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Abstract
This doctoral dissertation describes a mixed methods, longitudinal research project seeking to add to our understanding of how higher education institutions can foster students’ intercultural competence development more systematically. The focus of this project was on promoting intercultural competence as part of the formal curriculum for all students (i.e. domestic and international) using an evidence-based approach to course design. Evidence-based design is responsive to the target group and learning objectives, selects content and activities within the framework of relevant theories, and includes an evaluation stage (Stephan & Stephan, 2013). The evidence-based course design did not only draw upon existing theory and research, but also upon empirical data gathered from the target group in two studies (i.e. a mixed methods survey study, including a qualitative content analysis of students’ subjective understanding of intercultural competence, and a focus group study). The resulting course design complemented faculty-led instruction with peer-led experiential workshops and reflective assignments which serve as both, a learning and an assessment tool. The course has been pilot-tested with a group of \( n=34 \) students at Jacobs University Bremen in spring 2016. The evaluation stage consisted of a formative evaluation, exploring benefits and challenges of the course design, as well as a summative evaluation, assessing students’ intercultural competence development and to which extent the learning objectives of the course have been met. The formative evaluation has offered insights into the benefits and challenges of combining faculty- and peer-led instruction and the use of reflective papers as a learning and assessment tool. The summative evaluation has added to this and contributed to our understanding of how to assess intercultural competence as a learning outcome using a mixed methods approach that integrates direct and indirect evidence of students’ intercultural learning.
“Intercultural competence is no longer a mere aspiration but a ‘must have’ skill for the young generations in higher education” (Wang, Deardorff, & Kulich, 2017, p. 95)
Acknowledgements

This PhD thesis would not have been possible without a supportive community that inspired and encouraged me to grow, pushed me when I was struggling, and made sure I never felt alone during this journey. My heartfelt gratitude goes to my supervisors, Prof. Dr. Ulrich Kühnen and Prof. Dr. Margrit Schreier. You inspired me to pursue my passion, you made me believe I can succeed in this endeavor, and you were always by my side when I needed your support and input. Your appreciative feedback and pointed questions were crucial and invaluable to the process of conducting my research and writing this thesis. My thanks also go to my external supervisor, Dr. Athanasios Chasiotis whose perspectives and insights greatly contributed to my research. I am deeply grateful for the support of the community at BIGSSS – my special thanks go to Franzi for making South Hall feel like home and to all the fellows who contributed to this special atmosphere. Furthermore, this project would not have been possible without the support of Jacobs University Bremen. Thanks for allowing me to offer and pilot-test a new course as part of the Triangle area.

I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Karina De Santis and Prof. Dr. Özen Odağ, both of whom were my role-models during undergraduate studies and became my mentors along the way. Without you I would not be where I am today and I am deeply grateful for your invaluable support. I furthermore would like to thank Annette Gisevius for her mentoring and friendship. My thanks also go to all my colleagues at InterCultur for supporting me in the final stage of my PhD. It is a pleasure and honor to work with you and continue to pursue my passion for bridging theory and practice in intercultural learning.

Special thanks go to the people who were by my side throughout the ups and down of PhD life. Thanks to the banana family (aka Dora, Marufa, Sanne, Kwaku, and Nazan) for making this our joint journey, filled with laughter, love, and countless special moments. Words cannot capture the gratitude I experience for being part of this group of inspiring,
strong, and amazing people. Special thanks also go to Steffi whose been by my side from the first day of university – you will always be my roomie, no matter where we live.

Thanks to Daniel for being the kindest, most patient person I have ever met. You celebrated every step with me and carried me through the most difficult times of this journey. My deepest thanks go to my family – you inspired my curiosity, encouraged me to find my passion, and supported me in pursuing my dreams.
Table of Contents

List of Tables ......................................................................................................................................... 11

List of Figures ......................................................................................................................................... 13

1. Introduction ......................................................................................................................................... 15

2. Theoretical Background .................................................................................................................... 19

   2.1. Underlying Concept of Culture ................................................................................................. 19

   2.2. Intercultural Competence – A Brief History ............................................................................. 21

   2.3. Definitions and Models of Intercultural Competence ................................................................. 23

       2.3.1. Deardorff’s Pyramid and Process Model ............................................................................. 25

       2.3.2. Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) ................................................ 28

       2.3.3. Personal Leadership: Supporting Intercultural Practice through Self-Reflection ... 37

       2.3.4. Non-Western Perspectives on Intercultural Competence ................................................ 38

   2.4. Summarizing the Conceptual Framework of Intercultural Competence .................................... 42

   2.5. Empirical Research on Intercultural Competence in Higher Education ..................................... 44

       2.5.1. Exposure is Competence? .................................................................................................... 46

       2.5.2. Facilitating Students’ Intercultural Competence Development ......................................... 52

3. Methodology ....................................................................................................................................... 66

   3.1. Mixed Methods Research Design ............................................................................................ 67

   3.2. The Research Process ................................................................................................................ 69

       3.2.1. Stage 1: Evidence-Based Design ....................................................................................... 72

       3.2.2. Stage 2: Formative Evaluation ......................................................................................... 74

       3.2.3. Stage 3: Summative Evaluation ......................................................................................... 75
3.3. Quantitative Scales Used to Measure Intercultural Competence ........................................ 77

4. Evidence-Based Design: Designing an Intercultural Competence Course for Undergraduate Students ........................................................................................................................................ 85

4.1. Evidence-Based Design Process: Introduction and Step 1 ........................................ 89

4.2. Step 2: Goals of the Course ......................................................................................... 89

4.3. Step 3: Selecting Relevant Theories ........................................................................... 94

4.3.1. The Role of Experiential Learning ........................................................................ 94

4.3.2. Combining Faculty- and Peer-led Instruction ....................................................... 97

4.3.3. Encouraging Reflection and Meaning-Making ..................................................... 101

4.4. Step 4: Identifying Processes based on Empirical Data .............................................. 102

4.4.1. Methods ................................................................................................................. 102

4.4.2. Results ................................................................................................................... 107

4.4.3. Discussion ............................................................................................................. 112

4.5. Step 5: Identifying Activities based on Empirical Data .............................................. 115

4.5.1. Methods ................................................................................................................. 116

4.5.2. Results ................................................................................................................... 117

4.5.3. Discussion ............................................................................................................. 122

4.6. Discussion of the Final Course Design ........................................................................ 123

4.7. Concluding Remarks .................................................................................................. 125

5. Formative Evaluation: Benefits and Challenges of Faculty- and Peer-led Instruction and Reflective Assignments .......................................................................................................... 129

5.1. Underlying Assumptions .......................................................................................... 131
5.2. Methods ....................................................................................................................... 135
  5.2.1. Participants............................................................................................................ 136
  5.2.2. Data Collection ..................................................................................................... 137
  5.2.3. Data Analysis ........................................................................................................ 139
5.3. Results ........................................................................................................................ 141
  5.3.1. Peer-Instructors’ Perspective ................................................................................ 141
  5.3.2. Students’ Perspective ............................................................................................ 143
5.4. Discussion .................................................................................................................... 154
  5.4.1. Benefits and Challenges of Combining Faculty- and Peer-Led Instruction with
         Reflective Assignments ............................................................................................. 154
  5.4.2. Ideas for Improvement of the Course Design ....................................................... 162
  5.4.3. Limitations of the Formative Evaluation .............................................................. 163
  5.4.4. Implications of the Formative Evaluation ............................................................. 163
6. Summative evaluation: Mixed methods assessment of students’ intercultural competence
................................................................................................................................................ 166
  6.1. Assessing Intercultural Competence ........................................................................... 167
  6.2. The Assessment Plan ................................................................................................. 176
  6.3. Methods ....................................................................................................................... 179
    6.3.1. Quantitative Strand ............................................................................................. 180
    6.3.2. Qualitative Strand ............................................................................................... 181
  6.4. Results ......................................................................................................................... 184
    6.4.1. RQ3.1: Students’ Intercultural Competence Development ................................. 185
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.4.2.</td>
<td>RQ3.2: Achievement of Learning Objectives</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.1.</td>
<td>RQ3.1: Students’ Intercultural Competence Development</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.2.</td>
<td>RQ3.2: Achievement of Learning Objectives</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.3.</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.</td>
<td>Concluding Remarks</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.</td>
<td>Summary of Key Steps and Findings</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.</td>
<td>Contributions to Theory and Practice</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4.</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix A</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix B</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix C</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix D</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix E</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix F</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix G</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix H</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statutory Declaration</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Tables

Chapter 3
Table 3.1. Summary of research stages ......................................................... 76
Table 3.2. TMIC-S dimensions ................................................................. 79
Table 3.3. Short Form Cultural Intelligence (SFCQ) dimensions ..................... 81

Chapter 4
Table 4.1. Critical Moment Dialogue (CMD) questions .............................. 93
Table 4.2. Sample characteristics in study 1 ............................................ 103
Table 4.3. TMIC-S sample items ............................................................ 104
Table 4.4. Short Form Cultural Intelligence (SFCQ) dimensions and sample items ... 106
Table 4.5. TMIC-S descriptives .............................................................. 107
Table 4.6. SFCQ descriptives ................................................................. 108
Table 4.7. Qualitative Content Analysis (QCA) results ............................... 110
Table 4.8. Course content .................................................................. 125

Chapter 5
Table 5.1. Student sample characteristics ............................................... 136
Table 5.2. Overview of topics discussed in interviews with students and peer-instructors 138
Table 5.3. Course evaluation results ....................................................... 143
Table 5.4. Expected and experienced benefits and challenges of the peer-led workshops 148
Table 5.5. Expected and experienced benefits and challenges of the faculty-led lectures 149
Table 5.6. Expected and experienced benefits and challenges of reflective assignments 151
Chapter 6

Table 6.1 Test to Measure Intercultural Competence (TMIC) dimensions and facets .......... 173
Table 6.2 Short Form Cultural Intelligence Scale (SFCQ) dimensions ......................... 175
Table 6.3. Deductively derived coding frame ......................................................... 183
Table 6.4. Reliability analysis .................................................................................. 185
Table 6.5. Pearson product-moment correlations ....................................................... 187
Table 6.6. Results from two repeated-measures ANOVAs ....................................... 188
Table 6.7. Mean and standard errors for pairwise comparisons ............................... 189
Table 6.8. Descriptives for TMIC-S situational judgment tests (SJTs) ..................... 191
Table 6.9. Pearson product-moment correlations for pre-test data from situational judgement tests (SJTs) and self-report items from the TMIC-S ................................. 192
Table 6.10. Pearson product-moment correlations for post-test data from situational judgement tests (SJTs) and self-report items from the TMIC-S ..................... 192
Table 6.11. Overview of each student’s intercultural competence development ........ 197
Table 6.12. Main subcategories within the Code LO1: in-depth understanding of culture 206
Table 6.13. Subcategories within the Code LO2: linking knowledge to own experience 209
Table 6.14. Co-occurrence of L1 and L2 codes ....................................................... 214
Table 6.15. Descriptive statistics for evaluation items in the follow-up questionnaire .... 217
Table 6.16. Conceptual integration of empirical findings .......................................... 219
Table 6.17. Quantifying qualitative data on SFCQ dimensions ................................. 237
Table 6.18. Quantifying qualitative data on TMIC dimensions ............................... 248
List of Figures

Chapter 2

Figure 2.1. Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence ............................................. 26
Figure 2.2. Process Model of Intercultural Competence ............................................. 27
Figure 2.3. Development Model of Intercultural Sensitivity ....................................... 29

Chapter 3

Figure 3.1. Six-step evidence-based design process .................................................... 66
Figure 3.2. Research process overview ........................................................................ 71

Chapter 4

Figure 4.1. Six-step evidence-based design process .................................................... 85
Figure 4.2. Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence ............................................. 90
Figure 4.3. Personal Leadership model and reflective process ...................................... 91
Figure 4.4. Kolb’s learning cycle ................................................................................. 96
Figure 4.5. Selection of focus group participants’ intercultural superhero drawings ...... 119
Figure 4.6. Applying the six-stage process of evidence-based course design ............. 123

Chapter 6

Figure 6.1. Assessment plan ......................................................................................... 177
Figure 6.2. TMIC-S development over time ................................................................. 190
Figure 6.3. SFCQ development over time ................................................................. 190
CHAPTER 1

Introduction
1. Introduction

In light of anti-immigrant sentiments and support for right-wing populism in the USA and Western Europe, people’s ability to live and work peacefully and successfully across cultures seems ever more important. One of the places where people can develop such intercultural competence are higher education institutions. Over the past decades, many universities have adopted internationalization strategies, including efforts to attract international students and staff as well as to promote higher levels of student mobility, e.g. by offering numerous opportunities for going abroad (be it on short field trips, semester- or year-long study-abroad). While such efforts might be linked to financial or reputation motivations (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Jon, 2013; Jones, 2013), universities often claim to take these steps to prepare students to work and live in ever more diverse environments (Gregersen-Hermans, 2017; Jackson, 2015b, 2015a; Leask, 2009; Ramirez R., 2016; Wang & Kulich, 2015). Yet, though many higher education institutions state intercultural competence as a learning outcome, they all too often fail to specify how it can systematically be fostered through the formal and informal curriculum (Deardorff, 2006, 2011; Gregersen-Hermans, 2017; Pedersen, 2009).

To date, efforts to promote intercultural competence among students largely remain individual, isolated measures, most of which have not been systematically designed and evaluated. Furthermore, such measures tend to be limited to voluntary informal curricular activities for (incoming) international students (Hiller, 2011; Ramirez R., 2016; M. M. Zhang, Xia, Fan, & Zhu, 2016). Thus, universities might fail to realize domestic students’ potential for intercultural learning who could benefit from interactions with international students – a notion captured in the concept of Internationalization at Home (IaH). Two major barriers to intercultural learning on multicultural campuses highlight the need for interventions to support students’ learning process: (1) cultural diversity on campus does not automatically lead to intercultural contact between domestic and international students, and (2) contact and exposure do not automatically lead to intercultural learning and intercultural competence, but
can also have unwanted side-effects such as misunderstandings, rising tension, and stronger stereotypes and prejudice (Jackson, 2015b; Jon, 2013). Scholars and practitioners have repeatedly called for research-based interventions to promote meaningful intercultural interactions among students in higher education as well as to offer structured, guided opportunities for reflection and meaning-making to support intercultural learning and intercultural competence development (Jackson, 2015b; Jon, 2013; Pedersen, 2009; Yan Lo-Philip et al., 2015).

This doctoral research project seeks to add to our understanding of how higher education institutions can foster students’ intercultural competence development more systematically. The focus of this project is on promoting intercultural competence as part of the formal curriculum for all students (i.e. domestic and international) using an evidence-based approach to course design. Evidence-based design is responsive to the target group and learning objectives, selects content and activities within the framework of relevant theories, and includes an evaluation stage (Stephan & Stephan, 2013). The subsequent chapters provide more details on the theoretical background of this research (chapter 2) and its research design and methods (chapter 3). This is followed by describing the process of evidence-based course design (chapter 4). The subsequent chapters focus on the evaluation of the intervention, first taking a formative evaluation approach exploring benefits and challenges of the course design (chapter 5) and then offering a summative evaluation, assessing students’ intercultural competence development and the extent to which learning objectives of the course have been met (chapter 6). Finally, chapter 7 offers a discussion and conclusion for the entire research project, reflecting upon its limitations and contributions as well as direction for further research.

The research project has been carried out at Jacobs University Bremen, a small private university in Northern Germany with a student population of about 1,200 students from 111 countries at the time of the study (Academic Year 2016/2017). Undergraduate students live
and study on campus, providing them with ample opportunity for intercultural contact. All incoming freshmen students are required to participate in a peer-led intercultural training during their orientation week. A qualitative study demonstrated the training’s effectiveness in preparing students to live and study on a diverse campus and socialize with their peers (Binder, Schreier, Kühnen, & Kedzior, 2013). However, the study also showed that such a one-day training can only be a starting point for students’ intercultural competence development – a process which requires more time and opportunity for students to reflect upon their experience and learn from it. A quantitative follow-up study confirmed these findings (Kedzior et al., 2015). This doctoral research aims to explore how an elective course in students’ second semester can add to their intercultural competence development and facilitate making meaning from their intercultural experiences in the first semester. Chapter 4 offers more details on the context and aims of this elective course when describing the evidence-based design process. However, before diving into the empirical part of this project, the next chapter offers an overview of its theoretical background followed by presenting the research design and methods.
Chapter 2
Theoretical Background
2. Theoretical Background

This chapter offers an overview of underlying concepts and theories of this dissertation. It further provides a review of relevant empirical research to position the dissertation within the existing scholarly work. The first section in this chapter reviews the concept of intercultural competence, giving a brief account of its history and selected contemporary models. The second section focuses on intercultural competence research within the higher education context.

2.1. Underlying Concept of Culture

Before discussing the concept of intercultural competence, it seems imperative to clarify the underlying notion of culture. Not only has culture been defined in various ways across disciplines and time, but it is also used in different ways in everyday laypersons’ interactions (Matsumoto & Juang, 2013). Culture has been derived from the Latin word ‘colere’ which can be translated as ‘to cultivate’. Based on that meaning, culture has often been used to refer to high culture, such as literature, music, visual and performing arts. However, it can as well pertain to describing the way of living of a group, be it an organization, a national group, or any other collective which shares certain values, beliefs, behavioral conventions, and artifacts. Already back in 1952, a review of definitions of culture by Kroeber and Kluckhohn yielded a list of 164 different definitions (Spencer-Oatey, 2012). Until today, there is a multitude of definitions of culture across disciplines, including anthropology, linguistics, psychology, sociology, and many more. In the following, I will present three definitions from the field of psychology which capture aspects considered important to the understanding of culture in this dissertation. From the intersection of psychology and linguistics, Spencer-Oatey (2008, p. 3) defines culture as

“a fuzzy set of basic assumptions and values, orientations to life, beliefs, policies, procedures and behavioural conventions that are shared by a group of people, and that influence (but do
not determine) each member’s behaviour and his/her interpretations of the ‘meaning’ of other people’s behaviour.”

Acknowledging the diversity and complexity of definitions of culture, Matsumoto and Juang (Matsumoto & Juang, 2013, p. 15) offer a working definition of culture in their book on psychology and culture, defining

“human culture as a unique meaning and information system, shared by a group and transmitted across generations, that allows the group to meet basic needs of survival, pursue happiness and well-being, and derive meaning from life.”

Finally, in his contribution to a handbook on intercultural communication and cooperation, intercultural psychologist Alexander Thomas (2010, p. 19) offers an elaborate definition of culture:

“Culture is a universal phenomenon. All human beings live within a specific culture and contribute to its development. Culture creates a structured environment in which a population can function. It encompasses objects we created and use in our daily lives, as well as our institutions, ideas, and values. Culture is always manifested in a system of orientation typical to a country, society, organization or group. This system of orientation consists of specific symbols such as language, body language, mimicry, clothing and greeting rituals and is passed on to future generations of from the respective society, organization or group. This system of orientation provides all members with a sense of belonging and inclusion within a society or group and creates an environment in which individuals can develop a unique sense of self and function effectively. Culture has an influence on the perception, thought patterns, judgment and action of all members of a given society. The culture-specific system of orientation creates possibilities and motivation for action, but also determines the conditions and limits of the action.”

The definitions presented share four aspects considered important for the conceptualization of culture in this dissertation: (1) There are different layers of culture (i.e. observable artifacts, values, basic underlying assumptions), (2) culture influences how we feel, think, and act as
well as how we interpret others’ behavior, (3) culture is learned, transmitted across
generations and subject to gradual change, and (4) culture offers orientation and contributes to
our sense of belonging and meaning in life. Especially with regard to the latter aspect, it is
important to recognize that individuals belong to or participate in multiple cultural groups,
contexts, or collectives, ranging from micro-networks (i.e. family, work group, or sports club
culture) to more complex macro-networks (such as regional or national culture, or contexts
defined by gender, religion, social class, birth cohort, or sexual orientation) (Bolten, 2011,
2013; Markus & Kitayama, 2010; Rathje, 2006).

2.2. Intercultural Competence – A Brief History

The concept of intercultural competence has emerged within the discipline of intercultural
communication in the 1950s. Initially, it was conceptualized merely as a cognitive
phenomenon with an emphasis on culture-specific and language knowledge (Spitzberg &
Changnon, 2009). In the 1960s, studies on American service personnel traveling and living
abroad contributed to a first understanding of some components of effective intercultural
communication, such as stability, curiosity, flexibility, and sensitivity (Arasaratnam-Smith,
2017). Around the same time, the notion of competence was generally discussed in
psychology, with psychologist Robert W. White (1959) suggesting that competence is “an
organism’s capacity to interact effectively with its environment” (p. 297, as cited in
Arasaratnam-Smith, 2017, p. 7). Throughout the 1970s, several influential studies identified
what makes individuals, such as USA Peace Corps staff, successful across cultures. These
factors included cultural sensitivity, language skills, interest in nationals, patience/tolerance,
general maturity, adaptability, self-reliance, empathy, tolerance for ambiguity, inner strength
or the ability to deal with psychological stress (cf. e.g. Hammer, Gudykunst, & Wiseman,
For most of its history, the question of how to define intercultural competence has been closely connected to discussions of how to measure it. First efforts to develop quantitative measurements of intercultural competence go back to the 1970s and 1980s (Arasaratnam-Smith, 2017; Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009). From the 1990s onwards, such efforts were based on increasingly elaborate conceptual models, recognizing the need for a multidimensional measure. Yet, the question remained which dimensions of intercultural competence should be assessed and why (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009). Not only did models and measurements of intercultural competence become multidimensional, there also was a shift towards including processes and relationships (Arasaratnam-Smith, 2017; Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009). Taking a process-orientation means looking at how intercultural competence develops from lower to higher levels, while the inclusion of relationships acknowledges that intercultural competence manifests itself in interaction with others. Thus, it does not only matter if an individual is interculturally effective in reaching his or her goal in the interaction, but also if his or her behavior is perceived to be appropriate by the interaction partner.

Until today, there is no agreed upon definition or universally accepted measurement of intercultural competence. However, there are some common elements that have emerged throughout the concept's history as described above and which are included in most contemporary models: Intercultural competence is a multidimensional construct, including cognitive (knowledge), affective (attitude, motivation), and behavioral (skills) aspects (Arasaratnam-Smith, 2017; Deardorff, 2006; Rathje, 2006; Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009).

Following Spitzberg (1989, p. 250), a distinction is made between effectiveness, i.e. “the achievement of valued objectives or rewards”, and appropriateness, i.e. “avoiding the violation of valued rules or expectancies”. These two aspects have also been discussed by Spitzberg and Changnon (2009) in a more recent publication with regard to how competence is conceptualized in the intercultural field. The authors have argued that when talking about
intercultural competence, competence has often been equated with “a set of abilities or skills” (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009, p. 6). However, it remains questionable if there is a universal skill set of intercultural competence, especially because what is considered appropriate in one context might not be appropriate in another. The authors therefore conclude that competence should be conceptualized as the ability to manage interactions in a way that leads to effective and appropriate outcomes, a notion shared in many definitions and models of intercultural competence. Finally, most models list specific aspects of intercultural competence (compositional models), while some also specify relationships between those aspects and/or how intercultural competence develops over time from low to high levels (developmental models).

The next section presents selected contemporary models of intercultural competence in more detail, drawing upon both compositional and developmental models to identify which aspects of intercultural competence could be fostered in university students, how their intercultural competence develops over time, and how this development can be supported through a formal curriculum intervention.

2.3. Definitions and Models of Intercultural Competence

As mentioned above, there is no universally accepted definition of intercultural competence. However, in her influential work, Deardorff (2006) used the Delphi method to document consensus among leading intercultural scholars and higher education administrators on what constitutes intercultural competence and how to best assess it. The Delphi method “is a process for structuring anonymous communication within a larger group of individuals in an effort to achieve consensus among group members” (Deardorff, 2006, pp. 243–244). In a three-round process, Deardorff (2006) first used open questions to capture participating scholars’ definitions of intercultural competence and ideas on how to assess it. In the second round, scholars rated answers from round one on a four-point Likert scale and in the final
round they were asked to accept or reject data from round two (Deardorff, 2006). At the end of this process, most agreement was found for defining intercultural competence as the “ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations based on one’s intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes” (Deardorff, 2006, p. 248). This broad definition remains widely accepted until today. Furthermore, Deardorff (2006) was able to identify 22 items that participating scholars accepted as constituting intercultural competence. These items were grouped into attitudes (e.g. respect, openness, curiosity), knowledge (e.g. cultural self-awareness, deep cultural knowledge), and skills (e.g. to listen, observe, and evaluate). While the broad definition provides the working definition in this dissertation, more specific elements of intercultural competence will be discussed in the following sections.

Extensive reviews of intercultural competence models have been done elsewhere and are beyond the scope of this dissertation (cf. e.g. Arasaratnam-Smith, 2017; Bolten, 2007; Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009). However, drawing upon these reviews, I have selected models to be presented in more detail. Given the overall research focus on how to support university students’ intercultural competence development, three types of models seem particularly relevant – compositional, causal, and developmental models. While compositional models merely list components of intercultural competence, causal models also include statements about the interrelationships between them (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009). Based on her findings from her study with leading scholars in the intercultural field, Deardorff (2006) created two models which will be presented in more detail in the next section – the Pyramid and the Process Model of Intercultural Competence. While the Pyramid Model could be considered predominantly compositional, the Process Model makes some causal statements. Developmental models employ yet a different focus by identifying stages through which the development of intercultural competence is assumed to progress over time (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009). One of the major developmental models is the Development Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) by Bennett which will be introduced in more detail.
In their review of intercultural competence models, Spitzberg and Changnon (2009) further distinguish co-orientational and adaptational models. Co-orientational and adaptational models put emphasis on the interpersonal or interactional aspect of intercultural competence and focus on several interactants (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009). Thus, they appear less relevant to this research which has a focus on the individual development of intercultural competence among university students. Furthermore, co-orientational models tend to have a strong linguistic focus, whereas adaptational models focus on the process of mutual adjustment. The former model does not seem relevant for this research due to its strong linguistic focus, whereas the latter appears less suited as this research is not looking home-host culture acculturation. In addition to introducing the above-mentioned models in detail, additional aspects of intercultural competence and its development will be discussed by briefly introducing the notion of intercultural practice put forward within the Personal Leadership methodology by Schaetti, Ramsey, and Watanabe (2008) as well as by offering an overview of non-Western approaches to intercultural competence.

2.3.1. Deardorff’s Pyramid and Process Model

As presented above, Deardorff’s (2006) Delphi study yielded a total of 22 elements of intercultural competence on which at least 80% of the intercultural scholars (as well as higher education administrators) agreed. This list can visually be represented in multiple ways and Deardorff has organized it into the so-called Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence (figure 2.1). While this model is predominantly compositional, it entails causal assumptions as Deardorff (2006) generally assumes that lower level components enhance upper levels. More specifically, this means that attitudes such respect, openness, curiosity and discovery constitute “a fundamental starting point” (Deardorff, 2006, p. 255) for individuals to build the knowledge and skills needed to achieve desired internal and external outcomes.
In the Pyramid Model, the focus is on the 22 elements of intercultural competence found in the Delphi study. Causal relationships between different facets are captured more extensively in Deardorff’s (2006) Process Model of Intercultural Competence (figure 2.2). This model is an alternative visualization of the same 22 elements that “depicts the complexity of acquiring intercultural competence in outlining more of the movement and process orientation that occurs between the various elements” (Deardorff, 2006, p. 257). The Process Model focuses on movements from the personal level, i.e. an individual’s attitudes, knowledge, and skills, to the interaction level, i.e. the actual intercultural situation with the internal and external outcomes. Again, attitudes are assumed to provide the starting point of the cycle and the arrows indicate that the process of developing intercultural competence is a continuous
process in which “one may never achieve ultimate intercultural competence” (Deardorff, 2006, p. 257).

