvador and Mexico) and were rating the speech act performance of students who studied in nine different countries in some way obfuscated the results from Latin America. For example, it was suggested that the raters may have evaluated students who studied in Argentina more harshly because the pragmatic norms for requests in that country may favor making more direct requests than in some other Latin American countries⁴. In order to explore this possibility, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare the performance on all rated criteria on the *Speech Act Measure* between students studying in the nine countries in Latin America. No statistically significant differences in speech act performance based on country were found for the E group, the C group, nor for the combined sample. Furthermore, any difference in rating between Latin American countries would be assumed to affect the E and C groups equally, which does not help explain the differences between the E and C groups based on region. Therefore, this explanation – although still possible – is not supported by the results.

⁴ This generalization has not been verified by empirical research, however.

Table 9: *Speech Act Measure* Raw Mean Gain Score Ratings for Students Studying in Europe

		VIGNETTES														
		Entire Measure			Professor			Older person			Peer	Younger person				
			All Apologies	All Requests	Slower speech (2)	Paper extension (6)	Prof meeting (9)	Spill wine (1)	Airplane seat (4)	Less food,(8)	Friend's book (3)	Meeting friend (7)	Babysitting spill (5)	Leaving for school (10)		
Speech Act Measure Rating Criteria	Criterion 1 (overall success of the apology or request)	E 4.75* C 1.92			E .73* C .24			E .71* C .21				E .69* C .13				
	Criterion 2B (fit between choice of vocabulary and formality level)															
	Criteria 2C (fit between choice of verb tense/inflection and formality level)															
	Criterion 2D (fit between subject pronoun and formality level)														E .19* C .00	
	Criterion 3B (appropriateness of the level of directness)			E 2.42** C .44												E .60* C -.06
	Criterion 4A (level of politeness)			E .98* C .21	E .27* C -.02											
	Criterion 4B (appropriateness of the level of politeness)															

N=55 * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 10: *Speech Act Measure* Raw Mean Gain Score Ratings for Students studying in Latin America

		VIGNETTES												
		Entire Measure			Professor			Older person			Peer		Younger person	
			All Apologies	All Requests	Slower speech (2)	Paper extension (6)	Prof meeting (9)	Spill wine (1)	Airplane seat (4)	Less food,(8)	Friend's book (3)	Meeting friend (7)	Babysitting spill (5)	Leaving for school (10)
Criterion 1 (overall success of the apology or request)														
Criterion 2B (fit between choice of vocabulary and formality level)														
Criteria 2C (fit between choice of verb tense/inflection and formality level)						E .16* C -.23								
Criterion 2D (fit between subject pronoun and formality level)														
Criterion 3B (appropriateness of the level of directness)														
Criterion 4A (level of politeness)														
Criterion 4B (appropriateness of the level of politeness)														

N=29

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Research Question (2): How do students compare on intercultural sensitivity, culture strategy use, language strategy use, and speech act performance before and after one semester studying abroad?

Although the primary purpose of this research was to examine empirically the impact of the *Students' Guide* on study abroad students' language and culture learning, it was also of interest to the researchers to investigate how the study abroad environment – in and of itself – may have affected students' learning and use of strategies. Not only is there a need for research into students' language and culture learning in study abroad, in general, but there is a gap in the research literature with regard to using strategies to learn language and culture in study abroad. For these reasons, this section will report on the quantitative results for the E and C groups combined into one group.

Intercultural Sensitivity

With regard to intercultural sensitivity – as measured by the *Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI)* – paired *t*-tests were run in order to compare the pre- and posttest intercultural sensitivity scores of the combined sample (N=86). As can be seen in Table 11, when analyzing the *IDI* responses for the E group and the C groups combined (which we will call the “combined sample”), there were statistically significant changes over the 4-month period. The group as a whole shifted in the direction of greater intercultural sensitivity over the course of one semester studying abroad. Their overall intercultural sensitivity (Development Score or DS) increased significantly over time ($p=.001$), and there were declines in all three of the ethnocentrism scales (Denial/Defense, Reversal, Minimization), one of which – the Reversal finding – was statistically significant ($p<.001$). These findings indicate that students became more ethnorelative over time. In addition, there was an increase in the Acceptance/Adaptation scale, which was also significant ($p<.001$). These results suggest that spending one semester studying abroad has a positive impact on students' intercultural sensitivity.

Table 11: Comparison of Pre- and Posttest Mean Scores on the IDI (Combined Sample)

<u>Scales</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>St. Dev.</u>	<u>t value</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sig. (2-tailed)</u>
Defense-Denial (DD)					
DD pretest	1.51	.42	1.33	85	n.s
DD posttest	1.46	.43			
Reversal (R)					
R pretest	2.27	.75	3.02	85	.01**
R posttest	2.07	.77			
Minimization (M)					
M pretest	3.14	.75	.32	85	n.s.
M posttest	3.12	.83			
Acceptance-Adaptation (AA)					
AA pretest	3.24	.47	-4.58	85	.001***
AA posttest	3.48	.43			
Encapsulated Marginality (EM)					
EM pretest	2.02	.88	1.03	85	n.s.
EM posttest	1.93	.85			
Overall Intercultural Development Score (DS)					
DS pretest	99.07	15.34	-3.55	85	.001***
DS posttest	103.54	16.11			

(N=86) * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Culture Strategy Use

Looking at culture strategy use, as Table 12 shows, the results of paired-sample t -tests showed that three of the five *SILC* scales – Interpreting Culture, Nonverbal Communication Strategies, and Culture Shock/Coping Strategies – showed statistically significant shifts between the pre- and the posttest. As hypothesized, the shifts were in the direction of greater frequency of strategy use.

When the data were broken down into specific items, descriptive statistics showed that students used 41 of 52 culture strategies with greater frequency at the end of the semester. These shifts were statistically significant ($p < .05$, $.01$, or $.001$) in 26 of the 41 cases. Decreases in reported frequency of use occurred for only 11 of 52 culture strategies and only one decrease was statistically significant ($p < .05$). Closer inspection of these items showed that the decreases occurred on items pertaining to homestay strategies and on ideas for strategies to use upon returning home. These findings are difficult to interpret since we might have expected an increase in reported homestay strategies from pre- to posttesting, since most of the students were in homestay situations. In addition, we would have thought the students would be more directed to post-study abroad strategies as their overseas experience was ending. On the other hand, their answers to homestay and reentry strategies at time one might have been highly speculative given that these were going to be new experiences for them.

Table 12: Comparison of Pre- and Posttest Mean Scores on the SILC (Combined Sample)

<u>Scales</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>St. Dev.</u>	<u>t value</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sig. (2-tailed)</u>
SILC1 – Interpreting Culture					
SILC1 pretest	3.07	.52	-2.39	85	.05*
SILC1 posttest	3.21	.49			
SILC2 – Nonverbal Communication					
SILC2 pretest	2.49	.74	-4.99	85	.001***
SILC2 posttest	2.91	.57			
SILC2 – Reentry Strategies					
SILC3 pretest	2.15	1.23	.23	85	n.s.
SILC3 posttest	2.12	1.12			
SILC4 – Homestay Strategies					
SILC4 pretest	2.38	1.34	1.14	84	n.s.
SILC4 posttest	2.21	1.15			
SILC5 – Culture Shock/Coping Strategies					
SILC5 pretest	2.23	1.20	-4.93	83	.001***
SILC5 posttest	2.30	.84			

(N=86) * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Language Strategy Use

Moving to the results for the *LSS*, it was found that the combined sample reported using 44 of the 89 total language strategies on average more frequently in the posttest compared to the pretest. For 14 of those strategies, the increase in frequency of use from pre- to posttest was statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level. The individual *LSS* items were then grouped into the categories produced by factor analysis of the instrument and examined. A paired-samples *t*-test found that four of the five *LSS* factor groupings of items that resulted from the confirmatory factor analysis were found to have statistically significant shifts in frequency use between pre- and posttest (see Table 13). Two of the factors – Speaking and Listening – showed movement towards a higher frequency of reported strategy use, whereas Learning Structure and Vocabulary, and Reading showed a decline in frequency of use from pre- to posttest. The context of study abroad may help explain these findings. While abroad, students are likely to have more frequent opportunities than they would have at home to interact with NSs. Therefore, strategies for speaking and listening effectively may become more important – and more frequently used – in the study abroad context.

Table 13: Comparison of Pre- and Posttest Mean Scores on the LSS (Combined Sample)

<u>Scales</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>St. Dev.</u>	<u>t value</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sig. (2-tailed)</u>
LSS1 – Structure/Vocabulary					
LSS1 pretest	2.53	.47	3.71	85	.001***
LSS1 posttest	2.34	.43			
LSS2 – Speaking					
LSS2 pretest	2.57	.54	-6.25	85	.001***
LSS2 posttest	2.90	.46			
LSS3 – Listening					
LSS3 pretest	3.08	.45	-2.08	85	.05*
LSS3 posttest	3.17	.42			
LSS4 – Reading					
LSS4 pretest	2.46	.58	4.17	85	.001***
LSS4 posttest	2.23	.48			
LSS5 – Ask for Clarification					
LSS5 pretest	3.06	.66	.96	85	n.s.
LSS5 posttest	2.98	.66			

(N=86) * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Speech Act Performance

With regard to the combined sample's results on the *Speech Act Measure*, a paired-samples *t*-test shows that the mean for students' rated scores on the measure as a whole on Criterion 1, was significantly higher ($p < .001$) in the posttest (37.22) than in the pretest (34.09) (see Table 14). This result shows that the combined sample improved in their speech act performance on the entire *Speech Act Measure* over the course of one semester studying abroad.

Looking at the rated mean scores on the ten individual vignettes⁵, it was found that in all cases the combined sample's mean was higher in the posttest than in the pretest (see Table 14 below). The pre-post gains were statistically significant at the level of $p < .05$ in all cases except for in the "Meeting friend" vignette. These results again suggest that students' performance on the apologies and requests on the *Speech Act Measure* was rated as more pragmatically appropriate after one semester of studying abroad.

⁵ Note that the odd-numbered vignettes are apologies and the even-numbered vignettes are requests.

Table 14: Comparison of Pre- and Posttest Mean Scores on Criterion 1, “Overall Success,” on the Speech Act Measure (Combined Sample)

Vignette	Mean	St. Dev.	t value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Entire Measure (combined score of vignettes 1-10)					
Pretest	34.09	5.1	-6.43	85	.000***
Posttest	37.22	4.5			
Vignette 1: “Spill wine”					
Pretest	3.98	.87	-2.90	85	.01**
Posttest	4.26	.66			
Vignette 2: “Slower speech”					
Pretest	3.62	.95	-4.13	85	.001***
Posttest	4.09	.81			
Vignette 3: “Friend’s book”					
Pretest	3.34	.84	-2.49	85	.05*
Posttest	3.59	.93			
Vignette 4: “Airplane seat”					
Pretest	3.56	.91	-2.72	85	.01**
Posttest	3.86	.95			
Vignette 5: “Babysitting spill”					
Pretest	3.04	.91	-2.29	85	.05*
Posttest	3.32	.85			
Vignette 6: “Paper extension”					
Pretest	3.36	.83	-4.76	85	.001***
Posttest	3.83	.90			
Vignette 7: “Meeting friend”					
Pretest	3.12	1.1	-1.58	85	n.s.
Posttest	3.31	1.2			
Vignette 8: “Less food”					
Pretest	2.84	.88	-2.65	85	.01**
Posttest	3.16	.99			
Vignette 9: “Prof meeting”					
Pretest	3.60	.80	-2.60	85	.01**
Posttest	3.87	.73			
Vignette 10: “Leaving for school”					
Pretest	3.62	.99	-2.57	85	.05*
Posttest	3.94	.95			

(N=86) * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Research Question (3): Are gains in speech act performance related to prior language and culture experience, demographic variables, reported language and culture strategy use, or study abroad language contact variables?

Speech Act Performance and Background Variables

Selected variables from the *Background Questionnaire* and one variable from the *IDI* (i.e., a question about prior intercultural experience) were used to examine what affect the prior language and cultural experiences and demographics of the sample might have had on students' rated gains in speech act performance. These background variables were analyzed looking individually at the E group, the C group, and the combined sample. However, the combined sample was the only group with statistically significant results, which are reported below.

Using an independent samples *t*-test, three binary variables, "gender," "academic major" (i.e., "major in the TL" vs. "other major"), and "study of other languages" (i.e., "had studied other languages besides the TL" and "had **not** studied other languages besides the TL") were found to have no significant impact on students' rated gains on the *Speech Act Measure*. Two variables that did have a significant impact on the combined sample's rated gain on the *Speech Act Measure*, however, were "prior experience abroad" and "number of years of study of the TL." In the first case, it was found that those students who had never lived abroad before this study abroad experience ("NA"; N=32) gained significantly more on the entire measure (for Criterion 1) than those who had lived abroad before ("AB"; N=54) ("NA", M=4.31*; "AB", M=2.42; $p<.05$). As can be seen in Table 3 above, the amount of time that students had previously spent abroad ranged from less than 3 months to more than 10 years. A one-way ANOVA found that using the 6 categories of time previously spent abroad shown in Table 2 did not produce any statistically significant differences in *Speech Act Measure* gain scores among those 6 groups. Second, the number of years that students reported having studied the TL prior to studying abroad, when grouped into two categories, was found to have a statistically significant affect on students' Criterion 1 ("Overall Success") gain scores for the "Prof meeting" apology vignette. Students who reported having studied the TL for 3 or more years prior to leaving for study abroad ("3+"; N=13) had a higher rated mean gain score than those who had studied the TL for less than 3 years prior to leaving for study abroad ("<3"; N=73) ("3+", M=.88*; "<3", M=.17; $p<.05$).

Therefore, while there were no significant differences between students' performance on the *Speech Act Measure* based on gender, academic major, or previous study of languages other than the TL, two variables did produce significant differences: first, students who had never lived abroad previously improved their overall speech act performance more than students with previous experience abroad; second, students who had studied the TL for more than 3 years before going abroad improved more on the "Prof meeting" vignette than those who had studied the TL for less than three years. With regard to the first finding, those students who had not been abroad before may have started out with lower language proficiency, a situation that would have likely translated into lower pragmatic performance as well. Thus, lower proficiency students may have had more to gain. If the ACTFL proficiency scale is taken as an example, it takes a greater amount of knowledge of the TL to move from the "intermediate" to the "advanced" level than it does to move from the "beginner" to the "intermediate" level. This finding parallels previous research on language learning in study abroad which has found that lower proficiency

students tend to make greater gains in L2 acquisition (Brecht, Davidson, & Ginsberg, 1995; De Keyser, 1991; Freed, 1990; Marriott, 1995). However, none of those studies looked at the acquisition of L2 pragmatics, an area in which advanced students may be more equipped to make gains (Kasper, 1996). It is also possible that newcomers to study abroad were also more eager learners and consequently registered larger gains for that reason. Also, once in the country, they then had the exposure to NS input on pragmatic behaviors.

With regard to the second finding, the apology vignette “Prof meeting” may call for especially sophisticated linguistic maneuvering since the interlocutor is higher in social status (i.e., a distinguished professor) and the infraction is relatively high (i.e., forgetting a meeting with the professor for the second time). It may be that successfully apologizing to a person of higher status in a high infraction situation requires specific cultural knowledge. It might be expected that the initially more advanced students – with an already high level of linguistic resources – would have more mental energy available to focus on culturally-appropriate behavior and not just on linguistic issues. Another possible interpretation is that the initially more advanced students took more classes in the TL in the host country with professors not used to catering to the needs of L2 learners (and therefore, not as forgiving of pragmatic errors as, say, a language instructor). Those students would thus have had more interactions with “mainstream” professors in the TL through which they learned the appropriate levels of politeness, formality, or the most effective cultural behaviors when addressing a professor in a TL professor-student interchange. In fact, when the two groups “3+ years” and “<3 years” were compared in terms of whether they enrolled in classes intended for host country university students (i.e., not classes designed for study abroad students), there was a statistically significant difference (at the $p < .01$ level): the “3+” students enrolled in more courses intended for TL NSs than “<3” students.

Speech Act Performance and Reported Language Strategy Use

In order to explore the connection between higher reported use of language-learning and language-use strategies and rated gains in speech act performance, items on the *Language Strategy Survey (LSS)* and rated gain scores on the *Speech Act Measure* were tested for significant correlations. The researchers posited that increased use of language strategies would lead to gains in pragmatic appropriateness on apologies and requests. Tests were run for the combined sample and for the E and C groups separately. Whereas no significant correlations were found for the combined sample, numerous such correlations were found for the E and C groups individually.

Table 15 below shows the significant correlations for the E and C groups on *Speech Act Measure* Criterion 1 (“Overall Success”) for both the score on the entire measure and the scores on individual vignettes and gain on individual items on the *LSS*. As can be seen, the majority (nine out of twelve) of significant correlations between these two measures were in favor of the E group. In addition, the only item showing a negative correlation between strategy use and rated gain on speech acts was for the E group on item #85 which reads: “I translate in my head while I am reading to help me understand the text.” The negative correlation indicates that as E group students used this strategy less, their gain on the *Speech Act Measure* increased. The decrease in use of dependence on translation is generally seen as positive since it suggests that students have begun to think directly in the TL. The other 11 correlations for the E and C groups

are positive. Overall, then, the data show that increased self-reporting by students in use of language strategies is correlated with increased gain on rated speech act performance.

Another trend observed in the data was that E and C group correlations are fairly equally distributed between interlocutors of higher, equal, and lower social status and social distance. Thus, the relationship between language strategy use and gain on the *Speech Act Measure* does not seem to differ based on the characteristics of the interlocutors in the vignettes.

Considering the E group correlations on Criterion 1 of overall success, two listening strategies (#6 and #17) were found to correlate positively with rated gain on vignettes “Slower speech” (.43**) and “Friend’s book” (.44**), respectively. Another strategy, item #23 (“Use the speakers’ tone of voice as a clue to the meaning of what they are saying”) was found to correlate positively with both gain on the entire *Speech Act Measure* (.62***) as well as with gain on two other individual apology vignettes, “Prof meeting” (.53**) and “Friend’s book” (.50**). This finding suggests that E group students may have been able to improve their language ability by reading about this strategy in the *Guide* and then becoming more strategic about listening by not only paying attention to words, but also to the tone of voice.

The only item in the *LSS* which focuses explicitly on the strategic learning of speech acts, item #56, also correlated positively with “Leaving for school” (.52***), for the E group. Although it might be expected that students would have less difficulty with this particular vignette given that the interlocutor (i.e., Rachel, the host sibling) is of lower social status and distance, perhaps students did not have a lot of practice making requests of younger host siblings, and therefore the strategies for learning speech acts contained in the *Guide* had a more significant impact on this less frequent speech act situation.

A reading strategy (#64) and a writing strategy (#78) were found to correlate with gain on the entire measure (.42** and .43**, respectively) and, in the case of item #64, additionally with “Slower speech” (.48**). Lastly, three translation strategies, #78, #85, and #87, were found to correlate with “Prof meeting” and “Friend’s book,” which are both apology vignettes. The correlations with items #78 (.43**) and #87 (.44**) were both positive, while the correlation for item #85 (-.46**) was negative.

The C group was found to have three significant correlations between their reported language strategy use and their rated gain on the *Speech Act Measure*. The first two of these correlations are between vocabulary learning strategies, #38 and #45, and vignettes “Airplane seat” (-.43**) and “Spill wine” (.41**), respectively. Thus, increased use of one vocabulary learning strategy is related to improvement on the *Speech Act Measure*, while decreased use of another vocabulary strategy is related to improvement. In addition, the C group’s gain in use of a speaking strategy, #50, was found to correlate with gain on the “Prof meeting” vignette (.41**).

Table 16 shows correlations between the scores on Criterion 1 for all apologies and all requests separately and reported gain in frequency of use of language strategies. The E group was found to have two significant correlations, the first on two listening strategy items, #22 (.43**) and #23 (.65***). Both of these correlations were positive, suggesting that increased use of these strategies was associated with increased gain on speech act performance. The C group had three correlations; one on a listening strategy item, #25 (.41**), one on a vocabulary learning strategy item, #38 (-.41**), and one on a reading strategy, #64 (.44**). The negative correlation

on the item #38, “review words periodically so I don’t forget them,” suggests that reduced use of reviewing vocabulary words was associated with higher gain scores on the *Speech Act Measure*.

Tables 17 through 22 show the significant correlations between the *LSS* and the other Spanish and French NS rating criteria (Criteria 2-4) for the *Speech Act Measure*. All of the tables included below look at individual items on the *LSS*. Correlations were also run with the *LSS* factors and the items grouped by the *LSS* skill-based sections, but no significant correlations with the *Speech Act Measure* ratings were found. When looking at both the E and C groups individually, it can be seen in the tables below that there are a number of significant correlations between their *LSS* gain scores and the *Speech Act Measure* ratings for both the E and the C groups. There does not seem to be a particular pattern in which the correlations consistently group around particular strategies, or in which particular vignettes consistently show increased numbers of correlations. Several specific observations about the data shown in these tables can be made, however. First, the strategy on the *LSS* that might be expected to correlate highly with speech act performance – that is, #56 (“I figure out and model NSs’ language patterns when apologizing, requesting, or complaining”) – does in fact have eight positive correlations on various vignettes throughout the different criteria. All but one of these correlations is for the E group students, with one being for the C group (see Table 17). This finding suggests that increased use of speech act strategy #56 was correlated with rated gain on the *Speech Act Measure* primarily for the E group. The intervention that the E group received had a specific emphasis on speech acts; both the pre-departure orientation and the *Guide* included strategies for learning how to perform speech acts in a L2. Therefore, the correlations can be interpreted as indicating that the intervention may have had a positive impact by encouraging students to approach learning speech acts strategically.

The second observation is that in three cases – two for the E group and one for the C group – the strategy “I ask for help from my conversational partner” (item #57) correlated negatively with gain on vignettes “Friend’s book” (E group = -.42**; see Table 17), “Babysitting spill” (E group = -.43**; see Table 18), and “Less food” (C group = -.41**; see Table 19). Thus, despite the fact that a high percentage of the sample (42%) reported having participated in a conversation partner exchange during their semester abroad, a decrease in the use of asking a conversation partner for help was correlated with an increase in gain on speech act performance. First of all, a brief discussion of the nature of the conversation partner exchange is in order. The most typical kind of conversation partner exchange that students in this study described participating in was the “tandem” model in which two learners of each other’s native language meet on a regular basis and practice each language for approximately half of the time of the meeting. Most students reported that they were matched with their conversation partner through a program at their host institution. Although some students reported meeting frequently with their partner, other students indicated that they had actually met very few times with the partner, in many cases due to busy schedules. Some female students reported being turned off by the program as they were matched with local male students who were more interested in romance than language learning. As such, it is somewhat difficult to interpret this finding because each “partnership” was likely quite different in terms of the amount of contact with the TL and with the relationship between the student and his or her partner.

At the same time, this finding is somewhat surprising considering that having a host country conversation partner seems like a good opportunity to get more exposure to the TL and the host culture. The fact that students did not seem to use their conversation partner as a

resource to improve their speech act performance has indirect support from the fact that none of the E group students interviewed mentioned their conversation partner as one of the factors that helped them improve either their language or their culture skills.

Third, for the strategy “I imitate the way NSs talk” (item #7), it was found that as C group students increased their use of this strategy, their rated speech act performance increased, whereas for E group students the opposite was true – that is, if they reported less frequent use of this strategy at the end of the semester, they had greater gain on the *Speech Act Measure*. As can be seen, the C group had three positive correlations between this listening strategy (item #7) and the “Slower speech” vignette on Criterion 2B (Fit between vocabulary and formality) (.43**), “Slower speech” on Criterion 4A (Level of politeness) (.40**), and All Requests on Criterion 4A (.45**). The E group, on the other hand, has one negative correlation (-.41**) for this strategy on “Slower speech” for Criterion 2B. Thus, it appears that using this strategy more frequently helped C group students gain in rated speech act performance on several vignettes, whereas the same was not true for the E group students. This finding is difficult to interpret in that it would be desirable for the E group to use this strategy more frequently as well. Nevertheless, we will put forward several hypotheses to explain this finding. First of all, perhaps in the absence of formal input about types of language learner strategies, the C group saw “imitating competent speakers of the language” as a positive thing, while the E group’s strategy use was more diversified, given what they had learned about in the *Guide* and from e-journaling with the RAs. Another possibility is that the E group saw imitation as a negative thing in that they did not want to be seen as trying to directly replicate NSs’ pragmatic behavior; rather, they wanted to demonstrate their ability to strike out on their own and not to imitate.

Table 15: Significant correlations between rated gain on the *Speech Act Measure of Language Gain* on Criterion 1 (“Overall Success”) and gain in frequency of reported use of strategies on the *Language Strategy Survey* (LSS)

		VIGNETTES										
		Entire Measure	Professor			Older person			Peer		Younger person	
			Slower speech (2)	Paper extension (6)	Prof meeting (9)	Spill wine (1)	Airplane seat (4)	Less food (8)	Friend's book (3)	Meeting friend (7)	Babysitting spill (5)	Leaving for school (10)
Language Strategy Survey Items	Associate the sound of a word or phrase in the new language with the sound of a familiar word. (#6)		E .43** C ---									
	Understand what I hear without translating it word-for-word. (#17)							E .44** C ---				
	Use the speakers' tone of voice as a clue to the meaning of what they are saying. (#23)	E .62*** C ---			E .53** C ---				E .50*** C ---			
	Review words periodically so I don't forget them. (#38)					E --- C -.43**						
	Practice saying new expressions to myself. (#45)				E --- C .41**							
	Direct the conversation to familiar topics. (#50)				E --- C .41**							
	Figure out and model NSs' language patterns when apologizing, requesting, or complaining. (#56)											E .52*** C ---
	Find things to read for pleasure in the target language. (#64)	E .42** C ---	E .48** C ---									
	Find a different way to express the idea when I don't know the correct expression to use. (#78)	E .43** C ---							E .43** C ---			
	Translate in my head while I am reading to help me understand the text. (#85)				E -.46** C ---							
Put my own language out of mind and think only in the target language as much as possible. (#87)				E .44** C ---								

(E group N=42, C group N=44) * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 16: Correlations between gain on the *Language Strategies Survey* and gain on Criterion 1 of the *Speech Act Measure* (apology and request vignettes grouped separately)

		LSS mean gain score	Apology vignettes	Request vignettes
Language Strategy Survey Items	Ask for clarification if I don't understand it the first time around. (#22)	E .05 C -.18	E .43** C ---	
	Use the speakers' tone of voice as a clue to the meaning of what they are saying. (#23)	E .17 C .07	E .65*** C ---	
	Draw on my general background knowledge to get the main idea. (#25)	E -.05 C -.07	E --- C .41**	
	Review words periodically so I don't forget them. (#38)	E .10 C -.05		E --- C -.41**
	Find things to read for pleasure in the target language. (#64)	E .48 C .34		E .44** C ---

(E group N=42, C group N=44)

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 17: Significant correlations between rated gain on Criterion 2B (“Fit between choice of vocabulary and formality level”) on the *Speech Act Measure* and gain in frequency of reported use of strategies on the *Language Strategy Survey (LSS)*

		VIGNETTES										
		Entire Measure	Professor			Older person			Peer		Younger person	
			Slower speech (2)	Paper extension (6)	Prof meeting (9)	Spill wine (1)	Airplane seat (4)	Less food (8)	Friend's book (3)	Meeting friend (7)	Babysitting spill (5)	Leaving for school (10)
Language Strategy Survey Items	Imitate the way native speakers talk. (#7)	E -.41** C .43**										
	Listen for word and sentence stress to see what native speakers emphasize when they speak. (#13)										E .40** C ---	
	Pay attention to the rise and fall of speech by native speakers – the “music” of it. (#15)								E --- C -.41**			
	Ask speakers to repeat what they said if it wasn't clear to me. (#20)							E -.42** C ---				
	Make a mental image of new words. (#32)			E -.50*** C ---								
	Practice new grammatical structures in different situations to build my confidence level in using them. (#46)										E -.45** C ---	
	Direct the conversation to familiar topics. (#50)			E --- C .45**		E --- C .44**						
	Figure out and model NSs' language patterns when apologizing, requesting, or complaining. (#56)					E --- C .42**						
	Ask for help from my conversational partner. (#57)							E -.42** C ---				
	Switch back to my own language momentarily if I know that the person I'm talking to can understand what is being said. (#62)		E --- C -.45**									
	Find things to read for pleasure in the target language. (#64)	E .40** C ---	E .44** C ---		E .44** C ---							
	Wait to edit my writing until all my ideas are down on paper. (#81)							E .55*** C ---				

		VIGNETTES										
		Entire Measure	Professor			Older person			Peer		Younger person	
			Slower speech (2)	Paper extension (6)	Prof meeting (9)	Spill wine (1)	Airplane seat (4)	Less food (8)	Friend's book (3)	Meeting friend (7)	Babysitting spill (5)	Leaving for school (10)
Put my own language out of mind and think only in the target language as much as possible. #87)				E .42** C ---								
Try to understand what has been heard or read without translating it word-for-word into my own language. (#88)				E .42** C ---								

(E group N=42, C group N=44) * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 18: Significant correlations between rated gain on Criterion 2C (“Fit between choice of verb tense/inflection and formality level”) on the *Speech Act Measure* and gain in frequency of reported use of strategies on the *Language Strategy Survey (LSS)*

		VIGNETTES										
		Entire Measure	Professor			Older person			Peer		Younger person	
			Slower speech (2)	Paper extension (6)	Prof meeting (9)	Spill wine (1)	Airplane seat (4)	Less food (8)	Friend's book (3)	Meeting friend (7)	Babysitting spill (5)	Leaving for school (10)
<i>Language Strategy Survey Items</i>	Practice sounds in the target language that are very different from sounds in my own language to become comfortable with them. (#5)					E -.48*** C ---						
	Imitate the way native speakers talk. (#7)						E --- C .42**					
	Listen for word and sentence stress to see what native speakers emphasize when they speak. (#13)		E --- C -.49**									
	Understand what I hear without translating it word-for-word. (#17)						E -.41** C ---					

	VIGNETTES										
	Entire Measure	Professor			Older person			Peer		Younger person	
		Slower speech (2)	Paper extension (6)	Prof meeting (9)	Spill wine (1)	Airplane seat (4)	Less food (8)	Friend's book (3)	Meeting friend (7)	Babysitting spill (5)	Leaving for school (10)
Use the speakers' tone of voice as a clue to the meaning of what has already been said. (#23)	E .40** C ---										
Draw on my general background knowledge to get the main idea. (#25)					E .42** C ---						
Look at meaningful parts of the word to remind me of the meaning of the word. (#39)			E .50*** C ---								
Practice new grammatical structures in different situations to build my confidence level in using them. (#46)					E .46*** C ---						
Figure out and model NSs' language patterns when apologizing, requesting, or complaining. (#56)										E .45** C ---	
Ask for help from my conversation partner. (#57)									E -.43** C ---		
Find things to read for please in the target language. (#64)	E .42** C ---										
Find a different way to express the idea when I don't know the correct expression to use. (#78)							E --- C -.41**				
Ask for feedback from others, especially native speakers of the language. (#83)						E -.44** C ---					
Translate parts of a conversation into my own language to help me remember the conversation. (#86)									E --- C -.42**		
Try to understand what has been heard or read without translating it word-for-word into my own language. (#88)			E .40** C ---								

(E group N=42, C group N=44) * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

	VIGNETTES										
	Entire Measure	Professor			Older person			Peer		Younger person	
		Slower speech (2)	Paper extension (6)	Prof meeting (9)	Spill wine (1)	Airplane seat (4)	Less food (8)	Friend's book (3)	Meeting friend (7)	Babysitting spill (5)	Leaving for school (10)
Use new words in a variety of ways. (#42)										E .48*** C ---	
Use idiomatic expressions in the new language. (#44)							E --- C .41**				
Anticipate what will be said based on what has been said so far. (#53)							E - .49*** C ---				
Engage in topics even when they aren't familiar to me. (#54)								E --- C -.62***			
Encourage others to correct errors in my speaking. (#55)				E --- C .54***							
Figure out and model NSs' language patterns when apologizing, requesting, or complaining. (#56)						E .41** C ---				E .47** C ---	
Ask for help from my conversational partner. (#57)						E --- C -.41**					
Use words from my own language, but say it in a way that sounds like words in the target language. (#59)										E --- C .49***	
Find things to read for pleasure in the target language. (#64)								E --- C -.41**			
Find reading material that is at or near my level. (#65)								E --- C -.48**			

(E group N=42, C group N=44) * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 20: Significant correlations between rated gain on Criterion 3B (“Appropriateness of speaker’s level of directness”) on the *Speech Act Measure* and gain in frequency of reported use of strategies on the *Language Strategy Survey (LSS)*

		VIGNETTES										
		All Request Vignettes	Professor			Older person			Peer		Younger person	
			Slower speech (2)	Paper extension (6)	Prof meeting (9)	Spill wine (1)	Airplane seat (4)	Less food (8)	Friend’s book (3)	Meeting friend (7)	Babysitting spill (5)	Leaving for school (10)
<i>Language Strategy Survey Items</i>	Use the speakers’ tone of voice as a clue to the meaning of what has already been said. (#23)	E .42** C ---										E .53*** C ---
	Make an effort to remember the situation where I first heard or saw the word or remember the page or sign where I saw it written. (#40)	E --- C .40**		E --- C .44**								
	Figure out and model NSs’ language patterns when apologizing, requesting, or complaining. (#56)	E .45** C ---										
	Find things to read for pleasure in the target language. (#64)	E .40** C ---										
	Find reading material that is at or near my level. (#65)	E .41** C ---										
	Put my own language out of mind and think only in the target language as much as possible. (#87)											E .46** C ---

(E group N=42, C group N=44) * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 21: Significant correlations between rated gain on Criterion 4A (“Whether the speaker was ‘polite’, ‘somewhat polite’, or ‘impolite’”) the *Speech Act Measure* and gain in frequency of reported use of strategies on the *Language Strategy Survey (LSS)*

		VIGNETTES										
		All Request Vignettes	Professor			Older person			Peer		Younger person	
			Slower speech (2)	Paper extension (6)	Prof meeting (9)	Spill wine (1)	Airplane seat (4)	Less food (8)	Friend's book (3)	Meeting friend (7)	Babysitting spill (5)	Leaving for school (10)
Language Strategy Survey Items	Imitate the way native speakers talk. (#7)	E --- C .45**	E --- C .40**									
	Listen for key words that seem to carry the bulk of the meaning. (#12)											E --- C .45**
	Direct the conversation to familiar topics. (#50)						E --- C .61***					
	Figure out and model NSs' language patterns when apologizing, requesting, or complaining. (#56)											E .57*** C ---
	Use words from my own language, but say it in a way that sounds like words in the target language. (#59)	E .43** C ---										

(E group N=42, C group N=44) * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 22: Significant correlations between rated gain on Criterion 4B (“Appropriateness of speaker’s level of politeness”) on the *Speech Act Measure* and gain in frequency of reported use of strategies on the *Language Strategy Survey (LSS)*

		VIGNETTES										
		All Request Vignettes	Professor			Older person			Peer		Younger person	
			Slower speech (2)	Paper extension (6)	Prof meeting (9)	Spill wine (1)	Airplane seat (4)	Less food (8)	Friend’s book (3)	Meeting friend (7)	Babysitting spill (5)	Leaving for school (10)
Language Strategy Survey Items	Ask native speakers about unfamiliar sounds that I hear. (#8)											E .44** C ---
	Listen for key words that seem to carry the bulk of the meaning. (#12)		E .50*** C ---									
	Use the speakers’ tone of voice as a clue to the meaning of what has already been said. (#23)											E .46** C ---
	Draw on my general background knowledge to get the main idea. (#25)					E .41** C ---						
	Break words into parts I can identify. (#28)					E .41**						
	Practice new action verbs by acting them out. (#35)	E --- C -.41**										
	Make an effort to remember the situation where I first heard or saw the word or remember the page or sign where I saw it written. (#40)		E --- C .40**									
	Practice using familiar words in different ways. (#43)											E .43** C ---
	Practice saying new expressions to myself. (#45)		E --- C .44**									
	Direct the conversation to familiar topics. (#50)						E --- C .50***					
	Figure out and model NSs’ language patterns when apologizing, requesting, or complaining. (#56)											E .54*** C ---
	Use words from my own language, but say it in a way that sounds like words in the target language. (#59)	E .42** C ---										
Find things to read for pleasure in the target language. (#64)											E .41** C ---	

(E group N=42, C group N=44) * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Speech Act Performance and Reported Culture Strategy Use

The research team was also interested in exploring whether culture strategy use was statistically related to speech act performance. Because speech acts require not only linguistic, but also **cultural** knowledge in order to be pragmatically appropriate, it was posited that students who used culture learning strategies more frequently may also improve in their speech act performance. In order to investigate a potential relationship between such variables, the *Speech Act Measure* rated gain scores were tested for correlations with students' reported gain in frequency of strategy use on the individual items, on the five factors, and on the nine original sub-scales of the *Strategies Inventory for Learning Culture (SILC)*. Tables 23 through 27 show the significant correlations that were found for each of the *Speech Act Measure* rating criteria and for the E and C groups separately. Both groups were found to have significant correlations between gain in culture strategy use and rated language gain. Positive correlations suggest that increases in use of a culture strategy or set of culture strategies were related to increased gain on speech act performance, while negative correlations suggest that a reduction in use of a strategy or strategies was related to higher language gain.

Correlations on Criterion 1, "Overall Success"

E Group: Coping Strategies and Overall Success

Looking first at the correlations between the *SILC* and Criterion 1 ("Overall Success") on the *Speech Act Measure* vignettes (see Table 23), as can be seen there are a total of 14 correlations, 13 of which are positive and one of which is negative. The majority (8) of the correlations are with the C group, with the E group showing six correlations. Considering the E group first, one particular culture strategy, #11 ("I use a variety of coping strategies when I feel like I have culture shock overload") is correlated with the E group's mean rated gain scores on the entire *Speech Act Measure*, and with "Friend's book" and "Babysitting spill," which are both apologies. The correlations were .44, .40, and .46, respectively, with a *p*-value less than .01. The *Guide* contains a section which encourages students to use coping strategies when they have language or culture fatigue, a section which many E group students reported (in their e-journals) finding very helpful while studying abroad. Thus, it appears that the coping strategies may have had a role in helping E group students improve their apology and request performance. Indeed, making requests and apologies in a L2 can be a stressful activity since learners may not have fully acquired the capacity to be sure that they are not being offensive to the people with whom they are requesting and apologizing. Therefore, learning how to cope with language stress and not giving in to frustration could be a distinct benefit for learning speech acts.

E Group: Strategies for Getting Involved in the Host Culture and Overall Success

Two other *SILC* items, "I participate in sports and other activities" (#14) and "I go to the market in another culture and interact with people" (#42) were found to correlate with Criterion 1 on "Prof meeting," the respective correlations being .57*** and .42**. What the latter two items may have in common is the proactive involvement with people in the target culture, something which is encouraged in the *Guide*. Finally, there was an E group correlation between

item #49 (“I take a class that will help me keep up with the other culture”) – categorized in the *SILC* as a reentry strategy – and the “Less food” vignette.

C Group: Strategies for Interpreting Culture

For the C group, a pattern can be seen in the first four *SILC* items which correlated with *Speech Act Measure* rated gain on Criterion 1. That is, items #3, #4, #5, and #20 all have to do with making interpretations about another culture. These items correlated respectively with “Spill wine” (.45**) and the Entire Measure (.60***), “Babysitting spill” (.45*), “Paper extension” (.47***), and “Babysitting spill” (.45**). The other three correlations are with diverse items: item #17 (“I observe the behavior of people from another culture”) and “Slower speech” (.40**); item #27 (“I use different types of communication styles when talking with someone from another culture”) and “Slower speech” (.40**); and finally, item #47 (“I find a group of people who have had similar experiences to talk to and share experiences”), a reentry item (-.43**). As can be seen, the first seven correlations are positive, suggesting that as the reported frequency of these strategies increased, the C group’s gain on the *Speech Act Measure* also increased. Decreased use of the reentry strategy, #47, was correlated with language gain. Because the C group did not receive the intervention of this study, it must be assumed that the C group used these strategies more frequently as a result of their experiences in the study abroad environment. In addition, some C group students (as well as some E group students) participated in study abroad programs with a culture-learning component, which may have also been a factor in the C group’s learning. In a follow-up study with a subsample of the C group students, Hoff (2005) found evidence to support the assertion that other sources of support for culture learning (e.g., onsite advising and classes with a cultural component) seem to have helped the C group students improve their understanding of culture and intercultural sensitivity.

SILC Factors

Table 24 shows the significant correlations found between performance on Criterion 1 of the *Speech Act Measure* and reported strategy use on the *SILC* when grouped into the five *SILC* factors described above. Each group had two correlations. The E group had one positive correlation between Factor 5 (“Reentry Strategies”) and “Prof meeting” (.42**) and another between Factor 4 (“Culture Shock and Coping Strategies”) and “Spill wine” (.41**). On two different factors, 1 (“Interpreting Culture”) and 3 (“Homestay Strategies”), the C group had negative correlations on “Less food” (-.40**) and All Requests (-.41**), respectively. The negative correlation with the “Interpreting Culture” factor seems to suggest the opposite pattern from what was found when correlations were done with individual *SILC* items, namely that the C group seemed to have a pattern of positive correlations precisely with individual items related to making interpretations about culture. Overall, when items are grouped together in factors, the E group results suggest that increased strategy use is related to increased performance on two vignettes, while the C group results suggest that decreased strategy use is related to increased performance on one vignette and the five request vignettes grouped together.

SILC Original Categories

Significant correlations were also found between Criterion 1 of the *Speech Act Measure* and the nine categories originally used to group items on the *SILC* (see Table 25). Two of these categories (called “subscales” here), Subscale 2 (“Strategies I use for dealing with difficult times in another culture”) and Subscale 7 (“Strategies I use to interact with people in another culture”), were found to correlate with “Prof meeting” for the E group (.41** and .41**). The C group was found to have one correlation, which was between Subscale 1 (“Strategies I use when I am in surroundings that are culturally different from what I am used to”) and “Paper extension” (.42**).

Correlations on Other *Speech Act Measure* Rating Criteria

Tables 26 and 27 show the correlations between Criterion 3B (“Appropriateness of speaker’s level of directness”) and Criterion 4B (“Appropriateness of speaker’s level of politeness”) and individual items on the *SILC*. A pattern that arises from the E group data on both of these tables is the fact that there were six significant positive correlations with one particular vignette, “Leaving for school.” All but one of the *SILC* items (i.e., not item #22 – “I seek out ways in which our two cultures differ”) that correlated with “Leaving for school” have to do with proactive interaction with people from another culture, such as “participating in sports and activities,” “going to the market in another culture,” and “sharing pictures from home.” These findings would suggest that involvement with people from the host culture in a variety of settings is related to improvement in knowing how direct to be in communication with younger people in the host culture. As was discussed above, perhaps students’ interactions with younger people in the host culture were infrequent, such that gain in interactions with people from the host culture was significant for improvement on “Leaving for school.” In addition, the Spanish NS raters mentioned frequently that students were too direct in their request to Raquel, the younger sibling in “Leaving for school,” and that even though she was younger, it was not appropriate for the student to “tell her what to do.” Furthermore, the Spanish NSs who took the *Speech Act Measure* were significantly more indirect with Raquel than were the students in both the pretest and the posttest, as Table 42 in the discussion about requests in Spanish shows. Therefore, those students who were able to improve their level of directness with the host sibling may have been those who had a greater tendency to seek out interactions in the host culture.

The C group, on the other hand, does not have any significant correlations with “cross-cultural proactive interaction” items, but rather, their correlations on Criteria 3B and 4B, as with what was seen with Criterion 1, suggest that items relating to interpreting culture overall were more significant factors in their speech act performance as a group, on specific vignettes. *SILC* items #1, #2, #5, #10, and #19, which all had significant correlations for the C group, have to do with interpreting and trying to understand another culture. Another pattern which can be observed for the C group is that four out of eight of the correlations reported in Tables 26 and 27 are for the “Paper extension” vignette. Another three correlations are with “Slower speech” and the final one is with “Less food,” all of which are requests with higher status individuals.

A final observation is that for the combined sample, two significant correlations were found between the *Speech Act Measure* (Criterion 4B – level of politeness) and the *SILC*. As can

be seen on Table 27, gain on All Request Vignettes and on “Leaving for school,” which is also a request, was found to correlate with increased reported use of *SILC* strategy #29, “I listen to whether someone I am speaking with is indirect or direct in his/her communication style.” Both correlations were .40 with a significance of $p < .01$. As mentioned by the Spanish NS raters, being more indirect was typically seen as more polite, which may explain the connection between item #29 (observing directness) and Criterion 4B (level of politeness). Those C group students who observed NSs’ degree of directness more frequently improved more in their level of politeness on requests on the *Speech Act Measure*.

The findings described above suggest that overall, increased use of culture strategies was related in specific ways to increased gains on the *Speech Act Measure*. For the E group, greater use of coping strategies and being proactively involved in the host culture appear to be related to improvements in performance on apologies and requests in the TL. Although the results are somewhat mixed for the C group, it appears that using strategies for interpreting culture helped the C group improve their speech act performance. What these findings do not indicate is how the intervention affected the E group differently from the C group, given that both groups had correlations between reported culture strategy use on the *SILC* and improved performance on the *Speech Act Measure*.

Table 23: Significant correlations between rated gain on Criterion 1 (“Overall Success”) on the *Speech Act Measure* and gain in frequency of reported use of strategies on the *Strategies Inventory for Learning Culture (SILC) – Individual Items*

		VIGNETTES										
		Entire Measure	Professor			Older person			Peer		Younger person	
			Slower speech (2)	Paper extension (6)	Prof meeting (9)	Spill wine (1)	Airplane seat (4)	Less food (8)	Friend's book (3)	Meeting friend (7)	Babysitting spill (5)	Leaving for school (10)
Strategies Inventory for Learning Culture Items	I use a variety of coping strategies when I feel like I have culture shock overload (# 11)	E .44** C ---						E .40** C ---		E .46** C ---		
	I participate in sports and other activities (# 14)			E .57*** C ---								
	I go to the market in another culture and interact with people (#42)			E .42** C ---								
	I take a class that will help me keep up with the other culture. (#49)						E .40** C ---					
	I use different cultural perspectives to interpret situations in which something seems to have gone wrong. (#3)	E --- C .60***				E --- C .45**						
	I use generalizations instead of stereotypes when I make statements about people who are different from me. (#4)									E --- C .45*		
	I counter stereotypes others use about people from my country by using generalizations and cultural values instead. (# 5)			E --- C .47***								
	I observe the behavior of people from another culture very carefully. (# 17)		E ---- C .40**									
	I refrain from making quick interpretations about another culture. (#20)									E ---- C .45**		
	I use different types of communication styles when talking with someone from another culture. (#27)		E ---- C .40 **									
	I find a group of people who have had similar experiences to talk to and share experiences. (# 47)								E---- C -.43**			

(E group N=42, C group N=44) * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 24: Significant correlations between rated gain on Criterion 1 (“Overall Success”) on the *Speech Act Measure* and gain in frequency of reported use of strategies on the *Strategies Inventory for Learning Culture (SILC)* – Five Factors

		VIGNETTES										
		All Requests	Professor			Older person			Peer		Younger person	
			Slower speech (2)	Paper extension (6)	Prof meeting (9)	Spill wine (1)	Airplane seat (4)	Less food (8)	Friend's book (3)	Meeting friend (7)	Babysitting spill (5)	Leaving for school (10)
SILC Factors	Reentry Strategies (F#5)			E .42 ** C ----								
	Culture Shock/Coping Strategies (F#4)				E .41** C ---							
	Homestay Strategies (F#3)	E ---- C -.41 **										
	Interpreting Culture (F#1)						E----- C -.40**					

(E group N=42, C group N=44) * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 25: Significant correlations between rated gain on Criterion 1 (“Overall Success”) on the *Speech Act Measure* and gain in frequency of reported use of strategies on the *SILC* – Original Nine Sub-Scales

		VIGNETTES										
		Entire Measure	Professor			Older person			Peer		Younger person	
			Slower speech (2)	Paper extension (6)	Prof meeting (9)	Spill wine (1)	Airplane seat (4)	Less food (8)	Friend's book (3)	Meeting friend (7)	Babysitting spill (5)	Leaving for school (10)
SILC Items	Strategies I use for dealing with difficult times in another culture (Sub-scale 2).			E .41** C ---								
	Strategies I use to interact with people in another culture (Sub-scale 7).			E .41** C ---								
	Strategies I use when I am in surroundings that are culturally different from what I am used to (Sub-scale 1).		E --- C .42									

(E group N=42, C group N=44) * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 26: Significant correlations between rated gain on Criterion 3B (“Appropriateness of speaker’s level of directness”) on the *Speech Act Measure* and gain in frequency of reported use of strategies on the *SILC – Individual Items*

		VIGNETTES										
		Entire Measure	Professor			Older person			Peer		Younger person	
			Slower speech (2)	Paper extension (6)	Prof meeting (9)	Spill wine (1)	Airplane seat (4)	Less food (8)	Friend’s book (3)	Meeting friend (7)	Babysitting spill (5)	Leaving for school (10)
SILC Items	I participate in sports and other activities (# 14).											E .40** C ---
	I relax when I’m stressed out in another culture by doing what I normally do back home to make myself comfortable (# 16).		E -.42** C ----									
	I observe the gestures that people use in another culture (# 37).	E .40** C ----										
	I go to the market in another culture and interact with people (# 42).											E .42** C ----
	I consider ways in which different cultures might view things in different ways, for example how different cultures value privacy or independence (# 1).			E ---- C .42**								
	I figure out what cultural values might be involved when I encounter a conflict or something goes wrong (# 2).			E --- C .41**								
	I make distinctions among behavior that is <i>personal</i> (unique to the person), <i>cultural</i> (representative of the person’s culture), and <i>universal</i> (a shared human concern) (# 6).		E ---- C .41**									
	I treat some moments of culture shock as learning experiences, for example by writing about them in my journal (# 10).		E ---- C -.40**									
	I set aside my own cultural values and beliefs when trying to understand another culture (# 19).							E ---- C -.46**				
	I help people in another culture understand me by explaining my behaviors and attitudes in terms of my own culture (# 26).											E .40* C ----

(E group N=42, C group N=44) * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 27: Significant correlations between rated gain on Criterion 4B (“Appropriateness of Level of Politeness”) on the *Speech Act Measure* and gain in frequency of reported use of strategies on the *Strategies Inventory for Learning Culture (SILC)* – Individual Items

		VIGNETTES										
		All Request Vignettes	Professor			Older person			Peer		Younger person	
			Slower speech (2)	Paper extension (6)	Prof meeting (9)	Spill wine (1)	Airplane seat (4)	Less food (8)	Friend's book (3)	Meeting friend (7)	Babysitting spill (5)	Leaving for school (10)
SILC Items	I seek out ways in which our two cultures differ (# 22).											E .40** C ---
	I listen to whether someone I am speaking with is indirect or direct in his/her communication style (# 29)											E .50*** C ----
	I share pictures from home, for example of my own family (# 45).											E .43** C ----
	I consider ways in which different cultures might view things in different ways, for example how different cultures value privacy or independence (# 1).		E ---- C .42**									
	I observe the behavior of people from another culture very carefully (# 17).		E ---- C .43**									
	I set aside my own cultural values and beliefs when trying to understand another culture (# 19).						E ---- C -.41**					
	I mirror the communication style of the person I am speaking with, for example if they are always formal, I try to be formal too (# 30)			E ---- C .42**								
	I listen to whether someone I am speaking with is indirect or direct in his/her communication style (# 29).	Comb. Sample .40***										

(E group N=42, C group N=44, Combined sample N=86) * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Speech Act Performance and Study Abroad Language Contact Variables

In order to examine the impact of students' contact with the TL and culture during the semester abroad on their speech act performance, variables from the *Exit Language Contact Profile* were tested for significant correlations with the rated gain scores on the *Speech Act Measure*. The results are organized below into the following categories: living situation, host country friends, amount of time spent speaking the TL, university coursework, and extracurricular activities. Only those results which were statistically significant are included here.

Living Situation. Using a one-way ANOVA, no significant differences were found in *Speech Act Measure* scores based on the four types of living situations reported (i.e., host family, student dormitory, private residence with roommates, private residence without roommates). When the combined sample was divided into two groups, however, "those who lived with a host family" (N=64) and "those who did not live with a host family" (N=22) a statistically significant difference was found. The chi square test in Table 28 below shows the breakdown of E and C group students who did or did not live with a host family. It was found that living or not living with a host family was statistically related to rated gain on Criterion 1 ("Overall Success") of the *Speech Act Measure* for the C group at the $p < .01$ level. For the E group, living or not living with a host family was not statistically related to performance on the *Speech Act Measure*. On the other hand, for the C group, living with a host family was found to be related to improvements on Criterion 1 on the *Speech Act Measure*. The question arises, then, why the host family environment was seemingly more beneficial for the C group than for the E group. A possible interpretation is that perhaps in the absence of other resources – such as the *Guide* – the host family became the C group's focal learning opportunity and therefore was more significant in their learning of speech acts than it was for the E group, who had the *Guide* and received the intervention. In other words, the E group students were perhaps better equipped to make gains in their speech act development whatever the living arrangements, thanks to the input they received from the *Guide*.

Table 28: Comparing the Speech Act Performance on Criterion 1 (“Overall Success”) by E and C Group Students Who Did and Did Not Live with a Host Family

Language Gain on Criteria 1 - sum of all vignettes: gain scores in categories 2 * iA. Did the student live with a family from the host community (yes/no)? * Experimental or Control Group Crosstabulation

				iA. Did the student live with a family from the host community (yes/no)?		Total
				No, Didn't Answer	yes	
Experimental or Control Group						
Experimental	Language Gain on Criteria 1 - sum of all vignettes: gain scores in categories 2	Did worse on post-test	Count	1	3	4
			Expected Count	1.1	2.9	4.0
			Residual	-.1	.1	
		Did not gain (i.e., score of 0)	Count	0	3	3
			Expected Count	.9	2.1	3.0
			Residual	-.9	.9	
		Gained from pre- to post-test	Count	11	24	35
			Expected Count	10.0	25.0	35.0
			Residual	1.0	-1.0	
Total			Count	12	30	42
			Expected Count	12.0	30.0	42.0
Control	Language Gain on Criteria 1 - sum of all vignettes: gain scores in categories 2	Did worse on post-test	Count	0	12	12
			Expected Count	2.7	9.3	12.0
			Residual	-2.7	2.7	
		Did not gain (i.e., score of 0)	Count	2	0	2
			Expected Count	.5	1.5	2.0
			Residual	1.5	-1.5	
		Gained from pre- to post-test	Count	8	22	30
			Expected Count	6.8	23.2	30.0
			Residual	1.2	-1.2	
Total			Count	10	34	44
			Expected Count	10.0	34.0	44.0

In addition, there were no significant differences between the E and C groups with regard to having had an “extended conversation” in the TL with their host family or housemates. However, for the combined sample, on this variable, those students who had an “extended conversation” in the TL “every day” or “every couple of days” (grouped together, N=52) had a higher rated mean gain score on “Meeting friend,” on Criterion 1, compared to those who reported having had an “extended conversation” in the TL with their host family or housemates on average only “once a week”, “once per month”, or “infrequently” (grouped together, N=34). The former group’s mean gain on the “Meeting friend” vignette was .53, and the latter’s was -.09, a difference which was significant at the $p < .01$ level. This finding would suggest that students in the sample who took advantage of their housemates to practice the TL were able to improve more in apologizing to a host country friend (i.e., in the “Meeting friend” vignette).

Host Country Friends. A one-way ANOVA was conducted with the variable “average percent of friends that the student hung out with who were NSs of the TL” for the E and C groups separately as well as for the combined sample. For the C group and the combined sample, significant differences in performance on the *Speech Act Measure* were found. No significant differences were found for the E group students with this variable. These results are shown in Table 29 and Table 30 below.

Looking first at the C group, as can be seen in Table 29 below, the results on this variable generally follow a pattern in which students who had fewer friends who were NSs of the TL

gained more on their rated performance on Criterion 1 on the *Speech Act Measure*, with the exception that the students reporting 25% friends pattern together with the 50-100% categories in experiencing lower mean gain scores.

Table 29: One-way ANOVA Results for Rated Gain on Criterion 1 on the *Speech Act Measure* (“Meeting friend” and “Airplane seat” vignettes) and the Language Contact Variable “Average percent of friends that the student hung out with who were NSs of the TL” (C group)

	Average percent of friends who were NSs of the TL	N	Mean Gain	SD	Significance Level
Gain on Criteria 1, Apology Vignette 7 (“Meeting friend”)	Very few or none	23	.74	1.09	.05
	25%	8	-.31	.65	
	50%	9	-.06	.85	
	75%	3	-.50	.00	
	100%	1	.00	---	
Gain on Criteria 1, Request Vignette 4 (“Airplane seat”)	Very few or none	23	.13	.63	.001
	25%	8	-.13	1.25	
	50%	9	-.44	1.24	
	75%	3	-.83	1.04	
	100%	1	4.00	---	

N=44

With regard to the combined sample (Table 30), as with the C group, students who had fewer friends who were NSs of the TL tended to gain more on vignettes “Meeting friend” and “Airplane seat” (with the exception of one person who reported having 100% TL friends and gained 4 points on “Airplane seat”). Although this trend found for both groups might lead us to believe that having host country friends was a detriment to students’ gains in pragmatic ability, this explanation does not hold once the language proficiency of each group is taken into account. When the pretest means on the *Speech Act Measure* for the five reported frequency categories were compared, it was found that the groups with 75% and 100% NS friends started off with a higher pretest score on the “Meeting friend” and “Airplane seat” vignettes compared to the “very few or none,” 25%, and 50% groups. The posttest means for all of these groups on the “Meeting friend” and “Airplane seat” vignettes were very close, however. Thus, it appears that the students who had fewer TL NS friends during study abroad started out with a lower pragmatic ability but gained more over the course of the semester abroad than did those students who had more TL friends. This finding is in line with the differences in speech act performance according to amount of prior experience abroad – namely, that those with less prior experience abroad tended to gain more on the *Speech Act Measure*. Low initial TL proficiency may have also been a barrier to making friends who were NSs of the TL. In addition, those students who had studied the TL for fewer years prior to study abroad – an indirect measure of proficiency – were less likely to take classes in the host country which were intended for NSs of the TL. Those students instead were more likely to take classes intended for study abroad students. Taking classes with other study abroad students, in turn, may have limited lower proficiency students’ access to peers who were NSs of the TL, which might explain why those students had fewer friends.

Table 30: One-way ANOVA Results for Rated Gain on Criterion 1 on the *Speech Act Measure* (“Meeting friend” and “Airplane seat” vignettes) and the Language Contact Variable “Average percent of friends that the student hung out with who were NSs of the TL” (Combined sample)

	Average percent of friends who were NSs of the TL	N	Mean Gain	SD	Significance Level
Gain on Criteria 1, Apology Vignette 7 (“Meeting friend”)	Very few or none	38	.64	1.10	.05
	25%	28	.05	.91	
	50%	14	.14	.89	
	75%	5	-.50	.35	
	100%	1	.00	---	
Gain on Criteria 1, Request Vignette 4 (“Airplane seat”)	Very few or none	38	.26	.89	.01
	25%	28	.25	1.08	
	50%	14	-.29	1.25	
	75%	5	-.10	1.43	
	100%	1	4.00	---	

N=86

The frequency categories shown in Table 30 for the variable “average percent of friends that the student hung out with who were NSs of the TL” were collapsed into binary variables (0-25% and 50-100%) and independent samples *t*-tests were run on these variables. As a result of this procedure, it was found that on the apology vignette “Meeting friend” for Criterion 1, students who reported speaking the TL with friends 0-25% of the time had a higher rated language gain score ($M=.57$) than did students who used the TL with friends 50-100% of the time ($M=.14$, $p<.05$). Note that the “Airplane seat” vignette does not come out as having significant differences in this analysis, as it did above, perhaps because of the outlier with 100% TL friends who gained significantly on this vignette. Another significant difference was found, however, on the “Less food” request where students using the TL with friends 50-100% did significantly better ($M=.47$) than those who only used it only 0-25% with friends ($M=.03$; $p<.05$). This finding, then, is in contrast to the previous finding in that students with more TL friends gained more than students with fewer TL friends.

Time Spent Speaking the Target Language. Regarding the impact of the language contact variable “average amount of time spent speaking the TL outside of class” on rated gain on Criterion 1 of the *Speech Act Measure*, statistically significant differences between frequency categories were found on “Airplane seat” for the combined sample, but not for the E or C groups analyzed separately. Table 31 shows the results from the one-way ANOVA for the combined sample. As can be seen, those six students (two from the E group and four from the C group) who reported having spoken the TL outside of class 100% of the time, on average, had the highest gain score of the five groups. The standard deviation for the 100% group was also the highest of any group, suggesting this group of six students was heterogeneous. The next highest category was those who spoke the TL “infrequently,” followed by those who spoke it 25% of the time. Those who reported speaking the TL 50% and 75% of the time had negative rated mean gain scores. The spread of these findings makes them somewhat difficult to interpret. However, given that there is no clear progression or pattern, it cannot be concluded whether time spent speaking the TL outside of class helped students improve their performance on the “Airplane seat” vignette or not.

Table 31: One-way ANOVA Results for Rated Gain on Criterion 1 of the *Speech Act Measure* (“Airplane seat” vignette) and the Language Contact Variable “Average amount of time spent speaking the TL outside of class” (Combined Sample)

	Average amount of time spent speaking the TL outside of class	N	Mean Gain	SD	Significance Level
Gain on Criteria 1, Request Vignette 4 (“Airplane seat”)	Infrequently	6	.92	.97	.05
	25% of the time	27	.35	.92	
	50% of the time	31	-.02	1.07	
	75% of the time	16	-.31	1.01	
	100% of the time	6	1.17	1.81	

N=86

When this variable is collapsed into two categories and submitted to an independent samples *t*-test, another significant result is found. On the “Meeting friend” vignette there was a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) in performance on Criterion 1 between students who reported having an extended conversation in the TL “infrequently” to “once per week” (N=34) and students who reported having one from “every couple of days” to “every day” (N=52). The former had a mean gain of .01, whereas the latter had a mean gain of .48 ($p < .05$). This finding provides a clearer picture about the impact of speaking the TL outside of class, namely that doing so more frequently was related to improvement on the “Meeting friend” vignette. However, it is not clear why this pattern should be found for this particular vignette. One possibility is over the course of study abroad, students who spent more time outside of class speaking the TL (assuming that doing so was with host family or host country friends) may have had to perform apologies similar to that in “Meeting friend” in the TL, and therefore may have gotten practice in doing so. In comparison with some of the other vignette scenarios, the “Meeting friend” situation may be one of the more common types of apology situations, both with family and friends. Students who were living with a host family may have had to apologize for arriving late to dinner, for example. In contrast, making requests as in the “Airplane seat” situation may have been relatively less frequent in the students’ environment. Thus, those students who spent more time speaking the TL outside of class may have gotten more practice in making apologies about being late.

University Coursework. When the E and C groups were analyzed separately, no significant differences were found based on differences in courses taken. For the combined sample, however, on the “Friend’s book” apology, students who took subject courses in the TL for non-native speakers (NNSs) (i.e., courses intended for study abroad students) had a higher rated gain score (M=.66) on Criterion 1 on the *Speech Act Measure* than students who took subject courses intended for NSs of the TL (M=.16; $p < .05$). One possible interpretation of this finding is that courses intended for study abroad students were designed in such a way to meet the language learning needs of the students, whereas classes intended for NSs of the TL would likely not have catered to the needs of L2 learners. Thus, students who took study abroad courses may have gained more because their language needs were supported. Another possible explanation has to do again with the initial language proficiency levels of the students who tended to take each type of course. The students who tended to take courses intended for NSs of

the TL started out with a higher rated score on the *Speech Act Measure* pretest on all but one vignette, “Spill wine,” compared to those who took sheltered classes for NNSs. In addition, in the “Slower speech,” “Paper extension,” and “Leaving for school” request situations, the difference between the two groups’ pretest scores was significant ($p < .05$). Therefore, it appears that since the students who took mainstream NS classes started out with a higher score they did not gain as much as the students who took classes specially intended for NNSs. As was suggested above, it seems as though initially lower-proficiency students were able to gain more quickly during one semester abroad, whereas initially higher-proficiency students’ ability improved at a slower rate. It is also possible that initially higher-proficiency students could have made just as many gains as the lower-proficiency students, but that those gains did not make as much of a difference in their becoming more pragmatically appropriate over the course of one semester.

Extracurricular Activities. Students were asked to report on whether they participated in extracurricular activities such as volunteering in the community, doing an internship, or participating in a language partner exchange. No significant results were found for the E and C groups analyzed separately. For the combined sample, however, it was found that 14 (16%) volunteered, 17 (20%) worked as an intern, and 36 (42%) had a language partner. However, participation in any of these types of extracurricular activities did not result in any significant correlations with rated gain on the *Speech Act Measure*.

Research Question (4): Are gains in intercultural sensitivity related to prior language and culture experience, demographic variables, reported language and culture strategy use, or study abroad language contact variables?

Intercultural Sensitivity and Background Variables

In this study, intercultural sensitivity was measured using the *Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI)*. The *IDI* results are divided into six separate scores: (1) the overall “Developmental Score” (DS), (2) the “Denial-Defense Score” (DD), (3) the “Reversal Score” (R), (4) the “Minimization Score” (M), (5) the “Acceptance-Adaptation Score” (AA), and (6) the “Encapsulated Marginality Score” (EM) (see the *Instrumentation* section for a detailed description of these scales on the *IDI*). These scores are based on a gain score, which was calculated by subtracting the pretest score from the posttest score.

In order to examine the potential relation that students’ backgrounds may have had with the *IDI* scores, *t*-tests were conducted on these results using the binary variables “gender,” “major” (i.e., “major in the TL” vs. “other major”), “language studied abroad,” and “study of other languages” (i.e., “had studied other languages besides the TL” vs. “had **not** studied other languages besides the TL”). For the variables “gender” and “language studied abroad,” no significant results were obtained for the E or C groups analyzed separately. For the combined sample, gender was found to be statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level for the outcome of the R scale. That is, males were found to have a lower R gain score than females ($M = -.45$; $F = -.13$). The primary theoretical reason for a gain on Reversal is that the students have taken on a host culture identity. This may be a temporary survival strategy such as wearing host culture clothes, eating only host culture food, speaking the language, and negatively evaluating the home culture compared to the host culture. There is no theoretical reason that we are aware of to explain why females would have increased their R score compared to males.

Second, for the variable “language studied abroad” (i.e., Spanish or French), a significant difference was found at the $p < .05$ level for the combined sample. Students who studied French were found to have a lower gain score on the Encapsulated Marginality scale compared to those who studied Spanish ($F = -.46$; $S = .01$). An increase in EM is theoretically attributable to deeper cultural immersion and to stronger culture and language learning whereby the person is becoming more bicultural-bilingual. In the early stages, this change is often accompanied by a sense of identity confusion or conflict, which is what EM measures. The French versus Spanish finding could suggest that the students of Spanish were more immersed and were becoming more bicultural-bilingual than the students of French; however, it is not clear why this would be the case. Another possible explanation is that French students were more likely to find their new cultural understanding to be problematic to their own cultural identities, as compared to the Spanish speakers. This difference could be attributable to French culture being more hierarchical in nature compared to Spanish culture (Hofstede, 1991; Storti, 2001). Regardless, it is important to remind the reader that the number of French speakers in this study ($N = 19$) was small and therefore, the results regarding this group specifically should be interpreted with caution. Finally, the variable “Study of other languages” was not found to have a relationship with *IDI* scores for the E or C groups or the combined sample.

In addition, two other background variables were used to examine the *IDI* results: “prior experience abroad” and “number of years of study of the TL.” In the first case, a one-way ANOVA was run with the seven categories used to assess students’ amount of experience abroad prior to their participation in the current study. The seven categories were: “never,” “less than 3 months,” “3-6 months,” “1-2 years,” “3-5 years,” and “6-10 years.” There were no statistically significant results on the *IDI* based on these groupings for the E group, the C group, or the combined sample. With regard to the variable “number of years of study of the TL,” no differences were found for the C group or the combined sample, but an independent samples *t*-test did determine differences for the E group students analyzed separately. E group students who had studied the TL for three or more years (N=6) had a significantly lower mean Adaptation-Acceptance gain score (-.25) compared to students who had studied the TL for three or fewer years (N=36; M=.29; $p < .05$). This finding would suggest that students with less experience with the TL have more to gain interculturally through the study abroad experience. This finding is parallel to what was found in the speech act data, namely that students who had never lived abroad previously improved their overall speech act performance more than students with previous experience abroad. In addition, in his research with study abroad students participating in the American Field Service (AFS) program, Hammer (2005) found that students with lower pre-test *IDI* scores had a higher total gain from pre- to posttest on the *IDI* compared to those students who began the program with higher *IDI* scores and a greater degree of previous intercultural experience.

Intercultural Sensitivity and Speech Act Performance

Of interest to the researchers was whether students’ scores on the *IDI* were statistically related to their rated gain on the *Speech Act Measure*. Theoretically speaking, intercultural sensitivity is posited to be related to speech act performance because making requests and apologies in a pragmatically appropriate manner in another language and culture requires sensitivity to the fact that norms that govern social behavior such as performing speech acts differ from one culture to another. In order to investigate a possible connection between intercultural sensitivity and speech act performance, the *IDI* change scores and the rated gain scores for seven of the criteria on the *Speech Act Measure* were correlated. Analyses looking at the combined sample and at the E and C groups separately were conducted. While no significant correlations for the combined sample were found, a few correlations were found for the E and C groups individually, and are discussed below.

Although all *Speech Act Measure* rating criteria were included in the analysis, only three of the criteria resulted in significant correlations with the *IDI* gain scores. Four of the six correlations were for the E group (see Table 32). The first of these was a positive correlation (.44**) between the “Prof meeting” vignette on Criterion 2B (the fit between vocabulary and formality) and the Encapsulated Marginality (EM) scale, meaning that rated gain in appropriate use of vocabulary on “Prof meeting” was related to change on the EM score. This finding indicates that as students increased their sense of being a part of both cultures – the home culture and the host culture – they increased their gain in use of appropriate vocabulary on the “Prof meeting” vignette. The C group also had a positive correlation on this criterion; however it was on the Minimization (M) scale and with All Apology Vignettes. This finding is an anomaly as is the finding that the “Friend’s book” vignette on Criterion 2C (the fit between verb tense/inflection and formality) correlated positively (.46**) with change on the Reversal (R)

scale for the E group. As predicted, there was a negative correlation between gain on Criterion 2D (Fit between subject pronoun and formality) on the “Friend’s book” and “Airplane seat” vignettes with the R (-.40**) and M scales (-.41**) for the E group. This finding indicates that as students moved away from the Reversal and Minimization worldviews (i.e., a positive development in the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity) they were able to improve their apology and request performance on two specific vignettes. Lastly, the C group had a positive correlation (.50***) on Criterion 4A (Level of politeness) for the “Speak slow” vignette on the EM scale.

Because both the Acceptance-Adaptation scale, the Encapsulated Marginality scale, and the overall Developmental Score represent a worldview towards cultural difference that accepts that cultures are different in significant ways – such as in the way speech acts are performed – it might be expected theoretically that increases on this scale would correlate positively with increases in pragmatically appropriate speech act performance. Conversely, it might also be expected that decreases on the Denial-Defense and Minimization scales would be negatively correlated with speech act performance; that is, as one moves out of denying cultural difference (Denial), feeling that one’s own culture is superior (Defense), or trivializing cultural difference (Minimization), it would be expected that students would be able to improve in their apology and request performance because they would be moving towards recognizing that different social norms apply than those that are operative in their own culture. The results presented in Table 32 show that the theoretical predictions are obtained for Minimization and Encapsulated Marginality, but not for Denial-Defense or Acceptance-Adaptation. There is partial support for the hypothesis, but there are also the anomalous correlations mentioned above.

Table 32: Statistically significant correlations between gain on the *Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI)* and rated gain on the *Speech Act Measure*

	Developmental Score	Denial-Defense Scale	Reversal Scale	Minimization Scale	Acceptance-Adaptation Scale	Encapsulated Marginality Scale
Criterion 2B (Fit between choice of vocabulary and formality level)						
Vignette 9 (“Prof meeting”)						E .44** C ---
All Apology Vignettes				E --- C .40**		
Criterion 2C (Fit between choice of verb tense/inflection and formality level)						
Vignette 3 (“Friend’s book”)			E .46** C ---			
Criterion 2D (Fit between subject pronoun and formality level)						
Vignette 3 (“Friend’s book”)				E -.41** C ---		
Vignette 4 (“Airplane seat”)			E -.40** C ---			
Criterion 4A (Level of politeness)						
Vignette 2 (“Slower speech”)						E --- C .50***

(E group N=42, C group N=44) * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Intercultural Sensitivity and Reported Culture Strategy Use

One of the hypotheses of the study – which also motivated the strategies-based approach to culture learning taken in the *Students' Guide* – is that through being more strategic about learning culture, study abroad students may be able to develop their intercultural sensitivity. Therefore, it was of interest to the researchers whether reported culture strategy use on the *SILC* was statistically related to change scores on the *IDI*. Table 33 below shows the significant correlations that were found for the E and C groups on the *IDI* and on individual items on the *SILC*. No significant correlations were found for the combined sample.

Looking first at the E group, a significant positive correlation (.43**) was found between *SILC* item #7 (“I look at similarities as well as differences between people of different backgrounds”) and the E group’s gain on the overall Developmental Score (DS) on the *IDI*. This finding suggests that as E group students increased their use of this culture learning strategy, they improved their intercultural sensitivity. A negative correlation (-.54***) was found between change on the Denial-Defense (DD) scale and reported frequency of use of the *SILC* strategy #12 (“I keep in touch with friends and family”). It would appear that as students increased their contacts with people back home they had a worldview that was less representative of a Denial or Defense perspective. This finding may demonstrate the importance of coping strategies – such as maintaining ties to home – which are included in the *Guide*, for being able to improve one’s intercultural skills. This may be the case because the more students are able to compare and contrast life back home with life abroad, the more they are able to see the two different cultural settings as distinct in such a way that they are more accepting of different cultural ways of being, as would be indicated by a lowered DD score. In addition, two positive correlations (.41** and .42**) are shown in Table 33 between two *SILC* items relating to the study abroad living situation (items #43 and #45, respectively) and change on the Encapsulated Marginality (EM) scale. The relationship between these two strategies and the EM scale makes sense because EM gains are a reflection of more substantive contact with the culture, such as greater immersion in one’s living situation and, arguably, more cognizance of strategies to use in those situations. Finally, one reentry strategy, #51 (“I share my feelings and experiences with friends and family, even though they may not relate to all that I say”), was correlated positively (.42**) with the change score on the Minimization (M) scale.

The first two correlations for the C group (-.43** and .40**) shown on Table 33 are on *SILC* items relating to strategies for dealing with difficult times in another culture (items #10 and #16, respectively). The first of these is a negative correlation with the DS score, suggesting that decreased use of strategy #10 was related to increased gain in overall intercultural sensitivity. This result seems to suggest that writing in a journal was not helpful for the C group’s acquisition of a more interculturally sensitive worldview. The second item, #16, a coping strategy, was correlated positively with change on the EM scale. Because students moved down on this scale, this finding would suggest that using coping strategies can help resolve issues of feeling like an “encapsulated marginal” – in other words, feeling as if they do not fit in with any culture. The final C group correlation is a positive one (.40**) between item #42 (“I go to the market in another culture and interact with people”) and the DD scale.

Note that all of these findings need to be viewed with caution as there are only eight statistically significant correlations from a total of 104, which presents the possibility of some correlations occurring by chance.