![Figure 2.2. Process Model of Intercultural Competence (adapted from Deardorff, 2006, p. 256).](image-url)

A closer look at the arrows in figure 2.2 reveals that direct movement from attitudes and/or knowledge and skills to external outcomes is possible. Yet, it is assumed that “the degree of appropriateness and effectiveness of the outcome may not be nearly as high as when the entire circle is completed and begins again” (Deardorff, 2006, p. 257). In other words, it might be possible for an individual to behave and communicate appropriately in an intercultural situation without full achievement of a frame of reference shift, yet the degree of appropriateness and effectiveness is assumed to be more limited than if this internal outcome has been achieved as well (Deardorff, 2006). Thus, the Process Model of Intercultural
Competence captures the idea of different degrees of intercultural competence depending on the extent to which its various components have been achieved by an individual. Though this supports the notion of developmental stages of intercultural competence, both ways of visualizing the model derived from Deardorff’s research primarily offer information on the different components of intercultural competences rather than a framework for how it develops over time. As this dissertation seeks to explore how students can be supported in reaching higher levels of intercultural competence, intercultural competence development is at the core of this research. Both the Pyramid and the Process Model of Intercultural Competence offer valuable insights into the components of intercultural competence that could be targeted in an elective course. Yet, they are not sufficient to understand the process of intercultural competence development and how to foster it as part of the formal curriculum. Thus, the next section introduces the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS), an influential developmental model of intercultural competence.

### 2.3.2. Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS)

The Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) has been developed by Milton Bennett (M. J. Bennett, 1986) in the late 1980s. Bennett based the model on theoretical reasoning as well as his own experience in the field and discussions with fellow practitioners. One of the main purposes of the DMIS has always been to inform training design, offering intercultural trainers a framework for selecting and sequencing training methods and materials as to facilitate movement along the continuum towards more advanced stages. The DMIS is comprised of six stages, as depicted in figure 2.3, each of which represents a way of experiencing cultural differences (M. J. Bennett, 1986). The middle point separates ethnocentric and ethnorelativistic stages and represents a crucial turning point in how
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1 Within the framework of the DMIS, ethnorelativism is used as an antonym to ethnocentrism and not as a philosophical or ethical position in its own right (M. J. Bennett, 1986, 1993).
individuals experience cultural differences. While the terms intercultural competence and intercultural sensitivity are frequently used synonymously, it is only in the ethnorelative stages that one would speak of intercultural competence (M. J. Bennett, 1986).

Figure 2.3. Development Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (based on M. J. Bennett, 1986)

Overall, the six stages of the DMIS describe development towards an increased ability of coping with cultural differences. Initially, cultural differences are experienced as threatening and thus avoided or denied. As individuals develop more intercultural sensitivity, they increasingly perceive cultural differences as nonthreatening or even enriching (M. J. Bennett, 1986, 1993, 2004). While Bennett acknowledges the affective, cognitive, and behavioral dimensions of intercultural competence, he argues that its development is multidimensional and that the three dimensions are often blurred within each stage. Yet, one can hypothesize that cognitive development comes first in terms of creating meaningful categories for cultural differences, followed by an affective reaction to this development (e.g. experiencing cultural difference as threatening to one’s worldview), leading to a behavioral response which in turn results in cognitive restructuring and consolidation of categories, new affective appreciation of cultural differences and behavioral applications. (M. J. Bennett, 1986, 1993, 2004)

The following paragraphs are based on Bennett’s writings about the DMIS (M. J. Bennett, 1986, 1993, 2004) and offer an overview of the six stages including a brief discussion of factors inhibiting and promoting movement to the next stage, relating it to the higher education context and how to support students’ intercultural competence development.
The first three stages are ethnocentric stages whereby ethnocentrism is defined as “assuming that the worldview of one’s own culture is central to all reality” (M. J. Bennett, 1993). In the denial stage, the existence of cultural differences is simply denied, often due to lack of exposure to other cultures. Within the higher education context, this might pertain to students who grew up in small towns with very homogeneous populations, thus having little to no experience of cultural difference upon entering university. Consequently, students might lack meaningful cognitive categories for cultural difference and experience their worldview as central to all reality because it has not yet been challenged by other views. To support students in moving past this stage, exposure to cultural differences is required, ideally in the form of cultural awareness activities and facilitated intercultural contact. This could be achieved through campus activities such as a Multicultural Week or Intercultural Dinner. Jacobs University Bremen, for example, hosts Country Information Days (CIDs) on campus during which students from a specific country or region present information on their country/region, as well as performances (dance, music, art), and food. It is important to highlight that such activities expose individuals to rather superficial cultural differences, such as cuisine, art, or history, to encourage differentiation of general categories of cultural difference. According to Bennett, any discussion of more significant, deeper cultural differences (e.g. in communication styles) should be avoided at this stage because it might overwhelm the learner and easily trigger individuals to retreat into separation and isolation to remain in a state of denial.

As individuals start perceiving cultural differences, they enter the next stage which is called defense. University students might increasingly be confronted with students from other cultural backgrounds in class. This experience of cultural differences tends to make people feel that there is threat to their sense of reality and identity which previously have remained unchallenged. It might be the first time for some students to experience situations in which others view and do things differently, for example regarding asking questions in class.
Students might be used to speak up in class and challenge the instructor on content matters, but this could be perceived as inappropriate behavior by students from cultures in which such behavior implies a loss of face for the instructor. Being confronted with this cultural difference is likely to lead to a defensive reaction – hence the name of this stage. Defense can take different forms – either a negative evaluation of the other culture, i.e. adopting a derogatory attitude toward it and relying on negative stereotypes (e.g. “These Chinese students always agree with the teacher, they cannot think independently”), or a positive evaluation of one’s own culture, i.e. adopting an attitude of cultural pride (e.g. “We Germans are very good in critical thinking and speaking our mind”). A special case of defense is reversal in which an individual engages in negative evaluation of his or her own culture and praises another culture. This phenomenon has frequently been observed among high school exchange students who might adopt an extremely critical attitude about their home culture and overemphasize the positive aspects of their host culture (e.g. “In the USA, people are so much friendlier and open, in Germany everyone is just always complaining”). While this attitude often appears more interculturally sensitive than expressions of denigration or superiority, it nevertheless represents an ethnocentric mindset and a defensive reaction to cultural differences. Development beyond the defense stage can be facilitated by allowing feelings of cultural pride while simultaneously drawing people’s attention to commonalities across cultures. Emphasizing commonalities across cultures can pave the way for the next stage by offering learners a shift in focus from threat to something more positive.

This sets the stage for the third and last of the ethnocentric stages called minimization, marking the crucial transition to ethnorelativism. In this stage, individuals attempt to preserve their ethnocentric worldview by trivializing cultural differences and overemphasizing similarities. In minimization, cultural difference is experienced as relatively unimportant based on a feeling that “we are all the same, we are all human”. Though such an attitude might appear quite interculturally sensitive to many people, it is important to keep in mind
that it still reflects a rather ethnocentric perspective, assuming everyone is like oneself and thereby neglecting meaningful cultural differences. Individuals in minimization tend to believe that intercultural communication will function if only everyone is truly themselves – if this belief is violated and communication goes wrong, individuals in minimization are at high risk of retreating back into defense. Another major barrier to development is that people trivialize cultural differences and thus tend to underestimate the importance of intercultural sensitivity. At the same time, the transition from this to the next stage represents a major shift to more ethnorelative views. To facilitate this shift, emphasis should be put on cultural self-awareness. For intercultural learning interventions at university, this could mean to engage students in discussions, simulations, and reflections of personal experience. Such activities are likely to result in feelings of confusion among students. Therefore, instructors need to provide sufficient support to accept this confusion without retreating back into the comfort of previous ethnocentric stages.

Once individuals have successfully made the shift, they enter the first ethnorelative stage, called acceptance. Ethnorelativism is to be understood as the antonym to ethnocentrism and is characterized by “the assumption that cultures can only be understood relative to one another and that particular behavior can only be understood within a cultural context” (M. J. Bennett, 1993). In contrast to the ethnocentric experience of cultural differences as a threat, an ethnorelative perspective sees cultural differences as something inevitable and potentially enjoyable. The stages of ethnorelativism begin with acceptance, i.e. acknowledging and accepting cultural differences without perceiving them as threatening. Individuals in this stage tend to be curious about cultural differences and accept them as a given without retreating into defensive reactions. However, they are not yet able to adapt their behavior to other cultural contexts. Individuals start to develop cultural self-awareness by understanding their own world view as a relative cultural construct. They furthermore become increasingly able to recognize cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal behavior. The emerging ethnorelative
view can be strengthened by reinforcing such recognition processes and encouraging individuals to respect differences without judging them. Yet, there are two major barriers to further development in this stage. There is a risk that individuals get stuck in mere recognition of cultural differences without starting to accumulate knowledge and skills to build their capacity to respond and adapt to such differences. Another risk is that value differences might be perceived as offensive to one’s own way of seeing the world, making individuals prone to retreat into defensive reactions. To encourage development towards the next stage, instructors should encourage students to learn more about other cultures and developing their ability to adapt to cultural differences. One way of motivating and fostering this ability is to conduct simulations in which students can experience how adaptation can help collaboration across cultures to achieve common goals.

Once individuals appreciate cultural differences and start developing their skills to interact with culturally different others, they enter adaptation stage. The terminology has deliberately been chosen to stress that it is not about assimilation, but about expanding one’s repertoire of skills, such as flexibility in switching communication styles when necessary. Bennett describes adaptation as an additive process in which individuals maintain their worldview, skills and preferences, but extend them with new skills. Development within this stage occurs when individuals progress on their empathetic skills, becoming better able to temporarily shift their perspective and frame of reference to experience the situation from the other person’s viewpoint. Making progress within this phase can go on for years, with individuals gaining more knowledge on other cultures, becoming more fluent in foreign languages, improving their understanding of different communication styles and nonverbal behaviors, and improving their sensitivity to how situations can be perceived differently depending on one’s cultural perspective. To support learners in progressing, it is important to encourage linking knowledge with the practice of ethnorelative empathy. Yet, two challenges that individuals might face are mutual empathy, i.e. both interactions partners shifting to the
other’s perspective simultaneously, and struggling with how to express respectful
disagreement with other cultural views or behaviors. To support students’ development of
empathy and ability to adapt to culturally different contexts, instructors should provide
opportunities for interaction with culturally different others, such as facilitating multicultural
group discussions, empathy training, or small group work with culturally different
participants. Generally, instructors can take more of a supportive facilitator role, helping
students to progress in their own learning. Another issue that needs to be addressed is that of
authenticity and the question of how to adapt to culturally different ways and still be true to
yourself. To resolve that challenge, students should be encouraged to broaden their sense of
how they define themselves to include a wider repertoire of perception and behavior that they
perceive as authentic.

Before introducing the last stage of integration, it is important to note that according to
Bennett, movement to this stage does not represent significant improvement in intercultural
competence. Rather, it has been added to the model to capture a fundamental shift in how
some individuals define their cultural identity, especially those who have been immersed in
two or more cultures for longer periods of time. While they might be able to naturally move in
and out of different ways of perceiving and behaving, it typically comes hand in hand with
some level of identity crisis. If individuals fail to resolve this crisis, they might constantly feel
alienated and become encapsulated marginals. However, if individuals manage to develop a
coherent sense of self in which moving in and out of different cultural frames of reference is a
positive and necessary part of one’s identity, they can develop into so-called constructive
marginals. Such people show strong abilities to flexibly shift perspective and chose
appropriate behavior for different cultural contexts. To support students who are in the
integration stage in becoming constructive rather than encapsulated marginals, Bennett
recommends introducing them to this stage to help them reflect upon their experience. This
can help students understand the potential of their position as powerful, enabling them to
mediate between different cultures. For that, it can also be helpful to connect them with peers who are in the same stage, allowing them to develop a sense of belonging to a group of constructive marginals who share their experience and potential. However, it is important to keep in mind that while this stage is highly interesting to individuals experiencing multicultural identity challenges, it does not represent the desirable end point of developing intercultural sensitivity. For many students, continuous learning within the adaptation stage constitutes ever higher degrees of intercultural competence – with Bennett agreeing that reaching the end of the continuum, no matter whether this means in the adaptation or integration stage, does not equal an end of the intercultural learning process.

As mentioned in the beginning of this section, Bennett based the development of the DMIS on his own theoretical reasoning, practical experience, and discussions with intercultural practitioners. However, efforts to construct a measure that could identify the DMIS stage of an individual soon followed. The 50-item Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) has been developed in multiple phases, a process described in detail by Hammer, Bennett and Wiseman (2003). Confirmatory factor analysis, reliability analyses and construct validity tests with different samples validated all seven dimensions of the DMIS, i.e. denial, defense, reversal, minimization, acceptance, adaptation, and encapsulated marginality (Hammer et al., 2003). However, Hammer et al. (2003) found empirical overlap between denial and defense and acceptance and adaptation and good fit for a five-dimensional model with denial/defense, reversal, minimization, acceptance/adaptation, and encapsulated marginality. Yet, additional validity testing of the IDI with a larger, cross-culturally diverse sample of 4763 participants strongly supports the original DMIS dimensions, i.e. denial, defense, reversal, minimization, acceptance, and adaptation, as well as the integration stage or encapsulated marginality (Hammer, 2011). Based on these empirical findings, Hammer (2011) further concludes that minimization is “a transitional orientation toward cultural differences and commonalities, between the more monocultural (ethnocentric) orientations of
Denial and Polarization (Defense, Reversal) and the more intercultural mindsets of Acceptance and Adaptation” (Hammer, 2011, p. 486). Finally, Hammer (2011) argues that criterion validity testing from two additional studies supports the predictive validity of the IDI in the study abroad context “in terms of knowledge of the host culture, intercultural anxiety, intercultural friendships, and post sojourn overall satisfaction with the study abroad experience” (Hammer, 2011, p. 486).

The IDI has widely been used in study abroad research, assessing students’ development of intercultural sensitivity before and after the sojourn (cf. e.g. Anderson & Lawton, 2007; Engle & Engle, 2004; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004; Rexeisen, R. J., Anderson, P. H., Lawton, L., & Hubbard, 2008; Sample, 2013; Vande Berg, Connor-Linton, & Paige, 2009). More recently, the pre-test results of an intervention study with 314 students, faculty, and staff of a Nursing College in the USA showed that the majority of the sample is in minimization (Kruse, Didion, & Perzynski, 2014). Similarly, a review of studies using the IDI in the context of teachers and teacher education students suggests that 88-100% of them are in minimization or below as are up to 70% of teacher education faculty (Cushner, 2015).

As mentioned in the beginning, the DMIS can serve the training design process, highlighting that people at different stages of the developmental continuum have different needs concerning intercultural training, its content and methods. If most of the students in this study also were in minimization, the first sessions of the course could focus on cultural self-awareness, using discussions and reflections of personal experience for students to discover their own cultural identities and preferences as well as learn about those of their fellow students. Furthermore, the course design should ensure that students receive sufficient support to prevent them from being overwhelmed and encourage their openness to and curiosity about cultural differences. From there, the course could include content and activities that help students to learn more about cultural differences, recognize them, suspend their judgment, and develop their abilities to flexibly adapt their behavior to different interaction partners and
situations. This topic will be addressed again in chapter 4 when presenting the evidence-based design process.

The models presented so far offer a conceptual framework for this dissertation in terms of describing dimensions of intercultural competence as well as stages of development. They thereby serve the course design process in selecting which aspects of intercultural competence to target and how to select and sequence content and methods to foster learning without overwhelming students. To complement the conceptual framework, the following sections explore the potential role of self-reflection in intercultural competence development as well as non-Western perspectives on intercultural competence.

2.3.3. Personal Leadership: Supporting Intercultural Practice through Self-Reflection

A question that is not explicitly addressed in any of the models presented so far is how to practice intercultural competence under stress or when being exhausted, when cognitive capacities are limited, or important values are threatened. How can individuals transfer their attitudes and knowledge into action, especially in more challenging or critical intercultural interactions? To address this aspect, I am incorporating the Personal Leadership methodology by Schaetti et al. (2008; 2009). Personal Leadership is less of a theory and more of a practical methodology. It has been developed in the 1990s in an action research project within the context of the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication (SIIC) in the USA. The action research has been inspired by the observation that people who sincerely cared about interacting effectively and appropriately with culturally different others nonetheless often had a hard time doing so at SIIC. Schaetti et al. (2008, 2009) asked themselves how individuals can be supported in turning their motivation, culture-specific and culture-general knowledge into intercultural practice. Drawing upon research from different disciplines such as intercultural communication, leadership development, whole-person self-development, education, and positive psychology, they developed a framework for reflective practices that
enable people to remain open-minded, mindful, and creative even when confronted by uncertainty and confusion in light of cultural differences (Schaetti et al., 2008).

Personal Leadership entails a guide of questions that foster self-reflection to become more mindful of one’s judgments, emotions, and physical sensations, as well as to cope with ambiguity by framing it as an opportunity to explore new ways of being and doing. It actively encourages cultivating stillness, be it by conscious breathing, meditation, or other techniques, and holding a vision for oneself to confront challenging situations more consciously (Schaetti et al., 2008, 2009). The underlying assumption of Personal Leadership is that we have a choice of how to respond in critical or challenging situations – either we react on auto-pilot or we take a more deliberate approach based on mindfulness and self-reflection. Personal Leadership is used by a group of intercultural trainers and coaches around the world. Based on personal conversations with trainer colleagues, I am aware that many of them are using Personal Leadership in intercultural competence courses in higher education. However, to date, there only is anecdotal evidence and no published research on using Personal Leadership in such courses. I am including Personal Leadership in this research to contribute empirical insights into the potential use of this self-reflection method to support students in practicing intercultural competence.

2.3.4. Non-Western Perspectives on Intercultural Competence

Though there are plenty of intercultural competence models, most of them capture a Western perspective. Non-Western perspectives on intercultural competence have only started to emerge in publications in more recent years (Arasaratnam-Smith, 2017; Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009; Wang et al., 2017). Out of these publications on non-Western perspectives,
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2 There are about 30 facilitators of Personal Leadership, based in the USA, Europe, and parts of Asia, who are officially recognized by PL Seminars, an organization that teaches the method and certifies facilitators in it. After learning about Personal Leadership at the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication in 2015, I developed an interest to integrate it in my research. In the process, I also decided to become a certified facilitator of Personal Leadership, completing my recognition as a Senior Facilitator in December 2017.
the majority so far has been theoretical rather than empirical. Some prominent examples are the chapters on intercultural communication concepts in China, India, Latin America, Africa, and the Arab world included in The SAGE Handbook of Intercultural Competence (cf. e.g. Chen & An, 2009; Manian & Naidu, 2009; Medina-López-Portillo & Sinnigen, 2009; Nwosu, 2009; Zaharna, 2009). A common theme across most of these chapters is a more collective or group-oriented way of thinking about intercultural competence. Authors discuss the importance of consensus-seeking and community from the African perspective (Nwosu, 2009), and the strong commitment to groups (such as families) and their goals from an Arab perspective (Zaharna, 2009). The Chinese perspective conceptualizes interpersonal communication in the context of “dynamic movement between yin and yang” making it a continuous process with focus on “mutuality, respect, and honesty” (Chen & An, 2009, p. 199), while the Indian perspective similarly emphasizes mutual respect, responsibility, acceptance (Manian & Naidu, 2009, p. 246).

In their chapter on the Latin American perspective, Medina-López-Portillo and Sinnigen (2009) have discussed intercultural competence in relation to indigenous social movements which emerged in response to colonial structures. The link to colonialism is also made in a more recent publication by Steyn and Reygan (2017) with regard to South African higher education. With reference to the student protests in South Africa in 2015, the authors have argued that intercultural competence needs to be conceptualized not only in terms of facilitating intercultural contact but also in terms of decolonizing higher education. In that sense, efforts to conceptualize intercultural competence for the South African higher education context should address the Western bias in existing concepts and discuss African approaches to communication as well as acknowledge the colonial legacy in South Africa. The authors concluded:

“In the post-Apartheid, post-colonial context, an understanding of intercultural competence in higher education in South Africa must be underpinned by cognisance of the need to redress
often-traumatic economic and political processes that are both contemporary and historical and
the moral imperative to engage in renegotiation of personal subjectivities shaped within such
relations. Communication constitutes much more than the sharing or exchange of messages
and information but is rather inextricably bound up with power as well as the power to define
meaning and in this context should not be used to reinforce established power relations as a
means of maintaining the status quo.” (Steyn & Reygan, 2017, p. 91)

This example from the South African context reinforces the idea that higher education
institutions need to be very clear and explicit on what exactly students are supposed to learn
to become more interculturally competent. How to conceptualize intercultural competence for
a specific target group does not only depend on the developmental stage students are in, as
highlighted in the DMIS, but also on their specific context.

Another example highlighting the relevance of cultural context comes from recent
writings by Chinese authors. In his theoretical paper, Luo (2013) proposes a culture-specific
intercultural competence model for the Chinese business context that incorporates the concept
of guanxi. In his view, such a model does not replace existing Western models, but rather
complements them by adding elements from a specific cultural context. In their review of
intercultural competence papers from China published between 2002 and 2016, Wang et al.
(2017) conclude that intercultural competence has emerged as a topic within foreign language
education in China. Based on that, publications have largely focused on the distinction of
language proficiency and intercultural competence and how to move intercultural competence
into general education courses. Wang et al. (2017) further point to empirical studies on the
design and evaluation of intercultural competence interventions and assessment instruments in
the Chinese context. One example is research by Wang and Kulich (2015) who derived a list
of ten intercultural competence aspects from qualitative data obtained from n=57 students at a
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3 Guanxi refers to social capital, defined as an “intricate and pervasive relational network which Chinese
cultivate energetically” (Luo, 2003, p. 73), which is created by a group of individuals who have something in
common and who produce guanxi which also entails obligations based on the rule of reciprocity (Luo, 2003).
Chinese university. They conclude that most of these aspects fit into Western frameworks, but point to emic aspects such as “heart attitude” and a more collectivist, group-oriented approach to intercultural competence focusing on mutual respect and understanding. More specifically, students in this study referred to “heart attitude” or “xintai” to capture the emotional, intuitive aspect of intercultural communication and discussed the need to transform negative “xintai” like anxiety into positive “xintai” like peace or decency (Wang & Kulich, 2015). Another emic aspect found in this study pertains to a more collective approach to conceptualizing intercultural competence which puts importance on groups and interpersonal networks, including paying attention to mutual understanding, guanxi, sincerity of thoughts, and ingroup/outgroup tolerance. Furthermore, many students reflected upon their sense of how Chinese traditional philosophical ideas overlap with the concept of intercultural competence. Concerning implications of their study for international higher education, the authors argued for considering more ethnographic approaches to intercultural teaching and learning as well as mixed methods assessment approaches. The latter could involve adding qualitative measures like reflective reports to gain a more contextualized understanding of students’ intercultural competence development (Wang & Kulich, 2015).

On the one hand, the theoretical and empirical examples from China and South Africa demonstrate that context matters for conceptualizing intercultural competence in higher education. While it seems that Western models of intercultural competence can serve as a general framework in those contexts, they should be critically reviewed, expanded or adapted to contribute to a comprehensive understanding of intercultural competence in any specific higher education setting. On the other hand, studies like the one by Wang and Kulich (2015) highlight the importance of using qualitative tools like reflection papers to gain insights into students’ subjective understanding and experience of intercultural competence and its development.
2.4. Summarizing the Conceptual Framework of Intercultural Competence

Before reviewing empirical research on students’ intercultural competence development in higher education, this section presents how intercultural competence is conceptualized in this dissertation, based on the models presented above. Following Deardorff’s Pyramid Model, intercultural competence is seen as a multi-dimensional construct which includes affective (attitudes), behavioral (skills), and cognitive (knowledge) components which support intrapersonal (or internal) outcomes and interpersonal (or external) outcomes. If we seek to support students’ intercultural competence development, we need to address the multi-dimensional nature of this concept, both in course design and assessment.

Another aspect taken from the Pyramid Model is the complexity of intercultural competence with its specific elements for each of the dimensions. The 22 elements found in the Delphi study by Deardorff (2006) provide an overview of potential facets of intercultural competence which could be targeted in an elective course for students. However, looking at recent non-Western discourses on intercultural competence has revealed the importance of being open to context-specific aspects and students’ subjective understanding of intercultural competence (Steyn & Reygan, 2017; Wang & Kulich, 2015). Thus, Deardorff’s Pyramid Model serves as an initial framework for intercultural competence which is complemented by aspects emerging from students’ data in the empirical part of this dissertation.

The question of how intercultural competence develops over time is at the core of this research. One underlying assumption is that intercultural competence development is a never-ending process, thus any intervention at university is only part of a lifelong learning process. This assumption is shared by Deardorff (2006) in her discussion of the Process Model of Intercultural Competence. It also receives support from Bennett in his writings on the DMIS (M. J. Bennett, 1986, 1993, 2004). The DMIS further provides a framework for understanding the stages in which intercultural competence develops. It informs this research by offering ideas for how to support students in different stages of their development and how to balance
challenge and support to foster students’ learning process. In practice, this means to help students transform their experiences inside and outside the classroom into meaningful learning and selecting learning activities with awareness for how challenging they are for learners at different stages. In the DMIS, one of the major shifts is from minimization to acceptance/adaptation. It is assumed that at least part of the target group in this research is somewhere between minimization and acceptance with some level of curiosity about other cultures. Thus, it seems that promoting cultural self-awareness is fundamental to any efforts of developing intercultural competence. Building upon cultural self-awareness and attitudes such as open-mindedness and curiosity, both Deardorff’s models and the DMIS suggest that further learning goals for students could be increasing the complexity of their understanding of cultural differences, practicing perspective-taking and skills of observing and reflecting, as well as to build and broaden their abilities to adapt to culturally diverse contexts. Especially with regard to the latter, the Personal Leadership methodology (Schaetti et al., 2008, 2009) points to the importance of self-reflection and helping students explore ways of practicing their intercultural competence not only in situations where cultural diversity is inspiring and fun, but also in situations where it is challenging or where students feel insecure, misunderstood, or frustrated.

Overall, this research conceptualizes intercultural competence as a multi-dimensional construct, acknowledging that the design process and evaluation of the course must address its various dimensions and facets. Intercultural competence is further conceptualized as a lifelong learning process which proceeds in stages, highlighting the importance of tailoring the course to the target group’s specific learning needs. Before presenting more details on the research design and the course design process, the next section will offer an overview of the empirical research on intercultural competence in higher education.
2.5. Empirical Research on Intercultural Competence in Higher Education

As stated in the introductory chapter, intercultural competence is increasingly seen as a desired learning outcome in higher education. The wish to foster students’ intercultural competence seems to be related to various expected outcomes, such as supporting the academic and social integration of international students and promoting positive relationships among students of different cultural backgrounds, both in and outside the classroom. Beyond these immediate university-life-related benefits, intercultural competence is a soft skill that is increasingly requested by the labor market. Across the globe, the professional world is looking for university graduates who are prepared to work in global, multinational and diverse environments (Brinkmann & Van Weerdenburg, 2014; Jon, 2013; Ramirez R., 2016). Furthermore, many graduates might find themselves living and working in multicultural communities and societies. Intercultural competence is seen as enabling them to be good citizens who are able to approach local and global issues in a critical, ethnorelative way and generally contribute to harmonious relationships (Hart, Lantz, & Montague, 2017; Jon, 2013), a view shared and reinforced in various policy documents of the European Union (Council of Europe, 2008, 2011; Huber, 2012).