Table 33: Statistically significant correlations between gain on the *Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI)* and gain in frequency of reported use of culture strategies on the *Strategies Inventory for Learning Culture (SILC)*

	SILC Mean Gain Score	Developmental Score	Denial-Defense Scale	Reversal Scale	Minimization Scale	Acceptance-Adaptation Scale	Encapsulated Marginality Scale
I look at similarities as well as differences between people of different backgrounds (#7)	E .21 C .14	E .43** C ---					
I treat some moments of culture shock as learning experiences, for example by writing about them in my journal (#10)	E .71 C .48	E --- C -.43**					
I keep in touch with friends and family (# 12)	E .52 C .27		E -.54*** C ---				
I relax when I'm stressed out in another culture by doing what I normally do back home to make myself comfortable. (# 16)	E .64 C .55						E --- C .40**
I go to the market in another culture and interact with people (#42)	E .21 C .18		E --- C .40**				
I find out the rules and regulations (# 43)	E -.10 C .45						E .41** C ---
I share pictures from home, for example of my own family (# 45)	E -.14 C .00						E .42** C ---
I share my feelings and experiences with friends and family, even though they may not relate to all that I say (# 51)	E -.48 C .07				E .42** C ---		

(E group N=42, C group N=44) * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Correlation analyses were also run between the *IDI* gain scores and groupings of *SILC* items using first, the five *SILC* factors and second, the nine *SILC* subscales. No significant correlations were found for the E or C groups or for the combined sample on the *SILC* factors. However, two correlations were found for the E group on two of the *SILC* subscales (see Table 34). The first of these is positive correlation (.45**) between the Acceptance-Adaptation (AA) scale and *SILC* Subscale 1 (“Strategies I use when I am in surroundings that are culturally different from what I am used to”). The second is a negative correlation (-.41**) between the DD scale and *SILC* Subscale 2 (“Strategies I use for dealing with difficult times in another culture”). Both of these findings fit in with what would be predicted – that is, greater use of strategies in these two categories relates to increases on the AA scale and decreases on the DD scale, which both represent movements in the direction of greater intercultural sensitivity. Since

these correlations were only found for the E group, we would thus conclude that the intervention had a positive impact on students' intercultural sensitivity.

Table 34: Statistically significant correlations between gain on the *Intercultural Development Inventory* and gain in frequency of reported strategy use on the sub-scales of the *Strategies Inventory for Learning Culture (SILC)*

		SILC Mean Gain Score	Developmental Score	Denial-Defense Scale	Reversal Scale	Minimization Scale	Acceptance-Adaptation Scale	Encapsulated Marginality Scale
SILC Items	Strategies I use when I am in surroundings that are culturally different from what I am used to (Subscale 1)	E 4.86 C 3.77					E .45** C ---	
	Strategies I use for dealing with difficult times in another culture (Subscale 2)	E 2.83 C 1.84		E -.41** C ---				

(E group N=42, C group N=44) * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Intercultural Sensitivity and Study Abroad Language Contact Variables

Independent samples *t*-tests and one-way ANOVA were used to compare the sample's *IDI* scores based on variables of language contact as reported on the *Exit Language Contact Profile*. Looking first at the E group individually, it was found that those students who took courses intended for study abroad students (N=33) had lower gains on the DS on the *IDI* (1.93) than students who reported that they took course intended for NSs of the TL (N=9; DS=10.77; $p < .05$). This finding makes sense because students who took a course with NSs of the TL had a more direct experience with other students from that culture and thus, with the target language and culture. On the other hand, the students in the courses intended for study abroad students had a more mediated experience and presumably experienced less direct exposure to the language and culture or host culture students. E group students who reported that they "enrolled in a field study or internship" while abroad (N=12) had a significantly lower AA gain score (-.07) compared to students who did not enroll in a field study or internship (N=30; AA=.33; $p < .05$). Table 35 also shows a significant difference between the average frequencies with which students reported having spoken the TL outside of class on the Minimization gain score. Table 35 does not show a clear pattern of movement out of Minimization based on speaking the TL frequently versus infrequently. Because moving away from trivializing cultural difference (i.e., moving out of the Minimization stage) is represented by a negative gain score, it can be seen that those who spoke the TL "infrequently" had the highest positive gain score, as predicted. In other words, it would be expected that the more students interacted with hosts, the more they would recognize that cultural differences do exist, and thus, move away from minimizing cultural difference. The hypothesized pattern is found for the students who reported speaking the TL 25% and 75% of the time, but not for those who spoke it 50% or 100% of the time. Thus, the findings are unclear with regard to the impact that greater contact with the TL has on moving

towards the ethnorelative stages of the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity by moving out of the ethnocentric Minimization stage.

Table 35: One-way ANOVA Results for *IDI* Scores and the Language Contact Variable “Average amount of time spent speaking the TL outside of class” (E group)

	Average amount of time spent speaking the TL outside of class	N	Mean Gain Score	SD	Significance Level
Minimization Change Score	Infrequently	4	.75	.43	.05
	25% of the time	16	-.18	.81	
	50% of the time	10	.07	.39	
	75% of the time	10	-.39	.40	
	100% of the time	2	.72	.08	

N=42

In addition, one-way ANOVA produced statistically significant differences with regard to reported frequency of “speaking the TL at home,” either with host family members or with house- or dormmates. In this case, as shown in Table 36 those students who reported speaking the TL “infrequently” at home did not move out of Minimization (i.e., they had a positive mean gain score) as did students who reported speaking the TL 25-100% of the time at home (i.e., they had a negative mean gain score). Although this finding does not suggest that movement out of Minimization is based on incrementally more time spent speaking the TL (i.e., from 25% to 100%), the finding does point to the positive effect on intercultural sensitivity of speaking the TL at least 25% of the time versus “infrequently.” Therefore, this finding suggests that more frequent use of the TL in the home helped students move away from minimizing cultural differences. Indeed, it would be expected that the more students interacted with the hosts, the more they would recognize that cultural differences do exist, and thus, move away from Minimization.

Table 36: One-way ANOVA Results for *IDI* Scores and the Language Contact Variable “Average amount of time spent speaking the TL at home (with host family or house- or dormmates)” (E group)

	Average amount of time spent speaking the TL at home	N	Mean Gain Score	SD	Significance Level
Minimization Change Score	Infrequently	7	.46		.05
	A few times per month	1	-1.44		
	Once per week	6	-.48		
	Every couple of days	15	-.03		
	Every day	12	-.05		

N=42

The C group was also found to demonstrate significant differences in intercultural sensitivity based on language contact variables. C group students who “enrolled in subject courses intended for NSs of the TL” (N=17) had a significantly higher DD gain score (.06)

compared to those who did not enroll in courses with NSs (N=27; DD=-.12; $p<.05$). A higher DD score means that C group students were not moving out of this stage of development. Interestingly, the C group does not follow the pattern found for both the combined sample and for the E group, which was that those students who took classes with NSs of the TL tended to have a higher gain on the Developmental Score on the *IDI*. This finding may provide indirect evidence that the intervention, in combination with taking classes intended for NSs of the TL, had a positive impact on students' intercultural sensitivity.

Another finding for the C group was that students enrolled in classes with NSs of the TL had a significantly lower Encapsulated Marginality (EM) gain score (-.46) than those students who did not (.13) ($p<.01$). C group students who served as volunteers (N=6) follow the sample seen in the combined sample in that they have a significantly lower DS gain score (-4.73) compared to students who did not volunteer (N=38; DS=6.63), and C group volunteers had a higher DD score (.19) compared to non-volunteers (-.08). Finally, a significant difference on the variable "average amount of time spent speaking the TL outside of class" was found for the C group students, as shown in Table 37 below. With the exception of the students who spoke the TL 50% of the time outside of class, the other frequency category scores show a progression from "infrequently" to "100% of the time," with the lower frequency categories having a higher DD change score. This finding suggests that for the C group, a greater amount of time speaking the TL outside of class helped them move out of the Denial-Defense stage. This finding makes sense given that individuals in Denial/Defense generally are not aware of cultural difference as part of their own world and their increased interactions speaking the TL with others outside of class were likely to have made the foreign culture more real to them, thus moving them forward up the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity continuum.

Table 37: One-way ANOVA Results for *IDI* Scores and the Language Contact Variable "Average amount of time spent speaking the TL outside of class" (C group)

	Average amount of time spent speaking the TL outside of class	N	Mean Gain Score	SD	Significance Level
Denial-Defense Change Score	Infrequently	2	.50	.38	.01
	25% of the time	11	-.15	.16	
	50% of the time	21	.04	.28	
	75% of the time	6	-.18	.16	
	100% of the time	4	-.31	.38	

N=44

Looking now at the combined sample, it was found that the following variables had no impact on *IDI* scores: living with a host family, participating in a conversation partner exchange with a host country student, taking language courses in the TL, and taking courses intended for study abroad students.

Several language contact variables did result in significant differences for the combined sample. First, those students in the sample who reported that they "enrolled in subject courses intended for NSs of the TL" at their study abroad university (N=39) had a significantly higher Acceptance-Adaptation (AA) gain score compared to those students who did not enroll in such classes (N=47) ("Yes, took classes intended for NSs"=.28, "No, didn't take classes intended for

NSs”=.21; $p<.05$). This result may suggest that greater contact with host country students through taking classes with them results in greater acceptance and adaptation to cultural differences.

Second, those students in the sample who reported that they “enrolled in a field study or internship” (N=17) had a lower AA gain score compared to those who did not enroll in a field study or internship (N=69), and the difference was statistically significant (“Yes, field study or internship”=.02, “No, field study or internship” = .30; $p<.05$). It is not clear why participating in a field study or internship would have had a negative impact on students’ AA score. A partial explanation might be related to whether the students who participated in such activities were “developmentally ready” for the internship experience. If not, they might have been overwhelmed and consequently might have regressed on AA. A third significant difference for the combined sample is whether students did volunteering in the TL community while they were studying abroad. Students who reported having volunteered (N=14) had a lower Developmental Score on the *IDI* than those who did not report having volunteered (N=72) (Volunteers=-2.08, Non-volunteers=5.74; $p<.05$). The same variable, volunteering in the community, was found to relate to the Denial-Defense (DD) gain score as well: those who volunteered had a higher DD change score (.15) compared to those who did not volunteer (-.08; $p<.05$). Again, volunteering in the community appeared to have a negative impact on the sample’s intercultural sensitivity. More research would be needed to discover what factors might be at work in this case, although a possible explanation is that perhaps through volunteering the students got to know aspects of the host community **too** well, such that after getting to know the host culture better, students developed a negative view of that culture.

In addition, analysis using one-way ANOVA found that for the combined sample, the variable “average amount of time spent speaking the TL outside of class” was significantly related to students’ *IDI* scores. As can be seen in Table 38 below, students who spoke the TL 75% to 100% of the time had the highest DS results and the lowest DD results. Those who reported speaking the TL “infrequently” had the lowest DS result. These results suggest that increased time spent out of class speaking the TL helped students improve their intercultural sensitivity. For the Minimization scale, the results are more ambiguous. The students who spoke the TL “infrequently” had the highest score, followed by those who spoke the TL 100% of the time, 50%, 25%, and then 75%.

Table 38: One-way ANOVA Results for *IDI* Scores and the Language Contact Variable “Average amount of time spent speaking the TL outside of class” (Combined Sample)

	Average amount of time spent speaking the TL outside of class	N	Mean Gain Score	SD	Significance Level
Developmental Score	Infrequently	6	-5.67	11.53	.05
	25% of the time	27	6.66	9.85	
	50% of the time	31	1.04	11.87	
	75% of the time	16	9.92	9.01	
	100% of the time	6	7.92	16.23	
Denial-Defense Change Score	Infrequently	6	.24	.36	.01
	25% of the time	27	-.10	.27	
	50% of the time	31	.04	.31	
	75% of the time	16	-.13	.27	
	100% of the time	6	-.32	.37	
Minimization Change Score	Infrequently	6	.50	.66	.01
	25% of the time	27	-.07	.78	
	50% of the time	31	.06	.44	
	75% of the time	16	-.46	.40	
	100% of the time	6	.37	.79	

N=86

Research Question (5): Do students become more native-like in their use of semantic formulas to perform apologies and requests? How do the E and C groups compare with regard to the use of semantic formulas?

Apologies in Spanish

As described above, the types of semantic formulas that students and Spanish and French NSs used to perform requests and apologies were coded, quantified, and analyzed. *Semantic formulas* are defined as “strategies within a speech act set that if used alone or in combination with other strategies within that set, serve as the speech act.” Our interest in looking at semantic formulas stems from a desire to better understand what it meant for students to become more pragmatically appropriate during a semester abroad, and also in order to interpret differences in gain scores between the E and the C groups. It was posited that especially those students receiving the intervention may have become more native-like in their use of semantic formulas. What this would mean with regard to the use of semantic formulas is that students gain greater facility at abiding by the sociopragmatic norms of the speech community (i.e., where and when it is appropriate to use those semantic formulas), as well as conforming to the pragmalinguistic norms (i.e., what language structures are most appropriate for use with those semantic formulas in speech act performance).

As described above, students’ and Spanish NSs’ responses to the apologies on the *Speech Act Measure* were coded for six semantic formulas. Each of these is listed below with an example from both a student and a Spanish NS, taken from the data collected for this study. Note that the semantic formula “acknowledgement of responsibility” actually has two sub-categories because it includes both *rejections* of responsibility (e.g., “It wasn’t my fault.”) and *acceptances* of responsibility (e.g., “I’m so clumsy.”). Both types are exemplified below. For the purposes of comparing frequency of semantic formula use, however, these two sub-types were collapsed into a single category for analysis.

Apology expression

- Student: *Lo siento mucho. Voy por un paño y jabón.* (18E, posttest, “Spill wine”) ‘I’m very **sorry**. I’ll get a towel and soap.’
- Native: *Perdóneme, no quise demarrar el vino sobre el mantel.* (NS512, Perú, “Spill wine”) ‘**I’m sorry**, I didn’t mean to spill the wine on the tablecloth.’

Acknowledgement of Responsibility

Rejection

- Student: *Lo siento señora, fue una accidente.* (77C, pretest, “Spill wine”) ‘Sorry m’am, **it was an accident**.’

- Native: *Por culpa del autobús llegué tarde, pero no te preocupes que estoy bien.* (NS501, Argentina, “Meeting friend”) ‘**On account of the bus** I got here late, but don’t worry, I’m OK.’

Acceptance

- Student: *Ay, Señora, lo siento, por favor. Ahorita te compro una nueva tela para la mesa, no puedo creer que **estuve tan irresponsable!*** (89C, posttest, “Spill wine”) ‘Oh, m’am, I’m sorry, please. I’ll buy you a new cloth for the table, I can’t believe that **I was so irresponsible.**’
- Native: *¡Qué torpe soy! Volqué el vaso de vino.* (NS501, Argentina, “Spill wine”) ‘**How clumsy I am!** I knocked over the glass of wine.’

Explanation

- Student: *Perdóname, Sofía, es que estaba hablando por teléfono con mi mamá en los EEUU.* (37C, posttest, “Meeting friend”) ‘Forgive me, Sofía, **it’s just that I was talking on the phone with my mom in the U.S.**’
- Native: *Disculpa pero me atrasé buscando parqueo.* (NS502, Costa Rica, “Meeting friend”) ‘Sorry but I got held up looking for parking.’

Offer of Repair

- Student: *Lo siento. Puedo ayudarte repetir la tarea.* (77C, pretest, “Babysitting spill”) ‘I’m sorry. **I can help you do the homework over.**’
- Native: *Si querés que te ayude, me gustaría hacerlo.* (NS507, Honduras, “Babysitting spill”) ‘If you want me to help you, I’d like to do it.’

Intensification

- Student: *Ay, qué pena. Lo siento **mucho**, Marta.* (11E, posttest, “Friend’s book”) ‘Oh, that’s too bad. I’m **really** sorry, Marta.’
- Native: *De verdad lo siento **mucho**, espero poder recuperarlo pronto.* (NS511, Mexico, “Friend’s book”) ‘Truly I’m **very** sorry, I hope to be able to get it back soon.’

The tables below show the percent⁶ of the students (NNSs) and the Spanish NSs that used each of the five semantic formulas and the support strategy of intensification for each of the five

apology vignettes on the *Speech Act Measure*. For the students, both the pretest and posttest data were included in the analysis. In the tables that follow, differences between the use of a semantic formula from pre- to posttest that were found to be statistically significant are highlighted and marked with an asterisk. Statistically significant differences between the NNSs and the NSs are highlighted and the level of significance is marked with a crossed-lines symbol.

A caveat should be taken into consideration in interpreting the semantic formula use of both NSs and NNSs. In some instances, the multiple-rejoinder format of the *Speech Act Measure* limits the set of semantic formulas that would be appropriate in the student's response. For example, consider the following segment of the exchange between the student and Professor Sánchez in the "Prof meeting" vignette (taken from the English Prototype version):

Dr. Sánchez: Yes, indeed. I hope you won't forget it next time.

You:

Dr. Sánchez: I'm afraid I can't reschedule it for today. Let's try again next week at the same time.

The content of Dr. Sánchez's rejoinders calls for the use of both a "promise of non-recurrence" (PNR) and an "offer of repair" (OR). For example, a student might be expected to say something such as: "Of course, it'll never happen again [PNR]. So, would you be available to meet later today [OR]?" Consequently, the distribution of semantic formulas in each of the apology and request vignettes may not represent what students or natives would do given an open discourse task or in real life where they may negotiate using other types of semantic formulas and supportive moves. This issue, however, does not invalidate the use of a multiple-rejoinder DCT because it is possible that a professor could say what Dr. Sánchez says in this vignette, and if that were to happen, the student would have to respond given that particular context. Responses between NNSs and NSs in this context can then be compared to see whether differences exist between learners and natives in how they respond to a particular conversational context.

Looking first at the results for the E group, there are two significant pre-post differences. First, E group students increased significantly ($p < .05$) in their use of an "offer of repair" from pre- to posttest on the "Spill wine" vignette. Change in the average frequency of use of this semantic formula went in the direction of that of the NSs (85% > 100%), but surpassed the NSs' frequency (92%). Second, the E group increased significantly in their use of "intensification" on

⁶ Because semantic formula use was coded "0" for "did not use the formula" and "1" for "used the formula," the percentages shown in tables 39 through 62 can easily be converted into the group means. For example, "45% of the combined student sample used a particular formula" means that the mean frequency of use of that formula for the combined sample was .45 out of a total possible score of 1. The data were reported with percentages for the convenience of the reader.

the “Friend’s book” vignette (49% > 76%). This change indicates that the E group began using intensification in the posttest much more frequently than the natives used this strategy (42%).

Comparing the E group to the Spanish NSs, Table 39 shows six cases in which semantic formula use differed significantly between NNSs and NSs. First, E group students were found to use the semantic formula “acknowledgement of responsibility” significantly less than NSs both on the pretest and on the posttest in the “Spill wine” and “Babysitting spill” vignettes. On the “Friend’s book” vignette, the difference between the NSs and the NNSs was significant only in the posttest. Second, E group students’ use of the semantic formula “explanation” in the “Meeting friend” and “Prof meeting” vignettes was found to be significantly lower than that of the NSs. In the vignette “Meeting friend,” 100% of the natives used this semantic formula (students: pre=70%, post=85%) and in “Prof meeting,” 92% of NSs did so (students: pre=61%, post=67%). In both vignettes, the E group moved in the direction of the NSs by using an “explanation” more frequently in the posttest. Third, the E group’s use of the semantic formula “offer of repair” was found to differ significantly from that of the Spanish NSs on the “Prof meeting” vignette. In this vignette, students used this semantic formula less frequently (pre=61%, post=67%) than natives did (92%). The posttest shows E group students moving towards being more native-like in their use of this strategy.

Overall, in four out of six cases in which the differences between NSs and NNSs were statistically significant, the E group students moved in the direction of the Spanish NSs over the course of their semester abroad. In one case they moved in the opposite direction of the natives, and in the other case there was no change from pre- to posttest. These findings seem to suggest a tendency for the E group students to become generally more native-like in the use of semantic formulas in the *Speech Act Measure* apology vignettes, although that tendency is not the case across the board.

Table 39: Percent of Spanish NSs and of E Group Students Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Apologies

		Vignette #1 “Spill wine”	Vignette #3 “Friend’s book”	Vignette #5 “Babysitting spill”	Vignette #7 “Meeting friend”	Vignette #9 “Prof meeting”	
Apology Expression	NNSs	Pretest	100%	100%	97%	100%	88%
		Posttest	97%	94%	100%	94%	88%
	Spanish NSs	83%	83%	100%	100%	92%	
Acknowledgement of Responsibility	NNSs	Pretest	12% ^{††}	55%	67% ^{†††}	18%	6%
		Posttest	18% [†]	39% [†]	67% ^{†††}	18%	21%
	Spanish NSs	58%	75%	100%	33%	8%	
Explanation	NNSs	Pretest	9%	76%	21%	70% ^{†††}	61% [†]
		Posttest	9%	76%	30%	85% [†]	67% [†]
	Spanish NSs	8%	75%	33%	100%	92%	
Offer of Repair	NNSs	Pretest	85%	79%	91%	58%	61% [†]
		Posttest	100%*	94%	94%	67%	67% [†]
	Spanish NSs	92%	83%	92%	33%	92%	
Promise of Non-Recurrence	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	0%	18%	67%
		Posttest	3%	6%	6%	24%	76%
	Spanish NSs	8%	8%	0%	17%	58%	
Intensification	NNSs	Pretest	46%	49%	21%	24%	21%
		Posttest	55%	76%*	36%	15%	30%
	Spanish NSs	25%	42%	42%	8%	25%	

NNSs N=33; NSs N=12

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ † $p < .05$ †† $p < .01$ ††† $p < .001$ * = pre/post comparison using paired samples t -test† = comparison between NSs and NNSs means using independent samples t -test

Looking at the C group separately (Table 40), several differences between the E group can be seen. First, the C group’s posttest frequency of use of the semantic formula “acknowledgement of responsibility” on the “Spill wine” vignette (24%) was not significantly different (at the $p < .05$ level) from that of the Spanish NSs (58%), whereas there was a significant difference for the E group. Second, the C group’s frequency of use of an “explanation” on the “Friend meeting” vignette (pre=94%; post=97%) was not significantly different from that of the NSs (100%) as it was for the E group. There was a statistically significant difference between the C group’s frequency of use of an “offer of repair” on the “Friend meeting” vignette (68%) compared to the NSs (33%) in the pretest, but by the posttest the difference between the NNSs and NSs was not statistically significant. The E group had not had a significant difference on this semantic formula and this particular vignette. Finally, as with the E group, the C group increased significantly from pre- to posttest in their use of “intensification” (pre=41%; post=74%) on the “Friend’s book” vignette. Again, the direction of the increase was not towards the frequency shown in the Spanish NS sample (42%). Unlike the E group, however, the C

group's posttest frequency of use of "intensification" in this vignette was significantly different from that of the Spanish NSs.

Overall, in five out of seven cases in which the NNSs differed significantly from the NSs in either the pretest, the posttest, or in both, the C group students moved in the direction of the Spanish NSs. This finding suggests that, as in the case of the E group, the C group tended to become more native-like in the use of semantic formulas in apologies during a semester studying abroad. Thus, the speech act performance data do not provide any clear evidence that the intervention helped the E group improve their apology performance in one semester any more than the C group who did not receive the special input. Instead, these findings would suggest that exposure to Spanish NSs in the study abroad environment or continued study of Spanish over the course of 4 months may have helped all students become more native-like in their use of the semantic formulas for apologizing⁷.

Table 40: Percent of Spanish NSs and of C Group Students Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Apologies

			Vignette #1 "Spill wine"	Vignette #3 "Friend's book"	Vignette #5 "Babysitting spill"	Vignette #7 "Meeting friend"	Vignette #9 "Prof meeting"
Apology Expression	NNSs	Pretest	97%	100%	100%	94%	88%
		Posttest	100%	97%	97%	100%	88%
	Spanish NSs	83%	83%	100%	100%	92%	
Acknowledgement of Responsibility	NNSs	Pretest	9% ^{††}	35% [†]	59% ^{†††}	15%	9%
		Posttest	24%	47% [†]	62% ^{†††}	18%	9%
	Spanish NSs	58%	75%	100%	33%	8%	
Explanation	NNSs	Pretest	6%	65%	38%	94%	68% [†]
		Posttest	6%	74%	41%	97%	53% ^{††}
	Spanish NSs	8%	75%	33%	100%	92%	
Offer of Repair	NNSs	Pretest	97%	94%	91%	68% [†]	44% ^{†††}
		Posttest	97%	94%	97%	65%	56% ^{††}
	Spanish NSs	92%	83%	92%	33%	92%	
Promise of Non-Recurrence	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	3%	21%	79%
		Posttest	3%	0%	6%	21%	82%
	Spanish NSs	8%	8%	0%	17%	58%	
Intensification	NNSs	Pretest	24%	41%	35%	29%	21%
		Posttest	38%	74% ^{**†}	32%	12%	27%
	Spanish NSs	25%	42%	42%	8%	25%	

NNSs N=34; NSs N=12

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

† $p < .05$ †† $p < .01$ ††† $p < .001$

* = pre/post comparison using paired samples t -test

† = comparison between NSs and NNSs means using independent samples t -test

⁷ Due to the fact that we did not have a comparison group of students who studied Spanish in the at-home environment, we cannot distinguish between gains that are the result of simply continuing to study the TL and those that are the result of the study abroad environment in particular.

With regard to the pre-post differences for the combined sample (shown in Table 41), the only statistically significant change occurred with the strategy of “intensification” on apology vignettes “Friend’s book” and “Meeting friend.” For “Friend’s book,” a greater percentage of the sample employed intensification in the posttest (76%) compared to the pretest (45%), and the difference was significant at the $p < .001$ level. NSs used intensification in this vignette 42% of the time and, as such, students moved in a direction of being less like the NSs in the combined sample. The reverse trend is true for the “Meeting friend” vignette; use of intensification decreased from pre- to posttest, moving from 27% to 13% – a statistically significant difference. In this case, the change is in the direction of being more like the NSs.

Comparing the combined sample to the Spanish NSs, Table 41 shows seven cases in which semantic formula use differed significantly between NNSs and NSs. First, students were found to use the semantic formula “acknowledgement of responsibility” significantly less than NSs both on the pretest and on the posttest in the “Spill wine,” “Friend’s book,” and “Babysitting spill” vignettes. Only in “Spill wine” did students change their frequency of use of this semantic formula from pre- to posttest by more than 1 or 2 percentage points. However, this pre-post change was not statistically significant, and frequency of the use of an “acknowledgement of responsibility” remained significantly lower than as was true of the NSs.

Students’ use of the semantic formula “explanation” in the “Meeting friend” and “Prof meeting” vignettes was found to be significantly lower than that of the NSs. In the vignette “Meeting friend,” 100% of the natives used this semantic formula (students: pre=82%, post=91%) and in “Prof meeting,” 92% of NSs did so (students: pre=64%, post=60%). Comparing the percentages of these two apology vignettes, however, the percent of students who used an explanation in “Meeting friend” was noticeably closer to the natives than the percent of students who used this semantic formula in “Prof meeting” – i.e., a 9% difference in comparison with a 32% difference between NSs and NNSs. The difference is that the NSs were unanimous (i.e., 100%; SD = .00) in using an “explanation” in “Meeting friend,” whereas 92% of the NSs (SD=.29) used this semantic formula in “Prof meeting.”

The combined student sample’s use of the semantic formula “offer of repair” was found to differ significantly from that of the Spanish NSs on two vignettes, “Meeting friend” and “Prof meeting.” In the case of “Meeting friend,” students used an “offer of repair” more frequently (pre=63%, post=66%) than the natives did (33%). On the “Prof meeting” vignette, the opposite is true; students used this semantic formula less frequently (pre=52%, post=61%) than natives did (92%). The posttest showed students moving towards being more native-like.

Finally, although the difference between the NNSs and NSs in the use of “intensification” in the “Friend’s book” vignette was not statistically significant, the students’ use of this strategy was highly different from that of the natives – 76% of the NNSs in the posttest used “intensification” in comparison with 42% of the NSs. This difference may not have been statistically significant due to the high spread of scores within each of the two groups, producing high standard deviations for the groups (NS = .50, NNS = .52).

The findings for a semester abroad did not indicate any overall shift towards performing speech acts more like the native-speaker benchmark provided by the 12 NSs. Rather, the results were mixed. There were some instances where students did shift in their responses to performance that was seen as more native-like, such as in their use of an “explanation” in the “Meeting friend” vignette and in their use of “intensification” in the “Babysitting spill” vignette.

Then, there were cases in which the NNSs shifted in the opposite direction to being less like the NSs in the posttest than in the pretest, such as their use of an “acknowledgement of responsibility” in the “Prof meeting” vignette and their use of “intensification” in the “Friend’s book” vignette. Finally, with the use of some semantic formulas, NNSs had very similar rates of use as NSs in both the pre- and posttest, including the use of an “explanation” in the “Spill wine,” “Friend’s book,” and “Babysitting spill” vignettes and the use of an “apology expression” in the “Babysitting spill,” “Meeting friend,” and “Prof meeting” vignettes.

Table 41: Percent of Spanish NSs and of Students (Combined Sample) Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Apologies

		Vignette #1 “Spill wine”	Vignette #3 “Friend’s book”	Vignette #5 “Babysitting spill”	Vignette #7 “Meeting friend”	Vignette #9 “Prof meeting”	
Apology Expression	NNSs	Pretest	99%	100%	99%	97%	88%
		Posttest	99%	96%	99%	97%	88%
	Spanish NSs	83%	83%	100%	100%	92%	
Acknowledgement of Responsibility	NNSs	Pretest	10% ^{††}	45% [†]	63% ^{†††}	13%	7%
		Posttest	21% [†]	43% [†]	64% ^{†††}	18%	15%
	Spanish NSs	58%	75%	100%	33%	8%	
Explanation	NNSs	Pretest	8%	70%	30%	82% ^{†††}	64% [†]
		Posttest	8%	75%	36%	91% [†]	60% ^{††}
	Spanish NSs	8%	75%	33%	100%	92%	
Offer of Repair	NNSs	Pretest	91%	87%	91%	63% [†]	52% ^{†††}
		Posttest	99%	94%	96%	66% [†]	61% ^{††}
	Spanish NSs	92%	83%	92%	33%	92%	
Promise of Non-Recurrence	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	2%	19%	73%
		Posttest	3%	3%	6%	22%	79%
	Spanish NSs	8%	8%	0%	17%	58%	
Intensification	NNSs	Pretest	34%	45%	28%	27%	21%
		Posttest	46%	76% ^{***}	34%	13% [*]	28%
	Spanish NSs	25%	42%	42%	8%	25%	

NNSs N=67; NSs N=12

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

† $p < .05$ †† $p < .01$ ††† $p < .001$

* = pre/post comparison using paired samples t -test

† = comparison between NSs and NNSs means using independent samples t -test

Requests in Spanish

A similar analysis was done with requests in Spanish and is shown in Tables 42 through 50 below. The number of semantic formulas used to code the request data was considerably greater than that used for the apologies, due to the fact that requests are a more complex speech act than apologies in many languages. The semantic formulas were divided into three larger categories: “head act,” “supportive moves,” and “head act perspective.” A *head act* refers to that part of the utterance which on its own could convey the illocutionary meaning of a request. *Supportive moves* (also called external modifications – i.e., “external” to the head act) are utterances that are used in addition to the head act and that have the function of either mitigating or to increasing the force of the request as a means to convince the hearer to comply with the speaker’s wishes. Each of the supportive moves included in this analysis are listed below with examples. Finally, *head act perspective* relates to the person or people to whom the verb in the head act refers. Perspective is determined by the form of the verb, not by the presence of object pronouns. In this analysis, four types of perspective were analyzed: *hearer oriented*, *speaker oriented*, *inclusive* (speaker and hearer), and *impersonal*. The first type relates to utterances in which the speaker is emphasized as the agent (e.g., ‘Can **I** have the book?’). The second refers to those instances in which the hearer’s role is emphasized (e.g., ‘Can **you** give me the book?’). In *inclusive*, the roles of both the hearer and the speaker are emphasized equally (e.g., ‘Could **we** go now?’), whereas with *impersonal* perspective, neither interlocutor is mentioned (e.g., ‘Would it be possible to borrow that book?’).

In addition to these three categories, one other category of analysis was included, namely, verb modification of the semantic formula type “query preparatory,” which can be considered an example of an internal modification or downgrading. *Internal modifications* are “elements within the request utterance proper (linked to the Head Act), the presence of which is not essential for the utterance to be potentially understood as a request” (Blum-Kulka & House, 1989). Distinctions are made between two types of internal modifications: *syntactic* and *lexical/phrasal downgraders* and *upgraders*. Syntactic downgraders involve the strategic use of grammatical structures, interrogative, imperative, and conditional constructions, negation, and tense to soften the force of a request. Lexical/phrasal downgraders, in turn, refer to a large number of mitigating devices including the following which are relevant to Spanish: diminutives (*espérate un momentito*), cajolers (*No sé que hacer, digo, me lo podría prestar?*), vocatives or terms of address (Perdone, *señor*...), and politeness markers (*por favor*) (Márquez-Reiter, 2000). In this analysis we have focused on a single type of syntactic downgrader, that of modification to the head act verb in the semantic formula type “query preparatory.” Modification of the verb in Spanish took the form of changing the inflection from present tense to conditional or imperfect subjunctive. For example, the utterance *¿Puede usted hablar más despacio?* (‘Can you speak more slowly?’) would be considered a “query preparatory” with no modification because the model verb *poder* is in the present tense. Utterances such as *¿Podría/Pudiera hablar más despacio?* (‘Could you speak more slowly?’), *¿Sería posible que hablara más lento?* (‘Would it be possible for you to speak more slowly?’), and *¿Le importaría hablar más lento?* (‘Would you mind speaking more slowly?’) were all considered to be “query preparatory with verb modification” because the verb of the request head act is in the conditional or imperfect subjunctive form. Modifying the head act verb in this way softens the force of the request. This particular modification was chosen as a category of analysis because it found to be very frequent in the Spanish NS data.

The Spanish NSs also used a number different lexical downgraders on the *Speech Act Measure*, but we chose to focus on one in particular, the downgrader, *por favor* ('please'), which was coded for both the NSs and NNSs. The downgrader *por favor* was selected because two studies on requests in Mexican Spanish have shown that it is an important mitigating device in that variety of Spanish, although this mitigator may not be as important in other varieties such as Peninsular Spanish (Arellano, 2000; Curc6 & De Fina, 2002)

A list of the semantic formulas, supportive moves, and head act perspectives used to code the request data can be found in Appendix H. In addition, all of the categories of analysis are exemplified below using data collected in this study from both students and Spanish NSs. The only exception is that the category "explicit performative" was not used by any of the Spanish students or any of the NSs and therefore, no examples of that semantic formula are given (it was used in the French request data, however, which is why the category was maintained).

Head Act
<p><u>Mood derivable</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Student</u>: <i>Por favor, si no es molestia, hable mas despacio.</i> (61E, pretest, "Slower speech") 'Please, if it isn't a bother, speak more slowly.' ▪ <u>Native</u>: <i>Por favor, usted sabe que soy responsable, déme una extensión para la presentación.</i> (NS506, Argentina, "Paper extension") 'Please, you know that I'm responsible, give me an extension for the presentation.'
<p><u>Hedged performative</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Student</u>: <i>Quisiera preguntarte si es posible entregar la monografía un poquito mas tarde, tipo, la proxima semana</i> (74E, posttest, "Paper extension") 'I would like to ask you if it's possible to turn in the monograph a little bit later, next week.' ▪ <u>Native</u>: <i>Quisiera pedirle una prórroga en la redacción del artículo que tenemos pendiente.</i> (NS505, Colombia, "Paper extension") 'I would like to ask you for an extension for the writing of the article that we have coming up.'
<p><u>Locution derivable</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Student</u>: <i>Hola profesor. Tengo un problema con el papel. Tengo oportunidad viajar este fin de semana, pero necesito una extensión para mi papel.</i> (108C, pretest, "Paper extension") 'Hi professor. I have a problem with the paper. I have opportunity to travel this weekend, but I need an extension for my paper.'

- Native: *Doctor, le prometo que le entrego el trabajo la próxima semana. Es muy importante para mí visitar a mis amigos. ¿Me da la extensión?* (NS503, Colombia, “Paper extension”)
a ‘Doctor, I promise you that I’ll turn in the paper next week. It’s really important for me to visit my friends. **Are you giving me the extension?**’

Query preparatory

- Student: *Perdon, señor... ¿le importa cambiar el asiento con mi amiga? Es que queremos sentar juntos.* (12E, posttest, “Airplane seat”)
‘Excuse me, sir...**do you mind** changing the seat with my friend? It’s that we want to sit together.’
- Student: *Cuando habla muy rápido es difícil para mi y otras estudiantes para aprender. Puede hablar con más despacio en el futuro?* (69E, posttest, “Slower speech”)
‘When you speak very quickly it’s difficult for me and other students to learn. **Can** you speak more slowly in the future?’
- Native: *Raquel, puedo pedirte que estés lista para salir hacia la escuela a tiempo.* (NS501, Argentina, “Leaving for school”)
‘Raquel, **can I** ask that you be ready to go to school on time.’
- Native: *Raquel, te quería pedir si nos podemos ir más temprano a clases, resulta que es que estoy llegando muy tarde todos los días y estoy perdiendo casi 20 minutos de clases.* (NS502, Costa Rica, “Leaving for school”)
‘Raquel, I wanted to ask if **we can** go to classes earlier, it turns out that I’m arriving very late every day and I’m missing almost 20 minutes of classes.’

Query preparatory with verb modification

- Student: *Dr. Rodríguez... perdon, pero ¿sería posible que yo reciba un extensión para el trabajo?* (12E, posttest, “Paper extension”)
‘Dr. Rodríguez...sorry, but would it be possible for me to get an extension for the paper?’
- Student: *No quiero molestar a Ud., pero si es posible podría Ud. cambia de asiento con mi amiga?* (65E, pretest, “Airplane seat”)
‘I don’t want to bother you, but if it is possible **could** you change seats with my friend?’
- Native: *Por favor, Dr. Rodríguez, podría alargarme el plazo de entrega del proyecto?* (NS509, Spain, “Paper extension”)
‘Please, Dr. Rodríguez, **could you** extend the due date for the project for me?’

- Native: *Raquel, ¿te importaría si saliéramos más temprano? Es que tardas tanto en arreglarte que siempre llego tarde.* (NS509, Spain, “Leaving for school”) ‘Raquel, **would you mind** if we left earlier? It’s that you take so long in getting ready that I always arrive late.’

Want statement

- Student: *Es que unos de mis compañeros y yo no le podemos entender a usted, así que nos gustaría que hablara un poquito mas despacio.* (26C, posttest, “Slower speech”) ‘It’s that some of my classmates and I cannot understand you, so **we would like** you to speak a little more slowly.’
- Native: *Este plato me gusta mucho, sólo quiero comer menos cantidad. Es demasiado para mi.* (NS506, Argentina, “Less food”) ‘I like this dish a lot, **I just want to eat less quantity**. It’s too much for me.’

Hint

- Student: In order to exemplify a hint it was necessary to include an entire vignette, which is shown below (101E, posttest, “Slower speech”).

You: *Profesor Martínez*

Dr. Martínez: *¿Qué tal?*

You: *Mis compañeros y yo no podemos comprender cuando usted habla muy rápido.* (‘My classmates and I cannot understand when you speak very fast.’)

Dr. Martínez: *Qué pena. Tengo que recordar que después de todo ustedes no son nativo hablantes.*

You: *Sí, hablar más lento y claro nos ayudaría mucho.* (‘Yeah, speaking more slowly and clearly would help us a lot.’)

Dr. Martínez: *Claro, no hay problema. Voy a hacer todo lo posible por hablar más lento y con más cuidado. Dime de que otra manera puedo ayudarte.*

- Native: In order to exemplify a hint it was necessary to include an entire vignette, which is shown below (NS504, México, “Slower speech”).

You: *Dr. Martínez, ¿tiene un minuto?* (‘Dr. Martínez, do you have a minute?’)

Dr. Martínez: *¿Qué tal?*

You: *Doctor, fíjese que me está costando mucho trabajo la clase y concluí que es porque a veces usted habla muy rápido. Antes de venir a verlo platiqué con otros alumnos y tienen el mismo problema. ('Doctor, you know the class is really hard for me and I concluded that it's because sometimes you talk very fast. Before coming to see you I spoke with other students and they have the same problem.')*

Dr. Martínez: *Qué pena. Tengo que recordar que después de todo ustedes no son nativo hablantes.*

You: *Muchas gracias. ('Thanks a lot.')*

Dr. Martínez: *Claro, no hay problema. Voy a hacer todo lo posible por hablar más lento y con más cuidado. Dime de que otra manera puedo ayudarte.*

Supportive Moves

Preparator

- Student: *Disculpa, señor. Lo puedo pedir un favor?* (89C, posttest, "Airplane seat")
'Excuse me, sir. **Can I ask you a favor?**'
- Native: *Disculpe, quisiera pedirle un gran favor, ¿sería mucha molestia si intercambiara asientos con mi amigo?* (NS511, México, "Airplane seat")
'Excuse me, **I would like to ask you a big favor**, would it be a huge bother if you were to change seats with my friend?'

Getting a precommitment

- Student: *Hola señor. Si no está aquí con alguien, puede cambiar asientos con mi amigo, por favor?* (110C, pretest, "Airplane seat")
'Hi sir. **If you're not here with someone**, can you change seats with my friend, please?'
- Native: *Señor, disculpe. Espero que no sea mucha molestia, mire, mi amigo y yo viajamos juntos y queríamos ver si usted nos ayuda para poder ir sentados el uno al lado del otro cambiándose de asiento.* (NS508, Ecuador, "Airplane seat")
'Sir, excuse me. **I hope this isn't a bother**, look, my friend and I are traveling together and we wanted to see if you'll help us to be able to sit next to each other by changing seats.'

Grounder

- **Student:** *La cosa es que volar le da mucho miedo a mi amiga.* (30C, posttest, “Airplane seat”)

‘The thing is that flying makes my friend scared.’
- **Native:** *Va a ser un vuelo muy largo y queríamos estar juntos para hacernos compañía, pero no reservamos los asientos juntos.* (NS511, Mexico, “Airplane seat”)

‘It’s going to be a long flight and we wanted to be together to keep each other company, but we didn’t reserve seats together.’

Disarmer

- **Student:** *Estar en su clase es una experiencia buenisima para que escuchemos a un nativo hablante y por eso le damos las gracias pero si podría tratar de hablar más despacio creo que ayudaría mucho.* (89C, posttest, “Slower speech”)

‘**Being in your class is a really good experience for us to listen to a native speaker** and for that we thank you but if you could try to speak more slowly I think that would help a lot.’
- **Native:** *Usted sabe como es la vida de estudiante, hacer las cosas que están encima y dejar para más adelante las otras.* (NS506, Argentina, “Paper extension”)

‘You know what the student life is like, doing things that are on top [due immediately] and leaving the other things for later.’

Promise of reward

- **Student:** *Sí, entiendo señor, que sea más cómodo donde está ahora pero te daré mi almohada para que estés más cómodo y te compro un trago mientras volamos, lo que usted quiera.* (89C, posttest, “Airplane seat”)

‘Yes, I understand sir, that it is more comfortable where you are now but **I’ll give you my pillow so that you’re more comfortable and I’ll buy you a drink while we’re flying, whichever one you want.**’
- **Native:** *Si me diera una extensión podría hacer un análisis de los datos que usted propuso como parte optativa del trabajo. Le prometo que haré un trabajo excelente.* (NS501, Argentina, “Paper extensión”)

‘If you were to give me an extension I could do an analysis of the data that you proposed as an optional part of the paper. **I promise you that I’ll do an excellent paper.**’

Imposition minimizer

- **Student:** *Me encanta la comida! ¿Es posible poner más en un plato en el refrigerador para la cena en vez de comer toda para la comida? Entonces estoy comiendo todo pero sobre mas tiempo, y quiero comer toda porque ¡es tan rica!* (5E, posttest, “Less food”)

‘I love the food! Is it possible to put more on a plate in the fridge for dinner instead of eating all of it for lunch? **So then I’m eating everything but over more time**, and I want to eat all of it because it is so good!’
- **Native:** *Pero Doctor, usted sabe que he estado muy ocupado ultimamente, le prometo que voy a terminar el artículo tan pronto como regrese del viaje.* (NS505, Colombia, “Paper extension”)

‘But Doctor, you know that I have been very busy lately, I promise you that **I’m going to finish the paper as soon as I get back from the trip.**’

Acknowledgment of imposition

- **Student:** *Sí, entiendo señor, que sea más cómodo donde está ahora.* (89C, posttest, “Airplane seat”)

‘Yes, I understand sir, that it is more comfortable where you are now.’
- **Native:** *Lo sé, y me apena incomodarlos pero es un vuelo largo y nos gustaría estar juntos.* (NS507, Honduras, “Airplane seat”)

‘I know, and **I feel bad making you uncomfortable** but it’s a long flight and we’d like to be together.’

Appreciation

- **Student:** **Muchas gracias** señor, **muy amable.** (30C, posttest, “Airplane seat”)

‘Thanks a lot sir, that’s very kind.’
- **Native:** *Cuánto se lo agradecemos señor, muchísimas gracias.* (NS501, Argentina, “Airplane seat”)

‘How much we appreciate it sir, thanks a lot.’

Mitigation with the word ‘please’

- **Student:** **Por favor**, puede hablar un poco mas lento para que podamos entender bien? (30C, posttest, “Slower speech”)

‘**Please**, can you speak a little more slowly so we can understand well?’

- Native: *Quería pedirle **por favor** si puede hablar un poco más despacio, es muy difícil para mi entenderle cuando habla tan rápido.* (NS502, Costa Rica, “Slower speech”)
‘I wanted to ask you **please** if you can speak a little more slowly, it’s very difficult for me to understand you when you speak so fast.’

Head Act Perspective

Hearer oriented

- Student: *¿La próxima vez **puedes** quedar conmigo un poco más temprano?* (19E, posttest, “Leaving for school”)
‘Next time can **you** meet with me a little earlier?’
- Native: *Tal vez **podría** hablar más despacio para la próxima vez.* (NS507, Honduras, “Slower speech”)
‘Maybe **you could** speak more slowly the next time.’

Speaker oriented

- Student: *Discúlpeme profesor, pero **puedo** tener un poco más tiempo para hacer la tarea que nos dio?* (30C, posttest, “Paper extension”)
‘Excuse me professor, but can **I** have a little more time to do the homework you gave us?’
- Native: *Raquel, **puedo** pedirte que estés lista para salir hacia la escuela a tiempo.* (NS501, Argentina, “Leaving for school”)
‘Raquel, **can I** ask that you be ready to go to school on time.’

Inclusive (speaker and hearer oriented)

- Student: *Hola Raquel. Me gusta pasando a la clase contigo durante la mañana pero he llegado tarde reciente. ¿**Podemos** salir más temprano?* (77C, pretest, “Leaving for school”)
‘Hi Rachel. I like going to class with you during the morning but I’ve arrived late recently. **Can we** leave earlier?’
- Native: *Raquel, te quería pedir si nos **podemos** ir más temprano a clases, resulta que es que estoy llegando muy tarde todos los días y estoy perdiendo casi 20 minutos de clases.* (NS502, Costa Rica, “Leaving for school”)
‘Raquel, I wanted to ask if **we can** go to classes earlier, it turns out that I’m arriving very late every day and I’m missing almost 20 minutes of classes.’

Impersonal

- Student: *Pues, es que habla muy rápido. Algunos de nosotros no podemos entender todo lo que dice. ¿Sería posible hablar un poco más despacio?* (12E, posttest, “Slower speech”)

‘Uh, it’s that you speak very fast. Some of us cannot understand everything that you say. **Would it be possible to speak a little more slowly?**’
- Native: This perspective was not used by the NSs in this study.

The categories listed above were used to code both the student and NS request data. The use of these semantic formulas and supportive moves was then entered into SPSS in order to produce a profile of frequency of use for the E group, the C group, the combined sample, and the Spanish NSs. As with apologies, statistical tests were run to determine statistically significant differences between students’ pre- and posttest semantic formula and supportive move use, and between students’ and Spanish NSs’ frequency of use of these speech act performance strategies.

Tables 42 through 47 show the results for the E and C groups separately. Looking first at the results for head act semantic formula use, the most significant difference between the E and C groups was in the use of the semantic formula “query preparatory with verb modification.” On the “Slower speech” vignette, the E group started out using this semantic formula 9% in the pretest and increased their use to 33% in the posttest (Spanish NSs used this vignette 67% of the time in the “Slower speech” vignette), a statistically significant difference between pre- and posttest ($p < .05$) for the E group. Likewise, E group students increased their use of “query preparatory with verb modification” in the “Leaving for school” vignette from 0% to 15% ($p < .05$), towards the Spanish NSs’ frequency of 50%. While C group students did move in the direction of greater percentage of students using this same semantic formula, the differences between pre- and posttest were not significant for any vignette. In addition, Table 48 shows that the C group’s change from pre- to posttest was not as great as the E group’s; in the “Slower speech” vignette the frequency went from 12% to 21% and in the “Leaving for school” vignette, from 3% to 6%. The results for use of the semantic formula “query preparatory with verb modification” suggest that the E group was able to move towards being more native-like in their use of this semantic formula – i.e., by downgrading the verb more frequently – than the C group over the course of one semester abroad. In fact, differing use of this semantic formula by the E and C groups figured in the rated gain scores on the *Speech Act Measure* and would help explain why the E group gained more overall than the C group. The importance of softening the head act verb by using the conditional or imperfect subjunctive forms was expressed frequently by all of the Spanish NS raters in their qualitative comments on the *Speech Act Measure* data. The fact that the E group moved more than the C group in the direction of the NSs in the use of “query preparatory with verb modification” may be attributable to the intervention. No other results on the use of head act formulas between the E and C groups are significantly different from each other.

The statistically significant results for supportive moves show a number of differences between the E group and the C group. As Tables 46 and 49 indicate, each group had only one

case in which the frequency differed significantly from pre- to posttest. In the case of the E group, students significantly decreased their use of a “promise of reward” in the “Slower speech” vignette from pre- to posttest (12% to 0%; $p < .05$). This change went in the direction of the Spanish NSs, who used this semantic formula 8% of the time, but went farther in that direction than the natives. The percent of C group students who used an “acknowledgement of imposition” in the “Paper extension” vignette greatly increased from the pre- (44%) to the posttest (71%), which was significant at the $p < .05$ level. The remaining significant results between the E and C groups indicate that the two groups had somewhat different patterns of semantic formula use, however the differences do not provide any insights into why these two groups may have differed in the ways that they did.

Tables 44 and 47 show the results for frequency of use of perspective for the E and C groups. The frequency distribution is similar between the two groups and no statistically significant differences were found between the pre- and posttests or between the students and the Spanish NSs.

Table 42: Percent of Spanish NSs and of E Group Students Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Request Head Act⁸

Head Act Formula Type			Vignette #2 "Slower speech"	Vignette #4 "Airplane Seat"	Vignette #6 "Paper extension"	Vignette #8 "Less food"	Vignette #10 "Leaving for school"
Mood Derivable	NNSs	Pretest	6%	0%	0%	6%	6%
		Posttest	0%	0%	3%	9%	9%
	Spanish NSs		0%	17%	25%	8%	8%
Explicit Performative	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		Posttest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Spanish NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Hedged Performative	NNSs	Pretest	3%	0%	6% [†]	0%	0%
		Posttest	0%	0%	6% [†]	0%	0%
	Spanish NSs		17%	0%	42%	0%	25%
Locution Derivable	NNSs	Pretest	3%	12% [†]	24%	18%	18% [†]
		Posttest	3%	3%	9%	6%	15% [†]
	Spanish NSs		8%	0%	33%	17%	0%
Query Preparatory	NNSs	Pretest	55% ^{†††}	55% [†]	61%	24%	55%
		Posttest	49% ^{†††}	61% ^{††}	58%	21%	58%
	Spanish NSs		0%	17%	33%	17%	33%
Query Preparatory with Verb Modification	NNSs	Pretest	9% ^{†††}	12% ^{††}	18%	3%	0% ^{†††}
		Posttest	33% ^{*†}	27% [†]	30%	3%	15% ^{*†}
	Spanish NSs		67%	67%	17%	17%	50%
Want Statement	NNSs	Pretest	3%	3%	0%	12%	9%
		Posttest	3%	3%	0%	15%	3%
	Spanish NSs		0%	8%	0%	8%	0%
Hint	NNSs	Pretest	21%	21%	0%	46%	12%
		Posttest	12%	12%	6%	49%	12%
	Spanish NSs		17%	8%	0%	42%	8%

NNSs N=33; NSs N=12

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ † $p < .05$ †† $p < .01$ ††† $p < .001$ * = pre/post comparison using paired samples *t*-test† = comparison between NSs and NNSs means using independent samples *t*-test

⁸ Note that totals may not add up to 100% (i.e., a mean of 1.0) in each column due to the fact that in some cases individuals used more than one head act in a single vignette.

Table 43: Percent of Spanish NSs and of E Group Students Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Request Supportive Moves

Supportive Moves Formula Type			Vignette #2 "Slower speech"	Vignette #4 "Airplane Seat"	Vignette #6 "Paper extension"	Vignette #8 "Less food"	Vignette #10 "Leaving for school"
Preparator	NNSs	Pretest	33%	15%	3%	0%	3%
		Posttest	33%	18%	12% [†]	3%	9%
	Spanish NSs		25%	42%	0%	8%	25%
Getting a Precommitment	NNSs	Pretest	6%	3%	0%	0%	3%
		Posttest	6%	6%	9%	0%	3%
	Spanish NSs		8%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Grounder	NNSs	Pretest	91%	94%	100%	97%	94%
		Posttest	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Spanish NSs		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Disarmer	NNSs	Pretest	15%	0%	9% [†]	94%	24%
		Posttest	12%	6%	27%	91%	33%
	Spanish NSs		17%	17%	50%	100%	17%
Promise of Reward	NNSs	Pretest	12%	3%	12%	0%	0%
		Posttest	0%*	9%	33%	0%	0%
	Spanish NSs		8%	0%	17%	8%	0%
Imposition Minimizer	NNSs	Pretest	6%	15% [†]	55%	0%	3%
		Posttest	9%	6%	56%	3%	0%
	Spanish NSs		8%	0%	58%	17%	0%
Acknowledgement of Imposition	NNSs	Pretest	0%	30%	55%	3%	0%
		Posttest	18%	30%	58%	3%	6%
	Spanish NSs		8%	42%	42%	0%	0%
Appreciation	NNSs	Pretest	27%	91%	27%	3%	0%
		Posttest	42%	91%	33%	3%	3%
	Spanish NSs		33%	92%	17%	8%	0%
Mitigation with the word 'please'	NNSs	Pretest	21%	33%	42%	6%	6%
		Posttest	6%	21%	30%	9%	6%
	Spanish NSs		25%	33%	58%	17%	8%

NNSs N=33; NSs N=12

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

[†] $p < .05$ ^{††} $p < .01$ ^{†††} $p < .001$

* = pre/post comparison using paired samples t -test

[†] = comparison between NSs and NNSs means using independent samples t -test

Table 44: Percent of Spanish NSs and of E Group Students Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Request Head Act Perspective⁹

Head Act Perspective			Vignette #2 “Slower speech”	Vignette #4 “Airplane Seat	Vignette #6 “Paper extension”	Vignette #8 “Less food”	Vignette #10 “Leaving for school”
Hearer Oriented	NNSs	Pretest	61%	64%	18%	36%	33%
		Posttest	73%	61%	24%	27%	21%
	Spanish NSs		75%	75%	50%	58%	50%
Speaker Oriented	NNSs	Pretest	9%	3%	69%	12%	12%
		Posttest	6%	12%	51%	21%	3%
	Spanish NSs		8%	8%	50%	8%	8%
Speaker and Hearer Oriented	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%
		Posttest	0%	6%	0%	0%	58%
	Spanish NSs		0%	8%	0%	0%	33%
Impersonal	NNSs	Pretest	9%	9%	12%	3%	3%
		Posttest	9%	12%	18%	3%	6%
	Spanish NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

NNSs N=33; NSs N=12

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

† $p < .05$ †† $p < .01$ ††† $p < .001$

* = pre/post comparison using paired samples *t*-test

† = comparison between NSs and NNSs means using independent samples *t*-test

⁹ Percentages may not add up to 100% because when “hints” were used as the head act, “head act perspective” was not coded. In addition, when more than one head act was used by an individual in a single vignette, “perspective” was coded for the primary head act only (i.e., only one time).

Table 45: Percent of Spanish NSs and of C Group Students Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Request Head Act

Head Act Formula Type			Vignette #2 “Slower speech”	Vignette #4 “Airplane Seat	Vignette #6 “Paper extension”	Vignette #8 “Less food”	Vignette #10 “Leaving for school”
Mood Derivable	NNSs	Pretest	6%	6%	6%	0%	3%
		Posttest	6%	3%	0%	0%	0%
	Spanish NSs		0%	17%	25%	8%	8%
Explicit Performative	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		Posttest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Spanish NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Hedged Performative	NNSs	Pretest	0%	3%	6% [†]	0%	0%
		Posttest	3%	0%	6% [†]	0%	0%
	Spanish NSs		17%	0%	42%	0%	25%
Locution Derivable	NNSs	Pretest	0%	12% [†]	24%	3%	9%
		Posttest	0%	3%	21%	9%	15% [†]
	Spanish NSs		8%	0%	33%	17%	0%
Query Preparatory	NNSs	Pretest	47% ^{†††}	35%	59%	27%	56%
		Posttest	44% ^{†††}	59% ^{**††}	59%	18%	62%
	Spanish NSs		0%	17%	33%	17%	33%
Query Preparatory with Verb Modification	NNSs	Pretest	12% ^{††}	21% ^{††}	6%	3%	3% ^{††}
		Posttest	21% ^{††}	21% ^{††}	15%	6%	6% [†]
	Spanish NSs		67%	67%	17%	17%	50%
Want Statement	NNSs	Pretest	6%	9%	6%	18%	6%
		Posttest	6%	3%	3%	6%	6%
	Spanish NSs		0%	8%	0%	8%	0%
Hint	NNSs	Pretest	29%	21%	0%	53%	24%
		Posttest	27%	15%	6%	65%	6%
	Spanish NSs		17%	8%	0%	42%	8%

NNSs N=34; NSs N=12

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

[†] $p < .05$ ^{††} $p < .01$ ^{†††} $p < .001$

* = pre/post comparison using paired samples t -test

[†] = comparison between NSs and NNSs means using independent samples t -test

Table 46: Percent of Spanish NSs and of C Group Students Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Request Supportive Moves

Supportive Moves Formula Type			Vignette #2 “Slower speech”	Vignette #4 “Airplane Seat	Vignette #6 “Paper extension”	Vignette #8 “Less food”	Vignette #10 “Leaving for school”
Preparator	NNSs	Pretest	41%	24%	12% [†]	0%	3%
		Posttest	27%	29%	18% [†]	3%	0%
	Spanish NSs		25%	42%	0%	8%	25%
Getting a Precommitment	NNSs	Pretest	6%	9%	0%	0%	12% [†]
		Posttest	9%	6%	3%	0%	3%
	Spanish NSs		8%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Grounder	NNSs	Pretest	97%	91%	100%	100%	100%
		Posttest	97%	97%	100%	100%	100%
	Spanish NSs		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Disarmer	NNSs	Pretest	15%	0%	27%	91%	38%
		Posttest	21%	3%	41%	100%	50% [†]
	Spanish NSs		17%	17%	50%	100%	17%
Promise of Reward	NNSs	Pretest	3%	9%	12%	0%	0%
		Posttest	3%	9%	15%	0%	0%
	Spanish NS		8%	0%	17%	8%	0%
Imposition Minimizer	NNSs	Pretest	3%	3%	47%	0%	0%
		Posttest	6%	15% [†]	59%	3%	0%
	Spanish NSs		8%	0%	58%	17%	0%
Acknowledgement of Imposition	NNSs	Pretest	6%	47%	44%	0%	3%
		Posttest	12%	41%	71%*	0%	3%
	Spanish NSs		8%	42%	42%	0%	0%
Appreciation	NNSs	Pretest	44%	91%	29%	0%	9%
		Posttest	44%	88%	27%	0%	6%
	Spanish NSs		33%	92%	17%	8%	0%
Mitigation with the word ‘please’	NNSs	Pretest	9%	32%	32%	6%	9%
		Posttest	24%	32%	41%	6%	9%
	Spanish NSs		25%	33%	58%	17%	8%

NNSs N=34; NSs N=12

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

[†] $p < .05$ ^{††} $p < .01$ ^{†††} $p < .001$

* = pre/post comparison using paired samples *t*-test

[†] = comparison between NSs and NNSs means using independent samples *t*-test

Table 47: Percent of Spanish NSs and of C Group Students Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Request Head Act Perspective

Head Act Perspective			Vignette #2 "Slower speech"	Vignette #4 "Airplane Seat"	Vignette #6 "Paper extension"	Vignette #8 "Less food"	Vignette #10 "Leaving for school"
Hearer Oriented	NNSs	Pretest	74%	71%	21%	27%	24%
		Posttest	62%	56%	15%	24%	29%
	Spanish NSs		75%	75%	50%	58%	50%
Speaker Oriented	NNSs	Pretest	6%	9%	68%	18%	3%
		Posttest	6%	6%	65%	9%	6%
	Spanish NSs		8%	8%	50%	8%	8%
Speaker and Hearer Oriented	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	0%	0%	44%
		Posttest	0%	6%	0%	0%	56%
	Spanish NSs		0%	8%	0%	0%	33%
Impersonal	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	9%	3%	6%
		Posttest	6%	12%	15%	3%	3%
	Spanish NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

NNSs N=34; NSs N=12

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

† $p < .05$ †† $p < .01$ ††† $p < .001$

* = pre/post comparison using paired samples *t*-test

† = comparison between NSs and NNSs means using independent samples *t*-test

Table 48 shows the frequencies of use of the head act semantic formulas for the combined sample of students and for the Spanish NSs. The results that were found to be statistically significant are highlighted in the table. Looking first at NNS pre-post differences, it was found that the combined sample reduced their use of a "locution derivable" head act formula from pretest (12%) to posttest (3%) ($p < .05$) on the "Airplane seat" vignette. This result goes in the direction of the Spanish NSs, 0% of whom used this semantic formula in the "Airplane seat" vignette. The second significant pre-post result is the increase in use of the semantic formula "query preparatory" on the "Airplane seat" vignette from pretest (45%) to posttest (60%) ($p < .05$). This result goes in the direction of being *less* native-like, since the Spanish NSs who used this strategy in the same vignette only 17% of the time. The third pre-post result is an increase in the use of the semantic formula "query preparatory with verb modification" in the "Slower speech" vignette. Only 10% of the students used this semantic formula in the pretest, whereas 27% used it in the posttest, a difference significant at the $p < .05$ level. This result goes in the direction of being more native-like, given that the natives used this strategy in the same vignette 67% of the time. The results for this semantic formula for the "Airplane seat" vignette show a similar pattern of movement towards being more native-like, but the difference was not significant. Thus, in the case of two head act semantic formulas ("locution derivable" and "query preparatory with verb modification") students moved in the direction of being more like the NSs over the course of a semester abroad.

Looking at the significant differences between the students and the NSs, it can be seen that on the "Paper extension" vignette, students used the semantic formula "hedged performative" much less frequently than the natives (42%) in both the pre- (6%) and the posttest

(6%), a difference significant at the $p < .05$ level. Not only did students use this semantic formula much less frequently than natives in that particular vignette, they did not increase their frequency of use of this semantic formula during the semester abroad. Although it is not statistically significant, a similar pattern is seen with this semantic formula in the “Slower speech” and “Leaving for school,” where the NNSs used a “hedged performative” very infrequently in both the pre- and posttest and the Spanish NSs used this semantic formula 17% and 25% of the time, respectively.

Second, in the pretest students used the semantic formula “locution derivable” in the “Airplane seat” vignette more frequently (12%) than the Spanish NSs (0%), which was significant at the $p < .01$ level. By the posttest, however, students had reduced their use of this semantic formula to a frequency similar to that of the natives (NNS=3%, NS=0%). In “Leaving for school” vignette, students used a “locution derivable” head act more frequently (pre=13%, $p < .01$; post=15%, $p < .001$) than the Spanish NSs (0%). Unlike the previous vignette, however, students did not move towards becoming more native-like in their frequency of use of this semantic formula.

The data analysis for the semantic formula “query preparatory” yielded striking differences between NSs and NNSs in frequency of use. In the “Slower speech” and “Leaving for school” vignettes, the NNSs used this semantic formula much more frequently than the Spanish NSs. In the case of “Slower speech,” students used this semantic formula less frequently in the posttest than in the pretest (post=46%, pre= 51%) – moving in the direction of the Spanish NSs (0%) – however, the difference between natives and non-natives was significant in both the pre- and posttests. In the “Airplane seat” vignette, the students increased their frequency of use of this semantic formula (from 45% to 60%), which was in the direction of being less native-like since Spanish NSs used this semantic formula only 17% of the time. Although the results from the other vignettes were not statistically significant, the same pattern can be seen in the “Paper extension” and “Leaving for school” vignettes; that is, students used this semantic formula more frequently than the Spanish natives in both the pre- and posttest.

The opposite trend is seen with the semantic formula “query preparatory with verb modification” in which the Spanish NSs use this semantic formula much more frequently. Indeed, this result is intimately connected with the previous one, in that Spanish NSs did frequently use a “query preparatory,” but they tended to soften this semantic formula by downgrading the verb to the conditional or imperfect subjunctive form. Students, on the other hand, used the “query preparatory” formula at a similar frequency to the Spanish NSs, but they did not modify the verb to soften the request. Thus, Table 48 shows that for the “Slower speech” vignette, NNSs’ frequency of use of the “query preparatory with verb modification” was 10% in the pretest and 27% in the posttest, whereas NSs’ frequency of use was 67% in the same vignette. Similarly for the “Airplane seat” vignette, NNSs used this semantic formula 16% in the pretest and 24% in the posttest, whereas NSs used it 67%, and for the “Leaving for school” vignette, where the NNSs used this semantic formula 2% in the pretest and 10% in the posttest, but the NSs used this semantic formula 50% of the time. Although students became more native-like in the posttest, they were still significantly different from the NSs ($p < .05$). What this pattern would suggest is that students may be gradually acquiring more native-like use of the conditional or imperfect subjunctive as a means to soften the request. Students may have been more comfortable with the present tense verb form than with the conditional tense verb form in

the pretest, and become increasingly more comfortable at using the conditional tense by the end of their semester abroad.

The last significant difference between the combined sample and the Spanish NSs is with regard to the semantic formula “want statement.” In the pretest on the “Leaving for school” vignette, 8% of the students used this semantic formula whereas 0% of the Spanish NSs did so, a difference significant at the $p < .05$ level. The students’ posttest result moves towards the NS frequency level and is not significantly different.

Although not statistically significant, several other results are worth noting. First, Spanish NSs used a “mood derivable” head act in the “Airplane seat” and “Paper extension” vignettes more frequently than did students. These two vignettes are ones in which the interlocutor is either of higher status (“Paper extension” – a professor) or has high social distance (“Airplane seat” – a stranger). Students may have stayed away from a very direct request because they did not know how to be direct and polite at the same time, whereas NSs of Spanish would know how to make a direct request polite. This observation reflects previous research on requests in Spanish in which it has been found that in Argentine Spanish (Blum-Kulka & House, 1989), Mexican Spanish (Arellano, 2000; Curcó & De Fina, 2002), Peninsular Spanish (Le Pair, 1996; Mir, 1993), and Uruguayan Spanish (Márquez-Reiter, 2000) direct requests (i.e., “mood derivable”) are seen as polite. In addition, Blum-Kulka and House (1989) and Mir (1993) found that direct requests were significantly less frequent in American English compared to Argentine Spanish and Peninsular Spanish, respectively. Thus, the NNSs in this sample may be negatively transferring their preference for indirect semantic formulas to Spanish, where direct formulas are used more frequently. Secondly, the number of students using a “hint” in the “Leaving for school” vignette went from 18% in the pretest to 9% in the posttest, which is in the direction of being more native-like.

Table 48: Percent of Spanish NSs and of Students (Combined Sample) Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Request Head Act

Head Act Formula Type			Vignette #2 “Slower speech”	Vignette #4 “Airplane Seat	Vignette #6 “Paper extension”	Vignette #8 “Less food”	Vignette #10 “Leaving for school”
Mood Derivable	NNSs	Pretest	6%	3%	3%	3%	5%
		Posttest	3%	2%	2%	5%	5%
	Spanish NSs		0%	17%	25%	8%	8%
Explicit Performative	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		Posttest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Spanish NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Hedged Performative	NNSs	Pretest	2%	2%	6% [†]	0%	0%
		Posttest	2%	0%	6% [†]	0%	0%
	Spanish NSs		17%	0%	42%	0%	25%
Locution Derivable	NNSs	Pretest	2%	12% ^{††}	24%	10%	13% ^{††}
		Posttest	2%	3% [*]	15%	8%	15% ^{†††}
	Spanish NSs		8%	0%	33%	17%	0%
Query Preparatory	NNSs	Pretest	51% ^{†††}	45% [†]	60%	25%	55%
		Posttest	46% ^{†††}	60% ^{*††}	58%	19%	60%
	Spanish NSs		0%	17%	33%	17%	33%
Query Preparatory with Verb Modification	NNSs	Pretest	10% ^{††}	16% ^{††}	12%	3%	2% ^{††}
		Posttest	27% ^{*††}	24% ^{††}	22%	5%	10% [†]
	Spanish NSs		67%	67%	17%	17%	50%
Want Statement	NNSs	Pretest	5%	6%	3%	15%	8% [†]
		Posttest	5%	3%	2%	10%	5%
	Spanish NSs		0%	8%	0%	8%	0%
Hint	NNSs	Pretest	25%	21%	2%	49%	18%
		Posttest	19%	13%	6%	57%	9%
	Spanish NSs		17%	8%	0%	42%	8%

NNSs N=67; NSs N=12

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ † $p < .05$ †† $p < .01$ ††† $p < .001$ * = pre/post comparison using paired samples *t*-test† = comparison between NSs and NNSs means using independent samples *t*-test

Looking at the combined student sample’s use of supportive moves, Table 49 below shows the results from the pre-post and NNS-NS comparisons. Two results show a significant increase in the percent of students who used the supportive moves “disarmer” and “acknowledgement of imposition” from the pre- to the posttest. In the first case, in the “Paper extension” vignette, students went from 18% frequency of use of “disarmer” in the pretest to 34% in the posttest, which showed movement towards the frequency level of the NSs (50%). In the second case, students used an “acknowledgement of imposition” in the “Slower speech” vignette 3% of the time in the pretest and 15% of the time in the posttest ($p < .01$). This change was still different from the frequency found for the Spanish NSs, which was 8%.

Five significant differences were found between NNSs' and NSs' frequency of use of supportive moves. First, while NNSs used a "preparator" 8% of the time in the "Paper extension" vignette, NSs' did not use this supportive move at all (0%) in the same vignette. Additionally, although students increased their use of this supportive move in the "Paper extension" vignette in the posttest to 15%, there was greater dispersion around the mean (i.e., the standard deviation was .36 in the posttest compared to .27 in the pretest). This greater heterogeneity in the responses may explain why the NNSs' posttest result was not statistically different from the NSs. NNSs also used the supportive move "getting a precommitment" more frequently (8%) than the NSs (0%) in the pretest, but reduced their use of this semantic formula by the posttest. The Spanish NSs were unanimous in their use of a "grounder" in all five request vignettes (i.e., 100% did so). Students only differed statistically from the NSs on the "Airplane seat" vignette in the pretest, otherwise their use of "grounders" was strikingly similar. Finally, two other supportive moves – "promise of reward" and "imposition minimizer" – were found to have significant differences between students and natives in the "Airplane seat" vignette. In both cases, students used these strategies more frequently (9%-10%) whereas Spanish NSs did not employ these supportive moves at all.

Table 49: Percent of Spanish NSs and of Students (Combined Sample) Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Request Supportive Moves

Supportive Moves Formula Type			Vignette #2 "Slower speech"	Vignette #4 "Airplane Seat"	Vignette #6 "Paper extension"	Vignette #8 "Less food"	Vignette #10 "Leaving for school"
Preparator	NNSs	Pretest	37%	19%	8% [†]	0%	3%
		Posttest	30%	24%	15%	3%	5%
	Spanish NSs		25%	42%	0%	8%	25%
Getting a Precommitment	NNSs	Pretest	6%	6%	0%	0%	8% [†]
		Posttest	8%	6%	6%	0%	3%
	Spanish NSs		8%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Grounder	NNSs	Pretest	94%	93% [†]	100%	99%	97%
		Posttest	99%	99%	100%	100%	100%
	Spanish NSs		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Disarmer	NNSs	Pretest	15%	0%	18%	93%	31%
		Posttest	16%	5%	34%*	96%	42%
	Spanish NSs		17%	17%	50%	100%	17%
Promise of Reward	NNSs	Pretest	8%	6%	12%	0%	0%
		Posttest	2%	9% [†]	24%	0%	0%
	Spanish NSs		8%	0%	17%	8%	0%
Imposition Minimizer	NNSs	Pretest	5%	9% [†]	51%	0%	2%
		Posttest	8%	10% ^{††}	55%	3%	0%
	Spanish NSs		8%	0%	58%	17%	0%
Acknowledgement of Imposition	NNSs	Pretest	3%	39%	49%	2%	2%
		Posttest	15%**	36%	64%	2%	5%
	Spanish NSs		8%	42%	42%	0%	0%
Appreciation	NNSs	Pretest	36%	91%	28%	2%	5%
		Posttest	43%	90%	30%	2%	5%
	Spanish NSs		33%	92%	17%	8%	0%
Mitigation with the word 'please'	NNSs	Pretest	15%	33%	37%	6%	8%
		Posttest	15%	27%	36%	8%	8%
	Spanish NSs		25%	33%	58%	17%	8%

NNSs N=67; NSs N=12

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ † $p < .05$ †† $p < .01$ ††† $p < .001$ * = pre/post comparison using paired samples t -test† = comparison between NSs and NNSs means using independent samples t -test

As Table 50 shows, there were no statistically significant differences between pre- and posttest scores or between the combined sample and the Spanish NSs with regard to head act perspective. Both groups used the "hearer oriented" most frequently in the "Slower speech," "Airplane seat," and "Less food" vignettes, and the "speaker oriented" perspective more frequently in the "Paper extension" vignette. Both groups also used the perspective "speaker and hearer oriented" most frequently in the "Leaving for school" vignette and infrequently in the

other vignettes. The “impersonal” perspective was used relatively infrequently by both groups, although not a single Spanish NS used this semantic formula in all five vignettes, whereas 12% and 16% of the students used it in the “Airplane seat” and “Paper extension” vignettes, respectively.

Table 50: Percent of Spanish NSs and of Students (Combined Sample) Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Request Head Act Perspective

Head Act Perspective			Vignette #2	Vignette #4	Vignette #6	Vignette #8	Vignette #10
			“Slower speech”	“Airplane Seat	“Paper extension”	“Less food”	“Leaving for school”
Hearer Oriented	NNSs	Pretest	67%	67%	19%	31%	28%
		Posttest	67%	58%	19%	25%	25%
	Spanish NSs		75%	75%	50%	58%	50%
Speaker Oriented	NNSs	Pretest	8%	6%	69%	15%	8%
		Posttest	6%	9%	58%	15%	5%
	Spanish NSs		8%	8%	50%	8%	8%
Speaker and Hearer Oriented	NNSs	Pretest	2%	0%	0%	0%	39%
		Posttest	0%	6%	0%	0%	57%
	Spanish NSs		0%	8%	0%	0%	33%
Impersonal	NNSs	Pretest	6%	5%	10%	3%	5%
		Posttest	8%	12%	16%	3%	5%
	Spanish NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

NNSs N=67; NSs N=12

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

† $p < .05$ †† $p < .01$ ††† $p < .001$

* = pre/post comparison using paired samples *t*-test

† = comparison between NSs and NNSs means using independent samples *t*-test

Apologies in French

The same analysis done with the Spanish apology data was also conducted with the French apology data. The primary difference is that the number of both students (N=19) and French NSs (N=4) was considerably smaller than in the case of the Spanish samples. Because of the low numbers, statistical analyses were not performed in comparing student apology responses to those of the French NSs. However, pre-post comparisons of the students’ semantic formula use were conducted, the results of which are shown in Tables 51 through 53 below.

Looking first at the E group results in Table 51, it can be seen that the E group increased in their use of “intensification” in the “Prof meeting” vignette from the pre- to the posttest. This change goes in the direction of the French NSs (11% > 67%), but surpasses the NSs’ average frequency of 50%. Second, the E group’s decrease in use of an “explanation” in the “Prof meeting” vignette from pre- to posttest (89% to 44%) was significant at the $p < .05$ level. This change, however, goes in the direction of being less native-like, since three (75%) of the French NSs used this strategy in the same vignette. With regard to the C group, Table 52 shows that there were no statistically significant changes from pre- to posttest for this group.

Table 51: Percent of Spanish NSs and of E Group Students Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Apologies

			Vignette #2 “Slower speech”	Vignette #4 “Airplane Seat	Vignette #6 “Paper extension”	Vignette #8 “Less food”	Vignette #10 “Leaving for school”
Apology Expression	NNSs	Pretest	100%	100%	89%	89%	100%
		Posttest	100%	100%	89%	100%	100%
	French NSs		100%	75%	100%	100%	100%
Acknowledgement of Responsibility	NNSs	Pretest	33%	89%	100%	11%	89%
		Posttest	44%	100%	100%	11%	78%
	French NSs		75%	100%	100%	0%	25%
Explanation	NNSs	Pretest	0%	56%	22%	100%	89%
		Posttest	11%	89%	67%	89%	44%*
	French NSs		0%	75%	0%	100%	75%
Offer of Repair	NNSs	Pretest	89%	100%	89%	33%	0%
		Posttest	89%	100%	100%	22%	0%
	French NSs		75%	75%	50%	25%	50%
Promise of Non-Recurrence	NNSs	Pretest	11%	0%	11%	11%	78%
		Posttest	0%	0%	0%	44%	78%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	75%
Intensification	NNSs	Pretest	89%	67%	33%	22%	11%
		Posttest	89%	56%	56%	11%	67%*
	French NSs		50%	75%	50%	0%	50%

NNSs N=9; NSs N=4 * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ * = pre/post comparison using paired samples t -test

Table 52: Percent of Spanish NSs and of C Group Students Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Apologies

			Vignette #2 "Slower speech"	Vignette #4 "Airplane Seat"	Vignette #6 "Paper extension"	Vignette #8 "Less food"	Vignette #10 "Leaving for school"
Apology Expression	NNSs	Pretest	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		Posttest	100%	100%	90%	100%	70%
	French NSs		100%	75%	100%	100%	100%
Acknowledgement of Responsibility	NNSs	Pretest	30%	100%	100%	20%	100%
		Posttest	20%	100%	100%	30%	100%
	French NSs		75%	100%	100%	0%	25%
Explanation	NNSs	Pretest	0%	80%	40%	90%	60%
		Posttest	0%	70%	20%	100%	70%
	French NSs		0%	75%	0%	100%	75%
Offer of Repair	NNSs	Pretest	90%	100%	90%	20%	0%
		Posttest	90%	90%	90%	20%	0%
	French NSs		75%	75%	50%	25%	50%
Promise of Non-Recurrence	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	0%	0%	70%
		Posttests	10%	0%	0%	10%	70%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	75%
Intensification	NNSs	Pretest	80%	50%	40%	10%	10%
		Posttest	60%	60%	40%	10%	20%
	French NSs		50%	75%	50%	0%	50%

NNSs N=10; NSs N=4 * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$
 * = pre/post comparison using paired samples *t*-test

Table 53 below shows that two results were significantly different for the combined French student sample. The first of these relates to the semantic formula "promise of non-recurrence" in "Meeting friend" vignette, in which a greater number of students employed this semantic formula in the posttest (26%) than in the pretest (5%), significant at the $p < .05$ level. This change goes in the opposite direction of the French NSs, however, given that 0% of the natives used this semantic formula in the same vignette. The second significant pre-post difference was with the semantic formula "intensification" in the "Prof meeting" vignette. In the pretest, 11% of the students used this semantic formula, compared with the posttest in which 42% used it – a difference significant at the $p < .05$ level. In this case, the change went in the direction of becoming more like the four French NSs in this sample, 50% of whom used this semantic formula.

Although the NNSs and NSs could not be compared statistically, several differences between the students and the French NSs are worth noting. First, in the "Babysitting spill" vignette, while the French NSs do not use a single explanation (0%), 32% of the students gave an explanation in the pretest, and 42% do so in the posttest. French NSs do, however, use the semantic formula "explanation" in other vignettes, including "Friend's book," "Meeting friend," and "Prof meeting." Perhaps these French speakers did not believe that an "explanation" was

necessary with a younger interlocutor, or perhaps the particular situation does not call for an “explanation” in French. Again looking at the “Babysitting spill” vignette, only two (50%) of the French NSs used an “offer of repair” in their apologies, whereas 89% (pretest) and 95% (posttest) of the students used this semantic formula in “Babysitting spill.” Apparently, an “offer of repair” was not viewed by all French NSs as crucial to the apology, whereas the students relied heavily on this strategy. The opposite trend was found for this semantic formula in the “Prof meeting” vignette, in which 0% of the students used an “offer of repair” in both the pre- and posttests. Fifty percent of the NSs, on the other hand, used this semantic formula in the same vignette.

Table 53: Percent of French NSs and of Students (Combined Sample) Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Apologies

			Vignette #2 “Slower speech”	Vignette #4 “Airplane Seat	Vignette #6 “Paper extension”	Vignette #8 “Less food”	Vignette #10 “Leaving for school”
Apology Expression	NNSs	Pretest	100%	100%	95%	95%	100%
		Posttest	100%	100%	89%	100%	84%
	French NSs		100%	75%	100%	100%	100%
Acknowledgement of Responsibility	NNSs	Pretest	32%	95%	100%	16%	95%
		Posttest	32%	100%	100%	21%	89%
	French NSs		75%	100%	100%	0%	25%
Explanation	NNSs	Pretest	0%	68%	32%	95%	74%
		Posttest	5%	79%	42%	95%	58%
	French NSs		0%	75%	0%	100%	75%
Offer of Repair	NNSs	Pretest	89%	100%	89%	26%	0%
		Posttest	89%	95%	95%	21%	0%
	French NSs		75%	75%	50%	25%	50%
Promise of Non-Recurrence	NNSs	Pretest	5%	0%	5%	5%	74%
		Posttest	5%	0%	0%	26%*	74%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	75%
Intensification	NNSs	Pretest	84%	58%	37%	16%	11%
		Posttest	74%	58%	47%	11%	42%*
	French NSs		50%	75%	50%	0%	50%

NNSs N=19; NSs N=4

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

* = pre/post comparison using paired samples *t*-test

French Requests

The same analyses described above for the Spanish requests were conducted on the French *Speech Act Measure* data. The only difference is that because of the small number of French NSs (N=4), no statistical comparisons were made between the NSs and the NNSs.

Tables 54 through 59 show the comparative results on requests for the E and C groups, looking at the use of semantic formulas and support strategies. For the E group, only one significant pre-post difference was found. On Table 55, it can be seen that the E group increased their use of a “disarmer” from pre- to posttest in the “Slower speech” vignette ($p < .05$). When looking just at the C group, one unique finding for frequency of use of the head act formula “locution derivable” emerged in the “Leaving for school” vignette. C group students increased their use of a “locution derivable” head act from pre- (0%) to posttest (50%). This change went in the direction of being less like the French NSs who did not use this semantic formula in the same vignette, or indeed at all on the *Speech Act Measure*.

Table 54: Percent of French NNSs and of E Group Students Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Requests

Head Act Formula Type			Vignette #2 "Slower speech"	Vignette #4 "Airplane Seat"	Vignette #6 "Paper extension,"	Vignette #8 "Less food"	Vignette #10 "Leaving for school"
Mood Derivable	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	0%	0%	22%
		Posttest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	25%	0%	0%
Explicit Performative	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		Posttest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	25%	0%	25%
Hedged Performative	NNSs	Pretest	0%	11%	11%	0%	11%
		Posttest	11%	11%	0%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	25%
Locution Derivable	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	33%	11%	22%
		Posttest	0%	0%	22%	11%	22%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Query Preparatory	NNSs	Pretest	44%	44%	33%	33%	56%
		Posttest	33%	44%	33%	11%	78%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	25%
Query Preparatory with Verb Modification	NNSs	Pretest	22%	44%	22%	11%	0%
		Posttest	33%	22%	22%	11%	0%
	French NSs		75%	100%	75%	50%	25%
Want Statement	NNSs	Pretest	11%	0%	11%	22%	22%
		Posttest	0%	0%	11%	11%	11%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	25%	0%
Hint	NNSs	Pretest	22%	0%	0%	56%	0%
		Posttest	11%	11%	22%	78%	11%
	French NSs		25%	0%	0%	25%	25%

NNSs N=9; NSs N=4 * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ * = pre/post comparison using paired samples *t*-test

Table 55: Percent of French NSs and of E Group Students Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Request Supportive Moves

Supportive Moves Formula Type			Vignette #2 "Slower speech"	Vignette #4 "Airplane Seat"	Vignette #6 "Paper extension"	Vignette #8 "Less food"	Vignette #10 "Leaving for school"
Preparator	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		Posttest	0%	22%	0%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	25%	0%	25%
Getting a Precommitment	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		Posttest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Grounder	NNSs	Pretest	100%	89%	100%	89%	89%
		Posttest	100%	67%	100%	100%	100%
	French NSs		75%	75%	100%	100%	100%
Disarmer	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	11%	89%	22%
		Posttest	44%*	0%	11%	89%	11%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
Promise of Reward	NNSs	Pretest	0%	11%	22%	0%	0%
		Posttest	11%	11%	44%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	50%	0%	0%
Imposition Minimizer	NNSs	Pretest	0%	22%	11%	0%	11%
		Posttest	0%	22%	44%	0%	11%
	French NSs		0%	75%	0%	0%	0%
Acknowledgement of Imposition	NNSs	Pretest	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%
		Posttest	22%	44%	11%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	25%	0%	0%
Appreciation	NNSs	Pretest	56%	100%	11%	0%	0%
		Posttest	56%	100%	11%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	75%	0%	25%	0%
Mitigation with the word 'please'	NNSs	Pretest	11%	11%	44%	0%	22%
		Posttest	11%	33%	44%	33%	11%
	French NSs		50%	50%	25%	0%	0%

NNSs N=9; NSs N=4 * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

* = pre/post comparison using paired samples t -test

Table 56: Percent of French NNSs and of E Group Students Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Request Head Act Perspective

Head Act Perspective			Vignette #2	Vignette #4	Vignette #6	Vignette #8	Vignette #10
			“Slower speech”	“Airplane Seat	“Paper extension”	“Less food”	“Leaving for school”
Hearer Oriented	NNSs	Pretest	78%	89%	22%	44%	33%
		Posttest	89%	78%	0%	11%	78%
	French NSs		75%	100%	50%	25%	50%
Speaker Oriented	NNSs	Pretest	0%	11%	67%	33%	22%
		Posttest	0%	11%	67%	33%	11%
	French NSs		0%	0%	50%	25%	25%
Speaker and Hearer Oriented	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	11%	0%	45%
		Posttest	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Impersonal	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		Posttest	0%	0%	11%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	25%	0%

NNSs N=9; NSs N=4 * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

* = pre/post comparison using paired samples *t*-test

Table 57: Percent of French NNSs and of C Group Students Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Requests

Head Act Formula Type			Vignette #2 “Slower speech”	Vignette #4 “Airplane seat”	Vignette #6 “Paper extension”	Vignette #8 “Less food”	Vignette #10 “Leaving for school”
Mood Derivable	NNSs	Pretest	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		Posttest	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%
	French NSs		0%	0%	25%	0%	0%
Explicit Performative	NNSs	Pretest	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		Posttest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	25%	0%	25%
Hedged Performative	NNSs	Pretest	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%
		Posttest	0%	0%	10%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	25%
Locution Derivable	NNSs	Pretest	10%	10%	20%	10%	0%
		Posttest	0%	0%	20%	0%	50%*
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Query Preparatory	NNSs	Pretest	70%	60%	70%	30%	70%
		Posttest	50%	40%	40%	40%	60%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	25%
Query Preparatory with Verb Modification	NNSs	Pretest	10%	10%	10%	30%	20%
		Posttest	10%	30%	30%	0%	0%
	French NSs		75%	100%	75%	50%	25%
Want Statement	NNSs	Pretest	0%	10%	0%	10%	20%
		Posttest	0%	10%	10%	10%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	25%	0%
Hint	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	0%	40%	30%
		Posttest	30%	0%	0%	60%	0%
	French NSs		25%	0%	0%	25%	25%

NNSs N=10; NSs N=4 * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ * = pre/post comparison using paired samples *t*-test

Table 58: Percent of French NNSs and of C Group Students Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Request Supportive Moves

Supportive Moves Formula Type			Vignette #2 "Slower speech"	Vignette #4 "Airplane Seat"	Vignette #6 "Paper extension"	Vignette #8 "Less food"	Vignette #10 "Leaving for school"
Preparator	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		Posttest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	25%	0%	25%
Getting a Precommitment	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		Posttest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Grounder	NNSs	Pretest	80%	80%	100%	80%	100%
		Posttest	100%	90%	100%	90%	100%
	French NSs		75%	75%	100%	100%	100%
Disarmer	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	10%	90%	10%
		Posttest	20%	0%	0%	100%	20%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
Promise of Reward	NNSs	Pretest	10%	0%	40%	0%	0%
		Posttest	20%	0%	50%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	50%	0%	0%
Imposition Minimizer	NNSs	Pretest	0%	10%	40%	0%	10%
		Posttest	10%	10%	70%	0%	10%
	French NSs		0%	75%	0%	0%	0%
Acknowledgement of Imposition	NNSs	Pretest	0%	60%	0%	0%	0%
		Posttest	10%	70%	0%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	25%	0%	0%
Appreciation	NNSs	Pretest	50%	100%	20%	0%	0%
		Posttest	30%	100%	10%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	75%	0%	25%	0%
Mitigation with the word 'please'	NNSs	Pretest	40%	50%	40%	0%	0%
		Posttest	10%	20%	50%	10%	0%
	French NSs		50%	50%	25%	0%	0%

NNSs N=10; NSs N=4 * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

* = pre/post comparison using paired samples *t*-test

Table 59: Percent of French NSs and of C Group Students Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Request Head Act Perspective

Head Act Perspective			Vignette #2 "Slower speech"	Vignette #4 "Airplane Seat"	Vignette #6 "Paper extension"	Vignette #8 "Less food"	Vignette #10 "Leaving for school"
Hearer Oriented	NNSs	Pretest	80%	60%	10%	40%	30%
		Posttest	70%	80%	0%	20%	30%
	French NSs		75%	100%	50%	25%	50%
Speaker Oriented	NNSs	Pretest	10%	30%	80%	20%	0%
		Posttest	0%	10%	90%	20%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	50%	25%	25%
Speaker and Hearer Oriented	NNSs	Pretest	10%	10%	0%	0%	50%
		Posttest	0%	10%	0%	0%	60%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Impersonal	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	10%	10%	10%
		Posttest	0%	0%	10%	10%	10%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	25%	0%

NNSs N=10; NSs N=4 * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

* = pre/post comparison using paired samples *t*-test

Table 60 shows the head act semantic formula use results for the combined sample of NNSs and NSs. None of the pre-post changes for the combined sample were found to be statistically significant using an independent samples *t*-test. Some anecdotal differences between the students and the French NSs are worth pointing out, however. The use of the semantic formulas "query preparatory" and "query preparatory with verb modification" parallel what was found with the Spanish NSs and Spanish language students. That is, while NNSs tended to use an unmodified (i.e., present tense) verb to make a "query preparatory," French and Spanish NSs tended to downgrade or soften the verb by using the conditional or past subjunctive form of the verb. As can be seen below, in all vignettes except the "Less food" vignette, the "query preparatory" is the preferred semantic formula of the NNSs for the head act of the request. Only one French NS (25%) used an unmodified "query preparatory" in the "Leaving for school" vignette. In the "Slower speech," "Airplane seat," and "Paper extension" vignettes, 75-100% of the French NSs used a "query preparatory with verb modification." In two cases, in the "Slower speech" and "Paper extension" vignettes, the French students moved towards using a "query preparatory with verb modification" more frequently in the posttest than they did in pretest, a result which again follows the trend of the Spanish language students. A final observation is that in the "Less food" vignette, students increased their use of a "hint" as the main request strategy from pretest (47%) to posttest (68%). However, this change does not go in the direction of the frequency found in the French NS sample (25%).

Table 60: Percent of French NSs and of Students (Combined Sample) Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Requests

Head Act Formula Type			Vignette #2 “Slower speech”	Vignette #4 “Airplane Seat	Vignette #6 “Paper extension”	Vignette #8 “Less food”	Vignette #10 “Leaving for school”
Mood Derivable	NNSs	Pretest	5%	0%	0%	0%	11%
		Posttest	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%
	French NSs		0%	0%	25%	0%	0%
Explicit Performative	NNSs	Pretest	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		Posttest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	25%	0%	25%
Hedged Performative	NNSs	Pretest	0%	16%	5%	0%	5%
		Posttest	5%	5%	5%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	25%
Locution Derivable	NNSs	Pretest	5%	5%	26%	11%	11%
		Posttest	0%	0%	21%	5%	37%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Query Preparatory	NNSs	Pretest	58%	53%	53%	32%	63%
		Posttest	42%	42%	37%	26%	68%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	25%
Query Preparatory with Verb Modification	NNSs	Pretest	16%	26%	16%	21%	11%
		Posttest	21%	26%	26%	5%	0%
	French NSs		75%	100%	75%	50%	25%
Want Statement	NNSs	Pretest	5%	5%	5%	16%	21%
		Posttest	0%	5%	11%	11%	5%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	25%	0%
Hint	NNSs	Pretest	11%	0%	0%	47%	16%
		Posttest	21%	5%	11%	68%	5%
	French NSs		25%	0%	0%	25%	25%

NNSs N=19; NSs N=4 * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

* = pre/post comparison using paired samples *t*-test

The combined sample increased significantly in their use of three supportive moves from pre- to posttest: use of a “disarmer” in the “Slower speech” vignette (0% to 32%), use of an “imposition minimizer” in the “Paper extension” vignette (26% to 58%), and use of “mitigation with the word ‘please’” in the “Less food” vignette (0% to 21%). In all three cases, the change was towards being less like the French NSs, since none of the natives employed those semantic formulas in those vignettes.

Table 61: Percent of French NSs and of Students (Combined Sample) Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Request Supportive Moves

Supportive Moves Formula Type			Vignette #2 “Slower speech”	Vignette #4 “Airplane Seat	Vignette #6 “Paper extension”	Vignette #8 “Less food”	Vignette #10 “Leaving for school”
Preparator	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		Posttest	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	25%	0%	25%
Getting a Precommitment	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		Posttest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Grounder	NNSs	Pretest	89%	84%	100%	84%	95%
		Posttest	100%	79%	100%	95%	100%
	French NSs		75%	75%	100%	100%	100%
Disarmer	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	11%	89%	16%
		Posttest	32%**	0%	5%	95%	16%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
Promise of Reward	NNSs	Pretest	5%	5%	32%	0%	0%
		Posttest	16%	5%	47%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	50%	0%	0%
Imposition Minimizer	NNSs	Pretest	0%	16%	26%	0%	11%
		Posttest	5%	16%	58%*	0%	11%
	French NSs		0%	75%	0%	0%	0%
Acknowledgement of Imposition	NNSs	Pretest	0%	63%	0%	0%	0%
		Posttest	16%	58%	5%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	0%	25%	0%	0%
Appreciation	NNSs	Pretest	53%	100%	16%	0%	0%
		Posttest	42%	100%	11%	0%	0%
	French NSs		0%	75%	0%	25%	0%
Mitigation with the word ‘please’	NNSs	Pretest	26%	32%	42%	0%	11%
		Posttest	11%	26%	47%	21%*	5%
	French NSs		50%	50%	25%	0%	0%

NNSs N=19; NSs N=4 * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

* = pre/post comparison using paired samples *t*-test

No significant differences were found for use of perspective by the combined sample of students between the pretest and the posttest. Comparing the student and French NS frequencies, in most cases the two groups had similar patterns of head act perspective use. Two differences emerged, however. In the “Paper extension” vignette, 50% of the French NSs used the “hearer oriented” perspective, whereas students used this type only 16% in the pretest and 0% in the posttest. Second, in the “Leaving for school” vignette, while students use the “speaker and

hearer oriented” perspective 47% (pretest) and 37% (posttest), the French NSs do not use this strategy at all.

Table 62: Percent of French NSs and of Students (Combined Sample) Who Used Each Semantic Formula for Request Head Act Perspective

Head Act Perspective			Vignette #2	Vignette #4	Vignette #6	Vignette #8	Vignette #10
			“Slower speech”	“Airplane Seat”	“Paper extension”	“Less food”	“Leaving for school”
Hearer Oriented	NNSs	Pretest	79%	74%	16%	42%	32%
		Posttest	79%	79%	0%	16%	53%
	French NSs		75%	100%	50%	25%	50%
Speaker Oriented	NNSs	Pretest	5%	21%	74%	26%	11%
		Posttest	0%	11%	79%	26%	5%
	French NSs		0%	0%	50%	25%	25%
Speaker and Hearer Oriented	NNSs	Pretest	5%	5%	5%	0%	47%
		Posttest	0%	5%	0%	0%	37%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Impersonal	NNSs	Pretest	0%	0%	5%	5%	5%
		Posttest	0%	0%	11%	5%	5%
	French NSs		0%	0%	0%	25%	0%

NNSs N=19; NSs N=4 * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

* = pre/post comparison using paired samples *t*-test

Due to the limitations of a small French NS sample, it is not possible to make conclusions about whether students were becoming more native-like in their apology and request performance in French over the course of one semester abroad. Furthermore, although the E and C groups have slightly different semantic formula use patterns, there is no evidence that the intervention had a positive impact on the E group’s speech act performance.

Research Question (6): What insights does a qualitative analysis of the Speech Act Measure data provide with respect to students' speech act performance in Spanish?

Three qualitative analyses were conducted with the *Speech Act Measure* data. First, the Spanish NSs' qualitative comments about their ratings of students' speech act performance were reviewed and analyzed. Second, a subsample (N=20) of the Spanish-language students from the E and C groups (10 from each) was selected and each student's pretest and posttest were put side by side and compared. This sample included students who represented the continuum of gain scores that were obtained. Therefore, students were selected who, from pre- to posttest, had lost points (E group N=2; C group N=2), who had had no change (E group N=3; C group N=1), and had gained points (E group N=5; C group N=6)¹⁰. The scores of the students in the subsample ranged from -8 to +12. Third, the data from the Spanish NSs who completed the *Speech Act Measure* were analyzed. Some interesting insights were gleaned through these qualitative analyses, which are described below.

The preceding *quantitative* analysis showed some differences and similarities between the Spanish NSs and the students of Spanish in terms of each group's use of semantic formulas. An aspect that the Spanish NS raters commented on frequently, however, was the *content* of these semantic formulas. For apologies, the content of the semantic formulas "offer of repair" and "explanation," in particular, was often judged by the raters to be sociopragmatically inappropriate. In the first case, a number of students made "offers of repair" that the raters found unusual, inappropriate, or offensive; examples include offering to pay for the tablecloth or to buy a new tablecloth for the friend's mother after spilling wine on it in the "Spill wine" vignette (unnecessary and unusual for the Peninsular Spanish rater and insulting to the two Latin American raters), offering to write a note to Robert's teacher explaining why his homework was stained with grape juice (unrealistic and ineffective), and offering to buy Marta a glass of wine to make up for losing her book (inappropriate and insensitive). An example of the latter is shown below from the "Friend's book" vignette:

Marta: *No, es que ese libro ya está agotado. Ya no se puede conseguir en ninguna parte.*

You: *Yo lo sé, voy a buscarlo en otro sitio. Lo siento. Te comprare algunas copas la próxima noche.* ('I know it, I'm going to look for it in another place. I'm sorry. I'll buy you some glasses of wine tomorrow night.')

Marta: *Venga, olvidémoslo, pero a mí ya no me pidas ningún libro...*

Due to the fact that we did not collect data from the students in English, we do not know how they would have responded in their L1, and therefore, we cannot draw conclusions about whether for those particular students in those specific situations, choosing **those** solutions to repair the situation was something they would have done in their home culture and therefore reflected *negative transfer*. Another explanation for students' responses could have been an inability to

¹⁰ The following students were used in the subsample (their *Speech Act Measure* scores are in parentheses): 5E (+2), 9E (0), 17E (-1), 18E (0), 19E (+4), 20E (-2), 22C (-2), 23C (-1), 24C (+2), 36C (0), 37C (+1), 38C (+4), 46E (0), 79C (+8), 82C (+7), 87C (+1), 94E (+4), 101E (+4), 105C (-8), 106E (+6).

say what they wanted to in the L2, so they said what they could, even if it came out a bit overstated and unrealistic in the given the social context. Another possibility, which brings into question the validity of the discourse completion task as a measure of pragmatic ability, is that students may have not taken the task as seriously as they would take a real-life apology, and therefore may have written responses that they would not say in real life. But what is of interest here is that the students were perhaps inadvertently stepping on the toes of their hosts culturally speaking, essentially insulting them by blowing the incident out of proportion.

The content of “offers of repair” was also judged by the raters as inappropriate or impolite based on more subtle factors. For example, one rater commented that the student should have used “please” when saying to the friend’s mother in the “Spill wine” vignette, “*Let me know if there’s something I can do to help.*” Unless the word ‘please’ was included, using the command form of the verb to address the mother, as was done in this example, would not be polite in a formal situation. In addition, in the same vignette, an “offer of repair” sounded more sincere if the student offered a specific solution (e.g., “I’ll help clean the stain”) rather than simply asking the mother what he or she should do to help. Providing a specific solution was also seen as more sincere in the “Friend’s book” vignette. Being too direct in the “offer of repair” in the “Prof meeting” vignette was judged inappropriate. For example, one student (94E pretest) said, “*When is the next time we meet?*” The rater felt the student should not be so direct in assuming that they will meet, especially after having missed two meetings already, but rather question the professor about the next time he would be available to meet.

The content of the semantic formula “explanation” was also not always sociopragmatically acceptable to the Spanish NS raters. For all raters, giving a credible “explanation” was important to the successful use of that particular semantic formula. “Credible” explanations for the “Meeting friend” vignette included that the bus was late (not the student’s fault), simply forgetting about the meeting (seen as honest), unexpectedly receiving an overseas call from a relative (not the student’s fault). In addition, one rater commented that the “explanation” should not add insult to injury. For example, in the “Meeting friend” vignette several students gave the “explanation” that they had to stop to get a bite to eat before meeting Sofía, which is why they were late. The rater commented that by giving this type of excuse, the students appeared not to care that they had arrived late since stopping to eat could have been avoided.

With regard to requests, the content of the semantic formula “grounder” was a common factor that caused some students to be rated as sociopragmatically or pragmalinguistically inappropriate. In the “Slower speech” vignette, for example, a number of students said something to the extent of, “You speak too fast” to the professor to explain why they were asking him to speak more slowly. All raters felt that instead of placing the blame for not being able to understand on the professor, that the student should have said something “humbling,” which would place the blame for the request on the student himself or herself. For example, one student (24C posttest) used the following “grounder” in the “Slower speech” vignette which was judged as polite:

Lo que pasa es que no llevo mucho tiempo aquí y aun no puedo entender cuando usted habla de prisa. (‘The thing is that I haven’t been here long and I still can’t understand when you speak fast.’)

The content of “grounders” in the “Airplane seat” vignette was also a significant in the rating of politeness. Using “grounders” such as *quiero sentarme con mi amigo* (‘I want to sit with my friend’) and *necesito hablar con mi amigo* (‘I need to talk with my friend’) sounded too direct and demanding for a polite request to an older stranger, according to the raters. The raters’ suggested change would be to make the “grounder” more indirect by using a verb in the conditional tense such as *me gustaría sentarme con mi amigo* (‘I **would like** to sit with my friend’). Perhaps students had not yet acquired the pragmalinguistic ability to apply the conditional tense to the softening of requests.

As the Spanish native-speaker *Speech Act Measure* data presented above suggest, use of the conditional tense with the head act semantic formula “query preparatory” was an important mechanism for politeness. The native-speaker rater comments corroborate this finding in that they frequently mentioned the need to use the conditional tense in the head act in order to be polite. In addition, the raters also commented that the conditional tense was necessary to soften supportive moves, especially in the vignettes in which the hearer was of higher social status or higher social distance. In the “Slower speech” and “Paper extension” vignettes, a “preparator” was rated as more appropriately polite if the conditional tense was used instead of the present tense, for example by saying *Podría pedirle un favor?* (‘**Could** I ask you a favor?’) instead of *Puedo pedirle un favor?* (‘**Can** I ask you a favor?’). In the “Paper extension” vignette, using a semantic formula of “appreciation” with a simple “*gracias*” (‘thank you’) in the final rejoinder was inappropriate because it wrongly assumes that the professor, who has not agreed to the request at that point, will agree. Instead, using an “appreciation” semantic formula with the conditional, such as *Se lo agradecería* (‘I would appreciate it’) was judged as polite and appropriate.

Another issue that affected students’ rated performance on the *Speech Act Measure* was the inappropriateness of their level of formality. Instances of being both too informal when the situation called for formal language, as well as being too formal in an informal situation were observed in the data. Degree of formality could be conveyed in a number of ways, but primarily by the verb tense, the vocabulary, and the pronoun with which the interlocutor was addressed. With regard to the verb tense, as already mentioned, the conditional or past subjunctive tense was judged by the raters to be necessary to make the request polite, especially in the vignettes requiring formal language to speak to an interlocutor of higher social status or where social distance between the two was great.

The formality level of vocabulary was a sticking point for some students. First, a number of students used vocabulary that was not formal enough when speaking to a professor or to an older person (i.e., airplane passenger, friend’s mother). In one case, a student used the informal term “*hombre*” (‘man’) in addressing the professor in the “Paper extension” vignette. The full rejoinder was:

“Escucha, hombre, si quieres para mi a escribir una pagina más o alguna cosa, dime, pero necesito un extensión, por favor!” (‘Listen, man, if you want me to write one page more or something, tell me, but I need an extension, please!’)

Another example from the same vignette is the use of an attention-getting device with the professor. Student 22C (posttest) used the word *oiga* (‘hey’) which, although it is marked for the formal second person (i.e., *usted*), is primarily used informally as an attention getter and,

according to two raters, was not appropriate with a higher-status individual. The full rejoinder was:

Oiga, Dr. Rodríguez, mira, esta fin de semana encontré billetes de avión muy barato a la ciudad donde está mi mejor amigo. ¿Es posible que me das un extensión en el trabajo? ('Hey, Dr. Rodríguez, look, this weekend I found very cheap airplane tickets to the city where my best friend is. Is it possible for you to give me an extension on the paper?')

There were several cases in which students used profanity inappropriately as well (23Cy, 105Cy, 9Ey). Interestingly, all of the cases of inappropriate profanity occurred in the students' posttests. This observation would suggest that students had acquired such words from the input they received in study abroad, but had not acquired the ability to judge when the use of such words was socially acceptable (i.e., "sociopragmatic failure"). Indeed, the raters' comments suggest that profanity is acceptable in some circumstances, but not with a professor or at the dinner table with a friend's family (see Daly, Holmes, Newton, & Stubbe, 2004, for a context where the use of expletives was acceptable).

Being too formal in an informal situation was another issue that students had. For example, one student (101E posttest) used a "promise of non-recurrence" with Sofía in the "Meeting friend" vignette which, according to the rater, sounded like the student was talking to his or her mother. In another example, also in the "Meeting friend" vignette, one student (79C pretest) used formal language during the whole interchange. The rater commented that being so formal with a friend has the effect of putting social distance between the two. From the rater's perspective, this formality was inappropriate and impolite. The most appropriate thing to do in this vignette was to show solidarity with the friend by using language that demonstrates the closeness of the friend-friend relationship. This could be viewed as a pragmalinguistic problem since it is possible that the student was unaware of the level of formality conveyed by the Spanish that she chose to use. Since this was a pretest situation in which the student presumably had not yet had extensive exposure to more informal Spanish, the student's Spanish was most likely a reflection of the more formal Spanish learned in class. The response from this student follows:

Sofía (annoyed): *Oye, ¿dónde estabas? ¡Te he estado esperando aquí por más de media hora!* ('Hey, where were you? I've been waiting here for more than a half hour!')

You: *Discúlpame. Intenté a llegar temprano pero tenía problemas de encontrar un taxi.* ('Sorry. I attempted to arrive early but I had problems finding a taxi.')

Sofía: *¿Verdad? Pues, ya casi me iba a estudiar yo sola allá adentro.* ('Really? Well, I was just about to go in and study by myself.')

You: *Ay, perdón. Espero que no te enojas mucho.* ('Oh, sorry. I hope that you don't get too angry.')

Sofía: *Bueno, lo que quise decir fue que me estaba como que preocupando porque pensé que algo te había pasado.* ('Well, what I mean is that I was kind of worried because I thought something had happened to you.')

You: *Bueno, gracias. No te preocupes. Estoy aquí y bien lista para estudiar contigo.*
(‘Well, thanks. Don’t worry. I’m here and very ready to study with you.’)

This particular student’s (79C) language on this vignette was more informal in the posttest, as can be seen in the following data:

Sofía (annoyed): *Oye, ¿dónde estabas? ¡Te he estado esperando aquí por más de media hora!* (‘Hey, where were you? I’ve been waiting here for more than half an hour!’)

You: *¡Perdóname, Sofía! Me bajé en la parada equivocada del colectivo y me perdí.*
(‘Forgive me, Sofía! I got off at the wrong busstop and I got lost.’)

Sofía: *¿Verdad? Pues, ya casi me iba a estudiar yo sola allá adentro.* (‘Really? Well, I was just about to go in and study by myself.’)

You: *Lo siento. ¡Pero ahora estoy acá!* (‘Sorry. But now I’m here!’)

Sofía: *Bueno, lo que quise decir fue que me estaba como que preocupando porque pensé que algo te había pasado.* (‘Well, what I mean is that I was kind of worried because I thought something had happened to you.’)

You: *No, todo bien. Perdón. ¡Vamos a estudiar!* (No, everything’s good. Sorry. Let’s go study!’)

Exposure to informal registers of Spanish during study abroad likely helped this student become more appropriately informal with a friend in this vignette.

Research into another speech act in Spanish – refusals – by García (1992, 1999) and Félix-Brasdefer (2002) suggests that at least in Peruvian, Venezuelan, and Mexican Spanish (and perhaps in other regional Latin American dialects as well) showing solidarity (i.e., “positive politeness”) with a friend is an important strategy to soften a refusal. It is possible that solidarity strategies are also appropriate in the mitigation of an apology with a friend in Spanish, as in the “Meeting friend” vignette. More evidence of the appropriateness of showing solidarity comes from another comment made by a rater about the “Meeting friend” vignette. In the final rejoinder of this vignette, Sofía says *Estaba preocupada por si te había pasado algo*. (‘I was worried that something might have happened to you’). Several students, in response to this rejoinder, said something to the effect of *no necesitas preocuparte por mí* (‘You don’t need to worry about me’), which was understood by the rater as a rejection of the friend’s concern. One rater felt that this rejection of Sofía’s concern was rude, perhaps because it is a rejection of a demonstration of affection and solidarity between friends. The rater suggested that the most appropriate response would be to show appreciation for Sofía’s concern. A direction for future research would be to investigate whether a sociopragmatic difference exists between American English and different varieties of Spanish with regard to demonstrations of solidarity between friends in similar situations.

Having examined both raters’ comments and students’ pre- and posttests, some generalizations can be made about differences between pre- and the posttest performance on the

Speech Act Measure. First of all, pretest responses were often (but not always) shorter than posttest responses, apparently due to lack of linguistic resources on the part of the student (i.e., lower proficiency). At the same time, moving to longer and more elaborate responses in the posttest, did not always result in a higher rating in pragmatic performance. This generalization may reflect a tendency towards “verbosity” by L2 learners, as reported by Kasper (1997).

Second, in the posttest, students tended to incorporate more native-sounding language into their speech, for example by using regional slang. As discussed above, however, it seems that in some situations, students’ desire to incorporate the more native-sounding speech resulted in them using language which was not formal enough for the situation. Students were also too formal when the situation called for informal language. Inappropriate use of register – both formal and informal – may be the result of students not knowing how formal or informal specific words, phrases, or semantic formulas in Spanish are perceived.

Third, for the most part, students sounded more native-like in the posttest in their use of vocabulary and grammar, but they were not necessarily more pragmatically appropriate. For example, in the pretest, students were more likely to get rated lower for giving responses that were incomprehensible because they were grammatically incorrect. Thus, students seemed to have a better command of vocabulary and structure and were more comprehensible in the posttest. At the same time, grammar errors did not **always** impede communication, and many students whose pretest responses were not expressed very well grammatically, were still judged as highly appropriate pragmatically. As previous research has shown, being grammatically correct is not always a requisite precursor to being pragmatically appropriate (Schmidt, 1983).

These observations would suggest that students acquired a better command of the vocabulary and structures and used more native-sounding vocabulary, but may have not acquired many pragmatic features of the TL, although, as noted above, students did improve significantly in their rated speech act performance from pre- to posttest. The lack of acquisition of appropriate pragmatic behaviors during a relatively short sojourn abroad is not surprising given research by Olshain and Blum-Kulka (1985) and Barron (2004), for example, that suggests that acquiring pragmatic competence in a L2 requires much longer periods of time.

Finally, looking at students’ performance on the *Speech Act Measure* qualitatively, it was not possible to obtain any new insights as to why the E and the C groups differed with regard to their rated performance on apologies and requests. Generally speaking, both groups were equally represented with regard to being sociopragmatically inappropriate, as discussed in this section. Indeed, the quantitative data presented in the previous section was more useful in making distinctions between the E and C groups.

Research Question (7a): To what extent do study abroad students report using strategies described in the Students' Guide in order to effectively learn the target language and culture? With regard to the strategies that they use, how do they use them?

In this section both the e-journal data and the follow-up interview data are used to help respond to the research question since they provide a form of convergent validation.

Language and Culture Strategy Use Overall

Based on the e-journal data collected from all of the E group students and from the follow-up interviews conducted with a subsample of E group students, it is clear that E group students in both cohorts did use many of the language and culture strategies contained in the *Students' Guide* during their semester studying abroad. Furthermore, all of the students reported using at least some of the language and culture strategies. The following quotes give examples of some of the strategies from the *Guide* that students reported using.

Language strategy use:

I constantly have to ask for clarification, but am practicing some of the strategies mentioned [in the Students' Guide], like trying to imagine what I should have said in a situation, or mentally repeating phrases I originally had to have clarified. (Student 17, Cohort A, Week 2, Havana, Cuba)¹¹

I have tried to take some of the suggestions [in the Guide] of getting more involved in my host culture and to meet more native people. Just this weekend, I tried to start more conversations with natives and I had a lot of fun, while learning more about the people here and using my Spanish. (Student 1, Cohort A, Week 4, Cuernavaca, Mexico)

Culture strategy use:

The surveys [in the Guide] on the different forms of nonverbal communication helped me realize that in terms of personal distance and touching, Ecuador differs from the U.S. I have definitely noticed this at my internship because the kids are always right up next to me, practically on my lap most of the time. Until now I hadn't realized that this was a cultural thing. (Student 70, Cohort B, Week 8, Quito, Ecuador)

I have definitely used the [D.I.E. Model¹² in the Students' Guide] to evaluate cultural situations that seem "different" from what I'm used to. It seems that everyday I wonder about or question the French culture--Why do people I am meeting for the first time kiss me? Why do people yell at each other in the streets? I think that the suggestion to

¹¹ Quotes from the e-journals (as opposed to those from the follow-up interviews) are designated by the week for which the e-journal entry was assigned to be submitted to the researchers (e.g., "Week 2," "Week 8," etc.). See Appendix A for the e-journal assignment schedule. Quotes from the follow-up interviews are labeled "follow-up interview."

¹² The D.I.E. Model of Debriefing refers to a process for analyzing and understanding behaviors in another culture by considering different interpretations and ways that those behaviors may be evaluated. The acronym stands for Describe-Interpret-Evaluate, which is the suggested sequence for analyzing behaviors in another culture.

try to form these daily questions in a descriptive manner will help me out. I don't want to evaluate or criticize all of the cultural differences; I just want to get a better understanding of them. (Student 47, Cohort A, Week 6, Montpellier, France)

Preferences for Specific Language and Culture Strategies

Despite the fact that E group students reported using many of the language and culture strategies in the *Guide*, students had their own preferences about which strategies fit best with their situation, personality, and learning style. Hence, there were strategies from the *Guide* that did not appeal to certain students and consequently they did not use them. There was, however, no generalizable pattern here. The preferred strategies from the *Guide* varied from student to student, as did the ones identified by students as being on their “rejection” list. Here are two examples of these:

I found the vocabulary section to be interesting but not entirely useful for me. For one thing, I did not need any association devices to remember the Aymara words. I find that the most useful thing for me when learning new Spanish words is to write some sentences in Spanish which include the word. (Student 10, Cohort B, Week 4, Costa Rica)

I don't like the iceberg [model of interpreting culture]. It reminds me too much of boring work that I had to do in middle school and seems too simplistic to be helpful. (Student 18, Cohort A, Week 6, Costa Rica)

In addition, looking at the E group as a whole, there was no consistent pattern of students using language strategies more than culture strategies, or vice versa. Some students did report that they used the language or the culture strategies more frequently, but this differential use seemed to vary according to the students' prior language and culture experience, interests, personality, and specific situation. Thus, the e-journal data would suggest that students accessed both kinds of strategies equally. This was an encouraging finding since one of the special features of the *Guide* in the eyes of the authors was the fact that it combined two areas that are often treated separately in study abroad materials.

Strategies for Becoming More Proactive About Language and Culture Learning

The *Guide* is intended to encourage students to become proactive about their language and culture learning in study abroad by giving them a set of tools to improve their language and intercultural skills. There is evidence in the e-journals that a number of students did feel empowered to be active about language and culture learning as a result of reading the *Guide*. One student commented in the follow-up interview generally about this issue:

[The Guide] made me aware that I needed to be active in my learning and not just sit back and wait for it to happen kind of thing. So it really kind of pushed me to go out there and put myself out there and try to do everything I could to learn. That's how it really helped me. (Student 71, Cohort B, Follow-up Interview, Barcelona, Spain)

Looking more specifically at what ways the *Guide* encouraged students to be more proactive about language and culture, one student reported that her interest in learning French was reinvigorated after reading the section of the *Guide* on learning vocabulary:

The learning vocabulary section on page 185 was awesome. I am going to start using flashcards and I have a goal to learn 10 new words per day. This section excited me about learning French again, because like I said, I am a little discouraged right now with the language. Tomorrow I am going to the record store to buy some popular French music with the lyrics printed on the label. Then I am gonna look up the words I don't know and learn them. I think this is a really great suggestion from the book to learn common slang language that can be used at cafes and such. It's obviously a good conversation starter, too! (Student 67, Cohort B, Week 4, Montpellier, France)

Another student commented on how the D.I.E. model which is included in the *Guide* helped remind her to make the most of the opportunities for culture learning that were available to her during study abroad:

I liked the idea of the DIE model for processing information. Not only is it important to remember to think open-mindedly about experiences, but it's important simply to think about in the first place! What I mean is that it's easy to forget the importance of active learning and active thinking; it's easy to have an experience, frustrating or not, and then simply brush it off and forget about it. I personally think more about practical, day-to-day things than the fact that I am currently in a situation that offers me many potential things to learn. So the DIE model seems like an easy device to help me remember to make the most out of my encounters and try to learn something from them, not just passively live through them. (Student 63, Cohort B, Week 6, Santiago, Chile)

Strategies for Putting Cultural Concepts into Practice

In addition to reminding students to use strategies they were already aware of, several students also reported that the *Guide* helped them **put into practice** in their interactions with host country nationals larger concepts about culture that they were previously aware of but may not have applied actively to real life. Excerpts from two students who expressed this opinion appear below:

The culture readings for this assignment covered the subject of styles of communication and non-verbal which I have covered in my intercultural communication class at [my university], although it was a helpful refresher and reminded me to take notice of such things. Although I may know the concepts, I don't actively look out for these styles. (Student 80, Cohort B, Week 8, Montpellier, France)

I found the reading to be really interesting. I admit that some of the materials that were discussed were issues and ideas that I have already been taught or have been thinking about in looking forward to my studies abroad (i.e. generalizations, stereotypes, concept of surface-level and sub-culture). However, the concise and insightful way these concepts were presented helped me to more clearly imagine how I could specifically use those ideas in my own travels. (Student 78, Cohort B, Pre-departure, Montpellier, France)

This finding reflects another important learning outcome of the *Guide*, namely that the advice contained in the book can aid students in applying theoretical and abstract concepts about culture to everyday life and interactions with people from another culture.

Strategies for Dealing with Difficult Times

The previous quote suggests that the *Guide* helped a student deal with frustrations related to adjusting to another language and culture in study abroad. This theme was prominent in the e-journal entries; many students used the coping strategies in the *Guide* to help them move beyond frustrating times in the host country. One student described the coping strategies she used:

Coping strategies are things I have actively been doing. I make sure to exercise; I go for a run when I feel stressed, or call my mom. My other favorite strategy is to buy myself a treat from home at the grocery store: a really overpriced jar of peanut butter (a rarity here), or real 100% orange juice. (Student 63, Cohort B, Week 4, Santiago, Chile)

As described previously, many students also found that simply knowing that their frustrations were normal reactions to life in another culture was comforting. This finding suggests that becoming aware of what to expect while studying abroad can be a powerful strategy for coping with difficult experiences:

The other night I was so frustrated after dinner that I felt like crying. I had barely understood a single thing [my host family said]. I found myself getting mad at my host family while I sat in my room and wanting to avoid seeing them...I was really glad when I read the section [in the Guide] on language fatigue, because it made me realize that what I was going through was probably pretty normal. (Student 15, Cohort A, Week 2, Guatemala City, Guatemala)

Strategies for Becoming a Language and Culture Ethnographer

Another primary focus of the *Students' Guide* is to encourage students to become “ethnographers” of language and culture and therefore the *Guide* includes a number of activities designed with this goal in mind. To give two examples, the *Guide* advises students to ask NSs how to perform speech acts such as requesting and apologizing and to observe host country behaviors with regard to personal distance, eye contact, and touching. These kinds of activities are designed to give students guidance about how to take advantage of the fact that they are surrounded by members of the host culture during their sojourn abroad. The data from the e-journals and follow-up interviews suggest that students did in fact become language and culture ethnographers. Here are three examples:

I feel that after reading the section [on Non-Verbal Communication], I will try to pay more attention to what people do in terms of eye contact but I have noticed that my tendency as a US American is to interject and almost interrupt much more than I have noticed my host family do. I am going to need to pay a bit more attention to this. (Student 15, Cohort A, Week 8, Guatemala City, Guatemala)

The [Students' Guide] section on Varying Strategies for Apologizing was important. I seem to be always saying the wrong thing...I am still working on [apologies] and playing language detective by asking my host mom about appropriate expressions. (Student 11, Cohort A, Week 6, Santiago, Chile)

I think the guide helped me to be more observant and just to listen more and to pick up more of how Spanish is just spoken commonly rather than how you use academic Spanish. And I don't know just like...making mistakes and apologizing for things, and I would always over-apologize or just say "lo siento, lo siento," and it's more common to used, "perdón." So it's just like something like that I would have never known if I wouldn't have just listened and observed more. (Student 1, Cohort A, Follow-up Interview, Cuernavaca, Mexico)

The latter two quotes above speak specifically to students' learning about speech acts in the TL. There was additional evidence in the e-journals and the follow-up interviews that students did use strategies in the *Guide* to learn how to be more pragmatically appropriate when performing speech acts, such as requesting and apologizing, in the TL.

Strategy Use Beyond the Host Country

Although students primarily reported using the language and culture strategies to improve their French or Spanish language skills and to increase their knowledge and understanding of the **host** country culture, several students also reported using the language and culture strategies to learn about other languages and cultures. This use was generally the result of travel between countries in the region where students were studying abroad, but in some cases, such as in Cameroon and in Barcelona, Spain where languages other than French and Spanish are also spoken, students commented using strategies to acquire those languages. In addition, several students reported using the culture strategies in countries other than the host country. For example, one student who was studying in Spain traveled to Scotland and found herself using culture strategies there:

The intercultural skills weren't just for my experience in Spain. They also applied very well in Scotland as in the people I met in Scotland. I met an Australian in Scotland and I was very open to what she had to say and what she had to say about me, what she had to say about the US, what she had to say about the world, about Europe, and whatnot, and I was very open to that. And I think that was a lot of, that's what I gleaned a lot from the culture learning strategies was just being very open to other people; not trying to be ethnocentric, and say, "Americans are better than everybody else." Because I think especially going abroad and after reading the section and going back to it you're just like, "You know, Americans aren't the best thing since sliced bread." It doesn't mean that someone else is, some other culture is, it's just that you have this understanding that your way is not the best way, and no one else's way is the best way. It's the best way because everyone has their own individual ways. (Student 94, Cohort B, Follow-up Interview, Sevilla, Spain)

While the majority of students did not report using the language and culture strategies in countries other than their host country, the fact that some students did report doing so is a good sign. The *Guide* is intended to be language- and culture-general – that is, applicable to any language or culture – and therefore, a positive outcome of the use of the *Guide* would be that students would be able to apply the strategies learned from the *Guide* to any language or culture learning experience and in future contact with other cultures.

Strategy Use After Returning Home

One of the goals of the *Guide* is to encourage students to continue to be proactive language and culture learners after returning home from study abroad. There are strategies included in the *Guide* designed to aid students in continuing their learning back home and, in addition, many of the strategies intended for the study abroad environment can also be used equally effectively in the at-home environment in which language and culture learning is taking place. Therefore, there was an interest in finding out from students if they were continuing to use the strategies in the *Guide* after returning home from study abroad. Because the follow-up interviews were conducted three-to-five months after students had returned to the U.S. from study abroad, students were specifically asked about which language and culture strategies they had been using since coming home, and if they were using such strategies, the role that the *Guide* had played. Although several students reported not having used any language and culture strategies since reentry, the majority of students reported that they used strategies to maintain a connection with the TL and host culture after returning. Students reported keeping in touch by telephone and email with host country family and friends (both in English and in the TL), watching movies and TV shows in the TL, reading online newspapers in the TL from the host country, taking classes in the TL, seeking out and interacting with NSs of the TL in the community, among other strategies.

In addition, several students reported that they used cultural concepts they had learned in the *Guide* and through personal experience in study abroad to explain cultural difference to their U.S.-based friends and family. One student reported that she had realized after returning home that direct and indirect communication styles applied to cultural and regional differences within the U.S. itself. In some cases, students attributed these strategies to those which they had learned in the *Guide*, and in other cases students reported that they thought of doing these strategies on their own before reading about them in the *Guide*, or that their insights on cultural difference were also a result of the study abroad experience in itself. Interestingly, some students reported that as a result of the interview, they had read back over the *Guide* for the first time since coming home and expressed remorse about the fact that they had not followed some of the tips for post-reentry language and culture learning.

Students were also asked in the follow-up interviews about the extent to which they felt that they would use the strategies in the *Guide* in the future. Three students reported that they were planning future trips abroad and that they wanted to bring the *Guide* with them on those trips because they felt it would be useful. Several other students did not have specific plans for going abroad, but said that if they went abroad again they would read the *Guide* again because they felt it would be useful. Several students felt they would be able to use the cultural concepts in the *Guide* in their interactions with immigrants in the U.S. who come from other cultures. Several students also mentioned that they wanted to use the language strategies to continue improving their TL skills, for example, by using some of the listening strategies contained in the *Guide*.

Sharing Strategies from the *Guide* with Study Abroad Peers

Several students also reported talking about language and culture strategies to their study abroad peers who were not in the study and did not have the *Guide*. One student reported that when her roommate made a stereotypical comment about the host culture, she

explained to the roommate the differences between stereotypes and generalizations, a strategy for interpreting culture which she had learned in the *Guide*. Another student counseled her roommate about the “U-Curve” of cultural adjustment and about language fatigue – both concepts which she had learned in the *Guide* – in order to help the roommate deal with difficult times she was having. This finding is a positive one for the *Guide* in that it suggests that E group students were not only using language and culture strategies themselves, but also helping other study abroad students use these strategies. In addition, some of the students’ comments speak to the fact that study abroaders who were not participating in the study were really interested in the idea of a book that could help them improve their language and culture skills during study abroad. For example, one student said in the follow-up interview:

At one point I even said [to people], “I’m reading this book that I brought along with me because I’m participating in a study and it’s so amazingly wonderful” and a couple of other people were like, “Oh, can I borrow it, can I borrow it?” And I never got around to letting them use it, but everyone was so intrigued about the idea of being able to get a better grasp of study abroad and how to really cope with those situations while abroad. (Student 94, Cohort B, Follow-up Interview, Sevilla, Spain)

The Role of the *Guide* in Learning and Using Language and Culture Strategies

In a number of instances, students mentioned explicitly that they learned new strategies from reading the *Students’ Guide*, as in these examples:

The idea of keeping a "Learner's Log" interested me, as I had not heard about this technique until I read about it in Maximizing Study Abroad Guide. I think this is a great idea...I am going to try to start a notebook and keep entries of feedback on written exercises because it looks like a good way to keep track of what has been learned, and what skill(s) need to be worked on. (Student 75, Cohort B, Week 10, Senegal)

I found that the information provided in the book about nonverbal communication was very helpful. The information made me more aware of my own nonverbal communication patterns as well as those of my host country. (Student 2, Cohort A, Week 8, Cuernavaca, Mexico)

After reading the listening section, I couldn’t contain my enthusiasm...I started to watch TV more, listen in on more conversations, and using the strategies outlines on pages 167-172. (Student 94, Cohort B, Week 2, Sevilla, Spain)

However, in other cases it was difficult to discern from students’ e-journal entries whether they learned the strategies that they reported using from the *Students’ Guide*, or if they were already using those strategies prior to exposure to the *Guide*. For example, one student commented:

I make an effort to talk to as many Spanish people as possible. I also read in Spanish, whether or not I understand every word. I also try to talk Spanish with my classmates and roommates who speak English as well. I talk to my friends in Spanish at dinner. I ask questions of Spanish speaking people. Whenever I go out, I try to talk as much as possible. (Student 61, Cohort B, Week 2, Toledo, Spain)

The strategies for making an effort to use the TL as much as possible that the student writes about in the above entry were mentioned in the section of the *Guide* that she had read for Week 2. However, since she did not indicate if she learned these strategies from the *Guide*, it was not possible to attribute strategy learning directly to the *Guide*. A suggestion for future research would be to ask students to indicate explicitly where they learned the strategies that they report using.

Some students did indicate explicitly that they had been using language and culture strategies before they read about them in the *Guide*. A number of students mentioned, however, that reading in the *Guide* about the strategies they were already using validated and reinforced the value of such strategies. For example, one student commented in the pre-departure e-journal entry:

The most helpful section of the reading [for this week] was "Some Strategies for Culture-Specific Learning" on page 51. Since I have already been doing some of the things the passage suggests it makes me feel like I am on the right track. (Student 78, Cohort B, Pre-departure, Montpellier, France)

In other cases, students reported that reading about the strategies that they had already been using made them more conscious about their use of such strategies. For example, a student in Quito Ecuador (Student 94, Cohort B, Week 6) commented:

The advice beginning on page 198 was very good and reminded me of strategies that I had already been using, although not consciously thinking about them.

Another student had the following e-journal entry:

It was really useful to think about some new devices for listening and practicing new words and phrases, something I'm constantly doing anyways, and I feel like it was good to realize that I'm very much an association learner, and so that's something I can more consciously use now. (Student 46, Cohort A, Week 4, Cameroon)

Although providing students with **new** language and culture strategies that they can start using is a goal of the *Students' Guide*, another goal of the *Guide* is to simply make students more conscious and **strategic** about language and culture learning. Becoming strategic about one's learning is not limited to using new techniques and new concepts, but could also mean using strategies that one was aware of previously, but to use such strategies more effectively or more frequently. Therefore, the fact that students reported that the *Guide* helped them become more conscious about their use of strategies that they were already aware of represents a positive learning outcome of the *Guide*.

Not only did students report becoming more conscious of strategy use as a result of the *Guide*, but they also found that reading the *Guide* **reminded** them to use language and culture strategies that they were already aware of, but may have not remembered to use. For example, one student wrote:

It was helpful to read "Ideas for Interaction"...It's so important to make and pursue friends from your host country, such as through clubs, volunteering, church, and class. I have worked on being involved with all of these things. It's good to be reminded of this again though. (Student 45, Cohort A, Week 2, Montpellier, France)

With regard to strategies which students were already aware of before reading the *Guide*, a trend emerged in the e-journal data concerning prior experience with language and culture. A number of students who reported that they were already using certain language strategies contained in the *Guide* seemed to be those who were more experienced L2 learners. For example, one student wrote:

The least helpful sections to me were probably the [reading and] writing sections. I had gone [on study abroad] with a base in French, having taken 8, 9, 10 years of French and so I already had a system on how I learned to write and how I learned to read in French, so just having to read [the Guide] didn't help me. I'm sure a lot of people would read that...and it would be really useful. But for me, I just didn't find that it was useful because maybe it was a repeat. (Student 45, Cohort A, Follow-up Interview, Montpellier, France)

Many students who seemed to be less-experienced language learners, however, tended to report that numerous language strategies were new to them and that they would (or did) try using these new strategies in order to improve their TL skills.

A parallel finding for the culture strategies also emerged. Students who had previous experience with culture learning – such as through university coursework, study abroad preparation training, or previous travel abroad – were the ones more likely to report that they were aware of such strategies before reading about them in the *Guide*. Those for whom this study abroad sojourn was their first trip abroad in general tended to find the strategies in the *Guide* to be new to them.

The Importance of the Timing of the Materials

Another finding from the e-journals was that the timing of the readings was an important factor in students' use of the language and culture strategies. A number of students mentioned that reading about culture shock and adjustment and language fatigue early on in their study abroad experience was very comforting and extremely relevant to their situation at that time. One student commented:

So when I got to page 177 and read the part about "language shock and fatigue," I wanted to shout, Yes!!! I had no idea why I was feeling all of those things, but now I'm sure that's what it is. I am more tired than usual, and often times at the end of the day I feel exasperated to unlock the door and see that my family is home. All I want is alone time, to crawl into bed and read an American magazine. It's this overwhelming grouchiness and tiredness that hits me at the end of the day. I have found, though, that it was A LOT worse during the first few weeks. I am in my 8th week already, and I notice it much less. (Student 63, Cohort B, Week 6, Santiago, Chile)

The culture shock reading was right on time. I was starting to get really fed up when I picked up the book. It was almost like a second wind to read that part again. I needed to understand what exactly was going on, was it me, was it them? No, it was simply the two over time. (Student 72, Cohort B, Week 4, Madrid, Spain)

On the other hand, several students mentioned that by the time they read the section on strategies for reading and writing in the TL – which was assigned to be read in the tenth week of study abroad – they had already had to read and write so much in the TL for their courses, that they

had discovered many of the strategies contained in the *Guide* “the hard way,” that is, on their own, through trial and error. Some students expressed the opinion that they would have benefited more from reading about reading and writing strategies if they had done so towards the beginning of the semester abroad. Another student wished that she had read all of the “pre-departure” language strategies sections of the *Guide* prior to going abroad so that she could have been better prepared. Although some of these comments simply reflect the truism that hindsight is 20/20, these findings also suggest that sections of the *Guide* may be most relevant to students at particular points before and during the semester abroad. The issue of relevancy concurs with Bennett, Bennett, and Allen (1999) who argued that when training occurs at the right time – meaning that students are being challenged and supported sufficiently at the necessary time – then skill development is possible. Furthermore, students’ perceptions as to the timing of the materials can be used to inform the sequencing of the *Guide* for use with study abroad students, an issue which will be addressed more in depth in the “Suggestions for Teaching a Course Using the *Students’ Guide*” in the Discussion and Conclusions section of the report.

Conclusions

The qualitative findings presented above suggest that the E group students in this study did use the language and culture strategies contained in the *Students’ Guide* in a number of different ways. Furthermore, students often reported that strategy use led to positive outcomes in terms of their language and culture learning. An important point to bear in mind, which was in fact reiterated by several of the students in their e-journals and follow-up interview, was that the E group was being paid to read the *Guide* and to use the strategies contained therein. Therefore, these findings cannot necessarily be generalized to study abroad students who might read the *Guide* on their own, without the motivation of financial remuneration. Several students who thought the *Guide* was useful after having read it, still pointed out that had they not been in the study, they probably would not have used the *Guide*, given to the time constraints that they faced with the heavy load of coursework and internships that they were involved in. In the follow-up interviews, several students had the opinion that the *Guide* would work best if it were part of a required course or program for study abroad.

Research Question (7b): In which contexts do study abroad students use the strategies in the Students' Guide in order to effectively learn the target language and culture?

From the e-journal and follow-up interview data, it was found that students used the language and culture strategies in all of the imaginable contexts available in the study abroad environment. However, some contexts were more commonly reported than others. Those contexts that were common to a majority of students included the host family, the classroom, an internship or volunteer job, a language partner, host country friends, host country siblings, the movies, the bank, the subway, the coffee shop, the bar, and the market. More unusual contexts included the bus stop and lying in bed under a mosquito net.

The type of interactions in which students described using language and culture strategies were also diverse and included discussions with host country friends or family on religion, politics, culture, language, and the weather, business transactions in local shops, classroom lectures, and flirting, to name a few. Several examples are provided below to give a feel for these diverse interactions.

I have neither a language partner nor a host family, but I do use [listening] strategies with my teachers and with people I talk with at stores and on the street. They are especially useful when speaking with cab drivers. Most cab drivers, in Barcelona at least, are more than happy to converse with you and help you to improve your skills. If you ask them a question they will answer you and if I didn't understand, I ask another question to clarify. (Student 69, Cohort B, Week 2, Barcelona, Spain)

I use a lot of strategies for communication with people from another culture. I try to explain myself my attitudes and behaviors according to the norm in the US and try to differentiate between what's just my personal preference or attitude versus a cultural attitude. I use them everywhere, especially in my house with my family and in public conversations with people I just meet. (Student 64, Cohort B, Week 6, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic)

The last time I went to a cyber cafe, I forgot the word for computer, so I asked if I could use a máquina (machine), which worked fine. I also like to use descriptions if I do not know how to say something (p.202). I can vividly remember one time when I went into a local pharmacy in pursuit of Tums, but I did not know the word for antacid (anti-ácido). As a result, I proceeded to rub my stomach and ask for "la medicina para el estómago" (medicine for the stomach). Although the woman laughed at me, I got what I wanted. (Student 21, Cohort A, Week 6, Toledo, Spain)

I've been exposing myself more to situations where I have to speak French. I talk to my French roommates almost every weekday at dinner and our conversations vary from French politics to likes and dislikes. I went to a German movie with French subtitles. I've also had conversations with my girlfriend's mother who is French. (Student 80, Cohort B, Week 6, Montpellier, France)

Research Question (8): What are students' perceptions about the usefulness of the Students' Guide for the study abroad experience?

Overall Impressions of the Guide

In both the e-journals and the follow-up interviews, E group students were very positive about the value of the *Students' Guide* for study abroad students. One student summed up his perspective on the *Guide* in his last e-journal entry:

Maximizing [Study Abroad] has been an effective book not because it answers ALL of my questions, but because it provides guidance and structure during a time when one can feel utterly lost, wandering around in a mental, physical, and cultural landscape without any landmarks in sight. (Student 20, Cohort A, Week 11, Salamanca, Spain)

While there may have been strategies, information, and activities in the *Guide* which did not appeal to certain students, their overall take on the *Guide* was that it was very useful for the study abroad experience.

The Guide Provided Needed Guidance about Study Abroad

One of the likely reasons why students reported finding the *Guide* useful was the lack of guidance many students reported receiving from their study abroad programs. Although it is probable that most students in the sample participated in a pre-departure orientation through their university or study abroad program, they did not tend to have access to support on-site that went beyond logistical concerns. The need for on-site guidance about language and culture issues was captured by the following student:

I feel like every section I read, my reaction is, "Oh yeah!! I had forgotten to pay attention to that!!" I like doing these readings while I'm here. It keeps things fresher in my mind. I think if I had gone to my school's orientation in May (which was the alternative to participating in this project); I would have half-listened to everything and then promptly forgotten it. (Student 63, Cohort B, Week 6, Santiago, Chile)

The importance of support for language and culture learning in-country, when the learning tools will be most relevant to students, is evident in this student's e-journal excerpt.

At the same time, an issue that came out primarily in the follow-up interviews was that the *Guide* would function best as required reading for an on-site study abroad course or instructional session. As described earlier, a number of students admitted that if they had not been required to read the *Guide* because of their participation in this study, they may not have read it at all, despite the fact that they found the information valuable. This opinion is related to another common theme that students expressed, namely that a number of students felt that they were too busy with their classes, internships, and other activities in study abroad to take full advantage of the strategies contained in the *Students' Guide*. For example, one student wrote:

I have been trying to read the newspaper as often as I can, and I watch TV with my [host mother] sometimes, but it is hard to find time to do all the things that I wanted to do to enhance my language! I do as much as I can with the free time that I have, which is not very much. (Student 71, Cohort B, Week 8, Barcelona, Spain)

The reported lack of time makes becoming strategic and effective with their own language and culture learning all the more important for busy study abroad students.

Differences in Students' Perceptions about the Usefulness of the *Guide*

As described above, a trend emerged in the qualitative data with regard to perceptions about the usefulness of the language and culture sections of the *Guide*. Students who reported in their e-journals or follow-up interviews that they had an advanced level of proficiency in the TL tended to find the culture strategies more helpful than the language strategies, whereas students who reported having a relatively low-level of TL ability tended to find the language strategies more useful than the culture strategies. This trend in the qualitative data is partially confirmed by the following quantitative findings: using an independent-samples *t*-test, a statistically significant difference was found between E group students who had studied the TL for 3 or more years at the university level prior to studying abroad (i.e., presumably higher-proficiency students) and E group students who had studied the TL for less than 3 years at the university (i.e., presumably lower-proficiency students) with regard to how much of an impact they felt that the *Guide* had on their speaking, reading, and writing skills (the difference was not significant for listening skills, although the same trend is seen). E group students rated the *Guide's* impact on their language skills in four categories (i.e., listening, speaking, reading, and writing) on a scale from 1 to 5, from having “no impact” (1) to having a “profound impact” (5) (see Table 64 below for further discussion of students' ratings of the *Guide* concerning its impact on their language skills). Table 63 below displays the findings for the E group students' ratings of the *Guide* divided by years of study of the TL at the university level.

Table 63: E Group Ratings of the *Students' Guide* with regard to the Impact of the *Guide* on Language Skills (Divided by years studying the TL in the university)

Language Skill Area	Number of years studying the TL at the University	N	Mean Rating of the <i>Guide</i>	Standard Deviation	Significance Level (<i>p</i> -value)
Listening skills	< 3 years	34	3.24	1.05	n.s.
	≥ 3 years	7	2.71	.76	
Speaking skills	< 3 years	34	3.47	.87	.01
	≥ 3 years	7	2.43	1.27	
Reading skills	< 3 years	34	3.44	1.05	.01
	≥ 3 years	7	2.14	1.07	
Writing skills	< 3 years	34	3.71	.97	.05
	≥ 3 years	7	2.71	1.38	

N=41 (Note: one E group student was left out of this analysis because of missing data on number of years studying the TL at the university)

An explanation for the trend that less advanced students found the language strategies in the *Guide* more useful may be that lower-level language learners' greatest challenge in study abroad was mastering the basic grammar of the TL and therefore, strategies for doing so (i.e., primarily language strategies) were seen as the most useful. More advanced speakers of the TL may not have found basic communication and learning of the TL to be the most challenging aspect of their study abroad experience, which may explain why they tended to find the culture strategies more useful.

At the same time, both experienced and inexperienced language and culture learners were able to learn something from reading the *Guide*. In general, more experienced language learners were exposed to some new strategies, but perhaps more importantly, they were made more conscious of the benefits of being strategic with regard to learning language and culture, their use of strategies was validated and reinforced, and they were reminded to use strategies that they may have been aware of but may not have thought to use. Overall, less-experienced language and culture learners tended to find that many of the strategies were new to them and were helpful in improving their language and culture skills.

An interesting trend emerged from the follow-up interviews with regard to differing perceptions of the language versus the culture strategies contained in the *Guide*. First of all, without exception, all students who were interviewed reported that both their language and culture skills improved during study abroad. When asked the question "Did the *Guide* have a role in helping you improve your intercultural skills?" just one student (out of the 20 total students interviewed) reported that the *Guide* did not have a prominent role in her intercultural skills improvement. The other 19 students, on the other hand, reported that the *Guide* did have a role in the improvement of their intercultural skills. For example, one student responded to this question with the following statement:

I would say [the Guide] definitely helped with the culture...with starting to think of things from other people's perspectives and really understanding that people have different cultural [views], like they don't think right and wrong like you think right and wrong, or normal – it's just 2 totally separate boxes and one's not right and one's not wrong. You just got to think in their box; you can't think from your own cultural perspective and try to understand it because you'll just be butting your head up against the wall every day when you see...anything and you don't understand it. You've just got to be like, "OK, in Spain's idea why would this make sense, and not my idea." So I would say [the Guide] was helpful in that way. (Student 68, Cohort B, Follow-up Interview, Sevilla, Spain)

In contrast, in response to the parallel question "Did the *Guide* have a role in helping you improve your Spanish (French) language skills?" five out of 20 students reported that that the *Guide* did **not** have a strong role in improving their language skills. For example, one student reported the things that she did which helped her improve her Spanish skills, and commented that in comparison with these other activities, the *Guide* was not the most important factor:

Well, I think definitely my classes [helped me improve my language skills] because I was there for, we spent four hours in class per day. And I don't know, maybe just having the desire to learn too, because I think you could definitely go to a Spanish-speaking country and not pick up much Spanish at all if you don't really want to learn it and don't put the effort into it and I think also I had an intercambio, a person to talk with me, and that was

really helpful, just practicing and using my Spanish, and learning more common like common spoken Spanish. I think the [Guide] probably, I think it helped but not, but it wasn't like a huge factor in my learning of Spanish. (Student 1, Cohort A, Follow-up Interview, Cuernavaca, Mexico)

The fact that the student reports that the *Guide* was not “a huge factor in my learning of Spanish” is not surprising given that exposure to and practice using the TL is assumed to be the factor that primarily drives L2 acquisition. Although the *Guide* may assist students in their learning of the TL, the actual TL input would be assumed to be the most important factor. In fact, many of the strategies in the *Guide* are designed with this assumption in mind – namely, encouraging students to find ways to get exposure to and use the TL.

Therefore, in comparison with the benefits of extensive exposure to the TL that these students may have had in the study abroad environment, the *Guide* may not have been seen as the most significant factor in their language skills improvement, even though the language strategies contained therein may have been viewed as useful. One of the students who reported that the *Guide* did not have in significant role in the improvement of her language skills did say that the strategies for getting greater exposure to the TL were useful, but that in comparison with simple exposure to the TL, the *Guide* did not have an influential role:

I think that what [the language sections of the Guide] did was make me more aware of how I was improving my language skills, and look for different places to do that, whether it was eavesdropping on someone's conversation on the bus or trying to pick up conversations with random strangers. Strategies, yes, in a general sense, they helped, but other than that I think I just felt like it was the exposure on a day to day basis that really did it for me. (Student 63, Cohort B, Follow-up Interview, Santiago, Chile)

On the other hand, the fact that correlations between more frequent use of specific language strategies – especially listening and speaking strategies – and gains on the *Speech Act Measure* were obtained (as reported above) runs contrary to the notion that the use of the strategies contained in the *Guide* was insignificant in students' language learning. This apparent discrepancy may be explained by a difference between students' perceptions and the reality of their language gains in TL pragmatics, as measured by the *Speech Act Measure*. This finding is consistent with the “language myth” that Wilkinson (1998) describes, whereby students believe – erroneously – that mere exposure to the TL will necessarily result in language gains. Hence, the “language myth” may help explain why students may have perceived the *Guide* as insignificant to their language learning. It should also be noted that at least three of the five students who reported that the *Guide* did not play a significant role in their language skills improvement were reportedly advanced learners of the TL. As described above, the difference in proficiency level (or amount of time spent studying the TL previously) seems to have had an influence in students' perception of the usefulness of the language strategies contained in the *Guide*.

Usefulness of the *Guide* for Interactions with Host Country Nationals

Another important issue for the researchers was whether students found the strategies in the *Guide* useful in their interactions with host country nationals, both language- and culture-wise. Although students were not asked this question directly in the e-journals, as they were in the follow-up interviews, there is ample evidence from both data sources that students found

language and culture strategies useful for their interactions with NSs. For example, one student reported how language strategies helped her communicate better in Spanish with her host family:

The listening advice and activities have proven to be really helpful when I am with two native speakers of Spanish. I was with my language partner and her friend and they were talking really fast so I just listened for key words and I caught the gist of the conversation. Later, I wasn't afraid to ask them questions about what they said and that helped clear up any uncertainties that I had. (Student 1, Cohort A, Week 2, Cuernavaca, Mexico)

Students reported finding a number of other listening and speaking strategies contained in the *Guide* to be useful when speaking to NSs of the TL. Other strategies that students found useful for speaking with NSs of the TL included “listening for the speaker’s intonation,” “not translating word-for-word,” and “not faking understanding what the speaker has said.”

In terms of culture, many students commented on how the culture strategies helped them to figure out what was happening culturally in their interactions with host country natives after the fact. Students mentioned that they used strategies for interpretation such as the iceberg model of culture and the D.I.E. model, and strategies for determining culturally different communication styles – such as paying attention to direct and indirect communication styles – to help them understand why host country individuals acted as they did. One student explained how she observed NSs’ different intonation contours conveyed meaning and used the iceberg model to interpret interactions with her host mother:

I think with the direct and indirect thing, a lot of times if I asked my host mom if I could do something or if I could invite someone over to the house, and she said yes, I knew it wasn't like an automatic yes. You know there's a difference between a “yes” [unenthusiastic voice] and “yes” [excited voice]. So, realizing that, just not taking things at face value, just realizing all the things that are behind any kind of conversation and, a lot of times I guess I get offended easily, but then I would always think about the, I always had that little picture of the iceberg in my head. And I was like OK, you know, there's something else going on here, or it's just a different style of interacting...it allowed me to just go beyond what was coming out of my host mom's mouth and...helped me realize that she is coming from a completely different point of view. (Student 11, Cohort A, Follow-up Interview, Santiago, Chile)

The *Guide* as a Tool for Raising Awareness about One's Own Culture

Research and theory in the intercultural communication field suggests that a significant part of acquiring intercultural competence is becoming aware of one's own culture and cultural beliefs, practices, and values. Therefore, the *Guide* includes a number of activities designed to help students become more aware of their own culture. It was of interest, therefore, whether students did, in fact, report having insights about being U.S. American, and whether they perceived the *Guide* to have played a role in this process. This question was asked of students in the follow-up interviews and received a variety of replies. Two students did not feel that the *Guide* had helped them become more aware of themselves as U.S. Americans. Both of those students spoke to the fact that other life experiences were more powerful than the *Guide*. One student's parents were immigrants to the U.S., and therefore she felt like she had already had

many insights into cultural identity prior to study abroad. The other student commented that the cross-cultural interactions that she had during her study abroad experience (in Cameroon) were the most important source of insights about what it meant to be from the U.S. Several other students reported that the *Guide* was helpful in their reflections about cultural values and being U.S. American, but that the study abroad experience was the most important factor. For example, in response to the question of whether the *Guide* provided insights into being U.S. American, one student said:

The Guide really not so much, but really just my interactions with other people in Mexico. Well, I think the Guide did help me, because there was some activities – I can't remember how many – where you compared different cultural aspects...and those were really helpful because I had never really questioned it before; like you kind of always think that everyone does it this way, you know, and I didn't realize that it was just different, it's different everywhere. People do things differently and interact differently, and I think the Guide helped me in that way. (Student 1, Cohort A, Follow-up Interview, Cuernavaca, Mexico)

On the other hand, the majority of students who were interviewed after returning home felt that the *Guide* had been helpful in providing insights about being U.S. American. As reported, activities and readings in the *Guide* gave students useful perspectives on how other cultures might view people from the U.S. as being privileged, how each culture has differing beliefs, values, and communication styles, and how to move past being ethnocentric. In addition, several students commented on the fact that the *Guide* provided them with activities that were useful for reflection about cultural issues, including comparing themselves as U.S. Americans with the host culture.