In recent years, higher education institutions from around the world seem to have become increasingly aware of their role in responding to societal needs and prepare their graduates to be global professionals and responsible citizens (Gregersen-Hermans, 2017). Yet, it remains questionable to what extent internationalization efforts of higher education institutions lead to more interculturally competent graduates. Oftentimes, internationalization is less about the benefits for students but rather pursued in hope of financial benefits, such as money from the tuition fees of overseas students (Jon, 2013). Even if universities focus on benefits for students, they tend to rely on the myth that exposure equals competence, thus limiting their efforts to creating opportunities for exposure through study abroad, internships or field trips abroad (Jackson, 2015a; Leask, 2010; Yan Lo-Philip et al., 2015).
Yet, it is important to add that internationalization efforts do not exclusively focus on international students. From the 1990s onwards, higher education institutions in Europe, the UK, and Australia increasingly paid attention to their non-mobile domestic students (Leask, 2010). The term Internationalization at Home (IaH) has been introduced to capture the idea that cultural diversity on campus, resulting from increasing student mobility, could also benefit domestic students and provide them with intercultural learning opportunities. IaH shifted attention to including domestic instructors and students in any efforts to promote intercultural learning, as expressed by Otten (2003):

“A common concern of IaH and diversity plans is that domestic teachers and students should be included in international programs as intercultural learners. In fact, it could be argued that they need intercultural support more desperately than the international students” (Otten, 2003, p. 20)

Taking this idea further, some authors have pointed to the diversity among domestic students in terms of ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or physical abilities (Dervin, 2017; Jon, 2013), arguing that this diversity should be used to encourage intercultural competence development among the entire student body:

“As this diversity is reflected on campuses around the world, both through internationally mobile students and diverse local student populations, multicultural classrooms become a resource to be used purposefully to help develop intercultural skills for all students” (Jon, 2013, p. 98).

Yet, in a recent publication on intercultural competence in higher education, Gregersen-Hermans (2017) concluded that most universities still assume that fostering exposure (within the framework of student mobility or IaH) will promote students’ intercultural competence and prepare them to live and work in a globalized world. This is in sharp contrast to research offering more and more evidence that exposure does not equal competence. There are some universities which use more systematic interventions to promote intercultural competence development among their students. However, these tend to be isolated measures in one
institution with little exchange of best practices and lessons learned across institutions. A noteworthy exception is a recently published edited book by Deardorff and Arasaratnam-Smith (2017) which includes almost 30 case studies on interventions from across the globe, including a summary of this doctoral research (Binder, 2017). The subsequent sections first review research on the exposure is competence myth, followed by an overview of existing interventions to wrap up the status quo, lessons learned, and position this research in the empirical landscape.

2.5.1. Exposure is Competence?

Rising cultural diversity on campus often is connected to hopes, or even claims, that university students will become more interculturally competent, including domestic and international students. The “exposure is competence myth”, as Brinkmann and Van Weerdenburg (Brinkmann & Van Weerdenburg, 2014) have called it, can also be observed in business settings where human resource decisions tend to be based on people’s international experience, assuming that more experience means more intercultural competence. In their research, Brinkmann and Van Weerdenburg (Brinkmann & Van Weerdenburg, 2014) have busted the “exposure is competence myth”. They found no evidence supporting the assumption that individuals who have been more exposed to other cultures have higher intercultural competence scores (such as expatriates, people from more culturally diverse countries, etc.). The authors have argued that one of the explanations for this might be that being in culturally diverse place means proximity to other cultures, but not necessarily interaction with culturally different others (Brinkmann & Van Weerdenburg, 2014).

Rising student mobility in higher education has led to two assumptions, claiming that (1) study abroad positively impacts intercultural competence development of those who go abroad, and (2) rising diversity on campus offers opportunities for intercultural competence development among those who stay at home as well. However, empirical studies across
various study-abroad destinations and institutions with rising numbers of international students have painted a more nuanced picture, suggesting that exposure does not necessarily equal competence.

Does study abroad contribute to intercultural competence development?

This section will explore evidence for assumption 1 – suggesting that studying abroad contributes to intercultural competence development. One of the largest and most frequently cited studies has been the Georgetown Consortium Project by Vande-Berg, Connor-Linton, and Paige (2009) who gathered data from almost 1,300 U.S. students between 2003 and 2005. While most of the students participated in one of various study-abroad programs, the sample also included a control group of students who did not go abroad. All students completed the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) at two time points in a pre-/post-test design. Overall, the study-abroad group made significantly larger gains on the IDI than the control group which even showed a slight decrease. While prior international experience, such as living abroad, did not have a significant impact, prior language proficiency and taking classes in the host country language did contribute to intercultural learning as captured by the IDI. Overall, students who spent time with fellow home country nationals and host country locals made the biggest gains, as did those who received mentoring on-site during their stay abroad. Finally, Vande-Berg et al. (2009) found support that program duration mattered. While short programs lead to a slight increase at best, semester-long programs resulted in the greatest gains. For programs longer than one semester, they found a plateau effect.

More recently, another large, longitudinal study on U.S. students’ intention to study abroad, actual study abroad participation, and effects of study abroad confirmed that study abroad contributed to communication skills, as well as understanding of moral and ethical issues (J. Luo & Jamieson-Drake, 2014). There are various other studies which have shown that study abroad can lead to increased intercultural competence (Anderson & Lawton, 2007;
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Covert, 2014; Engle & Engle, 2004; Hamad & Lee, 2013; Jackson, 2015b; Ramirez R., 2016; Rexeisen, R. J., Anderson, P. H., Lawton, L., & Hubbard, 2008; Sample, 2013; Schartner, 2016). However, these studies have highlighted the importance of certain conditions to foster intercultural competence development, such as opportunities for meaningful contact with host nationals, including housing arrangement, staying in host families or being involved in the local community (Engle & Engle, 2004; Jackson, 2015b; Rexeisen, R. J., Anderson, P. H., Lawton, L., & Hubbard, 2008); willingness to communicate with culturally different others (Hamad & Lee, 2013; Jackson, 2015b); availability and use of extracurricular activities (Jackson, 2015b); mentoring on-site, e.g. by home faculty (Engle & Engle, 2004; Rexeisen, R. J., Anderson, P. H., Lawton, L., & Hubbard, 2008); encouraging and facilitating critical reflection and active processing of experiences (McAllister, Whiteford, Hill, Thomas, & Fitzgerald, 2006; Sample, 2013; Schartner, 2016); as well as supporting students in developing self-efficacy and agency in intercultural interactions (Covert, 2014; Schartner, 2016). While the majority of studies has focused on Western students’ study abroad experience, research on Asian students going abroad has emerged over the past years (e.g. Jackson, 2015b; Spencer-Oatey, Dauber, Jing, & Lifei, 2016; Yan Lo-Philip et al., 2015).

Concerning program duration, various studies have supported the findings from the Georgetown Consortium Project, suggesting that longer programs lead to more pronounced improvements on intercultural competence measures such as the IDI (Engle & Engle, 2004; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004). However, research by Engle and Engle (2004) compared students in a semester-long vs. year-long language immersion program and found that students made the greatest gains in the second semester, thereby disconfirming the plateau effect found by Vande Berg et al. (2009). Studies on short programs suggest that even programs of a few weeks can promote intercultural competence development, especially with regard to facets such as culture-specific knowledge, cultural identity reflection, and more appreciation and respect for other cultures (Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004; Root &
Ngampornchai, 2013). Other studies have compared study abroad to travel for leisure or informal education. Their findings seem to suggest that study abroad is more effective in promoting intercultural competence development than other types of going abroad which might be due to the more structured and intentional nature of study abroad programs (Parsons, 2010; Stebleton, Soria, & Cherney, 2013).

However, there are studies which paint a less optimistic picture, highlighting challenges such as promoting in-depth understanding of cultural differences, fostering self-reflection, and students’ over-estimating their intercultural competence. Based on their analysis of students’ reflective assignments, Root and Ngampornchai (2013) concluded that despite evidence for some intercultural learning, there has been a lack of more in-depth understanding and reflection on cultural differences. Similarly, Sample (2013) discussed differences in how deeply students reflected in a longer study abroad program, with only few students exploring to what extent their experience confirmed or challenged existing theories they learned before. In another study, Bloom and Miranda (2015) used a mixed methods approach to explore the intercultural sensitivity development of U.S. students during a four-week program to Spain. They concluded that progress on the quantitative instrument seemed to reflect students’ perception of intercultural sensitivity rather than their actual intercultural sensitivity, with qualitative data suggesting that such a short program did not led to “any dramatic shifts in (…) intercultural sensitivity” (Bloom & Miranda, 2015, p. 578). Similarly, Jackson’s (2015b) mixed methods study offered evidence that both, the study abroad and control group sample overestimated their intercultural competence. The mismatch between quantitative and qualitative data can go both ways as shown in Schartner’s (2016) study of international postgraduate students in the UK. While quantitative data suggested stagnation or decline in intercultural competence, qualitative data revealed that students felt more interculturally aware and confident in interacting with culturally different others (Schartner, 2016).
In conclusion, evidence seems to support the potential of study abroad programs for intercultural competence development. Yet, it also revealed conditions and factors contributing to its success in fostering intercultural competence, including opportunities for contact with locals and willingness to interact (on both sides), guided reflection, as well as support in developing self-efficacy. Furthermore, various studies have shown that duration of stay might determine how much progress students can make. Finally, recent research has demonstrated how mixed methods approaches can be used to gain deeper insights into students’ intercultural learning. On the one hand, qualitative data can complement and enrich the numbers from frequently used quantitative instruments like the IDI, enabling a more comprehensive understanding of how students experience their own learning. On the other hand, some studies have pointed to mismatches between quantitative and qualitative data. It seems worthwhile exploring mixed methods assessment further, adding to our understanding of how they can complement each other in assessing intercultural competence development.

**Does cultural diversity on campus create intercultural learning opportunities for all students?**

Let us now turn to assumption 2 arguing that increased student mobility creates intercultural learning opportunities for those who do not go abroad. Empirical research has consistently pointed to the lack of contact between local and international students. Thus, the potential for intercultural learning often goes largely unused for both sides – a challenge found across time and popular study-abroad countries, including Australia (Leask, 2009, 2010; Volet & Ang, 1998), New Zealand (J. C. Brown & Daly, 2005; Campbell, 2012; Z. Zhang & Brunton, 2007), the UK (Harrison & Peacock, 2010; Schartner, 2016; Spencer-Oatey et al., 2016), the USA (Halualani, Chitgopekar, Morrison, & Dodge, 2004a, 2004b), and Germany (Heublein, Özkilic, & Sommer, 2007; Stumpf, Gruttauer, & Bitzer, 2011).
Some studies have suggested that domestic and international students generally see value in cultural diversity and intercultural interactions (Leask, 2009, 2010; Osmond & Roed, 2010). However, research also offered insights into the barriers to contact, as perceived by both sides. Several studies showed that domestic students tend to stay in homogeneous peer groups, reporting barriers to intercultural contact such as language barriers, concerns that international students could be a burden in group work, anxiety about potential misunderstands, lack of shared lifestyle (e.g. shared knowledge of popular culture, drinking habits), as well as a general sense of not being prepared to interact with culturally different others, i.e. low intercultural self-efficacy (Harrison & Peacock, 2010; Leask, 2009, 2010; Osmond & Roed, 2010; Summers & Volet, 2008). International students might prefer to interact and work with other international students who are non-native speakers as well, which might decrease anxiety, and/or might experience difficulties to become part of pre-existing local groups (Osmond & Roed, 2010). Furthermore, some studies have observed tendencies to cluster with home country peers if there is a larger group of fellow nationals (Rienties, Nanclares, Jindal-Snape, & Alcott, 2012; Spencer-Oatey et al., 2016). The latter has been addressed in more depth in research on the experience of Chinese students in the UK, identifying barriers to socializing across cultures including individual factors (e.g. lack of willingness or confidence to interact in English, being there for the diploma only, being shy) as well as situational aspects (e.g. large group of Chinese, low levels of local students in some classes) and cultural factors (e.g. different concepts of friendships, different habits) (Spencer-Oatey et al., 2016).

With regard to the classroom and group work, research has repeatedly demonstrated that students tend to self-select into homogeneous groups (Ippolito, 2007; Leask, 2010; Osmond & Roed, 2010; Stumpf et al., 2011). If encouraged or forced to work in diverse groups for assignments, domestic students seem to see potential for becoming a more international person, while international students mainly frame it as an opportunity to make
local friends. However, especially domestic students reported challenges such as language barriers, having extra work because of language discrepancies, as well as anxiety to offend culturally different others (Ippolito, 2007; Osmond & Roed, 2010). A frequently cited study by Summers and Volet (2008) showed that even if students self-select into diverse groups, this does not necessarily mean their attitude towards it became more positive or that they were inclined to do so again. In sum, they and other authors have concluded that instructors need to purposefully plan multicultural group work, support students in the process, for example by offering help in developing skills needed for it, and be very explicit about the value and benefits of such group work (Rienties et al., 2012; Stumpf et al., 2011; Summers & Volet, 2008).

Overall, empirical evidence strongly suggests that higher education institutions need to actively create opportunities for contact between domestic and international students. It further seems important to increase students’ self-efficacy and abilities to decrease anxiety and make the most out of contact with students of other cultural backgrounds. This dissertation seeks to add to our understanding of how universities can promote and facilitate meaningful intercultural contact through an elective course. Such a course does not only offer opportunities for intercultural contact, but also supports students in developing intercultural competence, thereby encouraging and enabling them to seek intercultural contact and collaboration in other courses and beyond. The next section reviews research offering insights into how to foster students’ intercultural competence development, both in the formal and informal curriculum.

2.5.2. Facilitating Students’ Intercultural Competence Development

In response to the emerging understanding that exposure to cultural diversity on campus might not be sufficient to foster intercultural contact between domestic and international
students, studies were conducted to test various interventions seeking to promote intercultural contact and learning.

Interventions merely aimed at promoting intercultural contact assume that contact leads to intercultural learning, an idea that has been derived from the contact hypothesis. Most sources credit Allport with introducing the contact hypothesis in his book The Nature of Prejudice (1954). However, the idea that intergroup contact can reduce bias and prejudice seems to have been around since the 1930s. It emerged from observations showing that White students, soldiers, and seaman in the U.S. who had contact with Black counterparts had more positive interracial attitudes than those who had no such contact (Dovidio, Gaertner, & Kawakami, 2003). Dovidio et al. (2003) discussed how this led to empirical research on how contact might influence intergroup relations, including the well-known Robbers Cave experiment conducted by Sherif and colleagues in 1954 which highlighted conditions for successful intergroup contact. Within this theoretical and empirical context, Allport introduced four prerequisite conditions for successful contact that reduces intergroup conflict and promotes harmonious intergroup relations, including “(1) equal status within the contact situation; (2) intergroup cooperation; (3) common goals; and (4) support of authorities, law, or custom” (Dovidio et al., 2003, p. 7). Dovidio et al. (2003) reviewed the large body of research which tested these four conditions, concluding that empirical evidence generally supports the four aspects introduced by Allport, and in particular the role of cooperative interdependence. However, two additional conditions emerged from research, including the opportunity for personal contact (between members of different groups), allowing group members to receive individuating information and thereby deconstruct the idea of a homogeneous outgroup, and the development of intergroup friendships.

In another review of empirical evidence on the contact hypothesis, Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) conducted a meta-analysis of 515 studies, with a total of 713 independent samples, published between 1940 and 2000. Their findings are supportive of the contact
hypothesis, concluding that intergroup contact typically reduces intergroup bias and prejudice. They further found that the reduction of bias and prejudice was greatest under the four conditions suggested by Allport, though it seems they are not essential for prejudice reduction to occur. Using multiple tests, Pettigrow and Tropp (2006) were able to show that this effect is relatively robust, not being based on participant selection or publication biases. Furthermore, the authors concluded that contact effects seem to generalize to the entire outgroup and can be found across different outgroup target groups and contact settings, extending beyond racial and ethnic groups (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

Building on contact theory, those who research intercultural learning among university students seem to agree that while students can develop intercultural competence in interaction with culturally different others, contact alone is not necessarily sufficient. Universities need to support students in transformative learning processes in which they create meaning from their experience, including reflective learning that encourages students to become aware of their own cultural identity and re-evaluate their frames of reference, values, beliefs, and assumptions (Hart et al., 2017; Otten, 2000). In his position paper on Internationalization at Home, Otten (2000) argues that “[t]he personal experience of an intercultural encounter does not automatically initiate intercultural learning effects. It becomes a substantial learning experience only if it is reflected on.” (p. 18). Such reflective processes can occur in the classroom or in informal but facilitated group activities outside the classroom. This idea has received support from an in-depth case study by Bennett, Volet and Fozdar (2013) who repeatedly interviewed a dyad of a monolingual Australian and multilingual international student from Vietnam to explore how positive intercultural interactions occur. They concluded that while positive intercultural contact seems to support intercultural competence development, part of the explanation might be that the interviewer served as an authority figure who positively reinforced contact and encouraged reflection (R. J. Bennett et al., 2013).
In a similar vein, King, Baxter Magolda, and Massé (2011) argued that while higher education institutions need to promote opportunities for contact, this is not sufficient for intercultural competence development. There always is a risk that interactions with culturally different others might go wrong, reinforcing stereotypes and creating reluctance to engage in such interactions in the future. More specifically, the authors argued that “although dissonance, defined as the mental conflict that occurs when new information contradicts one’s beliefs or assumptions (…), may trigger students to reconsider and reframe their reaction in more informed and culturally sensitive ways, it may also trigger discomfort that impedes learning” (King et al., 2011, p. 469). In a mixed methods longitudinal study in the U.S. context, they found that most students in their research experienced a sense of discomfort in intercultural interactions, related to feeling stuck and not knowing how to resolve the dissonance they felt. While some students seemed able to cope with the discomfort by becoming curious about culturally different others or even generate new insights from critically reflecting upon their own views, King et al. (2011) suggested that most students need support to really learn from their discomfort and experience of dissonance.

In another influential paper, Leask (2009) reviewed some of the strategies and experiences of interventions for students at the University of South Australia, distinguishing between formal and informal curriculum interventions. The former entails planned teaching and learning activities whereas the latter captures extracurricular, optional activities. Concerning the formal curriculum, Leask (2009) recommended that instructors need to clearly state intercultural learning objectives, design learning activities that help students achieve those objectives, and make sure that both home and international students understand the purpose and value of intercultural interaction in the classroom, for example by using learning activities that encourage interaction and are relevant for students’ professional field. It further entails acknowledging that intercultural interactions can be challenging, supporting students in developing intercultural competence to succeed in such interactions. With regard to the
informal curriculum, Leask (2009) described some of the strategies employed at her institution, including to signal institutional support for cultural diversity by a clearly marked Muslim prayer room and offering halal food, as well as different interventions such as an online peer-mentoring system to connect home and international students prior to classes, a series of cross-cultural lunches, informal get-togethers for international students, as well as a learning guide on Asian names for domestic students. Such interventions received support from results of a student experience survey showing improvements in levels of satisfaction with intercultural interaction and sense of community. However, focus groups revealed that challenges remained with international students reporting that home students tended to avoid them and home students expressing difficulties in working and socializing with international students based on language and cultural differences (Leask, 2009). Overall, Leask (2009) concluded that interventions targeting the informal curriculum are complex and require purposeful planning and constant evaluation and adaptation and that special attention should be on encouraging interaction on all sides.

In another review, Zhang et al. (2016) briefly discussed best practices of managing cultural diversity among students in business schools in different countries, including peer mentoring programs, peer-assisted study sessions (PASS), language partner programs or conversation groups, and a Shared Reading Project where home and international students were paired to decide on a book to read and discuss. However, the authors concluded that “most of these best practices are only isolated initiatives and are limited to voluntary informal curriculums” (M. M. Zhang et al., 2016, p. 373). With regard to the formal curriculum, Hiller (2011) reached a similar conclusion, arguing that even though the EU’s Bologna process paved the way for intercultural competence to become integrated into the curriculum as a learning outcome, so far we have mainly seen isolated, experimental interventions to do so. Examples can be found at individual institutions making intercultural competence part of the mandatory curriculum, offering elective courses or outsourcing it to career centers or
international offices. The following sections offer a review of some of the formal or informal curriculum interventions that different higher education institutions around the world have implemented and evaluated. This provides a basis for positioning this dissertation project within the empirical landscape, recognizing what has already been done and what this research can contribute.

**Informal curriculum interventions**

On the informal curriculum side, various institutions have experimented with peer-mentoring or “buddy” programs and demonstrated positive effects of pairing students across cultures and years of study (Campbell, 2012; Leask, 2009, 2010; Quintrell & Westwood, 1994; Woods et al., 2013). Already in 1994, Quintrell and Westwood (1994) demonstrated benefits of structured contact between domestic hosts and international students in a peer-pairing program at an Australian university. International students reported a more positive experience of their first year of study, improvements in English fluency, increased knowledge of intercultural communication and Australian customs, as well as having made friends with their local host peer. Domestic students reported perceived benefits such as a better understanding of their own culture, knowledge on other cultures, and improved intercultural communication skills (Quintrell & Westwood, 1994).

More recently, the business school of the University of South Australia took the idea of mentoring further and paired up second year home and international students to be mentors for a diverse group of first year students (Leask, 2009, 2010). Mentor pairs received skills and intercultural communication training. Overall, both mentors and mentees reported positive outcomes, including higher levels of satisfaction with intercultural interactions, stronger sense of belonging to the community, and self-reported improved communication skills (Leask, 2009, 2010). Another example is a buddy program at a university in New Zealand in which 30 intercultural communication students were paired with 30 incoming international students as
part of their coursework (Campbell, 2012). Over a period of 12 weeks, they were encouraged to regularly interact with their buddies, including meeting up with another buddy pair. Furthermore, class time was used to reflect upon the experience, exchange ideas, and discuss how to best support the international buddies. Students also kept a reflective journal, the analysis of which supported the project by showing that it created opportunities for positive intercultural contact, learning about one’s own and other cultures, as well as relating class content to real experience. It seems that the buddy program provided local students with the necessary push to overcome perceived barriers to intercultural interaction while also offering international students a chance to connect with local students, learn more about their host country, and improve their language skills (Campbell, 2012). However, data from local and international students revealed challenges as well, including time issues (e.g. for students working on the side) and perceiving the contact to be forced through the mandatory nature of the project (Campbell, 2012).

The latter aspect also emerged in another study at an Australian university where a short-term mentoring program was embedded into a human resource management course (Woods et al., 2013). Mentors received skills training and were paired up with pre-university or first year students with most pairs being culturally diverse. Results suggested that while mentees generally reported a positive experience, framing their mentor as a new friend who offered help and an opportunity to practice English, some felt their mentor was not genuinely interested and only fulfilled the assessment component of the course. Furthermore, findings showed that the mentoring program had a positive impact on the amount of mentees’ intercultural interactions, but this was not found for mentors. The authors have speculated that this might be due to the short-term nature of the program and the fact that mentors had already been at the university for a longer time (Woods et al., 2013).

Another study conducted at a South Korean university has confirmed the benefits of offering local and international students opportunities for structured contact in a buddy
program and a culture and language exchange group (Jon, 2013). Data from a mixed methods study on these interventions demonstrated that Korean students reported higher levels of interaction with international students which in turn enabled them to develop their intercultural competence. Students in the study felt more interested in other cultures, more confident and capable of interacting across cultures, and more eager to lead an internationally oriented life (Jon, 2013). Jon (2013) concluded that this study offers support for the contact hypothesis in a non-Western setting as well as support for using structured programs to encourage contact between domestic and international students and create intercultural learning opportunities for local students. In another study, Klak and Martin (2003) explored the potential impact of a less structured informal curriculum intervention in the form of a series of Latin American cultural events at a U.S. university. Using longitudinal quantitative data, they could show that students who had participated in these cultural events scored significantly higher on intercultural sensitivity scales, in particular in terms of valuing intercultural contact and expressing interest in cultural differences (Klak & Martin, 2003).

Overall, these studies support the idea that informal curriculum interventions such as buddy programs, culture and language exchange groups, and cultural events can contribute to students’ intercultural competence development. While the focus of this research is on the formal curriculum, insights from the research reviewed so far support the role of more advanced peers, as demonstrated for buddy programs. Thus, the elective course that is designed and evaluated in this research includes a peer-learning component. It thereby seeks to contribute to our understanding of how the benefits of buddy programs can be brought into more structured learning interventions in the formal curriculum. The next section reviews research on formal curriculum interventions, looking at courses explicitly related to intercultural competence.

**Formal curriculum interventions**
Another type of intervention to promote intercultural competence development among students in higher education is more closely connected to the formal curriculum. Formal curriculum interventions either make intercultural competence courses part of the mandatory curriculum or offer them as elective courses. This section reviews empirical studies on courses or workshops that focus on domestic students or on domestic and international students together. Besides such interventions, many study abroad programs include some sort of training, often in the form or preparation and/or re-entry workshops. Such research has partly been presented earlier in this chapter and partly will be discussed here. However, it is not the focus of this dissertation as the overarching research question is how intercultural competence can be promoted among students on a multicultural campus, irrespective of study abroad programs.

In a study on domestic students at a Chinese university who took an intercultural communication course, Wang and Kulich (2015) could demonstrate that students were able to develop intercultural competence by interviewing people from other cultures. More specifically, students in the course received interview training and the assignment to interview someone from another culture. This entailed to share their own cultural story, build rapport, and reflect on the process of the overall assignment. Wang and Kulich (2015) showed that students made progress on the IDI regardless of whether their intercultural encounters were virtual or face-to-face. Furthermore, their analysis of qualitative data from students’ assignments revealed that students discussed how they developed an understanding of the complexity of culture, increased their cultural self-awareness, developed a positive attitude toward interacting with people from other cultures, overcame stereotypes and prejudice, were able to change perspectives and understand different world views, became more motivated to communicate across cultures and more confident in their ability to do so.

In an earlier study, Barker and Mak (Barker & Mak, 2013) reviewed four case studies published between 2004 and 2012, all of which focused on an evidence-based social
competencies program which had been integrated into courses across different disciplines. Students who participated in that program reported improved intercultural communication skills and self-efficacy. While there were no differences across disciplines, the authors concluded that the challenge is to tailor program content to make it relevant for students in their respective fields. Barker and Mak’s (2013) review of these four case studies offered support for promoting students’ intercultural skills through integrating evidence-based programs into their mandatory curriculum. However, it also highlighted the need to adapt any existing programs to students’ fields of study and different contexts. In yet another study, McKiernan, Leahy and Brereton (2013) surveyed 39 students who participated in an intercultural studies program elective at an Irish university. The program consisted of various modules and used different teaching methods. Students in the study expressed that they felt the elective had helped them increase their awareness and understanding of their own and other cultures, to be more open-minded and knowledgeable and therefore less anxious in intercultural interactions, better able to suspend judgment, and generally more interested in diversity.