The *Guide* as a Tool for Giving Students the Terminology to Talk about Their Experiences

Anecdotally, the research assistants also noticed that the E group students – both in their e-journals and in their follow-up interviews – were able to use specific terminology to describe complex cultural concepts they encountered in study abroad using terminology included in the *Guide*. Students used terms such as “ethnocentrism,” “ethnorelativism,” “communication styles,” and “cultural values.” It would appear that the *Guide* supplied the students with the relevant metalanguage for culture to be able to both understand and describe their study abroad experience. But because we did not collect qualitative data from the C group students, conclusions cannot be made on this issue. In one of the later follow-up interviews, after the research assistants had become aware of this potential effect of the *Guide*, a student was asked a question on this point. Here is her response, including the preceding context of the conversation:

Student: I know I hadn't ever learned [the cultural concepts included in the Guide] in any class, but I had learned them throughout life. And it was interesting to be able to define what they are.

Research assistant: Do you think the book gave you the language to be able to talk about your culture experiences? Like using words like 'ethnocentrism'?

Student: Well, it was more, yeah, part of it was understanding ethnocentrism and another part of it was just, you know, I had figured out some of these things through life experiences but I had no way of putting it into words. I had this unconscious knowledge

of it, but I didn't have a way of saying this is what I'm feeling. So it was really interesting for me to be able to fully explain myself. (Student 94, Cohort B, Follow-up Interview, Sevilla, Spain)

Her response suggests that the *Guide* did help her put words to cultural concepts that she may have been aware of previously, but may have not been able to articulate clearly. In Hoff's (2005) follow-up study with a subsample of the same participants, this hypothesis was demonstrated: Hoff found that the E group students were better able than the C group students to articulate the culture learning that had occurred during the study abroad experience.

A Quantitative Evaluation of the *Guide*

In addition to the qualitative data presented above, there were two questions on the *Exit Language Contact Profile* which were intended to get at students' perceptions about the usefulness of the *Students' Guide*. The first of these questions asked students to rate on a scale from one to five the extent to which the *Students' Guide* impacted their listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills. Table 64 shows the frequencies of students' answers to this question.

Table 64: E group Ratings of the Impact of the *Students' Guide* on Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing Skills

	Listening Skills	Speaking Skills	Reading Skills	Writing Skills
Profound impact	2 (5%)	3 (7%)	2 (5%)	1 (2%)
Noticeable impact	10 (23%)	7 (16%)	12 (27%)	8 (18%)
Some impact	17 (39%)	16 (36%)	13 (30%)	12 (27%)
Slight impact	11 (25%)	14 (32%)	10 (23%)	14 (32%)
No impact	4 (9%)	4 (9%)	7 (16%)	9 (21%)
Total	42 (100%)	42 (100%)	42 (100%)	42 (100%)

As the table above shows, very few E group students felt that the *Guide* had a “profound impact” in any skill area. For listening, speaking, and reading, more than 50% of the E group felt that the *Guide* either had a “noticeable impact” or “some impact” on their language skills. Slightly less than a majority (45%) of the students felt the same about their writing skills. Relatively few students reported that the *Guide* had “no impact.” It is notable that fewer students said that the *Guide* had “no impact” on their listening and speaking skills than on their reading and writing skills. This reflects a similar trend which was found with language strategy use, namely that students gained more in their reported use of listening and speaking skills. Again, this tendency is probably related to the greater extent to which students interacted orally with NSs of the TL during study abroad.

In addition, E group students were asked to indicate whether or not they would recommend the *Guide* to another student going abroad on a scale from one to four. Their responses were the following:

Yes, enthusiastically: 13 (31%)

Yes: 21 (50%)

Possibly: 3 (7%)

Probably not: 5 (12%)

As the breakdown shows, 81% of the students said “yes” they would recommend the *Guide* to a friend going abroad. The other 19% were either not sure or probably would not recommend it to a friend.

Conclusions

To summarize the findings for this research question, the majority of the students reported that they found the *Guide* useful for the study abroad experience. As described above, however, students did not find all parts of the *Guide* equally useful. Judging from the qualitative data, students’ evaluations about which parts of the *Guide* were most and least useful tended to vary primarily in terms of to their individual experiences, abilities, goals, and study abroad situations.

Findings for Revising the *Students' Guide* (Research Question #9)

Research Question (9): What suggestions do students have for revising the *Students' Guide*?

The primary purpose of this study was to field test the *Students' Guide* with the intention of making it meet study abroad students' needs more effectively. For this reason, both in the e-journals and the follow-up interviews students were asked to give suggestions for how to make the *Guide* better. Students had a number of suggestions for improvements to the *Guide*, some of which were mentioned by more than one person. Student suggestions are organized below in the following way: first, suggestions relating to the *Guide* as a whole, second, suggestions about specific sections of the *Guide*, and third, additional suggestions.

Suggestions for the *Guide* as a Whole

- **Move Suggested Answers to Back of Book.** Several students commented that they did not like having the suggested answers immediately following the activities. One suggestion was to move the suggested answers to the back of the book.
- **More Examples, Less Theory.** Several students suggested that the theoretical descriptions – primarily regarding culture – included in the *Guide* could be condensed and that specific examples that illuminate the theory should be expanded.
- **More Space for Reflective Writing.** A number of students commented that they would have liked to have had more space in the *Guide* for writing down their reflections to the information and activities in the culture sections. For example, one student suggested having more space on pp. 110-111 for the D.I.E. Activity.
- **Quotes.** The following comments were made about the quotes contained in the *Guide*:
 - A large number of students really liked reading the quotes and suggested that even more quotes from students be included.
 - It was suggested frequently that there were too many quotes from the same individual (i.e., Tammy Yak). The quotes should be from varied people.
 - One student felt like some of the quotes were from older people and that undergraduates would not relate as well to these quotes with regard to questions of the language used and life experience as they would to the quotes from fellow undergraduates.
 - Another student suggested including quotes from more popular study abroad sites rather than featuring those from Kyrgyzstan or Estonia.
- **Organization.** A number of students made suggestions about organization, although some suggestions were contradictory.

- *The sections on language are organized in a different way than the section on culture. It might be more helpful if each language section was also divided into pre-departure, in country, and post, like the culture section is.*
- Some students suggested putting all of the language pre-departure strategies together instead of organizing them by skill. Other students liked the organization of the language sections as it is.
- *“You know how we kept kind of jumping around a lot in this book with our assignments? I think it would work better if it was more like, you know, I know it's a guide book, but more a book that you could read cover to cover.”*
- Several students mentioned they would have liked the Translation Strategies section and the Writing Strategies section to be towards the beginning of the language section, as those strategies were needed from the outset of study abroad. Other students liked the organization of the language section of the *Guide* as it is.

Surveys: Language Strategies, Culture Strategies, and Learning Styles

More Explanation about the Surveys. One student felt that it would be helpful to have more explanation about the purpose of taking the surveys for students. In addition, that same student suggested that perhaps the relevant parts of the surveys could be placed at the beginning of each section of the *Guide* (e.g., putting the listening strategy section of the language strategies survey at the beginning of the listening section). She felt this may make the surveys more immediately relevant.

Culture Strategies: Pre-Departure Unit (pp. 39-71)

- **Subcultures within a Culture.** One student felt that the “You as a Culturally Diverse Person” section did not emphasize enough that within one culture there are subcultures and that a person can belong to these subcultures.
- **Values Chart.** Many students did not want to guess on the “Values Chart” what their host country’s values might be. They had no idea prior to living in that country. Some students suggested that this exercise should be done later, after having been in the host country for awhile. These comments suggested the value of, say, framing assignments around the impressions that they have of the host country based on media representations, films, popular magazine and newspaper stories, in order to encourage students to hypothesize more about the culture.

Culture Strategies: In-Country Unit (pp. 75-141)

- **More Explanation.** It was mentioned that three activities in this section could benefit from more contextualization and explanation:
 - Stereotypes and Generalizations Activity: *“Was the activity differentiating between stereotypes and generalizations trying to say that one is right and one is*

wrong? I understood how to do that one but I didn't really understand the purpose.”

- Culture Ethnography (p. 107): *“I was a little disappointed by the second paragraph of Cultural Ethnography because it was such an interesting example but then just left me hanging without explanation...I was very curious to know more about the situation after I read that.”*
- Circular vs. Linear Communication: *“I had trouble analyzing the circular vs. linear communication. I'm not sure exactly what an example of each would be. It would be nice to have an example of each listed with this activity on page 125.”*
- **More examples about Host Families.** One student made the following suggestion, *“I would have appreciated more examples like the one on p. 92 from a variety of host families. I always wonder what mine is thinking.”*
- **Include Age Differences in Gestures.** For the activity on p. 131, one student suggested pointing out to students that they should ask host country people from different age groups about what gestures mean, since they can vary. That student gave the following example: *“My professor [in Costa Rica], who is about 60 years old, explained to the class that holding up your middle finger is not offensive and can be used to point at something. However, some friends I have met here who are my age told me that it has the same meaning as in the U.S. and is offensive.”*
- **Include a Section on Sexual Harassment (or what may be perceived as sexual harassment from the perspective of another culture).** *“I'd like to suggest a section on harassing verbal and nonverbal communication. It's hard to know exactly how to deal with situations where you're really being sexually harassed in a foreign culture, because you're just not sure how to respond. It would have helped me a lot to have someone else's experience and input in that area.”*
- **Emphasize Being Proactive about Making Friends.** Several students said that it should be stressed even more in the *Guide* (p. 75) that it is up to the students themselves to be proactive about making host country friends. Since host country students already have their friends established, they may not necessarily be interested in foreign students. Another student suggested that the *Guide* discuss how “intimidating” it can be to try to make host country friends, but that one should keep trying.
- **More Attention on the Issue of ‘Creating Home Abroad’.** One student suggested going more in-depth about the issue of recreating home abroad, which is mentioned briefly on p. 84. This student felt it was a common problem faced by study abroad students and would have liked to have explored the issue more.
- **Reorganize the Coping Strategies Section.** One student had a couple of suggestions for reorganizing the section on coping strategies (pp. 91-95):
 - Listing your own coping strategies might be more effective after the discussion of “Terry” (p. 94). It's at that point that you are thinking about what you would do in Terry's position.
 - *“The quotes at the end of the chapter seem sort of randomly placed. Why does the Parr quote not precede the summary? If the summary on p. 95 was a little more*

concise I think it might end the chapter better. The summary was a little bland...that sounds harsh...but I was a little disappointed at the end of a section that I really got a lot out of.”

- **Less Iceberg.** A number of students did not like that the Iceberg Analogy was repeated several times in the text. They felt it was redundant (one student said “insultingly redundant”) and unnecessary to keep repeating it.
- **Change the Dialogue in ‘Debriefing in Action’.** *“The dialogue between John and Bob (pp. 108-109) seemed “foofy” [i.e., silly] and the conversation itself seemed scripted versus real-life. I think it would be more applicable if frustration could be vented between a host country native and a student, or a host mom and a student, instead of between a counselor and a student. In my experience, the best way to understand cultural nuances is to approach someone from the culture you have a comfortable, established relationship with [such as a counselor]. I had no access to any councilor from the States, and I think it implies a false security blanket to students expected to have help from a person such as John.”*
- **Use Different Terminology than “Low” and “High” Context.** *“I think it would be a good idea to think of a different way of saying it than “Low Context” and “High Context,” since to me those carry an associative value, as if one manner of communicating was better than the other. Something like “Context Independent” and “Context Dependent” might be better.”*
- **More about Greetings.** Several students felt the section on greetings (p. 136) should be expanded. Students should be encouraged to observe how the hosts greet and then follow suit.
- **Less Evaluation about the ‘Old Fashioned Journal’.** Several students did not like that the “old fashioned” style of journal writing was evaluated negatively in the *Guide*. Those students felt that that style worked well for them.
- **Expand the “Preparing to Return Home” Section.** *“I liked the section about what you want in leaving the country and how to deal with returning to your home country, but could you expand on how to deal with reverse culture shock? Everyone I’ve talked to I (myself included) feels like we’re going to be absolutely bewildered upon going home. Could you help us understand how to deal with being surrounded by people speaking our first language once again, and how to undo the cultural aspects we’ve picked up in our stay? Also, if we particularly enjoyed our experience studying abroad, how do we become comfortable with our own city once again? And how do we deal with having been so far from our home country friends and re-integrating into that lifestyle? I know that’s a bit off the path of the book, but it’s definitely the aspects we’ve discussed the most upon being confronted with actually leaving.”*

Culture Strategies: Post-Study-Abroad Unit (pp. 143-160)

- **Give me space!** *“You should include a big, bold reminder to students to ask their parents to give them space at first.”*

Language Strategies: Listening

- **Expand on the Issue of Hosts Wanting to Speak English.** Several students reported struggling with the fact that the host country natives wanted to practice their English with them, when the students wanted to practice the TL. There was a suggestion to give students more tips on how to deal with this issue.

Language Strategies: Learning Vocabulary

- **Strategy Additions.** Two students provided strategies for learning vocabulary that they found useful but that were not included in the *Guide*.
 - *“What has also been very effective for me is bringing a small, pocket-sized notepad whenever I go out with my Spanish friends. This way, a person can record the “street talk,” asking native speakers to explain colloquial phrases when socializing.”*
 - *“One thing I wish I had done would have been to develop a much larger vocabulary describing myself, but more importantly emotions and feelings. A beneficial strategy would be to definitely ask a native speaker how to express specific emotions and what are the best sayings colloquial or general for saying those.”*

Language Strategies: Speaking

- **“Este”...** On p. 200, it says that in Spanish, “*este*” will help to hold the floor for the speaker. One student said that she had never heard this usage in Spain. She suggested specifying that this word is used in some varieties of American Spanish.
- **Faking You Understand Can be Appropriate.** Several students mentioned that faking that you understand what a speaker has said is often more socially acceptable than to continually ask the speaker to repeat himself or herself.
- **Strategy Addition to "Speaking to Communicate".** *“I add to the list of good pre-departure activities speaking with friends and fellow students who study the target language. I spent an entire month before arriving in Chile speaking with friends in Spanish, and by the time I arrived, Spanish was a bit more familiar.”*
- **Discuss How to Deal with Controversial Topics in the TL.** *“I think you should perhaps do a bit of warning in the book like, “Don’t avoid controversial topics but be aware that if the controversial topic does come up, you need to have a good solid understanding of what your stand is because you’re going to have to defend it.” I mean, once abortion and adoption came up and religion and then war, there were so many things that I either hadn’t completely thought out or I had my opinions but I couldn’t express them in another language.”*

Language Strategies: Reading

- **Add Mysteries as Easy Reading.** *“In terms of easy reading I’d add mysteries. The vocabulary isn’t generally too difficult and breaks you in to reading in a second language pretty nicely.”*
- **Encourage Students to Prioritize.** A number of students mentioned that they would have liked to have done more of the language strategies, but did not because of time constraints. One student suggested that the *Guide* encourage students to make a list of which strategies they want to prioritize so that at least some of the strategies are done.
- **Change Wording on p. 217.** *“Why is it mentioned that Lassegard “is currently living in Tokyo.” Is his stay there so permanent that in ten years from now, this would be true? I thought this text was for long-term use, so it would make more sense to me to say something like “who at the time was living in Tokyo.” I don't know, that is really picky, but it bugged me!”*

Language Strategies: Writing

- **Remind Students About Needing Extra Time to Write in the TL.** *“Having a professor or peer revise your paper is definitely the way to go. It makes life significantly easier. But you forgot to mention time allotment – at our home university, many of us start term papers only a few days before they’re due. I discovered that doing that when you’re researching and writing in a foreign language is just about the worst idea possible and will prevent you from sleeping for about a week.”*
- **Discuss Non-Academic Writing.** *“I would also have liked to read some comments in this section on literary or other kinds of writing. There are many study abroad programs that do not necessarily involve academic writing. I will be including some creative writing in my final project here, and I know that some of my classmates will be using journalistic or literary writing in theirs. And even outside of class there are things like friendly letters or volunteer projects that require good writing skills. So I think that at least a small section on writing that is not academic would be appropriate.”*
- **Encourage Students to Read to Improve Their Writing.** *“I also think, though, that you should suggest that people read books in their host language because reading not only keeps up your comprehension skills, but in a sort of subconscious way improves your writing as well, with new vocab, clearer ideas of sentence structure, etc.”*

Additional Suggestions

- **Advise Students to Manage Their Time Wisely.** *“If there is one thing that I would tell future study abroad students, it is that you need to be prepared to do some work and you also need to learn how to manage your time wisely. You can't think that it is really going to be a vacation like I did!”*

- **Discuss Having to Switch Host Families.** One student suggested adding a discussion and examples about having to switch host families because of problems they were having. This experience was very traumatic for some students.
- **Discuss Bargaining.** One student suggested adding a discussion of bargaining. In some countries it is acceptable and in others it is not. For example, students should not assume that bargaining is the norm in all of Latin America, since in Chile bargaining is not acceptable.
- **Discuss the Parental Visit.** One student suggested adding a section about how to deal with acting as an “intermediary” for your parents when they come to visit your study abroad site. For example, the *Guide* could address what are things to keep in mind when you bring someone who has not had any exposure to the culture and you are now their kind of representative.
- **Speak to Second-Time Study Abroaders.** It was pointed out that students doing study abroad a second time would have a different take on material in the book from those doing it for the first time. Maybe there would be a section in that about that. "Oh, so you've done it before, you think you know it all, well let's just re-center you a little bit. You've experienced it but how is it going to be different."
- **Consider Changing Wording.** One student had the following comment about the language in the *Guide* in general: *“I think it (the guide) is sort of kitschy in a lot of ways. Like the activities when it says “I am this,” “I am that,” I think that's something you might want to stay away from.”*
- **Create Supplements for Specific Languages.** A number of students suggested that it would be helpful to develop supplements to the *Guide* for tips for learning specific languages (i.e., Spanish, French, Japanese, and so forth).
- **More Tips for Shy Students.** One student commented that many of the tips for getting to know people in the target culture required one to be outgoing. She suggested including more tips for getting exposure to the language and meeting host country natives that would be directed specifically at students who are shy.

Mini Case Study of One E Group Student: “Erica”

In order to illustrate how students use the *Guide* for language and culture learning, this section will take a more detailed look at the background and experiences of one of the E group students, examining data from all of the instruments used in the study. Note that the student will be identified with a pseudonym.

Erica (Student 94) studied abroad in Sevilla, Spain during the fall semester of 2003. A student at the College of Saint Catherine, a private, catholic, women’s college located in Saint Paul, Minnesota, Erica was majoring in Business Administration and was in her senior year. Prior to going abroad in 2003, she had been outside of the U.S. only once, when she participated in a three-week university study abroad summer program in Cuernavaca, Mexico. Even though she had studied Spanish for a total of five years before going to Sevilla, she had gone two consecutive years prior to 2003 without much study or use of Spanish and, as a result, reported feeling “rusty” with her Spanish language skills. Apart from her three-week sojourn in Mexico, her language learning had been by means of formal education, in high school and university. She had never studied any other language.

In Sevilla, Erica lived with a “host family” which primarily consisted of a Spanish woman in her seventies, “Milagros” (also a pseudonym). In addition to Milagros, another international student lived in the same home and it appears from Erica’s e-journals that some of Milagros’ grown children hung around the house frequently. Although Erica reported speaking Spanish only 25% of the time with the other student in the house, she and Milagros spoke only Spanish together. Erica reported that “every couple of days” she and her host mother would have a conversation in Spanish for 30 minutes or more. She reported becoming upset and stressed out on a regular basis as a result of their conversations because her host mother would force Erica to talk about controversial issues such as abortion, religion, U.S. foreign affairs, and the like, which Erica did not want to talk about for a variety of reasons. Among her reasons were that the issues did not interest her, that she did not want her host mother to think that all Americans felt the same way she did, or that she felt she could not adequately defend her positions – which often ran contrary to those of her host mother – in Spanish, a language in which she believed she was not very proficient. According to Erica, she told her host mother that she did not want to discuss controversial topics, but Milagros would continually bring them up and pressure Erica to respond.

By the end of the semester, after one particular conversation ended in Erica getting extremely angry, the two finally settled on speaking about uncontroversial topics such as movie stars and the weather. In her follow-up interview, the research assistant asked Erica whether she felt this restriction in topics limited her language learning. She responded that while it may have, the reduction in stress that she experienced as a result of not having to talk with Milagros about controversial topics was worth any lost opportunities to improve her Spanish. It is clear from her data, however, that she did find living with Milagros to be helpful in some instances with her language and culture learning, since Milagros seemed to serve as her most important NS informant. In the following excerpt, Erica reports about how she asked Milagros about gestures in Spain – a suggested activity in the *Guide* – which then led to a discussion of Spanish slang:

The non-verbal communication section [of the Guide]...gave me an opportunity to start a dialogue with my [host mother] about what gestures are appropriate, what gestures

aren't appropriate. And it also led into a conversation about learning the slang of a country...That dialogue between my [host mother] and I really helped to step up my Spanish.

With regard to school, she only took classes intended for study abroad students, which included Spanish conversation and grammar courses as well as content courses such as one focusing on Spanish and Latin American culture and another on business. From comments in her e-journals, it appears that she had high expectations for her performance as a student. She described being very disappointed with getting a “B” on an exam in one of her classes and being concerned about how that grade would affect her grade point average at her home university.

While living in Sevilla, she reported that she also participated in a conversation partner exchange with a young Spanish woman. However, this exchange did not seem to play a significant role in her study abroad experience, given that in her e-journals and follow-up interview she never once mentioned her language partner or the exchange. Apart from the language partner exchange, Erica did not report taking part in other structured extracurricular activities such as a volunteer job, an internship, or a field-study.

As reported on the *Exit Language Contact Profile*, Erica made very few, if any, friends in Sevilla who were NSs of Spanish. In the qualitative data, she never mentioned interactions with friends who were NSs, although she did talk about other study abroad students that she knew. With the friends she had, she reported speaking Spanish 25% of the time. Similarly, she described speaking Spanish with native or fluent speakers about 25% of the time when she was not in class. It appears, therefore, that her host mother was her primary out-of-class source of exposure to Spanish.

Based on Erica's e-journal entries, it appears that she was very motivated to improve her Spanish skills. For example, she was very enthusiastic about the language learning strategies in the *Guide* and reported trying out many of the strategies in order to improve her Spanish. She also expressed a desire to meet and talk to Spaniards. Given that she appeared to have been motivated to improve her Spanish through interacting with NSs of the language, the question arises as to why she did not seem to have many opportunities outside of class to speak Spanish. Several possible explanations become evident in her data. First, she reported that although she did not think of herself as a shy person when she is in the U.S., that in Spain she felt very shy about speaking to NSs of Spanish outside of her home and her classes. In fact, she asked the research assistant assigned to her whether she had any suggestions for shy students and, in her feedback about the *Guide*, recommended that we include more tips in the *Guide* to help shy students get more exposure to Spanish in ways more comfortable for them. One suggestion from the *Guide* that she did try was to become a regular at a local establishment. However, she reported that being a woman made this strategy difficult for her, as she says in the following excerpt:

The suggestions in the [Guide] that I find a regular hang-out and meet people there was difficult. I never saw a woman in a bar or a restaurant alone. Never. Women do not go places in Spain alone – especially not the bars and coffee shops that I frequently passed. When I did try visiting a pastry shop – pretty safe, right? – the only way I could avoid guys constantly coming up to me and telling me how beautiful I was or how they'd like to buy me a drink or take me out was to bury myself in my schoolwork. (Exit Questionnaire)

Thus, from her perspective, the type of people that she was able to meet by becoming a regular at a local establishment – that is, men who, in her mind, were looking for a romantic encounter – made using this strategy to increase her exposure to Spanish difficult.

The fact that she took classes with other study abroad students may have also prevented her from meeting host country students in a comfortable environment. Another barrier to her speaking Spanish in out-of-class environments may have been her relatively low proficiency in Spanish at the outset of her semester abroad. Low proficiency combined with shyness may have been particularly difficult to overcome. Erica also reported being very busy with her coursework, which may mean that she did not have time to search out opportunities to speak Spanish. Finally, according to Erica, U.S. American women in Spain may have difficulty making female friends because of certain commonly-held stereotypes about them:

The women in Spain are generally unfriendly [towards female study abroad students]. From what I've heard – from a Spanish male – it is because the women exchange students (U.S. females, to be specific) are generally looked upon as easy and that they only come to Spain to party, drink, and cheat on their boyfriends, if they have them in the U.S. Therefore, all those Spanish women who are looking for men to date seriously see that the American women are taking all the Spanish men. The men are just looking for a “no commitment” relationship and a good time and they know American women are generally looking for the same. Spanish women, in their minds, are looking for Mr. Right and a big commitment. In the mind of my friend and teacher, [a Spaniard,] he says the animosity towards American women from Spanish women is based around this idea – American women take Spanish men because neither party is looking for commitment. (Exit Questionnaire)

Undoubtedly, there are many other possible reasons why – despite being motivated to improve her skills through exposure to the language – Erica reported spending only 25% of her time outside of class speaking Spanish.

Looking now at Erica's data from the *Speech Act Measure*, it appears that she was able to improve her Spanish pragmatic ability over the course of one semester in Spain. Overall, she gained four points on the whole measure from pre- to posttest. Comparing the pretest to the posttest, in many cases she seems to have more control over syntactic structures and necessary vocabulary. For example, consider the pre- and posttest responses to the first rejoinder in the “Friend's book” vignette:

Pretest: *Lo siento, Marta, pero alguien robó tu libro. Mi (backpack) [*fue robaron] en el autobús. ('I'm sorry Marta, but someone stole your book. My backpack [*was (they) stole] in the bus.')*

Posttest: *Marta, lo siento muchísimo pero perdí mi bolso por el autobús y su libro era dentro del bolso. ('Marta, I'm really sorry but I lost my purse by the bus and your book was in the purse.')*

In the pretest, Erica had to insert an English word, presumably because she did not know the Spanish word for ‘backpack.’ In the posttest, she did not insert any English words. Although her posttest data was not free of grammatical errors (e.g., she should have used the verb *estar* instead of *ser* to express a locative meaning of ‘to be’ in her posttest response: *Su libro *era/estaba dentro del bolso*), her use of grammar and vocabulary was improved in the posttest.

With regard to pragmalinguistic features, the most notable difference between her pretest and posttest performance was the increased use of the conditional tense. While she did not use the conditional at all in the pretest, she used it in nine instances in the posttest, five of which were used in “query preparatory” semantic formulas when making requests. The fact that Erica began to use the conditional tense as an indicator of politeness in requests may have contributed to her gain on the *Speech Act Measure*. For example, for the vignette in which Erica gained the most points – the “Paper extension” vignette, in which she gained two points – the absence of the conditional in the pretest and its presence in the posttest is striking. Here are Erica’s pre- and posttest data for the “Paper extension” vignette:

Pretest

You: *Doctor Rodríguez, necesito más tiempo por el papel.* (‘Doctor Rodríguez, I need more time for the paper.’)

Dr. Rodríguez: *Mira, es que creo que has tenido mucho tiempo para trabajar en este proyecto en el fin de semana. No deberías haber esperado hasta el último momento para terminarlo.* (‘Look, I think you’ve had enough time to work on this project over the weekend. You shouldn’t have waited until the last minute to finish it.’)

You: *Yo sé. Mis amigos quieren que yo visite esta fin de semana.* (‘I know. My friend want me to visit this weekend.’)

Dr. Rodríguez: *Lo siento, pero no puedo darte más tiempo para entregar este trabajo. No creo que ir a visitar a unos amigos sea una buena excusa para pedir más tiempo.* (‘I’m sorry, but I can’t give you more time to hand in this paper. I don’t think going to visit some friends is a good excuse for asking for more time.’)

You: *Yo sé. Pero no veo frecuentemente y solo es un tiempo.* (‘I know. But I don’t see [them] frequently and it’s just one time.’)

Dr. Rodríguez: *Bueno, la verdad es que no me gusta hacer este tipo de cosas. No va conmigo.* (‘Well, the truth is I don’t like doing this type of thing. It’s not my policy.’)

You: *Muchas gracias. Está el mejor.* (‘Thanks a lot. That’s the best.’)

Dr. Rodríguez: *Bueno, vale, pero solamente esta vez.* (‘Well, OK, but only this time.’)

Posttest

You: *Doctor Rodríguez, ¿podría tener mas tiempo para trabajar en el proyecto?* (‘Doctor Rodríguez, could I have more time to work on the project?’)

Dr. Rodríguez: *Mira, es que creo que has tenido mucho tiempo para trabajar en este proyecto en el fin de semana. No deberías haber esperado hasta el último momento para terminarlo.*

You: *Yo entiendo, pero tengo la oportunidad a visitar a mis amigos en Lisboa y ellos solo tienen esto fin de semana para mi a visitar a ellos. ('I understand, but I have the opportunity to visit my friend in Lisbon and they only have this weekend for me to visit them.')*

Dr. Rodríguez: *Lo siento, pero no puedo darte más tiempo para entregar este trabajo. No creo que ir a visitar a unos amigos sea una buena excusa para pedir más tiempo.*

You: *Entiendo, Doctor, pero sólo esta una vez y sólo estoy en España por una mes más. ('I understand, Doctor, but just this one time and I'm only in Spain for one more month.')*

Dr. Rodríguez: *Bueno, la verdad es que no me gusta hacer este tipo de cosas. No va conmigo.*

You: *Jamás pediré para una extensión otra vez y **llevaría** a Usted si quisiera pero pienso que no quisiera estar con nosotros en Lisboa por tres días sin español. Estamos locos juntos. ('Never will I ask for an extension again and I would take you if you wanted but I think that you would not want to be with us in Lisbon for three days without Spanish. We are crazy together.')*

Dr. Rodríguez: *Bueno, vale, pero solamente esta vez.*

Another issue to consider in Erica's performance on the *Speech Act Measure* is her use of the formal and informal terms of address (i.e., *usted* and *tú*). In some cases it was difficult to compare the use of the terms of address between pre- and posttest due to the fact that Erica does not always refer to the hearer directly in her responses. However, in one particular vignette – “Airplane seat” – she did become more pragmatically appropriate in her use of the formal pronoun: in the pretest she inappropriately used the informal pronoun, *tú*, and on the posttest she appropriately used the formal pronoun, *usted*, to speak to the older passenger. However, even in the posttest, Erica did not have complete control over the verb morphology, possessive pronouns, and object pronouns that correspond to the formal and informal second person. For example, in the “Friend's book” vignette, she started out by using the pronoun *su* which corresponds to the formal term of address. Later in the vignette, however, she switched to the informal ‘you’ by saying: *Yo sé, pero era un accidente. ¿Puedo pagarte por el precio?* (‘I know, but it was an accident. Can I pay **you** (informal) for the price?’). In Spain, speaking with an acquaintance of the same age would typically call for the informal term of address.

In one of her e-journals, Erica commented on the fact that she was paying attention to the appropriate contexts for using *tú* and *usted* in Spanish, for example in the following quote:

The “Beyond Vocab” section [in the Guide] was useful as I have been asking several natives how to address people in stores, i.e., with the tú form or the usted form. It has been very useful to know these little points about how to effectively communicate without offending. After saying “¿tienes vitamina C?” [‘Do you (tú) have vitamin C?’] to a woman in a pharmacy and getting a strange look, not learning and going into another pharmacy and saying the same thing and getting the same funny look. After asking my [host mother] about that, she said that the majority of stores do not require the usted form, but the “important” stores such as pharmacies and doctor’s offices use a more formal introduction.

As the quote suggests, not only was she paying attention to the nuances of using these terms of address, she was also acting as a language ethnographer by asking her host mother about the behaviors she observed but could not quite understand. The *Students’ Guide* encourages students to do precisely those two things, just as Erica alluded to in the above quote.

With regard to Erica’s intercultural sensitivity, it was found that she made positive gains on the *Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI)* during her semester abroad. Her *IDI* profile suggests that in the pretest, she was in the Minimization stage. Her posttest results show that she moved towards the higher end of the Minimization stage, towards the stage of Acceptance. Movement within one stage over the course of four months is considered a positive improvement in intercultural sensitivity. Looking more specifically at her movement on the individual scales of the *IDI*, her results show that she moved towards resolution of the Denial-Defense, the Reversal, and the Acceptance-Adaptation scales. Her score in Acceptance-Adaptation may indicate that she had only moved into Acceptance and Adaptation with respect to the cultures she was familiar with, such as Spanish culture. However, she may not have had a more general understanding about the complexity of differences between cultures. Furthermore, she moved backward in the Minimization scale, which may suggest that instead of seeing cultures in terms of differences, she was focusing on the similarity between cultures.

Looking now at Erica’s impressions of the *Students’ Guide*, it is clear from her e-journals and her follow-up interview that she found the language sections of the *Guide* to be very useful. Consider the following quote from her interview:

I would admit I’m very influenced by the language section. For some reason I had this huge connection to the language section because it was so interesting for me and because I had been away from [learning a foreign language] for so long. And even when I was studying language in my classes [in the U.S.] it wasn’t, there’s such a disconnect between learning Spanish and being in a Spanish country. So, it was helpful for me to really understand ways to really maximize my language use and my language skills.

Overall, her data suggests that learning Spanish was both her primary goal in study abroad as well as her greatest challenge, which may explain why she was especially interested in the language section. In one of her early e-journals (Week 4), she reported that she got so excited after reading the week’s assigned section of the *Guide* that she decided to read through all of the language sections all at once, even though they were not assigned. Throughout her e-journals and in the interview, Erica reported that she tried using many of the language learning strategies in the *Guide* such as learning vocabulary by association, looking for ways to speak more Spanish (e.g., becoming a regular at a local establishment), listening for the main idea, paying attention to

how NSs of Spanish perform speech acts, among many others. The quotes below give some examples of how she reported using these language strategies:

The language section was a big help. I started to watch TV more, listen in on more conversations, and using the strategies outlined on pages 167-172. (Week 2)

The language section has been very beneficial as it gives me coping strategies when I understand nothing and suggests options to improve my language learning at a faster rate. For example, if I do not understand every word in the conversation, I try to grab the main ideas and maybe a couple of vocab words that I can remember for next time. The suggestion to learn 10 words a day was a helpful one as it seems very overwhelming to think of my large English vocab and minuscule Spanish vocab. (Week 2)

The advice beginning on page 198 was very good and reminded me of strategies that I had already been using, although not consciously thinking about...[For example,] per the book's suggestion, I am trying to focus on planning [i.e., thinking about what you will say before you say it] more;...keep conversations going: I love borrowing words, translating literally, foreignizing words, using simple words and descriptions, acting out words, and asking for help. I am learning to abandon certain words and I am no longer avoiding certain topics or words that I don't have the vocabulary for yet. (Week 6)

Not only did she use many of the language learning strategies, she also reported finding them very useful in helping her build her proficiency in Spanish. In addition, as the final quote shows, some of the language strategies that she read about in the *Guide* were not completely new to her, but reading about them brought the use of such strategies to the level of conscious awareness.

As discussed above, Erica believed that her shyness prevented her from fully taking advantage of the language learning opportunities available to her in study abroad. The following incident from her Week 4 e-journal describes how she felt:

I am not shy with people I know but when I'm confronting a new situation or wanting to talk to someone to practice my Spanish, I freeze up...[I had a bad experience] of asking for something – 20 Minutos (a Spanish newspaper) – and being turned down time after time only to find out the damn thing is free. It is handed out every morning on certain streets before 10 am and no one told me that it was free and where it was handed out in the half-dozen kiosks I went to look for it at. Or, if they did tell me this, I could not or did not understand. I feel like I tried to be assertive and failed. I know that this does not mean I should stop being assertive, I just need to remind myself that I can communicate – a little. [But] whenever I try to take a chance and communicate, the image of me getting turned down and feeling foolish and stupid flashes in my mind and I choke.

Erica had the opinion that many of the tips in the *Guide* for getting exposure to the TL were ones which shy people would not be likely to use. As mentioned above, for the Week 4 e-journal entry, she wrote to the research assistant assigned to her (i.e., Rachel) asking whether she had any tips about how shy people could get more exposure to Spanish in a comfortable manner. Rachel did give her some suggestions, such as joining a local non-profit organization as a volunteer and going to university lectures in Spanish. Towards the end of her semester abroad, Erica reported in her e-journals that she was feeling more confident about talking in Spanish to people that she did not know.

In addition to Erica's overwhelming positive response to the language sections of the *Guide* in the e-journals and interview, she also reported in the *Exit Language Contact Profile* that she felt the *Guide* had a "profound" impact on her speaking skills and a "noticeable" impact on her listening, readings, and writing skills. Thus, overall, it appears that the *Guide* was an important resource for language learning during study abroad for Erica.

Erica's impressions of the culture-focused sections of the *Guide* were less unequivocally positive. In her e-journals, she often stated that she did not find the culture learning information and activities to be useful and relevant for her situation. For example, in Week 2, Erica wrote:

I wasn't terribly interested in the culture reading. The culture is not a very large problem for me. I tend to be pretty open about constructive criticism and very observant about other people's behavior and try to blend in with the locals.

More specifically, in Week 6, she had the following opinion about the culture learning material:

The activities in the culture section were not useful to me at all. I could not find an event or experience where I could apply the cultural iceberg to in the activity. While the information on the D.I.E. model was interesting, I have not found myself – at least not consciously – doing these things in day-to-day life.

When Rachel questioned her further about this entry in an email exchange, specifically about the Iceberg and D.I.E.¹³ models of analyzing culture, Erica responded with the following comments:

About the Iceberg and D.I.E. models: my main point about not finding them useful is that I don't actively apply these principles to my cultural experience. I don't stop and think in the middle of the experience, "Is this an above-the-water cultural attribute or a below-the-water attribute?"...I have not been actively trying to apply any of these models to my experiences as I take the whole experience and not break it into pieces. I am much better at understanding the whole picture than I am in trying to break it into tiny little pieces.

It is interesting to note that she said that she did not use these techniques for analyzing culture and for that reason she did not find them useful. The *Guide*, however, introduces these models for the specific purpose of encouraging students to use them. In fact, if Erica had been trying to use the Iceberg or the D.I.E. models to analyze her interactions with her host mother, she may have had deeper insights about what was going on with the behavior she describes in the following e-journal excerpt:

When we in the States have a conversation, this involves expressing an opinion, and letting the other person give his/her opinion before talking again. It's a back and forth type of discussion with both people having the floor at separate times so each can hear the other's argument. Here in Spain, there is no pause, no break, no stopping to let the other person give his/her opinion. Here, people will talk over the other person. Therefore, person 1 must speak louder to get his/her opinion heard and then person 2 must increase his/her volume in turn to speak over person 1 again and the cycle increases until both appear to be yelling at each other...After observing this form of

¹³ The D.I.E. Model of Debriefing refers to a process for analyzing and understanding behaviors in another culture that involve by considering different interpretations and ways that those behaviors may be evaluated. The acronym stands for Describe-Interpret-Evaluate, which is the suggested sequence for analyzing behaviors in another culture.

communication...I find it challenging and pointless. How can one hear the argument of the other if they are talking over them? Not to mention, all the yelling just gives me a headache, and prevents me from being able to think further and makes me want to leave the conversation rather than involve myself in it...I know these are simply cultural differences that take time to adjust to.

Although in the above quote, Erica recognized that there were cultural differences between the U.S. and Spain with regard to communication styles, she did not look at the Spanish behavior from a cultural frame of reference that is different from her own, for example, by asking questions like: What are other interpretations of this interaction? What cultural information informs my own interpretation of this interaction? How might someone from the host culture feel about this interaction? Why might they feel that way? By using the D.I.E. model as a framework, the *Guide* encourages students to look at interactions from different perspectives so as to better understand the viewpoint of the host culture. For example, taking another possible interpretation, Spaniards may feel that talking over one another shows interest and engagement in the conversation.

Erica expressed similar negative feelings about other culture sections of the *Guide* in her e-journals, although she did find some culture-learning material to be useful. For example, she thought that the section on culture shock was very relevant to her own experience and helped her realize that what she was going through – namely, culture shock – was normal. She also reported in her e-journals that the sections on coping strategies, non-verbal communication, and low- and high-context communication styles were useful.

The most intriguing aspect about her opinions regarding the culture sections of the *Guide* emerged during the follow-up interview. Early on in the interview she mentioned several times that she did not find the culture section of the *Guide* very useful, for example in the following quote:

I found the language section much more beneficial, in its entirety, [than the culture section] because I don't feel like I came up with as much resistance towards the culture, with understanding and adapting to the culture as I did with the language...That whole culture section – I couldn't see how it applied directly to my situation in Spain.

But as the interview progressed, and topics related to culture-learning activities and information in the *Guide* were discussed (e.g., non-verbal communication), Erica slowly seemed to change her mind about her earlier comments contending that she had not learned anything from the culture section. Not too long after the comment above, she made the following comment:

I guess maybe looking back on it a bit more, [the culture section] was more useful than I might have given it credit for. But when I was in the situation I was just, "How does this apply to me? What is the point here?", because...I was just so much more open to everybody else's opinions. And I think that's been really helpful overall because that's something I brought back with me from Spain is just being open to everything, everything that everybody is seeing and not trying to shoot things down. I think that the book did a good job of explaining ways to not shoot it down, not to close up who you are, culturally or ethnically...the book did a good job of fostering a dialogue across cultures.

In the second half of the interview, when asked whether she thought that her intercultural skills had improved during study abroad, Erica made a complete turn-around in her perception of the

culture section. She told Rachel that the day before coming to the interview, she had written up some notes about the *Guide* and had written that she did not find the culture section useful at all. Looking at her notes and then putting them back down she said:

In post-reflection, the culture section is so much more beneficial [than what I thought previously]. But when I was in that situation, it was hard to see anything outside of, "Oh, I have all this language to learn, and all of this vocabulary, and all of these classes to take," that I couldn't really think beyond being directly centered around the Spanish.

Similar to what was discussed earlier, it seems like Erica was so focused on language out of necessity to be able to communicate in society and in school, that she did not take the time to think as much about cultural issues in the host country – or, at least she did not believe that she thought as much about culture as about language. Another interpretation of her initial assessment of the culture sections of the *Guide* comes from Hoff (2005) who notes that U.S. Americans' high sense of individuality and high rating of their intercultural knowledge may preclude them from being open to or seeking out intercultural training. On the other hand, when Erica took the time to reflect on culture – that is, by participating in the interview – she began to realize that what she had learned in the *Guide* with respect to culture had been useful to her. A pedagogical implication that can be drawn from Erica's progression from not recognizing the value of the culture-learning material to recognizing its value is the importance of asking students to reflect back on their study abroad experiences and to reassess what they have learned.

Overall, Erica found the *Guide* to be very useful for her study abroad experience. She reported in the *Exit Language Contact Profile* that she would "enthusiastically" recommend the *Guide* to a friend studying abroad. She also commented in her e-journals that she had shared the *Guide* with other study abroad students in Spain because she thought the information would be useful to them. An important point to take from this mini-case study of Erica is that a student's experience and personal motivations in study abroad may affect his or her use and perceptions of the *Guide*. It appears that because Erica was so focused on learning Spanish, she found the language sections of the *Guide* to be the most useful.

Summary of the Findings

Research Question 1: How do study abroad students receiving a language and culture strategy intervention compare to those who do not with respect to intercultural sensitivity, reported culture strategy use, reported language strategy use, and speech act performance? This question focused on the differences between the E and C groups based on quantitative data. First, no statistically significant differences were found between the two groups with regard to intercultural sensitivity on the *IDI*. Second, no differences were found between the E and C groups in terms of overall language strategy or culture strategy use on the *LSS* and *SILC*, respectively. Some differences between the two groups were found on individual items of these two instruments, however. On the *LSS*, for example, it was found that the E group students increased their use of five speaking and listening strategy items from pre- to posttest more than the C group students. Conversely, the C group increased their use of language strategies more than the E group on only three vocabulary learning strategy items. This difference between the two groups may reflect the effects of the treatment, in that the E group students gained more than the C group in their use of those language strategies that are assumed to best take advantage of the unique environment of study abroad – in other words, the E group students may have increased their use of speaking and listening strategies to match the increased frequency of contact with NSs of the TL. On the *SILC*, the item-by-item differences between the E and C groups were harder to interpret and did not provide consistent evidence for the effects of the treatment. For example, the E group increased more than the C group in their reported frequency of use of two strategies regarding interpreting culture and intercultural communication, which was as predicted. In two other items in the same categories, however, the C group increased in their frequency of use more than the E group, contrary to expectations. Third, it was found that the E group gained more than the C group during their semester abroad on rated speech act performance, a difference which became statistically significant once the data were grouped into the categories “gain,” “no gain,” and “loss.”

Research Question 2: How do students compare on intercultural sensitivity, culture strategy use, language strategy use, and speech act performance before and after one semester studying abroad? The findings from this research question suggest that the students in the combined sample (i.e., E and C groups together) gained in intercultural sensitivity on the *IDI*, gained in frequency of some, but not all, language and culture strategies, and improved their rated performance on the *Speech Act Measure* in all but one vignette (i.e., “Meeting friend”) over the course of one semester studying abroad. With regard to language strategy use in particular, it was found that the combined sample gained in their use of listening and speaking strategies, but reduced their use of vocabulary learning and reading strategies from pretest to posttest.

Research Question 3: Are gains in speech act performance related to prior language and culture experience, demographic variables, reported language and culture strategy use, or study abroad language contact variables? This question dealt with the multiplicity of variables that are at play in any given “study abroad” experience and the impact that they might have had on language gain. For the combined sample, two variables were found to impact speech act performance: “prior experience abroad” and “number of years of study of the TL.” Students who had never lived abroad before gained more on the entire *Speech Act Measure* than those who had lived abroad before. In addition, students who had studied the TL for more than 3 years prior to going abroad showed more gain on one specific vignette (i.e., “Prof meeting”) than those

students who had studied the TL for less than 3 years. A number of significant correlations were found between gain in reported language and culture strategy use and in rated speech act performance. For example, those students who increased their use of the listening strategy of paying attention to the speaker's tone of voice in the TL were able to gain more on the *Speech Act Measure*. With regard to culture strategies, E group students who reported being more proactive about getting involved with host country natives tended to gain more in pragmatic ability than those E group students who did not do so. Correlations such as these both help explain the relationship between strategy use and gain in apology and request performance and may help explain why the E group gained more than the C group on speech acts in this study. Finally, it was found that the amount of time spent speaking the TL outside of class, the number of friends who were NSs of the TL, and the type of coursework that students took (i.e., classes intended for NSs of the TL vs. classes intended for study abroad students) had an impact on students' scores on particular vignettes in the *Speech Act Measure*.

Research Question 4: Are gains in intercultural sensitivity related to prior language and culture experience, demographic variables, reported language and culture strategy use, or study abroad language contact variables? For this question, it was found, first of all, that gender, TL (i.e., French or Spanish), and number of years studying the TL had a significant impact on several individual scales on the *IDI*. Several significant correlations between scores on the *IDI* and the *Speech Act Measure* were found, however their interpretation was not clear. In addition, a number of correlations were obtained between the *IDI* and gain in culture strategy use for both the E and C groups. The different correlations found between the E and C groups may suggest the positive impact of the intervention on the E group. Finally, several language contact variables were found to have a significant impact on students' *IDI* scores. Those students who took classes with NSs of the TL gained more on the Acceptance-Adaptation scale on the *IDI*. Those who enrolled in a field study or internship gained less on the same scale. Students who volunteered gained less on the *IDI* Developmental Score. In addition, amount of time spent speaking the TL outside of class and the type of courses students took were found to be significantly related to scores on the *IDI*.

Research Question 5: Do students become more native-like in their use of semantic formulas to perform apologies and requests? How do the E and C groups compare with regard to the use of semantic formulas? This question focused on students' use of semantic formulas on the *Speech Act Measure*. It was found that both the E and the C groups (together and individually) differed significantly from Spanish and French NSs in the use of specific semantic formulas. Both groups also obtained statistically significant changes in their use of semantic formulas from pretest to posttest, although they did not always move in the direction of being more native-like. One significant difference between the E and C groups in the Spanish learner sample was that the E group – but not the C group – increased significantly from pretest to posttest in their use of mitigation of the verb in the semantic formula “query preparatory” (i.e., an utterance which queries the hearer's ability or willingness to comply with a request, for example, “Can you help me?”).

Research Question 6: What insights does a qualitative analysis of the *Speech Act Measure* data provide with respect to students' speech act performance in Spanish? This question looked at students' speech act performance from a qualitative perspective. First, it was found that not only the types of semantic formulas, but also the content of those semantic formulas was important in the Spanish NS ratings. Second, students did not always have control

over an appropriate register – for example, they were too formal when the situation called for informality or vice versa. There was qualitative evidence that students had incorporated more native-sounding vocabulary and structures into their speech over the course of the semester abroad. However, more native-sounding speech was not always used appropriately, for example, when some students incorporated regional slang or profanity in formal situations where it was not appropriate.

Research Question 7a: To what extent do study abroad students report using strategies described in the *Students' Guide* in order to effectively learn the target language and culture? With regard to the strategies that they use, how do they use them? For this question, it was found that students did report using language and culture strategies in their e-journals and follow-up interviews. They used those strategies in a variety of ways to improve their language skills, to interpret their interactions with host country individuals, and to cope with difficult times during study abroad, among others. For example, several students reported using association strategies instead of rote memory to improve their learning of vocabulary and other students reported using models such as the Iceberg Model of Culture and the D.I.E. Model to interpret their cultural experiences.

Research Question 7b: In which contexts do study abroad students use the strategies in the *Students' Guide* in order to effectively learn the target language and culture? For this question, it was found that students reported using language and culture strategies in a number of contexts such as with their host family, with their language partner, with taxi drivers, and in a variety of other contexts.

Research Question 8: What are students' perceptions about the usefulness of the *Students' Guide* for the study abroad experience? This question focused on what students said about the usefulness of the *Students' Guide* for the study abroad experience. Overall, the majority of students reported in the e-journals and follow-up interviews that they found the *Guide* useful for study abroad. 81% of the E group said “yes” they would recommend the *Guide* to a friend who was planning on studying abroad.

Research Question 9: What suggestions do students have for revising the *Students' Guide*? For this question, the E group students had a great number of suggestions for revisions to the *Guide* such as one student's suggestion to add tips about dealing with host country natives who want to speak English instead of the TL and another student's suggestion to put the suggested answers to the activities at the end of the *Guide* instead of immediately following the activity.

Limitations

Sample

The limitations of this study should be taken into consideration in interpreting the research results reported above. The first limitation regards the sample. The students who participated in the study were attending universities located in Minnesota, which means that we must be cautious in generalizing our findings to students from other parts of the U.S. While the

students in this sample came from a variety of schools in Minnesota – public and private, large and small – and are likely to be similar to other U.S. university study abroad populations in terms of demographics and study abroad experiences, strictly speaking, our findings pertain only to this sample. Second, the sample size was relatively small. We did not reach our original target of 150 students due to difficulties in finding local students who met the criteria for participating in the study and were willing to participate, since it was determined at the outset that the sample would be restricted to students in Minnesota. The lower-than-expected numbers of participants in the first cohort of students led us to recruit a second cohort in fall 2003. While including the second cohort more than doubled the sample size, doing so may have created an additional limitation, namely, the minor possibility of a cohort effect related to academic level of the respondent (i.e., cohort A students who studied abroad during the spring semester were, on average, one semester older than cohort A participants who were abroad in the fall). While the random selection of students helped to assure E and C group comparability, still it was reassuring that the quantitative analysis did not produce any statistically significant differences between students based on cohort.

Two other characteristics of the student sample also represent limitations of this study. First, because of the small number of students who were studying French (N=19), generalizations about this group specifically must be interpreted with even greater caution. Second, the sample was not evenly balanced between males and females, and females made up approximately two thirds of the sample (N=67). This imbalance in gender may have affected the results in some cases, as was demonstrated with one of the findings on the *IDI* in which a statistically significant difference was found between males and females. However, apart from that one particular finding, no other statistical differences based on gender were found.

In addition, as mentioned previously, the French and Spanish NS sample that completed the *Speech Act Measure* and provided us with NS baseline data were also small. Therefore, comparisons between the students and those NSs of French and Spanish need to be interpreted with caution.

Instruments

The first limitation to consider with regards to the *SILC*, the *LSS*, the e-journals, and the follow-up interviews is that they all relied on self-report data. That is to say, the researchers did not observe students' actual language and culture strategy use at the study abroad site. Therefore, we are dependent on students' perceptions and reports about their use of those strategies and cannot corroborate those reports with outside observation.

In addition, the *SILC* and the *LSS* are new instruments and, as such, are likely to be refined in the years ahead as more research evidence becomes available, as would be the case with most such instruments. The rigorous validity and reliability testing discussed in this article does provide us with strong initial support for the integrity of these instruments as measures of the underlying theoretical models upon which they are based. However, another limitation related to the factor analysis was that it was conducted using data from students who were not studying abroad (see description in the Instrumentation section). Consequently, it is possible that the factor analysis categories that were created do not adequately represent the population (i.e., study abroad students) which was the focus of this study.

The use of written a discourse completion task in the *Speech Act Measure* as the means to collect speech act data also has its limitations. First of all, a written DCT is an indirect measure of speaking and therefore is not as valid in measuring speaking as a direct measure of speaking would have been. The resources available for measuring pragmatic language ability in this study were too limited to have permitted the collection of oral speech act data. Consequently, we settled for the next best option of a measure which was a written projection of speaking. In addition, any kind of elicited data – whether written or oral – is not as valid as data collected in natural contexts. However, natural speech act data collection would have required observation of students' speech act behavior during the semester abroad – an option which was not possible for the purposes of this study.

In addition to the format of the instrument collecting speech act data, as described earlier, the fact that the Latin American Spanish NS *Speech Act Measure* raters were from two different countries, judging the responses from students who had studied in nine different Latin American countries is a significant limitation. Sociopragmatic norms may differ significantly among countries, among social classes within each country, among different regions within the same country, and among males and females (García, 1999). Therefore, this limitation should be taken into consideration when interpreting the speech act results from this study.

Finally, there were several considerable limitations in making comparisons between the NNS learners of Spanish and the Spanish NSs in terms of their semantic formula use in apologies and requests. First, there were only 12 NSs in the sample, which is a modest number for a benchmark group. Second, the NSs came from eight different Spanish-speaking countries (the countries are listed above in the description of the sample), and since each country may have different pragmatic norms regarding apologies and requests, grouping these individuals together is problematic. Third, the NSs were all living in the U.S. at the time of data collection and therefore, are likely to have contact with English, which may have influenced the semantic formulas they chose to use in Spanish. Due to these limitations, the comparisons between NNSs and NSs should be interpreted as suggestive at best.

There are also several limitations relating to the use of e-journals as a data-collection instrument. First, as mentioned above, the researchers did not require students to indicate whether they had learned about the strategies that they reported using in the *Guide*, or if they had already been using those strategies prior to exposure to the *Guide*. In addition, it was not possible for us to quantify strategy use based on what students reported in the e-journals because students' reports were not consistent in describing every single strategy they had used during a particular 2-week period. We realized later that it would have been useful to have such quantifiable information regarding language and culture strategy use within the qualitative framework of e-journaling in which that strategy use was described in detail.

Other Limitations

It is possible that the E group students' self-reports were affected by their special status as students in the experimental group. The researchers did their utmost to avoid this effect, by encouraging students to be honest in the e-journals and follow-up interviews about their opinions of the *Guide*, even if that meant giving negative opinions about the *Guide*, and, in addition, the researchers encouraged students to report their language and culture strategy use on the *LSS* and *SILC* honestly. Nonetheless, the E group students may have been unconsciously or consciously

biased by a desire to please the researchers (i.e., the social desirability effect) which could have affected their perceptions of the usefulness of the *Guide* as well as their reported use of language and culture strategies.

Another limitation concerns the possibility of intervening variables related to the fact that the students were participating in a myriad of study abroad programs. Although the researchers noted the programs that the students were on, we did not control for this variable. Because each study abroad program can differ based on a number of factors (e.g., degree of on-site support for students, types of orientations, types of classes offered), study abroad program may have been an intervening variable. For example, we do not know if the C group students had on-site support for their language and culture learning. If they did, on-site instruction may have provided similar knowledge to that which is contained in the *Guide*, which the E group had access to.

A final limitation relates to the fact that the researchers did not collect qualitative data (i.e., e-journals and follow-up interviews) from the C group students. It would have been helpful in interpreting the impact of the *Guide* to be able to compare the E group to the C group based on qualitative feedback. The decision was made not to collect qualitative data from the C group students for two reasons. First, one of the primary purposes of the qualitative data was to get feedback about the usefulness of the *Guide* and about ways it could be revised, to which only the E group students could contribute. Second, e-journal contact with the C group during study abroad would have amounted to an intervention on the part of the researchers, which would have compromised the experimental design of the study. Post-study-abroad follow-up interviews could have been conducted with the C group without an intervening effect. However, the mandate of the grant funding this research was to focus on the impact of the *Guide* on students, and therefore it was felt that C group interviews would not have represented the best use of limited resources. One of the RAs, Joe Hoff, did do follow-up interviews with C group students for his doctoral dissertation with interesting results. His study provided additional evidence that the *Guide* had helped the E group students better articulate and understand their intercultural experiences during study abroad. The C group students that he interviewed, on the other hand, were not able to talk about or explain their cultural experiences as clearly (Hoff, 2005).

Discussion and Conclusions

The primary aim of this study was to investigate whether the intervention, which consisted of the *Students' Guide*, a pre-departure orientation, and e-journaling with the researchers, had an impact on those students' language and culture learning. The hypothesis was that the invention would help students use more language and culture strategies and in turn, improve their language skills and intercultural skills more than if they had not had the invention. As was seen in the *quantitative* results presented above, there is evidence that the intervention did have a positive impact on the E group's language and culture learning, however, the **quantitative** evidence was not definitive enough to warrant making strong claims about the impact of the *Students' Guide*. The **qualitative** results, however, suggest that the *Guide* did have a very positive affect on students' study abroad experience, both language- and culture-wise.

Language and Culture Strategy Use

Considering the differences between the treatment group and the control group, it was found that the two groups did not differ significantly in their overall gain in use of the language and culture strategies contained on the *SILC* and *LSS*. Contrary to our initial hypothesis that exposure to the *Guide* would encourage E group students to use more strategies, there was no statistical difference between the E and C groups. Hence, we cannot claim that the intervention led to a global increase in use of language and culture strategies. At the same time, there were a number of individual items on the *SILC* and *LSS* which showed differences between the two groups. As reported above, there is some indication that perhaps the E group had been able to focus on those language strategies to which took the most advantage of the study abroad environment – i.e., speaking and listening strategies. The E group increased in their reported use of several speaking and listening strategies significantly more than the C group, whereas the C group increased more than the E group in several vocabulary learning strategies. The fact that the *Guide* encourages students to be proactive about taking advantage of the availability of NSs in the study abroad environment may explain why the E group gained more in the use in certain speaking and listening strategies compared to the C group. At the same time, the pattern of gaining more in use of speaking and listening strategies was found for the entire sample, as well, so there is evidence that both groups took advantage of the unique opportunities of the study abroad environment to some extent – perhaps the E group more than the C group.

With regard to the culture strategies, the picture is less clear as to why the E and C groups might have reported differing use of individual culture strategies – in other words, why the E group gained in reported frequency of use on some strategies more than the C group on some items and vice versa. What the E group students reported in the e-journals and follow-up interviews, however, was that they found most of the culture strategies useful and that they were indeed using culture strategies in their daily interactions. Thus, there is an apparent discrepancy between the quantitative and the qualitative data with regard to strategy use. One possible interpretation is that time constrained the number of strategies students could use. Many students reported in the qualitative data that they were constantly pressed for time during study abroad. In addition, several E group students commented that if they had had more time, they would have liked to use the strategies in the *Guide* to a greater extent to improve their language and culture learning. Therefore, one possible explanation is that due to lack of time, the E group students picked certain strategies that they found particularly useful to deploy more frequently. Although in the best-case learning scenario the E group would have increased their use of all of the language and culture strategies after learning about them in the *Guide*, perhaps given the time constraints, students increased their use of those strategies which were particularly relevant to their specific situation, or those strategies which fit their learning style best.

Another possible explanation for the different picture of strategy use that the quantitative and the qualitative data provide is that the internal standard by which students measured the frequency of strategy use had changed by the posttest. Remember that students completed the pretest *SILC* and the *LSS* prior to leaving for study abroad, while they were still in their home country. It is possible that by the time of the posttest, students had raised the bar in their own minds about what “very often,” “often,” “seldom,” etc., meant in terms of amount of use of strategies. Prior to leaving for study abroad, students may not have had many opportunities for interactions with people from another culture, whereas in study abroad, the environment would have lent itself to a significant increase in contacts with people from the host culture. The

qualitative difference in the home and abroad environments may have led students to change their perceptions of the relative frequency with which they used culture strategies and perhaps the language strategies as well. Students may have reported a relatively high use of language and culture strategies in the pretest, which meant that any gains in the posttest would necessarily be small or even negative, if students' internal standards had shifted.

With regard to the combined sample, looking first at language strategy use, the combined sample increased their use on two of the five *LSS* scales: Speaking Strategies and Listening Strategies. In addition, there was significant decrease in frequency of language strategy use on two of the five scales: Structure/Vocabulary Learning Strategies and Reading Strategies. Although this difference was not expected, it makes sense when considering the nature of the study abroad environment. Unlike the at-home environment, during study abroad, students would have had many more opportunities to speak and listen to the TL as spoken by NSs. On the other hand, while studying the TL at home by taking foreign language classes, students may have focused more on learning structure and vocabulary and on reading in the absence of a wide variety of opportunities for speaking and listening.

Considering the combined sample's culture strategy use, it was found that students increased significantly in the use of culture strategies on three of the five *SILC* scales: Interpreting Culture, Nonverbal Communication, and Culture Shock/Coping Strategies. This change goes in the expected direction; that is, after one semester studying abroad students were using culture strategies on these three scales more frequently. This movement is expected because in comparison to the at-home environment, the study abroad environment would have given students ample opportunities to use culture strategies in their interactions with host country natives and in their reflective interpretations of the cultural differences they experienced.

Intercultural Sensitivity

Comparing the E and C groups' results on the *IDI* did not indicate a statistically significant difference between the two groups' intercultural sensitivity. Thus, the quantitative data alone do not show that the intervention had an impact on students' intercultural skills. However, when the qualitative data are taken into consideration, it is clear from the e-journals and follow-up interviews that many E group students felt that the *Guide* helped them to improve their skills to function in intercultural interactions. A possible explanation for this discrepancy is that the *IDI* was not sensitive enough to measure the types of changes that distinguished the E group from the C group with regard to worldview about cultural difference. Perhaps the differences in intercultural sensitivity that the *Guide* may have affected were overwhelmed in the quantitative measurement by the impact of the study abroad experience in itself, which is expected to be qualitatively more significant than the *Guide*. The more likely explanation is that the intercultural sensitivity of both the E and C group members was strongly influenced by the study abroad experience. This would be consistent with theory and prior research. The differences between the two groups brought about by the intervention were much more nuanced (e.g., the E group students' use of intercultural terminology) than the fundamental shifts in worldview occasioned by the study abroad experience. Accordingly, it took qualitative approaches such as journals and interviews to discover the impact of the intervention.

With regard to the combined sample, it was found that students' intercultural sensitivity increased significantly during one semester abroad. Their overall intercultural sensitivity –

measured by the *IDI* Developmental Score – increased significantly, their score on the ethnorelative Acceptance-Adaptation scale increased significantly, and their scores on three ethnocentric scales decreased, although the difference was significant only for the Reversal scale. Taken together, these findings suggest that one semester of study abroad has a positive impact on students' intercultural sensitivity.

Speech Act Performance

As discussed above, the E group improved more overall than the C group in their rated performance of apologies and requests on the *Speech Act Measure*. Although the difference between the two groups was not statistically significant when analyzing the raw mean gain scores, when these scores were grouped into three categories (loss, no gain, gain), the greater improvement of the E group over the C group became significant. As was posited above, this finding suggests that the intervention had a positive impact on students' apology and request performance overall.

The analysis of semantic formulas and correlations between gain in language strategy use and speech act performance sheds light on the specific ways in which the E group improved their performance more than the C group. First of all, it was found that the E group in the Spanish sample significantly increased their use of polite verb forms in the request formula “query preparatory,” on three request vignettes from pre- to posttest (two of those increases were statistically significant). This increase in use of polite verb forms – primarily the conditional tense – moved in the direction of the Spanish NSs in this study. The Spanish C group had no statistically significant pre-post differences in the use of conditional tense on this semantic formula. This difference between the Spanish E and C groups may be attributed to the treatment which instructed students to observe what NSs do to be polite. In addition, it was found that higher frequency of use of the strategy “I figure out and model NSs' language patterns when apologizing, requesting, or complaining” by the E group (including both French and Spanish students) was positively correlated 8 times with various vignettes and rating criteria on the *Speech Act Measure*. In contrast, only one positive correlation between more frequent use of this strategy and speech act performance was found for the C group. This finding may suggest that the intervention had a positive impact on the E group students by encouraging them to approach learning speech acts strategically.

In sum, it does appear that the intervention consisting of the *Guide*, the pre-departure orientation, and the e-journaling had a positive impact on E group students' improvement in apology and request performance over the course of a semester studying abroad. Considering the qualitative responses from students, it was not only the focus on speech acts – both in the orientation and in the *Guide* – that assisted students in improving their speech act performance, but also the cultural information contained in the *Guide*. Because much of what underlies pragmatic appropriateness in a particular language is based on culture, we propose that the culture sections of the *Guide* compliment the learning of speech acts by encouraging students to look at language and culture from varying perspectives and to reflect and observe before making generalizations about the target language and culture.

For example, the following quote shows how one E group student examined speech act behavior that she observed in Spain:

“In the U.S., when somebody apologizes we usually expect the other person to accept our apology immediately. Here in Spain, it’s a very cold acknowledgement of the apology, if any acknowledgement at all. Part of this could be because I’m a foreigner and I have an accent or a grammatical error or two within my apology that might be a further annoyance to a person I’ve “wronged” in the first place by bumping into them or whatever. Or perhaps it’s a cultural thing where they silently acknowledge my apology and don’t feel the need to speak about it further. I’m not quite sure yet! This guy in the supermercado glared at me when I bumped into him, but maybe he was just a crabby guy, you know? It’s so hard to know when people are just being people, or when there are actually cultural differences.” (Student 107E, Madrid, Spain, Week 6)

In this quote, the student demonstrates her understanding of the difference between personal and cultural differences. In addition, she acts much like an ethnographer in carefully observing the behavior of the Spanish in performing apologies and in withholding a final judgment until she has gathered sufficient evidence. Although these behaviors cannot be attributed directly to the intervention since the student does not explain where she acquired this knowledge, those are the kinds of strategies that the *Guide* encourages students to use.

For the combined sample, on nine of the ten apology and request vignettes students were rated significantly higher in pragmatic appropriateness by the Spanish and French NS raters in the posttest than in the pretest. Thus, as a result of spending one semester abroad in a Spanish- or French-speaking country students were able to improve their apology and request performance. With regard to the “Meeting friend” vignette (i.e., the only vignette for which the pre-post difference was not significant), although students improved their performance from pre- to posttest, this difference was not statistically significant. It is an interesting question as to why students did not improve as much on this particular vignette. On the other vignette that is with an interlocutor who is a friend, the combined sample improved significantly from pre- to posttest, however, that “friend” was not a “close” friend as was the friend in the “Meeting friend” vignette. What may have made the difference between these two vignettes was that students did not know how to be pragmatically appropriate with a close friend. Several of the Spanish NS raters mentioned that students used language that was too “distant” and “cold” in this vignette, which may give support to this interpretation. In addition, several students reported in their e-journals and follow-up interviews that they had found it difficult to make friends with other host country students. If students did not have many opportunities to interact with close friends from the host country during study abroad, they may not have been exposed to the pragmatically appropriate behaviors associated with apologizing to close friends.

Variables in the Study Abroad Environment

As hypothesized, it was found in this study that what is referred to as “the study abroad environment” is not monolithic, but rather can be quite different from one situation to another. What was found was that some study abroad programs included extensive pre-departure and in-country support for both logistical and learning issues, whereas others provided students with very little. Many students, but not all, participated in internships or volunteer positions. A minority of students took classes with host country nationals, whereas the majority took courses intended for international students who are NNSs of the TL. In addition, each student brings to the study abroad environment his or her previous intercultural experiences, language learning

experiences, personal motivations, and personality traits, among other characteristics. As would be expected from these and other differences, the experiences of the students who participated in this study were in some cases very different.

The results presented above indicated some elements of students' background and of the study abroad environment that were found to correlate with differences in performance on the instruments used in this study. Looking first at students' background, it was found that students who had never lived abroad previously improved their overall speech act performance more than students with previous experience abroad. This finding suggests that the first time students go abroad their learning results in a greater degree of observable improvement in their pragmatic ability on speech acts such as apologies and requests, which clearly indicate the coming together of language and culture. It does not mean necessarily that students do not learn an equal amount during subsequent trips, but it may suggest that such learning may not result in such dramatic improvements in speech act performance. In addition, students who had studied the TL for more than 3 years improved more on one particular apology vignette, "Prof meeting," which is with a distinguished professor. It was hypothesized that more advanced students may have had more linguistic resources to be able to focus on acquiring the more sophisticated linguistic and cultural knowledge required to maneuver this high-stakes apology.

Three background variables were also found to have a relationship with change scores on certain scales of the *Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI)*, which was used to measure intercultural sensitivity: gender, language studied abroad, and number of years of prior TL study. The gender result was that females in the combined sample had greater gain scores on the Reversal scale, a finding that suggests females were identifying personally more with the host culture. The reasons for this are not clear; theory does not suggest that females are more likely to "go native." In the case of the language finding, Spanish learners had higher gain scores on Encapsulated Marginality, suggesting they were more immersed in their cultural environments than French learners. Again, the reasons for this finding are not evident; a closer examination of the context would be required to make sense of this. The years of prior TL study finding that greater gains on Acceptance-Adaptation occurred among those with less than three years of prior TL fits Hammer's (2005) finding that greater *IDI* gains happen among those with less experience.

With regard to the relationship between language contact variables and speech act performance, a number of significant findings were obtained. First, living with a host family was only found to positively impact the gains in speech act performance of the C group, but not those of the E group. It was hypothesized that perhaps in the absence of the *Guide* as a resource for language and culture learning, the host family became the C group's focal learning opportunity. On two vignettes (#4 and #7), the frequency of use of the TL with friends and outside of class in general did not have a clear linear relationship with language gain. Second, students who were enrolled in classes intended for study abroad students improved significantly more on the "Friend's book" vignette than those students enrolled in classes with host country students. Two possible interpretations can be made: first, that sheltered classes for study abroad students provide those students with needed linguistic (and perhaps cultural) support, and second, that initial language proficiency is confounding this variable because higher proficiency students would be more likely to take classes intended for NSs of the TL. Finally, extracurricular activities such as meeting with a conversation partner and participating in an internship were not found to relate to gain on apologies and requests.

In terms of the interrelationship between intercultural sensitivity – as measured by the *IDI* – and language contact variables, participating in courses intended for NSs of the TL positively impacted the intercultural sensitivity of E group students as well as the combined sample. That finding was in contrast to lesser gains for students who enrolled in courses for NNSs. These findings indicate that the more students are immersed in a host culture, the more they will need to cognitively and behaviorally adapt to be successful, which often equates to increased intercultural sensitivity. An interesting finding was that E group students who took part in internships or field studies made fewer gains in intercultural sensitivity than those students who did not. This result is counterintuitive except when one considers that information was not available on the quality of the internship or the field study experience. It is also possible that those experiences were so intense and challenging in a somewhat threatening way that, rather than gaining understanding of cultural diversity, these students became more protective of their own views when faced with overwhelming cultural diversity.

Similar results occurred for the combined sample related to volunteering; that is, not volunteering had a greater impact on intercultural sensitivity than volunteering. Again, students could have been overwhelmed by the volunteer experience and thus not open or able to increase their intercultural sensitivity. With regard to the variable “average amount of time spent speaking the target language outside of class”, students in the combined sample who more frequently spoke the TL outside of class had lower scores on the Denial/Defense substage of the DMIS, suggesting that the more one speaks the TL outside of class, the more intercultural sensitive one becomes. It can be concluded from these findings that students’ background and language contact experiences in the study abroad environment are important issues to consider when doing research with study abroad students, both in terms of evaluating language learning, as well as changes in intercultural sensitivity.

Overall, the statistically significant relationships between language contact variables and intercultural sensitivity were in the predicted direction (4 of 6 for the combined sample, 2 of 4 for the C group, and 3 of 4 for the E group). Positive *IDI* gains (e.g. reduced ethnocentrism and increased ethnorelativism) were found to be associated with participation in NS courses, frequency of speaking the TL at home, and frequency of speaking the TL outside of class. Contrary to expectations, the E, C, and combined samples showed negative *IDI* scales gains associated with internships and volunteering.

Directions for Future Research

Because of the limitations of self-report data, a suggestion for future research is that longitudinal ethnographic observation of study abroad students’ language and culture strategy use be done in addition to the administration of self-report quantitative measures such as the *SILC* and the *LSS* and qualitative means such as e-journals and follow-up interviews. Although this method would be somewhat intrusive in the lives of the study abroad students being researched, the researcher could act as a participant observer, following students around and observing what they do in their interactions at home, with their host family, in meetings with their language partners, in classes at the host country university, and in their interactions in the

host country public sphere (e.g., in the supermarket, in the coffee shop, etc.). Such observations could be followed up with interviews with the students, asking them to recall what they were thinking during their interactions with host country natives, what reflections they have on those interactions after the fact, what strategies they were using during those interactions, and what they might do differently to improve their interactions in the future. An ethnographic study would likely provide rich insights into how, why, and where students use language and culture strategies as well as effectively triangulate data collection methods.

Another suggestion that has been brought up time and again in studies on speech acts is to that future studies on speech act performance should collect natural speech act data. Although elicited data may approximate natural data, speech act research has suggested that natural data may differ in significant ways. More specifically, speech act interactions in natural settings may have more complex negotiation sequences and may reflect a wider range of moves on the part of the speaker and the hearer (Beebe & Cummings, 1985; Holmes, 2003; Golato, 2003; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2003; Koester, 2002).

It was suggested to the researchers by a colleague that if we had administered the instruments a third time, at the mid-point of the semester abroad, we may have found additional significant differences in language and culture strategy use, speech act performance, and intercultural sensitivity that did not come out in the pre-post test design. Using a mid-point test could also more clearly show development over time. Thus, future research on this topic may want to consider using a pre-mid-post testing design.

In addition, research is needed to examine if and how students retain and expand their TL and intercultural skills after returning home. One suggestion for examining what students experience language- and culture-wise after reentry would be to include a delayed post-test in which the same instruments are administered post-reentry after an extended period, such as 6 or 12 months after students return from study abroad.

Although this research has found that study abroad students benefited from having a self-access guidebook for language and culture learning, it would be useful for future research to examine whether use of the *Guide* in conjunction with a facilitated training or with feedback affect the outcomes in comparison with the “hands-off” version examined in this study. More specifically, a possible research question could be: Do students gain more in intercultural sensitivity if an on-site facilitator provided instruction relating the culture-general concepts contained in the *Guide* to culture-specific knowledge? Comments from at least one of the study abroad professionals participating in the larger research project (see the section on the *Program Professionals’ Guide* Study below) would suggest that students would benefit more. However, this question remains to be tested empirically.

Finally, this study has suggested that an educational intervention can have a positive impact on study abroad students’ language and culture learning during study abroad. As interventions such as this one become more common in the study abroad field, we would be wise to continue to evaluate such interventions for their efficacy. To date, very few studies (see for example Rodríguez, 2001) have examined the benefits that an intervention may have on study abroad students’ learning.

Suggestions for Teaching a Course for Study Abroad Students Using the *Students' Guide*

Although the *Students' Guide* was intended to function as a self-access guide for study abroad students, the materials contained in the *Guide* can also be used as a stand-alone study abroad course or integrated into existing language and culture courses intended for study abroad students. Based on the findings from this study, we can make several suggestions for teaching courses for study abroad students using the *Students' Guide*.

First of all, while it may not come as surprise to those involved in the education of study abroad students, the comments made by the E group students in their e-journals and follow-up interviews underscore the importance of the *sequencing* of materials. That is, certain information and activities will be most relevant to students at specific points in their study abroad sojourn. For example, students reported that reading about the culture shock, cultural adjustment, and language fatigue sections around the first month or month and a half of their stay in the host country came at just the right time. Students found those sections particularly useful, relevant, and comforting at that point in time because they were struggling precisely with those issues. Reading about culture and language fatigue in the *Guide* helped the students to understand that what they were going through was normal and that they would most likely continue adjusting such that they would move into a stage in which they did feel so psychologically stressed by the host culture and the TL.