Another study focused on two samples of German students who participated in experiential intercultural training (Behrnd & Porzelt, 2012). While the results once more suggested that merely having been abroad is not enough to lead to higher intercultural competence scores, the findings also showed that those who have intercultural experience to draw upon might benefit more from the training. Thus, it seems that while exposure does not necessarily equal competence, facilitating students’ meaning-making of their exposure and experience can support their intercultural learning. In a similar vein, Jackson (2015b) found that students from a Chinese university who participated in an elective course to support their learning process and make sense of their abroad experience benefitted more from the experience than the control group with no such course. The elective course had been designed
based on Kolb’s experiential learning theory⁴, the DMIS, and intergroup contact theory. Both, quantitative and qualitative data suggested that students who participated in this course were more likely to interact with local students during their stay abroad compared to the control group. Furthermore, the guided reflection in the course helped them to become more open-minded and interculturally competent (Jackson, 2015b).

In another study, Jackson (2009) focused on short-term sojourners from a Hong Kong university who went to the UK for five weeks for fieldwork. These students had received a semester-long preparation and their fieldwork program included experiential learning and critical reflection. Generally, quantitative and qualitative data supported that students developed a better understanding of cultural differences, moving beyond superficial observations of the visible environment to more profound reflections. They also developed more ethnorelative views and overall seemed to have become more interculturally competent. Yet, at the same time, Jackson (2009) found that most of the students overestimated their intercultural competence on the quantitative self-report. In conclusion, Jackson (2009) argued for experiential learning and guided reflection to help students becoming aware of their own limitations and set realistic learning goals for themselves. The usefulness of guided reflection has also been supported in a study by Sample (2013). Sample (2013) could show that students who had to write reflection papers and critical incidents about their study abroad experience and discuss them in their re-entry workshop did improve their intercultural competence, in comparison to those not going abroad and those who went abroad but did not join the course.

In yet another study, Engberg, Jourian and Davidson (Engberg, Jourian, & Davidson, 2016) could demonstrate students’ learning and development during study abroad were mediated by the extent to which they actively engaged with the host culture and stepped out of their comfort zone. The authors argued that this immersion in the host culture allowed students to

---

⁴ Kolb’s experiential learning theory defines learning as “the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience” (D. Kolb, 1984, p. 41). More details on this theory are provided in chapter 4.
experience dissonance which in turn enabled them to grow and learn, given they receive support and guidance, for example through reflective activities and journals.

Overall, these studies have offered support for the role of experiential learning and guided reflection in students’ intercultural learning and development of intercultural competence. It seems that if students are to benefit fully from their intercultural experience, be it during study abroad or on a multicultural campus at home, higher education institutions and educators need to encourage intercultural interaction, facilitate meaning-making through reflection, and offer support to students. The studies reviewed furthermore confirm the need for evidence-based programs which are grounded in what is known about intercultural learning and intercultural competence development. Finally, several of the studies have used mixed methods designs, demonstrating how the two types of data can offer a more comprehensive picture of students’ intercultural competence development, while also allowing to see to what extent quantitative and qualitative findings match.

As mentioned before, the overall focus of this doctoral research is on promoting and assessing intercultural competence development among university students and exploring how this can be done in an elective course. Considering the theories and empirical research reviewed so far, the first part of the research focuses on how to design an elective class accessible to all students using an evidence-based design process (chapter 4). The second part then focuses on formative evaluation by exploring benefits and challenges when putting the course design into practice, identifying areas for improvement as well as potential good practices that could be shared across institutions (chapter 5). Finally, the last part addresses the question of the intervention’s effectiveness, i.e. summative evaluation, as well as how to use multi-method assessment of students’ intercultural competence development throughout the course (chapter 6). For the latter, research so far has repeatedly demonstrated that commonly used quantitative self-report instruments can hardly capture the complexity of intercultural learning. Thus, adding qualitative data seems necessary to get a better
understanding of how and what students learn (Covert, 2014). As shown in the previous section reviewing existing empirical research, an increasing number of studies on students’ intercultural development employ a mixed methods design – allowing to gain a more comprehensive picture as well as to see to what extent the two types of data match or not. The next chapter describes the mixed methods research design in more detail to offer an overview of the larger, multi-stage research project before going deeper into the stages of course design, formative, and summative evaluation in the subsequent chapters.
Chapter 3

Methodology
Overall, this research has used a mixed methods, longitudinal design to collect and analyze various types of data required to address the different research questions. These research questions are all part of the overarching research focus on how to promote and assess university students’ intercultural competence development. The research design has been guided by the six-step process for evidence-based design suggested by Stephan and Stephan (2013) as shown in figure 3.1. This model provides a framework for the research project which seeks to address the design phase of the intervention (steps 1-5) as well as its evaluation (step 6).

Figure 3.1. Six-step evidence-based design process (based on Stephan & Stephan, 2013)

Steps one to five are related to the design of the program or intervention, including identifying the target group, goals, relevant theories, psychological and communication processes as well as techniques and exercises to activate these processes (Stephan & Stephan, 2013). The design process is described in more detail in chapter 4. In step six, the program or intervention is evaluated – this aspect is discussed in more detail in chapters 5 and 6. Here, a distinction is made between formative and summative evaluation. While the formative evaluation is context-specific and aims at identifying the program’s strengths and weaknesses to derive ideas for improvement, the summative evaluation attempts to generalize beyond the immediate context and assess the overall effectiveness of the program (Quinn Patton, 2002).
The subsequent section first explains why a mixed methods approach has been chosen, followed by describing the various stages of the research process in more detail.

3.1. Mixed Methods Research Design

In recent years, mixed methods research has increasingly gained attention as a third research approach or paradigm which attempts to combine quantitative and qualitative traditions (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007). Based on a review of 19 definitions of mixed methods research, Johnson et al. (2007) have derived the following general definition:

“Mixed methods research is a type of research in which a researcher or team of researchers combines elements of qualitative and quantitative research approaches (e.g., use of qualitative and quantitative viewpoints, data collection, analysis, inference techniques) for the broad purpose of breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration.” (p. 123)

Not only does mixed methods research allow addressing the trade-off between breadth and depth of research, it also has been connected to advantages such as being able to select from a broader range of research tools to address complex topics, combining quantitative and qualitative elements as to offset weaknesses of both types of research, as well as being able to combine multiple perspectives and gain a better understanding of the bigger picture (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Kuckartz, 2014). Especially in evaluation research, there seems to be a trend towards mixed methods studies, based on an understanding that neither numbers nor words alone are sufficient to capture the experience of those involved in a program or intervention (Kuckartz, 2014). It is important to acknowledge that the research question should drive the selection of a quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods approach. The latter seems particularly appropriate if

“one data source may be insufficient, results need to be explained, exploratory findings need to be generalized, a second method is needed to enhance a primary method, a theoretical stance needs to be employed, and an overall research objective can be best addressed with multiple phases, or projects” (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).
In this research project, several of these reasons have contributed to the decision to use a mixed methods approach. First, the overall research focus required a multi-stage process combining the design process with a formative and summative evaluation. Second, the design stage was assumed to benefit from combining quantitative methods (for breadth) with qualitative methods (for depth) with either of the two data sources considered an insufficient basis for designing the course. Finally, for the evaluation stage, one type of evidence might have fallen short of telling the whole story. Thus, combining quantitative and qualitative data has been assumed to offer a more comprehensive picture of students’ experience of the course and their intercultural competence development. Furthermore, as discussed in the previous chapter, research on intercultural competence development among university students has pointed to a potential mismatch between quantitative and qualitative assessment. This makes it even more important to take both perspectives into account and explore this phenomenon further. In addition, combining quantitative and qualitative methods of assessing intercultural competence is in line with recommendations from leading scholars in the field (Deardorff, 2011, 2017). While quantitative assessment tools have long been used in pre-post-test designs to test the effectiveness of intercultural learning interventions, adding a qualitative perspective allows gaining insights into students’ diverse and individualized learning experience and how they develop their intercultural competence (Deardorff, 2011, 2017; Quinn Patton, 2002).

However, employing a mixed methods approach has raised questions of when and how to integrate the two types of data, with the potential for mixing often not fully exploited by researchers (Plano Clark, Garrett, & Leslie-Pelecky, 2010). On the one hand, researchers need to be clear on the purpose of mixing. Johnson et al. (2007) have distinguished five broad purposes of mixing methods, including triangulation (i.e. using different methods to look at the same phenomenon to see if the results converge), complementarity (i.e. using one method to enhance, elaborate, illustrate, or clarify results from the other), development (i.e. using results from one method to inform the design and use of the other method), initiation (i.e.
using both methods to discover paradoxes or contradictions to reframe the research question),
and expansion (i.e. using different methods for different inquiry parts to expand the range of
the study). On the other hand, researchers need to decide on a strategy for mixing, which can
range from mixing in the discussion (on the level of overall findings), to using a matrix or
joint display (on the level of results), all the way to transforming one type of data into the
other (on the level of data), for example by quantifying qualitative data for joint statistical
analysis of both data sets (Kuckartz, 2014; Plano Clark et al., 2010). The next section
provides more details on the methods of data collection and analysis used and on how mixing
was done in the various stages of this research.

3.2. The Research Process

Figure 3.2 depicts the overall research process, including the evidence-based design stage
(chapter 4), the formative evaluation (chapter 5), and the summative evaluation (chapter 6).
For each stage, the visualization includes specific research question(s) as well as which types
of data were used to address the question(s). To explore the various research questions,
pertaining to needs assessment, design, and evaluation of the intervention, a multiphase
research design was required. Such a design is often used in evaluation studies, enabling
researchers to flexibly address multiple research question related to one overall research
objective (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). In this research, the phases included the design
process as well as the formative and summative evaluation of the intervention. The design
stage used a mixed methods approach, collecting qualitative and quantitative data in two
sequential studies. For both types of evaluation, a pre-post-test design was used, collecting
quantitative and qualitative data in the beginning and at the end of the intervention. Thus, the
evaluation phases used a longitudinal, mixed methods approach, as typically done in
evaluation studies (Kuckartz, 2014).
Yet, the multi-stage, longitudinal complex nature of this research project made it difficult to fit it into existing typologies for mixed methods research. Therefore, I have followed Guest’s (2013) suggestion of shifting focus from the overall study to the points of interface, describing each point of interface including the timing of integration of quantitative and qualitative data and the purpose of doing so. Concerning the points of interface, I further have drawn upon the three strategies of mixing quantitative and qualitative strands discussed by Plano Clark et al. (2010) who distinguish mixing in the discussion section (at the level of overall findings), in a matrix (at the level of results), and by data transformation (at the level of data).

For all stages, more detailed descriptions on the methods of data collection and analysis can be found in the corresponding chapters. This chapter mainly serves to offer an overview of the entire research process as well as to specify the purpose and timing of mixing quantitative and qualitative data at the various points of interface.
Figure 3.2. Research process overview
3.2.1. Stage 1: Evidence-Based Design

In the first stage, the focus has been on the evidence-based design process, guided by research question 1:

*RQ1: How can a formal curriculum intervention be designed following an evidence-based approach?*

Guided by steps one to five in the model by Stephan and Stephan (2013), this stage entailed two studies conducted sequentially to gather empirical data for designing the intervention, i.e. an elective course for first-year university students. In the first study, a paper-and-pen questionnaire has been administered to all 270 incoming undergraduate freshmen students during their orientation week. The response rate was 49%, resulting in a final sample of n=133 students. The questionnaire entailed two measures of intercultural competence, complemented by additional measures to assess self-efficacy, subjective well-being, personality traits, and demographics. More details on the scales included in the questionnaire are provided below following this overview of the entire research process. In addition, the questionnaire included an open question asking students for their own definition of intercultural competence. Thereby, a qualitative element was added to the questionnaire, mixing quantitative and qualitative approaches already in the stage of data collection. The questionnaire can be found in Appendix A.

The two types of data were analyzed separately. Quantitative data were analyzed in SPSS using descriptive analyses and t-tests to explore baseline levels of intercultural competence among the first-year undergraduate students as well as to pilot-test the scales. The qualitative data from the open question were analyzed using Qualitative Content Analysis, based on recommendations by Schreier (2012), to gain an understanding of students’ subjective conceptualizations of intercultural competence. The two types of data were integrated in the discussion section with the purpose of triangulation. Triangulation was used to derive conclusions about the baseline level of intercultural competence among the first-year
In the second study, a qualitative approach has been taken conducting four focus groups with a total of n=18 participants. The main aim of the second study was to further explore students’ understanding of intercultural competence as well as their ideas for how promote it as part of their overall studies. Focus groups can be used to gather data on participants’ attitudes, perceptions, and ideas, including the group interaction with limited input and facilitation from the researcher (Quinn Patton, 2002; V. Wilson, 1997). In this study, focus groups were composed of three to eight undergraduate students of different cultural backgrounds, study majors, gender, and years of study, with the aim of gaining insights into a diverse set of experiences and ideas. Focus group discussions took place on campus, in a comfortable atmosphere with snacks and drinks provided, and were scheduled for about 1.5 hours. Based on a topic guide, participants were encouraged to discuss (1) who needs intercultural competence and why, (2) how intercultural competence can be developed at the university, (3) students’ experience of the orientation week training, as well as (4) students’ ideas for an elective course on intercultural competence. The data from video recordings of the focus groups was transcribed verbatim and analyzed in MaxQDA in multiple rounds of coding. Starting with inductive coding, various coding rounds were used to work towards condensing identified topics into a comprehensive coding frame, also establishing links to theoretical concepts and qualitative findings from study 1.

To address research question 1 of how to design the elective course using an evidence-based design process, findings from both studies were integrated in the discussion. The purpose of mixing findings from both studies was expansion. Expansion enabled gaining insights into students’ baseline level and subjective understanding of intercultural competence as well as moving on to exploring their ideas for promoting intercultural competence development on campus in general and in an elective course in specific.
3.2.2. Stage 2: Formative Evaluation

Data for the second and third stage were collected concurrently and in part used to inform the stages of formative and summative evaluation. However, in this section, they are described separately to provide a clear account of the underlying research questions, types of data collection and analysis, and points of integrating quantitative and qualitative data as well as the purpose of mixing. The formative evaluation stage is guided by two research questions:

*RQ2.1:* What are benefits and challenges of combining faculty- and peer-led instruction with reflective assignments?

*RQ2.2:* How can the course design be improved?

To address these questions, data were collected from students enrolled in the course as well as from peer-trainers involved in instructing the course. On the qualitative side, semi-standardized interviews with a heterogeneous subsample of n=10 students were conducted at the beginning and end of the course. The purposive sample was constructed as to represent the course participants’ diversity regarding gender, study major, and cultural background as good as possible. Interviews followed a topic guide (see Appendix B) while remaining flexible to adapting the order and wording of questions to each interviewee and probing whenever appropriate. At the end of the course, all students in the course filled in the post-test questionnaire (see Appendix A). Amongst others, this questionnaire included 15 close-ended evaluation items designed to shed light on some of the topics addressed in the interviews. It further entailed two open questions asking students to write down what they liked and disliked about the course design. In addition, semi-structured group interviews were conducted with all five peer-trainers in the beginning, middle, and end of the course to explore their expectations, experience, and ideas for improvement.

Concerning data analysis, data from the peer-trainers was analyzed by inductive coding in multiple rounds, condensing their words into categories and organizing those into expected and experienced benefits, challenges, and learnings. The various types of data from
the students were analyzed in multiple steps: In the first step, their answers to the open questions in the post-test questionnaire were analyzed combining inductive and deductive coding to identify benefits and challenges that students experienced. In the next step, interview data were analyzed in the same way, using the codes from the first step while expanding the coding frame by additional topics emerging from the interview data. The quantitative data from the questionnaires was analyzed using descriptive statistics and then integrated with the qualitative findings in the discussion with the purpose of triangulation.

3.2.3. Stage 3: Summative Evaluation

In the summative evaluation, the focus has been shifted from improving the course to assessing its overall effectiveness in supporting students’ intercultural competence development (research question 3.1) and meeting the learning objectives (research question 3.2):

*RQ3.1: How did students’ intercultural competence development develop throughout the course and beyond?*

*RQ3.2: To what extent did students achieve the learning objectives of the course?*

To address research question 3.1, quantitative data collected by questionnaires in the pre-test ($t_1$), post-test ($t_2$) and follow-up test ($t_3$) were analyzed statistically to test for changes in intercultural competence over time (see Appendix A for all questionnaires). These findings were complemented by qualitative data from students’ reflective assignments in two steps. The coding of qualitative data was guided by the dimensions of the quantitative assessment tools, using a coding frame with deductively derived categories, while allowing for subcategories to emerge inductively from the data. Following analysis, findings from both strands were merged in a matrix or joint display with the purpose of complementarity (i.e. qualitative results enriching and illustrating the quantitative results). In a second step,
qualitative data were transformed into quantitative data to compare both data sets at the level of data to see if they converge or diverge.

To address research question 3.2, findings from the qualitative strand based on analysis of students’ reflective papers was complemented by quantitative findings from the quantitative assessment in the pre- and post-test survey. In this case, mixing occurred in the discussion with the purpose of triangulation. Table 3.1 offers a summary of all three research stages specifying the types of data collection and analysis as well as how and when mixing of qualitative and quantitative data occurred.

Table 3.1. Summary of research stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research stage</th>
<th>Data collection</th>
<th>Data analysis</th>
<th>Mixing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1:</strong></td>
<td>Baseline questionnaire:</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics, t-tests</td>
<td>In the discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based</td>
<td>quantitative items</td>
<td></td>
<td>For triangulation and expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design</td>
<td>Baseline questionnaire: open question (qualitative)</td>
<td>Qualitative Content Analysis (QCA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus group discussions</td>
<td>Inductive coding in multiple rounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2:</strong></td>
<td>Semi-standardized interviews (in the beginning and</td>
<td>Mix of inductive and deductive coding</td>
<td>In the discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>end of the course)</td>
<td></td>
<td>For triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td>Post-test questionnaire: open questions (qualitative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-test questionnaire: quantitative items</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group interviews with peer-trainers</td>
<td>Inductive coding in multiple rounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 3:</strong></td>
<td>Longitudinal questionnaires (pre-, post-test, follow)</td>
<td>Statistical analysis</td>
<td>In a matrix and by data transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>up): quantitative items</td>
<td></td>
<td>For triangulation and complementarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td>Reflective papers</td>
<td>Mix of inductive and deductive coding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3. Quantitative Scales Used to Measure Intercultural Competence

As mentioned above, more detailed descriptions on the methods of data collection and analysis can be found in the corresponding chapters for each research stage. However, as the quantitative questionnaire has been constructed in the beginning of the research process and used from baseline all the way to follow-up test, this section offers more information on the selection of the two quantitative measures of intercultural competence. In their review of some of the most commonly used tests to measure intercultural competence, Matsumoto and Hwang (2013) concluded that the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS; Van Dyne, Ang, & Koh, 2008, 2009), the Intercultural Adjustment Potential Scale (ICAPS; Matsumoto et al., 2001, 2003, 2006), and the Multicultural Personality Scale (MPQ; Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2000, 2001; Van Oudenhoven & Van der Zee, 2002) seem most promising. Despite some conceptual overlap between the dimensions included in these instruments, their names reveal their slightly different foci – which is why it is crucial to select a tool that fits learning outcomes, target group, and setting of the specific intervention.

To ensure satisfactory alignment, then proposal development phase of this dissertation was used to pilot-test two of these three scales, i.e. the CQS and MPQ, with a convenience sample of undergraduate students at Jacobs University Bremen. Not only did the MPQ show rather poor psychometric qualities, its focus on personality also did not really match the focus on learnable aspects of intercultural competence in this project. The evidence-based course design described in chapter 4 has built upon baseline data from the potential target group. Assessment in this project started before the exact learning goals had been specified because learning goals have partly been developed based on the baseline findings. Therefore, selecting an instrument happened prior to defining learning outcomes and the guiding principle was to find a tool that is suited to measure abilities that can be trained (as opposed to measuring traits) – resulting in choosing the Test to Measure Intercultural Competence in its short form, TMIC-S (Schnabel, Kelava, van de Vijver, & Seifert, 2015).
The original 75-item TMIC has been developed based on relevant theories, expert interviews with intercultural trainers, and a quantitative pre-test with employees of an intercultural training company. It then was tested further in two studies resulting in a six-dimensional model with 17 different facets (Schnabel, Kelava, Seifert, & Kuhlbrodt, 2015). Subsequently, it was condensed into a 25-item scale with one facet per dimension, based on theoretical reasoning and validated using data obtained from a German and a Brazilian sample, demonstrating its validity and showing that is distinct yet correlated to cultural intelligence dimensions (Schnabel, Kelava, van de Vijver, et al., 2015). In addition to the 25 self-report items, the TMIC-S includes one situational judgment test (SJT) per dimension, presenting respondents with a short description of a situation and four behavioral options asking them to select how they would behave – a measure assumed to offer additional information on behavioral intentions (Schnabel, Kelava, van de Vijver, et al., 2015). Table 3.2 (on the next page) offers an overview of the six dimensions and facets measured in the TMIC-S.

The facets measured in the TMIC-S capture various elements of intercultural competence as described in Deardorff’s Pyramid Model (cf. figure 2.1). Cultural identity-reflection (CIR) can be linked to cultural self-awareness, while information-seeking (IS) relates to curiosity and discovery. Socializing is conceptually similar to openness and ability to relate, whereas sensitivity in communication (SC) is related to adaptability. Mediation of interests (MI) and goal setting (GS) entail skills which might be linked to skills to listen, observe, and interpret as well as to flexibility and adaptability. Yet, in contrast to the Pyramid Model, the TMIC-S consists of a six-dimensional framework conceptualizing intercultural competence in terms of communication, learning, social interaction, self-knowledge, self-management, and creating synergies.
Table 3.2. TMIC-S dimensions (adapted from Schnabel, Kelava, van de Vijver, et al., 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Definition of the dimension</th>
<th>Facet measured in TMIC-S</th>
<th>Definition of the facet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Captures verbal and non-verbal aspects, including sensitivity, clarity, flexibility and perspective-taking in communication</td>
<td>Sensitivity in communication (SC)</td>
<td>To put oneself in the position of another person in order to understand him or her better; high sensibility for verbal and nonverbal communication aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Intercultural interaction often means being confronted with unknown, thus requiring willingness to learn and strategies for doing so</td>
<td>Information-seeking (IS)</td>
<td>Purposeful collection of information about a foreign country or another culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social interaction</td>
<td>Building personal relationships and networks with others</td>
<td>Socializing (SZ)</td>
<td>Establishing and maintaining contact with people from other cultures quickly and easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-knowledge</td>
<td>Actively reflecting upon and understanding one’s own cultural identity</td>
<td>Cultural identity reflection (CIR)</td>
<td>Intensively and constantly reflecting upon one’s own cultural character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-management</td>
<td>Ability to deal with challenges and problems</td>
<td>Goal setting (GS)</td>
<td>Having clear goals and being able to implement them consistently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating synergies</td>
<td>Ability to recognize potential misunderstandings and lead a group towards common goals and successful collaboration</td>
<td>Mediation of different interests (MI)</td>
<td>Mediating between parties in order to achieve the greatest possible benefit from different approaches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that each measurement instrument has its own distinct focus in terms of which aspects of intercultural competence are measured, it seemed worthwhile to include a second scale in this research. On the one hand, this was assumed to help in gaining a more comprehensive picture of students’ intercultural competence development. On the other hand, data from both instruments could be used to cross-validate the scales. Therefore, the Short Form Cultural Intelligence scale (SFCQ) was included in the assessment plan. It seemed to suit the target group and learning context better than the original Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) in two ways: First, its items have been phrased more culture-general, therefore appearing more suited
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for a culture-general course in a highly diverse university. The pilot-test using the CQS revealed that some students reported difficulty to respond to some CQS items which refer to aspects such as “knowing the legal systems of other countries”, leading students to wonder how many of the over 100 countries represented on campus they would have to know to agree with this statement. Second, the SFCQ excluded the motivational facet based on the assumption that motivation is related to cultural intelligence but not necessarily part of it (D. C. Thomas et al., 2015). In this intervention, students self-selected into participation by choosing the intercultural competence course as an elective class. Their motivation to take the course could be intrinsic (e.g. seeking to improve one’s abilities to make friends on a multicultural campus or succeed in multicultural group work) and/or extrinsic (e.g. putting intercultural competence on one’s CV). Regardless of the exact nature of their motivation, the aspect of motivation indeed seemed secondary to exploring how students’ knowledge, skills, and ability to practice intercultural competence develop throughout the course. These three dimensions could be captured by the SFCQ, which is based on the definition that “[c]ultural intelligence is the ability that individuals have to interact effectively across cultural contexts and with culturally different individuals” (D. C. Thomas et al., 2015, p. 1100).

The SFCQ encompasses three facets, cultural knowledge, cultural skills, and metacognition, as shown in table 3.3. Cultural knowledge includes culture-specific and culture-general knowledge, including recognizing the existence of other cultures, knowledge of cultural differences, and complexity of that knowledge. Cultural skills were derived from reviewing the literature and narrowed down to relational skills, tolerance of uncertainty, adaptability, empathy, and perceptual acuity. Cultural metacognition is a key dimension in the model, defined as “knowledge of and control over one’s thinking and learning activities in the specific domain of cultural experiences and strategies” (D. C. Thomas et al., 2015, p. 1102), and measured by awareness of cultural context, conscious analysis of the influence of the cultural context, and planning courses of action in different cultural contexts. Thus, cultural
metacognition seems to capture abilities to practice intercultural competence in specific situations. On a conceptual level, the SFCQ aligns well with the conceptualization of intercultural competence described in chapter 2 by including knowledge, skills, and metacognition (which can be related to attitudes and intrapersonal abilities). The three dimensions are measured with a ten-item self-report scale which has been validated across 14 samples with a total n=3526, representing multiple countries, including general population, students, and employees, and demonstrating the SFCQ’s content and construct validity, robustness across cultures and languages, as well as its potential to predict intercultural effectiveness (D. C. Thomas et al., 2015).

In addition to these two scales to measure intercultural competence, all questionnaires included measures of self-efficacy (GSES; Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995), subjective well-being (Flourishing scale; Diener et al., 2009), as well as personality traits (TIPI; Gosling, Rentfrow, & Swann, 2003). Perceived self-efficacy, defined as “people’s beliefs about their capabilities to exercise control over their own level of functioning and over events that affect their lives” (Bandura, 1993, p. 118), has been added assuming that it might be related to intercultural competence for different reasons. On the one hand, several scholars have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge (K)</td>
<td>Culture-specific and culture-general knowledge, including recognizing the existence of other culture, knowledge of cultural differences, and complexity of that knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills (S)</td>
<td>Relational skills, tolerance of uncertainty, adaptability, empathy, perceptual acuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognition (MC)</td>
<td>Knowledge of and control over one’s thinking and learning activities in the specific domain of cultural experiences and strategies, measured by awareness of cultural context, conscious analysis of the influence of the cultural context, and planning courses of action in different cultural contexts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3. Short Form Cultural Intelligence (SFCQ) dimensions (based on D. C. Thomas et al., 2015)
suggested that individuals with higher self-efficacy are more likely to seek intercultural
contact, experience less anxiety in intercultural interaction, and find it easier to adapt to new
cultural environments (Briones, Tabernero, Tramontano, Caprara, & Arenas, 2009; Milstein,
2005; Yashima, 2010). On the other hand, any experience of successful intercultural
interaction might contribute to greater confidence in one’s ability to do so, therefore
increasing people’s perceived self-efficacy (Milstein, 2005; Yashima, 2010). To be able to
explore this potential relationship between intercultural competence and perceived self-
efficacy, the questionnaires included the General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES), a 10-item
measure designed to assess a general sense of perceived self-efficacy (Schwarzer &
Jerusalem, 1995). Likewise, a couple of authors have discussed how the Big Five personality
traits might be related to intercultural competence (van der Zee & van Oudenhoven, 2013; J.
Wilson, Ward, & Fischer, 2013). While including a full measure of the Big Five seemed
beyond the scope of the questionnaire, it seemed worthwhile to include a short measure of the
Big Five to explore potential relationships with intercultural competence measures in this
research. Therefore, the questionnaires included the Ten Item Personality Inventory by
Gosling et al. (2003). Finally, one could argue that higher intercultural competence should
enable students to have more positive intercultural interactions and establish and maintain
positive relationships on campus, thus contributing to their subjective well-being. To explore
if there is any evidence in support of this assumption, the Flourishing scale by Diener et al.
(2009) has been included in the questionnaire to measure subjective well-being.