Another example related to sequencing was that many students reported that they wished they would have read the section in the *Guide* on writing term papers in the TL towards the beginning of their semester abroad rather than towards the end, when that section was assigned. Many students reported that they could have benefited more from having guidance on writing in the TL for those papers they wrote early on in the semester. Since students may be required to write academic papers even from the beginning of the semester, the writing tips could perhaps best be introduced soon after students' arrival in the host country. Of course, if there is an instructor on-site, teaching a course with the *Guide*, who knows precisely when students will be asked to start writing papers in the TL, the writing tips could be introduced prior to the first paper, whenever that may be.

A second suggestion for instructors to consider when using the *Guide* is to follow the principle of spiral learning, that is, integrating the same concepts in new ways throughout the course as a means to reinforce learning. Especially with regards to the cultural concepts and culture learning strategies, reading the information and doing the activities in the *Guide* just one time may not be enough for those concepts and strategies to sink in. A number of students in this study reported that although they may have learned some of the concepts in previous courses, it was helpful to be reminded about that information. In addition, several students who participated in the follow-up interviews reported that they were glad they had read over the *Guide* again (i.e., because the researchers had asked students to do so for the purposes of the interview), because they had been reminded about some concepts and strategies that they had read previously in the *Guide*, but had then later forgotten about.

Another suggestion would be to include journaling about the *Guide* and language and culture learning in study abroad as a supplementary activity to teaching a course with the *Guide*. From our own observations and from those of several students, the act of reflecting on the

information in the *Guide* and on experiences in study abroad by means of the e-journals students submitted to the researchers was a useful tool in students' learning. In this study, the e-journal assignments also helped to ensure that students were actually reading the *Guide* and thinking about how it applied to their lived experiences and, therefore, it also functioned as a measure of accountability.

Fourth, students' comments in the e-journals and follow-up interviews suggest that many study abroad students would benefit from having external motivations for reading and doing the activities in the *Guide*. Several students commented that, for reasons such as being too busy and not wanting to read in English (but only the TL), if they had not participated in the research project and been required to read the *Guide* (i.e., their external motivation), they may have not done so, even though having been required to read it, they found the information to be useful. Other students also expressed the idea that making the *Guide* part of a larger program (e.g., on-site advising, a study abroad course) would be more effective than simply supplying students with a copy of the *Guide* and encouraging them to read it. These kinds of comments seem to suggest that the *Guide* would be most effective as a required and integral part of a course or program for study abroad students, rather than merely a supplementary or optional resource. A model for such a course has been developed at the University of Minnesota. The University of Minnesota has two 1-credit courses for study abroad students, the first of which is for students to take while on-site in the host country, and the second is for students after they return from study abroad. Both courses use the *Students' Guide* as the primary course text. Because the courses carry academic credit, students are required to read the *Guide* and to do complementary assignments during and/or after study abroad in order to receive a grade in each course.

A final suggestion that has been brought up both by the student participants in this study and by colleagues in the field is that instructors and facilitators may want to supplement the *Guide* with specific information about the host culture and the TL. The *Guide* was purposefully generic, so as not to focus on any particular language or culture, in order to be applicable to all study abroad students and also to pursue the goal of developing students' skills to adapt to and learn about *any* language or culture, not just a particular one. Not surprisingly, however, study abroad students are typically hungry for language- and culture-specific information about the host country in which they are living in or preparing to live in. Hence, instructors teaching a course using the *Students' Guide* would very likely want to supplement the *Guide* materials with information specific to the language(s) and culture(s) for which the course is intended.



PROGRAM PROFESSIONALS' GUIDE STUDY

The Program Professional's Study describes the results of field-testing the *Maximizing Study Abroad Program Professionals' Guide* (PPG) with program professionals in the study abroad field. This section of the study is divided into the following sections: Aims of the Study, Research Design, Instrumentation, Data Collection Procedures, Data Analysis Procedures, Findings, Discussion, and Conclusions.

As mentioned previously, the ability of program professionals to teach about culture and language learning strategies in the field of international education depends on many factors, such as their background, the commitment of the institution to preparing them, the status of training in the field of international education to date, and the availability of resources for such training. To date, no resource such as the PPG has been available which specifically focuses on training and theory in culture and language learning strategies for study abroad. Therefore this study provides the field of international education with a new resource for development of program professionals who are better informed about the potential role of language and culture strategies in study abroad.

Aims of the Study and Research Questions

The purpose of the program professionals' study was to field-test the use of the PPG with a group of program professionals in the field – in some cases in conjunction with the *Maximizing Study Abroad Students' Guide* – in preparing and implementing pre-departure and on-site study abroad programming. The primary research question for the PPG study was:

- What are the ways that program professionals can use the PPG in student orientations?
How do they perceive the role of this guide in the student orientation process?

In addition to this overarching question, seven additional research questions guided the study, each of which is listed below:

Research Questions

1. Overall, what did the participants think of the PPG?
2. What reasons did the program professionals give for choosing the activities/materials for their orientation(s)?
3. Did the program professionals think they were successful in integrating the materials from the PPG into their pre-departure orientation(s)? Why or why not? What challenges did they face?
4. What were students' perceptions/reactions to the materials the program professionals used for the orientation activity (or activities)?

5. Do the program professionals have any suggestions for how we might revise the PPG (e.g., adding additional activities or information, changing the organization, providing suggested times for activities)?
6. What advice or tips do the participants have for other program professionals considering using the PPG?
7. In what ways, if any, did the readings and/or activities from the PPG provide insights into the participants' practice as study abroad professionals?

Research Design

Participants

A total of 13 program professionals participated in the study. The participants were chosen through purposive sampling, on the basis of the type of institution they represented for the Study Abroad Advisors (SAAs), the type of program for the On-site Resident Directors (ORDs), and the type of program for the Faculty Director. The SAAs were chosen in order to represent a variety of institutions, private and public, large and small. The ORDs were chosen to represent a variety of programs such as "field study" or "island"¹⁴ programs and also based on whether they were native to their country or not in order to compare approaches between host country natives and U.S. Americans. The Faculty Director was chosen as a representative of Faculty Directors who lead programs abroad – a U.S. American fluent in the host country language. The participants were paid an honorarium based on the length of their participation in the study: the SAAs were paid \$250, the ORDs were paid \$500, and the Faculty Director was paid \$500. All of the program professionals involved in the study were involved in conducting orientations for their students. Two additional ORDs from the University of Minnesota Montpelier program and the IES Tokyo, Japan program were recruited to join the research study project but had to decline for personal reasons and a lack of time.

The descriptions of the three groups of participants chosen for the PPG study are listed below. Note that all participants in the PPG study were female.

1. Study Abroad Advisors (SAAs): Eight SAAs who were based at their home campuses in Minnesota (7 participants) and Wisconsin (1 participant) were selected for the study. The sample of SAAs was limited to those located in Minnesota and Wisconsin so that they could attend an orientation with the researchers at the University of Minnesota. The SAAs were in charge of assisting students select a study abroad program and designing pre-departure orientations that assist students in preparing for their sojourn abroad. The eight SAAs came from six institutions including a large public university, four small to mid-size private colleges and public universities, and a small women's college. The institutions represented were the following: University of St. Thomas; College of St.

¹⁴ "Island" program refers to a study abroad program that has no connection with a local university or other local organization. Usually the majority of the students are U.S. Americans. The students take courses at the study abroad program center only. Classes may be taught by local university faculty, however. "Field study" program refers to a program that may include a specific study or experience based elsewhere in the host country.

Catherine; Macalester College; University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire; University of Minnesota; St. Olaf College and Carleton College, Northfield; and the Carlson School of Management at the University of Minnesota. All of the SAAs were U.S. citizens who were either native to the U.S. or had lived in the U.S. for a significant period of time.

2. On-site Resident Directors (ORDs): Four ORDs who were each located at a study abroad site in either France, Ghana, India, or Spain were selected for the study. Three of the ORDs were natives of the host country (i.e., those from Ghana, India, and Spain). The ORD located in France was a U.S. American who was fluent in French. Two of the ORDs were new to the field and this was their first year as ORDs. The ORDs were chosen for their varied backgrounds: being native to their host culture, native to the host culture but having lived or studied in the U.S. or a U.S. American living abroad. They were also chosen to represent three types of study abroad programs: field study programs in India and Ghana, a field-based program that emphasizes language learning in France, and a large “island” program in Spain. The four programs represented were the following: Minnesota Studies in International Development (MSID), Ghana; MSID, India; School for International Training (SIT), Toulouse, France; and the Fundación Ortega y Gasset, Toledo, Spain.
3. Faculty Director: One Faculty Director from a mid-sized private university led a group of students on an “island program” for a semester in Paris, France. The program represented was the University of St. Thomas, Semester in Paris program. The Faculty Director was native to the U.S. but fluent in French.

What the Program Professionals Were Asked to Do

The SAAs and the Faculty Director were given a day-long orientation about using the PPG in September of 2003. There were a number of components to the orientation: (1) the participants completed their Institutional Review Board consent forms, (2) they were informed about the expectations of their participation in the study, (3) they learned about the strategies-based approach to language and culture learning, (4) they reviewed the *Learning Style Survey* (Cohen, Oxford, & Chi, 2002), the *Language Strategy Survey* and the *Strategies Inventory for Learning Culture* with the researchers, (5) they learned about the concept of *speech acts* (as representing the coming together of language and culture through the performance of speech functions like requesting, apologizing, and complaining), and (6) they were given a general overview of the PPG. They were also asked to do a culture and language learning activity from the PPG handouts section. Finally, they were asked to brainstorm ways in which they could use the PPG in practice at their home campuses. The Faculty Director stayed on for further discussion of the expectations of how to use the PPG for both pre-departure and on-site programming.

The four ORDs were each given individual orientations with similar content as that provided in the SAAs’ orientation. One of the research assistants (RA) – Joe Hoff – conducted three of the individual orientations at three different locations in order to make attending the orientation convenient for the overseas-based participants. The orientation sites included the Learning Abroad Center at the University of Minnesota, the 2003 NAFSA conference in San Antonio, and the 2003 CARLA summer institute in Minneapolis. Another member of the

Learning Abroad Center staff who was familiar with the PPG administered the orientation to the fourth ORD at a meeting in Ecuador, since Joe Hoff was not able to meet that ORD elsewhere. All program professionals were given a copy of the PPG and a *Students' Guide*. They were also given the option of obtaining copies of the *Students' Guide* for their individual students.

The following are the tasks that the program professionals agreed to carry out as participants in this study. These tasks were provided to the participants during the orientation session.

List of Tasks for the PPG Study Participants

1. Participate in an orientation session for study abroad program professionals in which you will learn about the *Program Professionals' Guide*;
2. Thoroughly read the *Program Professionals' Guide* and also familiarize yourself with the *Students' Guide* during Fall 2003;
3. Plan and implement at least one event during your participation in the study. This event is to incorporate activities and information from the *Program Professionals' Guide* (such as the D.I.E. culture debriefing model and the Aymara vocabulary activity) into your pre-departure orientation(s);
4. Submit monthly electronic journal reports during the time that you participate in the study, describing your experiences in planning and using the *Program Professionals' Guide*;
5. Submit samples of the materials (e.g., handouts for students, final orientation agenda with timeframes, etc.) that you create and use in conjunction with the *Program Professionals' Guide* during your participation in this study; and
6. Provide the researchers with feedback by means of a final evaluation questionnaire and, with your consent, a telephone interview in December 2003 or January 2004.

The requirements for the three groups of program professionals differed slightly. The requirements for the SAAs were that they (1) submit a monthly journal about the process of preparing the pre-departure orientation, (2) do at least one pre-departure orientation for their students that included information or activities from the PPG, and (3) answer a final exit questionnaire. The participants were given overall general questions and a set of guiding questions to assist them with their journal reports (see the Instrumentation section below). Finally, three of the SAAs were asked to participate in follow-up interviews concerning specific points they made in their exit questionnaires. The three were chosen because they had commented on unique aspects of using the PPG materials in their contexts. These unique aspects are as follows: conducting a special orientation for language learners, working with an advanced level of students who already had training in intercultural communication, and working with students attending field-based programs in developing countries.

The Faculty Director for the St. Thomas program in Paris was given the same questions, guidelines, and requirements. The Faculty Director was the only participant in the study who had to conduct a pre-departure orientation and on-site orientations while traveling with students abroad. She was also asked therefore to include journals and activities from the on-site portion

of her study. She was required to do at least two activities from the PPG while on-site, in addition to her pre-departure orientation. She was given a follow-up interview to address certain aspects of her responses on the exit questionnaire.

The ORDs were given a similar set of questions and guidelines. They were asked to do at least two activities from the PPG with their students on-site. All ORDs took part in a follow-up interview by phone concerning certain responses to their exit questionnaires.

Instrumentation

The instruments involved in this study included journal reports, exit questionnaires, and follow-up interviews for select individuals. Each of the instruments is described individually below.

Journal Reports. The journal reports were intended to capture the thoughts of the various program professionals as they went through the process of learning about the contents of the PPG, planning their orientations, deciding on which activities or information to use, and then describing the success/lack of success in the outcomes of the orientations. The program professionals were also asked to submit any handouts they created to supplement the *Maximizing Study Abroad* materials.

Journal Protocol Guiding Questions. During the orientations, the program professionals were given the following list of questions and requirements to guide them in writing their journals:

General Questions

1. What was the process you went through each month in planning and using the *Program Professionals' Guide*?
2. What did you use from the *Program Professionals' Guide* that worked well? What didn't work well? Why?

Guiding Questions

1. What materials or information from the *Program Professionals' Guide* and/or *Students' Guide* did you use? Please explain how you used these specific materials and the context in which you use them?
2. How successful do you think you were in integrating the materials from the *Program Professionals' Guide* into pre-departure orientations and advising?
3. Did you face any challenges in integrating the materials into pre-departure orientations? If so, what were they?
4. In what ways if any did the readings and/or activities from the *Program Professionals' Guide* provide any insights into your practice as a study abroad professional? Please explain.

5. What were students' perceptions of the materials you used for the orientation or advising activity?
6. What parts of the *Program Professionals' Guide* are most relevant for the "typical" study abroad student population when conducting a pre-departure orientation? What parts are least relevant?
7. Is there anything else you would like to tell us?

Exit Questionnaire. The exit questionnaire (see Appendices J and K) was designed to focus on the PPG in terms of the suggested revisions/highlights of the guide for the research study participants. Respondents were also asked if the use of the PPG gave them any special insights into the study abroad field.

Follow-up interviews. The follow-up interviews were designed to address any particularly interesting or unique responses to the exit questionnaire. Four SAAs, the four ORDs, and the Faculty Director, were selected for the follow-up interviews.

Data Collection Procedures

The approach taken for data collection was hands-off, with an occasional note of encouragement sent to the participants to hand in their journals. The SAA group had the most difficulty in submitting their journals on a monthly basis most likely due to the fact that they did not plan their orientations until the end of the semester and had little time to work on the project, as the study and preparing orientations were a lesser part of their overall responsibilities. One SAA sent in only the exit questionnaire, while the other SAAs submitted at least two journal reports.

The ORDs sent in journal reports on a more regular basis, usually two or three for the semester as they had to plan their orientations and any other type of programming for the entire semester. They were also required to do at least two activities during the semester.

The Faculty Director had the most interaction with Joe Hoff as she often asked for assistance in planning activities. She submitted two journal reports even though she said that she was extremely busy throughout the semester.

Data Analysis Procedures

The data was coded according to questions from the *Exit Questionnaire* devised by RA Joe Hoff who had extensive experience in the study abroad field as a study abroad advisor and resident director. The questions were derived from the main research questions and any emergent themes that came directly from the participants' responses. The coded units were entered into an Excel database with the findings coming from this database.

Findings and Interpretations

All of the program professionals used the PPG as a resource on the theory and application of teaching culture and language learning strategies to their students either in a new manner or reinforcing already existing practices. They used the materials in the PPG as a way to challenge themselves in invigorating their programming. They reported that the PPG gave them new insights into their role as a Program Professional. Depending on their role as SAA, ORD or Faculty Director, the material of the PPG was fully integrated into regular programming or used as a separate orientation or programming event. The results will be presented separately for each of the three types of program professionals: SAAs, ORDs and the Faculty Director.

Research Question (1): Overall, what did the participants think of the Program Professionals Guide (PPG)?

Study Abroad Advisors

The SAAs found that the PPG offered a mixture of new material and old material already referenced that was now available in a much more organized and clear manner. The timelines in the section on orientations and workshops were helpful in assisting the SAAs in deciding what material to present and for how long. One SAA stated that she found that the amount of material was somewhat overwhelming. This finding may suggest that although the PPG could be used without any training in its use, it may be beneficial to have a community of practice either online or at a college or university in which ideas can be discussed on how to use the materials.

Of special note were two SAAs who commented that the language learning strategies were especially helpful. One SAA held a special orientation for students attending programs in non-English-speaking countries. This finding may suggest that language learning strategies are not normally discussed during pre-departure orientations.

On-site Resident Directors

Several ORDs stated that they found the integration of the research, theory, and application of culture and language learning strategies as presented in the PPG to be very beneficial. They appreciated the “strategies-based” approach to culture and language learning that encouraged a more active student learning experience.

Faculty Director

The Faculty Director thought the PPG was well-organized and appreciated the option of being able to photocopy activities from the PPG

Overall, the program professionals agreed that the PPG was comprehensive and a good resource. They used a variety of activities to match the type of orientation/programming they administered on their programs/campuses.

Research Question (2): What reasons did the program professionals give for choosing the activities/materials for their orientation(s)?

The program professionals used the activities from the PPG in a variety of ways. The activities were integrated into the regular orientation and other programming offered during the semester. Sometimes, the material from the PPG was integrated with other material that the program professionals had used previously. At other times the material was treated as new and used as “stand-alone” orientation material. Occasionally the language learning material was emphasized over culture-learning material. Program professionals used different materials from the PPG depending on how advanced or less-advanced the audience was.

Study Abroad Advisors

The SAAs used the PPG materials in pre-departure orientations. Pre-departure orientations ranged from one-hour or one-day events towards the end of the semester to a series of events throughout the semester before students departed for their study abroad experience. Usually the PPG materials were used in one orientation that focused on culture or language learning. In one case, the culture and language learning orientations were separate events. Some SAAs used the PPG materials in orientations intended for an audience of students going to multiple destinations. Other SAAs used the materials in orientations for an audience of students going to a specific destination.

In addition to regular orientations, one SAA used the *Maximizing Study Abroad* materials from both the *Students' Guide* and the PPG in a set of weekly emails sent to students by peer advisors to assist them in preparation for their sojourn abroad. The goal of sending the e-mails was to have the students start thinking about their role as U.S. citizens in the world as well as the role of the host country in the world. The culture learning concepts in the *Students' Guide* provided topics for this purpose.

The majority of SAAs referenced the surveys from the PPG and used them in their orientations. An example of the use of a survey is the use of the *Language Strategy Survey* for an orientation specifically focusing on language learning abroad. The SAA who used this survey in an orientation hoped to have the students discuss the strategies they already used in order to recognize what worked for them.

Another SAA chose materials from the PPG that addressed a more experienced group of students and could be appealing to students going to diverse locations. Her institution, Macalester College, had a more advanced population of students in terms of having previous experiences abroad and attending programs in diverse locations including many developing countries. Macalester College sends most of its students on program administered by other

institutions. The SAA expressed a need then to cater the activities used from the PPG materials for a population with more intercultural experience, including previous experiences abroad.

On-site Resident Directors

The ORDs in the group represented a variety of programs in diverse locations. Three of the four ORDs were native to their home cultures. The School for International Training (SIT) ORD was a native U.S. American who spoke French fluently and had been living in France for a number of years. The MSID Ghana ORD was Ghanaian but had recently completed her Ph.D. at a U.S. institution. The MSID India and Spain ORDs were natives of their home countries. Both MSID directors were new to their jobs as ORDs. Thus, the varied approaches to the use of the PPG materials were in part a reflection of their differing backgrounds. The SIT ORD and MSID Ghana ORD, having been educated in the U.S., appeared to be most comfortable in using the PPG and *Students' Guide* materials.

The other variable that influenced the use of the PPG materials by the ORDs involved the type of program represented. Culture and language learning concepts were already integrated into the SIT and MSID program models whereas in the Spain program it was not. The SIT and MSID programs include an internship or field experience as well as homestays. The SIT and MSID programs usually have low-level language students. On the SIT program, students learn beginning-to-intermediate French. On the MSID programs, students learn beginning Hindi in India and beginning Twi in Ghana, although English is recognized in both of these countries as an “official language.”

In the MSID programs, a course entitled “Cross-cultural Perspectives on Work, Family” already existed. The focus of the course was more culture-specific than culture-general. Both MSID programs looked at ways to integrate the PPG and the *Students' Guide* materials into their programming with this context in mind. One of the MSID ORDs stated that in choosing the activities, she focused on how well the PPG and *Students' Guide* activities complemented MSID programming. Her goals included having the students develop a greater appreciation for cultural similarities and differences and encouraging reflection on their cultural exchange experience.

SIT programs in general have traditionally had culture and language learning as a goal and have taught culture learning skills as a regular part of the program. The SIT ORD found it fairly easy to integrate the PPG and *Students' Guide* materials into existing course work and on-site programming. Activities and readings were chosen that complemented the existing SIT programming, such as the “drop-off” that SIT is famous for where students are taken to a certain area of a city and need to meet and speak to the natives of the host country and begin thinking of their field study project. They reported that the “D.I.E.” activity from the PPG and *Students' Guide* materials was helpful in this project. It would appear that the PPG materials fit in well with the SIT experiential model.

The Spain program is an “island” program, meaning that there is no field study component and classes are not taken with host country natives. Rather classes are held with U.S. Americans or other foreign students. Most students do live in a homestay, however. All instruction is in Spanish as the students are admitted with an intermediate to advanced level of Spanish-language skills. The PPG materials were an add-on to regular orientation programming

that encouraged students to manage culture shock and to seek opportunities to relate with host nationals and not only with same-country students.

Faculty Director

The Faculty Director led a group of “lower-level” language students on an “island program” in Paris where the students did not live in a homestay. The PPG materials were treated as an add-on to the orientation program. The Faculty Director focused on those language learning strategies that give students ideas about different ways they can meet and build relationships with local people. She hoped that assisting students in getting greater exposure to the TL and culture would help them to improve their language skills, to adjust to a different culture, and to avoid the attitude that “everyone hates Americans.” By doing so, she wanted to assist her students in “breaking out of this very simplistic and defensive way of thinking” (FD, Paris, France).

Research Question (3): Did the program professionals think they were successful in integrating the materials from the PPG into their pre-departure orientation(s)? Why or why not? What challenges did they face?

Study Abroad Advisors

All of the SAAs reported success with the use of the PPG materials for their pre-departure orientations and other programming. One of the SAAs commented that use of the materials generated “animated” discussions among students (SAA, Carleton College). Another said that “I received good feedback from peers and, a few times, also got students to participate. I think that means they were engaged.” (SAA, University of Minnesota). Challenges included time issues, using the PPG with more advanced student populations (e.g., students with prior experiences abroad), and particular uses of the PPG material.

On specific aspects of study abroad programming, one SAA commented on how well the PPG material integrated into existing pre-departure programming involving emails being sent to future study abroad students. The use of the PPG materials improved the content of the peer advisers’ emails.

A different focus on the PPG concerned how well and easily the PPG material framed much of the orientation material the SAA used previously. The framework helped the SAA at the College of St. Catherine to have better-organized activities to achieve her goals.

Another SAA commented on the success she obtained with particular exercises, including the *Learning Styles Survey*. She said that the use of the *Learning Styles Survey* assisted the students in focusing on different teaching styles in other countries and the need for understanding the various modes of learning which are brought into play more in an intercultural context than in one’s home country.

Two main challenges surfaced for all of the SAAs: time and competition for time with other orientation topics. A common complaint amongst SAAs is that there is never enough time

to cover all of the topics that need to be covered in a pre-departure orientation. Certain logistics such as health and safety have priority over other topics. The second main concern was not having enough time for each individual exercise.

Other challenges included using the PPG with a more advanced group of students, preparing the students to use the *Students' Guide* on their own while abroad, and combining culture-specific material with culture-general material. One SAA commented on using the PPG materials with a more experienced group of students:

I still don't think that they [the PPG and Students' Guide] speak effectively to certain segments of the US population: students from elite secondary and post - secondary schools who have traveled a lot and perhaps lived abroad, or for that matter minority kids from inner city schools that have had to work openly on intercultural conflict resolution as part of the school curriculum. How do we speak effectively to students who think they know all about intercultural relations because the world is suddenly "globalized" but have had no real practice of living on their own in another culture?
(SAA, Macalester)

Another SAA commented on the challenge of encouraging the students to use the *Students' Guide* on their own if they are not using it in a specific class. She was concerned that unless there was someone to facilitate the use of the books, the students would not use it. Still another SAA stated that for her the challenge was the teaching of culture-general concepts when the students appeared to be more interested in culture-specific information.

On-site Resident Directors

Given that there were three program types represented in the ORD portion of the study as well as different ORD backgrounds, the approaches to the use of the PPG on-site varied. In all programs the ORDs used the PPG materials throughout the semester/academic year in more than two different orientations, the required number. In addition to culture learning materials the SIT and Spain ORDs used the language learning materials.

The SIT ORD was able to integrate the PPG materials into her orientation easily since they complemented already existing culture and language learning programming. The Spain ORD commented that she used the PPG materials in both large groups and small groups. The use of the materials appears to have been more effective, however, in small groups as the more intimate nature of the small group allowed for more discussion. She commented on the need for the materials to be translated into Spanish as Spanish was the lingua franca of the program. She also commented on the difficulty of using the materials with a group of students with a mixed level of prior intercultural experience. She reported that some students already knew the concepts such as "culture shock" and therefore were not as interested.

There were mixed results reported by the two MSID program directors. The MSID Ghana ORD commented more favorably on the use of the PPG materials than the MSID India ORD. The MSID India ORD repeatedly stated that students found the PPG materials to be redundant, given the materials that were already being used in the program, while the MSID Ghana ORD found that the materials truly assisted her students in adjusting to the Ghanaian culture. The MSID Ghana ORD was successful in integrating the materials into her biweekly

discussions by building the general discussion around the activities from the PPG. Examples of ways the PPG materials were perceived and used by ORDs are given below.

[On the nature of the materials overall] *The materials were very helpful to “operationalize” the theoretical background I already work with and to fill in necessary course work that helps build towards more substantial coursework...the guide should remind us to think just about progression through the experience abroad, and the ways in which students’ culture and language shock can work for and against us at different times depending on students’ adaptation levels. Therefore, program design should remain conscious of these trends. I would qualify my progression as smooth—even smoother than previous years (before using the guide). Previously I set my students off on highly stressful language and cultural interactions with little preparation. MAXSA materials allowed me to concentrate on critical consciousness raising and skill building through concentrated activities that better prepared my students to venture further on their own after smaller steps we took as a group to help them feel ready.* (ORD, SIT Toulouse)

[On the language learning strategies] *During one of the 3 sessions we assign to field learning orientation and CSP [Community Study Project] development, I divided the class in groups of 2-3 to study the [Language] Strategies in sections. Each sub group had 2 goals; 1. trouble shoot for new vocabulary and phrasing in French, 2. To prioritize the strategies in terms of which best suited them. All students appreciated the puzzle like approach to understanding the French document, these are not students who see themselves as readers of French quite yet. When it came to the prioritizing, each group had a different section and the rest of the group followed along as they nominated their choices. This was a great language exercise as I was able to match up differing skill and confidence levels.* (ORD, SIT Toulouse)

[Example of use of the Coping Scenarios activity] *I asked them to also list the coping strategies they themselves had come up with to help them deal with aspects of Ghanaian life that they disliked. As had happened in September, when I opened the floor for discussion, we had an interesting half hour. This time, we had discussion that centered on the concept of boredom. One of the students in particular found himself bored at home in the evenings. With only four television stations and not much of an outdoor nightlife in Ghana, he was bored. He noted that he was especially homesick for Borders Bookstore and the books he could buy there to read at night. That comment of his sparked a discussion about the communitarian versus individualistic understandings of entertainment. I enjoyed this session better than the first one because I was far more prepared for the complexity of the discussion that ensued than I had previously been. I also learned that personal coping strategies could be supplemented with insider knowledge. I provided the student with a list of evening activities going on in various parts of the city that only somebody who had lived in Ghana for a much longer period of time could know. I tied the provision of the list in to the discussion and focused on the importance of orality versus written scripts in both cultures. Much of what goes on in Ghana is best advertised by word of mouth.* (ORD, MSID Ghana)

[Challenge of using the PPG and Students’ Guide] *A major challenge in using the guide with the full academic year group was that the MAXSA material is (for obvious reasons) optional and not a prescribed requirement, and the academic year group chose to regard*

the MAXSA material as redundant to their requirements [Cross-cultural Perspectives on Work course taught in the MSID India program]. (MSID India)

Faculty Director

The Faculty Director of the island program in Paris felt that overall the PPG materials, such as the “personal distance survey,” were helpful “because they gave the students a chance to open up and discuss what worked for them and what did not.” She organized extra meetings of the group to discuss the PPG materials. Although successful, these extra meetings were few and took up more time than expected. The reentry meeting at the end of the semester abroad was especially difficult for students to attend as they were finishing papers and preparing for tests, but did assist the students in preparing themselves mentally for the return home. She recommended that the University of St. Thomas attempt to integrate the materials into the regular “French Culture and Life” course if possible to arrange for more time and appreciation by the students.

The findings revealed that successes and challenges exist for all participants in the study. The findings based on the differences between the SAAs, ORDs, and Faculty Director demonstrate that the role of the Program Professional and program specifics affect the use of the PPG materials and their applicability to programming. Suggested revisions of the materials as described below must be viewed within the program professionals’ particular context.

Research Question (4): What were students' perceptions/reactions to the materials the program professionals used for the orientation activity (or activities)?

Study Abroad Advisors

The SAAs were not required to do a formal evaluation of their pre-departure orientations. Rather, they had been asked to informally inquire about student reactions to the materials. The reactions to the materials by the students were mixed. As in any pre-departure orientation, there were those students who were interested and those who were not. One SAA who had sent email messages to her students throughout the semester using the materials responded that her students “liked the weekly cultural topics” (SAA, Eau Claire).

Returned students who were assisting with an orientation “bought into this concept...raved about them” (SAA, St. Olaf). On the same subject, another SAA stated:

I would really like to take some of these lessons to returnees since I typically find it much easier to engage students in cross-cultural issues and discussions once they have returned from abroad (SAA, St. Thomas)

The point mentioned above may be important for SAAs who invite returnees to assist with orientations. Since they have already experienced culture and language learning abroad, they may be able to discuss the value of the *Maximizing Study Abroad* materials to the outgoing students.

Two SAAs commented on specific reactions to the generalizations/stereotype exercise. The exercise was described as being “too repetitive and not challenging enough” (SAA, Carlson School of Management) and “slow to get started and didn’t have as much interaction as I would have liked” (SAA, University of Minnesota).

Several SAAs specifically mentioned well-received activities and information including the “Exercise in Getting What you Want,” “Discovering Your Cultural Diversity,” and “Things You Should Know” (SAA, University of Minnesota). The same SAA tied the “Discovering Your Cultural Diversity” activity in order to discuss the dynamics of living with each other during the program as well as with the host country natives (i.e., Italians, in this case). She also used this activity to demystify stereotypes of the host country natives by pointing out that similarities exist in a larger cultural group but that differences between individuals exist as well.

The SAA who conducted a language orientation for a small group of students stated that her students found the Language Learning Strategies to be very helpful and that in regular language classes at her institution, strategies are not taught. She then thought it would be helpful to have the second year language classes teach language-learning strategies. The concept of learning language-learning strategies was evidently well-received by these students.

On-site Resident Directors

Student reactions to the PPG materials on-site were mixed. The SIT ORD commented that the majority of students found the PPG activities helpful such as “US Cultural Patterns” and the “DIE model.” One of her students found the terminology of the *Language Strategy Survey* to be “nerdy” as “some of the terminology used overlooks the psychological dimension of becoming that language learner.” The SIT ORD meant that her students were beginning students and were struggling with the reactions of the French to their childlike language ability. Therefore the terminology of the *Language Strategy Survey* seemed too academic and did not address the feelings that these students were experiencing as they struggled with the language. The Spain ORD stated that students expressed that the activities had helped them recognize the process of cultural adjustment that they were experiencing. The MSID India ORD found that although the students admitted the *Students’ Guide* was useful “they felt that the MSID experience was something that the *Students’ Guide* had not catered for, and that the book had not helped particularly as far as guiding them through their own intense experiences in the field-placement/internship sites went.”

Faculty Director

The Faculty Director, outside of a few group activities, allowed the students to use the *Students’ Guide* on their own. She reported, however, that she was told by the majority of students that they did not use it. She did feel that the students’ found the topics raised in the group activities based on the PPG materials to be helpful for discussion.

Research Question (5): Do the program professionals have any suggestions for how we might revise the guidebook (e.g., adding additional activities or information, changing the organization, providing suggested times for activities)?

The findings related to revising the PPG will be reported below in the section entitled “Findings for Revising the PPG.”

Research Question (6): What advice or tips do participants have for other program professionals considering using the PPG?

Study Abroad Advisers

The Study Abroad Advisers stated that there is much to learn in the PPG and use during orientations. Examples of their comments are listed below:

1. *“You don’t have to “create a new orientation”. ...pick one or two activities to start with, and incorporate them in to what you already do” (SAA, University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire).*
2. *“Try not to be overwhelmed by the amount of material. Try to connect in your mind the materials in the PPG and those found in the Students’ Guide. Think about integrating the MAXSA materials into the fabric of your orientation program, rather than separating them out or attaching them at the end of your regular program” (SAA, College of St. Catherine).*
3. *“...they [SAAs] should adapt it to how their programs can best use the materials” (SAA, St. Olaf).*
4. *“Familiarize yourself with the entire Guide before you begin to use it and think of ways to incorporate the material into sessions/meeting that you already organize. Provide students with copies or, at least, handouts from the Student Guide to enhance the use of the PPG.” (SAA, Carleton, College).*
5. *“It pays to take the time to think the activities through and add some country specific info as examples to culture general information” (SAA, University of Minnesota).*

On-Site Resident Directors

The ORDs who responded focused on how the materials fit in with the program goals. Here are some of their comments

1. *“I would integrate a few items at a time and make certain that they jibe with term-long themes and if at all possible, on doing assignments (journals, internships etc.) It is this continuity in program approach that engages students in the deeper levels of language*

and culture learning, and very often they naturally get hooked on it” (ORD, SIT Toulouse).

2. *“Read the whole text before you use any of the activities. Thinking of the activities and sessions as compartments is not very useful. It is better to think of the guide as one giant activity. That way, you would be better able to incorporate various lessons into one activity.” (ORD, MSID Ghana).*

Faculty Director

The Faculty Director also called for integrating the materials into regular programming. She said, “Schedule time for activities and informal discussions of the materials into the program.”

Research Question (7): In what ways, if any, did the readings and/or activities from the PPG provide insights into the participants’ practice as study abroad professionals?

Study Abroad Advisors

The SAAs did find that the readings and activities in the PPG did provide them with insights into their practice as study abroad professionals. Looking more specifically at some of their comments, several SAAs reported that the PPG materials provided them with a new spark for doing things and trying new ways of approaching topics. Second, one SAA commented that the PPG gave her the idea to create a series of three-part (pre-departure, on-site, reentry) one-credit courses with the PPG as a framework for the course. Third, the PPG materials provided another SAA with a comprehensive approach to facilitating orientation that exemplifies the best practices in preparing students for study abroad. Finally, the PPG materials made one SAAs’ implicit knowledge more explicit and allowed a way “in” to discuss some of the topics that can seem very abstract and far-away when students are just preparing to go abroad.

On-site Resident Directors

The ORDs also found that use of the PPG provided them with insights. For example, the PPG materials allowed the France ORD to easily put into practice the theoretical models of intercultural communication and language acquisition. She was much more comfortable with teaching this approach of culture and language learning strategies. The France ORD also remarked that the PPG and *Students’ Guide* materials could be used as a curriculum and that culture and language learning strategies should no longer be considered an add-on, but rather, they should be treated as building blocks for a course. The Spain ORD commented that the PPG materials – specifically the section entitled “Program professional vs. Intercultural facilitator” (p. 65) – gave her “an insight about the difference in role when you try to be an Intercultural Facilitator and give students the space they need to express what they are experiencing, and not just lecture them about what they are going through.” Finally, the Ghana ORD reported that the PPG materials gave her insights as to how the PPG concepts can be easily applied to the

experiences the students are having and facilitated by the ORD. With respect to this issue, she commented:

This month I took a number of field trips with the students and I was amazed at the various occasions we had to draw on various activities in the book to better understand the situation at hand. One example would suffice. On a trip up in the mountains, one student saw children playing a game which she found fascinating. To draw the others' attention to this, she pointed at what she was seeing which invariably meant she pointed at the children, a faux pas in the Ghanaian context. Although the children were too engrossed to notice, I did and used the opportunity to talk about the multiple meanings of hand gestures. I did not really think about the connections between that discussion and the book until the conversation was over. It made me realize that in a sense we, the facilitators, need to be equipped with the information in the book so that we can impart the lessons of the book as and when the situation so demands and not just during specific periods when we work on activities.” (ORD, MSID Ghana)

Faculty Director

The Faculty Director felt that the use of the materials allowed students to “verbalize their feelings.” She felt thought that in order for the materials to be effectively used they must be incorporated into the program in a more structured fashion (FD, Paris, France).

Findings for Revising the PPG

Study Abroad Advisors

In discussing revisions for the PPG, SAAs discussed practice, training, and theory-related aspects of the PPG. The following suggestions were made:

Practice-Related Revisions

1. Add suggested time limits for each activity.
2. Add more activities in the handouts section. "The more the better" appeared to be the response of a number of SAAs.
3. Add the "Toe-to-Toe" icebreaker exercise¹⁵. This is an effective tool to get students thinking about little cultural differences.
4. Change the format of the exercises so that there are a variety of formats represented.
5. Remove the answers to the exercises from the handouts.
6. Include a "Tips for the Learner" sheet similar to the ones included in the *Learning Styles Inventory* and add more explanation about the *Language Strategy Survey* and the *Culture Learning Strategies Inventory and Index* in the PPG.
7. Include a list of suggestions from users of the PPG.
8. Include Speech Act information. Such information could be valuable for students going to other English-speaking countries to demonstrate the cultural and linguistic differences between different Anglophone countries.
9. Include more concise and self-guided activities. Students don't always have long attention spans and if the material is concise, they will read it and work through it.
10. Provide ideas or examples on how to use the section entitled "Defining and Understanding Intercultural Communicative Competence" (p. 47).
11. Provide suggestions on how and when to incorporate the section "Recognizing Students Level of Intercultural Sensitivity" (p. 59) in orientations.
12. Provide more information on how to talk about the surveys in the "Orientations and Workshops" section.

¹⁵ The "Toe-to-Toe" exercise is as follows: Participants usually pair off and stand facing each other with their toes touching. They must stand this way for three minutes while discussing some topic. After the three minutes, they must discuss how it felt to be so close to each other. This is a good exercise for demonstrating proxemics in different cultures.

Training- and Theory-Related Revisions

1. Add examples, suggestions, or tips on how to use the material for learners at different levels (beginning, middle, and advanced culture and language learners).
2. Add orientation examples or theory for ways to assist faculty directors who lead short-term study abroad programs to teach culture and language learning strategies.
3. Add a section which discusses ways to present materials in a faculty development workshop, especially for those who plan to lead short-term programs.
4. Add a section which addresses the preparation for experiential learning, establishing learning plans, journaling, the processing of the experience, and transitioning the reentry into learning at home.
5. Add ideas to intersperse some of the activities with other types of programming rather than doing a series of exercises at one session.
6. Add a larger section on how to connect the PPG to the *Students' Guide*.
7. Include theory and more material on “Speech Acts: Where Language and Culture come Together.”
8. Include ways to present the PPG and students' materials as useful. “We need to get students to buy-in to reflective learning about cross-cultural experiences and pragmatics; [have it] appear as ‘useful info.’” (SAA, Macalester College).
9. Include a short summary on language acquisition theory.
10. Include more facilitation suggestions for teaching the students to use the *Students' Guide* on their own abroad.
11. Add more suggestions on how to link culture-general concepts to culture-specific content. “*It would be great to have more advice on using a culture-specific story or experience to explain culture-general topics*” (SAA, University of Minnesota).
12. Include a more in-depth rationale for both the PPG and the *Students' Guide* on why learning cultural-general topics is important.

On-site Resident Directors

The ORDs also discussed practice, training, and theory-related revisions but with a longterm approach since they work with students for an entire semester.

Practice-related Revisions

1. Suggest that the *Learning Strategies Survey* be used as an assignment in itself. “*The language learning strategies can be assigned as an element of a language course. Students can be made accountable to the Kolb model to reflect and add to their experiences of becoming a language learner*” (ORD, SIT Toulouse).

2. Add a front page FAQ and follow up page references for each section of the PPG to make it more user-friendly.
3. Translate the materials into Spanish.
4. Add a section in the PPG on tips on working with different-sized groups.
5. Within the different activities, add points on how to do the different sections.
6. Clearly separate the theory section in the PPG from the practice section.
7. Add more activities that you can copy and handout from the *Program Professionals' Guide* – especially concerning language learning activities.

Training and Theory-Related Revisions

1. Discuss the Kolb model in the *Students' Guide*. “*Kolb's Learning Cycle¹⁶ is not just for teachers to apply theoretically. It can also be given to students to apply as well. It goes along with and validates the different learning styles in the Learning Styles Survey. And it emphasizes experiential learning as tied to the classroom learning, an especially important part of study abroad*” (ORD, SIT Toulouse).
2. Add information on troubleshooting problems with group-building and group-building theory (ORD, SIT Toulouse).
3. Add theory on how to work with different experience levels of students: “*Specifically, how to draw out students who are earlier on the DMIS in a group who is farther along without alienating them further?*” (ORD SIT Toulouse).
4. Include theory on how the role of the ORD affects the use of the PPG materials versus using other members of the in-country leadership team (such as a host country national) to deliver the materials: “*I asked [an American teaching English in Toulouse] to facilitate the reentry discussion by discussing her past experiences and soliciting student questions and input. As the speaker was not me, (there could be something in the guide about the ways in which certain roles may be best played by other members of the in-country leadership team – after 15 weeks there are often those who no longer respond to my ‘telling them how it is’), she had a disarming, diffusing effect on the group. By asking her questions the group more or less made our way through the salient points of ‘A thoughtful return.’*”(ORD, SIT Toulouse).
5. Add a section with more guidance at the beginning of the PPG on being an intercultural facilitator.
6. “*Add a section or emphasize more points about moving from one culture to another within the host culture and what challenges that presents: i.e., moving from an urban environment to a rural environment. Talk about the loneliness that can occur in such situations*” (ORD, MSID, India).

¹⁶ Kolb's Learning Cycle involves four learning preferences that comprise a cycle: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation.

7. “Add a section talking about the difference in systems in a country – i.e., even though a country is less developed it doesn’t mean that the systems of the country are better or worse, just different” (ORD, MSID, India).
8. “Add or expand a section specifically for those going on developing country programs that students are not going to change the world and should not try to do so” (ORD, MSID, India).

Faculty Director

The Faculty Director had one suggestion for revision: “Make the guidebook for students less wordy and they would be more willing to use it. The *Students’ Guide* is too busy. It would be best to cut down some of the text.”

Summary of the Findings

The program professionals in general found the PPG to be a helpful resource that contributed positively to their orientations and other programming. There were successes and challenges that accompanied the use of the materials.

Study Abroad Advisors

1. The SAAs used the materials from the PPG and the *Students' Guide* to supplement their orientations in a variety of ways. Both culture learning and language learning orientations were held. Some activities fared better in practice than others.
2. The theory behind the *Guides* assisted the SAAs in preparing effective materials for their pre-departure orientations.
3. Two main challenges surfaced for the SAAs: finding time for the individual activities and integrating them into already existing orientations, given that these then competed with other regularly scheduled activities.
4. Another challenge that surfaced was how to use the PPG materials with differing levels of students – those who are more advanced in culture learning and language learning vs. those who are at the beginning level.
5. The three surveys were great tools to use for discussion during orientations.
6. The SAAs suggested practical and theoretical revisions to the PPG ranging from changing specific aspects of individual activities to adding a section on language acquisition theory.
7. The SAAs overall suggested to other program professionals in the field the following: Do not be overwhelmed by the amount of material, try to read the entire PPG before deciding on what activities to use during an orientation, and try to integrate the materials into the fabric of existing orientations as time is always a factor.

On-site Resident Directors

Because of the longer time involved on-site, the ORDs focused on integrating the materials in a holistic manner and on relating the concepts from the PPG to the direct learning experiences of the students.

1. The ORDs felt that the PPG material assisted them in discussing the processes and experiences that the students went through during the study abroad experience.
2. The ORDs took different approaches to integrating the materials in their on-site programming. In the case of the SIT and MSID Ghana programs, the ORDs were successful in integrating the material into their regular programming. The ORD from Spain used the PPG material she felt was advantageous to already existing

programming. The MSID India ORD felt that the PPG material overlapped with already existing MSID coursework.

3. The theory discussed in the PPG was very helpful in planning activities and in delivering a more holistic approach to culture and language learning. Group dynamics, however, are a major focus for the ORDs. More information on using the materials in large or small groups, or less-advanced and more-advanced groups is needed.
4. Students attend programs in a variety of settings, including developing countries. More information discussing study in a developing country, specifically the difference in systems and attitudes towards host country nationals is needed.
5. One of the ORDs felt that the PPG material should be used as the basis for a credited course and treated as a regular part of the programming. In this way, students would not treat the material as “frivolous and “busy work” (ORD, SIT Toulouse).
6. One ORD suggested to think of the PPG materials as one giant activity and not to use them in a compartmentalized fashion.

Faculty Director

The Faculty Director suggested two findings based on her experiences using the PPG materials leading a group of students abroad:

1. Because of the structure of the program, she felt that time to incorporate activities into programming was an issue. She suggested that the materials be integrated into regular programming before the program begins.
2. She reported that the use of the PPG materials allowed students to verbalize their feelings about living abroad.

Limitations

There were several limitations to the PPG Study. First of all, the number of participants in the study was small (13 total). As a result, while the findings may hold true for the broader population of program professionals, the findings cannot be automatically generalized to all Study Abroad Advisors, ORDs and Faculty Directors. Second, each participant’s experiences could have been treated as a separate case study and studied in much more depth than was done in the present study. For example, the ORDs came from different backgrounds. The constraints of the research design (largely based on time and budget) did not allow for an in-depth study demonstrating how the ORDs’ backgrounds affected the way they used the PPG materials. Third, the orientation for the ORDs was not uniform due to logistics. Although the content was the same for each individual, the delivery of the orientation may have affected the outcome. For example, the ORDs who attended an orientation at the NAFSA conference, because of time constraints, were not able to discuss the PPG materials in as much of an in-depth manner as those who attended the orientation in Minnesota. Finally, due to time constraints, no U.S.-based

reentry orientation by the SAAs or the Faculty Director was possible in order to examine the use of the PPG during that segment of the study abroad experience.

Discussion

While the study suggests that the PPG provided the program professionals with new and different ways to teach culture and language learning strategies to their students, a number of questions arose out of the findings. The questions involve the end goals of the use of the PPG materials in daily practice.

Study Abroad Advisors

The SAAs were able to improve the culture and language learning segments of their orientation programming because the PPG offered theory and activities that addressed specific needs. Examples include how the PPG material discussed what the content should be offered during the different stages and how the PPG provided easily accessible activities and information to be given to students in handout fashion. Time and the timing of certain activities were still and always will be an issue for SAAs who need to cover a variety of topics with so little time.

The nature of the study allowed the SAAs to choose information and activities they thought were appropriate to their students' levels and to the type of orientation they were planning. The findings demonstrate that a number of SAAs have difficulty in selecting material that is appropriate for different levels of students. The program professionals requested more guidance to assist them in deciding what material was pertinent to the different levels.

A number of SAAs also inquired as to how to advise their students on using the *Students' Guide* as a self-study guide. This question leads to a larger question concerning the purpose and use of the PPG and the *Students' Guide* materials. The SAAs must question whether they will use the *Maximizing Study Abroad* materials as stand-alone materials and integrate them occasionally or use them in a more holistic manner in preparing students to use the *Students' Guide* while they are abroad either by themselves or in an integrated fashion abroad.

Finally, a number of SAAs commented that while the PPG material was not new to all of the participants, it was packaged in a comprehensive and easily accessible manner that assisted them in creating more effective orientation programming. The new packaging of the material facilitated the culture and language learning orientation process.

On-site Resident Directors

The ORDs viewed the PPG materials as representing a new approach to teaching culture and language learning. For the MSID Ghana and SIT ORDs, the PPG material was integrated into the regular orientation programming and this approach was quite effective in accomplishing the training goals. For the MSID India program, the students complained that the material was too basic and not applicable to their situation in India. There was also a question as to how the

materials related to the regular programming or course work already in existence, that is, whether to start from scratch with the *Maximizing Study Abroad* materials or to attempt to integrate the *Maximizing Study Abroad* materials into already existing programming.

Faculty Director

The Faculty Director worked with students in both a pre-departure capacity as well as on-site. As with the SAAs and the ORDs' comments above, the Faculty Director called for a more integrated approach to using the materials, especially while on-site.

Conclusions

The use of the PPG and *Students' Guide* materials by study abroad program professionals is, in our opinion, an exciting development in the international education field. The program professionals were successful in utilizing the materials to contribute to their orientations or other programming. The PPG and *Students' Guide* materials created and reinforced a new dynamic amongst the program professionals – the redefining of their roles as culture learning and language learning facilitators. This is especially true for the On-site Resident Directors.

The practice of implementing the PPG and *Students' Guide* materials was overall successful. Successes and challenges were noted by the program professionals. Revisions for the PPG were also suggested. In the future, with time and planning, culture and language learning strategies that assist study abroad students in becoming more interculturally competent could become a regular part of the programming for the three stages of the study abroad experience.

Directions for Future Research

The PPG segment of the *Maximizing Study Abroad* Research Project involved a number of Study Abroad Advisors, On-site Directors, and a Faculty Director. These program professionals were asked to use the materials in the PPG and the *Students' Guide* in their pre-departure orientations and on-site programming. The findings from this segment of the overall *Maximizing Study Abroad* research project point to several areas for future research.

Amongst the program professionals, there is agreement of a need to define their role as facilitators in teaching culture and language and to examine the training needed to support that role. Future research may attempt to identify the different models of this role that presently exist in the field, thereby understanding where to go from here. This is especially true for ORDs and Faculty Directors who facilitate culture and language learning while abroad, the time when students' learning can be maximized the most (Bacon, 2002; Laubscher, 1994). Clarification of the roles of program professionals as culture and language learning facilitators may also provide

study abroad offices and higher education institutions with a better idea of what type of training is needed for Study Abroad Advisors, On-site Resident Directors, and Faculty Directors. Currently there is question about the expertise of international education administrators (Mestenhauser, 1998) as well as the status of international education in general (Brown, 2000; Mestenhauser, 1998).

In addition to the role of the program professional, the external variables that affect the use of the PPG and *Students' Guide* materials must be examined. Given that a wide variety of variables affect nonacademic student outcomes (Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004), a closer examination of the variables involved may shed light on how to maximize the use of the PPG and *Students' Guide* materials for different types of programs and different types of study abroad offices. For example, instead of allowing the program professionals to pick and choose activities as they see fit, it may be beneficial to prescribe different training models to be used in different types of programs such as an island program versus a field study program to examine which type of training works best. The same can be true for different types of study abroad offices. Is it possible to prescribe different orientation models to examine which may be more effective or less effective? More research is needed in this area.

A variable that might be crucial to a future study that is alluded to above is the background of the ORD in teaching these materials. Does the training of the ORD affect the manner in which the materials are used on-site? Is there a different approach used by native ORDs versus U.S. American ORDs? Does the cultural perspective of a native ORD differ from that of a U.S.-born ORD and therefore have an effect on outcomes? For example, the MSID Ghana ORD, who was native to Ghana and had been educated in the United States, appeared to use the PPG materials more effectively than the MSID India ORD who was native to India but educated elsewhere. The pedagogical slant of the *Maximizing Study Abroad* materials may reflect a more U.S.-American approach to teaching which emphasizes discussion and engaging activities versus the pedagogy of other countries which may not be as interactive. This difference in approach by the ORDs could affect the use of the PPG as well as the delivery of the training.

Finally, it would be beneficial to examine the effect of prescribing a completely integrated approach to teaching culture and language learning strategies that would follow through from pre-departure to the reentry stage. As Engle and Engle (2004) suggest, training programs throughout the three stages of study abroad should build on each other rather than conflict or overlap with each other. Examining the effect of establishing an integrated system would allow the international education field in general to create a more holistic approach to this training that encompasses all of the stages of the experience that would align with Mestenhauser's (1998) vision of an intermediate stage of internationalization development in the education abroad field.



LANGUAGE INSTRUCTORS' GUIDE STUDY

Aims of the Study and Research Questions

Foreign language instruction is a key vehicle through which students can gain the necessary skills, attitudes, and behaviors that enable them to understand and effectively interact with culturally diverse others whether at home or abroad. One can argue that at no time in recent history are these abilities as important as they are today. Towards this goal, foreign language instructors play an important role in transmitting to students the relevant knowledge that is needed to know how to learn another language, use another language, and function effectively in another culture whether they plan to study abroad or not. For students to learn as much as possible from the instructor about language and culture in the classroom and beyond, it is also beneficial that the language instructors themselves understand not only the content of the languages that they teach (e.g., grammatical structures), but also that they possess meta-level knowledge of the cultural context and processes of teaching culture-embedded languages to students. There is a myriad of tools and techniques available for use by foreign language instructors to attain these competencies, yet a strategies-based curriculum can be a particularly effective means through which to encourage and enrich language and culture learning by students and language instructors alike. The *Maximizing study abroad: A language instructors' guide to strategies for language and culture learning and use* (*Language instructors' guide* or LIG, for short) was developed for the purpose of providing instructors tools with which to promote learning of language and culture, both in terms of preparation for students and for themselves. Furthermore, as few materials exist for the language instructor that integrate language and culture learning through strategies-based instruction, the LIG is distinctive.

Research questions

To determine the relevance and applicability of the LIG to language instructor practices related to study abroad and associated contexts, research on the LIG was conducted during the 2003-2004 academic year with four post-secondary-level language instructors. The overall aim of the study was to determine the impact of use of the LIG on each instructor's teaching with regard to the integration of intercultural and linguistic content in the classroom. To elicit this information, nine research questions were utilized. They were:

1. What elements of the *Language Instructors' Guide* did the instructors use in their language teaching? Why did they choose to include those specific materials?
2. What were the successes instructors had incorporating materials from the *Language Instructors' Guide* into their curricula?
3. Did the instructors encounter any challenges in integrating the *Language Instructors' Guide* materials into their curricula?

4. Of the materials from the *Language Instructors' Guide* that the instructors chose to include, which would they use again? Would they modify those materials in any way?
5. What effect did language instructor use of the *Language Instructors' Guide* elements in class have on the instructors' students?
6. Did the instructors' students indicate in any way that they were considering participating in study abroad? If so, did the use of the *Language Instructors' Guide* play a role in their decision to consider studying abroad? How?
7. What insights, if any, did the readings and supporting materials from the *Language Instructors' Guide* provide the instructors regarding their work as a language instructor?
8. Do the instructors have any suggestions for improving the *Language Instructors' Guide*?

Research Design

Participants

Research on the LIG utilized a case study design wherein four language instructors served as the participants. Instructors of French and Spanish in three Midwest post-secondary institutions were invited to participate in the study. Two of the study participants, one French instructor and one Spanish instructor, taught at a small private liberal arts college (total enrollment ~3,000) in the Midwestern region of the United States. The other two study participants both teach Spanish in a large public university (total main campus enrollment ~51,000) also located in the U.S. Midwest. Both institutions were on the semester system. Each participant received \$1,000 in monetary compensation for participation in the study, and a one-time payment to each instructor was made when all data had been collected. Table 65 provides a demographic summary of each participant. It can be seen from the table that the study participants included three native English speakers and one native Spanish speaker. The instructors' collective teaching experience ranged from 7 to 36 years with a mean of 19 years. Two of the instructors were teaching specialists and two were professors (Associate and Full, respectively). The courses that they chose for inclusion of the LIG were all at the third-semester level or higher. Instructors were given no direction as to the level of language course in which they should use the LIG; they made this decision themselves. Detailed profiles of each participant follow the table.

Table 65: Language Instructor Profiles

Instructor name and title	Native language of instructor	Levels taught	Institution	Course(s) taught as part of study	Number of years as TL instructor
Elizabeth, Teaching Specialist	English	Beginner, intermediate, advanced	large public university in Midwest	Spanish 1003: Intermediate Spanish I	7
Gillian, Associate Professor	English	Beginner, intermediate, advanced	small private liberal arts college in Midwest	Spanish 231: Intermediate Spanish 1	23
Magda, Teaching Specialist	Spanish	Beginner, intermediate, advanced	large public university in Midwest	Spanish 3044: Spanish for Health Care Professionals	10
Wanda, Professor	English	Beginner, intermediate, advanced	small private liberal arts college in Midwest	French 232: Intermediate French 2	36

A short description of the four instructors who participated in the study is provided below. Note that the participants have been given pseudonyms.

Elizabeth

Elizabeth was a Teaching Specialist in Spanish at a large public university in the Midwestern United States. This university has a relatively low rate of students who study abroad; in 2004, that percentage was 5%. She was a native of the United States and English was her first language. When the study began, she had had two years of experience teaching French and seven years of experience teaching Spanish. In her position at the time of the study, she had had the opportunity to teach all of the first four semesters of Spanish language courses. Elizabeth chose to use the LIG in two sections of Spanish 1003 (i.e., Intermediate Spanish I) for the study, a course which emphasized building communicative skills.

Gillian

Gillian was an Associate Professor of Spanish at a small private liberal arts college in the U.S. Midwest. She was a native English speaker from the United States and had taught beginner, intermediate, and advanced levels of Spanish culture and civilization, oral and written communication, and literature for 23 years at the time of the study. Foreign language departments at her institution emphasized a content-based approach to language instruction beginning with second year courses. In addition, language instructors at her university had been using a strategies-based approach for several years. The context in which she was teaching was one in which over 60% of the student body took part in study abroad programming in one form

or another and, as such, study abroad was a persuasive theme in the planning and execution of foreign language curricula at her institution.

The course that Gillian chose for inclusion in the LIG study was Spanish 231 (i.e., Intermediate Spanish I). This course is a content-based course that concentrated on the geographic and human diversity of the Spanish-speaking world through six themes: Intercultural Perceptions in The U.S. and the Spanish-speaking World, Geography and Development in the Spanish-speaking World, Environmental Challenges and Solutions in the Spanish-speaking world, Population and Demographic Changes in the Spanish-speaking World, Ethnic Diversity in the Spanish-speaking World, and Families in the Spanish-speaking World.

Magda

Magda was a Teaching Specialist at the same large public university in the U.S. Midwest as Elizabeth. She was a native Spanish speaker from Argentina. Her foreign language teaching experience included teaching beginner, intermediate, and advanced levels of Spanish to undergraduate and graduate students for ten years, as well as five years teaching beginner-level English as a Second Language (ESL) to adult learners in the U.S.

As part of the study, Magda incorporated use of the LIG into two sections of Spanish 3044 (i.e., Spanish for Health Care Professionals). This course, which was the second of two courses available to students in Medical Spanish at her institution, focused on students' communicative skills in Spanish through medical-related content that utilized the Spanish-speaking cultural context of the urban area in which the course took place. The goal of the course was to provide current and future health care professionals interested in the health professions the opportunity to improve their linguistic and cultural skills at an advanced level of communication in Spanish, through medical-related content.

Wanda

Wanda was a Professor of French at the same small private liberal arts college in the U.S. Midwest as Gillian. She was a native English speaker and has over 36 years of experience teaching all levels of French. As previously mentioned (see the instructor profile for Gillian), the foreign language programs at this institution emphasized a content-based curriculum in their courses, especially at the intermediate and higher levels. Wanda considered these mid- to high-level courses to more closely resemble sociological or anthropological courses except that they were taught using the target foreign language as the medium of instruction.

French 232 (i.e., Intermediate French 2) was the course chosen for inclusion in the LIG research study. It was a content-based course that focused on cultural identity in the Francophone world. Course themes were: The French-speaking World, Introduction to Cultural Identity, Ethnic or National Identities, Linguistic and Cultural Identity, and Class Identity.

What Instructors Were Asked to Do

To determine the impact of use of the LIG materials on students who may, or may not, study abroad as well as their bearing on language instructors' own practice, study participants

took part in the research study in two phases. Phase one, the pilot stage, took place in fall 2003 during which time participants prepared for phase two, data collection, in spring 2004.

In phase one, participants were asked to attend an orientation session to learn more about the research study, the LIG, and strategies-based instruction. An added benefit of the orientation meeting was the opportunity to bring the participants together to meet each other as well as to become acquainted with the members of the research team. The remainder of the fall semester was spent reviewing the materials from the LIG and developing a curriculum plan for one of their courses for use in the following semester.

During the second phase, data collection, participants were asked to first submit a curriculum plan that outlined how they proposed to integrate the strategies-based approach of the LIG into the curriculum of at least one of their language courses during spring 2004. Along with the curriculum plan, the instructors were asked to submit the syllabi for their chosen course(s) and samples of materials they ultimately used or adapted for use from the LIG in their chosen course(s). Additionally, they were asked to complete the following data collection instruments: (1) monthly feedback reports on their use of the LIG based on a semi-structured question format, (2) two focus group interviews, (3) an exit questionnaire, to provide the research team with feedback on their participation in the study, and (4) an exit interview. See Table 66 for the timeline for participation requirements.

Table 66: *Language Instructors' Guide Study Requirements Timeline*

Fall 2003: Pilot Phase	Participation in an orientation to the research study and <i>Language Instructors' Guide</i> materials
	Development of language curriculum incorporating the <i>Language Instructors' Guide</i> materials in preparation for use in spring 2004
Spring 2004: Data Collection Phase	By end January: Submission of curriculum plan and syllabi
	Throughout semester: Completion of monthly reports
	Throughout semester: Submission of supporting and/or adapted materials used in curriculum from the <i>Language Instructors' Guide</i>
	Midpoint and end of semester: Participation in two focus group interviews
	End of semester: Completion of <i>Exit Questionnaire for Language Instructors</i>
	End of semester: Completion of an individual exit interview

Instrumentation

There were three primary instruments used in the study. They were the *Language Instructors' Guide Monthly Questions for Language Instructor Study Participants* (Emert & Demmessie, 2004), Focus Group and Individual Exit Interviews, and an Exit Questionnaire for Language Instructors (Emert & Demmessie, 2004). Each instrument is described below.

Language Instructors' Guide Monthly Questions for Language Instructor Study Participants

To gather information on how participants used the LIG throughout the semester in spring 2004, each instructor completed a monthly report questionnaire, the *Language Instructors' Guide Monthly Questions for Language Instructor Study Participants* (Emert & Demmessie, 2004), that consisted of nine semi-structured questions. Language instructors responded to the following questions each month:

- What elements of the *Language Instructors' Guide* did you use in your language teaching? Why did you choose to include those specific materials? Please provide specific examples.
- Please describe your experience incorporating those specific materials into your curriculum, highlighting what was successful.
- Did you encounter any challenges in integrating the *Language Instructors' Guide* materials into your curriculum? If so, please describe those challenges.
- Of the materials from the *Language Instructors' Guide* you chose to include, which would you use again? Would you modify them in any way? Please elaborate.
- Please comment on the effect that your use of the *Language Instructors' Guide* elements in class had on your students.
- Have your students indicated in any way that they are considering study abroad? If so, has the use of the *Language Instructors' Guide* played a role in their decision to consider studying abroad? How?
- What insights, if any, have the readings and supporting materials from the *Language Instructors' Guide* provided you regarding your work as a language instructor? Please explain.
- Do you have any suggestions for improving the *Language Instructors' Guide* in general? Please explain.
- Do you have suggestions for improving the *Language Instructors' Guide* so that it could better meet the needs of language learners? Please explain.
- Is there anything else you would like to add?

There were two additional questions for the first month called “Pre-course Questions.” These questions were: “For which course will you incorporate the LIG elements into your curriculum?” and “What components of the LIG are you planning to incorporate into your curriculum plan/syllabus? Please be specific.” (see Appendix L).

Interviews

Two types of interviews were used in the study to gather data: focus group interviews and individual exit interviews. The focus group interviews used the monthly report questionnaire as a template yet were otherwise unstructured so that the participants were able to deviate from the questionnaire as they saw fit. If the information provided veered too far off topic, the participants were redirected using questions from the monthly report questionnaire as

prompts. The individual exit interviews were semi-structured. Participants were first asked if they had general comments about the LIG and about their participation in the study, otherwise the questions contained in the *Exit Questionnaire for Language Instructors* (see next section) were used as follow-up questions. As with the focus group interviews, participants could discuss whatever they felt was relevant to the study during the individual exit interview.

Exit Questionnaire for Language Instructors

The *Exit Questionnaire for Language Instructors* (Emert & Demmessie, 2004) queried participants about their experience with the LIG in two sections. Section one asked for information on the instructors' contact information and details about their language teaching experience (i.e., languages taught, number of years taught for each, and levels taught for each). Section two consisted of open-ended questions pertaining to each participant's (1) general impressions of the LIG, (2) indications from students of ways in which the LIG aided in their language and culture learning as well as in their desire to study abroad, (3) choice and reasoning behind the materials that she selected and/or adapted for use in her course(s), (4) efforts to integrate materials from the LIG into her language curricula, (5) opinion regarding the impact of use of the materials on her teaching practice, (6) suggestions for revisions to the LIG, (7) sense about whether or not she intended to use the LIG in future courses (see Appendix M for the complete questionnaire).

Data Collection Procedures

Phase One: Orientation and Materials Preparation

The first step for all participants was to attend an orientation session conducted by members of the research team in September 2003. During the four hour session, participants were provided in-depth information on the LIG, introduced to strategies-based instruction as well as to its relevance and scope of use in the study, and given information on requirements for participation in the research. Each participant was given a copy of the *Maximizing Study Abroad: A Language Instructors' Guide to Strategies for Language and Culture Learning and Use* materials as well as a copy of the *Students' Guide*. Participants were also offered the option of using the *Students' Guide* with their students; one instructor, Emilce, did use the *Students' Guide* with her students. After the provision of in-depth information about the study and the materials, each language instructor gave permission to the research team to report results from her research by signing a consent form.

During the orientation the language instructors were also introduced to members of the research team and to their primary contact for the data collection phase of the study, Margaret, an individual who served as an outside consultant on the project. Margaret had previously piloted the LIG during its initial development and, at the time of the study, was a Spanish instructor at the same large public institution from which two of the study participants originated. She served as a ready resource for study participants when they had questions on how to integrate the materials into their curriculum, due to her previous experience using the materials in her own study-abroad oriented Spanish language classroom. In addition, Holly Emert, a research assistant on the *Maximizing Study Abroad* project with over ten years of experience in foreign language teaching, served as a secondary contact for the participants during the study.

After the orientation session, participants were given the remainder of fall 2003 to choose one or more foreign language courses into which they would integrate the LIG materials and to develop a curriculum plan outlining how they planned to use the LIG in the course throughout the spring 2004 semester. The only materials in the LIG that all instructors were required to use were the *Learning Style Survey*, *Language Strategy Survey*, and the *Culture-Learning Strategies*

Inventory. Other than the requirement to incorporate the language and culture strategies surveys into their French or Spanish curriculum, language instructors were allowed to choose the exact materials that they would use in their course(s). Their use of the LIG was not prescribed for them for several reasons. First, a primary goal of the study was to determine how language instructors would use the LIG on their own, with little explicit direction from the research team. Second, because there was a wide variety of course content, teaching processes, and contexts for use of the LIG, allowing language instructors to use the LIG as they determine appropriate would help determine the ways in which the LIG could best be used by instructors in the future. Each participant submitted their curriculum plan and course syllabus either electronically or in hard-copy format by the end of January 2004.

Phase Two: Data Collection

Each language instructor completed monthly report questionnaires, submitted support materials used from the LIG, took part in focus group interviews, completed an exit questionnaire, and took part in an individual exit interview to fulfill the requirements for participation in the study.

Language Instructors' Guide Monthly Questions for Language Instructor Study Participants

The monthly report questionnaire was sent to participants electronically at the end of January 2004. Each individual had the choice to complete and submit the document electronically or in hard copy format. Email reminders were sent to all participants to alert them about impending report submission deadlines. Two of the Spanish instructors always turned in their monthly reports in a timely fashion, that is, at the end of February, March, and April/May, 2004. The other two instructors did not always submit their monthly reports on time. When instructors missed a deadline, they were reminded via email to submit their reports. One of the Spanish instructors at the large public institution submitted her final monthly report in June 2004, approximately one week after submitting both her second monthly report and her final exit questionnaire. The French instructor at the small liberal arts college did not submit her reports until September 2004, four months after the spring 2004 semester had ended. In addition to the questionnaires, participants were asked to submit materials that they had used and/or adapted from the LIG with each monthly report. These materials were submitted electronically when possible or otherwise submitted in hard copy format.

Focus group interviews

Focus group interviews took place at the mid-point and end of the study. Each interview was conducted in person by Holly Emert and/or Margaret, the consultant on the study. Each interview was tape-recorded with participant permission and later transcribed. The mid-semester focus group interviews took place in March and April 2004. Each interview lasted approximately one hour. Due to the physical distance between each institution, it was difficult for all four language instructors to attend the focus groups interviews at one time, therefore each interview took place at each respective institution and was attended by the two instructors of each institution. The final focus group interview took place in August 2004, approximately three

months after the end of the data collection period. All three Spanish instructors attended the final focus group interview, however, at the time of the interview the French instructor was out of the country and therefore she was unavailable for the meeting. Due to a technical mishap with the final focus group tape, only one half of the final focus group interview could be transcribed and thus made available for use in the study.

Individual exit interviews

Final interviews with each instructor took part after they had submitted all required documentation as part of the study. Interviews took place in-person between one member of the research team (i.e., either Holly or Margaret) and each individual participant. Each interview lasted approximately one hour. Interviews with the three Spanish instructors occurred in June 2004. The French instructor was unable to take part in an interview until September 2004 due to being out of the country in the summer of 2004. As with the focus group interviews, each session was tape-recorded with permission from each language instructor and later transcribed. Due to technical problems with the tapes for the instructors at the liberal arts college, only the first half of the Spanish instructor's interview could be transcribed and only three quarters of the French instructor's tape could be transcribed.

Exit Questionnaire for Language Instructors

Language instructors were sent an electronic mail version of the *Exit Questionnaire for Language Instructors* (Emert & Demmessie, 2004) in early May 2004. Participants submitted their completed questionnaire after they had submitted other required materials as part of the study but prior to the final exit interview. All three Spanish instructors submitted their questionnaire electronically in May 2004; the French instructor submitted her questionnaire in hard copy format in September 2004.

Data Analysis Procedures

Data collected as part of this case study were primarily qualitative in nature. Analysis procedures included first grouping each set of data by instrument and then by chronology. So, for example, monthly reports from all four instructors were gathered and then separated by month 1, 2, and 3, prior to analysis. Holly Emert categorized results by hand based on the thematic relevance to each research question. Results from the monthly questionnaires, submitted materials, focus group interviews, individual exit interviews, and exit questionnaires were listed in the Summary of Findings section.

Findings

In this study, the primary goal was to determine the impact that the use of the LIG had on teacher efforts to improve student understanding and utilization of language and culture learning strategies. Ascertaining the relevance, applicability, and means of use of the LIG in language instruction was also paramount. In this section, the research findings based on the monthly questionnaires, the results of focus group interviews, individual exit interviews, and exit questionnaires are provided. Applicability of these findings to the overall research questions are examined in the discussion section. Although instructors were asked to complete all of the questions each month, at times some instructors did not do so and did not indicate why not. There was no follow up to determine the reason for such omissions. Thus, findings will report exclusively on the data provided, not the omissions.

Instructors' Responses to *Language Instructors' Guide* Monthly Questions

Pre-course questions: *“For which course will you incorporate the LIG elements into your curriculum?” and “What components of the LIG are you planning to incorporate into your curriculum plan/syllabus?”*

In the following sections, results are provided for each instructor alphabetically by pseudonym.

Elizabeth

Elizabeth included several types of content from the LIG in her course syllabi for two sections of Spanish 1003 (Intermediate Spanish I). Materials that she planned to use with her students prior to the beginning of the semester included:

- *Learning Style Survey* (ACT-5, DM-1-8¹⁷) (week 1, day 3),
- “Iceberg Analogy” (ACT-61, DM-61-68) (week 2, day 9),
- “Describe-Interpret-Evaluate (D.I.E.) Model” (ACT-63, DM-37) (week 2, day 9)
- *Language Strategy Survey* (ACT-7, DM-9-14b), week 8, day 38.

Elizabeth stated that she decided to delay the use of the *Language Strategy Survey* until later in the semester for two reasons. First, she was not sure how she could fit the survey into the already full curriculum that needed to be covered between the beginning of the semester and the first test. Second, she did not want to add so much new content that she would get behind in her teaching sequence compared to other Spanish 1003 instructors. For example, including the

¹⁷ These codes refer to the pages in the *Language Instructors' Guide* where these surveys and activities can be found.

Iceberg Analogy and the D.I.E. model during the second week of class had already added two days to her schedule and she was concerned about adding more content early on in the semester. This being said, she planned to incorporate the *Language Strategy Survey* earlier in the schedule next time irregardless of time pressures because “if in fact it is helpful to them, it would be better for them to have it at the beginning of the semester rather than later.” Although no other content from the LIG, other than that cited, was detailed in the syllabi, Elizabeth planned to incorporate activities from the LIG throughout the semester to help students in their culture-general learning.

Gillian

For her chosen course, Spanish 231 (Intermediate Spanish I), Gillian did not explicitly list any activities or content from the LIG in her syllabus. As part of her planned curriculum, however, she submitted to the research team the following list of materials and content from the LIG that she planned to include in her course during the spring 2004 semester:

- *Learning Style Survey* (ACT-5, DM-1-8),
- *Language Strategy Survey* (ACT-7, DM-9-14b),
- *Culture-Learning Strategies Inventory* (DM-15-19),
- “The Good Language Learner” (ACT-9, DM-21),
- “Reading Strategy Training” (ACT-19),
- “Listening Strategy Training” (ACT-23),
- “Exploring U.S. Culture” (ACT-33, DM-35),
- “Differentiating Between Stereotypes and Generalizations” (ACT-43, DM-39), and
- “Speech Acts” (ACT-71, DM-71-73).

She planned to modify the speech act materials to “focus on real academic speech acts in the third-semester Spanish classroom, not on culturally appropriate apologies,” (e.g., initiating class discussions, encouraging others to participate, and bringing tasks to a close with a focus on effective student-student interaction). She also stated that she would incorporate other materials or content as she deemed necessary throughout the semester.

Magda

Magda used the LIG in two sections of Span 3044 (Spanish for Health Care Professionals). She incorporated numerous materials from the LIG into her course syllabi. The noted materials were from the LIG and the *Students’ Guide* were the following:

- *Language Strategy Survey* (ACT-7, DM-9-14b) (week 1, day 1),
- *Culture-Learning Strategies Inventory* (DM-15-19) (week 1, day 1),
- *Learning Style Survey* (ACT-5, DM-1-8) (week 1, day 1)
- “You as a Culturally Diverse Person” (*Students’ Guide* reading pp. 39-41) (week 2, day 3)

- “Becoming Familiar with Culture: The Iceberg Analogy” (*Students’ Guide* reading pp. 42-47) (week 4, day 7),
- “Culture-specific and Culture-general Learning” (*Students’ Guide* reading pp. 48-53) (week 6, day 11),
- “Responding to Stereotypes About You” (*Students’ Guide* reading pp. 56-57) (week 8, day 15)
- “Understanding the Ways Cultures Differ in Values” (*Students’ Guide* reading pp. 59-68) (week 10, day 19)
- “Understanding Yourself as a Member of a Culture or Cultures” (*Students’ Guide* reading pp. 69-73) (week 12, day 19)
- “Strategies for Making Cultural Inferences” (*Students’ Guide* reading pp. 107-113) (week 14, day 27), and
- “Strategies for Developing Intercultural Competence” (*Students’ Guide* reading pp. 101-105) (week 15, day 29).

Unlike the other participants in the study, Magda gave each student a copy of the *Students’ Guide* for use in the course.

These materials and their sequence were chosen based on how they would aid student comprehension of other course readings and CD-ROM video components. In addition, Magda hoped the sequencing would “help students understand culture issues, keep them thinking critically and able and open to reflecting on discussed items. Hopefully these exercises will provide them with some tools that they will be able to apply in potential situations in the[ir] health care related future careers.”

Wanda

Wanda used the LIG in French 232 (Intermediate French II), which is a content-based course focused on the exploration of cultural identity in the Francophone world. In preparation for her inclusion of the LIG in her course, Wanda planned to incorporate materials on strategies, speech acts, and especially content related to stereotypes with her students. She did not explicitly list activities or content from the LIG in her course syllabus.

Wanda stated from the outset of the study that she did not feel that the LIG was a good fit with her curriculum. She felt this to be true because the LIG was not content-focused and also because the topic of her course – cultural identity – was complex and abstract. She warned that, despite the seemingly good fit of the LIG to the topic of cultural identity, she felt that the LIG materials were too concrete whereas her course was more abstract. She also felt that the breadth of her course, in terms of number of countries and cultures covered, added further complexity which made it challenging to incorporate content from the LIG into her curriculum.

Although she did not feel that the LIG was a perfect fit for French 232, she commented that it would be a much better fit for the French 231 (i.e., Intermediate French I), due to the nature of the course. French 231 was designed as a “cross-cultural comparison of the U.S. and

France in terms of 4 topics: the family and child-rearing practices, images of the Other and stereotypes, schooling and the education system, and finally immigration, which she implied would mesh better with the goals and objectives of the LIG.

Instructors' Responses to Monthly Questions for Month 1 (February)

Month 1 (February): Question 1: What elements of the Instructors' Guide did you use this month in your language teaching? Why did you choose to include those specific materials? Please provide specific examples.

Elizabeth

Elizabeth wanted to provide students with a framework for culture learning throughout the semester and it was with this objective in mind that she assigned the *Learning Style Survey*, the "Iceberg Analogy," and the "Describe-Interpret-Evaluate (D.I.E.) Model" from the LIG in the first two weeks of the semester. She assigned the *Learning Style Survey* as homework for the fourth class period and used it as a point of discussion during the next class period. A reading on the Iceberg Analogy was assigned for the ninth class period. For that class, she covered both the Iceberg Analogy and the D.I.E. model with students.

In the first month, Elizabeth also used the vocabulary learning activity "How Do You Learn Vocabulary" (ACT-13-15/DM 25-30) to demonstrate that by using strategies learners could increase the number of new words they would be able to learn. The activity also helped to reinforce the students' prior knowledge about "being aware of and expanding" their learning styles.

Gillian

Surveys from the LIG were the first materials that Gillian incorporated into her curriculum. Based on her own teaching style and also feedback from Margaret, Gillian decided to distribute the surveys separately so as to not overload her students. She planned to incorporate the three surveys into her coursework, the *Learning Style Survey*, the *Language Strategy Survey*, and the *Culture Strategies Survey*. The first two surveys were used in whole or in part, but the last survey was not used as planned during the first month of class.

The first survey she used, the *Learning Style Survey*, was assigned to students as homework on the first day of class. Despite her intention to review the results during the next class, she was unable to do so due to the extra time taken by her scheduled language laboratory orientation session. She planned to follow-up with the survey during the following month.

The second survey that she used, the *Language Strategy Survey*, was divided into sections to target discussion. This survey was assigned as homework on day one. She made separate color-coded handouts in three sections for ease of student use; they were organized by Listening Strategy Use, Reading Strategy Use coupled with Vocabulary Strategy Use, and Speaking Strategy Use. She used the Listening Strategy Use portion of the survey as an introduction to the language laboratory orientation on day two of class. She used the Reading

Strategy Use survey alongside her adapted version of ACT 19-21, “Reading Strategy Training” (see Appendix N), as an introduction to reading strategies. These reading strategies materials were assigned as homework for day five of the course. Although she liked the examples given in the original version of ACT-19-21, she chose to adapt it to be more relevant for the content of her course. Her adaptation consisted of exchanging descriptions of the products described in the original version for extracts from authentic readings and then translating the entire document into Spanish. She described that as part of the debriefing of this activity with her students, she had the best discussion (in English) that she had ever had with third-semester-level students. She was not sure if this could be attributed to the activity from the LIG or to the level of the class – she felt it was probably the latter – but she found that the students were able to articulate very well the factors that go into the readability of a text conceptually and practically.

Gillian planned to wait until mid-semester or later to use both the Speaking Strategy Use portion of the survey as well as the *Culture Strategies Survey*. Based on consultation with Wanda (her fellow institutional colleague), she considered reassigning these same surveys at the end of the semester as a means for students to determine if they had made any changes in their use of strategies. Another technique she planned to use was having mini-conferences with each student after the first exam to talk with them not only about their test results but also as an opportunity to talk with them individually about their language and culture survey results. She felt this latter approach might work better than trying to systematically incorporate the surveys into regular class sessions. She considered asking students to complete the “Strategies of Good Language Learners” handout (DM-21) as a self-evaluation prior to her meeting with each of them.

With regard to other activities that Gillian used during the first month, she concentrated her use of LIG activities on listening and reading skills in Spanish, as well as examining U.S. culture. As part of her work on listening strategies using news clips as the chosen realia, Gillian adapted for use ACT-23, “Listening Strategy Training.” She did not feel that this activity, especially the directions, was as helpful for her as it could have been since she had used this sort of strategy training for years. She stated that the activity was “a watered-down version of what I’ve been doing routinely.”

A second activity in which Gillian incorporated materials from the LIG was ACT-33/DM-35, “Exploring U.S. Culture.” Rather than use the version of DM-35 provided in the manual, she adapted this activity, eliminating items such as “Route 66” that seemed irrelevant and translating the entire document into Spanish. She also added a category asking students to write down a reason why they had chosen to include topics, as a way to get them talking in class (see Appendix O).

Magda

During the first month of the study, Magda used the *Learning Style Survey*, *Language Strategy Survey*, and *Culture-Learning Strategies Inventory* as a means to collect information from her students, to guide her in creating materials, and also to aid her in assigning work groups for other class activities. In addition, she also felt that the information from these surveys would help students understand how they learn.

Despite her intentions and plans to use all three surveys on the first day, constraints arising from multiple priorities (i.e., lack of time, multiple assignments) prevented Magda from accomplishing her objective. As a result, she decided to assign only the *Learning Style Survey* for the first week of class, as she hoped to gain information on the types of learners she had in her class. The other two inventories were rescheduled for the first two months of the semester. With regard to the *Language Strategy Survey*, she felt that this survey would be useful in challenging students to examine how they learn language. In addition, the *Culture-Learning Strategies Inventory* would “provide the opportunity [for students] to be exposed to learning culture; this will motivate students to value their own culture as well as learning and appreciating the target one.”

A primary goal for Magda in the use of materials from the LIG was the need to help students understand themselves as cultural beings first, before examining culture-specific aspects of healthcare for Spanish-speaking populations. She selected the activity “You as a Culturally Diverse Person” for just this reason:

I have selected this activity to provide an opportunity to [tackle] the hard task of having to define oneself culturally first to then having to define the population students as future health care providers might have to. There are many denominations used to refer to patients who are immigrants from Spanish speaking countries. It is necessary to have a clear picture of how difficult it is to define oneself culturally first before defining or referring about patients whose primary language is first Spanish. [This activity] lets students have a first hand experience in defining a human being as a cultural being.

The second activity used by Magda from the LIG was “Becoming Familiar with Culture,” which included the Iceberg Analogy. She adapted the activity by first showing her students a video of a Spanish-speaking patient describing miscommunications that had occurred between himself and a health care provider. The LIG activity, which examines visible and invisible aspects of culture as a framework for understanding culture, was used by Magda to help students scrutinize the content of the video both in terms of verbal and non-verbal cues.

Wanda

The language, culture, and learning styles surveys were the first materials that Wanda used with her students. No other feedback was provided by Wanda for the first month of the study.

Month 1 (February): Question 2: Please describe your experience incorporating those specific materials into your curriculum, highlighting what was successful.

Elizabeth

Elizabeth reported that her students responded well to the materials that she chose for inclusion in her courses during the first month. For example, she commented, “I can see my students taking time to think about the materials, and making pertinent and thoughtful remarks in class.” Use of the *Learning Style Survey* was particularly successful. She piloted its use in three of her classes in fall 2004 and, despite the unfamiliarity she felt with the materials at that time,

the introduction of learning styles and their impact on learning “changed the tenor of the classroom.” She learned from her pilot use of the Learning Styles Survey that she needed to dedicate a significant amount of time – such as an entire 50 minute class period – to exploring learning styles, since students were enthusiastic about discussing how they learned best. In fact, the amount of input that students provided about learning styles led Elizabeth to become frustrated at times, thinking about how all of their input might impact her course sequencing.

Elizabeth’s use of the survey in two of her three classes during the study produced noticeable differences in her students. Her relationships with the students in her classes were different from her relationships with the students with whom she did not discuss learning styles, and she did not believe that these differences were due to coincidence. She reported that the students who were not exposed to learning styles were:

...much more hesitant to open discussions with one another; they also seem in general more passive and somewhat disenchanted (or perhaps cynical) with forced language learning. Had I not seen the positive results in my classes’ attitudes using the survey last semester [when she piloted the materials], I would indeed put the differences in my classes’ attitudes down to coincidence, but I saw the same improved attitude last semester in all three of my classes.

Her inclusions of supporting materials that reinforced her commitment to teaching to diverse learning styles were appreciated by students as well. She stated that students seemed more willing to complete assignments knowing that she was doing her best to meet their needs by following up initial discussion about the importance of learning styles to language learning with activities that suited their learning styles. She summed up her experience with the *Learning Style Survey* with the statement, “helping them help themselves has made my job easier and more pleasant.”

Magda

Magda reported in the first month that the inclusion of the LIG activities was positive overall, despite initial challenges in getting students to self-explore. Students were able to provide feedback to Magda in-class individually and through small group work as well as through a web-based course tool. Students reported that the “You as a Culturally Diverse Person” activity helped them see differences between the perceptions that they had of others but also the perceptions others had of them. Students felt their class discussion about how they were perceived by others was uncomfortable at times but fruitful. Magda felt that the acknowledgement that communication is a two-way process was powerful for students. The “Becoming Familiar with Culture” activity allowed Magda to, in her words, “move to a deeper exploration of the situation and discussion. It was very powerful to listen to students share their views and discuss why they believed the patient perceived the situation a certain way. It also provided the opportunity to try to understand how and why the doctor also experienced barriers in communication.”

Magda expressed her experience using the materials by stating: “I am very excited to have found the opportunity to incorporate materials that motivate, engage, and challenge the students in their language and culture learning, tools to help in the understanding of culture-related aspects of a highly diverse culture and language as Spanish.” She also mentioned the

usefulness of giving students a means other than in-class group discussion to share their opinions. That is, as part of her class, students could correspond with her and with other students via email, as part of a web-based communication tool. She felt that some students who were not ready to open up in class were able to express themselves in-depth on a one-on-one basis. Overall, including opportunities for personal experiences tied to culture allowed students to express themselves at a deeper level and “created a connection with the instructor,” according to Magda.

Wanda

During the first month, Wanda reported that having students complete all of the surveys in their entirety was “overkill—too much too soon.” In hindsight, she would shorten them or, at the very least, break the surveys up and have students complete them in parts. Her primary concern was that the surveys be used when there was adequate time for instructors to go over them with students in class so that their applicability to learning could be addressed. An example of how she would divide up one of the surveys for future use would be to assign students to do just the Reading Strategy Use portion of the *Language Strategy Survey* before (or perhaps after) they read a text in French. She felt that there were advantages and disadvantages to having them complete the surveys before or after completing an assignment, but she did not elaborate further on this point.

Month 1 (February): Question 3: Did you encounter any challenges in integrating the Language Instructors’ Guide materials into your curriculum this month? If so, please describe those challenges.

Elizabeth

During the first month, Elizabeth reported having two primary concerns regarding the use of LIG materials. First, as the use of the materials was still relatively recent in her teaching, she was hesitant to use some of the materials, not knowing how students would react to them. Second, she wanted to be sure that use of any chosen materials would be worth students’ time and efforts. She specifically noted the fact that, although students were interested in culture learning in general, the course grade was dependent upon the acquisition of grammar, vocabulary, and writing knowledge and skills – not on learning about culture. The challenge was, therefore, to provide appropriate culture learning for students while providing instruction in traditional linguistic structures at the same time.

Magda

Magda noted two challenges using the materials the first month: reconciling her personal expectations of how much content from the LIG she could add to her existing curriculum and determining how she could best analyze and use results from the *Learning Style Survey*.

With regard to her personal expectations, her initial enthusiasm about being able to give each student a copy of the *Students’ Guide* as well as using the LIG materials was dampened

when she realized that the original content of the course was already quite extensive, making the inclusion of new materials difficult. She met this challenge by including as much as possible from the LIG at opportune times. For instance, when students were learning medical terminology during the second week of class, she referred them to the vocabulary learning sections in the *Students' Guide*. The effort was well-intentioned, yet the actual result was often that students did not have time for the optional content. Although she thought that giving students English-language resources for home use could be helpful (otherwise, all of her class materials were in Spanish), she was unsure how many students used the self-access materials. Despite this, she continued to mention the *Student's Guide* to students and how it could be helpful to them.

Another challenge that Magda encountered was that she was not sure how to best analyze results from each student's *Learning Style Survey*. In addition, examining all of her students' results was time-consuming. She debriefed student comments about the survey in class, but she was not sure how to individualize the results. She specifically requested that the LIG authors provide insights on how to more effectively assign and collect the results from this survey.

Month 1 (February): Question 4: *Of the materials from the Instructors' Guide you chose to include, which would you use again? Would you modify them in any way? Please elaborate.*

Elizabeth

Of all the LIG materials she used during the first month, Elizabeth reported that she would use all of them again, especially those strategies related to cognate use. However, she would also continue to adapt the activities to fit her course needs.

Magda

Magda reported that she would use all of the materials that she had used during the first month in her course again. One adjustment that she would make would be to send the surveys to students via email the week prior to the start of classes as homework for the first class period. This comment reflects one of her personal challenges in using the LIG in her classes, namely, finding the time to incorporate all of the elements from the LIG that she thought were useful. Sending the surveys to students prior to the start of classes would leave time for discussion of results rather than taking class time to complete them in whole or in part. Magda felt she would be able to better incorporate the materials into her curriculum in the future: "I find the *Guide's* tools are very relevant and powerful. No doubt I will be making modifications, having the experience of using them once and having and according to the class audience needs."

Month 1 (February): Question 5: *Please comment on the effect that your use of the Language Instructors' Guide elements in class had on your students this month.*

Magda

The materials Magda used the first month enabled students to talk about their personal opinions as they related to their own experiences, all while including others' views. Students seemed to be taking advantage of the materials based on how they were able to reflect and respond at a deep level with regard to class topics.

Wanda

Students reported that the Culture-Learning Strategies Inventory was the least helpful to them. Wanda felt this to be so because "they could not link up the items on the inventory with the experience of classroom learning (as opposed to in-country learning)." This comment from Wanda may indicate the need for instructors to clarify the ways in which strategies could be useful in domestic as well as study abroad contexts for students. Other instructors mentioned that it was not until they pointed out to students how strategies can be adapted to fit a given situation that they understood their relevance in diverse situations.

Month 1 (February): Question 6: Have your students indicated in any way that they are considering study abroad? If so, has the use of the Language Instructors' Guide played a role in their decision to consider studying abroad? How?

Elizabeth

During the first week of class a few students indicated their interest in study abroad. However, the interest that those students showed with regard to study abroad did not seem to be tied, in any way, to the inclusion of the LIG materials in Elizabeth's classes.

Gillian

In the first month, Gillian reported that despite the indication by students inside and outside of class that they were interested in study abroad, she felt that the LIG did not have a major impact on students' intentions to study abroad. She felt that this was the case because over 60% of students at her school studied abroad and that often those students chose her institution with the variety and quality of study abroad programs in mind.

Magda

Most of the students in Magda's courses were deeply involved in cultural interaction with Spanish speakers in the urban setting in which they lived. Some students indicated to Magda their desire to do volunteer work in Latin America where they had prior experience, but study abroad, *per se*, did not emerge as a primary goal. Most of her students bridged diverse cultures on a daily basis at home.

Wanda

In responding to this question in the first month, Wanda was surprised by this question given the heavy emphasis on study abroad that already existed on her campus. For students at her institution, the question was not “Will I study abroad?”, but rather, “Will I study abroad in a French/Francophone country or in a non-Francophone region of the world?” She did find the question interesting in that it caused her to reflect on her own practice vis-à-vis making overt connections between study abroad and her classroom practices. She realized that she did not routinely promote study abroad in general or even in the francophone world. She simply assumed, as she said, that, “if we succeed in arousing our students’ curiosity (about) culture(s) in general – and about France and Francophone cultures, in particular – they will naturally want to go abroad and experience a different culture first hand.”

With regard to the role the use of materials from the LIG had on student intentions to study abroad, she did not feel there was a direct link between the two at this point in the semester. In addition, she felt that “there is quite a distance between studying French in a classroom setting and deciding to study abroad.”

Month 1 (February): Question 7: What insights, if any, have the readings and supporting materials of the Language Instructors’ Guide provided you regarding your work as a language instructor? Please explain.

Elizabeth

The impact of theory on practice had been the most enlightening for Elizabeth. Through use of the LIG, she realized that “the effectiveness of the instructor comes not just from what and how I teach, but in helping my students to develop the skills to learn what I’m teaching.” From using the LIG in the pilot stage of the study through the implementation phase of the study, Elizabeth realized that much of her student success came not from happenstance, but from the explicit use of language and culture learning strategies. For Elizabeth, learning about language teaching theory without application had not in the past had an impact on her teaching (she shared that she was an experiential learner). The LIG was therefore a means through which she could bridge theory and application in a way that worked well for her.

Gillian

Gillian did not feel that the LIG provided her with any major new insights, as she had taught content-based instruction for many years that incorporated intercultural communication concepts. She felt that many of the activities in the LIG were variations of things she already used. Despite feeling that the materials were not new information for her, she did feel the materials “could have a great impact on teaching assistants, younger faculty members, faculty who teach based on a more traditional grammatical syllabus, and faculty at campuses where study abroad is the exception rather than the rule.”

Magda

Magda reported that being able to review the materials prior to her course was a great way to obtain information on its theoretical framework, explanations, tips, and resources. She felt the LIG was a “very complete tool kit” for the language instructor. She felt it was also important to emphasize for potential users of the LIG that it was just as relevant for domestic contexts as it was for study abroad contexts.

Month 1 (February): Question 8: Do you have suggestions for improving the guide in general? Please explain.

Responses to this question can be found below in the “Suggestions for Revising the *Language Instructors’ Guide*” section of this report.

Month 1 (February): Question 10: Is there anything else you would like to add?

Elizabeth

Elizabeth reported that she enjoyed working with the LIG and was happy to have the opportunity to use it.

Wanda

Wanda felt the overall strength of the LIG was to offer teachers well-researched, general material on culture, the study of culture, and related activities that integrated culture and language learning that “promote[d] a learner-centered, communicative classroom.” The LIG’s primary weakness, according to Wanda, was that it did not provide a comprehensive curricular framework for teachers to use for a particular course or an entire language program. What was needed, she felt, was a framework that would “set out a structure or sequence of tasks, and then help teachers map out an overall program of instruction that would lead learners through the various tasks and promote their attaining the objectives identified at the beginning.”

Instructors' Responses to Monthly Questions for Month 2 (March)

Month 2 (March): Question 1: What elements of the Instructors' Guide did you use this month in your language teaching? Why did you choose to include those specific materials? Please provide specific examples.

Elizabeth

In the second month of the study, Elizabeth used the *Language Strategy Survey* as well as the “Differentiating Between Stereotypes and Generalizations” activity (ACT-43/DM 39) in her class. The primary instructional goal for including the *Language Strategy Survey* was to help students discover ways in which they could incorporate language learning strategies into their daily lives. Elizabeth hoped the survey would inspire them. In addition, Elizabeth decided to introduce the topic of stereotypes versus generalizations to her students although it did not directly relate to her curriculum. She did this based on past success with the activity as well as her desire to give them a way to distinguish cultural differences.

Gillian

Gillian did not use any new LIG materials in her course in March. Her reasons included being two days behind her colleagues regarding course content and thus having to catch up, having a heavy testing schedule in March that limited her time to include new materials, and needing to concentrate her efforts on strategies for intensive academic writing, which was part of her set curriculum. Although she did not use materials from the LIG in her lessons in March, she did spend out-of-class time becoming more familiar with the materials by re-reading sections on listening and reading strategies and by personally taking the *Learning Style Survey* and the *Language Strategy Use Survey* as a way to further understand their applicability to students.

Magda

Magda included two activities from the LIG in her curriculum in the second month. The first was an adaptation of the “Differentiate Cultural from Personal and Universal” activity available on page 49 of the *Students' Guide* and the “Differentiating between Stereotypes and Generalizations” activity (ACT-43, DM-39) in the LIG.

With regard to the “Differentiate Cultural from Personal and Universal” activity, Magda chose to adapt this activity for her students to build their understanding and analysis skills of the course readings. She applied the concepts behind differentiating between personal, cultural, and universal values to a reading entitled “Cultural Values of the Latino Patient,” where students, in small groups, identified and analyzed the following concepts as they appeared in the reading: collectivism, nepotism, self-worth, *machismo*, marianism (i.e., a special reverence and adoration for the Virgin Mary in the Catholic religion), power distance, respect, religiosity, *simpatía* ‘sympathy,’ time orientation, and personal space. After discussing these concepts, students viewed a video segment between a doctor and her patient and completed a values chart based on the interaction. Students were asked to identify the values they observed as personal, cultural, or

universal, to justify that identification, and finally, to contrast the Latino values with mainstream U.S. American values.

The second activity from the LIG that Magda used was “Differentiating between Stereotypes and Generalizations.” Magda’s overall goal for using this activity was to help students avoid stereotyping in their ideas and practice. She adapted the essence of the activity available in the LIG and applied it to a course reading whereby students were presented with examples of stereotypes and generalizations and they had to label them as one or the other. The class as a whole discussed why each one was or was not a stereotype. After the class discussion, Magda broke the class into groups of three with the task of finding stereotypes in the course reading, analyzing the context in which a stereotype was used, and then determining as a group how it could be reframed as a generalization. A whole class discussion followed. Magda felt this activity provided students with a tool to better process information and to make interpretations more appropriately.

Wanda

No report was turned in for month two from Wanda.

Month 2 (March): Question 2: Please describe your experience incorporating those specific materials into your curriculum, highlighting what was successful.

Elizabeth

Elizabeth felt that her use of these materials – despite some occasional challenges – was successful in the sense that students were more aware and often more able to talk about cultural difference. An example of this was the “Differentiating Between Stereotypes and Generalizations activity.” Elizabeth was surprised by student reactions to the activity in that students seemed to have deeply-held beliefs that if they were making positive statements or attributions about another culture, then they were generalizing and if they made negative statements, then they were stereotyping an aspect of that culture. Elizabeth found that the activity was a useful way to help students make a more productive distinction between the two (i.e., *stereotypes* are “the automatic application of information about a country or culture group, both positive and negative, to every individual in it”; *generalizations* are “initial ideas about a group used to form hypotheses about individuals in that group”).

Magda

Magda was pleased with the results of both of these activities, as they allowed students to:

View concepts and values in a very conceptual and practical way...they had to create a habit of figuring out under what circumstances the statements are being made, the difference in opinions shared and they can exercise a practice to try to avoid what can be presented in a not so positive way. What was successful was that students could

communicate their ideas and share the experience of situations they have and experience with and understand differences.

The activities allowed students to make a connection between concepts of culture learning and their course materials, which Magda felt was an asset.

Month 2 (March): Question 3: *Did you encounter any challenges in integrating the Language Instructors' Guide materials into your curriculum this month? If so, please describe those challenges.*

Elizabeth

In the second month, Elizabeth reported that the biggest challenge in using the *Language Strategy Survey* came from students not remembering and from Elizabeth forgetting to remind them of ways in which they could take charge of their own learning. When she introduced the survey to students, they had a hard time grounding it in what they had covered since the beginning of the semester. Elizabeth felt that they needed a summary at the end of the inventory entailing how they best memorized subject matter. She also felt that she needed to frame the strategies better as part of her instructional practices. A challenge that emerged from the use of the inventory with students was that many students concentrated on what they could not do well in terms of strategy use, as opposed to focusing on the strategies that they did use or could use. Elizabeth learned from this feedback that again, she would have to frame her use of the inventory more carefully in the future.

Magda

As in the first month of the study, in the second month it was a continual challenge for Magda to find time to incorporate components of the LIG into her course curriculum. Another challenge was incorporating parts of the LIG that focused on language learning strategies. Due to the learning objectives of her practitioner-oriented course, she felt that the culture learning strategies were more relevant and applicable to her audience. Although she was already working with language skills as part of the course, she planned to incorporate specific LIG-related language learning strategies into the second half of the course. She also continued to urge students to use the *Students' Guide* at home as a resource.

Month 2 (March): Question 4: *Of the materials from the Instructors' Guide you chose to include, which would you use again? Would you modify them in any way? Please elaborate.*

Magda

Magda planned to use the LIG in the future but with a focus on the refinement of current materials and the inclusion of other content.

Month 2 (March): Question 5: *Please comment on the effect that your use of Language Instructors' Guide elements in class had on your students this month.*

Elizabeth

Although she did not feel that she could tie this directly to the LIG, Elizabeth felt that students were more open than they might have otherwise been to discussion of difficult topics such as the drug trade between the U.S. and Latin America.

Magda

Magda reported during the second month that students were “elaborating more and analyzing information at a deeper level” as a result of the LIG.

Month 2 (March): Question 6: *Have your students indicated in any way that they are considering study abroad? If so, has the use of the Language Instructors' Guide played a role in their decision to consider studying abroad? How?*

Gillian

In the second month, Gillian reported that the LIG materials did not seem directly relevant to her students' plans to study abroad. Again, her institution has an average study abroad rate for all students of 60% and so study abroad is a prominent theme in academic choices made by students. She did feel, however, that the timing of her institution's study abroad fair and the fact that many of her Spanish 231 students would need to complete their foreign language requirement in the near future (probably through one of her institution's Interim Abroad program) could provide her with opportunities to use some of the more culturally-focused content of the LIG in the second half of the semester. Because her department's content-based Spanish curriculum used their unit on the conflict between environmental conservation and the tourism industry in the Galapagos Islands as a way to promote their institution's Ecuador program, Gillian felt that the timing of this would make the introduction and use of the *Culture Learning Strategies Survey* an opportune one at that time to bridge in-class and out-of-class learning.

Month 2 (March): Question 7: *What insights, if any, have the readings and supporting materials of the Language Instructors' Guide provided you regarding your work as a language instructor? Please explain.*

Elizabeth

Using materials from the LIG for the second time and especially re-reading the materials in preparation for their use as part of the study allowed Elizabeth additional time to process how

she used these materials in preparation for taking “fuller advantage” of them the following semester.

Gillian

After reexamining the LIG during the second month, Gillian stated that she felt the materials, as a stand alone resource or in conjunction with the other *Maximizing Study Abroad Guides*, were relevant not only for the foreign language classroom but also for out-of-class learning whether students intended to study abroad or not. She felt that “given the number of Spanish-speakers in the U.S. (as well as speakers of other languages), many of the activities [were] even more important for use domestically than internationally because of their immediacy.”

Gillian specifically mentioned the Styles- and Strategies-based Instruction in the Classroom section on pages 36-46 to be “succinct, clear, based on theory but understandable to FL instructors who aren’t specialists in second language acquisition, with good examples. This may be one of the strongest features of the LIG.” Although she previously stated that many aspects of the LIG did not always fit well with her content-based curriculum, she felt that they would suit proficiency-based and communicative classrooms quite well. She saw the materials as a good fit for study abroad orientations and on-site courses and she intended to use several of the materials, for example, “Discovering Your Cultural Diversity,” “Exploring Cultural Practices and Perspectives Through Critical Incidents,” when she taught an advanced-level Interim Abroad in Spain course in the near future. She summarized her view of the utility of the LIG for instructors as follows:

The more I familiarize myself with the Instructors’ Guide, the more I see it not as a resource book to be applied to any given Spanish course, but rather as a compendium of resources to be used at a variety of levels of instruction and in diverse contexts (conventional classrooms, study abroad pre-departure sessions, immersion courses abroad, individualized use in advising students, etc.).

Her focus in the future was going to be to use the materials as appropriate in her other courses rather than try to “force” activities that did not mesh well with her second year content-based curriculum.

Month 2 (March): Question 8: Do you have suggestions for improving the guide in general? Please explain.

Responses to this question can be found below in the “Suggestions for Revising the *Language Instructors’ Guide*” section of this report.

Month 2 (March): Question 9: Do you have suggestions for improving the guide so that it could better meet the needs of language learners? Please explain.

Gillian

Gillian shared several suggestions for updating the *Language Strategy Survey* so that it was not “overly focused on the word- or phrase-level of discourse – learning individual words.” Gillian felt that for intermediate to advanced language students, they should be exposed to more context-related vocabulary in embedded writings in addition to active vs. passive vocabulary. Her specific vocabulary strategy use suggestions were:

Strategies for learning new words

- Look specifically for cognates,
- Connect words with larger context (for example, link new environmental vocabulary with a text you’ve read on deforestation), and
- Distinguish between words to be learned for recognition only and words to be learned for active use in speaking or writing.

Strategies to make use of new vocabulary

- Read online newspapers and magazines in the TL to practice vocabulary relating to current issues, and
- Keep a vocabulary journal of words you want to add to your personal active vocabulary.

In addition, Gillian provided suggestions for reading strategy use items that could be added to the *Language Strategy Use Survey*. They were:

Reading strategy use

- Read material slightly above my reading level to challenge myself,
- Locate reading materials on topics of personal interest to me,
- Read out-of-class on a variety of topics to broaden my “reading repertoire”: human interest, current events, issues important to adult readers, children’s books, etc.,
- Read online periodicals from a variety of Spanish-speaking countries,
- Look at all the graphic elements of a text (photos, drawing, maps, charts, tables, etc.) before reading the verbal elements,
- Underline main ideas as I read,

- Take notes in the margin as I read to help process main ideas (and recall them later),
- Talk with friends or classmates in Spanish about things I've read in Spanish, and
- Share interesting articles in Spanish (from the Internet, etc.) with friends, classmates, or teachers.

Instructors' Responses to Monthly Questions for Month 3 (April/May)

Month 3 (April/May): Question 1: What elements of the Language Instructors' Guide did you use this month in your language teaching? Why did you choose to include those specific materials? Please provide specific examples.

Elizabeth

Elizabeth did not incorporate any specific materials from the LIG into her course the third month. She did state, however, that some of the cultural knowledge that she had read in the LIG had helped her to facilitate some of the activities that she had used in class. She gave an example, an activity entitled, "Tell me who your friends are and I'll tell you who you are," which asks students to reflect upon cultural differences between Spain and the U.S. related to social pressure and the differing roles of parents with children in the two societies (see Appendix P).

Gillian

Students in Gillian's class completed the Speaking Strategy Use portion of the *Language Strategy Survey* and also the *Culture-Learning Strategies Inventory* on the next to last day of class. These materials were used as prompts for a discussion about the usefulness of the strategies in interactions with Spanish-speakers or culturally different individuals in the U.S. or abroad. Gillian noted the activities in which students in her course would engage following the completion of her course: six of 24 of her students would be participating in an Interim Abroad course in Costa Rica or Ecuador following the course, several students would have summer jobs that involved interactions with Spanish-speaking workers, and other students would be taking the fourth semester of Spanish. Gillian felt that the surveys gave her students "practical hints about how to take their Spanish out of the classroom and into the real world, and helped bring the semester to an up-beat, forward-looking close." Gillian was quite pleased with the effect that use of the surveys had on her students:

Using the surveys in this way left us feeling good about the semester; they allowed us to make a bridge between conventional classroom language study and real-world language use in a natural way. For the first time ever, the last topic of discussion in third-semester Spanish was not one more recap of what was going to be on the final exam!

Magda

Magda planned to use several activities from the LIG as part of her course during the third month, but ultimately did not include the “Responding to Stereotypes About You,” “Understanding the Ways Cultures Differ in Values,” “Understanding Yourself as a Member of a Culture or Cultures,” “Strategies for Making Cultural Inferences,” and “Strategies for Developing Intercultural Competence” activities for several reasons. She initially wanted to include them as companions to her textbook “The Latino Patient” by Nilda Chong to help them develop their cultural awareness, development, and competence. She felt that the activities would provide students with a framework in which to place their understanding of the textbook readings. The reasons why she was ultimately unable or chose not to include these activities included time constraints and that, as the weeks passed in her course, she determined that most of the students in her class were sophisticated enough in their understanding of culture that many of the activities were not relevant to them.

Based on student feedback on other course readings and interviews, Magda decided to include “Contrasting U.S.-American Views with the Host Country” (*Students’ Guide*, pp. 65-68) and “A Model of Intercultural Sensitivity” (ACT-59-60, DM-57-60; *Students’ Guide*, pp. 101-105). She had not anticipated using these activities when she initially created her curriculum plan.

Wanda

The final report from Wanda was submitted in June, 2004. Since her last report, Wanda incorporated content on stereotypes and generalizations and also speech acts into her curriculum. Although stereotypes were treated earlier in her institution’s language sequence, specifically in Intermediate French I, Wanda included content on stereotypes and generalizations from the LIG into varied authentic and literary course texts that concentrated on French colonization and particular Francophone countries and cultures. To address speech acts in her course, she created phrases with embedded speech act functions, for example, saying you are lost, getting into the conversation, bringing things to a close. She put each phrase that related to a particular speech act on different colored pieces of paper.

Month 3 (April/May): Question 2: Please describe your experience incorporating those specific materials into your curriculum, highlighting what was successful.

Magda

The activity “Contrasting U.S.-American Views with the Host Country” provided the class as a whole with the means to share “great dialogue” through anecdotes and other comments about their experiences interacting with Spanish speakers. Magda stated, “I am very satisfied with the students’ analysis of the different categories since one of my goals was to help students consider cultural perspectives before expressing opinions after listening to interviews and more particularly when processing reading materials.”

The intent behind the activity “A Model of Intercultural Sensitivity” was to help students determine the intercultural development of individuals with whom they come in contact and to enhance awareness in students that “there is a process in development of cultural sensitivity and that by realizing that one can help others along that same process.” The discussion of this topic in Spanish was challenging so the class ultimately switched to English for the conversation, which Magda felt in this case was the “right path to take.”

Wanda

Wanda was surprised at the success of integrating work on stereotypes and generalizations into her course via text analysis. She was able to “tie the notions of authorship, audience, and purpose of texts to the notion of the images one has of the Other versus the images one presents of oneself and one’s culture to different audiences for different purposes.” Her feedback on the use of materials from the LIG in her lesson was that the concepts behind stereotyping or generalizing were more complex than portrayed in the LIG. She cautioned that language instructors should be careful not to describe the concepts as simple changes in wording (e.g., wording of stereotypes equating to the use of “all,” versus wording of generalizations using words such as “most” or “many”), but rather to place examples of stereotypes and generalizations in context in each instance of use.

Finally, although students enjoyed the activity on speech acts, as did Wanda, she stated, “I am not absolutely sold on the value of this kind of practice, especially at the intermediate level.”

Month 3 (April/May): Question 3: Did you encounter any challenges in integrating the Language Instructors’ Guide materials into your curriculum this month? If so, please describe those challenges.

Magda

One challenge for Magda three months into the research study was not having access to LIG materials in the TL. As her course was conducted entirely in Spanish, she was not confident that her adaptation of the materials into that language was always lexically accurate. A second challenge for Magda was that she felt that she needed an entire 50-minute class period to adequately complete an activity from reflection to written product, although the use of that time was positive.

Wanda

As previously stated, Wanda felt that the materials were better suited to a communicatively-oriented language classroom rather than to a content-based one.

Month 3 (April/May): Question 4: *Of the materials from the Language Instructors' Guide you chose to include, which would you use again? Would you modify them in any way? Please elaborate.*

Gillian

After using LIG materials for the first time, Gillian felt that she would probably use the surveys again. When using the *Culture-Learning Strategies Inventory* in the future, however, she would highlight interactions with Spanish-speakers both within the U.S. and abroad rather than concentrating only on study abroad contexts.

Magda

As previously stated, Magda would reuse all of the materials that she had used up until and including the third month. Modifications of their use would center on incorporating aspects of LIG content and materials as part of different exercises, such as discussion and role plays, instead of using them in isolation.

Month 3 (April/May): Question 6: *Have your students indicated in any way that they are considering study abroad? If so, has the use of the Language Instructors' Guide played a role in their decision to consider studying abroad? How?*

Gillian

Gillian did not feel that students were influenced by the use of the LIG concerning study abroad. Again, she felt that it was her institution's strong support of study abroad that had a greater impact on her students' desires to study outside of the U.S.

Magda

Seven of her 27 students were going to travel to Spain or Latin America in the summer following her course and she suggested that they take the *Students' Guide* with them as a resource for themselves and their peers. She did not report any other specific relationship between study abroad and the *Maximizing Study Abroad Guides*.

Month 3 (April/May): Question 7: *What insights, if any, have the readings and supporting materials of the Language Instructors' Guide provided you regarding your work as a language instructor? Please explain.*

Magda

Magda found the LIG to be helpful in her own learning. As she stated, "I am extremely satisfied with the extent and clarity and simplification of theories and tips for practical usage. For example, it really helped me to read and learn about Bennett's model and I am curious to expand on that. The bibliography section is excellent as well." In addition, she felt that the precise explanations on how to incorporate culture into language teaching has taught her "enormously and made me realize there are so many things I need to keep learning but this has not discouraged me, on the contrary it has motivated me to keep going with one more look to achieve an effective teaching and achieve student learning in a positive way."

Month 3 (April/May): Question 8: *Do you have suggestions for improving the guide in general? Please explain.*

Responses to this question can be found below in the "Suggestions for Revising the *Language Instructors' Guide*" section of this report.

Focus Group Interviews

Mid-semester Focus Group Interview (March 2004): Elizabeth and Magda

Language instructors had been using the LIG in their courses for approximately two months when they took part in the first focus group interview. At that stage of the study, both instructors had experienced benefits as well as constraints in using the materials. With regard to constraints, when asked to discuss how their usage of the LIG was progressing, both instructors noted that several of the LIG activities were too basic for their students and needed to be adapted so that they could address varied levels of language and culture knowledge and ability. Magda, for example, found that for her students, 90% of those who by her estimation had studied abroad or were taking part in service learning opportunities in the community at the time of the study, had a higher level of knowledge and understanding than many of the LIG materials seemed to target, especially with regard to language skills. She had to adapt many of the activities so that they were appropriate for the higher linguistic and experience levels of the individuals in her course: "They can relate, they can even apply things they are learning in terms of the vocabulary. So with the learner strategies section, I find there are things that are too basic for them to do. I'm amazed at how (high a level) they write, how they speak." Time was a factor as well for her: "...it's a lot of work to develop level-appropriate exercises that would really fit in with our curriculum, or with the curriculum that I'm doing in that class, especially because it's such a strict curriculum."

In terms of benefits, both instructors felt there was a connection between the use of materials in the LIG and students' abilities to discuss course materials at a higher conceptual level. Magda, for example, felt it was because of her students' experiences in the community and elsewhere that they were able to make a connection based on use of the LIG materials. Elizabeth discussed a situation in which students in one course in which she did not use LIG materials – contrasted with students in courses in which she had used the LIG either during the pilot or study stages of the research – were not able to make broader connections between course content and meta-levels of culture learning:

I get some strange comments in [Spanish] 1004 [in which she did not use LIG materials] that I don't get from either one of my 1003 classes [in which she used LIG materials]. For example a student...we were talking about a song....called "Americas" and in it a man from the Dominican Republic is talking about problems with the Dominican Republic and they were asking, "Yeah, but why is [it] called "Americas" if they are in the Dominican Republic?" So I was explaining the fact that America is not just the United States – this is the Americas. And one student asked, "Yes, but why do they call themselves 'Americans' if they don't speak English?" I've never gotten anything approaching that in 1003.

With regard to how her students related to the course topics in general, Elizabeth felt there were important differences in how students understood the course materials, given to their ethnic backgrounds. She felt the "individual differences" issue had repercussions for how language instructors use the LIG and even wondered if the LIG would need to be revised to address the issue. She continued:

This is actually something that I wanted to bring up...what I find is that my students from middle-class, white, Midwestern upbringing seem really open to this and really catch on to it quickly...you know, who knows if they're on the surface buying into it, but it's not really going very deep – I don't know. What I have noticed is that sometimes minority students from other cultures of the same class, like we bring up this cultural information, and it's almost as if they don't quite know how to deal with it. I have a student from the Philippines, for example, in one of my 1003 classes, and we were talking about environmental pollution. We had talked about environmental pollution in Latin America and I asked them... "what are some examples of environmental pollution?" and he said, "too many white people around here." I don't really know how to mediate that with the class. Actually that's one thing that I find I'm a little bit at a loss with. We bring up a lot of these cultural ideas and we sort of give them the OK to talk about them but I feel like I need more guidance on mediating them and I would love it if the book could provide some ideas on how to mediate these things that are going to come up...I don't know if it's possible within the context of the book but it seems like if we're going to give permission to the students and encourage instructors to bring some of these things up, we also have to help them deal with them. I feel like I need training in psychology or something.

In response to this comment, the group discussed the need to establish an atmosphere of trust in the classroom so that issues such as these could be discussed. Another option discussed for this situation was to acknowledge the comment so that the student felt heard, but then to follow-up with the individual outside of class or similar to address the comment. Elizabeth stated that these comments on how to address this type of classroom situation were very helpful

and “concrete.” Another suggested revision to the LIG that emerged from this focus group interview related to a perceived need for ancillary materials. In her Medical Spanish course, students had individual copies of the *Students’ Guide* for their use alongside the LIG materials Magda chose to include in her curriculum. Because she did not want students to rip pages out of the *Students’ Guide*, she suggested that a workbook of the *Students’ Guide* materials be developed for use.

As the group discussed how they were using the LIG in class, the topic arose concerning how the LIG was a different way of thinking about and teaching language as compared with more typical language curricula present in many language classrooms. An example of the dialogue was when Margaret (the outside consultant) shared how she had totally changed her teaching of a certain verb tense after reading the LIG. She realized that the reason many of her students had trouble with that particular grammatical concept was that it was being taught in her textbook as an English grammatical form which was simply translated into the TL. When she realized this, she changed her teaching so that it reflected the cultural context of how that verb form was actually used in the TL. After that change, she found that students had an easier time learning that verb form. Margaret also noted that using the LIG materials and incorporating much of the LIG into their course curricula in systematic ways required a long-term focus. Both Magda and Elizabeth agreed with that observation.

When asked to describe the specific materials that they had found useful during the first two months of the study, Elizabeth mentioned the *Language Strategy Survey*. For her, this instrument helped her relationship with her students; it “opened up a space for discussion, that kind of seemed in a way, to change our relationship. They seemed much less hesitant to talk to me to give me feedback.”

Mid-semester Focus Group Interview (April 2004): Gillian and Wanda

At the two month mark, both Gillian and Wanda felt that the LIG had much to add to the language teaching field notwithstanding inconsistencies that they felt needed to be addressed to make the LIG as beneficial as possible to language instructors in the future. Areas in which the instructors felt adjustments or revisions needed to be made included how LIG materials are presented and explained to the target audience of language instructors, how language and culture are integrated in the LIG, and the scope of application of the materials.

They believed that the LIG is well-designed and full of resources useful for language instructors at all stages of their careers and for many contexts of application, whether within or outside of the classroom, at home or abroad. Wanda commented that one aspect of the LIG that she particularly appreciated was the layout of the culture learning sections. She felt it was well-written, explained, and understandable. She commented, however, that further description needed to be added on how to use the LIG. Both Wanda and Gillian felt that there was insufficient description in the LIG concerning how its contents could be used for different audiences, for example, on-site during study abroad or in the home country, as well as for different language proficiency levels, such as beginner and intermediate. According to these two instructors, one element missing from the LIG was how it could be used as part of an overall language curriculum, whether abroad or at home. Wanda stated:

The time for the fitting in [of the LIG into language curriculum] is at the conceptualization stage and it's not taking a course that already exists and seeing how I can add element X, Y, or Z, but instead re-conceptualizing the course so as to make the course not a "language course" only but a language and culture course – fully integrated.

The issue of how to choose materials from the LIG as part of a curriculum also has to do with the way materials are presented for use. According to Wanda, authors typically develop materials in one of two formats: using a recipe method where activities are completed in sequence and without much deviation from the materials provided. This format provides security for many language instructors but can also be frustrating for those who want to, but cannot, use all of the available materials. A second format is when a variety of materials are presented from which an instructor can choose what works for him or her at any given time. Both Wanda and Gillian stated that they had no problem adapting the LIG for their purposes but that they had had many years' of experience doing so; less-experienced teachers would likely need more guidance than is available in the current form of the LIG. They suggested adding further commentary describing ways in which the materials might be used for this-or-that purpose. Without this sort of commentary, Wanda felt some language instructors could be overwhelmed with all of the resources available in the LIG. In addition, the LIG should make explicit how it can be integrated into an existing curriculum, as well as how it can be used as a stand-alone resource.

Wanda also felt the LIG does not do an adequate job illustrating how to integrate language and culture teaching across a curriculum. As an example, she warned against presenting dramatic contrasts between native and target cultures early on as it has the potential to shut down students who are at lower stages of the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) scale:

The developmental sequence of culture learning has to be brought together with the developmental sequence of language learning and we have to see how the two can complement each other at every stage, rather than...find[ing] a neat activity so do it. That's the wrong way to approach culture learning. It takes a longer view where the two are working in tandem all the way through. This guide doesn't face this head-on.

Related to the integration of concepts in the LIG, she felt that many of the concepts were also not fully integrated throughout the LIG. For example, the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity was presented, but then rarely mentioned afterward as a part of other materials. She also wondered how she could assess each student's level of intercultural sensitivity without administering the *IDI*. She suggested that a simple Likert scale could be developed for the LIG based on the DMIS and then included in the LIG.

A related issue that arose was how to push learning (especially culture learning) past the surface level. Wanda stated:

We don't even really have any proof that teaching students to buy tickets to trains, to read bus schedules...we don't have any evidence that says that moves them up the Bennett [DMIS] scale. They can remain as ethnocentric as they were at the beginning...Those are very touchy issues to face when you are also teaching in a language that the learners are learning.

The importance of how one presents the materials did not stop with the contents of the LIG but also included its title. Gillian stated:

I guess even the title is...well you have to call everything something, but a language instructors' guide to strategies, blah, blah, blah. I think it would be easy for people to think all of this...at least half of it, if not more, as much more appropriate for study abroad pre-departure orientation than actual classroom work.

Both instructors felt the title of the LIG limits its potential because it suggests a narrowed context of application when it actually has applicability to all forms of language instruction. Gillian commented that the LIG might be better suited to “non-conventional classroom use,” but would also be well-suited to the short-term study abroad programs that both she and Wanda teach during the Interim session each year. Wanda concurred:

It will be fabulous to take these materials and to try them out on-site, in the one-month total immersion experience. I think there are a lot of things that will be a very good fit – the thing about observational tools and then sending them out, those kinds of things. The ethnographic interview...

Both instructors agreed that the possibilities for application of the LIG were numerous and yet the LIG needs editing so that its scope of application is evident. They both felt, for example, that it is not practical to use the survey and inventories all at once or in their entirety with students in the language classroom. Doing so could cause survey burn-out and reduce their intended effectiveness. Instead, Wanda suggested breaking them down into components of four or five items under each skill – especially the language-related tools – for teachers to use as they see fit. She also suggested putting them on a CD-ROM for ease of use. Gillian felt the *Culture-Learning Strategies Inventory* in particular contained problematic wording; it seemed heavily weighed toward study abroad. A more important question for Wanda, however, was the need to question why an instructor should use the survey and inventories in the first place. No matter why one uses one or more of them, however, they commented that the LIG needs to provide a clearer framework to help instructors determine what they need and which LIG materials would help them to best achieve their goals. Wanda stated that the issue of how to use the *Culture-Learning Strategies Inventory* most effectively was more significant for her because she saw culture learning as more important than language learning overall:

Once (students) leave (the language classroom)...guess what? Nothing. Whatever they have that's going to stay with them, if they don't continue with the language, is the culture. So for me it's important...to have a really excellent culture inventory...(it's about) the growing of the intercultural mind.

She suggested that several culture inventories could be developed, one for on-site use abroad and one for the more typical language classroom in the home setting.

The LIG provides activities and materials for teaching students and language instructors about learning how to learn. For Wanda, the language classroom should teach students, “to develop a meta-level of discourse – about their own language learning, about their own learning styles, about culture learning. This is one of the strengths of the book.” A surprise for both Gillian and Wanda, however, was the realization that many activities that they used in their own curriculum seemed to be more advanced than those of the LIG in terms of both their conceptualization and appropriateness. They attributed this to their years of experience teaching

language which incorporates language and culture learning strategies, but especially due to their content-focused curriculum, in which language was being used as the medium of instruction, not the goal of instruction. Gillian commented, “I’m finding myself thinking, OK, instead of ‘Can I adapt this?’ this is what I’m doing and how I’m doing it and it’s some of those activities need to be in the manual!” In addition, both instructors believed the LIG lacked necessary visuals, which they had found to be critical to place learning in context. Gillian explained:

We know that students attach to words, for example, the visual images of objects in their own culture. We realized how difficult it is for students to talk about not only objects, but concepts, if they have no visual context other than their own visual culture...One thing that struck me is how devoid of visual context these activities are and I think it’s essential for students to try to bridge the gap between their own culture and another culture.

Wanda was also surprised that a very useful technique for learning vocabulary called “chunking” does not appear in the LIG. During the last month or so of the study Wanda was also working on incorporating speech acts into her curriculum, a skill that she normally did not explicitly include until the fifth semester of French. Her efforts focused on the use of speech acts related to requests embedded as part of the specific thematic content of her course.

The bottom line for both instructors was that for the LIG to be useful it has to meet teachers’ needs at varied levels and in multiple contexts. The key notion for Wanda with regard to the LIG was *intentionality* – that is, language instructors must know how to integrate language and culture and ideally within a context-based framework so that their learning is not isolated. An example of this is the “Differentiating Between Stereotypes and Generalizations” activity; Wanda felt it is a useful exercise but that students must know how to not just qualify statements with “some” or “many” but qualify them in context by grounding them in the situation, for example, not just saying “Most French...,” but saying “So and so in the text that we read called ‘da, da, da.’” Doing so appropriately can be problematic for teachers themselves, however. Wanda stated, “These are things that lots of teachers, number one, aren’t aware of themselves, and number two, do not know how to get at in the classroom.”

In closing, both Gillian and Wanda reiterated that they believed that the LIG was a needed resource at many levels, but especially with regard to the integration of culture and learning. Gillian stated, “No one book or no set of materials can do everything for everybody. It’s fine for things to be what they are and to do what they are very well....[the LIG] needs to be clear [about] what it is [and] how it can be used.” Wanda commented, “My having participated in the project is going to reap very considerable benefits.” It is a positive result that both of these instructors, who have an average of 30.5 years of language teaching experience, see clear value in the LIG in terms of how it integrates language and culture learning for language instructors. They feel it could be of even more benefit, however, if it more explicitly described the varied contexts and types of applications for which it could be used.

Final Focus Group Interview (August 2004): Elizabeth, Gillian, and Magda

At the very beginning of the interview, all three of the language instructors present were asked to answer the question, “When you think of the *Language Instructors’ Guide*, what comes to mind?” As it had been two-to-three months since the end of the data collection period, the question was asked in the hopes of eliciting from each instructor her overall opinion of the LIG.

All three instructors responded that it was an important resource useful for varied contexts and types of instruction. Magda stated, “it’s an amazing resource for instructors here [in the U.S.] working with students planning on study[ing] abroad or as [for] myself, for students working with Spanish-speaking, in my case, populations here.” For Gillian, the value of the LIG was in its potential use as part of a wide-ranging curriculum: “I would want people to think of it as a resource guide for a total curriculum, instead of a resource guide for an individual course.” Elizabeth felt it was useful in setting a foundation for learning, especially the use of some of the activities that appear early in the LIG, such as the survey and inventories and meta-learning activities such as the “Describe-Interpret-Evaluate (D.I.E.) Model.” Elizabeth specifically stated that she felt such activities enabled her to refer to content in her textbook within the larger framework provided by the LIG:

For me the most useful purpose was setting the groundwork, so that whatever came up in our books we had a base that we could refer back to as a class and say, “Oh, this is referring to...this is what we saw in the D.I.E. model,” or, “This is what we saw in one of the surveys.”

Gillian mentioned that one reason why it was important to think of how to use the LIG as part of a total curriculum was the fact that many language instructors do not have the flexibility of being the sole teacher for a course. Rather, they routinely need to keep pace with other instructors teaching the same course. Under such circumstances, everyone involved in that particular course needs to consider how others could use the materials. In this case, Gillian felt that the LIG could become a model for professional development. During the study Gillian shared with her colleagues at her institution the materials that she took or adapted from the LIG. Those colleagues who did, indeed, use the activities, did so primarily because they fit their content-based curriculum rather than because they thought they should use the LIG as part of their language program. Related to this last point was a point that Gillian reiterated in the interview, namely, that, despite its usefulness generally, the LIG is better suited to a proficiency-based curriculum than a content-based curriculum because:

We work with language functions, we work with strategies – listening, speaking, all that – but if it doesn’t have topic relevance, it doesn’t fit into our curriculum. So a lot of these things, like gestures, I think that stuff is great – students love it – but it is an aberration for our curriculum...things like that mean a lot more if you can contextualize it.

Following the line of discussion of how the LIG was not a perfect fit with all goals of language instruction, Magda discussed how there seemed to be a tension in the LIG between its usefulness in home-based classrooms versus study abroad contexts. It was easy for her to identify which sections of the LIG were suited for each context, but she felt she did not have adequate time to adapt all the activities and had to decide which materials were worth her time adapting for the classroom. Gillian shared that she had had similar thoughts, yet she also stated that “I think there are classroom applications for all of these activities, depending on what kind of class you’re talking about.” These comments related primarily to the use of wording that related primarily to study abroad situations. The solution may be one of adapting the phrasing/content of activities to fit a given (e.g., home-based) language classroom, which is primarily an issue of time.

Individual Exit Interviews

All four instructors were first asked to share their impressions of the LIG, including whether or not they had enjoyed taking part in the study. Unequivocally, all four instructors indicated that they enjoyed the opportunity to experiment with the LIG. As expressed previously, they found the materials to be an important addition to the language instruction field, although with some caveats. Stated benefits of the LIG included its theoretical grounding both in terms of its breadth and also its non-technical language, its “goldmine” of activities that could be used in myriad contexts, and its user-friendly format. Areas in which the instructors felt the LIG could be improved included the need to: (1) better integrate intercultural and language learning so that the connection is more explicit for LIG users and their students, (2) better frame activities so LIG users know how to adapt materials for varied levels and contexts of instruction, and (3) and refocus the LIG away from a primary focus on study abroad to more clearly promote a balanced view of its use for both study abroad and home-based linguistic and cultural diversity.

The instructors felt that the LIG improved their teaching by providing them with content to help them understand the underlying conceptual language and culture learning framework on which the LIG is based. The theoretical grounding of the LIG was clearly explained and easy to understand, according to Magda. With regard to both her own understanding and learning as well as that of her students, Elizabeth commented that the LIG “...has given me some tools that I can use when I’m working with my students to gauge their reactions, to see how they’re doing, to let them know in a convincing manner that I’m interested in what works for them.” In addition, the *Learning Style Survey* was particularly helpful to Elizabeth because it made her realize that she learned differently from many of her students, which she had not considered previously to using the LIG. Magda stated that she found the LIG to be very easy to use and that, “you don’t have to be an expert in the field [to use it].”

The LIG also gave the instructors many activities they could use in myriad ways in the classroom or elsewhere, either in an original or adapted form. The LIG was used to greater or lesser degrees throughout the study by all four instructors and their uses of it varied. The two instructors who were teaching using a more communicative approach (i.e., Elizabeth and Magda) were better able to use chosen LIG activities in their original, if not translated, form, and still have them meet the needs of their curriculum. For the other two instructors – Gillian and Wanda – the content-based nature of their curricula posed a challenge when they tried to incorporate LIG materials. They found that they had to adapt the activities in substantive ways to integrate them into their classroom. Gillian stated that this was a common practice for her when using any materials, however, not just the LIG: “We find that commercially available materials don’t do what we want to do in the second year of our language instruction. So for a period of years we’ve been putting together all kinds of different materials.” With regard to study abroad settings, Wanda commented that the LIG is:

A terrific fit for a course that’s taught on-site in C2 (culture two)—I think it’s a very good fit...I think the book has phenomenal application (potential) on-site. I think what isn’t as good about it is that it doesn’t help students see enough about how to negotiate another culture from a classroom setting.

Despite these challenges, both Gillian and Wanda commented that the LIG added value to their curriculum, although more time was needed to adapt them for their needs. For these instructors, a more important question to be considered when using the LIG was not which activities to use,

but how to frame learning for students so that students would understand the goal of using certain types of materials such as those contained in the LIG. Wanda stated, “What counts is an overall sequence where you identify where students are and then you move them along a developmental sequence....there’s not enough of it in the book!” She further added, “The materials don’t do as much for the intercultural as they could, especially in the intercultural, in the context of a classroom.”

Another issue for Wanda was how to integrate the LIG within an existing curriculum. She felt that the LIG does not adequately address this need: “There’s not enough of addressing how to integrate these materials into an existing sequence.” Gillian stated that she sees the LIG as a resource for her entire curriculum, not just for a certain course or two. A key for her and for other instructors was to embed the LIG materials bit by bit into a chosen curricular sequence no matter how the materials were used. This thought was echoed by all of the instructors in the study – that is, whatever material instructors incorporate from the LIG, it makes sense to start slow with one or two activities and then rework it to fit their needs or add other activities as necessary. Gillian commented,

My advice to somebody starting: When you’re trying to do something new and incorporate new things, you do it a little bit at a time. You say, “This semester I’ll do three things. Next semester I’ll have these three and three more.” Or, “Over the summer now, I’ve got the momentum going and I’ll do a few.”

In addition to the need for a more explicit link between language and culture learning for instructors, all four instructors felt that the LIG did not do an adequate job in elucidating how activities could be adapted by instructors for varied levels of student linguistic and cultural competence. Of the courses in which the LIG was used as part of the study, there was wide variation in content and in participants, and these differences impacted how the LIG was perceived and used. In the course concentrating on Medical Spanish, for example, Magda, commented that she was surprised at how sophisticated many of her students were with regard to previous experience with linguistically- and culturally-diverse populations both within the U.S. and abroad. Due to this experience, she found that many of the LIG activities were too basic for her needs, especially the language activities. She specifically called for tips for language instructors about how to adapt LIG activities:

I mentioned that I would like to expand or move it to a higher level with the language learning strategies activities. Somehow some things are not new...so an adaptation of that or something, of those activities [would be useful]. I think these activities from the language learning strategies are more for the beginner or intermediate level and I didn’t see good use for the advanced level. If there are tips here for the instructors...could you do this for a different level?

Both Gillian and Wanda, who were teaching second-year courses using the LIG, also mentioned that explanations of how to adapt activities so that they are applicable to higher levels of language study are needed. Three of the instructors mentioned that for experienced language instructors, this need may not be as great, as they typically already have the skills that would enable them to adapt LIG materials to their needs, but that for language instructors new to the field, more explicit suggestions would be needed. These comments illustrate that the LIG contains many activities that are widely applicable to diverse settings and levels of students. Nevertheless, they felt that although many instructors have the necessary skills to adapt LIG

activities to fit varied applications, additional information needs to be provided in the LIG that demonstrates how activities can be modified for students at differentiated levels of learning.

Another comment made by several of the instructors in the individual exit interviews was that the name of the LIG (i.e., *Maximizing Study Abroad*) was a misnomer. They felt that use of the materials were as equally suited to home contexts as well as to study abroad contexts. Wanda stated, “The implication in part by the title [is] that we are trying to get students to study abroad. I would rather not have it focused that way. I would like to get students to be able to look at themselves and the Other and to understand each in terms of the Other. Don’t just sell it as “study abroad,” sell it as [an] ‘integration of language and culture’ and play up the development of intercultural competence.” Suggestions were provided by two of the instructors related to the need to rewrite the materials in such a way that they could more easily be used without making explicit reference to study abroad – for example, by reworking the surveys (or by writing different versions) so that words such as “homestay” do not automatically appear in the activity. All instructors agreed that however the LIG is used, it has value for the language classroom.

Exit Questionnaire for Language Instructors

Question 1: Overall, what do you think of the Language Instructors’ Guide? Please explain.

All four instructors stated that the LIG was useful as a resource for language teaching both in terms of its value to language instructors as well as to students. Two instructors specifically mentioned that the LIG provided them with a framework for language teaching, either through the theoretical framework of the LIG or with regard to providing tools through which to integrate culture and language coherently. One instructor had hoped to better integrate culture into her language curriculum for some time but, in addition to using a mandated textbook that covered culture in a piece-meal fashion, she did not feel she had had “the organizing principles [she] needed to do it coherently.” The LIG provided her with tools to present culture as a rational system as opposed to an add-on to her curriculum without having to jettison her curriculum: “The LIG [does] a great job instructing what tool one can choose to teach [with] in an organized manner, how one can apply it, and the importance of it.” Another instructor stated,

The LIG is a treasure-trove of materials...the explanations and duplicable masters are a potential goldmine....some of which are appropriate for classroom-use at a variety of levels, others of which are most appropriate for study abroad pre-departure or on-site use, and lastly, others of which work best as food for thought for instructors to adapt to their own needs. They would be an excellent resource for TAs, new teachers, and even experienced teachers who haven’t emphasized strategies-based instruction in the past.

The LIG was not seen as a perfect panacea for the challenges of integrating culture and language in the classroom, however. One instructor stated that although she felt the surveys were interesting and of value in the classroom, using them all at once as suggested by the LIG could be “overkill” and could work against their intended impact. Two of the instructors used the LIG as part of their content-based curriculum and found that it was not always an easy fit for

their needs. Despite this caveat, these same instructors felt the LIG was a great resource for the right language curriculum, depending on the instructional goals of the course and instructor needs.

Question 2: Did you have any indication from students that the use of the LIG materials in the curriculum was helpful in their language and culture learning? If yes, please explain how, using as many specific examples as possible (e.g., student comments on how materials you incorporated from the guide helped them remember vocabulary or to understand an aspect of the target culture).

Three of the instructors reported that they did not hear any comments from students that explicitly related to the use of the LIG in class, whether favorably or not. Gillian stated that this may have been due to the fact that she adapted each of the LIG activities that she used and incorporated them into her own curriculum and therefore, the LIG activities could not be distinguished from non-LIG materials. Magda, on the other hand, observed that after using several LIG activities students were better able to engage in meaningful conversations about subject matter in a way that reinforced concepts of language and culture learning. The culture materials, in particular, allowed for the “Sharing of opinions and being exposed to different experiences and perspectives of aspects of [the] target culture through the eyes and voices of peers.” Although many of the materials that Magda used in her course were not new to students, she felt they did motivate and challenge them to tie their own life experiences to course content.

Question 3: In what ways does the LIG encourage students to think about participating in study abroad when they might not have considered it before?

Although all four language instructors felt that there was little direct impact of the LIG on student intentions to study abroad, they all noted that the LIG materials could promote in students a desire to seek out other languages and cultures. Three of the instructors stated that the materials enhanced the students’ understanding and curiosity of other cultures. For example, this statement from Wanda seemed to sum up their thoughts best:

[The Language Instructors’ Guide material] piques their curiosity about other culture. It gives them a sense of adventure. It provides them with tools for decoding the other culture and therefore diminishes their fear, on the one hand, and leads them to believe that they can be successful, on the other. Inspiring a sense of confidence in learners that they will in fact be able to negotiate a culture other than their own is an important outcome of the use of these materials.

Although not directly related to the LIG, of note is the recognized potential of the *Maximizing Study Abroad Students’ Guide* for students during a study abroad experience. Several of the students in Magda’s course planned to study abroad following the spring 2004 semester. Destinations included primarily Spain, but also Latin and South America. Although the direct impact of the LIG on students’ plans to study abroad could not be determined, several students did mention to Magda that they intended to take copies of the *Students’ Guide* (received

as part of the LIG study) along with them when they went abroad. Their intention was to use it themselves as well as to share it with friends.

Question 4: Are you planning to follow up with your students to see if the information you provided them from the LIG was useful? If yes, how?

None of the language instructors planned to keep in contact with students specifically to determine the impact of the LIG.

Question 5a: Material selection and adaptation process: What were your reasons for choosing the activities/materials that you selected from the LIG for use in your language curriculum (e.g., brevity, time needed for the activity)?

Other than materials required to be used as part of the study (i.e., the *Learning Style Survey*, the *Language Strategy Survey*, and the *Culture-Learning Strategies Inventory*), all the instructors chose materials that supported course instructional goals. For two of the instructors, Elizabeth and Magda, their primary goal was to enhance students' cultural understanding and sensitivity in their classrooms. The way Magda did this, for example, was to provide students exposure to interactions between health care workers and Spanish-speaking patients through the use of videos or other materials. She encouraged the cultural understanding and sensitivity in her students by including LIG materials as part of her set curriculum or as stand-alone materials.

Question 5b: Was the LIG material selection process challenging for you? Why or why not?

The primary challenge for the instructors was determining the best fit of LIG materials for their curriculum. For Magda, the difficulty was knowing which materials would work best with her students when she was not knowledgeable about their linguistic backgrounds and level of cultural experience. She ultimately determined that the advanced level of her students' TL abilities rendered many of the language-learning specific activities irrelevant, other than strategies for vocabulary learning; she therefore changed her focus to concentrate on the use of culture activities in class. For Wanda, choosing materials was not at all challenging because she felt they were not appropriate for her content-based curriculum and thus did not use many of them. For Gillian, using strategies as an organizing framework was easy to accomplish yet using activities straight from the LIG without adapting them was problematic.

Question 5c: Were certain materials more time-consuming in terms of preparation than others? If yes, which materials were more time consuming and why?

Two of the four instructors felt that using the LIG was time-consuming to some degree, either in terms of materials adaptation or in time invested in understanding the LIG itself. For Magda, she was cognizant of the need to read and understand the entire LIG thoroughly before determining how she would incorporate materials into her course curriculum, and this took a significant amount of time during the pilot stage of the study in fall 2003. For both Magda and Gillian, significant extra time was needed to choose the materials that were suitable for their curriculum and also to adapt materials – for instance, to translate them into the TL or to change the content to fit a particular course topic. Gillian felt that only the survey and inventories were suitable to be used in English; all other materials that she used she translated into Spanish, which took a lot of time. The need to translate the activities into the TL was Gillian’s biggest frustration, as she stated:

This is what is most challenging for the teacher using the LIG. The materials are not “ready” for classroom use in a foreign language class where the goal is to maximize the use of the target language...This, to me, is the major drawback to the materials.

For the two instructors who did not find LIG materials preparation to be time-consuming, Elizabeth stated this was so because she used the materials just as she found them in the LIG. For Wanda, time was not an issue because she did not use many of the materials in her course.

Question 5d: Did you adapt LIG materials for use in your curriculum?

Three language instructors shared how they adapted LIG materials. The primary reason cited was to make the chosen activities more relevant to their specific curriculum. Another reason was to enable students to connect their own experiences with course content; adapting the materials provided a better means for them to do so because it explicitly tied strategy use to the curriculum.

Elizabeth had had prior experience with LIG materials before taking part in the study. She had, for example, previously used what came to be known as “the Aymara Language Activity.” She had done a somewhat similar activity from the *Styles- and Strategies-Based Instruction Guide* (Cohen & Weaver, 2005) which uses English vocabulary rather than Aymara, and she felt that the use of English was helpful because it allowed students to examine root words and how they have connections to Spanish as well as giving students a stronger foundation in English. She also felt that doing this reinforced the benefits of knowing a second language. Elizabeth was not completely satisfied with the Aymara-language activity available in the LIG because she felt that “it was disheartening to students; none of them were able to memorize more than a few of the words. The students have literally hundreds of words to memorize in the course of a semester, and it seems psychologically discouraging to do this exercise with them when no one in the class has a very good success rate with it.” Elizabeth also adapted the “You as a Culturally Diverse Person” exercise. She replaced the “you” in the center of the map with *El Mundo Hispano* ‘The Hispanic World’ and had students complete the map relating to different

aspects of the Spanish-speaking world. She repeated this activity with students at the end of the course and they compared how their perceptions of the Spanish-speaking world had changed over time.

Gillian adapted several materials by both translating some of them into Spanish, yet also changing how she used them as opposed to how the LIG suggested they be used. She first adapted the *Language Use Strategy Inventory* by introducing it to students bit by bit, rather than all at once. She integrated three activities, “The Good Language Learner” (ACT-9), “Reading Strategy Training” (ACT-19-20-21), and “Listening Strategy Training” (ACT-23) into her curriculum, and translated three activities, “Exploring U.S. Culture”(DM-35), “Reading Strategy Training” (ACT-19-20-21), and “Differentiating Stereotypes and Generalizations” (DM-39). Ultimately, however, she did not use this last activity, as it seemed too basic for her students.

Question 5e: Would you have wanted more guidance from the LIG about selecting materials (e.g., provision of a rationale for use of each activity)? Why or why not?

Although the instructors recognized the benefit of having guidance available in the LIG for their use should they want it, two of the instructors, Gillian and Elizabeth, did not personally desire guidance. For Elizabeth, having additional guidance other than that provided by Margaret (the outside consultant) during the course of the study would have been limiting for her. That is, a possible negative outcome for her of more guidance could have been an inability to see beyond the possibilities of the activity. In other words, if use of a certain activity had been described as for “X” purpose, she might not have felt the freedom to use it in another fashion. For Magda, the guidance that the LIG provided gave her adequate theory and background information to help her decide which activities to use. Wanda felt that more guidance would improve the LIG especially with regard to helping teachers examine their reasons for using LIG materials in the first place in a given course or language program. Additional information for use by language instructors on how to adapt or plan a curriculum inclusive of the LIG would also be beneficial.

Question 5f: What advice do you have for making individual exercises in the LIG more appropriate for students?

Three of the language instructors felt the activities needed to be adapted so that they were more reflective of a given cultural context. They also suggested that instructors use them in as integrated a fashion as possible. With regard to the better integration of the activities, Magda felt that it would be beneficial for the activities to be used in such a way that it was not obvious to students that they were doing a particular type of language manipulation activity such as strategy use. For her purposes, Wanda would have benefited from a more sophisticated collection of activities that focused on more abstract topics – that is, more applicable to a wider range of topics. She would also have liked to see the LIG aligned more closely to the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines. For Gillian, the lack of LIG materials in Spanish was most limiting for her. She acknowledged the difficulty of producing materials in all languages, but suggested that there could be supplements developed in French, Spanish, and German as a starting point. She also shared ways that several of the activities could be made more appropriate for students:

- “Instructor Survey” (ACT-3): Add questions on students’ work or volunteer activities involving use of the TL; languages other than the TL with which students have experience; students’ plans for study abroad in countries other than those of the TL.
- “Awareness Raising Using the Learning Style Survey” (ACT-5): Elizabeth felt that because some students (e.g., those with disabilities) are often reticent to share personal information early on in a class, it would be helpful to add an instructors’ note concerning how results from the survey could be used with the entire class rather than individually. This would be done in order to take the immediate focus off individual students before a level of trust could be established in the classroom such that these students would feel free to share personal anecdotes.
- “Reading Strategy Training” (ACT-19): Gillian felt that this activity was incomplete because more information was needed about “the importance of genre and the conventions of different types of genres. For example, what kinds of language or features might different types of texts emphasize (e.g., commands in advertisements or instructions for use or assembly, past tense verbs in news stories, subjunctive in opinion pieces, etc.)” More attention also needed to be paid to the lay-out of the materials, according to Gillian, such as calling attention to the importance and possible use of captions, photos, and graphics.
- “Listening Strategy Training” (ACT-23)/”Strategies to Become a Better Listener” (DM-31): Gillian felt this activity was geared toward face-to-face conversations despite being useful for other tasks. She suggested that if the activity used a news clip, DM-31 should talk about the importance of using background knowledge for understanding the news clip. “For example, knowing the details of current news stories from seeing or reading the news in English helps provide a context for listening to the news in Spanish.” Students should be provided with as many means as possible to develop hypotheses about what is going on.
- “Strategic Use of Translation” (ACT-29): Gillian would have liked to see more relevant information, such as phrases related to university life, rather than a random list of idiomatic expressions. Doing so would allow “some interesting cultural analysis of U.S. culture and the presence or lack of counterparts in the TL and culture. This would also reinforce one of the key vocabulary learning strategies: category.”
- “Exploring U.S. Culture” (ACT-33/DM-35): Gillian felt that part 2 of this activity ran the risk of playing into student stereotypes of U.S. versus Hispanic families. She suggested:

Solicit[ing] first the cultural values and priorities that emerge first from both a meal at McDonald’s and a leisurely family meal in U.S. culture and the changes in meal time from their parents’ generation to theirs. This would present culture as a dynamic process and suggest that a range of alternatives exist in any culture. A similar thing might be done for Hispanic families...this might help introduce the nuances that exist in any culture because of socioeconomic class, ethnic group, life in rural vs. urban areas...etc.”

- “Teaching Culture Using Cultural Objects or Products” (ACT-35): Gillian felt that this activity did not provide enough cultural contextual clues for the use of objects in class. She suggested that the directions for the activity emphasize the contexts of objects before analyzing them – for instance, not just have students describe a Zapotecan rug, but also discuss how they are produced, the role that their production plays in the broader economy, and the like.
- “Culture Clash” (ACT-37): Although Gillian believed that simulations could be useful, the premise of an “ancient culture that traditionally only used telepathy to communicate” used in this activity seemed too far-fetched for her to use in the classroom. She suggested changing the activity to reflect a different perspective.
- “Differentiating between Stereotypes and Generalizations” (ACT-13/DM-39): Despite the caveat of needing a Spanish language version, Gillian felt that it would be important to address the fact that not just U.S.-Americans but peoples of all cultural backgrounds have stereotypes of others, and that cultural processes are multi-directional.
- “Speech Acts” (ACT-71) and “Synthesizing Strategies for Grammar Practice and Speech Acts” (ACT-73): For her content-based curriculum, Gillian found these activities hard to incorporate into her curriculum. She wanted to use speech acts in her classroom as she knew they had merit, yet she did not have adequate time to adapt them to suit her needs.

Question 6a: Integrating materials into the language curriculum: Do you think you were successful in integrating the materials from the Language Instructors’ Guide into your language curriculum? Why or why not?

The two instructors who taught a language acquisition-based curriculum felt that they were successful in integrating LIG materials into their curriculum; the two instructors who used a content-based curriculum felt they were less successful. Elizabeth was first challenged by the new approach of the LIG and how best to use the materials. Once she experimented with them, however, she found that it made her teaching easier, as both she and her students had a framework for “turn[ing] a fairly standard reading full of factoids but no culture (from our regular textbook) into a lesson in culture learning.” She was successful in integrating the materials that she chose for her course despite wanting to include more. Elizabeth felt that she could have sequenced the activities differently or used them more effectively with students but she was happy with her use of the materials. Her experience in the study gave her insights into this issue, which she expressed as follows: “I’m really beginning to see how much of a process this is. I’m sure I’ll be adding and adapting exercises every time I teach the course.” Magda received comments from students throughout the semester that they were constantly learning new things. She attributed this to her use of the LIG. As indicated earlier in this report, because of the fact that their language curricula was content-based, both Wanda and Gillian did not feel that it was possible to successfully integrate LIG materials into their curricula without substantial revisions.

Question 6b: Was integrating the materials from the LIG into your curriculum challenging for you? Why or why not?