For the pre-, post-test and follow-up questionnaires, some more scales were added in
an attempt to capture concepts related to the notion of intercultural practice from the Personal
Leadership methodology described in chapter 2 (Schaetti et al., 2008, 2009). To measure
mindfulness, the 15-item Mindfulness Attention Awareness Scale (MAAS) by Brown and
Ryan (2003) was added to the questionnaire. To measure self-awareness and self-knowledge,
the 12-item Integrative Self-Knowledge Scale was added (Ghorbani, Watson, & Hargis,
Ghorbani et al. (Ghorbani et al., 2008) define integrative self-knowledge “as an adaptive and empowering attempt of the self to understand its experience across time to achieve desired outcomes” (p. 397). Finally, six items were taken from the Emotional Intelligence Scale (Schutte et al., 1998) to measure emotion recognition and emotion regulation of one’s own emotions. These were complemented by the ten-item emotion regulation questionnaire (ERQ; Gross & John, 2003), measuring individuals’ ability to regulate their emotions through cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression. Adding measures of mindfulness, integrative self-knowledge, and emotion recognition and regulation has been done to potentially capture elements of Personal Leadership’s intercultural practice, such as being mindful and attentive to one’s judgments and emotions. It furthermore allowed exploring if any of these are related to intercultural competence measures in this research, especially in the summative evaluation in chapter 6.
Chapter 4

Evidence-Based Design
4. Evidence-Based Design: Designing an Intercultural Competence Course for Undergraduate Students

This chapter addresses research question RQ1 of how to design a formal curriculum intervention following an evidence-based approach. The focus is on the design phase of the elective course on intercultural competence for undergraduate university students at Jacobs University Bremen, an international university in Northern Germany. The chapter is structured along the six-step process by Stephan and Stephan (2013) as visualized in figure 4.1. In step 1, the target group is identified, followed by step 2 of deriving the learning goals of the intervention. In step 3, relevant theories are selected which inform the course design and content. Steps 4 and 5 aim at identifying the processes and activities that foster achievement of the learning goals. In this project, steps 4 and 5 were informed by empirical evidence from the target group which has been gathered in two studies, a mixed methods survey study and a qualitative focus group study. This chapter focuses on steps 1-5, i.e. the design phase. The full process as shown in figure 4.1 includes an evaluation of the intervention in step 6. The subsequent chapters offer more details on the evaluation phase, presenting results of the formative (chapter 5) and summative evaluation (chapter 6) of the intervention.

![Figure 4.1. Six-step evidence-based design process (based on Stephan & Stephan, 2013)](image)

As discussed in chapter 2.5, research has frequently documented low levels of intercultural contact among local and international students across countries attracting high numbers of international students, such as Australia, New Zealand, the UK, the USA and Germany,
suggesting that the potential for intercultural learning on culturally diverse campuses has often not been fully exploited (J. C. Brown & Daly, 2005; Campbell, 2012; Halualani et al., 2004a, 2004b; Harrison & Peacock, 2010; Heublein et al., 2007; Hiller, 2011; Ippolito, 2007; Leask, 2009; Marginson, 2007; Otten, 2000; Stumpf et al., 2011; Todd & Nesdale, 1997; Ward & Masgoret, 2004; Westwood & Barker, 1990; Z. Zhang & Brunton, 2007). And even if contact occurs, intercultural interaction does not automatically result in higher intercultural competence among students. In fact, students might experience discomfort and uncertainty when communicating and collaborating with culturally different others (King et al., 2011). This sense of discomfort has been assumed to originate from becoming increasingly aware that other cultures have different fundamental assumptions, worldview, and beliefs – thereby threatening our deeply-rooted ethnocentrism (Albert, 1986; M. J. Bennett, 1993). Thus, intercultural learning can be psychologically stressful to students who might feel challenged in their identities and worldview, become more self-aware, and realize how much more there is to learn to interact successfully across cultures (Paige, 1993).

Indeed, various studies have demonstrated that interventions need to go beyond encouraging intercultural interaction and actively support students in their intercultural learning process. Instructors need to provide opportunities for guided reflection for students to make meaning from their experience and support students in developing the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to increase their intercultural competence (Harrison & Peacock, 2010; Jackson, 2015a; Jon, 2013; King et al., 2011; Leask, 2009, 2010; Osmond & Roed, 2010; Pedersen, 2009; Summers & Volet, 2008; Yan Lo-Philip et al., 2015). Yet, formal curriculum interventions targeting intercultural competence often suffer from a lack of clarity on the specific learning goals and remain rather vague when it comes to what exactly students are expected to learn and how progress can be assessed (Deardorff, 2006, 2011; Gregersen-Hermans, 2017; Pedersen, 2009).
By now, there are noteworthy exceptions with a rising number of publications on formal and informal curriculum interventions to foster students’ intercultural competence. Research has demonstrated positive effects of peer mentoring or “buddy” programs (Campbell, 2012; Devlin, 1997; Geelhoed, Abe, & Talbot, 2003; Glaser, Hall, & Halperin, 2006; Shigaki & Smith, 1997; Stone, 2000; Westwood & Barker, 1990), residence hall interventions (Todd & Nesdale, 1997), campus-wide intercultural programs (Jon, 2013; Klak & Martin, 2003) and multicultural group work (Rienties et al., 2012; Stumpf et al., 2011; Summers & Volet, 2008; Yi Wang, Harding, & Mai, 2012). However, interventions aiming to support students’ intercultural competence development still tend to be isolated, individual measures, oftentimes focusing on the voluntary informal curriculum and targeting the integration of international students (Hiller, 2011; Ramirez R., 2016; M. M. Zhang et al., 2016). Furthermore, publications on formal curriculum interventions (as reviewed in chapter 2.5) tend to focus on the evaluation stage without elaborating on the details of the design process. On the one hand, this might at least partly be due to limited space in journal publications. Thus, one of the contributions of this research is to dedicate a whole chapter of the dissertation to describing the design process in detail. On the other hand, it seems that the majority of intercultural trainings or programs has been designed based on intuition (i.e. whatever feels right) and familiarity (i.e. choosing methods and activities one is familiar with), rather than grounding it in available theories and evidence (Chang, 2017; Gudykunst, Guzley, & Hammer, 1996; Kratochwill & Shernoff, 2003; D Landis & Bhawuk, 2004; Stephan & Stephan, 2013). As Landis and Bhawuk (2004) have observed, despite “a continued concern … with the building of theories and models that can inform training … the bridging of theory and practice … is yet to be achieved” (pp. 463-464). One way to bridge theory and practice is employing an evidence-based approach to course design. Using an evidence-based approach encourages those who design learning interventions to be specific and clear about the target group and learning objectives. The target group and learning
objectives in turn drive the selection of theories and empirical evidence that inform the selection of learning activities used in the intervention. Furthermore, the evidence-based approach includes an evaluation stage offering an opportunity to contribute to our scientific understanding of the effectiveness of different learning interventions.

Yet, evidence-based interventions still seem scarce, be it in schools (Kratochwill & Shernoff, 2003), business settings (Chang, 2017), or universities (Deardorff, 2006, 2011; Gregersen-Hermans, 2017). Therefore, a major contribution of this research project is to demonstrate and describe the use of an evidence-based approach for designing (and evaluating) an intercultural competence course for university students, following the six steps suggested by Stephan and Stephan (2013). It thereby offers an example of how to develop an intercultural competence learning intervention based on evidence from theories, prior research and data gathered from the target group. Using such an evidence-based approach helps to ensure that the resulting intervention has clear learning goals that are appropriate for the target group and that the overall design, learning activities, and assessment plan are aligned with these learning goals. The learning intervention designed in this project is an elective course for undergraduate students at Jacobs University Bremen, Germany. Jacobs University Bremen requires all incoming freshmen students to participate in an intercultural awareness training during their orientation week. Previous research has demonstrated its usefulness in promoting intercultural contact among students and preparing them to live and study on a multicultural campus (Binder et al., 2013; Kedzior et al., 2015). Building upon this introductory training, the intervention designed in this research project seeks to contribute to a more sustainable intercultural learning process by offering an elective course for students of all majors in their second semester. The course has first been offered in spring 2016 and evaluated with a group of n=34 students from 18 different nationalities.
4.1. Evidence-Based Design Process: Introduction and Step 1

The following sections offer an in-depth account on how to apply the six-stage process for designing evidence-based intercultural learning programs suggested by Stephan and Stephan (2013). In the first step, the target group of the course was identified – in this case undergraduate students in their second semester of study, of any study program and cultural background. In the second step, goals of the course were developed, and in the third step relevant theories were selected. Those steps provided the basis for step four which included identifying relevant psychological and communication processes that should be activated in learners. In step five, techniques and activities were chosen to activate these processes and in step six, the outcomes were evaluated. The subsequent sections draw upon existing literature to address steps two and three, use empirical data gathered from the target group to discuss steps four and five, and briefly present some results from the evaluation in step six. However, in this research, the evaluation stage has been divided into formative and summative evaluation which are presented in more detail in chapters 5 and 6.

4.2. Step 2: Goals of the Course

Acknowledging the diversity of intercultural competence models which have been extensively reviewed elsewhere (e.g. Scheitza, 2009; Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009), the course has mainly been designed on the basis of Deardorff’s Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence (Deardorff, 2006), complemented by the notion of intercultural practice as discussed by the founders of the Personal Leadership methodology. Personal Leadership is a self-reflective method of taking control of one’s own experience by being more mindful and creative, enabling better communication and relationships with others (Schaetti et al., 2009). Chapter 2.3 and 2.4 have provided more details on the theoretical framework on intercultural competence underlying this research, thus this section only highlights relevant key aspects.
The Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence shown in figure 4.2 offers a well-established framework specifying 22 components of intercultural competence that achieved at least 80% agreement among scholars from the intercultural field who participated in a Delphi study (Deardorff, 2006). These 22 items were arranged into the Pyramid Model with attitudes such as respect, openness, and curiosity as the “fundamental starting point” (Deardorff, 2006, p. 255). This foundation is complemented by knowledge, including cultural self-awareness and deep cultural knowledge, and skills, such as being able to listen, observe, and evaluate. In addition, there are so-called internal outcomes such as flexibility, adaptability, and empathy. All of these, i.e. attitudes, knowledge, skills, and internal outcomes, contribute to the desired external outcomes of effective and appropriate communication and behavior (Deardorff, 2006).

Figure 4.2. Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence (adapted from Deardorff, 2006, p. 254)
Yet, the Pyramid Model offers rather little insight into how individuals use these intercultural competence elements in actual intercultural encounters. This is why the notion of intercultural practice from the Personal Leadership methodology by Schaetti et al. (2008, 2009) has been added to complement the theoretical framework of intercultural competence in this project. Schaetti et al. (2008, 2009) conceptualized intercultural competence as consisting of culture-specific knowledge, culture-general knowledge, and an intercultural practice in which this knowledge is used to behave in an interculturally competent manner. Figure 4.3 offers a visualization of the Personal Leadership notion of intercultural competence on the left side as well as its reflective process which is presented in more detail in the following section.

Figure 4.3. Personal Leadership model and reflective process (based on Schaetti et al., 2008)
Personal Leadership has first been introduced in the late 1990s based on action research done at the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication (SIIC) in the USA. The aim of this action research was to explore why people who were highly motivated to successfully communicate across cultures still had difficulty transferring their motivation and knowledge into practice. An underlying assumption of the Personal Leadership approach is that “no amount of culture-specific and culture-general knowledge will save us, no amount of preplanning will serve us, unless we have an intercultural practice that helps us translate it into moment-to-moment competence” (Schaetti et al., 2009, p. 136). In their book on Personal Leadership, Schaetti et al. (2008) argued that as much as individuals might enjoy interacting with culturally different others, they nevertheless tend to rely on habitual patterns and ways of reacting. As a consequence, they might find themselves immersed in resistance-related judgments, emotions, and physical sensations, long before being aware that something has challenged them (Schaetti et al., 2008). This is in line with Bennett’s (M. J. Bennett, 1993) view that intercultural sensitivity requires us to overcome our deeply-rooted ethnocentrism. While Bennett (M. J. Bennett, 1993) merely concluded that students need support in their learning process towards more ethnorelativism, Schaetti et al. (2008) developed a reflective process, guided by question of the so-called Critical Moment Dialogue (CMD). This process encourages learners to recognize if “something’s up”, i.e. if they feel challenged, irritated, inspired etc., and pay mindful attention to their judgments, emotions, and psychical sensations (Schaetti et al., 2008, 2009). The CMD offers a range of questions to reflect on what is going on and disentangle from any automatic reaction. It encourages learners to critically reflect on their habitual patterns, asking what these patterns reveal about expectations, assumptions, values, and beliefs. In addition, it includes questions on what learners know about the situation and the people involved and, more importantly, what they do not know. Table 4.1 offers an overview of the CMD, its topics and sample questions that guide the reflective process. The aim of that reflective process is to give a sense of clarity and support individuals
in taking a deliberate decision of what to do next – as shown in the last two rows of table 4.1.

Schaetti et al. (2009) have pointed out that in some cases we might end up with the same action as our automatic response, but “having invited reflection and released ourselves from habit, we can be sure that we’re responding to the situation with as much intercultural competence as possible” (Schaetti et al., 2009, p. 136).

Table 4.1. Critical Moment Dialogue (CMD) questions (based on Schaetti et al., 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions to guide reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attending to judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending to emotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending to physical sensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligning with vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating stillness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the end of the reflection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discerning right action</th>
<th>What, if anything, is the right thing for me to do or say?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learnings</td>
<td>What have I learned from this reflection? In what ways am I more able to adjust my behaviors to suit the unique moment?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on these models of intercultural competence, the following goals have been derived for the elective course on intercultural competence: Upon successful completion of the course, students were expected to (1) have an in-depth understanding of how culture influences how we feel, think, and act, (2) be able to relate this knowledge to their everyday experience in a multicultural environment, and (3) be familiar with the Personal Leadership methodology and Critical Moment Dialogue and be able to apply it to their own experience to establish an intercultural practice.
4.3. Step 3: Selecting Relevant Theories

The intercultural competence models discussed above have served as a general framework for deriving the overarching goals of the course. In step 3, more specific literature on designing intercultural learning experiences has been reviewed to identify relevant theories to designing this course. While there is huge diversity of intercultural trainings, some authors have offered systematic approaches to describe intercultural trainings based on differences in content and methods. Concerning content, a frequently used distinction is between culture-general and culture-specific training. Culture-general training refers to input on cultural self-awareness, culture’s influence on thinking, feeling, and acting as well as on cultural differences in general. Culture-specific interventions, in contrast, focus on conveying information about specific countries or regions and offer advice on how to interact with people from these cultures (Brislin & Pedersen, 1976; Fowler & Blohm, 2004; Graf, 2004; Gudykunst & Hammer, 1983; Kinast, 2010; Triandis, 1977). For the intervention designed in this project, a culture-general approach seems most suitable for the target group as students at Jacobs University Bremen live and study on a campus with fellow students from over 100 countries.

4.3.1. The Role of Experiential Learning

With regard to the approach to training, a distinction has been made between didactic (or knowledge-based) and experiential (or experience-based) approaches (Fowler & Blohm, 2004; Graf, 2004; Gudykunst et al., 1996; Gudykunst & Hammer, 1983; Kinast, 2010). While didactic training approaches focus on cognitive learning and assume that providing knowledge enables participants to succeed in intercultural interactions, experiential approaches use “structured activities to confront the trainees with situations that may be encountered in a foreign culture” (Gudykunst & Hammer, 1983, p. 124), creating an experience that can be debriefed and from which participants can learn. Experiences are created through simulations, role-plays, observation, and other activities, but also include any
real-life experience that participants bring to the training. The didactic approach to intercultural training typically uses methods like lectures, readings, videos, and discussion techniques which are also frequently used in traditional university teaching (Gudykunst & Hammer, 1983). While the didactic approach focuses on cognitive learning, the experiential approach also involves learners emotionally and behaviorally (Gudykunst et al., 1996). Given that intercultural competence consists of cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions, intercultural learning interventions at universities should extend didactic approaches by including experiential elements. This has received support from research suggesting that effective intercultural training uses a blend of both, the didactic and experiential approach (Fowler & Blohm, 2004; Graf, 2004; Root & Ngampornchai, 2013).

Design-wise these insights led to the decision to complement traditional, knowledge-oriented modes of instruction by experiential elements. According to Bennett (2012), combining didactic and experiential approaches could mean to create experiences that increase students’ curiosity or help them in reducing anxiety in unfamiliar situations, to select relevant concepts and theories than students can use to make meaning from their experiences inside and outside the classroom. The notion of creating experiences which are reflected upon and linked to relevant concepts has been captured in Kolb’s learning cycle, as depicted in figure 4.4. Kolb’s learning cycle is based on Experiential Learning Theory (ELT) which views learning as a process of constant learning and relearning which can best be facilitated by actively including learners in the process, drawing upon their ideas and experiences about the topic and encouraging them to reexamine those ideas and integrate them with new information (A. Kolb & Kolb, 2005). More specifically, individuals assimilate new experiences into existing concepts and accommodate existing concepts to new experiences, whereby they create and construct their own knowledge. In short, ELT defines learning as “the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience” (D. Kolb, 1984, p. 41).
The learning process can be visualized in a learning cycle as shown in figure 4.4. Concrete experience provides the basis for reflective observation which serves to assimilate the experience and observations into abstract concepts (abstract conceptualization) which can then be drawn upon for active experimentation which in turn leads to a new experience. In the context of students’ intercultural learning this could mean that students (1) watch a video about stereotyping (concrete experience), (2) share their feelings, thoughts, and observations about the video (reflective observation), (3) are encouraged to relate it to what they have already learned about stereotypes in class and derive their own insights on how to deal with stereotypes (abstract conceptualization), (4) and then can experiment with those ideas in a follow-up activity (active experimentation). Research has demonstrated individual and cultural differences in preferences for different parts of this learning cycle (Barmeyer, 2004; A. Kolb & Kolb, 2005; Yamazaki, 2005). Thus, intercultural learning experiences should
ideally consist of multiple learning cycles to promote the complex process of intercultural competence development (Gregersen-Hermans & Pusch, 2012). In sum, the course design should be learner-oriented, actively drawing on participants’ experience and encouraging meaning-making by supporting students in linking their experience to existing and new knowledge.

4.3.2. Combining Faculty- and Peer-led Instruction

Based on these considerations, the course has been designed to combine traditional faculty-led classes with peer-led, experiential workshops. Combining the two modes of instruction has allowed to blend didactic and experiential methods. While faculty seemed best qualified to convey knowledge and content than can be drawn upon in the experiential sessions, it has been assumed that those experiential sessions might be well-facilitated by peers. Jacobs University Bremen has already used peer-led instruction in its intercultural awareness training during the orientation week for incoming new students. A qualitative exploratory study and subsequent quantitative research on the use of peer-trainers in that context have found strong support for the format (Binder et al., 2013; Kedzior et al., 2015). Students who participated in the interview study by Binder et al. (2013) agreed that their peer-trainers were credible role-models who shared their experience and understood their concerns. They further highlighted the comfortable atmosphere of the training and the majority perceived their trainers to be competent and approachable during and after the training (Binder et al., 2013). These results were confirmed by a subsequent quantitative study with a different cohort of students at Jacobs University Bremen. Participants rated the format of using peers as trainers positively, agreed that they were well-prepared and competent, and expressed interest in becoming peer-trainers themselves (Kedzior et al., 2015). Though it seems that other universities in Germany have also used peer-instructors in intercultural training sessions, Hiller (2010) is one of the few to write about their experience with this format at the Europe University Viadrina. Her
anecdotal evidence has offered support for the assumption that peer-instructors can create a valuable learning experience for the participants while simultaneously developing their own skills further.

Generally, however, there seems to be little to no research on the benefits and challenges of integrating peer-led instruction into intercultural competence courses at universities. Yet, there has been a long-standing tradition of research on other forms of peer-led instruction offering insights into potential benefits and challenges. Studies on more traditional forms of peer-led instruction such as tutoring or seminars with teaching assistants have demonstrated positive effects for learners such as reduced anxiety, improved retention and performance, more creativity, higher confidence and more willingness to try difficult tasks, as well as satisfaction and enjoyment with peer teaching situations (Goldschmid & Goldschmid, 1976; McKenna & Williams, 2017; Topping, 1996). Furthermore, findings from studies on peer-mentoring programs pairing up local and international or junior and senior students suggested that peer-mentors can support first-year or international students in their transition, for example by helping them reduce anxiety, make social contacts, access university services, and integrate into the campus community (Calder, 2004; Glaser et al., 2006; Husband & Jacobs, 2009). This is in line with findings on peer-led instruction showing its potential in connecting students and ease incoming students transition into university life (Byl et al., 2015; Goldschmid & Goldschmid, 1976). In their review of evidence on peer-assisted learning as a tool for social and academic integration, Byl et al. (2015) found support for peers’ ability to create an intimate atmosphere for first-year students which is conducive to reflection and establishing relationships. In addition, studies have shown that those who teach also learn. These studies have yielded evidence for a range of positive effects for peer-instructors, including increased knowledge and expertise in the subject they teach, improvements in communication and teaching skills, as well as increases in self-esteem and confidence (Ford, Thackeray, Barnes, & Hendrickx, 2015; Goldschmid & Goldschmid, 1976;
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Topping, 1996). Likewise, research on peer-mentoring has shown that peer-mentors benefit from the experience as well, including developing their communication skills, knowledge on other cultures, and self-confidence (Glaser et al., 2006; Husband & Jacobs, 2009; Quintrell & Westwood, 1994).

Another reasoning that has led to the assumption that peer-instructor might well be suited to facilitate experiential sessions on intercultural competence lies in the nature of intercultural learning. In comparison to most subjects taught at university, intercultural learning requires learners much more to get out of their comfort zone. On the one hand, intercultural learning is inherently challenging to learners, confronting them with threats to their sense of self and reality and encouraging rising levels of self-awareness (Paige, 1993). On the other hand, Bennett (2012) has argued that instructors need to push people out of their comfort zone for learning to occur and avoid that learners get bored. Yet, at the same time, instructors need to be careful to not over-challenge learners and risk resistance to participation and learning. The art of facilitating intercultural learning is to “balance[e] challenge and support in the program [which] reduces resistance, limits frustration, and enhances the potential for deeper learning” (J. M. Bennett, 2012, p. 16).

While challenges are built into the intervention through the selection of content and learning activities, it can be assumed that peers might be able to provide a unique type of support in the learning process. They share students’ experience and language and can create a safe atmosphere in a community of peers. Over the last decades, research on various forms of peer-teaching (i.e. more advanced students tutoring or teaching less advanced students) and peer-learning (i.e. collaborative learning on the same level) has offered support for the unique role peers can play in university education. There has been consensus that peer-teaching and peer-learning do not replace but rather complement traditional forms of teaching by creating spaces in which students feel more confident to ask questions or admit they did not understand something to peers of a similar age and educational achievement (Boud, 2001;
Goldschmid & Goldschmid, 1976). More recently, McKenna and Williams (2017) have concluded that existing research suggests “that the social proximity or cognitive congruence of peers to the experiences of learners may assist their understanding of learners’ difficulties, along with their ability to relate better to learners, than academic staff” (pp. 77-78). Likewise, Brown et al. (2014) discussed research offering support for peer instructors’ higher cognitive and social congruence, meaning they are better able to anticipate which materials learners might find difficult and adapt it to their needs (cognitive congruence) and can create a comfortable, safe learning environment where students can express themselves freely (social congruence).

Based on Social Learning Theory by Bandura (1971, 1977), one could further argue that peers act as role models who are able to get learners’ attention, motivate them by authentically conveying the relevance of the content to everyday life at the university as well as create a safe learning environment where learners can experiment with new behaviors. This has received further support from research showing that peer instructors can act as role models who create a comfortable learning environment in which learners experience less anxiety (McKenna & Williams, 2017). In their study, McKenna and Williams (2017) found that peer instructors were perceived as role models who share learners’ experience, are easier to relate to than faculty, and who can offer guidance on what to expect in the future, such as difficult situations during one’s studies or in the chosen professional field. Overall, such findings support the idea that peers can act as role models who have faced similar challenges and situations and therefore can authentically convey to students why it is worth to get out of their comfort zone and develop their intercultural competence. At the same time, they can contribute to a learning environment in which students feel comfortable to talk about challenges, fears, or struggles.
4.3.3. Encouraging Reflection and Meaning-Making

As presented above, the course design has been done based on Kolb’s learning cycle, acknowledging that it is neither sufficient for students to cognitively learn about intercultural competence nor to merely experience cultural diversity on campus. Instead, the course has been designed in a way that it creates opportunities for students to have a concrete experience or activate their memory of intercultural experiences they have had outside the classroom while putting emphasis on reflection and making connections to existing knowledge (e.g. from faculty-led lectures). Students’ personal intercultural experience offers huge potential for intercultural learning, but experience per se does not automatically fuel the learning process. To learn from experience, students need to reflect upon it and create meaning – a process which should be initiated and facilitated in the classroom and beyond (Otten, 2000). In terms of course design, the reflection component has been integrated by making sure there is sufficient time for debriefing in the experiential sessions. Furthermore, exams have been replaced with weekly reflective tasks, asking students to link what they have read for the lectures or experienced in the workshops to their existing knowledge and experience.

Reviewing the literature on intercultural learning and training design allowed to address step 3 in the evidence-based design process and identify additional relevant theories for the course design. At the end of step 3, the preliminary course design consists of a blend of didactic and experiential approaches to intercultural learning, with faculty teaching knowledge-based lectures and peers facilitating experience-based workshops. Furthermore, reflection is actively encouraged in debriefings and homework assignments. In the next section, this course design is refined based on empirical data gathered from the target group in two studies (step 4 and step 5).
4.4. Step 4: Identifying Processes based on Empirical Data

The following section describes the first of two studies which served to obtain empirical data from the target group to further develop and refine the course design. The two studies have informed steps 4 and 5 in which processes and activities are identified that facilitate achievement of learning goals. Study 1 used a paper-and-pen questionnaire containing two quantitative measures of intercultural competence and a qualitative open question on students’ subjective understanding of intercultural competence. Study 2 employed focus groups to discuss students’ needs and ideas for an intercultural competence course.