The challenges that instructors encountered in incorporating LIG materials into the curriculum related to both content and process issues. In terms of process, including new activities into set curricula was a stated challenge for three of the instructors. For Magda, she did not have enough time to include as many LIG materials as she would have liked. Another challenge for Magda was knowing how to interpret results from the survey and inventories. For both Elizabeth and Gillian, they discovered that they were inhibited from including more activities than they wanted to because soon after the beginning of the semester they began to fall behind other colleagues who used the same required curriculum they did. Related to the difficulty of using the LIG materials in their content-based language classrooms, using the materials were challenging or not possible for Gillian and Wanda. Wanda stated that her course was more closely aligned with an anthropological or sociological course that is taught “in and through the language” rather than a traditional language course. This course focus made the LIG materials less appropriate for inclusion, she felt. Gillian found that she analyzed the LIG materials regarding what was missing in them compared to her own strategies-based materials that she had developed over the years. They both felt that the LIG materials seemed better suited to proficiency-based language classrooms.

Question 6c: Was time an issue regarding the preparation of these materials? Why or why not?

Time was a factor when the materials needed to be translated but it was not a notable constraint otherwise throughout the semester. For Gillian, the constant need to translate the activities as well as the need to make them consistent across sections made time a negative factor for her. She also stated that had the materials been a better match for her course, she would have “worked harder to make time to use more of them.” For Magda, Elizabeth, and Wanda, time was not a noted constraint. For Wanda, time was not a significant factor primarily because she did not use a critical mass of materials that would have created time pressures regarding materials preparation.

Question 6d: Was time an issue regarding the use of these materials? Why or why not?

The primary time issue related to the use of LIG materials was how to incorporate them into a full or set curriculum. When Elizabeth chose to use the materials as they appeared in the LIG, time was not an issue; she could adapt them with minimal effort. They were difficult to use, however, in the sense that she had to incorporate them into an already full curriculum. In addition, she wanted to use many more activities but was unable to for fear of losing time as compared to her colleagues who used the same curriculum. For Magda, time pressures came from deciding which materials to use and which not to use in general, not just which LIG

materials to use. Wanda did not use a great number of LIG activities and, as a result, time was not an issue.

Question 6e: Would you have wanted more guidance from the LIG about using the materials in the classroom? Why or why not?

Although having guidance available was useful, most language instructors felt that further guidance was not a critical need for them. Both Gillian and Magda felt that they did not need substantial guidance using the LIG overall. However, Magda felt it would be helpful to know how to adapt the materials for higher stages of student learning. Elizabeth, on the other hand, felt that she was as successful as she was with the LIG in part due to the availability of Margaret (the outside consultant) to assist her with her questions. Margaret, who had extensive experience using the LIG in language courses, was able to help Elizabeth adapt materials for her students. Wanda felt that more guidance was warranted about how to incorporate the LIG into the instructional sequence.

Question 7: Do you plan to use the materials from the LIG in future language courses?

All four instructors planned to use the LIG in future contexts, although not necessarily in the same courses in which they used it for the study. Gillian was the only instructor who did not plan to use LIG materials in her future language courses; she explained that her third semester content-based course is the only language course that she routinely taught and that the LIG were not a good fit for its curriculum. She was planning, however, to use the LIG in Interim Abroad courses that she was going to teach in the future. She would use the LIG in the following segments:

- Study Abroad Pre-departure: “Discovering Your Cultural Diversity” (ACT-31), “Culture Clash” (ACT-37), “Nonverbal Communication” (all activities), and “Becoming Familiar with Culture: The Iceberg Analogy” (ACT-61/DM-61).
- Study Abroad On-site: “Teaching Culture Using Cultural Objects or Products” (ACT-35), “Exploring Cultural Practices and Perspectives Through Critical Incidents” (ACT-39), “Differentiating Between Stereotypes and Generalizations” (ACT-43), “Communication Styles: Home Culture and Target Culture” (ACT-47/DM-43), “Writing Practice and Intercultural Debriefing” (ACT-63), “Hypothesis Refinement” (ACT-65/DM-60), “Conducting an Ethnographic Interview” (ACT-67/DM-71)

Gillian also reported that her department was planning on having informal monthly sessions for students on pragmatic aspects of language learning and intercultural communication. She believed that the LIG would be an excellent resource for this purpose. Elizabeth planned to use the LIG at a variety of levels in the future. The activities that were most useful for her students were the surveys because they “allowed the class a common base from which we could discuss culture.” Of the materials that she used from the LIG, Wanda found the materials on stereotypes and generalizations, as well as the surveys to be the most useful. The stereotypes and

generalizations materials were useful for laying a foundation on this topic to be exploited by other activities and discussions later on. The surveys could have been helpful if shortened and not used all in one sitting. Wanda would use these materials again but in a course more suited to the building of language skills (e.g., in Intermediate French I). Magda felt the culture learning activities were most useful and it is these materials that she would use again in the same Medical Spanish course.

Question 8: In what ways, if any, did the readings and/or activities from the Language Instructors' Guide provide new insights into your practice as a language educator? Please explain.

The impact of use of the LIG on the language instructors' practice ranged from the new insights into how they teach, to the examination of what they teach and how they can improve in these areas. Elizabeth gained knowledge about the nature of good teaching, not just about teaching culture as part of her language instruction. The *Learning Styles Survey* in particular opened her eyes to how her own learning style impacts the classroom. She stated:

I don't think I was clearly aware of the wide variety of students' learning styles, and thus did not teach as well to students whose learning style varied from my own. I thought my own style was the norm, but after taking the survey myself and talking with my classes about their results, I realized that fewer than 25% of the students seem to share my learning style! I now make more of an effort to teach to a variety of styles.

The greatest benefit for Wanda in taking part in the LIG research study was the opportunity it afforded her to reexamine her teaching practices. Through the examination of the LIG materials, she was able to clarify the types of materials that have the best fit with her curriculum. For Magda, she also enjoyed learning about new ways of preparing and using activities. She stated, "It is fulfilling to discover new and improved ways to apply materials to enhance students' learning. As a language instructor this is the proof for the need [for] constantly updating and appl[ying] improvement for teaching language and culture." Although Gillian did not find that the LIG gave her any major new insights, she did state that it would "serve as food for thought for future in-class and out-of-class activities."

Question 9: What parts of the LIG are most relevant for the "typical" language classroom (i.e., not a special pre-departure study abroad-oriented language course)?

Defining what a "typical" language classroom looks like was the point of departure for this question. Gillian and Magda conceptualized this type of language classroom as a first or second year proficiency-based course. In this language learning setting, the entire LIG would be useful as a language learning framework and instructors should use the LIG as it fits an entire language learning sequence. Within that sequence, concentrating on the vocabulary, speaking, listening, and reading skills would be most relevant, according to Gillian. With regard to specific activities in the LIG, Elizabeth felt that the surveys, the "Differentiating Between Stereotypes and Generalizations" activity, and the background information on stereotypes and

generalizations contained in the Culture-Learning Strategies section were most helpful for her with regard to the classroom. She felt these activities give students a foundation of “learning how to learn” so that an instructor can successfully adapt any exercise to a culture-learning activity without “losing” students. Wanda felt the material on stereotypes and generalizations as well as speech acts were most useful.

One language instructor, Gillian, also discussed the relevance of the LIG to the understanding and practice of non-U.S.-American instructors in the U.S. and also all instructors of varied expertise who could use a framework for language instruction beyond a grammar-based model. Gillian felt that the LIG materials could be especially useful for language instructors who are trained in literature but not language. For those instructors, and others, who rely on the textbook and its ancillaries as the curriculum, the LIG “could inspire major changes in their teaching by providing sufficient theory to contextualize them within language instruction and, more importantly, by emphasizing the application of theory to practice.” She felt that the clear organization and scaffolding from less- to more-complex strategies also have benefits for culture and language learning. In addition, as she felt the LIG “serve[s] as a meta-discourse on language teaching and learning in the U.S.,” non-U.S.-American teaching assistants would be well-served at varied levels through an examination and understanding of the LIG. Gillian felt that this could not only improve their teaching but help them “know the lingo” such that it could improve their job search possibilities.

Question 10: What advice or tips do you have for other language instructors who are considering using the Language Instructors’ Guide?

All four language instructors had numerous pieces of advice for prospective LIG users. First, know your course needs – for instance, whether it is content-based or language acquisition-focused. An examination of language curriculum is key before trying to choose and include LIG materials. Other suggestions were:

- Read the LIG completely, as well as the *Students’ Guide*. In the LIG, start by reading sections II-V first, as it is important to familiarize yourself with its underlying philosophy to see how it meshes with your own teaching philosophy, style, and context,
- Begin incorporating materials that focus on the traditional skills: speaking, listening, reading, and vocabulary,
- Start small and be realistic with regard to what you will be able to include the first time around. Don’t try to “cram” as many activities into a course as you can – be selective and go for quality over quantity,
- Share the materials with colleagues and collaborate with others – sharing is always fun and instructive to all,
- Always choose materials relevant to students’ backgrounds and needs,
- Integrate the activities into your curriculum versus using them as add-ons,
- Think of other, out-of-class applications of the LIG, such as study abroad programs,

- Develop an assessment or ways to connect student learning from the beginning of the semester to the end, and
- Apply materials in the TL only.

Question 11: Do you have any suggestions for how we might revise the Language Instructors' Guide (e.g., adding additional activities or changing its organization)?

Wanda felt strongly that the LIG should focus more on helping instructors to better incorporate the activities that they use in an appropriate instructional sequence, rather than to take part in the “activities syndrome,” as she called it, when instructors try to use as many activities as possible. Revisions to the LIG, therefore, could guide language instructors in how to exploit an activity over several class periods or how it could be recycled at higher levels for maximum impact. The goal of the LIG should be in helping instructors to develop “an overall sequence of instruction that will move learners along both the language proficiency continuum and the cultural proficiency continuum, integrating language work and cultural exploration and processing at every stage of the process.” On a practical note, she would like to see the activities and Duplicable Masters in a CD-ROM format for ease of use. Wanda would also like to see materials that help students examine their own cultural and linguistic development. She suggested an activity based on the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (1986, 1993) by Milton Bennett that allows students the opportunity to explore their own intercultural sensitivity as a means to assess their intercultural learning. She also wanted to see the focus of the *Guides* shift from a comparative perspective between two cultures to a more pan-cultural focus. Doing so would allow students to move out of a binary thinking mode to one that is more inclusive of multiple cultural frameworks. Another important revision, according to Magda, would include the development of end-of-year assessments related to the LIG. She also thought that materials in the LIG also needed to be adapted so that they would be applicable to more advanced levels of learners.

Findings for Revising the LIG

Content Revisions for the *Language Instructors' Guide*

- **Be more explicit about the value of the LIG for non-study abroad contexts.**
 - Wanda felt that the LIG should have clearer explanations about how to use it in the instruction of language learners who may never be in a TL context. In addition, she would like to see more techniques included that teach students how to be language and culture ethnographers even if their language skills are not advanced.
 - Gillian stated, “It would be nice to see at least some mention of the relevance of the activities in intercultural communicative exchanges within the U.S. outside of the language classroom.” By this she meant that the LIG should share that these materials are relevant inside and outside of the classroom, within or outside of the U.S. context.
 - Two of the instructors felt that the name of the LIG should be changed so that it does not reflect only a study abroad emphasis.
- **Update the LIG so that the content and activities are suitable for varied levels of learners, not just lower levels.** All the instructors felt that the authors should revise the vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, listening, reading, and writing sections so that these sections are suitable for advanced language learners.
- **Provide clearer direction on how each component of the LIG can be used for different purposes.**
- **Revise the LIG so that it does not focus solely on discrete-point activities.** Two of the instructors, Wanda and Gillian, found the majority of activities in the LIG to be discrete-point in focus. They felt these types of activities are more useful in a communicative language classroom rather than in content-based language classrooms. This could be rectified, in part, by reworking activities so that they are conceptually-oriented. In other words, they would have a general goal of communication in mind with varied approaches outlined for how to attain that goal.
- **More fully integrate the intercultural perspective throughout all sections of the LIG.** Wanda felt that the language should be taught through the intercultural lens and therefore the intercultural perspective needs to be more fully infused throughout all aspects of the LIG. She specifically stated that “I am convinced that you people at CARLA working on intercultural education are probably better placed than nearly anyone to provide direction in this important area because intercultural learning is at the basis of vocabulary learning, grammar learning, the learning of communication techniques, the exploration of self and the Other, etc...I urge you to pick up the ball on this.”
- **Beware of presenting cultural differences through the use of dramatic contrasts in examples.** Wanda felt that students who are less experienced with cultural difference (i.e., lower on the DMIS scale), may see examples of highly contrasting differences and feel threatened by them in some way. Wanda further stated that the LIG should move

away from contrasting different cultures to a multiple culture focus so that students move from a binary thinking mode to a more pan-cultural one. Therefore, the LIG needs to provide a range of examples for use by instructors so that each activity is developmentally appropriate and inclusive of multiple cultural frameworks.

- **Clarify the Describe-Interpret-Evaluate (D.I.E.) model.** Elizabeth felt the distinction between “interpreting” and “evaluation” should be clearer than it is currently written for the D.I.E. model.
- **Create a measurement of intercultural sensitivity to include in the LIG.** Wanda felt that since it is not possible to include the *Intercultural Development Inventory* in the LIG for student use, a simple measure of intercultural sensitivity based on the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity should be created for inclusion in the LIG.
- **Revise or develop a second version of the *Culture-Learning Strategies Inventory and Index*.** Several of the language instructors found that students often discounted the value of this instrument overall when they saw sections that did not directly pertain to their experience (e.g., items related to homestay families). Because of this, several of the instructors suggested that a new non-study abroad specific version be created for the LIG or that the original version be revised (perhaps by adding a note) so that students know that they can skip the sections of the inventory that do not relate to them.
- **Revise the *Language Strategy Survey*.** Suggested revisions include:
 - Vocabulary Strategy Use
 - **Strategies for learning new words:**
 - Look specifically for cognates,
 - Connect words with larger context (for example, link new environmental vocabulary with a text you’ve read on deforestation),
 - Distinguish between words to be learned for recognition only and words to be learned for active use in speaking or writing, and
 - “Chunk” vocabulary together.
 - **Strategies to make use of new vocabulary:**
 - Read online newspapers and magazines in the TL to practice vocabulary relating to current issues, and
 - Keep a vocabulary journal of words you want to add to your personal active vocabulary.
 - Reading Strategy Use
 - Read material slightly above my reading level to challenge myself,
 - Locate reading materials on topics of personal interest to me,
 - Read out-of-class on a variety of topics to broaden my “reading repertoire”: human interest, current events, issues important to adult readers, children’s books, etc.,

- Read online periodicals from a variety of Spanish-speaking countries,
 - Look at all the graphic elements of a text (photos, drawing, maps, charts, tables, etc.) before reading the verbal elements,
 - Underline main ideas as I read,
 - Take notes in the margin as I read to help process main ideas (and recall them later),
 - Talk with friends or classmates in Spanish about things I've read in Spanish, and
 - Share interesting articles in Spanish (from the Internet, etc.) with friends, classmates, or teachers.
- **Revise certain activities.**
 - “Instructor Survey” (ACT-3): Suggested additional questions to add to the Instructor Survey include information on students’ work or volunteer activities and their use of the target language; other non-target language use; and students’ plans for study abroad in countries other than those of the target language.
 - “Awareness Raising Using the Learning Style Survey” (ACT-5): Elizabeth felt that information should be added for instructors about how to use this activity with individuals and the class as a whole so that all student needs can be met.
 - “Reading Strategy Training” (ACT-19): Gillian felt more information was needed about “the importance of genre and the conventions of different types of genres. For example, what kinds of language or features might different types of texts emphasize (e.g., commands in advertisements or instructions for use or assembly, past tense verbs in news stories, subjunctive in opinion pieces, etc.)?” More attention also needed to be paid to the lay-out of the materials, according to Gillian, such as calling attention to the importance and possible use of captions, photos, and graphics.
 - “Listening Strategy Training” (ACT-23)/”Strategies to Become a Better Listener” (DM-31): Gillian felt this activity was primarily focused on in-class, face-to-face use and should be adapted to include news clips or similar other types of materials that could be used to improve listening behaviors by students.
 - “Strategic Use of Translation” (ACT-29): Gillian called for more student-relevant content in this activity, for example, using phrases related to university life, rather than a random list of idiomatic expressions.
 - “Exploring U.S. Culture” (ACT-33/DM-35): To be sure that an accurate representation of culture appears in this activity, Gillian felt that a range of dining possibilities needs to be explored, not just one type of experience that is generalized to an entire population.
 - “Teaching Culture Using Cultural Objects or Products” (ACT-35): Gillian felt that this activity did not provide enough cultural contextual clues for the use of objects in class. She suggested that the directions for the activity emphasize the contexts of objects before analyzing them.

- “Culture Clash” (ACT-37): Gillian found the premise of “an ancient culture” used in this activity to be too far from reality for students to take it seriously. She suggested a more up-to-date scenario be substituted.
- Despite the caveat of needing a Spanish language version, Gillian felt that it would be important to address the fact that not just U.S.-Americans, but peoples of all cultural backgrounds, have stereotypes of others, and that cultural processes are multi-directional.
- **Include suggestions on how to sequence materials.** Elizabeth called for the provision of suggested sequencing for use of the surveys (as well as which surveys should be used together for maximum impact) and other materials. She felt that providing this information was important so that students would have an understanding of how they learn in general, as well as how they learn language and culture specifically, but that it was necessary to provide the information without overloading them by giving them too much, too soon. Wanda felt the LIG needs to describe how LIG activities can be used over several course periods for maximum impact.
- **Provide guidance on how to interpret and use results from *Language Strategy Survey*.** Two instructors were unsure of how to incorporate the results from the *Language Strategy Survey* and other measures into their curricula. They felt summative information such as that available at the end of the *Learning Style Survey* would be helpful.
- **Provide guidance on how to interpret and use results from the *Learning Style Survey*.** Magda was not sure how to use results from the *Learning Style Survey* with her students. She suggested adding background content for instructors in the LIG that would provide insights into how best to assign and then collect the results from students for use later.
- **Include additional materials.**
 - Wanda wanted to see the inclusion of activities and content from Claire Kramersch’s *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*. She also recommended the use of content from the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Foreign Language Standards, which promotes the idea that all language teaching should be content-focused; the key would be to transform the 5 Cs of the Standards into a “coherent instructional sequence.” She felt that the addition of information from these works and others would meet the challenge of “Creat[ing] an overall framework for learning and teaching in which language and culture are integrated at every step of the process. In other words, the idea is to get away from the notion of doing the language first and then, if there is time, we can do culture on Friday.” The second challenge, according to Wanda, was to “Treat culture – C1 and C2 – in a sophisticated way in the TL even though learners’ language is at the lower end of the proficiency scale.” In her view, if the authors of the LIG are serious about improving the “compatibility between the LIG and the ACTFL Standards, then you need to give more attention to the teaching of non-linguistic content. For example, how can one teach physical and human geography? How can one explore schooling?”

- Magda suggested the addition of a culture and language learning assessment rubric as well as end-of-year assessments to evaluate student learning.
- Elizabeth wanted to see a section in the LIG that addresses how instructors can mediate the different ways that students perceive and interpret the materials. For example: How do you address comments in the classroom such as those equating environmental pollution with white people? This issue actually occurred in one of Elizabeth's classes during the study. Psychologically intense situations such as these can occur and Elizabeth felt the LIG should provide as much guidance as possible on this and related issues for instructors.

Format/Organizational Revisions for the *Language Instructors' Guide*

- **Better integrate the Classroom Activities and the Duplicable Masters sections.** For example, one instructor felt that a notation at the bottom of each activity sheet that indicates its corresponding Duplicable Master sheet would facilitate use of the materials. She specifically cited the "Exploring U.S. Culture" activity which is labeled ACT-33/ACT-34 yet the matching Duplicable Master is DM-35. She noted that it would be better if the two shared the same number. She also found it cumbersome to search for the ACT sheets and DM sheets in two separate parts of the binder, and that having the ACT and DM sheets for a particular activity placed together in the binder would be more convenient.
- **Create a comprehensive index.** Two of the instructors felt a key need was the inclusion of an index of activities organized by function, topic, vocabulary, and grammatical point. This index would make the LIG more user-friendly for instructors.

Development of Future *Language Instructors' Guide*-Related Materials

- **Create a video to accompany the LIG.** Magda would like to see a video produced on several of the mini-case studies that exist in the LIG. She felt that it would be helpful for students to first see a situation as it happens to others rather than always expecting students to relate learning to their personal experiences.
- **Create a CD-ROM which contains the Classroom Activities and Duplicable Masters.** Both Wanda and Gillian felt that a CD-ROM would be useful so that language instructors could adapt activities electronically to suit their needs without retyping the entire document.
- **Create target-language versions of the LIG.** All four instructors stated that the LIG in its current form as a culture-general tool (i.e., suitable for use in any language learning context) is an important resource. They also stated that they were inhibited from time to time in using the materials because they were not available in the TL. To remedy this situation, they called for the creation of additional TL versions of the LIG, beginning with French, Spanish, and German.

Summary of the Findings

In response to research question #1 (What elements of the *Language Instructors' Guide* did the instructors use in their language teaching? Why did they choose to include those specific materials?), the LIG materials that instructors used most often included the survey and inventories, which they were requested to use, and other activities that concentrated on vocabulary and context-building activities for language, and cultural awareness and processing activities for culture. Overall, the instructors stated that they thought these instruments could be useful in helping students to understand all the myriad ways of learning language as well as to determine how students acquired information in general (e.g., their learning style preferences). The instructors found the *Learning Style Survey*, *Language Strategy Survey* and the *Culture-Learning Strategies Inventory* to be beneficial for their students, although instructors cautioned against using them without forethought as to how they best fit the curriculum (e.g., in terms of sequencing and scope of follow-up).

With regard to specific language learning activities, the instructors focused on efforts to promote student vocabulary learning. The goal of increasing student success in learning vocabulary was attempted through using activities such as “How Do You Learn Vocabulary” and in placing meaning in context. For instance, one instructor used a speech act activity and, notwithstanding her initial reticence, was surprised at the success of the activity. Instructors used more culture-related activities overall than language activities during the study. One instructor stated this was the case because the cultural activities seemed more relevant for her course, which focused on Medical Spanish. Two of the instructors used cultural self-awareness activities and cultural processing activities to frame learning for students, particularly by referencing the Iceberg Analogy and the Describe-Interpret-Evaluate model. Elizabeth, for example, found that later in the semester when discussing topics with students she simply had to say “remember the D.I.E. model” and students were able to reframe their discussions to take different cultural worldviews into account. Other activities used from the LIG included “Differentiating between Stereotypes and Generalizations” and “You as a Culturally Diverse Person,” to name but two examples.

Instructors also took time to familiarize themselves with the materials even when they did not have plans to use them with their students. They found that doing so gave them a greater understanding of the potential uses of the LIG in general, which further helped them incorporate LIG activities later in the semester. In addition to the LIG materials, Magda assigned activities from the *Students' Guide* to give students more grounding in cultural concepts – for example, Bennett’s “Model of Intercultural Sensitivity” and content on comparing and contrasting and the activity “Contrasting U.S.-American Views with the Host Country,” all in efforts to increase students’ language and culture learning skills.

In asking research question #2 (What were the successes instructors had incorporating materials from the *Language Instructors' Guide* into their curricula?), the goal was to determine the most successful activities used by instructors. Instructors stated that results from the use of the survey and inventories were useful in helping students place their learning in context and in making learning a personal, interactive process with both the instructor and the TL. One instructor found the *Culture-Learning Strategies Inventory* and the *Learning Style Strategy Use Inventory* to be particularly helpful in making an explicit link between students’ (and her own)

ways of learning and success with the TL. This was one of her goals in using these materials. Utilization of the surveys was a success, especially for Elizabeth and Magda, because the materials helped students understand that communicating is a two-way process that takes initiative and reflection. Both of these instructors found that through the use of these and other LIG materials, students were more willing and able to share their personal feelings at a deeper level, which they found to be valuable to the class as a whole. Furthermore, Magda stated that the activities helped students to “view concepts and values in a very conceptual and practical way,” which allowed them to connect higher concepts to their course materials.

With regard to their own learning, using the LIG caused some of the instructors to reexamine their own underlying teaching philosophies with regard to how they conceptualized and practiced the teaching of language. Initially several instructors found LIG activities not directly applicable to their own content-based classroom use but with some reworking, they found that almost any LIG activity could be used effectively for student learning. Gillian stated, “I think there are classroom applications for all of these activities.”

Research question #3 (Did the instructors encounter any challenges in integrating the *Language Instructors’ Guide* materials into their curriculum?) solicited information about challenges that instructors faced in using the LIG materials. The challenges that they encountered centered on integrating new materials into an already-full curricula, finding time to update and choose materials that were as relevant as possible to students, and helping students to realize that language learning could be strategic as well as to keep the strategies fresh in mind for them as learning tools. Several of the instructors taught courses with mandated curricular goals and discovered that the first time using the LIG caused them to fall behind their colleagues, a not unexpected result.

With regard to use of the survey and inventories, in the future the instructors shared that they would be more judicious in how they would use each of the instruments, such as disseminating them one at a time or even breaking them up into sections based on the focus of the lesson or unit. Several of the instructors had planned to use all of the survey and inventories early on in the semester but found that it was “overkill” – namely, students started to exhibit signs of survey burnout which decreased the intended effectiveness of the activities. One instructor commented that as she reused these and other materials, she would find better ways of integrating them into her courses and thus constraints, such as time, would eventually diminish for her, she felt.

Another challenge related to choosing materials that were most appropriate for the students’ needs, such as the necessity to translate LIG materials into the TL so that they were appropriate for the third- or higher-semester-level of language that they taught. Despite knowing that the LIG is a culture-general tool, this was a frustration for several instructors and they suggested that the development of multiple-language versions of the LIG activities would be helpful. Another challenge encountered was integrating strategies-based instruction into the language curriculum in a sustained fashion, such that students would continually reassess their language learning habits in efforts to be as successful as possible. One instructor found this to be a personal challenge, namely, to remember to point out to students that they use strategies all the time and that they should be deliberate in their use of them. Perceived superficial treatment of topics in some LIG materials was also mentioned; several instructors felt that certain activities were too basic and needed guidance in the form of tips as to how to adapt them to suit varied contexts of learning and levels of language proficiency.

Research question #4 (Of the materials from the *Language Instructors' Guide* that the instructors chose to include, which would they use again? Would they modify them in any way?) was designed to capture activities in the LIG that were particularly useful in the language classroom. All of the instructors would continue to use the materials that they incorporated into their courses but often with modifications. Considerations of how the materials would be used in the future included time (e.g., sequencing of chosen materials), effectiveness (i.e., which activities best promote course goals), and appropriateness (e.g., if the chosen activity need to be translated into the TL). Several of the instructors commented that it would take time – as with any new materials – to incorporate the LIG as a substantial component of their curricula.

In response to research question #5 (What effect did language instructor use of the *Language Instructors' Guide* elements in class have on the language instructors students?) instructor comments were mixed. Although several instructors stated that they could not explicitly tie student behavior to their use of the LIG and that they were not sure there was an explicit link between the LIG and students, several of the instructors commented that students seemed more reflective and open in sharing their opinions when discussing topics. Students also seemed better able to frame their comments and to express deeper levels of thought than students who had not been exposed to the LIG.

When asked research question #6 (Did the instructors' students indicate in any way that they were considering study abroad? If so, did the use of the *Language Instructors' Guide* played a role in their decision to consider studying abroad? How?), all four instructors stated that they did not feel that the LIG had a significant impact on student decisions on whether or not to study abroad. The two instructors at the private liberal arts college, where over 60% of their students take part in study abroad opportunities annually, felt that their students typically already had study abroad in mind when deciding to matriculate in their college, so the LIG served more as a complement to what they were already doing. Three of the instructors commented that their use of the LIG made them consider how they could make overt connections between study abroad and the MAXSA materials in future courses. One instructor, for example, stated that this question prompted her to make explicit connections for her students between study abroad and classroom practices, something she had not previously been doing.

When asked in research question #7 (What insights, if any, did the readings and supporting materials from the *Language Instructors' Guide* provide the instructors regarding your work as a language instructor?) about their own growth as a language instructor through use of the LIG, several of the instructors described how the LIG gave them a framework for not only understanding the theory behind culture and language learning with strategies, but also that they learned more about themselves as learners. Instructors commented on the dynamic between the instructor as not only a life-long learner but also as a facilitator of learning for their students. The LIG provided them with a method to incorporate strategies that seemed to work for students and which encouraged them to expand their teaching repertoire. Although one instructor did not see the LIG as adding greatly to her own knowledge base due to her long experience in the field, she did see the LIG as a key resource for language instructors in general, whether they are already versed in the diverse methodologies and theories of the language teaching profession or not. Two instructors reiterated that the LIG would be especially valuable to newer teachers, especially those whom teach using communicatively-oriented curricula. Instructors agreed that a primary challenge for some language instructors in using the LIG is that it takes a paradigmatic shift in thinking, to a certain degree, to understand the underlying framework of the materials;

many language instructors are not familiar with the intercultural paradigm and how it intersects with language. One instructor emphasized how the developmental process of culture learning needs to be better integrated with the developmental process of language learning. She felt the LIG did not extrapolate enough on this important point. All instructors agreed that a foundational challenge in using the LIG is in helping teachers embody the language-as-culture-and-vice-versa framework that is intrinsic in the LIG.

In response to research question #8 (Do the instructors have any suggestions for improving the *Language Instructors' Guide*?), all four instructors provided numerous insights on how the LIG could be revised to better serve language instructors with regard to both its content and formatting. In terms of its content, instructors expressed that the LIG should more clearly explain the multitude of ways in which it can be used for study abroad and non-study abroad contexts, differing levels of instruction, and for different types of uses (e.g., classroom use or language instruction on-site abroad). Other comments related to the need to make sure activities are not overly focused on communicative language learning goals at the expense of learning content. Suggestions were provided as to how to make the exercises and other components of the LIG more user-friendly with regard to both its content and format, including the development of ancillary materials (e.g., the creation of language-specific versions) and putting the Duplicable Masters sections with the Activities. None of the language instructors felt that sections of the LIG needed to be replaced, *per se*; they simply need to be reworked so that they are more suitable for varied audiences and uses.

Limitations of the Study

Sample

The LIG study utilized a case study design with four language instructors comprising the sample. Thus, generalizing the findings beyond this small instructor sample is problematic and should only be done with care. Additionally, the four instructors all taught at institutions based in southern Minnesota at the time of the study and thus may share teaching or other characteristics that language instructors in other parts of the state, region, country, or world may not.

Other Limitations

As part of the study, the language instructors did not complete any type of instrument of any kind to determine their own levels of intercultural sensitivity, language and culture strategy use, or other types of learning embodied in the LIG materials themselves. A possible limitation, therefore, in interpreting their feedback was not explicitly knowing their levels of knowledge, skills, and behaviors related to the LIG materials that they were asked to use. This information would have been useful to serve as a baseline for comparing their reflections on the materials in general as well as to those of the other study participants.

An additional limitation is the self-report nature of the research. In addition, language instructors were given the freedom to incorporate as many, or as few, materials and activities

from the LIG as they desired, other than the request by the research team to incorporate the *Learning Style Survey*, *Language Strategy Survey*, and the *Culture-Learning Strategies Inventory and Index* at the beginning of their respective courses. Although this method was used by design to determine, in part, how much or how little language instructors would use when left to their own devices to do so, researchers interested in the specific use of certain materials or activities from the LIG would most likely need to script the use of chosen materials in future studies.

Discussion

The principal goal of the study was to determine the impact of use of the LIG on each instructor's teaching with regard to the integration of cultural and linguistic content and processes through strategy use in the classroom. Whereas following only four teachers in-depth meant a limited sample, it had the advantage of providing a high level of detail, resulting in extensive valuable feedback regarding the LIG, which was the main purpose of the study. The study also sought to determine the ways in which they felt the LIG impacted their own understanding of the concepts presented in the LIG; how language instructors used the LIG, particularly the challenges and successes they experienced; and if use of the LIG encouraged students to study abroad. Overall, language instructor participants felt that the LIG was a cache of useful theoretical and practical information and that it enabled them to gain greater understanding of culture and language learning concepts, especially with regard to strategies-based learning. The LIG also provided them with numerous activities to integrate language and culture for students in the classroom. Suggested areas for improvement included providing further clarification and elaboration of culture and language learning principles, clearer descriptions of ways language instructors could adapt the materials for varied uses and contexts, a framework of how the LIG fits into typical language learning curricular models, and ancillary materials to supplement the LIG. Information also emerged from the study providing advice for other language instructors who consider using the LIG.

Overall Instructor Perceptions of the *Language Instructors' Guide*

All four instructors enjoyed using the LIG and felt that it was a valuable contribution to the language teaching field despite its need for some fine-tuning. It was useful for them in that it provided clear, distinct explanations of intercultural and language learning theory and processes, which made the LIG accessible for novice or experienced instructors. Of note were sections on intercultural development and intercultural processes, learning styles, and strategy use in general for both language and culture. The instructors felt that the LIG provided a framework for learning culture and language, especially in terms of bridging theory to practice. Although Wanda felt the LIG did not give her any totally new insights, for Elizabeth the LIG showed her how theory is directly applicable to student learning, especially with regard to strategy use and this was a revelation for her as she had discounted in the past the applicability of theory in her day-to-day work with students in the classroom. These divergent views could possibly be tied to the experience level of the instructors – the previous comment was made by Wanda, an instructor with three decades' of experience, and the latter comment by Elizabeth, an instructor with less

than 10 years' language teaching experience. These commentaries and others from instructors indicate that the LIG provides instructors with useful information on content and processes involved in integrating language and culture learning, and that it does have value for language instructors depending on their needs and desires. It is also interesting to note that several instructors commented that they often do not take the time, for various reasons, to read about classroom-relevant theory and that participating in the LIG study gave them that opportunity, which they appreciated. This finding indicates that the "extent, clarity, and simplification of theories," as Magda stated, found in the LIG were of benefit to language instructors and that it improved their teaching, which supports the implicit goal of the study to show that the LIG has a *positive* impact on language teacher practice.

Regarding use of the LIG as part of an existing curriculum, instructors felt it provided a beneficial framework for understanding language and culture learning through the use of strategies as well as by providing information on intercultural communication and other content. Several instructors felt that more needs to be said in the LIG, however, related to how to use it as part of an existing curricular framework, especially in terms of sequencing and language assessment. For example, many language learning classrooms assessments do not focus on the integration of culture and language but on student mastery of grammatical and lexical knowledge. The instructors would like to see suggestions on how teachers can reconceptualize their current teaching to incorporate the LIG, rather than use them as "add-on" activities that can negatively impact both class time and learning objectives. In other words, integration is the goal. Alignment with the ACTFL Proficiency Standards was also a suggested addition for one instructor. For Wanda, what is missing from the LIG is *intentionality* – that is, guidance to help instructors decide deliberately what works for them from the LIG and how to place their chosen activities in an overall learning framework, not just for one class but for their entire language sequence. These findings highlight difficulties in melding any new language materials to an existing framework, and the LIG is no different. The positive finding here is that instructors clearly understand the goal and scope of the LIG in general as well as its applicability to their teaching. Suggested changes such as those mentioned above are to be expected and are welcomed. As Gillian stated, "No one book or set of materials can do everything for everybody."

When instructors reflected on the LIG, they found that its benefit to language instructors could be diminished by having study abroad in its title. They felt strongly that the LIG has wide applicability and that the current name could cause instructors to discount it as irrelevant for their typical classroom settings, before they ever took a look inside. They suggested a name change.

Instructor Uses of the *Language Instructors' Guide*: Successes and Challenges

All four instructors chose materials from the LIG with particular learning goals in mind for their students. Instructors used the *Learning Style Survey*, *Language Strategy Survey*, and the *Culture-Learning Strategies Inventory*, although in different sequences and different permutations. In general, more culture-related activities were utilized than language-related activities. The instructors had positive results from using LIG activities, although the amount of activities used varied according to available amounts of time and other factors such as each instructor's perceived value of LIG materials.

The *Learning Style Survey*, *Language Strategy Survey*, and the *Culture-Learning Strategies Inventory* were used differently by instructors with varied results. All instructors planned to use all of the instruments early on in their courses, but several found this to be impossible if they were to stay on track with their colleagues who taught the same curriculum, while others chose to use some of the instruments later in the semester so that they did not overwhelm students. In general, instructors found that these materials helped students to understand how they learn and expanded their understanding of learning styles and strategies as a framework for learning language, as well as where they fit in as individuals as part of the learning process. Magda found that once students overcame their initial reticence to self-explore, that the class as a whole became much closer and more willing to tie their own personal anecdotes to course content throughout the semester. Elizabeth found that when students realized that she truly cared that there were diverse learning styles in the classroom (including her own, which was different than 90% of her students), the students seemed to engage more and were more invested in learning outcomes than what she had seen with other classes that did not use the LIG. She stated that use of the LIG “made teaching easier and more pleasant.” She felt that if the LIG can encourage the building of trust through revealing similarities in learning styles and in other ways, which it seems to have done in these examples, than it has achieved a laudable goal.

Challenges in using these materials included the need for guidance in how to sequence the use of these materials, the need to translate them into the TL, requests for aide in how to analyze results from the survey and inventories, and requests for a second version of the *Culture-Learning Strategies Inventory* that does not contain study abroad-focuses content, as this information seemed to district students who were not planning to study abroad. All of these findings indicate the value of these three instruments to frame ways of learning and types of learning for students and instructors alike. How they are used, and in which forms, will vary according to classroom needs but the suggested improvements do not diminish their apparent value.

Of materials chosen for use by instructors, several were cited as particularly relevant and successful, including sections on intercultural development, intercultural processes (D.I.E. model and the Iceberg Analogy), and listening and vocabulary strategy use. Some instructors used many more LIG activities than others, an issue which can be tied perhaps to the perceived value of the LIG to their classroom. Wanda, for example, stated that she felt that the LIG was not very relevant to her content-based classroom and thus did not use many of the materials. Another instructor of content-based language, Gillian, did use many of the materials but spent more time making them relevant to her students. She stated that she accepted that she could only update a few materials during any one semester but that this is true when she uses any new materials. In other words, she incorporated activities little by little until eventually she had a range of applicable activities for use in the classroom. These examples indicate that the belief system of the instructor relates to how much or how little they may incorporate available materials from the LIG. Wanda did not feel the LIG was that relevant to her but decided to “play the game,” by using more activities as part of the study. She also used a speech act activity with her students and was pleasantly surprised by the positive result. This outcome points to the need to again frame for instructors the applicability of the LIG for varied contexts. All of the instructors felt that the LIG in general provided too many basic activities and that there needed to be additional activities provided, or at least guidance on how to adapt existing materials, so that they are applicable to varied levels of student language proficiency and ways of learning. For example,

they would recommend having advice on how to embed cultural materials from the home context or to simply adapt chosen activities so that they can be used in multiple ways in the same classroom. This is helpful information for the next version of the LIG.

Results from using the activities included increased student awareness of diverse perspectives and an enhanced ability on the part of students to express their opinions at higher conceptual levels than previously. The LIG also helped students to place themselves in the learning cycle in terms of how their own experiences are cultural and impact how they learn language and perceive speakers of other languages. A challenge that emerged from the use of the materials is that learning culture and language in an integrative fashion can challenge students to examine their own identities in such a way that diversity can seem challenging. Gillian stated that this challenge to one's identity occurred with a student in her classroom and she felt she needed a degree in psychology at times to help that student and others understand their own role in the world with regard to cultural and linguistic diversity. These results highlight the fact that the LIG differs from traditional language teaching materials in that it is a system of understanding that successful learning of culture and language involves the acknowledgement that individuals construct reality through interrelationships and that effective communication is contingent upon each participant's perceptions of reality. This realization and potential changes in identity can be difficult for students. The fact that students were challenged in their thinking by discussions that emerged from the use of LIG activities is a testimony to the potential worldview shifts that can occur for students in the language classroom through the LIG. Because of this, the LIG must clearly outline the inherent values and potential risks of its use – when used to its fullest potential, it is not simply content for a typical grammar-based classroom. This instructor's call for guidance on mediating questions related to identity indicates that the LIG is fulfilling one of its purposes, namely to challenge students to learn about and accept the Other.

Another result of the study is that instructors felt the LIG was better suited to a communicative classroom than to a content-based learning framework. All instructors felt the LIG was of value to their teaching and to their students, yet the two instructors who used the LIG in content-centered classrooms felt that they had to work hard to revise LIG materials so that they suited their purposes. One way in which they felt the LIG was more oriented to proficiency-based learning is that many of the activities seemed to them to be overly concrete, rather than more abstract and suited for wider language learning goals. In addition to domestic classroom use, these two instructors felt the LIG would be of particular value on-site abroad (e.g., used as part of Interim Abroad courses that they routinely teach). The finding that the LIG may not suit content-based curricula as easily as more traditional proficiency-based classrooms is important in that it highlights the challenges instructors often face in reworking teaching materials to best fit their needs. It also indicates that more explanation should be provided in the LIG for language instructors on how the LIG can be used for different types of language instruction.

The LIG is a language- and culture-general set of materials – that is, applicable to any language learning setting – and instructors found value in this model. Nonetheless, instructors often commented that it would be nice to have TL versions of LIG activities, so that they would not have to continually spend time translating them for use with students. They also suggested the development of a CD-ROM of all LIG activities to make it easier for instructors to revise

them for their own purposes. These needs are not uncommon and yet unavoidable at this time. Instructors everywhere must adapt materials and this remains true for the LIG.

Impact on Student Decisions to Study Abroad

Instructors did not indicate that their use of the LIG had any direct impact on student decisions to study abroad. The two instructors at the private college, Gillian and Wanda, felt that the LIG supported their institution's efforts that were already in place to encourage study abroad, but that the LIG in itself was not a deciding factor in student study abroad choices. Nonetheless, when asked how the LIG impacted her students, one of these instructors reassessed how she presented study abroad in her teaching in general. She realized that she routinely taught on the assumption that if language and culture are well presented, and represented, in her classroom that study abroad would be a natural result at some point for students. For the two instructors at the public university, Elizabeth and Magda, students also did not indicate that the use of LIG materials made them explicitly think about study abroad. Magda reported that her use of the LIG and the *Students' Guide* with students did cause some students to state that they would take their copy of the *Students' Guide* with them on their study abroad trip (which had already been scheduled prior to the course); they wanted to share it with other students. This outcome would suggest that students may well see value in the *Maximizing Study Abroad* materials in general, even if instructors have some misgivings about the LIG materials in particular. What all of the feedback from instructors suggests, with regard to the impact of the LIG in student decisions to study abroad, is that the LIG can have an impact if its use is explicitly framed for students as relevant to diverse experiences abroad. It is also important to reiterate that all of the instructors felt that the LIG should be used to promote student experience in diverse settings at home, not just in international sojourns.

Although the results from this study would suggest that the LIG is not as directed at study abroad situations as is the *Students' Guide*, it can be a useful tool for better understanding cross-cultural differences. For example, several instructors commented that their use of the LIG helped students to better understand diverse worldviews and to practice more ethnorelative behaviors, for example, using the Describe-Interpret-Evaluate model in situations where cultural difference is an issue. This finding may be more important than whether or not students decide to study abroad through use of the LIG, as the ability for students to interact with culturally diverse individuals in any setting is a primary objective of the LIG, whether that happens in the home context or abroad. Gillian stated, "Given the number of Spanish-speakers in the U.S., as well as speakers of other languages, many of the activities are even more important for use domestically than internationally because of their immediacy." This statement supports the value of the LIG for all contexts, not just study abroad.

Suggestions for Other Language Instructors Who Use the *Language Instructors' Guide*

The study participants provided numerous suggestions for other language instructors who consider using the LIG. The first area of consideration is for each language instructor to determine their needs before using the LIG: Are they searching for ways to complement their existing curriculum and if so, how? Are they searching for a broader framework in which to ground their practice? Answering all of these questions and others are crucial to successful use

of the LIG, according to the language instructors who participated in this study. Other suggestions included the following: (1) reading both the LIG and *Students' Guide* thoroughly so as to have a firm grounding in its underlying principles, (2) incorporating activities that focus on traditional skills (e.g., listening, speaking, and writing) first before more untraditional methods, (3) incorporating chosen materials slowly and deliberately (choose quality over quantity), (4) concentrating on integrating LIG materials into the curriculum as a whole versus using them as add-ons, (5) applying the materials in the TL whenever possible, and (6) (and perhaps most importantly) always choosing materials that are relevant to student needs, first and foremost. All of these suggestions reflect the realities of the language classroom, namely, that few instructors have time to waste on experimenting with activities that do not achieve learning goals in as time efficient a manner as possible for themselves and for students.

Study participants commented that perhaps the most essential and difficult aspect of using the LIG is for language instructors to realize that it represents a new way of conceptualizing language learning for both instructors and students alike. According to the study participants, the LIG is not simply a useful new set of materials, but much more: it is a paradigmatic shift in thinking for language teaching and not one that they felt instructors can use to its utmost advantage without dedicating themselves to reading it thoroughly and experimenting with it long-term. They felt that it was worth the effort, however, despite the aforementioned caveats in its use. This last point refers to the opinion that prospective LIG users need to grasp the underlying theoretical frameworks of the LIG to take full advantage of it. Understanding how culture – especially intercultural learning – intersects with language and vice versa, in an integrative fashion, is not the same as including cultural content in a piecemeal fashion in the curriculum. It is a new way of viewing the world – one in which there are a multitude of lenses through which to construe diverse worldviews and actions. This knowledge can be both powerful and challenging for teachers and students alike and should not be dismissed lightly.

Conclusions

The overall goal of the LIG study was to determine the impact of use of the LIG on language instructor practice with regard to the integration of culture and language in the language classroom. Findings from the study show that, despite the constraints of time, full curricula, and other inhibitors in the language classroom, the LIG is a positive addition to the existing assortment of instructional materials available for use by language instructors and that it is useful to both increase instructors' own knowledge and for application in the classroom with students. Instructors in this study felt that the LIG was an important tool for use with students who choose to study abroad, but that it would also be valuable when used in domestic language learning contexts where there are as many, if not more, diverse learning contexts than abroad. No matter what the context of use of the LIG, however, study participants felt that the LIG is a worthwhile tool that language instructors should add to their teaching repertoire.

Directions for Future Research

Whenever new materials are developed, there are a multitude of avenues for further research and this reality is no different for the LIG. Possibilities for future research include studies on the use of the LIG in different types of practice, studies on the LIG itself (e.g., suitability of its contents to given contexts), and the relationship between the user of the LIG and the LIG.

An important area for future research that emerged from this study is the need to further explore the applicability and effectiveness of the LIG for language learners in varied language learning situations other than those intended for students studying abroad, especially those in which the integration of culture and language learning has not been the focus. Although as stated in the beginning pages of the LIG, the guide was designed for use in any language learning context, all four instructors stated that the title of the LIG, as well as certain wording contained within, do not make the applicability of the LIG to varied contexts explicit. Studies that examine the use of the LIG in varied domestic contexts as well as language learning situations abroad would further inform the field regarding this issue.

Another avenue of research is a study of the ways in which the LIG (or parts of the LIG) are used for different types of language curricular models. The current study found real differences in the way the language instructors used the LIG based on the type of language curricula they used (i.e., communicative or content-based). Further exploration of this topic is needed.

Another area of suggested research relates to the interrelationship of a language instructor's own knowledge of, as well as comfort level with, intercultural and linguistic content, context, and process as they relate to their perception and use of the LIG materials. The need for research on this topic is clear when one considers that teachers typically teach content with which they are most familiar and comfortable. Therefore, instructors' level of understanding as well as their ability to teach appropriate intercultural and language-oriented content in the language classroom is important so that students are as prepared as possible for a culturally diverse world. The linkage between instructor knowledge and use of the LIG is a topic worthy of exploration.

References for the *Students' Guide, Language Instructors' Guide, and Program Professionals' Guide Studies*

- Adams, R. J. (2000). *An evaluation of the impact of BYU study abroad programs on language learning strategy use*. Unpublished master's thesis, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.
- Allen, H. W., & Herron, C. (2003). A mixed-methodology investigation of the linguistic and affective outcomes of summer study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals*, 36(3), 370-385.
- Altbach, P. G. (2002). The context and implications of the globalization of the knowledge economy: Farewell to the common good. *International Educator*, XI(4), 13-17.
- Arellano, S. (2000). A hierarchy of requests in California Spanish: Are indirectness and mitigation polite? In A. Roca (Ed.), *Research in Spanish in the U.S.: Linguistic issues and challenges*. Somerville: Cascadilla Press.
- Bacon, S. M. (2002). Learning the rules: Language development and cultural adjustment during study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35(6), 637-646.
- Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Beebe, L., & Cummings, M. (1985). *Speech act performance: A function of the data collection procedures?* Paper presented at TESOL Convention, New York.
- Bennett, M. J. (1993). Toward ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (2nd ed.) (pp. 21-71). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Bennett, J., & Paige, R. M. (2004). *Workshop manual: Training design for international and multicultural programs*. Portland, OR: Intercultural Communication Institute.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Brecht, R. D., Davidson, D. E., & Ginsberg, R. B. (1995). Predictors of foreign language gain during study abroad. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 37-66). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Brecht, R. D., & Robinson, J. L. (1995). On the value of formal instruction in study abroad: Student reactions in context. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 317-334). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Brislin, R. W., & Yoshida, T. (Eds.). (1994). *Improving intercultural interactions: Modules for cross-cultural training programs*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Brown, M. (2000). Study abroad: Package or experience? In H. Callan (Ed.), *International education: towards a critical perspective* (pp. 9-12). Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.
- Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1989). Single sample cross-validation indices for covariance structures. *Multivariate behavioral research*, 24(4), 445-455.
- Carlson, J. S., Burn, B. B., Useem, J. & Yachimowitz, D. (1990). *Study abroad: The experience of American undergraduates*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Center For Women's Intercultural Leadership. (2003) *Reentry course resources*. St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Indiana. Retrieved February 22, 2005, from <http://www.saintmarys.edu/%7Eecwil/php/intercultural.learning/reentry.course.resources.php>.
- Cohen, A. D., Oxford, R. L., & Chi, J. C. (2001). *Language Strategy Survey*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.
- Cohen, A. D., Oxford, R., & Chi, J. C. (2002). *Learning Style Survey*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.
- Cohen, A. D., and Paige, R. M. (2001). *Maximizing study abroad through language and culture strategies*. A Title VI International Research and Studies Program grant proposal submitted November 5, 2001 to the U.S. Department of Education. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.
- Cohen, A. D., Paige, R. M., Kappler, B., Demmessie, M., Weaver, S. J., Chi, J. C., & Lassegard, J. P. (2003). *Maximizing study abroad: A language instructors' guide to strategies for language and culture learning and use*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.
- Cohen, A. D., & Shively, R. L. (2002). *Speech Act Measure of Language Gain*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.
- Cohen, A. D. & Shively, R. L. (2002/2003). Measuring speech acts with multiple rejoinder DCTs. *Language Testing Update*, 32, 39-42.
- Coleman, J. A. (1996). *Studying languages: A survey of British and European students*. London, UK: CILT (Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research).
- Collentine, J. (2004). The effects of learning contexts on morphosyntactic and lexical development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(2), 227-248.

- Curcó, C., & De Fina, A. (2002). Modo imperativo, negación, y diminutivos en la expresión de la cortesía en español: El contraste entre México y España. In M. Placencia and D. Bravo (Eds.), *Actos de habla y cortesía en español*. Muenchen: LINCOM Europa.
- Cushner, K., & Brislin, R. (1996). *Intercultural interactions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cushner, K., & Brislin, R. W. (1997). *Improving intercultural interactions: Modules for cross-cultural training programs. Vol. 2*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Daly, N., Holmes, J., Newton, J., & Stubbe, M. (2004). Expletives as solidarity signals in FTAs on the factory floor. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(5), 945-964.
- Dewey, D. P. (2004). A comparison of reading development by learners of Japanese in intensive domestic immersion and study abroad contexts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(2), 301-327.
- Díaz-Campos, M. (2004). Context of learning in the acquisition of Spanish second language phonology. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(2), 249-273.
- Engle, L., & Engle, J. (2004). Assessing language acquisition and intercultural sensitivity development in relation to study abroad study design. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 219-236.
- Fowler, S. M., & Mumford, M. G. (1995). *Intercultural sourcebook: Cross-cultural training methods*. (Vol. 1). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Fowler, S. M., & Mumford, M. G. (1999). *Intercultural sourcebook: Cross-cultural training methods* (Vol. 2). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Freed, B. F. (1990). Language learning in a study abroad context: The effects of interactive and non-interactive out of class contact on grammatical achievement and oral proficiency. In J. Alatis (Ed.), *Linguistics, language teaching and language acquisition: The interdependence of theory, practice and research* (pp. 459-477). Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Freed, B. F. (Ed.) (1995). *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Freed, B. F. (1999). *Retrospective views from the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies and prospects for the future: Study abroad and language learning*. Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Freed, B. F., Dewey, D. P., Segalowitz, N. S., & Halter, R. H. (2004). The Language Contact Profile. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(2), 349-356.

- Freed, B. F., Segalowitz, N., & Dewey, D. P. (2004). Context of learning and second language fluency in French. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(2), 275-301.
- García, C. (1992). Refusing an invitation: A case study of Peruvian style. *Hispanic Linguistics*, 5(1), 207-243.
- García, C. (1999). The three stages of Venezuelan invitations and responses. *Multilingua*, 18(4), 391-433.
- Gochenour, T. (Ed.) (1993). *Beyond experience: The experiential approach to cross-cultural education* (2nd ed.). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Golato, A. (2003). Studying compliment responses: A comparison of DCTs and recordings of naturally occurring talk. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(1), 90-121.
- Gudykunst, W., Ting-Toomey, S., & Nishida, T. (1996). *Communication in Personal Relationships across Cultures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Gudykunst, W. (2004). *Theorizing about intercultural communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Hammer, M. R. (1999). A measure of intercultural sensitivity: The Intercultural Development Inventory. In S. M. Fowler & M. G. Mumford (Eds.), *The intercultural sourcebook* (Vol. 2, pp. 61-72). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Hammer, M. R., & Bennett, M. J. (1998, 2001). *The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) manual*. Portland, OR: Intercultural Communication Institute.
- Hammer, M. R., Bennett, M. J., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27(4), 421-443.
- Hammer, M. R. (2005). *Assessment of the impact of the AFS study abroad experience: Executive summary*. Retrieved July 10, 2005, from Retrieved April 24, 2005, from <http://www.afs.org/AFSI/pdfs/assessment.pdf>.
- Harrison, R., & Hopkins, R. (1967). The design of cross-cultural training: An alternative to the university model. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 3, 431-460.
- Hoff, J. G. (2005). *Students' perceptions of the culture learning process during the study abroad experience*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Hoffman-Hicks, S. D. (2000). *The longitudinal development of French foreign language pragmatic competence: Evidence from study abroad participants*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Holmes, J. (2003). Socio-pragmatic aspects of workplace talk. In Y. Kawaguchi, S. Zaima, T. Takagaki, K. Shibano, & M. Usami (Eds.), *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Linguistic Informatics* (pp. 151-170). Tokyo: Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Ife, A. (2000). Language learning and residence abroad: How self-directed are students? *Language Learning Journal*, 22, 30-37.
- Institute of International Education. (2003). *Open Doors Report*. Retrieved April 24, 2005, from <http://opendoors.iienetwork.org>.
- Ishihara, N. (2005a). *Emulating and resisting pragmatic norms: The role of learner agency and subjectivity in interlanguage pragmatics*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation paper. Minneapolis, MN: Second Languages & Cultures, College of Education & Human Development, University of Minnesota.
- Ishihara, N. (2005b). *Exercising agency: L2 speakers' resistance to L2 pragmatic norms in authentic L2 use*. Paper presented at the 16th International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning, Bloomington, Indiana.
- Jöreskog, K. G., & Sörbom, D. (1984). *LISREL-VI user's guide* (3rd ed.). Mooresville, IN: Scientific Software.
- Juffer, K. A. (1993). The first step in cross-cultural orientation: Defining the problem. In R. M. Paige (Ed.) *Education for the intercultural experience* (2nd ed., pp. 201-218). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Juhasz, A. M., & Walker, A. M. (1987). *The impact of study abroad on university student's perceptions of self*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED341916.)
- Kasper, G. (1996). The development of pragmatic competence. In E. Kellerman, B. Weltens, & T. Bongaerts (Eds.), *EUROSLA 6: A selection of papers*, 55, 103-120.
- Kasper, G. (1997). Beyond reference. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 345-360). London: Longman.
- Klein, F., & Cohen, A. D. (2003). "The intersection of language and culture." In A. D. Cohen, R. M. Paige, B. Kappler, M. Demmessie, M., S. J. Weaver, J. C. Chi, & J. P. Lassegard, J. P. *Maximizing study abroad: A language instructors' guide to strategies for language and culture learning and use* (pp. 88-84). Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced

- Research on Language Acquisition. Retrieved February 18, 2003, from http://www.carla.umn.edu/maxsa/samples/IG_IntLangCulture.pdf.
- Knight, J., & De Wit, H. (1997, November) *Internationalisation of Higher Education in Asia Pacific Countries*. Paper presented at the 9th Annual Conference of the European Association of International Education, Barcelona, Spain.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2003). Coping with high imposition requests: High vs. low proficiency EFL students in Japan. In A. Martínez Flor, E. Usó Juan, & A. Fernández Guerra (Eds.), *Pragmatic competence and foreign language teaching* (pp. 161-184). Castelló de la Plana, Spain: Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I.
- Koester, A. J. (2002). The performance of speech acts in workplace conversations and the teaching of communicative functions. *System*, 30(2), 167-184.
- Kohls, R. L. (1979). *The survival kit for overseas living*. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.
- Kohls, L. R. (2001). *Survival kit for overseas living, for Americans planning to live and work abroad* (4th ed.). New York: Longitude.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- LaBrack, B. (1993). The missing linkage: The process of integrating orientation and reentry. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (2nd ed., pp. 241-279). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Lafford, B. A. (1995). Getting into, through, and out of a survival situation: A comparison of communicative strategies used by students studying Spanish-abroad and 'at home'. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 97-121). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Landis, D., & Bhagat, R. S. (Eds.). (1996). *Handbook of intercultural training* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Landis, D., & Brislin, R. (Eds.). (1983). *Handbook of intercultural training* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Landis, D., Bennett, J. M., & Bennett, M. J. (Eds.). (2004). *Handbook of intercultural training* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Larsen, D. (2002). Knowing who we are. *International Educator*, 11, 11-13, 42.
- Laubscher, M. R. (1994). *Encounters with difference: Student perceptions of the role of out-of-class experiences in education abroad*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

- Le Pair, R. (1996). Spanish request strategies: A cross-cultural analysis from an intercultural perspective. *Language Sciences*, 18(3-4), 651-670.
- Lundy Dobbert, M. L. (1998). The impossibility of internationalizing students by adding materials to courses. In J. Mestenhauser & B. Ellingboe (Eds.), *Reforming the higher education curriculum, internationalizing the campus* (pp. 53-68). Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- Márquez-Reiter, R. (2000). *Linguistic politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A contrastive study of requests and apologies*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Marriot, H. (1995). The acquisition of politeness patterns by exchange students in Japan. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 197-224). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Martin, J. N. (1989). Predeparture orientation: Preparing college sojourners for intercultural interaction. *Communication Education*, 38(3), 249-257.
- McCabe, L. T. (2001). Globalization and internationalization: The impact on education abroad programs. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 5(2), 138-145.
- Medina-Lopez-Portillo, A. (2004). Intercultural learning assessment: The link between program duration and the development of intercultural sensitivity. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 179-200.
- Mestenhauser, J. (1998). International education on the verge: In search of a new paradigm. *International Educator*, VII(2-3). Retrieved April 28, 2002, from <http://www.oldsite.nafsa.org/publications/ie/spring98/verge.html>.
- Mestenhauser, J. (2000). *Missing in action: Leadership for international and global education for the 21st Century*. Papers on Higher Education. UNESCO.
- Miller, L., & Ginsberg, R. B. (1995). Folklinguistic theories of language learning. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 293-316). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Mir, M. (1993, April). *Direct requests can also be polite*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning, Champaign, Illinois.
- Olshtain, E. & Cohen, A. (1983). Apology: A speech-acts set. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 36-55). Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- Olshtain, E., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1985). Degree of approximation: Nonnative reactions to native speech act behavior. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 303-325). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

- Overfield, D. (1994). Cross-cultural competence and apologies among learners of Spanish as a foreign language. *Osamayor*, 8, 45-61.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. NY: Newbury House/Harper & Row.
- Paige, R. M. (Ed.). (1993). *Education for the intercultural experience*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Paige, R. M. (2003a). The intercultural development inventory: A critical review of the research literature. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 6, 53-61.
- Paige, R. M. (2003b). Editorial. In R. M. Paige (Guest Ed.). Special issue on intercultural development. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27, 383-385.
- Paige, R. M. (2004). Instrumentation in intercultural training. In D. Landis, J. M. Bennett, & M. J. Bennett (Eds), *Handbook of intercultural training* (3rd ed., pp. 85-128). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Paige, R. M., Jacobs-Cassuto, M., Yershova, Y. A., & DeJaeghere, J. (2003). Assessing intercultural sensitivity: An empirical analysis of the Hammer and Bennett Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27(4), 467-486
- Paige, R. M., & Kappler, B. (1998). Review of W. Hoffa and J. Pearson (Eds.) 1997. NAFSA's guide to education abroad for advisers and administrators (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 4, 205-215.
- Paige, R. M., Cohen, A. D., Kappler, B., Chi, J. C., & Lassegard, J. P. (2002). *Maximizing study abroad: A students' guide to strategies for language and culture learning and use*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.
- Paige, R. M., Cohen, A. D., Kappler, B., Chi, J. C., & Lassegard, J. P. (2002). *Maximizing study abroad: A program professionals' guide to strategies for language and culture learning and use*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.
- Paige, R. M., Rong, J., Zheng, W., & Kappler, B. (2002). *Culture-Learning Strategies Inventory and Index*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.
- Paige, R. M., Rong, J., Zhang, W., Kappler, B., Hoff, J., & Emert, H. (2002). *Strategies Inventory for Learning Culture*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.

- Pelligrino, V. A. (1998). Student perspectives on language learning in a study abroad context. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 4, 91-120.
- Pusch, M. (1979). *Multicultural education*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Rodríguez, S. (2001). *The perception of requests in Spanish by instructed learners of Spanish in the second- and foreign-language contexts: A longitudinal study of acquisition patterns*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Schmidt, R. (1983). Interaction, acculturation and the acquisition of communicative competence (p. 137-174). In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Segalowitz, N., & Freed, B. F. (2004). Context, contact, and cognition in oral fluency acquisition: Learning Spanish in at home and study abroad contexts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(2), 173-199.
- Segalowitz, N., Freed, B. F., Collentine, J., Lafford, B., Lazar, N., & Diaz-Campos, M. (2004). A comparison of Spanish second language acquisition in two different learning contexts: Study abroad and the domestic classroom. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 1-18.
- Sell, D. K. (1983). Research on attitude changes in U.S. students who participate in foreign study experiences: Past findings and suggestions for future research. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 7, 131-147.
- Singelis, T. M. (Ed.) (1998). *Teaching about culture, ethnicity, & diversity: Exercises and planned activities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stimpfl, J.R., & Engberg, D. (1997). What to know before you go: Creating a basis of comparison for research on study abroad programs. *International Education Forum*, 17(1), 7-21.
- Storti, C. (1994). *Art of crossing cultures*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Storti, C. (1998). *Art of coming home*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Storti, C. (2001a). *Figuring foreigners out*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Storti, C. (2001b). *Cross-cultural dialogues*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Storti, C. (2001c). *Old world, new world: Bridging cultural differences: Britain, France, Germany and the U.S.* Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Summerfield, E., Sibley R., & Stellmaker, H. (1997). Predeparture orientation and reentry

- programming. In W. Hoffa & J. Pearson (Eds.), *NAFSA's guide to education abroad for advisers and administrators* (2nd ed., pp. 233-253). Washington, D.C.: NAFSA Association of International Educators.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1994). *The challenge of facework*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Ting-Toomey, S., & Oetzel, J. G. (2001). *Managing intercultural conflict effectively*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- University of the Pacific (2004). What's up with culture? Online cultural training resource for study abroad. Retrieved March 21, 2004 from <http://www.pacific.edu/sis/culture/>.
- Vande Berg, M. (2004). Guest editor. Special issue on study abroad research. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 253-276.
- Ward, C., Bochner, S., & Furnham, A. (2001). *The psychology of culture shock* (2nd ed.). Hove, UK: Routledge.
- Wight, A. R., & Hammons, M. A. (1970). *Guidelines for Peace Corps cross-cultural training*. Estes Park, CO: Center for Research and Education.
- Wilkinson, S. (1998). On the nature of immersion during study abroad: Some participant perspectives. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 4, 121-138.
- Woodman, K. (1998). *A study of linguistic, perceptual and pedagogical change in a short-term intensive language program*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.



Appendix A: Assignment Schedule of Readings in the *Students' Guide* for E Group Students While Studying Abroad

TIME PERIOD	CULTURE	LANGUAGE	ASSIGNMENT DUE DATES
During Orientation	-Introduction to Culture Learning Strategies, pp.35-37 -You as a Culturally Diverse Person (mapping activity), pp.39-41 -Strategies for Keeping a Journal, pp.115-119	Beyond Knowing the Vocabulary, pp.207-214	
Prior to Departure	You as a Culturally Diverse Person, pp.41-57	No assignment	Submit E-journal by 6/27/03
WEEK			
1	Understanding the Ways Cultures Can Differ in Values, pp.59-68	Introduction and Listening Strategies, pp.163-179	
2	-Understanding Yourself as a Member of a Culture or Cultures, pp.69-72 -Strategies for Social Relations—Interacting with Hosts, pp.75-82	Completion of Week 1 assignment	Submit E-journal by 9/12/03
3	Adjusting, pp.83-99	Learning Vocabulary, pp.181-195	

WEEK	CULTURE	LANGUAGE	ASSIGNMENT DUE DATES
4	Strategies for Developing Intercultural Competence, pp.101-105	Completion of Week 3 assignment	Submit E-journal by 9/26/03
5	Strategies for Making Cultural Inferences, pp.107-113	Speaking to Communicate, pp.197-214	
6	Completion of Week 5 assignment	Completion of Week 5 assignment	Submit E-journal by 10/10/03
7	Strategies for Intercultural Communication, pp.121-127	Reading for Comprehension, pp.215-221	
8	Nonverbal Communication, pp.129-138	Completion of Week 7 assignment	Submit E-journal by 10/24/03
9	No assignment	Writing Strategies, pp.223-230	
10	No assignment	Completion of Week 9 assignment	Submit E-journal by 11/7/03
11	Preparing to Return Home, pp.139-142	Translation Strategies and Conclusion, pp.231-236	Submit E-journal by 11/21/03
<i>AFTER RETURNING HOME</i>			
	Suggested reading: Continue the Learning (Post-Study-Abroad Unit), pp.143-159	Suggested reading: Post-Study-Abroad Activities, pp. 179, 195, 214, 221, 230	

Appendix B: Background Questionnaire

Study ID _____

**Entrance Background Questionnaire**

Maximizing Study Abroad Through Language and Culture Strategies

The responses that you give in this questionnaire will be kept confidential. This cover sheet is to allow the researcher to associate your responses with your name if needed. However, only the research assistant entering your responses into the computer will see this name. An ID number will be used in place of your name when referring to your responses in publications, etc. Every effort will be made to keep your responses confidential.

Thank you for your cooperation. The information that you provide will help us to better understand the backgrounds of students who are studying languages in various contexts. Your honest and detailed responses will be greatly appreciated.

Please note: the term “target language” refers to the language which you will be studying when you go abroad.

I. CONTACT INFORMATION

Name _____

Phone Number (where you can best be reached) _____

Email (that you will use while abroad) _____

Current Address:

Street _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

When you return from studying abroad, will you still live at the address you listed above?

 Yes No

Permanent Address (if different from above):

Street _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

II. BASICS

1. What is your major? _____
2. What year are you in school?
 Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate Student

III. STUDY ABROAD

3. Which language will you be studying when you go abroad? Spanish French
4. In which country will you be studying when you go abroad?
 France Mexico Spain Venezuela Other: _____
- a) In which city will you be studying? _____

IV. LANGUAGE BACKGROUND AND EDUCATION

5. What is your dominant language (i.e. the language you speak most comfortably today)?
 English Other: _____
6. If your answer to Question 5 was “English” and you are not a native speaker of another language, jump to Question 7.
 - a) What is your native language? _____
 - b) Rate your ability in that language:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Listening	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Speaking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Writing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. When you communicate with your own family, what language(s) do you use?

English Other(s): _____

a) If your answer was French or Spanish, please fill in the chart below to indicate with whom in your family you use French or Spanish, and estimate how often you have interactions **for an extended period of time** in French or Spanish.

Language	Family member(s) (circle or write in those that apply)	Every day	Every couple days	Once per week	A few times per month	Seldom
French	Mother	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	Father	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	Other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Spanish	Mother	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	Father	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	Other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>				

8. Was any of your **pre-college** education in a medium of instruction other than English?

No, jump to Question 9 Yes, answer (a) through (c) below

a) If yes, which language(s)? _____

b) If yes, where
(City/Country)? _____

c) If yes, for how many years at each of the levels below?

<u>Kindergarten - Elementary School</u>	<u>Middle School</u>	<u>High School</u>
_____	_____	_____

9. For how many years, at each of the levels below, have you studied the target language?

<u>Elementary School</u>	<u>Middle School</u>	<u>High School</u>
_____	_____	_____
<u>University/College</u>	<u>Other</u>	
_____	_____	

10. What other languages, apart from the target language, have you taken as subjects in school?

<u>Language</u>	<u>Length of time studied</u>	<u>Where studied (City/Country)</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

11. Rate your average ability across different kinds of tasks in the language you will be studying while abroad (French or Spanish):

- a) Listening comprehension: My ability to understand language spoken to me in a full range of situations with older adults, peers and children alike is:
 Excellent Good Fair Poor
- b) Speaking: My ability to use the language appropriately in a full range of situations with older adults, peers, and children alike is:
 Excellent Good Fair Poor
- c) Reading comprehension:
- My ability to read with comprehension academic texts is:
 Excellent Good Fair Poor
 - My ability to read with comprehension texts from the popular press is:
 Excellent Good Fair Poor
- d) Writing:
- My ability to write intelligibly and coherently on academic themes is:
 Excellent Good Fair Poor
 - My ability to write intelligibly and coherently in an e-mail message is:
 Excellent Good Fair Poor

Appendix C: Exit Language Contact Profile

Study ID _____

**Exit Language Contact Profile**

Maximizing Study Abroad Through Language and Culture Strategies

The responses that you give in this questionnaire will be kept confidential. This cover sheet is to allow the researcher to associate your responses with your name if needed. However, only the research assistant entering your responses into the computer will see this name. An ID number will be used in place of your name when referring to your responses in publications, etc. Every effort will be made to keep your responses confidential.

Thank you for your cooperation. The information that you provide will help us to better understand the backgrounds of students who are studying languages in various contexts. Your honest and detailed responses will be greatly appreciated.

Please note: the term “target language” refers to the language which you studied while you were abroad (i.e., French or Spanish).

Name _____

Which language did you study while you were abroad? French Spanish

I. STUDY ABROAD LIVING SITUATION

Please check the box, (A) through (E) below, that best describes your living arrangements during your semester studying abroad, and answer the questions associated with your selection. Only answer the questions that correspond to **your** living arrangements abroad. If you had more than one type of living arrangement, check all that apply and answer the corresponding questions.

A. I lived with a family from the host community.

If you lived with a host family, respond to the following questions:

- 1) On average, how often did you have an *extended* conversation (more than 30 minutes) in the target language with members of your host family?
 - Every day
 - Every couple of days
 - Once per week
 - A few times per month
 - Infrequently
- 2) Were any members of the host family able to engage in conversation with you in English? Yes, answer (3) below No, jump to (4)
- 3) If yes, list each family member who was able to converse in English and indicate on average how often you engaged in conversation with that person in English:

	Every day	Every couple of days	Once per week	A few times per month	Infrequently
Family Member #1:	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Family Member #2:	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Family Member #3:	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Family Member #4:	<input type="checkbox"/>				

- 4) Were there other non-native speakers of the target language living with your host family (for example: other study abroad students)?
 - Yes, answer (5) below No, jump to Section II, *Language Contact*
- 5) If yes, on average how often did you use the target language to communicate with the non-native speakers in the household?
 - 100% of the time
 - 75% of the time
 - 50% of the time
 - 25% of the time
 - Infrequently

B. I lived in a student dormitory.

If you lived in a dormitory, respond to the following questions:

- 1) I had a roommate or roommates.
 Yes, answer (2) and (3) below No, jump to (4) below
- 2) If yes, were your roommates native speakers or non-native speakers of the target language?

	Native speaker	Non-native speaker
Roommate #1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Roommate #2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Roommate #3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 3) If yes, on average how often did you use the target language to communicate with your roommate(s)?
- 100% of the time
 - 75% of the time
 - 50% of the time
 - 25% of the time
 - Infrequently
- 4) How often did you have an *extended* conversation (more than 30 minutes) in the target language with your roommate(s) or the other residents of your dormitory?
- Every day
 - Every couple of days
 - Once per week
 - A few times per month
 - Infrequently
- 5) Approximately what portion of the residents of your dormitory were native speakers of the target language?
- 100%
 - 75%
 - 50%
 - 25%
 - Very few or none

C. I lived in a private room, house, or apartment with other people.

If you lived in a room/house/apartment with other people, respond to the following questions:

- 1) Were your roommates native speakers or non-native speakers of the target language?

	Native speaker	Non-native speaker
Roommate #1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Roommate #2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Roommate #3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 2) On average, how often did you use the target language to communicate with your roommate(s)?

- 100% of the time
 75% of the time
 50% of the time
 25% of the time
 Infrequently

- 3) How often did you have an *extended* conversation (more than 30 minutes) in the target language with your roommate(s)?

- Every day
 Every couple of days
 Once per week
 A few times per month
 Infrequently

D. I lived in a private room, house, or apartment by myself.

E. I had other living arrangements: _____

II. LANGUAGE CONTACT

1. On average, when you talked with other people **outside of class**, how much of that time was spent speaking the target language with native or fluent speakers of that language?

- 100%
 75%
 50%
 25%
 Infrequently

2. On average, what portion of the friends you hung out with while abroad were native speakers of the target language?
- 100%
 - 75%
 - 50%
 - 25%
 - Very few or none
3. When you hung out with these friends, native or non-native, while you were abroad, on average how much of that time was spent speaking the target language?
- 100%
 - 75%
 - 50%
 - 25%
 - Infrequently
4. What kind(s) of structured activities involving the use of the target language did you participate in outside of class?
Please check all that apply:
- Language partner exchange (Please describe): _____
 - Volunteer position (Please describe): _____
 - Internship (Please describe): _____
 - Other (Please describe): _____

How do you think the structured activities in which you participated affected your learning of the target language?

5. Do you think your **gender** had any influence on the nature of your language experience? In other words, did it facilitate or hinder your language learning opportunities?
- Yes No

If yes, please explain:

III. STUDY ABROAD COURSES

1. What type of program(s) did you enroll in while studying abroad?

Please check all that apply:

- Regular courses in a foreign university
- Special courses for international students
- Field study or internship
- Other: _____

2. Pick the option below that best describes the *subject* courses (e.g., History, Economics, Sociology) that you took during your semester studying abroad:

- I took subject courses taught in the target language that were intended primarily for local, native-speaking students
- I took subject courses taught in the target language that were intended primarily for study abroad students
- I took a combination of subject courses taught in the target language and courses taught in English
- I only took subject courses taught in English
- I did not take subject courses while studying abroad (jump to Question 4)

3. If you took subject courses, approximately how many of the other students in your classes were **host country students**?

- 100%
- 75%
- 50%
- 25%
- Very few or no host country students

4. Did you take French or Spanish language courses while abroad? Yes No

If yes, what was the focus of the course(s) and the level(s)?