4.4.1. Methods

Participants

In the first study, all incoming freshmen undergraduate students at Jacobs University Bremen, Germany, were sampled in late August 2015. During their orientation week, n=270 students were invited to participate in the mandatory one-day intercultural awareness training. Prior to the start of the training, they were given the baseline questionnaire which n=133 students filled in (response rate: 49%). As summarized in table 4.2, the final sample had an age range of 17 to 25 years with a mean age of 18.7 years. 46% of the final sample were female (n=61), 84% grew up with a monocultural background (n=110), i.e. they were born in the same country as both their parents, 77% were raised monolingual at home (n=100), 45% had experience living abroad prior to coming to the university (n=58), and 21% previously had participated in intercultural trainings (n=27). Students in the sample were relatively evenly spread across the three focus areas of the university, each of which comprises various study programs under one common theme (i.e. Mobility, Health, and Diversity).
Table 4.2. Sample characteristics in study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>n=133</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Range: 17-25 years; mean = 18.7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>46% female (n=61; male n=71, 54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Area(^5)</td>
<td>Mobility (BSc majors): 46 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health (BSc majors): 36 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity (BA majors): 41 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other: 9 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural identity(*)</td>
<td>Monocultural: 110 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bi-/Multicultural: 21 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language at home</td>
<td>Monolingual: 100 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multilingual: 29 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living abroad experience</td>
<td>Yes: 58 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 72 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous training</td>
<td>Yes: 27 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 103 (79%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(*based on own nationality, country of birth, and country of origin of both parents

Data collection

The paper-and-pen questionnaire comprised a variety of closed-ended questions, demographics, as well as one open-ended question. The open-ended question asked students to define intercultural competence ("Please describe in your own words what ‘intercultural competence’ means to you"). The closed-ended questions included two scales to measure intercultural competence, the 25-item Short Form Test to Measure Intercultural Competence, TMIC-S (Schnabel, Kelava, van de Vijver, et al., 2015), and the 10-item Short Form Cultural Intelligence Scale, SFCQ (D. C. Thomas et al., 2015). The rationale of using these two scales to measure intercultural competence has been discussed in detail in chapter 3.3. On the one

\(^5\) Jacobs University Bremen clusters its 16 undergraduate programs into three so-called focus areas. The focus area “mobility” is concerned with mobility of people, goods, and information and includes Bachelor of Science (BSc) programs such as “Industrial Engineering & Management”, “Mathematics”, “Computer Science”, and others. The focus area “health” is concerned with bioactive substances and captures BSc programs such as “Biochemistry and Cell Biology”, “Chemistry”, “Physics”, “Earth and Environmental Sciences”, and others. The focus area “diversity” looks at diversity in modern societies and includes Bachelor of Arts (BA) programs such as “Global Economics & Management”, “Integrated Social Sciences”, “International Relations: Politics & History”, “Psychology”, and others. For more information, please visit the university’s website: www.jacobs-university.de
hand, each measurement instrument focuses on slightly different aspects of intercultural competence. Thus, including more than one measure allows to gain a more comprehensive picture of students’ intercultural competence development. On the other hand, data from both instruments can be used to cross-validate the scales.

The TMIC-S measures learnable facets of intercultural competence across six dimensions (i.e. communication, learning, social interaction, self-knowledge, self-management, and creating synergies). In contrast to the original 75-item version, the TMIC-S captures one facet per dimension, i.e. sensitivity in communication, information-seeking, socializing, cultural identity reflection, goal-setting, and mediation of different interests. Its validity has been demonstrated using data from a German and a Brazilian sample, further showing that it is distinct yet correlated to cultural intelligence dimensions (Schnabel, Kelava, van de Vijver, et al., 2015). Table 4.3 summarizes the TMIC-S dimensions and facets and shows sample items for each facet. Answers to the TMIC-S were recorded on 6-point Likert scale (1 “does not apply at all” to 6 “fully applies”) and Cronbach’s alpha was 0.83 for the baseline assessment.

Table 4.3. TMIC-S sample items (adapted from Schnabel, Kelava, van de Vijver, et al., 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Facet measured in the TMIC-S</th>
<th>Sample item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Sensitivity in communication (SC)</td>
<td>I know how other people feel without them having to tell me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Information-seeking (IS)</td>
<td>When planning a trip abroad I use various sources of information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social interaction</td>
<td>Socializing (SZ)</td>
<td>I use a large part of my free time in order to cultivate contacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-knowledge</td>
<td>Cultural identity reflection (CIR)</td>
<td>I make an effort to understand to what extent my behavior is shaped by culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-management</td>
<td>Goal setting (GS)</td>
<td>When I plan something I usually then go on to achieve my aim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating synergies</td>
<td>Mediation of different interests (MI)</td>
<td>I am good at mediating between people with conflicting interests.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The SFCQ offers a theory-based short form of the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS). Cultural intelligence has been defined as “the ability that individuals have to interact effectively across cultural contexts and with culturally different individuals” (D. C. Thomas et al., 2015, p. 1100), resembling the general definition of intercultural competence used in this research. In contrast to the original Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS), the SFCQ excludes the motivational dimension based on the assumption that motivation is related to cultural intelligence but not necessarily part of it (D. C. Thomas et al., 2015).

The SFCQ captures three dimensions, cultural knowledge (i.e. culture-specific and culture-general knowledge), cultural skills (i.e. relational skills, tolerance of uncertainty, adaptability, empathy, and perceptual acuity), and meta-cognition (i.e. awareness of cultural context, conscious analysis of the influence of the cultural context, and planning courses of action in different cultural contexts). The three dimensions are measured in a ten-item self-report scale which has been validated across 14 samples with a total n=3526, representing multiple countries, including general population, students, and employees, and demonstrating the SFCQ’s content and construct validity, robustness across cultures and languages, as well as its potential to predict intercultural effectiveness (D. C. Thomas et al., 2015). Sample items for each of the SFCQ dimensions are shown in table 4.4. Answers to the SFCQ were recorded on a 7-point Likert scale (1 “strongly disagree” to 7 “strongly agree”) and Cronbach’s alpha was 0.81 for the baseline assessment.
Table 4.4. Short Form Cultural Intelligence (SFCQ) dimensions and sample items (based on D. C. Thomas et al., 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Sample item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge (K)</td>
<td>Culture-specific and culture-general knowledge, including recognizing the existence of other culture, knowledge of cultural differences, and complexity of that knowledge</td>
<td>I can give examples of cultural differences from my personal experience, reading, and so on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills (S)</td>
<td>Relational skills, tolerance of uncertainty, adaptability, empathy, perceptual acuity</td>
<td>I sometimes try to understand people from another culture by imagining how something looks from their perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognition (MC)</td>
<td>Knowledge of and control over one's thinking and learning activities in the specific domain of cultural experiences and strategies, measured by awareness of cultural context, conscious analysis of the influence of the cultural context, and planning courses of action in different cultural contexts</td>
<td>I think a lot about the influence that culture has on my behavior and that of others who are culturally different.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data analysis

The quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS, including descriptive analyses and t-tests. For the qualitative data, 12 participants did not provide an answer and five answers were excluded as they did not pertain to intercultural competence. Given that the majority of the sample is using English as a second or third language, it was assumed that these five participants did not understand the question or were not familiar with the term intercultural competence. The n=116 definitions of intercultural competence were analyzed using Qualitative Content Analysis (QCA) following the steps described by Schreier (2012). First, the coding frame was created using a combined deductive and inductive approach. The components from Deardorff’s Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence (2006) were arranged into an initial coding frame which was supplemented with subcategories derived inductively from looking through the data (see Appendix C for the full coding frame). Next, all definitions were segmented into units of meaning to establish the coding units. After piloting the coding frame on a subset of definitions and finalizing the coding frame, all
definitions were coded using MaxQDA. A quarter of all segments was given to a second
coder who independently coded these segments using the same coding frame. The initial
interrater-coder agreement was 79%. Both coders discussed cases of disagreement which led
to refining the coding frame by collapsing two subcategories into one which led to an
interrater-coder agreement of 89%.

4.4.2. Results

Both intercultural competence measures showed relatively high mean values with the TMIC-S
(measured on a 6-point scale) scoring a mean of $M = 4.4$, $SD = 0.56$, and the SFCQ (measured
on a 7-point scale) scoring a mean of $M = 5.3$, $SD = 0.77$. A look at the subscales of both
measures as shown in tables 4.5 and 4.6 reveals that on average students scored lowest on
learning and self-knowledge for the TMIC-S and on metacognition for the SFCQ.

Table 4.5. TMIC-S descriptives (measured on a 6-point Likert scale from 1 “does not apply at
all” to 7 “fully applies”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TMIC-S dimension</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Synergies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Knowledge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.83</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6. SFCQ descriptives (measured on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 “fully disagree” to 7 “fully agree”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SFCQ</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent samples t-tests revealed a significant difference in intercultural competence scores for gender, mono- vs. multilingualism at home, and previous intercultural training experience. Women had significantly higher means than men on both scales, the TMIC-S ($t(130) = 3.3, p = 0.01, M_{\text{women}} = 4.57, SD_{\text{women}} = 0.46, M_{\text{men}} = 4.32, SD_{\text{men}} = 0.57$) and the SFCQ ($t(130) = 2.4, p = 0.017, M_{\text{women}} = 5.47, SD_{\text{women}} = 0.73, M_{\text{men}} = 5.15, SD_{\text{men}} = 0.77$). Participants who were raised multilingually at home showed significantly higher means on the SFCQ ($t(127) = -2.7, p = 0.008, M_{\text{monolingual}} = 5.21, SD_{\text{monolingual}} = 0.70, M_{\text{multilingual}} = 5.64, SD_{\text{multilingual}} = 0.92$). Students with previous intercultural training experience had significantly higher means on both scales, the TMIC-S ($t(119) = -2.46, p = 0.015, M_{\text{no training}} = 4.38, SD_{\text{no training}} = 0.53, M_{\text{training}} = 4.67, SD_{\text{training}} = 0.49$) and the SFCQ ($t(128) = -2.22, p = 0.028, M_{\text{no training}} = 5.23, SD_{\text{no training}} = 0.76, M_{\text{training}} = 5.59, SD_{\text{training}} = 0.71$). No significant differences were found for study major (Bachelor of Arts vs. Bachelor of Science students), previous international experience, or mono- vs. multicultural background.

Findings from the QCA are shown in Table 4.7. A total of n=263 text segments were coded for the 116 definitions. As mentioned before, the initial coding frame was based on Deardorff’s Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence, using its specific elements as subcategories. Additional subcategories were added as they emerged from the data to capture any emic elements of students’ subjective understanding of intercultural competence. As shown in the coding frame (see Table 4.7 for all subcategories, see Appendix C for detailed
coding frame), each subcategory belongs exclusively to one dimension of intercultural competence. In line with most conceptualizations of intercultural competence, these dimensions include attitudes, knowledge, and skills. Another distinction is made between intrapersonal outcomes (i.e. processes occurring within the interculturally competent person) and interpersonal outcomes (i.e. processes occurring between the interaction partners). This distinction is closely related to the original distinction between internal and external outcomes in Deardorff’s (2006) model. Its terminology has also been inspired by Stier (2006) who differentiates between intrapersonal (mainly cognitive and emotional) competencies and interpersonal (mainly interactive) competencies. In this research, a similar distinction was made to differentiate elements of intercultural competence which manifest themselves within the individual from those that become visible in interaction.

About a third of all text segments pertained to either the interpersonal dimension (33%) or the affective dimension (31%), with fewer text segments addressing the cognitive dimension (19%) or the intrapersonal dimension (12%), and only 5% relating to the behavioral dimension. The remaining 1% included two segments coded as miscellaneous. Table 4.7 shows how frequently each subcategory within a dimension was referred to. In the affective dimension, the majority of participants mentioned tolerance/acceptance (38%) and respect for other cultures (36%) as elements of intercultural competence. For the behavioral dimension, the ability to relate to others was most frequently referred to (64%). In the cognitive dimension, most references were made to having an understanding of culture (76%). For the intrapersonal dimension, about a quarter of the text segments pertained to tolerating ambiguity (26%). In the interpersonal dimension, most text segments made reference to adaptability to different styles and environments (40%).
Table 4.7. Qualitative Content Analysis (QCA) results (based on a total number of text segments of n=263)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension/Subcategory</th>
<th>n=number of text segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(% of total text segments/of total n within this dimension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective Dimension</strong></td>
<td>81 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance/Acceptance</td>
<td>31 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for other cultures</td>
<td>29 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>10 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity/Discovery</td>
<td>7 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing Own Culture*</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral Dimension</strong></td>
<td>14 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to relate to others*</td>
<td>9 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to listen and observe</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to analyze, interpret, and relate</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive Dimension</strong></td>
<td>50 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of culture</td>
<td>38 (76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture-specific information</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural self-awareness</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociolinguistic awareness</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrapersonal Dimension</strong></td>
<td>31 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerate ambiguity</td>
<td>8 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive flexibility</td>
<td>6 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspend judgment</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cultural empathy</td>
<td>5 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnorelative view</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness*</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definitions did not only differ in terms of which dimensions and subcategories they referred to, but also in complexity, i.e. how many different dimensions were mentioned. While most of the definitions referred to one or two dimensions only (36% and 47.5% respectively), only 13% of all definitions made reference to three dimensions, 3.5% made reference to four dimensions, and none of them included all five dimensions. Further analysis revealed that half of the definitions mentioned either the interpersonal dimension only (n=20), affective and interpersonal (n=15), affective and cognitive (n=12), or cognitive and interpersonal (n=11).

In sum, students conceptualized intercultural competence mainly in terms of interpersonal outcomes (adaptability), attitudes (tolerance/acceptance, respect for other cultures), and knowledge (understanding of culture). Their definitions captured all elements of intercultural competence of Deardorff’s Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence (2006) except for sociolinguistic awareness. Several elements had to be added to the coding frame which emerged inductively from the data, including “valuing own culture”, “ability to relate to others”, “mindfulness”, “harmonious interaction”, “learning through interaction”, “conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Dimension</th>
<th>85 (32%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability (to different styles &amp; environments)</td>
<td>33 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonious interaction*</td>
<td>14 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate interaction</td>
<td>9 (10.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning through interaction*</td>
<td>8 (9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural interaction</td>
<td>7 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict management*</td>
<td>6 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective interaction</td>
<td>3 (3.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cultural cooperation</td>
<td>3 (3.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-discrimination*</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These sub-categories are data-driven and emerged inductively from the data.
management”, and “non-discrimination”. As discussed in chapter 2.3, emerging non-Western approaches to intercultural competence have confirmed existing models like the Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence, but also stressed the need to complement them by context-specific, emic elements (Wang & Kulich, 2015). In a similar way, results from the QCA have shown that students’ intercultural competence definitions largely fit the theoretical framework of the Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence. However, allowing subcategories to emerge inductively from the data means that the design process has also only informed by additional elements from students’ subjective understanding of intercultural competence which might not be captured in existing models.

4.4.3. Discussion
This first study served to gain insights into the status quo of intercultural competence levels and understanding among the incoming freshmen students who constitute the target group for the elective course designed in this chapter. The findings serve as a first set of evidence to tailor the course design and content to students’ needs. Both quantitative self-report measures have demonstrated a relatively high baseline level with means above the middle point of the scale, indicating some degree of intercultural competence among the majority of students. Yet, what these scales measure does not necessarily reflect actual competence, practiced in concrete situations, but rather awareness, attitudes, and knowledge as well as subjective beliefs about one’s intercultural skills. Furthermore, a closer look at the subdimensions of both scales revealed where students scored lowest on average, offering an indication of what aspects of intercultural competence to potentially focus on in the course. It seems that students might benefit from strategies on how to fuel their own intercultural learning process, improve on self-management, and on their metacognitive skills. This could be done by encouraging students to think about strategies of continuous intercultural learning and by teaching them different ways of managing their emotions and reactions in intercultural situations.
Furthermore, it could entail showing students strategies for making sense of their intercultural experiences by being aware of their existing cultural knowledge, planning how to transfer that knowledge into action, and reflecting upon assumptions and making adjustments when experience and expectations differ. All of these aspects are covered in the Personal Leadership methodology introduced above.

In addition to these insights from the quantitative part of the study, the QCA on students’ definitions of intercultural competence showed that they generally seem to have an idea of what intercultural competence means, especially in terms of attitudes (tolerance/acceptance, respect for other cultures) and the desired interpersonal outcomes (mainly adjustment, integration, and harmony). Yet, the lack of complexity of their definitions and negligence of specific skills might be another hint that they need support in transferring attitudes and knowledge into desired behavioral outcomes. Thus, it could be beneficial for students to gain a deeper understanding of culture in the course and learn how to transfer that understanding into practice, including being aware of culture-general skills and how to continue developing them through self-directed learning beyond the scope of the course.

In this study, insights from the quantitative and qualitative parts of the study have been merged in the discussion with the purpose of triangulation. Adding insights from the analysis of students’ subjective definitions of intercultural competence has allowed to enrich the numbers from the two intercultural competence measures and enabled a more comprehensive picture of the intercultural competence levels of the target group. In this case, qualitative findings have confirmed quantitative findings, suggesting that students have some level of understanding of intercultural competence which is largely in line with the Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence by Deardorff (2006). Qualitative findings did not only offer a richer picture of students’ intercultural competence, they also allowed to identify context-specific aspects that students considered sufficiently relevant to include them in their definitions of intercultural competence. The majority of those data-driven, context-specific subcategories
could be related to the dimension of interpersonal outcomes, with students associating intercultural competence with “harmonious interaction”, “learning through interaction”, “conflict management”, and “non-discrimination”. These data-driven aspects seem to reflect a concern with maintaining harmonious relationships on campus and preventing or managing negative interactions marked by conflict and discrimination. Given students’ specific context of living and working in a highly diverse, relatively small community (of less than 300 students in their year of study), these data-driven elements might reflect their concern with promoting harmony and mutual learning while avoiding conflict and discrimination. In addition, data-driven subcategories added elements in the affective (“valuing own culture”), behavioral (“ability to relate to others”), and intrapersonal outcomes (“mindfulness”) dimensions. Those elements further support the assumption that students are concerned with establishing and maintaining good relationships with their peers and highlight additional aspects such as being mindful and valuing one’s own culture. Overall, these data-driven elements of intercultural competence have offered further support the inclusion of the learning goal of familiarizing students with the Personal Leadership methodology as a way of practicing intercultural competence and cope with critical moments.

Overall, findings from study 1 have influenced the selection of processes and activities by showing that the target group seems to have a basic level of understanding of intercultural competence and interest to develop it, thus shifting emphasis to building a more complex understanding of culture, its influence on how we feel, think, and act, and to supporting specific cognitive, affective, and communicative processes such as perspective-taking and suspending judgment, emotion management, and flexibility to switch between different communication styles. These processes can be identified in the Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence as shown in figure 4.2 and complemented by the notion of intercultural practice in the Personal Leadership methodology as visualized in figure 4.3.
4.5. Step 5: Identifying Activities based on Empirical Data

The second study has been conducted to address step 5 and identify activities to finalize the course design. At this step it once more has become apparent why higher education instructors should employ an evidence-based design process. As Bennett (2012) has concluded, the “process of selecting activities has traditionally consisted of identifying the latest collections of exercises and simulations and stringing the best of them together to create a stimulating program” (p. 17). However, such an approach to selecting activities suffers from a lack of alignment of activities with the learning goals and processes that should be activated to achieve these goals. Instead of picking the latest exercises or those one is familiar with, the selection of activities should be based on criteria such as whether those activities support achievement of the learning goals and whether they are appropriate for the target group and content (J. M. Bennett, 2012; Stephan & Stephan, 2013). Unfortunately, systematic overviews of intercultural learning activities and how they relate to existing theories and empirical research hardly exist to date. In an attempt to fill that gap, Fowler and Blohm (2004) have reviewed commonly used training methods, discussing advantages, shortcoming, and possible uses of methods such as lectures, written materials such as readings, visual materials like videos, case studies, simulations, role-plays, and exercises. Concerning more specific activities and exercises, there are numerous books with exercises that trainers can draw upon (cf. e.g. Berardo & Deardorff, 2012; Saphiere, Kappler Mikk, & Ibrahim Devries, 2005; Thiagarajan & Thiagarajan, 2011). Typically, these books include descriptions of activities, including possible adaptations and debriefing questions to support participants in making meaning from the experience. For this course, a handbook has been created, providing detailed information on the learning activities and content of each experiential workshop session (see Appendix D).
4.5.1. Methods

Participants

In the second study, a sample of n=18 undergraduate students were recruited to participate in focus groups using a mix of convenience and purposive sampling strategies (Quinn Patton, 2002). In the first step, the entire undergraduate student body was contacted via the university mailing list to invite students to participate in a discussion group on intercultural competence. The initial selection of participants was more of a convenience sample as every student who responded to the invitation was included in the sample. The 18 interested students were asked to submit demographic information including gender, cultural background, and study major. This information was used to purposefully compose four heterogenous focus groups with regard to gender, cultural background, and study major. The final sample of n=18 students were mainly undergraduate first-year students from social science and business majors, out of which ten were female. Students stated their cultural background as German (n=5), Chinese (n=2), US-American/German (n=2), US-American (n=1), Kosovan (n=1), South Korean (n=1), Italian (n=1), Palestinian (n=1), Philippian/Singaporean (n=1), and Bulgarian/Turkish (n=1). Students were compensated for their time by experiment credit for students in first-year methods courses.

Data collection

Four focus groups composed of three to eight participants were conducted from September 21-26, 2015. The focus groups were scheduled for 1.5 hours and took place in a seminar room of the university. Snacks and drinks were provided to create a comfortable atmosphere. After providing participants with general information on the discussion topic and obtaining their informed written consent, an icebreaker task was used to approach the topic of intercultural competence. Participants were asked to draw their intercultural superhero. Once participants completed their pictures, they were asked to present them to the group and explain what they
sketched on paper. The moderator facilitated the turn-taking when necessary and guided the discussion following the topic guide created before to make sure certain topics were covered (see Appendix E for topic guide). These topics included discussing (1) who needs intercultural competence and why, (2) how intercultural competence can be developed at the university, (3) students’ experience of the orientation week training, as well as (4) students’ ideas for an elective course on intercultural competence. For the latter, participants were explicitly encouraged to bring in any ideas, no matter whether they seem feasible or not, and also discuss their thoughts the idea of involving peers or external trainers in teaching the course. With participants’ consent, the focus groups were video-taped and transcribed.

Data analysis

All focus groups were transcribed verbatim and analyzed in MaxQDA using several rounds of coding. In the first round, inductive coding was used to identify themes and subcategories within each theme. In the second and third round, these codes were condensed into a comprehensive coding frame, linking identified codes to previous findings from the QCA in study 1 as well as to theoretical concepts when possible.

4.5.2. Results

Four main themes emerged from the data, (1) students’ concept of intercultural competence, (2) meta discussion on intercultural competence, (3) intercultural competence development, and (4) ideas for a course on intercultural competence. While the first theme covers students’ definition of intercultural competence and thereby is directly related to the elements identified in the QCA in study 1, the second theme includes parts where participants moved beyond discussing elements of intercultural competence to a more general discussion on intercultural competence, including the underlying notion of culture or the idea of lifelong learning. The third and fourth theme capture codes for segments pertaining more to how intercultural
competence can be developed, in general (theme 3) and in an elective course at the university (theme 4).

**Theme 1: Students’ concept of intercultural competence**

While students addressed many of the elements from study 1, there were some notable differences which will briefly be presented here. In the affective dimension, two additional aspects were brought up in two of the focus groups: courage and love. Some participants commented that it takes courage to admit mistakes in intercultural encounters, for example when having made false assumptions or having behaved inappropriately. Likewise, some participants equated intercultural competence with showing love for all human beings. In the cognitive dimension, three of the four groups discussed the importance of linguistic competence – an aspect also covered in some of the intercultural superhero pictures (see figure 4.5 for examples) with the superhero speaking various languages, a prerequisite for being able to communicate with each other. Another facet brought up by participants was to learn a few words of another person’s language:

“P1: (...) it's good if you try to, for example if your roommate is from China, you can start learn a little bit of Chinese and the other way around. That's a really cool way to kind of just get to know each other. - P2: And to show them that you care and that you are interested”

Similar to study 1, there were rather few comments on specific skills. With regard to intrapersonal outcomes, most of the discussion evolved around ethnorelativism, which one participant linked to being crucial to growth and development:

“Or if you said something and someone is like 'Please don't say that, that's incredibly offensive where I am from' - and one is to be like 'Ok, I can like learn from this experience' or just like 'I was wrong'. Because if you always just stick to whatever you have always believed then you are never gonna be able to grow.”
Finally, in the interpersonal dimension, an additional category was brought up with the idea of creating synergies by integrating different cultural styles as captured in this participant’s example:

“Because you can learn from what they do and then maybe just share all advantages from different ways of preparing a presentation or doing a group paper together. And then for your next paper that you may have to do on your own, you know, oh wait, I learned something new from this person and then from that person. And then that helps you personally grow with your own knowledge and education.”

Figure 4.5. Selection of focus group participants’ intercultural superhero drawings

**Theme 2: Meta discussion on intercultural competence**

In the focus groups, participants went beyond describing elements of intercultural competence and elaborated on four topics related to the concept of intercultural competence. All groups
discussed the human tendency to prefer being with people who are similar and be afraid of the unknown, meaning it requires effort to be interculturally competent:

Even though every human has (...) fear about something which is foreign, which is alien, which is different, but the more educated you are, the more likely that you get used to it, be like, I try it out, I try things, I just look it up and give it a try and then make up my mind afterwards instead of just like saying, I haven't seen it yet, it probably isn't good for me.”

All groups also discussed that intercultural competence requires a lifelong learning process:

“I think there is no situation in which you can say, I am intercultural competent and that's it for now. I think it's a process. There is always things you can learn, you can experience, and I think there is just no situation in which you can say, ok, I am confident with that, that's enough intercultural competence for me (laughing, some other participants also laugh), and I am out of here. So that's not the way the world is built and the different cultures are just too complex to say that it’s enough.”

Two groups brought up the issue of power and the question who adapts to whom in intercultural situations and one group discussed the underlying notion of culture when talking about intercultural competence, asking to think beyond national culture.

**Topic 3: Intercultural competence development**

Participants’ comments on how intercultural competence can be developed were grouped into four subtopics. The first subtopic has evolved around how intercultural competence can generally be promoted, for which participants brought up exposure to other cultures (for example through living abroad, exchange programs, intercultural contact), exploring similarities and differences between cultures, and learning about intercultural theory. The second, related topic concerns influencing factors in this process, which participants named as parents/socialization, role models, and the Internet which might enable new forms of intercultural contact. The third topic relates to how intercultural competence is already promoted at the university, including informal learning activities (such as cooking together,
celebrating different cultural and religious festivals), the intercultural training during orientation week, the international community on campus, as well as housing arrangements and assignment into multicultural groups in classes. Finally, students discussed their own role in developing intercultural competence, addressing issues like being motivated to engage in intercultural contact, escaping the tendency to cluster with one’s own cultural group, as well as making the most out of being in an international community:

“I think it's also up to us as much as it is up to them [the university]. I think they can help facilitate these things and promote them more but also it's in our hands to a certain extent (...) to take advantage of the environment we are in and the fact that we have such a gift and advantage to be around in like such an intercultural environment, period.”

**Topic 4: Ideas for an intercultural competence class**

Across all focus groups, participants were encouraged to share their ideas on the content, learning activities, and instructors of an intercultural competence class. They were explicitly encouraged to think outside the box of traditional university classes. Concerning content in general, participants expressed a desire to learn about their own culture (cultural self-awareness) and those of others (culture-specific knowledge) as well as about intercultural theories (culture-general knowledge). They discussed using a flexible design with multicultural group work and opportunities to interact rather than just passively receiving knowledge. Two groups also expressed their preference for designing the course as pass/fail to reduce the performance pressure. One group expressed their doubts that students would show up if they did not get credit points as an incentive, mainly because of their high work load with other courses. Concerning specific learning activities, participants offered suggestions ranging from more traditional project work in groups and interactive formats to field trips, informal learning components such as cooking together or treasure hunts. Finally, focus groups were encouraged to discuss how they would feel about a peer-learning
component where older students teach younger students, similar to the orientation week training. All groups were positive about this idea, arguing that older students can share their experience, be authentic role models, create a more comfortable atmosphere for discussing intercultural issues, and benefit from this experience as well. While some participants argued that professors should be involved because they have more theoretical expertise, others expressed doubts whether they would be comfortable discussing real intercultural challenges with their professors. Overall, participants were rather skeptical of bringing in professional intercultural trainers, expressing doubts that the class would feel too formal and that external instructors have no knowledge of their unique context and just come and go.

4.5.3. Discussion

With topic four being most relevant to the course design, the discussion section will mainly focus on this topic and only briefly address the other three. The first two topics addressed students’ understanding of intercultural competence, confirming the findings from study 1 and contributing ideas for discussing intercultural competence on a meta level in the course. Data on these topics thereby yielded additional data-driven elements of intercultural competence, allowing more insights into students’ subjective understanding of intercultural competence. Topic three amongst others offered glimpses into students’ experience at the university that could be built upon in the course, including their contact with other cultures as well as the issue of clustering, both of which speak in favor of purposefully using the cultural diversity in the course and allowing sufficient time for students to socialize and work across cultures in small groups. As topic four directly concerned ideas for course design, it has offered multiple insights that influenced the final course design.

With regard to step 5 of identifying activities, many students expressed a desire to receive theoretical input while placing emphasis on interactive or more informal activities. While activities such as treasure hunts or field trips were beyond the scope of the course
designed here, this finding speaks in favor of offering theoretical input in lectures and readings and using interactive workshops with activities that allow students to apply what they have learned previously and link it to their own experience inside and outside the classroom. Students showed interest in obtaining culture-general knowledge, but also discussed culture-specific knowledge as being crucial to becoming interculturally competent. Their desire to learn about each other’s culture and benefit from the diversity on campus led to including activities that allow students to share information about their cultures in small groups, such as interviewing each other. For the overall design, students’ suggestion about making the course a pass/fail course to reduce pressure was taken up. Finally, the design aspect of combining faculty- and peer-led instruction was received positively in all focus groups and therefore maintained.

4.6. Discussion of the Final Course Design

Figure 4.6 offers a visualization of the results of steps 1-5 in the evidence-based design process, summarizing the final course design. It also includes information on step six which is described in briefly in the next section and in more detail in chapters 5 and 6.

Figure 4.6. Applying the six-stage process of evidence-based course design
The course has been offered for the first time in spring semester 2016, i.e. over 14 weeks from February to May 2016. A total of 34 first-year students from 18 different nationalities, various majors, and both genders enrolled in the course. Students could select the course to satisfy their elective course requirements in the so-called Triangle area which offers general education courses for students across all majors (see step 1). Upon successful completion, students received 2.5 ECTS credits for active attendance and completion of the weekly reflective assignments. The overall aim of the course has been to support students’ intercultural competence development and the specific learning outcomes (see step 2) include to (1) promote an in-depth understanding of culture and its influence on how we feel, think, and act, (2) encourage students to link this knowledge to their own experience, and (3) familiarize students with the Personal Leadership methodology as a way of establishing an intercultural practice. These goals have been addressed in alternating faculty-led lectures (75 minutes with all 34 students) and peer-led experiential workshops (2.5 hours in two smaller groups with two peer-instructors each) (see step 3). Peer-instructors were recruited from the third-year cohort of the intercultural relations program and had just completed an intercultural trainer certificate program during the winter school. Informed by the theoretical framework described in step 3 and the empirical studies conducted to address steps 4 and 5, the content of each week is provided in table 4.8. A detailed handbook is available in the appendix (Appendix D).

---

6 The “Intercultural Relations and Behavior” (IRB) program has been a Bachelor of Arts (BA) program at Jacobs University Bremen, combining social psychology and social sciences (i.e. sociology, political science, mass communication, economics) to address the question how culture influences individual and collective behavior. More info on IRB program can be found in the program handbook: https://www.jacobs-university.de/drupal_lists/archives/programs/IRB_Handbook_2014.pdf

7 The Winter School on Intercultural Competence is a two-week course offered as part of the Winter School program at Jacobs University Bremen (for more information, please see: https://www.jacobs-university.de/study/winter-school). Since 2013, the two-week course has been offered by Jacobs University Bremen and InterCultur gGmbH (a non-profit intercultural training company) to university students and external participants who seek to become certified intercultural trainers. The course covers topics such as intercultural theory, training design and facilitation techniques, visualization techniques, experiential learning, learning and teaching across cultures, and more.
### Table 4.8. Course content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lectures</th>
<th>Workshops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductory session</td>
<td>Teambuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is culture? An introduction to cross-cultural psychology</td>
<td>Exploring cultural identities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How culture influences how we feel, think, and act</td>
<td>Practicing cognitive flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural interaction</td>
<td>Switching styles – expanding your repertoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Leadership</td>
<td>Practicing personal leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrap-up session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.7. Concluding Remarks

This chapter has demonstrated how the first five steps of the six-stage process for intercultural program design by Stephan and Stephan (2013) can be used to systematically design an elective university course on intercultural competence. The course described in this chapter has been designed for first-year undergraduate students at an international, private university in Germany. The elective course aims to promote students’ intercultural competence development along three specific learning objectives. These learning objectives have been derived based on a review of relevant literature, a clear concept of intercultural competence, as empirical evidence from the target group. Empirical evidence has been gathered in two studies which informed the course’s design as well as the selection of content and activities.

This chapter has demonstrated how to use an evidence-based approach to the design of formal curriculum interventions aiming to support students’ intercultural competence development. It thereby contributes to the emerging literature on evidence-based intercultural program design, demonstrating how to apply the six-stage process described by Stephan and Stephan (2013) to the design of an intercultural competence course for university students. In their publication, Stephan and Stephan (2013) presented an example of how they implemented the six-stage process to the design of an intercultural dialogue program, drawing upon
evidence in the form of existing theories and research. Not only does this chapter shown how to implement the process to a different type of intervention, but also how to go a step further and include empirical evidence from the target group of the intervention. In that sense, evidence can come from existing theories and research, as described by Stephan and Stephan (2013), but it can be complemented by data from the specific target group to inform the design process.

Another contribution of this chapter is to serve as an example to other higher education instructors seeking to design intercultural competence courses. Though the learning goals, processes, and activities discussed in this chapter are partly specific to the target group and context, instructors at other institutions can draw upon the theoretical framework and review of existing research presented in this chapter and in chapter 2. Their resources might not allow to use time-consuming qualitative research methods such as qualitative content analysis (QCA) of students’ subjective definitions of intercultural competence or focus groups. However, they might still be able to collect data from the target group, for example through a baseline questionnaire. Such a questionnaire could include one or two quantitative measures of intercultural competence, serving to gain insights into the status quo of students’ intercultural competence level and to provide a basis for evaluation of the intervention in later steps. It furthermore could entail open questions to learn more about students’ expectations, needs, and interests concerning intercultural competence.

Generally, instructors at other higher education institutions might define different learning goals and select different processes and activities to suit their specific target groups and contexts. However, they can still benefit from the findings presented in this chapter in terms of more general design features of the course such as peer-led instruction, experiential learning activities, and reflective assignments. These features have largely emerged from the review of existing theories and research, thus being less context- and target group-specific than the learning objectives and specific learning activities. However, as mentioned before,
this chapter has focused on steps one to five, i.e. the design phase, only. The subsequent chapters address step 6, the evaluation, which has enabled insights into benefits and challenges of the course design as well as its effectiveness in increasing students’ intercultural competence and achieving the learning objectives. The next chapter focuses on the formative evaluation to explore the benefits and challenges of design features such as combining faculty- and peer-led instruction and including reflective assignments.
Chapter 5

Formative Evaluation
5. Formative Evaluation:

Benefits and Challenges of Faculty- and Peer-led Instruction and Reflective Assignments

This chapter provides more details on the formative evaluation of the elective course on intercultural competence designed in the previous chapter. It thereby constitutes part of the evaluation (step 6) of the model by Stephan and Stephan (2013), conducting a context-specific evaluation aimed at identifying strengths and weaknesses of the course design as well as deriving ideas for its improvement. The next chapter adds to this by offering details on the summative evaluation, seeking to go beyond the immediate context of the course and assess its overall effectiveness in promoting students’ intercultural competence and achieving the specific learning goals formulated in chapter 4 (Quinn Patton, 2002).

The elective course “Intercultural Competence in Practice” has been designed using the six-step evidence-based approach Stephan and Stephan (2013). The design phase (steps 1-5) has been described in detail in the previous chapter. The course has specifically been offered for first-year undergraduate students at Jacobs University Bremen, Germany. The small, private university in Northern Germany has a highly diverse student body with almost 1,400 students from 110 countries in 20178. The course has been offered in spring semester 2016 (i.e. February to May 2016) as an elective course for first-year students of all study programs. In spring 2016, a total of 34 students were enrolled in the course. They received 2.5 ECTS for attending alternating lectures (75 minutes instructed by a faculty member) and workshop sessions (2.5 hours facilitated by peer-instructors). In addition to mandatory attendance, students had to successfully complete weekly reading and reflection assignments.

Peer-led sessions were facilitated by students in their final year of their undergraduate studies in the “Intercultural Relations and Behavior” program. Peer-instructors were recruited from a pool of students who had previously completed an intercultural trainer certificate.

---

8 For facts and figures about Jacobs University Bremen, please refer to: https://www.jacobs-university.de/sites/default/files/ju_fact_sheet_e_30.pdf
course offered by the university in collaboration with a non-profit intercultural training and education company. In total, five peer-instructors joined the pilot project. They did not receive any monetary compensation for their work. However, they were incentivized by having an opportunity to gain experience in intercultural training and deepen their training and facilitation skills. Peer-instructors met bi-weekly with the author to discuss each workshop as well as any issues emerging throughout the semester. Workshops were run in two smaller groups with two peer-instructors each, allowing peer-instructors to share responsibilities and have sufficient flexibility to balance their workload as a student with their role in the project. Peer-instructors decided to pair up to complement each other in teaching style and skills, though at times their pairing was rather driven by who was available.

The combination of faculty- and peer-led instruction, complemented by weekly reflective assignments to replace exams, constitute some of the unique features of this course which are evaluated in this chapter. More specifically, this chapter addresses two research questions:

*RQ2.1: What are benefits and challenges of combining faculty- and peer-led instruction with reflective assignments?*

*RQ2.2: How can the course design be improved?*

The following section presents assumed benefits and challenges of combining faculty- and peer-led instruction with reflective assignments derived from existing theories and empirical research. Though these assumptions offer insights on potential answers to research question 2.1, they only serve as a starting point of exploration. This formative evaluation is largely exploratory in nature, seeking to identify additional insights on both research questions inductively from the data. It thereby adds to our emerging understanding of how to use peer-led instruction and reflective assignments to complement more traditional faculty-led teaching on intercultural competence.
5.1. Underlying Assumptions

The previous chapter has presented relevant theories and empirical evidence that contributed to the decision of complementing faculty-led, knowledge-oriented lectures with peer-led experience-based workshops and reflective assignments. This section draws upon those theories and existing empirical research to derive assumptions about potential benefits and challenges related to these design features. The assumptions have been explored in the formative evaluation of the course seeking to identify benefits and challenges of the design as well as ideas for its improvement.

The course design combines faculty- and peer-led instruction, based on the assumption that faculty is highly qualified to instruct knowledge-oriented sessions, while peer-instructors might offer unique benefits in facilitating students’ intercultural learning process in experiential sessions. Intercultural learning often requires learners to leave their comfort zone, critically examine their identity, values, and worldview, and engage in learning activities in which they experiment with new behaviors (J. M. Bennett, 2012; Gregersen-Hermans & Pusch, 2012; Paige, 1993). As presented in the previous chapter, research on various forms of peer-instruction has supported the assumption that peers can create a safe and comfortable learning environment in which such learning is possible (Binder et al., 2013; Boud, 2001; K. Brown et al., 2014; Goldschmid & Goldschmid, 1976; Hiller, 2010; Kedzior et al., 2015; McKenna & Williams, 2017). However, as Gregersen-Hermans and Pusch (2012) have argued, intercultural learning does not only require trust among students and instructors, but also perceived relevance of content and activities. From a social learning perspective (Bandura, 1971, 1977), it can be assumed that peer-instructors act as role models, increasing students’ attention and motivation by explaining from their own experience why developing intercultural competence is important for living and studying on an international campus. This assumption has received support in prior qualitative research on peer-led intercultural training at Jacobs University Bremen (Binder et al., 2013) as well as from the use of peer instruction.
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in other contexts (McKenna & Williams, 2017). Overall, it seems that in the presence of peers, students “are able to articulate what they understand and to be more open to be critiqued by peers, as well as learning from listening to and critiquing others” (Boud, 2001, p. 8). Jacobs University students participating in focus groups during the design phase of the course (presented in chapter 4) all were positive about the idea of involving peer-instructors. They related it to expected benefits such as peer-instructors serving as authentic role models who share students’ experience and can create a more comfortable atmosphere for talking about intercultural challenges. Some focus group participants explicitly expressed doubts that they would feel comfortable sharing intercultural challenges with professors but would do so with peer-instructors. These aspects have been summarized in the first assumption capturing assumed benefits of peer-led facilitation of experiential workshop sessions:

Assumption 1: Peer-instructors can establish a safe learning environment in which students can share experiences and ideas, imitate and experiment with new behaviors and communication styles, as well as learn with and from each other.

Though students might feel more comfortable discussing intercultural challenges with peers, faculty is highly qualified to instruct more traditional knowledge-oriented sessions. In such sessions, faculty can teach about their areas of expertise, providing content that can be drawn upon in the peer-led experiential sessions and reflective assignments. Generally, there seems to be widespread consensus among scholars that peer-led forms of instruction do not replace teaching by faculty but rather complement it, for example by creating additional spaces in which students feel comfortable to ask questions, discuss ideas, and seek support (Boud, 2001; Goldschmid & Goldschmid, 1976). In support of this argument, Topping’s (1996) review of research on peer tutoring has found that some students expressed a preference for being taught by faculty. Similar results have been found in the focus groups conducted in the first part of this research (presented in chapter 4). In some focus groups, participants emphasized their desire for faculty to be involved in teaching, assuming faculty has more
theoretical expertise. Thus, the following assumption has been made about benefits of faculty-led instruction:

**Assumption 2:** Faculty is perceived as a credible source of knowledge, having the authority and expertise to instruct knowledge-oriented lectures.

Besides positive effects for learners, empirical research on peer-led forms of instruction and peer-mentoring has demonstrated benefits for those who teach or mentor, including increased knowledge and expertise in the subject they teach, acquisition of knowledge on other cultures, improvements in communication and teaching skills, as well as increases in self-esteem and confidence (Ford et al., 2015; Glaser et al., 2006; Goldschmid & Goldschmid, 1976; Husband & Jacobs, 2009; Quintrell & Westwood, 1994; Topping, 1996). Again, students participating in the focus groups (presented in chapter 4) also expressed the expectation that those who teach can learn at the same time. Based on these findings, the following assumption has been added about the expected benefits of peer-led instruction:

**Assumption 3:** Peer-instructors will benefit from the experience by developing their communication and facilitation skills as well as becoming more confident.

However, various authors have commented on potential challenges of various forms of peer-led instruction, including investing into recruitment and skills training of peer instructors to ensure quality of instruction (K. Brown et al., 2014; Hiller, 2010; Topping, 1996). For the intercultural competence course evaluated in this chapter, this challenge has been addressed by recruiting peer-instructors who had previously completed an intercultural trainer certificate program. However, research on peer-mentoring programs has pointed to other potential challenges such as increased stress on the peer-mentors, lack of mutually shared expectations and objectives, and mentees not showing up for meetings, potentially because they feel less pressure compared to formal meetings with professors (Glaser et al., 2006). While the latter challenge has been countered by mandatory attendance, the potential issue of peer-instructors
being respected as both teachers and peers remains. Based on these ideas and findings, the
following assumption has been added to capture potential challenges of peer-led instruction:

Assumption 4: Challenges might entail that peer-instructors need to manage their
workload, be a respected authority and peer, and qualified to facilitate experiential
activities.

Finally, another design feature of the course has been to replace exams with reflective
assignments. Based on Kolb’s learning cycle, which has been described in the previous
chapter (A. Kolb & Kolb, 2005; D. Kolb, 1984), it is assumed that reflection plays a crucial
role in students’ meaning-making from potential learning experiences inside and outside the
classroom. It is through reflective processes that students make connections to their existing
knowledge, including what they have learned in faculty-led sessions, and create new
knowledge from their experience by drawing abstract conclusions from it. Reflective
assignments therefore are assumed to play an important role in encouraging students to link
knowledge and experience. They further are assumed to enable students to engage with course
content on a continuous basis, thereby deepening their learning. All of this has been
summarized in the following assumption on the benefits of reflective assignments:

Assumption 5: Reflective assignments support the learning process by engaging
students with the course content on a continuous basis as well as by promoting
meaning-making and linking experience and knowledge.

These five assumptions have served as a starting point for the formative evaluation,
summarizing assumed benefits and challenges of combining faculty- and peer-led instruction
and integrating experiential sessions and reflective workshops. These assumptions have been
derived based on existing theories and empirical evidence. Yet, as there has so far been rather
little research on this particular design for intercultural learning interventions, the formative
evaluation has been largely exploratory, allowing for additional benefits, challenges, and
ideas for improvement to emerge inductively from the data. The next section offers more
details on how the data collection and analysis, followed by presenting and discussing results to derive insights on both research questions guiding the formative evaluation.

5.2. Methods
This study is part of a longitudinal, mixed methods doctoral research project focusing on the design and evaluation of an intercultural competence course for university students. Chapter 3 has offered a comprehensive overview of the overall research design and on the second stage, the formative evaluation, in particular. The formative and summative evaluation both draw on data collected longitudinally from the beginning to the end of the course. This chapter focuses on the formative evaluation, guided by the following two research questions:

*RQ2.1:* What are benefits and challenges of combining faculty- and peer-led instruction with reflective assignments?

*RQ2.2:* How can the course design be improved?

To address these research questions and explore the assumptions presented above, this part of the evaluation mainly has drawn upon qualitative data obtained in semi-structured interviews with course participants and peer-instructors, complemented by qualitative and quantitative data from the post-test questionnaire administered to all students enrolled in the course. To gain more comprehensive insights into benefits and challenges of the course design as well as ideas for improvement, triangulation of data and between-method triangulation have been used (Flick, 2004). Triangulation of data has been achieved by collecting data from two different groups of people, i.e. students enrolled in the course and peer-instructors. In addition, different research methods have been combined for between-method triangulation, in this case questionnaires and semi-structured individual and group interviews.
5.2.1. Participants

Data were collected from all students enrolled in the course as well as from the five peer-instructors who facilitated the peer-led experiential sessions. All n=34 students filled in the pre- and post-test questionnaire. From this sample, a sub-sample of n=10 students has been drawn for semi-structured interviews using a purposive sampling strategy. The aim was to compose a heterogeneous sample with regard to gender and cultural background. The demographic characteristics of the sample and sub-sample are provided in table 5.1.

Table 5.1. Student sample characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Sub-sample for interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24 (71%)</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10 (29%)</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality (self-identified)</td>
<td>18 different nationalities</td>
<td>8 different nationalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Germany: 7</td>
<td>Germany: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>India: 4</td>
<td>USA: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USA: 3</td>
<td>Albania, China, Nepal,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albania, Bulgaria, China, Ethiopia, Senegal: 2 each</td>
<td>India, Rwanda, Egypt: 1 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Egypt, Guatemala, Kosovo, Nepal, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Taiwan, Tanzania: 1 each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>17 (50%)</td>
<td>6 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>17 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the overall sample, students self-reported coming from 18 different cultural backgrounds, the majority was female (71%), and they were evenly spread across Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science majors. About half of them had previous experience living abroad (53%) and the age range was 17 to 22 years. In the interview sample, half of the sample was female (50%) and eight different cultures were represented. Six of them were enrolled in Bachelor of Arts programs and four in Bachelor of Science programs. In addition, all n=5 peer-instructors were included in this part of the research as the second source of data. All were female, enrolled in the “Intercultural Relations and Behavior” program of the university and in their final year of study, four of them reported being German and one reported being Spanish.

5.2.2. Data Collection

Data were collected by two methods, semi-structured interviews and paper-and-pen questionnaires. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with the sub-sample of students and the peer-instructor sample. Peer-instructors participated in semi-structured group interviews in the beginning, middle, and end of the course, discussing their motivation and expectations, ongoing experience, as well as ideas for improvement.

The sub-sample of n=10 students was interviewed individually in the beginning and after the course. Student interviews followed a topic guide, addressing students’ motivation and expectations in the pre-interview and their experience, perceived learning, and evaluation of the course design in the post-interview. Group interviews with peer-instructors also used a topic guide. Table 5.2 offers an overview of the topics discussed in the interviews with students and peer-instructors.
Table 5.2. Overview of topics discussed in interviews with students and peer-instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Student interviews</strong></th>
<th><strong>Peer-instructor interviews</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning of the course</strong></td>
<td>• Introduction, motivation, expectations &lt;br&gt;• Experienced intercultural challenge(s) &lt;br&gt;• Experienced positive intercultural situation &lt;br&gt;• Thoughts on course design features</td>
<td>• Motivation to become peer-instructors &lt;br&gt;• Expected benefits &lt;br&gt;• Expected challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle of the course</strong></td>
<td>• Experience so far &lt;br&gt;• Experienced benefits &lt;br&gt;• Experienced challenges &lt;br&gt;• Thoughts on benefits and challenges of the course design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End of the course</strong></td>
<td>• Overall experience of the course &lt;br&gt;• Specific elements of the course (combining lectures and workshops, involving peer-instructors, reflective papers instead of exams) &lt;br&gt;• Perceived learnings &lt;br&gt;• Ideas for improvement</td>
<td>• Overall experience &lt;br&gt;• Experienced benefits and challenges &lt;br&gt;• Thoughts on benefits and challenges of the course design (for peer-instructors, students, the university) &lt;br&gt;• Ideas for improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most interviews lasted between 15 and 30 minutes, with a few taking more or less time. Interviews with peer-instructors were done during the regular supervision meetings, whereas interviews with students were scheduled individually. Students received a monetary reward of 10 Euros for their participation in the pre- and post-interview. All interviews were audio-recorded with participants’ consent and transcribed verbatim using the F4 software.

The second method of data collection were paper-and-pen questionnaires which students completed in the first (pre-test questionnaire) and last (post-test questionnaire) session of the course. The scales used in the questionnaire, such as the TMIC-S and SFCQ to measure intercultural competence, have been described in detail in chapter 3. The formative evaluation presented in this chapter has used data from the post-test questionnaire which additionally included 15 close-ended evaluation items asking participants to rate different aspects of the course on a 7-point Likert scale (from 1 “strongly disagree” to 7 “strongly
agree”). The items were constructed to assess to what extent students agreed with some of the expected benefits of the faculty-led lectures and peer-led workshops, the reflective assignments, and the overall course design. The post-test questionnaire furthermore had two open questions asking students to write down what they liked and disliked about the course design. While all n=34 students completed the post-test questionnaire, n=31 provided answers on what they liked and n=29 gave answers on what they did not like about the course design.

Triangulating two methods of data collection enabled to gather qualitative data from all data sources, i.e. the full sample of students enrolled in the course, the sub-sample who joined the interviews, and the sample of peer-instructors. It furthermore allowed to gather qualitative and quantitative data which can complement each other.

5.2.3. Data Analysis

Qualitative data from the interviews and open questions in the questionnaire have been analyzed using inductive coding in various cycles supported by MaxQDA. In the first step, students’ answers to the open questions in the post-questionnaire were coded using open coding that stayed close to participants’ original wording. This first cycle coding served to summarize the data, followed by second cycle coding in which codes from the first cycle were grouped into a smaller number of categories (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014). More specifically, codes from the first cycle were condensed into more abstract themes and grouped into benefits and challenges of the faculty-led lectures, peer-led workshops and reflective homework assignments, as well as ideas for improvement. Based on the distinction of different types of coding by Miles et al. (2014), this approach could be labeled descriptive coding, seeking to summarize data into themes relevant to the research questions.

The codes identified in the first step, analyzing data from the open questions, subsequently served as a basis for coding data from the interviews conducted with students before and after the course. This approach is similar to provisional coding as described by
Miles et al. (2014). Provisional coding starts with a list of codes from prior investigation which is revised and expanded based on the analysis. During the analysis of students’ data from the interviews, additional themes emerged from the data, including students’ motivations and expectations (from the pre-interviews) and their perceived learnings and ideas for improvement (from the post-interviews). Codes from both steps of the analysis were refined and defined, resulting in a full coding frame that covered the benefits and challenges of peer-led workshops, faculty-led lectures, reflective assignments, as well as students’ intercultural learning and suggestions for improvement of the course (see Appendix F for coding frame).

Data from the interviews with peer-instructors were coded using the same two-cycle process described by Miles et al. (2014) to identify themes which emerged inductively from the data. To remain open to the unique perspective of peer-instructors, coding started from scratch and did not use and revise the existing list of codes which emerged from the student data. While group interviews with peer-instructors focused specifically on their experience of facilitating the experiential sessions, the individual interviews with students focused on the entire course, including faculty- and peer-led sessions as well as reflective assignments. The themes emerging from the data obtained from peer-instructors were grouped into expected and experienced benefits and challenges of being a peer-instructor, their learnings and ideas for improvements, as well as their thoughts on benefits and challenges of peer-led instruction for students and the university (see Appendix G for list of codes).

Quantitative data from the evaluation items in the post-test questionnaire were analyzed using SPSS to conduct descriptive statistical analysis. Quantitative results are presented in the next section and integrated with qualitative findings in the discussion section.
5.3. Results

The results section presents findings in reverse order, starting with the perspective of peer-instructors, followed by an integrated portrayal of results from the qualitative and quantitative data obtained from students.

5.3.1. Peer-Instructors’ Perspective

Prior to the course, peer-instructors expected professional and personal growth, such as gaining confidence, applying knowledge from their studies, and strengthening their training and facilitation skills from the intercultural trainer certificate program they had just completed. They furthermore discussed opportunities for building relationships with each other and the first-year students as well as for having fun together. Yet, they also expected challenges such as balancing their role of being a peer with being an authority, balancing their teaching responsibility with their overall workload, establishing trust with the group, and keeping everyone motivated, especially because workshops were scheduled in the evening.