Please check all that apply:

- Literature course
 - Beginning Intermediate Advanced
- Grammar course
 - Beginning Intermediate Advanced
- Conversation course
 - Beginning Intermediate Advanced
- Writing course
 - Beginning Intermediate Advanced
- Other language course: _____
 - Beginning Intermediate Advanced

IV. LANGUAGE ABILITY

Now that your study abroad experience is drawing to a close, we would like you to rate your overall ability to perform tasks in each of the skill areas in French or Spanish:

1. Listening comprehension: My ability to understand language spoken to me in a full range of situations with older adults, peers and young children alike is:
 Excellent Good Fair Weak

2. Speaking: My ability to use the language appropriately in a full range of situations with older adults, peers, and young children alike is:
 Excellent Good Fair Weak

3. Reading comprehension:
 My ability to read academic texts with comprehension is:
 Excellent Good Fair Weak
 My ability to read texts from the popular press with comprehension is:
 Excellent Good Fair Weak

4. Writing:
 My ability to write intelligibly and coherently on academic themes is:
 Excellent Good Fair Weak
 My ability to write intelligibly and coherently in an e-mail message is:
 Excellent Good Fair Weak

V. POST-STUDY ABROAD

1. After this study abroad experience, how would you characterize your motivation to study the language of the host country?
 Increased greatly
 Increased somewhat
 Stayed the same
 Decreased a little
 Decreased a lot

2. After finishing your study abroad semester, will you be staying in the host country, traveling to another country, or coming back to the United States right away?
Please check all that apply:
 I will stay on in the host country for (time period) _____.
 I will travel to another country where the language is spoken for (time period) _____.
 I will travel to another country where the host language is not spoken.
 I will be returning to the United States immediately after the end of the semester
 Other, please explain _____

VI. THE STUDENTS' GUIDE

Answer the following questions **only** if you were in the experimental group.

1. Rate the extent to which you think exposure to the *Students' Guide* had an impact on any improvement you noticed in your language skills over the semester of study abroad:

	Had a profound impact	Had a noticeable impact	Had some impact	Had a slight impact	Had no impact
Listening	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Speaking	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Reading	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Writing	<input type="checkbox"/>				

2. Would you recommend the *Students' Guide* to someone who is going to study abroad?

Yes, enthusiastically Yes Possibly Probably not No

Additional comments about the *Students' Guide*:

Appendix D: *Strategies Inventory for Learning Culture*



Strategies Inventory for Learning Culture (SILC)

R.M. Paige, J. Rong, W. Zheng, B. Kappler, J. Hoff, H. Emert

Directions: The purpose of this inventory is to find out more about you as a culture learner. Check the box that describes the frequency of your use of each listed strategy. The categories are: Seldom, Sometimes, Often, Very Often, and Not Applicable.

I. Strategies I use when I am in surroundings that are culturally different from what I am used to:	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Not Applicable
1. I consider ways in which different cultures might view things in different ways, for example how different cultures value privacy or independence.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
2. I figure out what cultural values might be involved when I encounter a conflict or something goes wrong.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
3. I use different cultural perspectives to interpret situations in which something seems to have gone wrong.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
4. I use generalizations instead of stereotypes when I make statements about people who are different from me.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
5. I counter stereotypes others use about people from my country by using generalizations and cultural values instead.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
6. I make distinctions among behavior that is <i>personal</i> (unique to the person), <i>cultural</i> (representative of the person's culture), and <i>universal</i> (a shared human concern).	<input type="checkbox"/>				
7. I look at similarities as well as differences between people of different backgrounds.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
8. I talk about my cross-cultural expectations with my family and friends at home.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
9. I try to understand what my friends living in another culture say about my own culture from their perspective.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
10. I treat some moments of culture shock as learning experiences, for example by writing about them in my journal.	<input type="checkbox"/>				

11. I use a variety of coping strategies when I feel like I have culture shock overload.

II. Strategies I use for dealing with difficult times in another culture:

- | | Seldom | Sometimes | Often | Very Often | Not Applicable |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 12. I keep in touch with friends and family. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 13. I keep a journal or a diary about my experiences. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 14. I participate in sports and other activities. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 15. I find someone from my own culture to talk to about my cultural experiences. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 16. I relax when I'm stressed out in another culture by doing what I normally do back home to make myself comfortable. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

III. Strategies I use for making interpretations about another culture:

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 17. I observe the behavior of people from another culture very carefully. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 18. I analyze things that happen in another culture that seem strange to me from as many perspectives as I can. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 19. I set aside my own cultural values and beliefs when trying to understand another culture. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 20. I refrain from making quick interpretations about another culture. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 21. I check the accuracy of my interpretations with people from the other culture. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

IV. Strategies I use for communicating with people from another culture:

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 22. I seek out ways in which our two cultures differ. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 23. I investigate common areas of miscommunication between people from another culture and my own culture by talking to other people who know the two cultures well. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 24. I read materials from the other culture to better understand current issues. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 25. I build relations with local people by finding opportunities to spend time with them. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

26. I help people in another culture understand me by explaining my behaviors and attitudes in terms of my own culture.

V. Strategies I use to deal with different communication styles:

- | | Seldom | Sometimes | Often | Very Often | Not Applicable |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 27. I use different types of communication styles when talking with someone from another culture. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 28. I use a different approach when my communication style doesn't seem to be working well. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 29. I listen to whether someone I am speaking with is indirect or direct in his/her communication style. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 30. I mirror the communication style of the person I am speaking with, for example if they are always formal, I try to be formal too. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 31. I respect the way people from another culture express themselves. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

VI. Strategies I use to understand non-verbal communication (for example, gestures or eye contact) in another culture:

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 32. I learn about the ways in which people from another culture use non-verbal communication. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 33. I examine how my own nonverbal communication is influenced by my culture. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 34. I observe which nonverbal communication differences are most challenging for me to adjust to in another culture. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 35. I practice using a variety of different nonverbal communication patterns. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 36. I notice how far people stand from each other in another culture and try to keep the "right distance" from others. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 37. I observe the gestures that people use in another culture. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 38. I ask friends in another culture to explain the meaning of different gestures to me. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 39. I use eye contact in a way that is appropriate in another culture. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

VII. Strategies I use to interact with people in another culture:

	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Not applicable
40. I join clubs or organizations of people who have interests like mine.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
41. I ask people in another culture about their perceptions of my culture.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
42. I go to the market in another culture and interact with people.	<input type="checkbox"/>				

VIII. Strategies I use regarding my living situation:

43. I find out the rules and regulations.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
44. I get permission before bringing someone home.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
45. I share pictures from home, for example of my own family.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
46. I teach games common in my own country to my homestay family.	<input type="checkbox"/>				

IX. Strategies I use when I return home:

47. I find a group of people who have had similar experiences to talk to and share experiences.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
48. I participate in cultural activities related to my experience in another culture.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
49. I take a class that will help me keep up with the other culture.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
50. I volunteer for work related to the other culture, for example with international students at a local university.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
51. I share my feelings and experiences with friends and family, even though they may not relate to all that I say.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
52. I keep connected with friends that I made in the other culture.	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Appendix E: Language Strategy Survey



Language Strategy Survey

Maximizing Study Abroad Through Language and Culture Strategies

Andrew D. Cohen, Rebecca L. Oxford, & Julie C. Chi

Directions: *The purpose of this inventory is to find out more about you as a language learner. To answer the questions, think about your past experiences learning a new language. Check the box that describes the frequency of your use of each listed strategy. The categories are: Seldom, Sometimes, Often, Very Often, and Not Applicable. Please note that “target” language refers to the new language you are learning.*

Listening Strategy Use

Strategies I use to increase my exposure to the target language:

- | | Seldom | Sometimes | Often | Very Often | Not Applicable |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Attend out-of-class events where the new language is spoken. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Listen to talk shows on the radio, watch TV shows, or see movies in the target language. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Listen to the language in a restaurant or store where the staff speak the target language. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Listen in on people in public who are having a conversation in the target language to try and catch the gist of what they are saying. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Strategies I use to become more familiar with the sounds in the target language:

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 5. Practice sounds in the target language that are very different from sounds in my own language to become comfortable with them. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Associate the sound of a word or phrase in the new language with the sound of a familiar word. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Imitate the way native speakers talk. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Ask native speakers about unfamiliar sounds that I hear. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Strategies I use to prepare to listen to conversation in the target language:

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 9. Pay special attention to specific aspects of the language; for example, the way the speaker pronounces certain sounds. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. Predict what the other person is going to say based on what has been said so far. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

11. Prepare for talks and performances I will hear in the TL by reading some background materials beforehand.

Strategies I use when I listen to conversation in the target language:

12. Listen for key words that seem to carry the bulk of the meaning.

13. Listen for word and sentence stress to see what native speakers emphasize when they speak.

14. Pay attention to when and how long people tend to pause.

15. Pay attention to the rise and fall of speech by native speakers – the “music” of it.

16. Practice “skim listening” by paying attention to some parts and ignoring others.

17. Understand what I hear without translating it word-for-word.

18. Focus on the context of what people are saying.

19. Listen for specific details to see whether I can understand them.

If I do not understand some or most of what someone says in the target language I use the following strategies:

20. Ask speakers to repeat what they said if it wasn't clear to me.

21. Ask speakers to slow down if they are speaking too fast.

22. Ask for clarification if I don't understand it the first time around.

23. Use the speakers' tone of voice as a clue to the meaning of what they are saying.

24. Make educated guesses about the topic based on what has already been said.

25. Draw on my general background knowledge to get the main idea.

26. Watch speakers' gestures and general body language to help me figure out the meaning of what they are saying.

Seldom

Sometimes

Often

Very Often

Not Applicable

Vocabulary Strategy Use

I use the following strategies to learn new words:

- | | Seldom | Sometimes | Often | Very Often | Not Applicable |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 27. Pay attention to the structure of the new word. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 28. Break the words into parts that I can identify. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 29. Group words according to parts of speech (e.g., nouns, verbs, adjs). | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 30. Associate the sound of the new word with the sound of a word that is familiar to me. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 31. Use rhyming to remember new words. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 32. Make a mental image of new words. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 33. List new words with other words that are related to it. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 34. Write out new words in meaningful sentences. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 35. Practice new action verbs by acting them out. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 36. Use flash cards in a systematic way to learn new words. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

I use the following strategies to review vocabulary:

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 37. Go over new words often when I first learn them to help me remember them. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 38. Review words periodically so I don't forget them. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

I use the following strategies to recall vocabulary:

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 39. Look at meaningful parts of the word (e.g., the prefix or the suffix) to remind me of the meaning of the word. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 40. Make an effort to remember the situation where I first heard or saw the word or remember the page or sign where I saw it written. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 41. Visualize the spelling of new words in my mind. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

My strategies to make use of new vocabulary:

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 42. Use new words in a variety of ways. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 43. Practice using familiar words in different ways. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 44. Use idiomatic expressions in the new language. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Speaking Strategy Use

Strategies I use in order to practice speaking:

- | | Seldom | Sometimes | Often | Very Often | Not
Applicable |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 45. Practice saying new expressions to myself. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 46. Practice new grammatical structures in different situations to build my confidence level in using them. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 47. Think about how a native speaker might say something and practice saying it that way. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Strategies I use to engage in conversations:

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 48. Regularly seek out opportunities to talk with native speakers. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 49. Initiate conversations in the target language as often as possible. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 50. Direct the conversation to familiar topics. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 51. Plan out in advance what I want to say. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 52. Ask questions as a way to be involved in the conversation. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 53. Anticipate what will be said based on what has been said so far. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 54. Engage in topics even when they are aren't familiar to me. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 55. Encourage others to correct errors in my speaking. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 56. Figure out and model native speakers' language patterns when requesting, apologizing, or complaining. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

When I can't think of a word or expression I try to:

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 57. Ask for help from my conversational partner. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 58. Look for a different way to express the idea, like using a synonym. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 59. Use words from my own language, but say it in a way that sounds like words in the target language. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 60. Make up new words or guess if I don't know the right ones to use. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 61. Use gestures as a way to try and get my meaning across. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 62. Switch back to my own language momentarily if I know that the person I'm talking to can understand what is being said. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Reading Strategy Use

I use the following strategies to improve my reading ability:

- | | Seldom | Sometimes | Often | Very Often | Not
Applicable |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 63. Read as much as possible in the target language. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 64. Find things to read for pleasure in the target language. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 65. Find reading material that is at or near my level. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 66. Plan out in advance how I'm going to read the text, monitor to see how I'm doing, and then check to see how much I understand. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 67. Skim an academic text first to get the main idea and then go back and read it more carefully. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 68. Read a story or dialogue several times until I understand it. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 69. Pay attention to the organization of the text, especially headings and subheadings. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 70. Make ongoing summaries of the reading either in my mind or in the margins of the text. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 71. Make predictions as to what will happen next. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

When I see words and grammatical structures I do not understand:

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 72. Guess the approximate meaning by using clues from the context of the reading material. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 73. Use a dictionary to get a detailed sense of what individual words mean. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Writing Strategy Use

I use the following basic writing strategies:

- | | Seldom | Sometimes | Often | Very Often | Not
Applicable |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 74. Practice writing the alphabet and/or new words in the target language. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 75. Plan out in advance how to write academic papers, monitor how my writing is going, and check to see how well my writing reflects what I want to say. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 76. Write different kinds of texts in the target language (e.g., personal notes, messages, letters, and course papers). | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 77. Take class notes in the target language as much as I'm able. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

While I am writing an essay or academic paper I use the following strategies:

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 78. Find a different way to express the idea when I don't know the correct expression to use; e.g., use a synonym or describe the idea. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 79. Review what I have already written before continuing to write more. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 80. Use reference materials such as a glossary, a dictionary, or a thesaurus to help find or verify words in the target language. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 81. Wait to edit my writing until all my ideas are down on paper. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

I do the following once I have written a draft of my essay or paper:

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 82. Revise my writing once or twice to improve the language and content. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 83. Ask for feedback from others, especially native speakers of the language. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Strategic Use of Translation

I use the following translation strategies:

- | | Seldom | Sometimes | Often | Very Often | Not Applicable |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 84. Plan out what to say or write in my own language and then translate it into the target language. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 85. Translate in my head while I am reading to help me understand the text. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 86. Translate parts of a conversation into my own language to help me remember the conversation. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

I use the following strategies to work directly in the target language as much as possible:

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 87. Put my own language out of mind and think only in the target language as much as possible. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 88. Try to understand what has been heard or read without translating it word-for-word into my own language. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 89. Use caution when directly transferring words and ideas from my own language into the target language. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Appendix F: *Speech Act Measure*
(English Prototype, Latin American Spanish, Peninsular Spanish, and French versions)

Study ID _____



Speech Act Measure
(English Prototype)

Maximizing Study Abroad Through Language and Culture Strategies
 Andrew D. Cohen & Rachel L. Shively

Student instructions: *Please read carefully from the beginning to the end of each of the request or apology situations. Then think through what you would say in such a situation in the host country. When deciding what you would say to someone you have come to know, for example, you may want to think about target-language speakers you know personally and imagine how you would interact with them. Once you have an idea of what you would say in Spanish/French for each exchange in the interaction, please write that down in the space provided.*

1) During dinner with a friend's family in the host community you accidentally spill your glass of red wine on the table cloth.

You:

Friend's mother: Oh, dear!

You:

Friend's mother: No, no. Don't worry about it. You don't have to do that. The stain will probably come out in the wash.

You:

2) A required history class taught in Spanish for study abroad students has just ended and you are sitting there feeling frustrated. Your professor, Dr. Martínez, has once again spoken too rapidly for you to understand. You check with fellow students and find out that they are having the same problem. So, you get up your courage, go up to him after class, and request that he try to speak a bit slower and more clearly.

You:

Dr. Martínez: What's up?

You:

Dr. Martínez: Oh, sorry about that. I have to remember that you guys are not native speakers, after all.

You:

Dr. Martínez: Sure, no problem. I'll do my best to speak more slowly and carefully. Let me know if I can help you in any other way.

3) You borrowed an academic book from Marta, a host community friend you don't know very well. You've really wanted to get ahold of this book for some time since it is crucial for your research paper, but the library doesn't have it and, to make matters worse, you found out it is actually out-of-print. Your friend agreed to let you borrow the book only after you promised to take especially good care of it. Today, while coming back from class, you accidentally left your backpack on a public bus and her book was in the backpack. When you called the bus company's lost-and-found, they informed you that the bag hadn't turned up, so somebody probably walked off with it. You have to call Marta to explain and apologize.

You:

Marta: Oh my gosh! Are you serious?!

You:

Marta: I can't believe you lost my book! I asked you to be super careful with it when I loaned it to you.

You:

Marta: No, no. I mean, you know that book isn't in print anymore – you can't buy it *anywhere*.

You:

Marta: Well, let's just forget about it then. But I'm not going to lend you anymore books!

4) You and your friend are taking a long intercontinental flight. You were not able to book adjacent seats on the flight, although you really want to sit together. When you get to your assigned seat on the plane there is an older gentleman, who you think is from the host country, sitting in the seat next to yours. You want to ask him if he would mind switching seats with your friend, although that would mean he would have to move to a less comfortable seat in the middle of the plane.

You:

Passenger: You mean ... you want me to move? Well, where is your friend's assigned seat?

You:

Passenger: You know, your friend is sitting in a seat right in the middle of the plane. I really like having a window seat like I've got now. I don't think I really want to move.

You:

Passenger: Oh, well, I guess I could move. I can see that you and your friend really want to sit together.

You:

5) To earn a little extra money, you agree to babysit Roberto, the 10-year-old sibling of a friend in the host community, while your friend and her parents go to theater. As you are cleaning up after dinner, you accidentally overturn the pitcher of grape juice on the kitchen table and soak Roberto's math homework he needs to turn in the next day. You go into the next room where he is watching TV to tell him what happened and to apologize.

You:

Roberto (running into the kitchen): Oh, no! My math assignment!

You:

Roberto: What am I going to do? It's ruined! I'm going to have to do it all over again. My teacher won't accept homework looking like this.

You:

Roberto (grudgingly): Yeah, I guess so. I can't believe you did that.

You:

6) You find a great bargain airfare for this weekend only, which you want to make use of in order to visit good friends in a somewhat distant city. In order to take advantage of this deal, you need to ask your professor, Dr. Rodríguez, for an extension on a paper that you were going to work on this weekend, and which is due next week.

You:

Dr. Rodríguez: Well, you know, you had plenty of time to work on this paper already. There was no need to wait until the last minute to prepare it.

You:

Dr. Rodríguez: I'm sorry, but I can't really agree to give you an extension on this paper. I don't think that going to visit friends during the semester is a good enough reason for an extension.

You:

Dr. Rodríguez: Well, I'm not so thrilled about doing it. It's not my policy.

You:

Dr. Rodríguez: Ok, well, just this time.

7) You promise to meet your close friend from the host community, Sofía, in order to help her study for an important English literature exam. She has been really kind about helping you with your learning of Spanish. You agree to meet her outside the library, but you arrive 45 minutes late for the meeting.

Sofía (annoyed): Hey, where've you been?! I've been waiting here for over an hour!

You:

Sofía: Oh, really? Well, I was about to give up and go inside to study on my own.

You:

Sofía: I mean ... I was even worried something happened to you.

You:

8) The meals your host mother, María, prepares for you are delicious. The problem is that she gives you far too much food, which you then end up struggling to finish. So you want to ask her to give you smaller portions, but you also don't want to hurt her feelings.

You:

María: Thank you. It's my grandmother's secret recipe.

You:

María: Oh, but you're not doing my grandmother justice by just eating a little!

You:

María: But I thought you *liked* the food.

You:

María: Well, okay. I'll serve you less food if you really want, dear.

9) You completely forget a crucial meeting with the distinguished professor, Dr. Sánchez, with whom you are doing an internship. An hour later you call him to apologize. The problem is that this is the second time you've forgotten such a meeting with your professor.

Dr. Sánchez: What happened to you?

You:

Dr. Sánchez: I can imagine that you have a lot on your mind these days, but this is the second time you've missed a meeting you agreed to attend

You:

Dr. Sánchez: Yes, indeed. I hope you won't forget it next time.

You:

Dr. Sánchez: I'm afraid I can't reschedule it for today. Let's try again next week at the same time.

10) Your 15-year-old host-family “sibling,” Raquel, likes to walk with you to the university since it’s a long walk from home and her high school is located right next door. You also like her company and the chance to practice Spanish, but she is often late getting going in the morning. As a result, you have been arriving late to class and don’t feel comfortable about that. You want to ask Raquel to try to get going earlier so that you can get to class on time.

You:

Raquel: Hey, I’m never *that* late. My classes start a half hour later than yours. Anyway, I thought at the university it didn’t matter if you got to class late.

You:

Raquel: Yeah, okay ... I’ll try to get ready earlier.



Speech Act Measure (Latin American Spanish)

Maximizing Study Abroad Through Language and Culture Strategies
Andrew D. Cohen & Rachel L. Shively

Student instructions: *Please read carefully from the beginning to the end of each of the request or apology situations. Then think through what you would say in such a situation in the host country. When deciding what you would say to someone you have come to know, for example, you may want to think about target-language speakers you know personally and imagine how you would interact with them. Once you have an idea of what you would say in Spanish for each exchange in the interaction, please write that down in the space provided.*

1) During dinner with a friend's family in the host community you accidentally spill your glass of red wine on the table cloth.

You:

Friend's mother: ¡Ay, mijo/a!

You:

Friend's mother: No, no. No te preocupes. No te pongas en eso. La mancha se le quitará con la lavada.

You:

2) A required history class taught in Spanish for study abroad students has just ended and you are sitting there feeling frustrated. Your professor, Dr. Martínez, has once again spoken too rapidly for you to understand. You check with fellow students and find out that they are having the same problem. So, you get up your courage, go up to him after class, and request that he try to speak a bit slower and more clearly.

You:

Dr. Martínez: ¿Qué tal?

You:

Dr. Martínez: Qué pena. Tengo que recordar que después de todo ustedes no son nativo hablantes.

You:

Dr. Martínez: Claro, no hay problema. Voy a hacer todo lo posible por hablar más lento y con más cuidado. Dime de que otra manera puedo ayudarte.

3) You borrowed an academic book from Marta, a host community friend you don't know very well. You've really wanted to get ahold of this book for some time since it is crucial for your research paper, but the library doesn't have it and, to make matters worse, you found out it is actually out-of-print. Your friend agreed to let you borrow the book only after you promised to take especially good care of it. Today, while coming back from class, you accidentally left your backpack on a public bus and her book was in the backpack. When you called the bus company's lost-and-found, they informed you that the bag hadn't turned up, so somebody probably walked off with it. You have to call Marta to explain and apologize.

You:

Marta: ¡Dios mío! ¿Estás hablando en serio?

You:

Marta: ¡No te puedo creer que hayas botado mi libro! Cuando te lo presté te dije que tuvieras mucho cuidado con él.

You:

Marta: No, no. Lo que quiero decir es que tú sabes que ese libro está discontinuado – no lo puedes comprar en ninguna parte.

You:

Marta: Está bien, olvidémonos de eso. ¡Pero no te voy a prestar más ningún otro libro!

4) You and your friend are taking a long intercontinental flight. You were not able to book adjacent seats on the flight, although you really want to sit together. When you get to your assigned seat on the plane there is an older gentleman, who you think is from the host country, sitting in the seat next to yours. You want to ask him if he would mind switching seats with your friend, although that would mean he would have to move to a less comfortable seat in the middle of the plane.

You:

Passenger: ¿Lo que quieres decir es ... que me cambie de asiento? ¿Dónde está el asiento de tu amigo?

You:

Passenger: Sabes que la silla de tu amigo está en el medio del avión. A mí me gusta sentarme en la ventanilla tal y como estoy ahora. No me quiero cambiar.

You:

Passenger: Está bien, creo que me puedo cambiar. Puedo ver de que tu amigo y tú verdaderamente quieren sentarse juntos.

You:

5) To earn a little extra money, you agree to babysit Roberto, the 10-year-old sibling of a friend in the host community, while your friend and her parents go to theater. As you are cleaning up after dinner, you accidentally overturn the pitcher of grape juice on the kitchen table and soak Roberto's math homework he needs to turn in the next day. You go into the next room where he is watching TV to tell him what happened and to apologize.

You:

Roberto (running into the kitchen): ¡Ay, no! ¡Mi tarea de matemáticas!

You:

Roberto: Y ahora ¿qué voy a hacer? ¡No sirve! Me va a tocar hacerla toda otra vez de nuevo. Mi profesor/a no recibe tareas así.

You:

Roberto (grudgingly): Uhu, creo que sí. No puedo creer que hayas hecho esto.

You:

6) You find a great bargain airfare for this weekend only, which you want to make use of in order to visit good friends in a somewhat distant city. In order to take advantage of this deal, you need to ask your professor, Dr. Rodríguez, for an extension on a paper that you were going to work on this weekend, and which is due next week.

You:

Dr. Rodríguez: Bueno, como sabes, ya has tenido suficiente tiempo para hacer este trabajo. No tenías ninguna necesidad de esperar hasta el último minuto para escribirlo.

You:

Dr. Rodríguez: Lo siento, pero no puedo darte una extensión en este trabajo. Pienso que ir a visitar a unos amigos este semestre no es una razón válida para que te dé una extensión.

You:

Dr. Rodríguez: Bueno, no estoy muy contento en dártela. No es mi política.

You:

Dr. Rodríguez: Está bien, pero sólo por esta vez.

7) You promise to meet your close friend from the host community, Sofía, in order to help her study for an important English literature exam. She has been really kind about helping you with your learning of Spanish. You agree to meet her outside the library, but you arrive 45 minutes late for the meeting.

Sofía (annoyed): Oye, ¿dónde estabas? ¡Te he estado esperando aquí por más de media hora!

You:

Sofía: ¿Verdad? Pues, ya casi me iba a estudiar yo sola allá adentro.

You:

Sofía: Bueno, lo que quise decir fue que me estaba como que preocupando porque pensé que algo te había pasado.

You:

8) The meals your host mother, María, prepares for you are delicious. The problem is that she gives you far too much food, which you then end up struggling to finish. So you want to ask her to give you smaller portions, but you also don't want to hurt her feelings.

You:

María: Gracias. Es la receta secreta de mi abuela.

You:

María: ¡Ah, pero no estás siendo justa con mi abuela si sólo te comes un poquito!

You:

María: Pero yo pensé que te había gustado la comida.

You:

María: Está bien. Te serviré menos comida si tú realmente quieres, mijo/a.

9) You completely forget a crucial meeting with the distinguished professor, Dr. Sánchez, with whom you are doing an internship. An hour later you call him to apologize. The problem is that this is the second time you've forgotten such a meeting with your professor.

Dr. Sanchez: ¿Qué te pasó?

You:

Dr. Sánchez: Me imagino que tienes muchas cosas en tu mente en estos días, pero esta es la segunda vez que no vienes a la cita que tú mismo acordaste.

You:

Dr. Sánchez: Claro que sí. Espero que la próxima vez no se te olvide.

You:

Dr. Sánchez: Temo que no podamos posponer la cita para más tarde hoy. Por ahora, dejémosla para la próxima semana a esta misma hora.

10) Your 15-year-old host-family “sibling,” Raquel, likes to walk with you to the university since it’s a long walk from home and her high school is located right next door. You also like her company and the chance to practice Spanish, but she is often late getting going in the morning. As a result, you have been arriving late to class and don’t feel comfortable about that. You want to ask Raquel to try to get going earlier so that you can get to class on time.

You:

Raquel: Oye, yo nunca llego así de tarde. Mis clases empiezan media hora más tarde que las tuyas. De todos modos, yo pensaba que en la universidad no era importante si uno llegaba tarde a clase o no.

You:

Raquel: Bueno . . . trataré de estar lista más temprano.



Speech Act Measure (Peninsular Spanish)

Maximizing Study Abroad Through Language and Culture Strategies
Andrew D. Cohen & Rachel L. Shively

Student instructions: *Please read carefully from the beginning to the end of each of the request or apology situations. Then think through what you would say in such a situation in the host country. When deciding what you would say to someone you have come to know, for example, you may want to think about target-language speakers you know personally and imagine how you would interact with them. Once you have an idea of what you would say in Spanish for each exchange in the interaction, please write that down in the space provided.*

1) During dinner with a friend's family in the host community you accidentally spill your glass of red wine on the table cloth.

You:

Friend's mother: ¡Ay, dios mío!

You:

Friend's mother: No te preocupes. De verdad, no tienes que hacer eso. Seguramente la mancha se irá en cuanto lo lave.

You:

2) A required history class taught in Spanish for study abroad students has just ended and you are sitting there feeling frustrated. Your professor, Dr. Martínez, has once again spoken too rapidly for you to understand. You check with fellow students and find out that they are having the same problem. So, you get up your courage, go up to him after class, and request that he try to speak a bit slower and more clearly.

You:

Dr. Martínez: ¿Qué pasa?

You:

Dr. Martínez: Ay claro, lo siento mucho. Es que de verdad a veces se me olvida que no sois nativo hablantes.

You:

Dr. Martínez: Claro que sí. No es ninguna molestia. Haré lo que pueda para hablar más despacio y por favor dime si puedo ayudarte con otras cosas.

3) You borrowed an academic book from Marta, a host community friend you don't know very well. You've really wanted to get ahold of this book for some time since it is crucial for your research paper, but the library doesn't have it and, to make matters worse, you found out it is actually out-of-print. Your friend agreed to let you borrow the book only after you promised to take especially good care of it. Today, while coming back from class, you accidentally left your backpack on a public bus and her book was in the backpack. When you called the bus company's lost-and-found, they informed you that the bag hadn't turned up, so somebody probably walked off with it. You have to call Marta to explain and apologize.

You:

Marta: Estarás bromeando, ¿no?

You:

Marta: No me puedo creer que hayas perdido el libro. Te dije que tuvieras mucho cuidado con él.

You:

Marta: No, es que ese libro ya está agotado. Ya no se puede conseguir en ninguna parte.

You:

Marta: Venga, olvidémoslo, pero a mí ya no me pidas ningún libro....

4) You and your friend are taking a long intercontinental flight. You were not able to book adjacent seats on the flight, although you really want to sit together. When you get to your assigned seat on the plane there is an older gentleman, who you think is from the host country, sitting in the seat next to yours. You want to ask him if he would mind switching seats with your friend, although that would mean he would have to move to a less comfortable seat in the middle of the plane.

You:

Passenger: ¿Quieres cambiarte de asiento? Bueno, y ¿dónde está sentado tu amigo?

You:

Passenger: Mira, es que tu amigo está justo en el centro del avión y a mí me gusta sentarme al lado de la ventana como aquí. Lo siento, pero prefiero quedarme aquí.

You:

Passenger: Bueno, si insistes, supongo que me podría cambiar. Veo que tenéis mucho empeño en sentaros juntos, ¿no?

You:

5) To earn a little extra money, you agree to babysit Roberto, the 10-year-old sibling of a friend in the host community, while your friend and her parents go to theater. As you are cleaning up after dinner, you accidentally overturn the pitcher of grape juice on the kitchen table and soak Roberto's math homework he needs to turn in the next day. You go into the next room where he is watching TV to tell him what happened and to apologize.

You:

Roberto (running into the kitchen): ¡Ay, no! ¡Mis deberes de matemáticas!

You:

Roberto: ¿Y qué hago yo ahora? Están hechos un asco. Lo tendré que repetir de nuevo. Mi maestro no lo aceptará así.

You:

Roberto (grudgingly): Sí, supongo. No me puedo creer que hicieras eso.

You:

6) You find a great bargain airfare for this weekend only, which you want to make use of in order to visit good friends in a somewhat distant city. In order to take advantage of this deal, you need to ask your professor, Dr. Rodríguez, for an extension on a paper that you were going to work on this weekend, and which is due next week.

You:

Dr. Rodríguez: Mira, es que creo que has tenido mucho tiempo para trabajar en este proyecto en el fin de semana. No deberías haber esperado hasta el último momento para terminarlo.

You:

Dr. Rodríguez: Lo siento, pero no puedo darte más tiempo para entregar este trabajo. No creo que ir a visitar a unos amigos sea una buena excusa para pedir más tiempo.

You:

Dr. Rodríguez: Bueno, la verdad es que no me gusta hacer este tipo de cosas. No va conmigo.

You:

Dr. Rodríguez: Bueno, vale, pero solamente esta vez.

7) You promise to meet your close friend from the host community, Sofía, in order to help her study for an important English literature exam. She has been really kind about helping you with your learning of Spanish. You agree to meet her outside the library, but you arrive 45 minutes late for the meeting.

Sofía (annoyed): Ey, ¿dónde estabas? Te he estado esperando más de media hora.

You:

Sofía: ¿Ah, sí? Pues yo iba a entrar a estudiar sola.

You:

Sofía: Estaba preocupada por si te había pasado algo.

You:

8) The meals your host mother, María, prepares for you are delicious. The problem is that she gives you far too much food, which you then end up struggling to finish. So you want to ask her to give you smaller portions, but you also don't want to hurt her feelings.

You:

María: Gracias, es la receta secreta de mi abuela.

You:

María: A mi abuela no le gustaría que comieras tan poco.

You:

María: Pero pensaba que te gustaba la comida.

You:

María: Bueno, vale. Te pondré menos si de verdad no quieres comer más.

9) You completely forget a crucial meeting with the distinguished professor, Dr. Sánchez, with whom you are doing an internship. An hour later you call him to apologize. The problem is that this is the second time you've forgotten such a meeting with your professor.

Dr. Sánchez: ¿Qué te ha pasado?

You:

Dr. Sánchez: Yo supongo que tienes mucho trabajo que hacer estos días. Pero es que ya es la segunda vez que hemos quedado y que a tí se te olvida venir.

You:

Dr. Sánchez: Bueno, eso espero, que no se te olvide la próxima vez que quedemos.

You:

Dr. Sánchez: Me temo que no voy a poder quedar contigo a otra hora. ¿Qué tal te viene la semana próxima a la misma hora?

10) Your 15-year-old host-family “sibling,” Raquel, likes to walk with you to the university since it’s a long walk from home and her high school is located right next door. You also like her company and the chance to practice Spanish, but she is often late getting going in the morning. As a result, you have been arriving late to class and don’t feel comfortable about that. You want to ask Raquel to try to get going earlier so that you can get to class on time.

You:

Raquel: Oye, que yo nunca tardo *tanto*. Es que mis clases empiezan media hora más tarde que las tuyas. Además, yo pensaba que no importaba llegar tarde a las clases en la universidad.

You:

Raquel: Vale. De acuerdo. Intentaré arreglarme antes.



Speech Act Measure (French)

Maximizing Study Abroad Through Language and Culture Strategies
Andrew D. Cohen & Rachel L. Shively

Student instructions: *Please read carefully from the beginning to the end of each of the request or apology situations. Then think through what you would say in such a situation in the host country. When deciding what you would say to someone you have come to know, for example, you may want to think about target-language speakers you know personally and imagine how you would interact with them. Once you have an idea of what you would say in French for each exchange in the interaction, please write that down in the space provided.*

1) During dinner with a friend's family in the host community you accidentally spill your glass of red wine on the table cloth.

You:

Friend's mother: Oh mon Dieu!

You:

Friend's mother: Non non. Ne vous inquiétez pas. Vous n'avez pas à faire ça. La tâche partira sûrement au lavage!

You:

2) A required history class taught in French for study abroad students has just ended and you are sitting there feeling frustrated. Your professor, Dr. Martin, has once again spoken too rapidly for you to understand. You check with fellow students and find out that they are having the same problem. So, you get up your courage, go up to him after class, and request that he try to speak a bit slower and more clearly.

You:

Dr. Martin: Oui, qu'y-a-t-il?

You:

Dr. Martin: Oh je m'excuse. J'oublie toujours qu'une partie de mes étudiants ne parle pas bien français.

You:

Dr. Martin: Bien sûr, sans problème. Je vais faire mon possible pour parler moins vite et plus clairement. N'hésitez pas à me dire s'il y a autre chose que je peux faire pour vous aider.

3) You borrowed an academic book from Marthe, a host community friend you don't know very well. You've really wanted to get ahold of this book for some time since it is crucial for your research paper, but the library doesn't have it and, to make matters worse, you found out it is actually out-of-print. Your friend agreed to let you borrow the book only after you promised to take especially good care of it. Today, while coming back from class, you accidentally left your backpack on a public bus and her book was in the backpack. When you called the bus company's lost-and-found, they informed you that the bag hadn't turned up, so somebody probably walked off with it. You have to call Marthe to explain and apologize.

You:

Marthe: Oh non, c'est pas possible! C'est une blague?!

You:

Marthe: J'arrive pas à croire que t'as perdu mon livre! Je t'avais pourtant demandé d'y faire hyper attention quand je te l'ai prêté.

You:

Marthe: Non, non. Enfin, tu sais très bien que ce livre n'est plus publié. On ne peut l'acheter nulle part.

You:

Marthe: Bon, n'en parlons plus. Mais je ne te prêterai plus jamais rien, c'est sûr!!

4) You and your friend are taking a long intercontinental flight. You were not able to book adjacent seats on the flight, although you really want to sit together. When you get to your assigned seat on the plane there is an older gentleman, who you think is from the host country, sitting in the seat next to yours. You want to ask him if he would mind switching seats with your friend, although that would mean he would have to move to a less comfortable seat in the middle of the plane.

You:

Passenger: Hein? Vous voulez que je change de place? Et il est assis où, votre ami?

You:

Passenger: Vous comprenez, votre ami est assis en plein milieu de la rangée. Moi, je préfère ma place ici, près du hublot. Je n'ai pas vraiment envie de changer.

You:

Passenger: Bon, bon, c'est d'accord. Je vois bien que vous et votre ami avez vraiment envie d'être assis à côté.

You:

5) To earn a little extra money, you agree to babysit Robert, the 10-year-old sibling of a friend in the host community, while your friend and her parents go to theater. As you are cleaning up after dinner, you accidentally overturn the pitcher of grape juice on the kitchen table and soak Robert's math homework he needs to turn in the next day. You go into the next room where he is watching TV to tell him what happened and to apologize.

You:

Robert (running into the kitchen): Oh non! Mon devoir de math!

You:

Robert: Qu'est ce que je vais faire? Il est fichu! Va falloir tout que je refasse! Mon prof n'acceptera jamais un truc pareil!

You:

Robert (grudgingly): Ben ouais, c'est clair. J'arrive pas à croire que t'as fait ça!

You:

6) You find a great bargain airfare for this weekend only, which you want to make use of in order to visit good friends in a somewhat distant city. In order to take advantage of this deal, you need to ask your professor, Dr. Renault, for an extension on a paper that you were going to work on this weekend, and which is due next week.

You:

Dr. Renault: Oui mais vous aviez amplement le temps de travailler sur cette dissertation, au lieu d'attendre jusqu'au dernier moment!

You:

Dr. Renault: Je suis désolé mais je ne peux pas vous accorder plus de temps. Et de toute façon, je ne pense pas qu'aller rendre visite à des amis en plein semestre soit une raison valable.

You:

Dr. Renault: Ça cette idée ne me plait pas vraiment. Ce n'est pas dans mes habitudes.

You:

Dr. Renault: Bon d'accord, mais c'est exceptionnel.

7) You promise to meet your close friend from the host community, Sophie, in order to help her study for an important English literature exam. She has been really kind about helping you with your learning of French. You agree to meet her outside the library, but you arrive 45 minutes late for the meeting.

Sophie (annoyed): Et alors t'étais où?! Ça fait plus d'une demi-heure que je t'attends!

You:

Sophie: Ah vraiment? Tu sais j'ai failli aller étudier seule à l'intérieur.

You:

Sophie: Mais...je me faisais du souci, je pensais même qu'il t'était arrivé quelque chose.

You:

8) The meals your host mother, Marie, prepares for you are delicious. The problem is that she gives you far too much food, which you then end up struggling to finish. So you want to ask her to give you smaller portions, but you also don't want to hurt her feelings.

You:

Marie: Merci! C'est la recette secrète de ma grand-mère!

You:

Marie: Oh ma grandmère serait deçue si elle vous voyez manger si peu!

You:

Marie: Mais je pensais que vous aimiez...

You:

Marie: Très bien, je vous servirai de plus petites portions.

9) You completely forget a crucial meeting with the distinguished professor, Dr. Sartre, with whom you are doing an internship. An hour later you call him to apologize. The problem is that this is the second time you've forgotten such a meeting with your professor.

Dr. Sartre: Que vous est-il encore arrivé?

You:

Dr. Sartre: Je comprends que vous êtes très occupé ces jours-çi mais c'est la deuxième fois que vous oubliez un rendez-vous que VOUS m'avez fixé.

You:

Dr. Sartre: Oui, certainement, et j'espère que vous n'oublierez pas cette fois!

You:

Dr. Sartre: Je crains de ne pouvoir vous recevoir aujourd'hui. Seriez-vous disponible la semaine prochaine à la même heure?

10) Your 15-year-old host-family “sibling,” Rachel, likes to walk with you to the university since it’s a long walk from home and her high school is located right next door. You also like her company and the chance to practice French, but she is often late getting going in the morning. As a result, you have been arriving late to class and don’t feel comfortable about that. You want to ask Rachel to try to get going earlier so that you can get to class on time.

You:

Rachel: Oh, je ne suis jamais SI en retard que ça! Mon cours commence une demi-heure après le tien. Et puis je pensais qu’à la fac on pouvait arriver en retard sans problème.

You:

Rachel: Ouais OK...je vais essayer d’être prête plus tôt!

Appendix G: Follow-up Interview Protocol



Follow-up Interview Protocol

Maximizing Study Abroad Through Language and Culture Strategies

1. Overall, what did you think of the *Students' Guide*? Please explain.
2. Specifically, which sections of the guide do you feel were most helpful in your language and culture learning experiences while abroad? Which sections were least helpful? Please explain.
3. Looking back now, in what ways might the guide have influenced your interactions with native speakers of the target language – language- or culture-wise? Please explain and give examples.
4. Do you think your language skills in Spanish or French improved while you were abroad?
 - If so, what were the most important factors that lead to this improvement? Did the guide play any role?
 - If not, why do you think your skills did not improve?
5. Do you think your intercultural skills improved while you were abroad?
 - If so, what were the most important factors that lead to this improvement? Did the guide play any role?
 - If not, why do you think your skills did not improve?
6. Since your return to the US, have you used any of the post-study abroad tips from the guide to maintain and improve your abilities in Spanish or French? If so, please give examples.
7. Since your return to the US, have you used any of the culture learning strategies contained in the guide to assist you in the reentry process? If so, please give examples.
8. Has the use of the guide provided you with any insights into being a U.S. American? Please explain.
9. In the future, to what extent do you think you might use the language and culture strategies that you came in contact with in the guide? Please explain.
10. Do you have any suggestions on how to improve the guide? (For example, changing the organization, adding different types of information, making it more user-friendly, etc.)
11. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Appendix H: Categories for the Semantic Formula and Supportive Move Coding of the *Speech Act Measure*

Categories for the Semantic Formula Coding of the Speech Act Measure

APOLOGIES

A. *Semantic Formulas*

1. Apology expression: Use a word, expression, or sentence with a verb such as “sorry,” “excuse,” “forgive,” or “apologize.”
2. Acknowledge responsibility: Absolute acknowledgment of responsibility → rejection of responsibility (high, middle, low, lower, reject)
3. Explanation: Describes what caused the offense (e.g., the bus was late); intended to set things right
4. Offer of repair: Makes a bid to do something or provide payment for damage
5. Promise of non-recurrence: Commits to not having the offense happen again

B. *Intensification*

Modification of strategies with intensifiers such as “really”, “very”, “Oh, my gosh!!”

- Je suis *vraiment* or *très* desoléé.
- ¡Ay, *dios!* ¡Lo siento *mucho!*

REQUESTS

A. *Head Act*

1. Mood derivables: Include verbs with imperative morpho-syntax, and also functional equivalent infinitive forms and elliptical imperatives. e.g., “Get out!”, “Out!”, “No Smoking!”
2. Explicit performatives: The illocutionary intent is explicitly named by the speaker by using a relevant illocutionary verb. e.g., “I ask that you give five dollars.”, “I suggest you leave now.”

3. Hedged performatives: The illocutionary verb denoting the requestive intent is modified, e.g., by modal verbs or verbs expression intention. e.g., “I’d like to/I wanted to ask you to lend me \$1.00.”, “I have to ask you to come early.”
4. Locution derivables: The illocutionary intent is directly derivable from the semantic meaning of the locution. Three subcategories:
 - a. Need and obligation statements: “You need to clean the office.”, “I need you to clean the office.”
 - b. Ought/should/must + verb: “You should/ought to/must put on a sweater.”
 - c. It is + adjective (of urgency, need, obligation) + that/to: “It’s important to be on time.”, “It’s urgent that you call me.”
5. Query preparatory: The utterance contains reference to a preparatory condition for the feasibility of the request, typically one of ability, willingness or possibility, as conventionalized in a given language. e.g., “Can you help me with this?”, “Is it possible to have some light?”
 - a. Query preparatory with very modification: The utterance contains a “query preparatory” whose verb is in a tense other than the present as a strategy to soften the force of the head act. The tense is either the conditional or the imperfect subjunctive (Spanish). e.g., “Could you help me with this?”
6. Want statements: e.g., “I want you to leave now.”
7. Hints: A non-conventionalized indirect means of performing requests which require some inference on the part of the hearer for correct interpretation. e.g., “The furniture is very dusty. It can’t be that way when the meeting takes place.”

B. *Supportive Moves*

1. Preparator: Prepares the hearer by announcing that she will make a request. e.g., “Can I ask you a favor...”
2. Getting a precommitment: Checking on a potential refusal. e.g., “This might be too much to ask...”, “I know you may be too busy to do this...”
3. Grounder: The speaker gives reasons, explanations, for the request. e.g., “I’ve been very busy lately...”, “I was absent from class yesterday...”
4. Disarmer: The speaker tries to remove any potential objections the hearer. e.g., “Look, we’re on the same team...”

5. Promise of reward: A reward due to on fulfillment of the request is announced. e.g., “If you agree to complete the pilot test, you’ll receive a free book.”
6. Imposition minimizer: to reduce the imposition checking with the hearer. e.g., “It won’t take much time...”, “I’ll give it right back to you tomorrow...”
7. Acknowledgement of imposition: e.g., “I know you’re really busy, but...”, “This is a lot to ask, I know, but...”
8. Appreciation: e.g., “I would really appreciate it...”, “It would be wonderful...”

C. *Perspective of the Request*

Hearer oriented: Emphasis on the role of the hearer. e.g., “Could *you* clean up the kitchen?”

Speaker oriented: Emphasis on the speaker’s role as a recipient. e.g., “Can *I* borrow your notes from yesterday?”

Speaker and hearer oriented: Inclusive strategy. e.g., “So, could *we* tidy up the kitchen?”

Impersonal: e.g., So, it might not be a bad idea to *get the kitchen cleaned up*.

D. *Use of the politeness marker ‘please’ (i.e., ‘por favor’ or ; ‘s’il vous plais’)*

Appendix I: Speech Act Measure French and Spanish Native Speaker Rating Criteria

Speech Act Measure Rating Criteria: Request Vignettes

Student ID: _____

Vignette # (circle one): 2 4 6 8 10

1. Overall Success of the Vignette:

Please judge the overall success of the request made by the respondent. Think about whether you would want to comply with the request if you were in the position of the hearer.

Based on the speaker's responses, if you were the hearer...

- 5 = I would happily comply with the speaker's request
- 4 = I would comply with the speaker's request, but somewhat reluctantly
- 3 = I would comply with the speaker's request, but reluctantly
- 2 = I would comply with the speaker's request, but only very reluctantly
- 1 = I would absolutely not want to comply with the speaker's request

Please briefly describe why you rated the way you did:

2. Formality (register):

For rating purposes, "formality" is the degree to which the respondent's language appropriately acknowledges the social distance between speaker and hearer in a given social situation. Ask yourself whether the speaker used language that was too "intimate" or too "distant," given the context of the vignette (e.g., at home, on the plane) and the relative status of the speaker to the hearer (i.e., stranger, acquaintance, friend, etc.).

A. Given the context of the vignette, the situation was:

3 = formal 2 = somewhat informal 1 = informal

B. The fit between the speaker's **choice of vocabulary** and formality level was:

5 = excellent 4 = very good 3 = good 2 = fair 1 = poor

Please briefly describe why you rated the way you did:

C. The fit between the speaker's choice of **verb tense/inflection** and formality level was:

5 = excellent 4 = very good 3 = good 2 = fair 1 = poor

Please briefly describe why you rated the way you did:

- D. The fit between the speaker's choice of **subject pronoun** (i.e., tú/usted; tu/vous) and formality level was:

2 = appropriate **1** = inappropriate

Please briefly describe why you rated the way you did:

3. Directness:

For rating purposes, "directness" means the degree to which the speaker uses language to specifically make a request (e.g., **direct** → "María, close the window, I'm cold."), or if the speaker performs the *function* of making a request but the words themselves do not specify a request (i.e., **indirect** → "It's a little cold in here...", implying the speaker is requesting that the hearer to close the window).

- A. The speaker was:

3 = direct **2** = somewhat direct **1** = indirect

- B. The speaker's level of directness was:

5 = very appropriate
4 = appropriate
3 = somewhat appropriate
2 = inappropriate
1 = very inappropriate

Please briefly describe why you rated the way you did:

4. Politeness:

For rating purposes, "politeness" refers to the degree to which the language the respondent uses to make the request reflects appropriate consideration for the hearer's needs and feelings in a given social situation. In thinking about "politeness," the raters should also ask themselves, given the context of the vignette, whether they would feel offended by the speaker's language and whether they would think that the speaker was being rude.

- A. The speaker was:

3 = polite **2** = somewhat polite **1** = impolite

- B. The speaker's level of politeness was:

5 = very appropriate
4 = appropriate

3 = somewhat appropriate

2 = inappropriate

1 = very inappropriate

Please briefly describe why you rated the way you did:

Speech Act Measure Rating Criteria: Apology Vignettes

Student ID: _____

Vignette # (circle one): 1 3 5 7 9

Please rate the apology vignettes in the *Speech Act Measure* using the criteria listed below.

Notes:

- “Respondent” and “speaker” refer to the research subject who completed the *Speech Act Measure* (i.e., the “You” on the instrument). “Hearer” refers to the person rating the measure, imagining that they are in the position of the interlocutor talking to the research subject.
- Do not give the respondent a lower score for grammatical errors, UNLESS those grammar errors inhibit the ability of the hearer to understand what the speaker is trying to communicate. But if you cannot understand what the speaker is trying to communicate because of grammar errors, you can give him/her a lower score.
- Do not give the respondent a lower score for spelling errors. The instrument is meant to reflect oral speech, in which case spelling errors would not be important.
- Please rate all of the data for the same vignette first before moving on to rating another vignette. In other words, rate all of the vignette #1’s together, then all the vignette #2’s, etc.
- **DON’T FORGET TO WRITE THE STUDY ID# ON EACH RATING SHEET!!** That is the only way we can track which test you have rated.

1. Overall Success of the Vignette:

Please judge the overall success of the apology made by the respondent. Think about whether you would feel satisfied with the apology if you were in the position of the hearer.

Based on the speaker’s responses, if you were the hearer...

- 5** = I would feel very satisfied with the speaker’s apology
- 4** = I would feel satisfied with the speaker’s apology
- 3** = I would feel somewhat satisfied with the speaker’s apology
- 2** = I would feel unsatisfied with the speaker’s apology
- 1** = I would feel very unsatisfied with the speaker’s apology

Please briefly describe why you rated the way you did:

2. Formality:

For rating purposes, “formality” is the degree to which the respondent’s language appropriately acknowledges the social distance between speaker and hearer in a given social situation. Ask yourself whether the speaker used language that was too “intimate” or too “distant,” given the context of the vignette (e.g., at home, on the plane) and the relative status of the speaker to the hearer (i.e., stranger, acquaintance, friend, etc.).

A. Given the context of the vignette, the situation was:

3 = formal **2** = somewhat informal **1** = informal

B. The fit between the speaker’s **choice of vocabulary** and formality level was:

5 = excellent **4** = very good **3** = good **2** = fair **1** = poor

Please briefly describe why you rated the way you did:

C. The fit between the speaker’s choice of **verb tense/inflection** and formality level was:

5 = excellent **4** = very good **3** = good **2** = fair **1** = poor

Please briefly describe why you rated the way you did:

D. The fit between the speaker’s choice of **subject pronoun** (i.e., tú/usted; tu/vous) and formality level was:

2 = appropriate **1** = inappropriate

Please briefly describe why you rated the way you did:

Appendix J: Exit Questionnaire for Study Abroad Advisors (*Program Professionals' Guide Study*)



Exit Questionnaire for Study Abroad Advisors
Maximizing Study Abroad Through Language and Culture Strategies

Thank you for participating in the *Maximizing Study Abroad* research! We really appreciate the thought and effort that you have put into this project. This questionnaire will help us to better understand the context and audience for your pre-departure orientations as well as your experiences using the *Program Professionals' Guide*. Your honest and detailed responses will be greatly appreciated. The responses that you provide in this questionnaire will be kept confidential.

I. CONTACT AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Name: _____

Work Phone: _____

Work Address: _____

City: _____ Zip: _____

Total number of years conducting pre-departure study abroad orientations:

Total number of years working as a study abroad advisor (with any organization, not just your current one): _____

Current Title/Position: _____

Please describe the primary duties of your current position:

II. OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Please write your answers below each question using Microsoft Word.

1. Overall, what did you think of the *Program Professionals Guide (PPG)*? Please explain.
2. What were your reasons for choosing the activities/materials that you selected for your orientation(s)?
3. Do you think you were successful in integrating the materials from the *PPG* into your pre-departure orientation(s)? Why or why not?
4. What were students' perceptions/reactions to the materials you used for the orientation activity?
5. Are you planning to follow up with your students to see if the information you provided them from the *PPG* was useful? If yes, how?
6. Which parts of the *PPG* do you think are most relevant for the "typical" study abroad student population when conducting a pre-departure orientation? Which parts are least relevant?
7. In what ways, if any, did the readings and/or activities from the *PPG* provide insights into your practice as a study abroad professional? Please explain.
8. Material selection process:
 - a. What criteria did you use to select materials for the pre-departure orientation(s) you conducted (e.g., brevity, content, language issues)?
 - b. Was the material selection process challenging for you? Why or why not?
 - c. Did you supplement the *PPG* materials with other materials? If yes, please briefly describe how you did so.
 - d. Would you have wanted more guidance from the *PPG* about selecting materials (e.g., rationales for the activities, times for each activity)? Why or why not?
9. Integrating materials into the orientation:
 - b. Was integrating the materials from the *PPG* into your orientation challenging for you? Why or why not?
 - c. Were time issues regarding the preparation and use of these materials challenging for you? Why or why not?
 - d. Were certain materials more time consuming in terms of preparation and implementation? If yes, which materials and why?
 - e. Would you have wanted more guidance from the *PPG* on using the materials in orientation? Why or why not?
10. Do you plan on using the materials from the *PPG* in future student pre-departure orientations?

- If yes, which materials from the PPG did you find the most useful and why?
 - If yes, what might you do differently with the *PPG* materials?
 - If not, what factors have influenced this decision?
 - If you are unsure, what factors have influenced this decision?
 - If you are unsure, would you like to talk to someone about any issues you have regarding using PPG materials in the future?
11. What advice or tips do you have for other program professionals considering using the *PPG*?
12. Do you have any suggestions for how we might revise the guidebook (e.g., adding additional activities or information, organization, suggested times for activities)?
13. Is there anything else you would like to tell us?

III. INFORMATION ON PRE-DEPARTURE ORIENTATION(S)

Please list all the pre-departure orientations that you conducted during Fall 2003 in which you incorporated the *Maximizing Study Abroad* (MAXSA) materials (Note: for the study, you were only required to conduct *one* orientation using these materials):

	Orientation date	Length of orientation	Number of students who attended the orientation	Amount of time spent using the MAXSA materials	Was the orientation mandatory for students?	Was the orientation general or culture-specific?	If culture-specific, which culture(s)?
1.					<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> General <input type="checkbox"/> Culture-specific	
2.					<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> General <input type="checkbox"/> Culture-specific	
3.					<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> General <input type="checkbox"/> Culture-specific	
4.					<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> General <input type="checkbox"/> Culture-specific	

Is there any other information that you can provide that would help us to understand the context and audience for your pre-departure orientation(s)? If you listed more than one orientation above, please indicate to which one you are referring.

Please return the completed *Exit Questionnaire* with photocopies of any additional materials that you used in conjunction with the *PPG* materials in your pre-departure orientation(s) **by January 31, 2004** to:

Mailing address:

Joe Hoff
Learning Abroad Center/Center for
Advanced Research on Language Acquisition
230 Heller Hall
271 19th Avenue S,
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Email address: Joe Hoff, hoff0509@umn.edu

Feel free to contact anyone on the *Maximizing Study Abroad* research team with questions or comments.

Thanks again for participating in this project!

Appendix K: Exit Questionnaire for On-Site Directors (*Program Professionals' Guide Study*)



Exit Questionnaire for On-Site Directors
Maximizing Study Abroad Through Language and Culture Strategies

Thank you for participating in the *Maximizing Study Abroad* research! We really appreciate the thought and effort that you have put into this project. This questionnaire will help us to better understand the context and audience for your orientations/on-site programming as well as your experiences using the *Program Professionals' Guide*. Your honest and detailed responses will be greatly appreciated. The responses that you provide in this questionnaire will be kept confidential.

I. CONTACT AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Name: _____

Work Phone: _____

Work Address: _____

City: _____ Zip: _____

Total number of years conducting study abroad orientations/on-site programming:

Total number of years working as an On-Site Resident Director (with any organization, not just your current one):

Current Title/Position: _____

Please describe the primary duties of your current position:

II. OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Please write your answers below each question using Microsoft Word.

1. Overall, what did you think of the *Program Professionals' Guide (PPG)*? Please explain.
2. What were your educational goals that led you to choose the activities/materials that you selected for your orientation(s)/programming?
3. Do you think you were successful in integrating the materials from the *PPG* into your orientation(s)/programming? Why or why not?
4. Did students volunteer any reactions to the materials or did you solicit any written course or activity evaluations? If so, what were students' perceptions/reactions to the materials you used for the orientation/programming activity?
5. Are you planning to follow up with your students to see if the information you provided them from the *PPG* was useful? If yes, how?
6. Which part(s) of the *PPG* do you think are most relevant for on-site orientation and programming? Which parts are least relevant?
7. In what ways, if any, did the readings and/or activities from the *PPG* provide insights into your practice as a study abroad professional? Please explain.
8. Material selection process:
 - a. What criteria did you use to select materials for the on-site orientation(s)/programming you conducted (e.g., brevity cultural content, language issues)?
 - b. Was the material selection process challenging for you? Why or why not?
 - c. Did you supplement the *PPG* materials with other materials? If yes, please briefly describe how you did so.
 - d. Would you have wanted more guidance from the *PPG* about selecting materials (e.g., rationale for the activities, times for each activity)? Why or why not?
9. Integrating materials into the orientation:
 - a. Was integrating the materials from the *PPG* into your orientation/programming challenging for you? Why or why not?
 - b. Was time an issue regarding the preparation and use of these materials? Why or why not?
 - c. Were certain materials more time-consuming in terms of preparation and implementation? If yes, which materials and why?
 - d. Would you have wanted more guidance from the *PPG* on using the materials in orientation? Why or why not?
10. Do you plan on using the materials from the *PPG* in future student orientations/programming?
 - If yes, which materials from the *PPG* did you find the most useful and why?
 - If yes, what might you do differently with the *PPG* materials?

- If not, what factors have influenced this decision?
 - If you are unsure, what factors have influenced this decision?
 - If you are unsure, would you like to talk to someone about using PPG materials in the future?
11. What advice or tips do you have for other program professionals considering using the *PPG*?
 12. Do you have any suggestions for how we might revise the guidebook (e.g., adding additional activities or information, organization, suggested times for activities)?
 13. Were there any special circumstances related to your study abroad context/location that influenced the type of activities/information you chose to offer your students? If so, please elaborate:
 14. Did the progression of activities from the *PPG* you planned for your students throughout the term go smoothly? If so, why? If not, why not? Would you do anything differently in the future?
 15. Is there anything else you would like to tell us?

III. INFORMATION ON ORIENTATION(S)/PROGRAMMING ACTIVITY

Please list all the orientations/programming activities that you conducted during Fall 2003 and/or Spring 2004 in which you incorporated the *Maximizing Study Abroad* (MAXSA) materials (Note: for the study, you were only required to conduct *two* orientations/programming activities using these materials):

	Orientation/ Programming activity date	Purpose: (e.g. introductory meeting, re-entry activity) and activities used from the PP Guide (page references)	Length of orientation/ activity	Number of students who attended the orientation/ activity	Amount of time spent using the MAXSA materials	Was the orientation/ activity mandatory for students?	Was the orientation/ activity general or culture-specific?	If culture- specific, which culture(s)?
1.						<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> General <input type="checkbox"/> Culture-specific	
2.						<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> General <input type="checkbox"/> Culture-specific	
3.						<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> General <input type="checkbox"/> Culture-specific	
4.						<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> General <input type="checkbox"/> Culture-specific	

Is there any other information that you can provide that would help us to understand the context and audience for your orientation(s)/programming activities? Did you use culture specific examples to demonstrate culture-general topics from the Maximizing Study Abroad Guides? If so, please explain. Please indicate to which orientation/programming activity you are referring.

Please return the completed *Exit Questionnaire* with photocopies of any additional materials that you used in conjunction with the *PPG* materials in your events **by May 20, 2004** to:

Mailing address:

Joe Hoff
Learning Abroad Center/Center for
Advanced Research on Language Acquisition
230 Heller Hall
271 19th Avenue S,
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Email address: Joe Hoff, hoff0509@umn.edu

Feel free to contact anyone on the *Maximizing Study Abroad* research team with questions or comments.

Thanks again for participating in this project!

Appendix L: Language Instructor Monthly Questions



Language Instructors' Guide

Monthly Questions for Language Instructor Study Participants

Maximizing Study Abroad Through Language and Culture Strategies

Pre-course Questions

- For which course will you incorporate the *Language Instructors' Guide* elements into your curriculum?
- What components of the *Instructors' Guide* are you planning to incorporate into your curriculum plan/syllabus? Please be specific.

Monthly Questions

- 1) What elements of the *Instructors' Guide* did you use this month in your language teaching? Why did you choose to include those specific materials? Please provide specific examples.
- 2) Please describe your experience incorporating those specific materials into your curriculum, highlighting what was successful.
- 3) Did you encounter any challenges in integrating the *Instructors' Guide* materials into your curriculum this month? If so, please describe those challenges.
- 4) Of the materials from the *Instructors' Guide* you chose to include, which would you use again? Would you modify them in any way? Please elaborate.
- 5) Please comment on the effect that your use of *Instructors' Guide* elements in class had on your students this month.
- 6) Have your students indicated in any way that they are considering study abroad? If so, has the use of the *Instructors' Guide* played a role in their decision to consider studying abroad? How?
- 7) What insights, if any, have the readings and supporting materials of the *Instructors' Guide* provided you regarding your work as a language instructor? Please explain.
- 8) Do you have suggestions for improving the guide in general? Please explain.

9) Do you have suggestions for improving the guide so that it could better meet the needs of language learners? Please explain.

10) Is there anything else you would like to add?

Appendix M: Exit Questionnaire for Language Instructors



Exit Questionnaire for Language Instructors ***Maximizing Study Abroad Through Language and Culture Strategies***

Thank you for participating in the *Maximizing Study Abroad* research! We appreciate the thought and effort that you have put into this project. This questionnaire will help us to better understand your experiences using the *Language Instructors' Guide*. Your honest and detailed responses will be greatly appreciated. The responses that you provide in this questionnaire will be kept confidential.

You may submit this questionnaire via mail or electronically. If you choose to submit the form electronically, please complete and send the form using Microsoft Word. Thank you again for your participation!

I. CONTACT AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. Contact Information

Name: _____

Current Title/Position and Institution: _____

Email address: _____

Work phone: _____

Work Address: _____

City: _____ Zip: _____

Summer Phone/Contact Information: _____

B. Language Teaching Information

1. Which language(s) have you taught?

Language(s) and number of years taught for each: _____

Level(s) taught for each _____

II. OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

2. Overall, what do you think of the *Language Instructors' Guide* (LIG)? Please explain.
3. Did you have any indication from students that the use of the LIG materials in the curriculum was helpful in their language and culture learning? If yes, please explain how, using as many specific examples as possible (e.g., student comments on how materials you incorporated from the guide helped them remember vocabulary or to understand an aspect of the target culture).
4. In what ways does the LIG encourage students to think about participating in study abroad when they might not have considered it before?
5. Are you planning to follow up with your students to see if the information you provided them from the LIG was useful? If yes, how?
6. Material selection and adaptation process:
 - a. What were your reasons for choosing the activities/materials that you selected from the LIG for use in your language curriculum (e.g., brevity, time needed for the activity)?
 - b. Was the LIG material selection process challenging for you? Why or why not?
 - c. Were certain materials more time-consuming in terms of preparation than others? If yes, which materials were more time consuming and why?
 - d. Did you adapt LIG materials for use in your curriculum?
 - If yes, describe how you did so.
 - If yes, describe how the LIG materials enhanced your curriculum.
 - e. Would you have wanted more guidance from the LIG about selecting materials (e.g., provision of a rationale for use of each activity)? Why or why not?
 - f. What advice do you have for making individual exercises in the LIG more appropriate for students?
7. Integrating materials into the language curriculum:
 - a. Do you think you were successful in integrating the materials from the LIG into your language curriculum? Why or why not?
 - b. Was integrating the materials from the LIG into your curriculum challenging for you? Why or why not?
 - c. Was time an issue regarding the preparation of these materials? Why or why not?

- d. Was time an issue regarding the use of these materials? Why or why not?
 - e. Would you have wanted more guidance from the LIG about using the materials in the classroom? Why or why not?
8. Do you plan to use the materials from the LIG in future language courses?
 - If yes, which materials from the LIG did you find the most useful and why?
 - If yes, what might you do differently with the LIG materials?
 - If no, why not?
 9. In what ways, if any, did the readings and/or activities from the LIG provide new insights into your practice as a language educator? Please explain.
 10. What parts of the LIG are most relevant for the “typical” language classroom (i.e., not a special predeparture study abroad-oriented language course)?
 11. What advice or tips do you have for other language instructors who are considering using the LIG?
 12. Do you have any suggestions for how we might revise the *Language Instructors’ Guide* (e.g., adding additional activities or changing its organization)?
 13. Is there anything else you would like to tell us?

Thank You!!

Please return the completed Exit Questionnaire for Language Instructors with photocopies of any additional materials that you used in conjunction with the LIG materials to Holly Emert, MAXSA research assistant, by May 15, 2004 for University of Minnesota participants and by May 25, 2004 for St. Olaf College participants. Should you have any questions, please contact Holly via email or by phone (see below for contact information).

Mailing address:

Holly Emert
 Department of Educational Policy and Administration/CARLA
 330 Wulling Hall
 86 Pleasant St. SE
 University of Minnesota
 Minneapolis, MN 55455

Appendix N: Gillian's Adaptation of ACT 19-21 Reading Strategy Use

Español 231: Exploración de temas culturales y estrategias de lectura

Las oraciones a continuación son de artículos de distintas revistas o periódicos en español. Léelas y adivina ["guess"] el tema central del artículo.

Por ejemplo:

“Los extranjeros siguen identificando España con el sol, la playa, los toros, las vacaciones, la sangría y el flamenco. Cada vez valoran más su riqueza ecológica y ambiental.” (*Cambio 16*, 22 abril 1996, pág. 26.)

¿Cuál es el tema central? _____

¿Qué palabras o frases te ayudaron a identificar el tema central? _____

1. “Se incrementarán el número de puestos de trabajo en los que se demanden el conocimiento y el uso de las tecnologías de la información, independientemente del sector económico.....Según Ignacio Mazo, de Arthur Andersen, ‘el nuevo trabajo debe ser capaz de asimilar los cambios tecnológicos así como un cambio en el uso del tiempo, no determinado por un horario convencional.’ (*QUO*, septiembre 2000, pág. 90) _____

2. “[A los padres españoles les falta] tiempo para dedicar a los hijos, derivado de la incorporación de la mujer a la vida laboral, sin que la mayoría de los hombres haya cambiado sus roles dentro del hogar, al tiempo que la fuerte irrupción de las nuevas tecnologías en los hogares y, sobre todo, entre los más jóvenes de la casa, hayan modificado también de manera importante los patrones de comunicación y, por tanto, el tiempo que la familia comparte los ratos de ocio. Aún así, un 86 por ciento de los padres y un 78 por ciento de los hijos considera que la unión familiar es algo importante.” (*ABC* [edición electrónica], 18 febrero 2003) _____

3. “...Tompkins comenzó en 1991 la conquista de lo que llegaría a ser el mayor parque privado del mundo. Para 1995, sus adquisiciones sumaban unas 230 mil hectáreas de bosques vírgenes que costaban 12 millones de dólares. Sus dominios incluían varios volcanes, inmensos bosques de alerces de 3 mil años de antigüedad, decenas de lagos, fiordos, cascadas y varias especies animales y vegetales en peligro de extinción.” (*Muy Interesante*, pág. 36) _____

4. “Fuerteventura recibió la llegada de 107 inmigrantes africanos, incluídas dos mujeres, en un periodo de menos de diez horas en el que arribaron a la isla cinco pateras, dos de las cuales fueron interceptadas con sus respectivos patrones a bordo.....Agentes de [la Guardia Civil], de la Policía Nacional y de la Policía Local de la capital, Puerto del Rosario, han participado en la detención de los referidos inmigrantes, cuatro de los cuales son marroquíes, al igual que los dos patrones capturados, mientras que los restantes 103, entre los que se encuentran las dos mujeres, son de origen subsahariano.” (*ABC* [edición electrónica], 26 febrero 2003) _____

5. “Vicente tuvo conciencia de la injusticia que se cometía con los indígenas. Y no podía ser legal que llegaran a sus aldeas perdidas en el monte, ingenieros y peritos para medir el terreno y comunicarles que estaban sembrando en propiedades ajenas. Era más frecuente que les presentaran a firmar unos papeles—no sabían leer y estaban escritos en castellano, lengua desconocida por todos ellos.....” (*Cambio 16*, 25 mayo 1998, pág. 64). _____

6. “La Agencia Europea del Espacio (ESA) trabaja ya en lo que va a ser el proyecto científico más ambicioso de la historia. Si sus resultados son los esperados, superará el desciframiento del genoma humano, la llegada de seres humanos a la Luna y la construcción de la ISS. Se llama Darwin... [e] intentará encontrar vida fuera del Sistema Solar; para ello, buscará planetas similares a la Tierra y analizará directamente sus atmósferas, para rastrear la presencia de los compuestos que posibilitan la existencia de seres vivos.” (*QUO*, febrero 2002, pág. 62) _____

7. “En la Comunidad de Madrid en el año 2000...en la franja de edad 15-19 años, hubo 1.036 nacimientos, 347 de madres extranjeras: 128 jóvenes eran de Ecuador, 54 de Colombia, 35 de Marruecos, 29 de la República Dominicana y 22 de Rumanía. ‘El fracaso escolar es factor de riesgo [para que una joven de 15-19 años sea madre soltera] porque a partir de aquí las adolescentes entran en un circuito no normalizado y dejan de tener un proyecto de vida. Además,...la falta de información sexual y las barreras para el uso de anticonceptivos hacen el resto.’” (*ABC* [edición electrónica], 26 febrero 2003)

8. “El sarampión jugó un papel clave en la extinción de los nativos de las islas de Tierra del Fuego, en el sur de Argentina. El virus llegó allí en barcos que a finales del siglo XIX abastecían a misioneros europeos, y se encontró con una población indefensa. Los misioneros y sus hijos superaban la enfermedad sin problema.” (*QUO*, junio 2003, pág. 52). _____

9. “Los resultados de una encuesta elaborada por Gallup...[revelan que] el 61,7 por ciento de los españoles cree que nuestro país acoge más inmigrantes de los que puede. Los trabajadores con baja cualificación, las amas de casa y los jubilados son los más críticos con la cantidad de inmigrantes que llega. La encuesta pone de manifiesto que las personas con menos nivel cultural y con más edad son las que más pegas ponen a la entrada de ciudadanos extranjeros, mientras que las más preparadas y las más jóvenes son las menos reacias.” (*ABC* [edición electrónica], 16 abril 2003)

10. “Un grupo de empresarios chinos planea construir una réplica de un pueblo español, tomando como referencia la arquitectura de Toledo. En este pueblo se levantará una plaza de toros en la que se llevarán a cabo corridas de toros, pero con ciertas modificaciones.” (*QUO*, noviembre 2003, pág. 158)

11. “España sufre una desertización alta, de más de un tercio de sus superficie, que alcanzaría el 67,16 por ciento.....La desertización, característica de los países de la cuenca mediterránea, priva al suelo de su potencial productivo debido a diversos factores como las variaciones climáticas, incendios, inundaciones, contaminación y la actividad humana. Este proceso es una de las causas del cambio climático y puede llegar a provocar la pérdida de poder económico por la escasez de materias primas obligando a la población a emigrar a otras zonas más ricas.” (*ABC* [edición electrónica], 12 mayo 2003)

Appendix O: Gillian's adaptation of DM 35 Exploring U.S. Culture

Español 231: Exploración de la cultura de EE.UU.

¿Qué aspectos de la cultura norteamericana incluirías tú en un cursillo de orientación sobre los EE.UU. para estudiantes extranjeros recién llegados de países de habla hispana? Mira la lista a continuación e indica cuáles de los aspectos incluirías (y por qué)?

Aspecto	¿Incluirlo? (•)	¿Por qué?
Abrahám Lincoln		
el béisbol		
Broadway y la comedia musical		
el capitalismo		
los centros comerciales		
la Coca-Cola		
las computadoras		
la Constitución		
la Declaración de la Independencia		
Disneylandia		
los electrodomésticos (el microondas, el lavaplatos, etc.)		
la Estatua de la Libertad		
la Guerra Civil de EE.UU.		
el fútbol (americano)		
la Gran Depresión (1929+)		
Henry (Enrique) Ford		
Hollywood		
Internet		
el jazz		
Jorge W. Bush		
Jorge Washington		
Martin Luther King		
McDonald's (hamburgueserías y otras cadenas de comida rápida)		
Miss America		
MTV		
la música rock		
el "Pony Express"		
Santa Claus		
el 11 de septiembre de 2001		
el Supertazón (Super Bowl)		
"Survivor"		
"Thanksgiving" (Día de acción de gracias)		
Watergate		
el "Wild West"		

¿Qué otros aspectos fundamentales no en esta lista serían importantes de incluir en tu opinión?

**Appendix P: “Tell me who your friends are and I’ll tell you who you are” Activity
(Elizabeth)**

What type of pressure do you feel from your family? Friends? Society?

Does potential gossip about you affect the way you behave?

“Tell me who your friends are and I’ll tell you who you are”

“What-will-people-say” (gossip)

Hispanic society is more rigidly structured than Anglo-Saxon society. From a very young age children learn from their parents how to behave and, due to parental control over them, the children rarely abuse the privileges granted them by their parents. Children are told from a young age what is and what is not acceptable behavior in their community. This “what-will-people-say” is an extremely important factor in determining the conduct of young people, because they have been taught that their behavior can bring honor or disgrace to the family. And though it is true that there is a black sheep in every family, and that ongoing globalization is causing many changes in Hispanic society, the old proverb “Tell me who your friends are and I’ll tell you who you are” is a faithful description of the social pressure that induces young people to behave with a certain degree of integrity.

How is young people’s behavior in the Hispanic world different from that of young people in the US?

What are these differences due to?

They usually say “culture,” so then we discuss, indirectly, how culture develops by discussing some of the factors that affect youth in Spain.

How many of you live with your parents?

How many of you have a car?

How many of you drive?

How many of you work?

If you didn't work would you still live at home? Why/why not?

<u>Spain</u>	<u>United States</u>
Part-time jobs very uncommon	Many part-time jobs available.
Limited supply of housing; many children live with their parents until they get married, and sometimes even after that.	Ready supply of cheap apartments that they can rent while they are students and don't have much money.
	Wouldn't live with parents even if they didn't work because:
Bank loans not available for students.	Student loans available, and also:
For parents to pay for their children to live away from the family would be seen as the parents driving the children out of the house.	Parents pay their rent while they are at school so that they can learn how to be independent
Driving age of 18, license very difficult and expensive to get. Have to take mass transit.	Driving age of 16; can drive to work, school and to and from friends' houses. Have money to pay for car.

The effect of all this: students and young people are very dependent on their parents for housing and money. To a certain extent, this leads to increased control of parents over their children, but:

Breakfast analogy.

Summation: culture is created in part by laws (Driving age), economy, housing...and in turn affects all these things.