In the group interviews during and after the course, peer-instructors confirmed experiencing all of their expected benefits. They reported additional benefits such as being able to share insights from their student life, developing their self-presentation and communication skills as well as using their trainer skills in a real-world setting. Concerning challenges, they discussed keeping the group motivated and getting students to listen and participate. They experienced being challenged by their own exhaustion in the evening as well as by having to deal with different group dynamics. They also reported facing some difficulties with answering questions from the lectures, especially because their own workload did not allow them to join the faculty-led sessions.

The group interview at the end of the course allowed to explore what peer-instructors have generally learned from the whole experience. Besides the above-mentioned benefits, peer-instructors realized that being a skilled facilitator is a continuous learning process. They
elaborated on becoming increasingly aware that despite their qualification, they might make things unnecessarily complicated (such as splitting students into smaller groups using complex methods) and could recall things they would like to improve. With regard to the students in their course, peer-instructors felt the workshops allowed them to discuss and experiment in a more comfortable atmosphere in which peer-instructors were credible, authentic guides with less hierarchical distance. They further discussed how students might have benefitted from hearing about different perspectives in the multicultural and interactive setting of the workshops. In terms of challenges, the timing of the workshops seemed to be challenging to both students and peer-instructors. However, peer-instructors highlighted that they were positively surprised about students’ active participation in the evening sessions.

When discussing benefits for the university at large, peer-instructors assumed that the course promoted an inclusive atmosphere and offered a relatively cost-efficient way of supporting students’ intercultural competence. They elaborated on potential positive outcomes related to higher intercultural competence among students, such as increased open-mindedness and well-being among students, less clustering and more exchange across cultural groups, as well as have less conflict and improved abilities to resolve it. Concerning challenges, peer-instructors pointed to the need to find enough motivated and qualified peer-instructors who are willing to commit time and effort in their final year of study. Overall, the group interviews with peer-instructors revealed numerous benefits they experienced, offering support for assumption 3. However, findings also shed light on the challenges peer-instructors experienced, pointing to where support might be needed. With regard to the latter, peer-instructors gave specific ideas for improvement during the interviews which will be presented together with the improvement ideas of students in the final section of the results.
5.3.2. Students’ Perspective

This section presents findings on students’ expectations and motivation in the beginning of the course, expected and experienced benefits and challenges of the peer-led workshops, faculty-led lectures, and reflective assignments as well as their ideas for improvement.

Findings have been complemented by results from analysis of quantitative data from the post-test questionnaire. Table 5.3 summarizes the descriptive statistics for the 15 evaluation items.

Table 5.3. Course evaluation results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item (7-point Likert scale; 1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The course enabled me to develop my own intercultural competence further.</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have learned things that I can apply to my everyday life at Jacobs.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I liked the workshops.</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I liked the lectures.</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lectures helped me to gain more knowledge on intercultural topics.</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workshops allowed me to practice intercultural competence.</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workshops allowed me to get to know my peers better.</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workshops allowed me to learn more about myself.</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The peer trainers were competent instructors.</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The peer trainers were credible role models.</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt comfortable sharing my experience and thoughts in the workshops.</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reflective papers (homework) contributed to my learning.</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would have preferred to have exams instead of reflective papers.</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I have not learned anything useful in this course.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend this course to others.</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Expectations and motivation prior to the course**

In the beginning of the course, interview participants discussed their motivations and expectations for taking the elective course “Intercultural Competence in Practice”. Motivations for enrolling in the course ranged from generally being interested in understanding culture from an academic, psychological perspective to an interest in learning more about other cultures, for example those of other students in class. Students’ motivators also included the perceived relevance of intercultural competence in times of globalization and for making a career in international environments. Finally, some students were attracted by certain features of the course design such as having more interactive sessions and no exams.

Students had various expectations about the course, ranging from gaining general knowledge about cultural influences on individuals to acquiring culture-specific knowledge about other cultures represented in the course. Furthermore, students expected to learn more about themselves and their culture as well as learning about others’ perspectives and ideas. Some students expressed more specific expectations, including learning how to accept people for who they are, co-exist peacefully, and avoid offending others as well as being able to communicate one’s own values and expectations. Across interviews, students emphasized that they did not only want to learn such things in theory, but in a way that would enable them to apply it to their own life at an international university and later on in their careers. Overall, interviews showed that students selected the course with diverse motivations and expectations.

**Expected and experienced benefits and challenges of the peer-led workshops**

Tables 5.4 offers a summary of benefits and challenges that students expected from and/or experienced in the peer-led workshops. The display of findings distinguishes aspects pertaining to the workshop format and those relating explicitly to the peer-instructors. In this
and the subsequent tables, topics which emerged from the qualitative questionnaire data are marked with asterisk. Topics without an asterisk were derived from the interviews with students. Numbers in brackets show how many of the ten interviewed students mentioned the respective benefit or challenge.

Concerning expectations about the workshop format, half of the interviewed students expected it to be interactive, allowing them to share ideas, thoughts, and experiences. Four students expected opportunities to meet new people and make friends, three discussed the aspect of learning from each other and three expected to practice and apply knowledge from the faculty-led lectures. Two students discussed that the workshops should feel more comfortable, with less pressure than a more formal faculty-led session. All of these expected benefits did come up in the post-interviews, in which almost all participants highlighted the comfortable atmosphere of the workshops, the opportunity to practice and apply knowledge as well as to learn from each other. In addition to the level of interactivity, workshops were evaluated positively for the enjoyable learning and flexible format. During the post-interview, two students discussed the aspect of making new friends and one highlighted having gained additional knowledge from the workshops. Quantitative data further supported the favorable attitude towards the workshop format, with students expressing that they liked the workshops ($M=6.2$, $SD=0.8$) and agreeing that the workshops allowed them to practice intercultural competence ($M=6.3$, $SD=0.9$), get to know their peers ($M=6.2$, $SD=1.2$) and to learn more about themselves ($M=6.2$, $SD=0.8$).

With regard to the peer-instructors, almost all students expected that it would be easier to share experiences and thoughts with them. Half of them highlighted that peer-instructors shared their experience of being a student at this particular university and could give own experiences and examples, thereby encouraging students to open up. In a similar way, three students expected them to be competent guides as they already had more experience in this international environment. Finally, two students expressed the expectation that peer-
instructors could gain teaching experience. The post-interviews revealed that the majority of students experienced the expected benefits of having a shared experience with the peer-instructors and therefore finding it easier to share ideas and experiences with them. The majority also described them as competent guides and two explicitly called them role models. Two students emphasized how friendly and approachable peer-instructors were and one pointed to their open-mindedness, especially in terms of being genuinely interested in what students in the workshop had to say. Another aspect that emerged from the data was discussed by some students who explained how positive effects from the peer-led workshops carried over into other courses, as described by the following quote from a student in the course:

“I think last semester I really didn't do well in class participation since I didn't feel like I want to speak up a lot in the class asking questions, but after taking this course, in the middle of this course, when I went to other classes, I had really enough good participation in classes. Because maybe I felt like if I can participate in this, you know, workshops, I think it should be the same thing with other classes.”

Again, most of these aspects have received further support from the quantitative data with students evaluating the peer-instructors positively, agreeing they were competent ($M=6.2, SD=0.8$) and credible role models ($M=6.1, SD=0.9$). The findings further suggest that the atmosphere in the workshops was generally conducive to the students feeling comfortable to share their experience and thoughts ($M=5.8, SD=1.0$).

In terms of challenges, students expected that the scheduling of workshops in the evening could become an issue. One explicitly mentioned that the interactive format could be exhausting. Another student expressed concerns that the atmosphere of the workshop might change if more emotional topics were discussed, worrying that students might become polarized in their views on certain topics. The post-interviews revealed that the timing of the workshops did indeed pose one of the major challenges to students. In addition, several students discussed different degrees of participation among students with some being more
active than others. This included comments from students who were less active and expressed a preference for working in even smaller groups to feel more comfortable. However, it was also expressed as an observation by more active students about those who spoke up less.

When discussing potential challenges of being taught by peer-instructors, some students pointed to possible authority issues due to a lack of respect for them as teachers, but at the same time expressed that they considered it rather unlikely to happen. Two students discussed that while peer-instructors could create an atmosphere conducive to openly sharing experiences and ideas, a limiting factor could be that in the small community of this university some students might be friends with the peer-instructors (or friends of them), thereby feeling inhibited to share very personal stories. Finally, two students brought up the aspect of peer-instructors having less professional expertise than faculty members. All of these aspects showed up in at least some of the post-interviews, complemented by a few students experiencing a lack of transparency or consistency by the peer-instructors in how they were balancing their role of being a peer and an authority. One student furthermore expressed that he would have liked male instructors to be involved as well.

Concerning the combination of faculty-led lectures and peer-led workshops, students generally expressed very favorable attitudes, emphasizing that the workshops complemented the lectures by offering a space in which the relevance of the lecture content became clearer and where they could apply this new knowledge in the workshop activities and relate it to their own experience:

“I think one is really enhancing the other, I don't see a point of just meeting in the evening and do some role play things, I mean this is always good fun, but this is then really lacking the theoretical aspects and the academic aspect of it as well. But only having the lectures would be way too dry, I guess. Because after these 75 minutes you were able to get most of the content, but then you were really like, ok, give it a day to sink in and then we can apply it maybe in the seminar.”
Table 5.4. Expected and experienced benefits and challenges of the peer-led workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer-led workshops</th>
<th>Expected (beginning of semester)</th>
<th>Experienced (end of the semester)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits</strong></td>
<td>Interactive (5)</td>
<td>*Comfortable environment (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Making new friends (4)</td>
<td>*Practice/apply knowledge (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning from each other (3)</td>
<td>Learn from each other (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice/apply knowledge (3)</td>
<td>*Enjoyable learning (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comfortable environment (2)</td>
<td>*Interactive (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexible format (3)</td>
<td>*Interactive (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Making new friends (2)</td>
<td>*Enjoyable learning (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Gain new knowledge (1)</td>
<td>*Flexible format (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Peer instructors | Easier to share with peers (8) | *Easier to share with peers (8) |
|                 | Shared experience with instructors (5) | *Competent instructors/guides (8) |
|                 | Competent guides (3) – have more experience in this environment | *Shared experience with instructors (7) |
|                 | Can gain teaching experience (2) | *Role models (2) |
| Challenges | Timing (in the evening) (3) | *Timing (in the evening) (9) |
| | Interactivity can be exhausting (1) | *Differences in oral participation (5) |
| | Atmosphere might change with more emotional topics (1) | |
| | Authority issues (3) | *Authority issues (3) |
| | Confidentiality concerns (2) | Lack of transparency/consistency (3) |
| | Less professional/expertise (2) | *Confidentiality concerns (2) |
| | | *Less professional/expertise (1) |

Expected and experienced benefits and challenges of the faculty-led lectures

Tables 5.5 offers an overview of benefits and challenges that students expected from and/or experienced in the faculty-led lectures. Again, topics which emerged from the open question in the post-test questionnaire are marked with an asterisk. Topics without an asterisk were derived from the interviews with students and numbers in brackets show how many interviewed students mentioned this theme.
Most students participating in the interviews expected the faculty-led lectures to be informative, allowing them to gain knowledge, and some expressed that they expected them to be well-structured. Both aspects emerged from the post-interviews as well, with all students agreeing that the lectures were informative. One student additionally elaborated on how faculty-led sessions encouraged critical thinking. In terms of expected challenges, only one participant discussed the challenge of faculty having to keep students’ attention by engaging them and preventing them from drifting off. However, at the end of the semester, two students criticized a lack of examples in the lectures. While one student felt the theories and concepts were too complex, another found the content too repetitive.

Table 5.5. Expected and experienced benefits and challenges of the faculty-led lectures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty-led lectures</th>
<th>Expected (beginning of semester)</th>
<th>Experienced (end of the semester)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Informative/knowledge gain (8)</td>
<td>Informative/knowledge gain (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well structured (3)</td>
<td>Well-structured (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encouraged critical thinking (1)</td>
<td>Encouraged critical thinking (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Need to engage students and keep their attention (1)</td>
<td>Lack of examples (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Too complex (1) vs. too repetitive (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quantitative data from the post-test questionnaires filled in by all students have supported the use of faculty-led lectures with most students stating that they liked the lectures ($M=5.3$, $SD=1.1$). They further confirmed the assumed benefit by finding relatively strong agreement that lectures contributed to students’ knowledge on intercultural topics ($M=5.8$, $SD=0.7$). Overall, qualitative and quantitative findings offer support for assumption 2.

**Expected and experienced benefits and challenges of the reflective assignments**

Table 5.6 summarizes the benefits and challenges that students expected and/or experienced with the reflective assignments. Again, topics which were identified in the questionnaire data
are marked with an asterisk and numbers in brackets indicate how many students mentioned these aspects in the interviews.

In the pre-interviews, all students expressed a positive view toward having reflective assignments instead of exams. Most of them expected these assignments to support their learning process. They discussed how reflective assignments might contribute to more sustainable learning compared to exams and how they offer documentation of one’s own learning process. Six students felt that having weekly assignments reduced pressure, especially toward the end of the semester when exam period starts. Related to that some students highlighted the flexibility of this format, allowing them to work at their own pace. One student also expected the reflective assignments to enable critical reflection and self-discovery. In the post-interviews, students confirmed that the assignments supported their learning process and allowed for critical reflection and self-discovery. One student referred back to the aspect of reduced pressure at the end of the semester. New aspects emerging from the data included that reflective papers offered students a chance of expressing highly personal experiences and thoughts, especially those they would not want to share in front of peers in the workshops. Four students felt that the assignments helped to improve their writing skills. In the quantitative survey, reflective papers were evaluated as contributing to the students’ learning ($M=5.8$, $SD=1.0$) and students disagreed with the idea of having exams instead ($M=1.7$, $SD=1.0$), offering additional support in favor of reflective assignments.

In terms of challenges, only one student expected a challenge in the form of having to stick to the minimum and maximum number of words given in the instructions. At the end of the course, four students felt the questions were too repetitive and four reported challenges with sticking to weekly deadlines. One student explained that it took her a while to get used to it and express herself openly and honestly, while another student argued that reflecting upon yourself always is challenging, yet beneficial and should become more integrated into education:
“I don’t feel like people actually have the time or make the time to evaluate who they are or how they are and why they act the way they do. Because we are always too preoccupied […] And I think that if this were to be integrated into an education system, that would be very valuable. It would make us more well-rounded. […] I think well-rounded is being content with yourself, not being confused, knowing how to approach these ambiguous situations and coming to terms with the idea that everything is always in a very grey area, you are never right, you are never wrong, you cannot blame anyone, you can just start to learn to cope with it.”

Table 5.6. Expected and experienced benefits and challenges of reflective assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflective assignments</th>
<th>Expected (beginning of semester)</th>
<th>Experienced (end of the semester)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits</strong></td>
<td>Support learning process (7)</td>
<td>Supported learning process (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less pressure, esp. in the end (6)</td>
<td>Critical reflection/self-discovery (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexible, work at own pace (3)</td>
<td>Being able to express personal things (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical reflection/self-discovery (1)</td>
<td>Improve writing skills (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less pressure in the end (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenges</strong></td>
<td>Word limit (1)</td>
<td>*Too repetitive (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadlines/time management (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Being honest (1) / reflecting is always a challenge (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learnings of students**

Results from the quantitative data suggest that students generally agreed that the course enabled them to develop their intercultural competence further ($M=6.2, SD=0.6$) and that they learned things they can apply to their everyday life at the university ($M=6.0, SD=0.7$). They furthermore disagreed with the reversely phrased item of not having learned anything useful ($M=1.8, SD=1.5$). Finally, they expressed agreement that they would recommend this course to other students ($M=6.3, SD=0.8$).
Upon being asked what they have learned in the course, all students participating in the interviews discussed having gained greater cultural self-awareness and a deeper understanding of culture and cultural differences. They considered both aspects highly crucial to their ability to interact successfully across cultures. Nine of ten participants explicitly referred to having acquired a broader understanding of culture (beyond national culture) as well as an understanding of the origins of culture. Eight of them highlighted getting familiar with the Personal Leadership methodology and exploring how to apply it to their own life, for example to tensions or conflicts in multicultural group work in other courses. Six students commented on their improved understanding of different communication styles, including becoming more aware of their own style and practicing to switch styles.

Half of the interviewees mentioned having improved their ability to engage ambiguity and suspend judgment and four referred to having gained culture-specific knowledge about other cultures represented by students in the course. Overall, students’ perceived learnings capture affective, cognitive, and behavioral dimensions of intercultural competence. Six participants offered specific examples of situations where they observed that they behaved differently and applied learnings from the course, such as two students describing how they tended to feel too shy to speak up in public or in class, but gained confidence in the workshops and now speak up more in other courses. Another student realized how difficult it was for her to engage ambiguity and be comfortable with things out of her control, leading her to deliberately seek opportunities to give up control (e.g. by having friends organize trips instead of organizing it herself) and step out of her comfort zone. Yet another student remembered a situation where a friend was in a bad mood which typically would have led her to avoid interacting with the friend, but instead she reflected on her judgment, looked for alternative explanations for the friend’s mood, and decided to bring her chocolate which turned out to be exactly what the friend needed and appreciated. Another student discussed how he applied Personal Leadership to resolve tensions in his multicultural group working on
an assignment together. Yet another student explained how she uses her Personal Leadership vision statement to be more patient and calm in everyday life. Across these examples, students explained that it felt positive and rewarding to try out new behaviors and step out of their comfort zone.

**Ideas for improvement by students and peer-instructors**

This section presents ideas for improvement as discussed by students and peer-instructors in the interviews at the end of the course. Students’ ideas can be organized into those relating to content, structure and logistics, as well as the role of peer-instructors. Concerning content, student suggested to diversify content by replacing some Personal Leadership sessions with simulations and using more video material. In terms of structure and logistics, students discussed a different scheduling of workshops, smaller workshop groups, grading to reward effort, bi-weekly assignments as well as different assignment questions, and more workshop sessions in total. With regard to the peer-instructors, students suggested to keep the same trainers all semester instead of allowing them to rotate across groups. They furthermore argued that there might be a need for supporting them in their ability to balance their peer and authority roles. Some suggested having faculty occasionally joining workshop sessions.

Peer-instructors also discussed changing the scheduling of the workshops, for example to the afternoon. They further suggested to change the course title due to a perceived overuse of the word “intercultural” in the context of their university. Concerning their own role, they agreed with students’ idea of keeping the same peer-instructors for the whole semester and highlighted again that pairs of peer-instructors should ideally complement each other in trainer style and skills. To achieve a better mix in terms of gender and nationalities among peer-instructors, they suggested to advertise the project earlier to encourage interested third-year students to sign up for the intercultural trainer certificate course during the winter break. Finally, peer-instructors suggested that their role could be a paid teaching assistant position,
5.4. Discussion

This section summarizes and discusses the findings of the formative evaluation. It merges qualitative and quantitative results to draw conclusions about the assumptions outlined before. This approach is complemented by insights which have emerged from the data, both on benefits and challenges of the course design (RQ2.1) and ideas for its improvement (RQ2.2).

5.4.1. Benefits and Challenges of Combining Faculty- and Peer-Led Instruction with Reflective Assignments

The first part of the formative evaluation has been guided by research question 2.1: What are benefits and challenges of combining faculty- and peer-led instruction with reflective assignments? To explore this research question, assumptions about potential benefits and challenges have been derived from related literature and available empirical evidence. The discussion section first reviews insights on these assumptions based on the results presented above. This is complemented by discussing additional findings that have emerged inductively from the data.

_Assumption 1: Benefits of peer-led instruction_

The first assumption has stated expected benefits of peer-led instruction, including (1) the creation of a safe learning environment in which students can (2) share experiences and ideas, (3) imitate and experiment with new behaviors and communication styles, and (4) learn with and from each other. Intercultural learning often is challenging for learners, requiring them to leave their comfort zone, engage in critical self-reflection and make an effort to overcome ethnocentric tendencies and judgments (Bennett, 2012; Paige, 1993). Thus, any attempt to
promote students’ intercultural competence should include considerations of how to create an appropriate learning atmosphere in which participants feel safe and motivated (Gregersen-Hermans & Pusch, 2012). As presented above, a major assumption underlying this project has been that peer-instructors are able to create such a learning environment. Qualitative data from both the interviews and questionnaires has supported this assumption and confirmed previous findings on different types of peer-led instruction (Binder et al., 2013; Boud, 2001; K. Brown et al., 2014; Goldschmid & Goldschmid, 1976; Hiller, 2010; Kedzior et al., 2015; McKenna & Williams, 2017). In addition, the aspect ‘enjoyable learning’ emerged from the data, suggesting that some students did not only feel comfortable and safe, but even experienced the learning process as something they could enjoy.

These findings link to the second aspect of assumption 1, with results suggesting that students’ perception of having a shared experience with peer-instructors contributed to the comfortable atmosphere. This can be related to another frequently mentioned aspect of students finding it ‘easier to share with peers’. While this in line with previous findings, interviews revealed the ease of sharing might partly be explained by students’ perception that peer-instructors are genuinely interested in what they have to say. In addition, results confirmed the third aspect of imitating and experimenting which students mainly described in terms of practicing and applying knowledge, for example from the lectures or readings. The assumed benefit of encouraging students to imitate and experiment with new behaviors partly has been derived from the social learning perspective (Bandura, 1971, 1977), assuming peer-instructors act as role models. While this notion has already received support from previous research (Binder et al., 2013; Kedzior et al., 2015; McKenna & Williams, 2017), it is further supported by qualitative findings in this project which include peer-instructors being described as ‘role models’ and ‘competent instructors/guides’ in both the interviews and questionnaires.
Finally, assumption 1 includes the expected benefit of students being able to learn with and from each other. This has received support from qualitative interview findings with students mentioning topics such as ‘learn from each other’ and ‘gain new knowledge’. As Boud (2001) argued, students learn from what others say in class and from discussing and interacting with them. This has been confirmed by the qualitative results which further showed that students highlighted the interactive and flexible format of the peer-led sessions. Overall, assumption 1 has largely been supported by the qualitative results. Quantitative results provided further evidence in favor of assumption 1, showing that students perceived peer-instructors to be competent role-models and agreed that the learning atmosphere was comfortable and enabled them to share their experience and express their thoughts.

Qualitative data revealed additional benefits not covered in assumption 1. The interactive and comfortable nature of the peer-led sessions did not only enable mutual learning, but also allowed students to make new friends across boundaries such as study programs, living in different residence halls, or clustering in cultural groups. As presented in depth in chapter 2.5, previous research has demonstrated the potential of informal curriculum interventions in encouraging intercultural interaction. However, when it comes to formal curriculum interventions and taking advantage of cultural diversity in the classroom, various studies have found tendencies to cluster with peers from a similar cultural background, especially if there is a larger group of them (Rienties et al., 2012; Spencer-Oatey et al., 2016). This tendency has not only been counteracted by the fact that the course evaluated in this chapter consisted of 34 students from 18 different cultural backgrounds but might also be overridden by students perceiving it as a chance to make new friends. Furthermore, in the course “Intercultural Competence in Practice” students were regularly encouraged to work and discuss in diverse groups. As reviewed in chapter 2.5, various authors have argued that multicultural group work needs to be purposefully planned and students need support along the way, for example in terms of developing intercultural competence (Rienties et al., 2012;
As this course specifically focused on supporting students’ intercultural competence development, it included numerous structured activities and reflection to assist students in their intercultural interactions.

However, findings have pointed to the two sides of the intimacy of the peer-group which both enables and limits the sharing of personal experiences and thoughts. It is particularly interesting to note that students expressed their most private thoughts in the reflective assignments, sometimes to their own surprise, which demonstrates the important function of this component in supporting the learning process and offering students yet another space to reflect and express themselves. Offering various forms and spaces of self-expression did not only seem important to counter students’ concerns over how much they wish to share in front of their peers, but also to cater to differences in how comfortable students feel to speak up in bigger groups. The exploratory approach taken for the formative evaluation enabled data-driven insights, thereby adding important insights on the potential limits of an intimate atmosphere in the peer-group. At the same time, findings have already pointed to a solution in terms of using reflective assignments to enable sharing of highly personal or intimate thoughts.

Overall, findings from the interviews and questionnaires have confirmed assumption 1, offering evidence that peer-instructors were able to create a safe learning environment in which students felt comfortable to share experiences and ideas, practice and apply content from the lectures, as well as learn with and from each other, including learning about other students’ cultures and perspectives. Additional aspects emerging from the data included benefits such as making new friends as well as potential challenges like the double-sided nature of the intimacy of the peer-group which both enabled and limited sharing of experience and ideas, highlighting the need to offer various spaces and forms of expression and self-reflection to students.
**Assumption 2: Benefits of faculty-led instruction**

The second assumption focused on faculty-led sessions, arguing that faculty members are perceived as credible sources of knowledge and have the authority and expertise to instruct knowledge-oriented lectures. Various authors have suggested that peer-led instruction should complement faculty-led lectures, but cannot and should not replace it (Boud, 2001; Goldschmid & Goldschmid, 1976). This has been supported by empirical evidence showing that some students express preferences for being taught by faculty (Topping, 1996). Such preferences have also been found in the focus group research described in chapter 4 with some students stating that faculty should be involved as they have more knowledge and expertise. This received further support from the formative evaluation, with quantitative data suggesting that the majority of students evaluated the lectures positively and agreed that faculty-led sessions contributed to their knowledge on intercultural topics. Likewise, all interviewed students mentioned that the faculty-led sessions were informative and allowed them to gain knowledge. Overall, both quantitative and qualitative results have offered support assumption 2 with students perceiving faculty to be credible sources of knowledge, suited to teach sessions focused on cognitive learning and knowledge transfer. Furthermore, some students suggested that faculty could join some of the workshop sessions in future course, implying that faculty is perceived as having expertise and authority to teach and supervise.

**Assumption 3: Benefits for peer-instructors**

Assumption 3 focused on potential benefits for peer-instructors, arguing that they will benefit from the experience by developing communication and facilitation skills and becoming more confident. These assumed benefits have been derived from prior research on different forms of peer-led instruction and peer-mentoring. Such research has identified benefits such as increased knowledge and expertise in the subject peer-instructors teach, acquisition of
knowledge on other cultures, improvements in communication and teaching skills, as well as increases in self-esteem and confidence (Ford et al., 2015; Glaser et al., 2006; Goldschmid & Goldschmid, 1976; Husband & Jacobs, 2009; Quintrell & Westwood, 1994; Topping, 1996).

Indeed, data obtained from peer-instructors in this research offered support for assumption 3. Results have suggested that peer-instructors benefitted from the experience in terms of professional and personal growth, including gaining confidence, developing their self-presentation and communication skills, as well as applying and deepening their facilitation skills from their Train-the-Trainer course. The latter aspect further has offered support for the idea of a win-win solution by involving peer-instructors in the course, allowing for the above-mentioned benefits of peer-led workshops while at the same time offering the peer-instructors a chance to practice their newly gained trainer skills in a real-life course immediately after completion of their trainer certificate.

**Assumption 4: Challenges of peer-led instruction**

Assumption 4 focused on challenges of peer-led instruction, including peer-instructors having to manage their workload, be a respected authority and peers, and qualified to facilitate experiential activities. With regard to the latter aspect, various authors have discussed the need to invest into recruitment and skills training of peer-instructors to ensure teaching quality (K. Brown et al., 2014; Hiller, 2010; Topping, 1996). In this project, this potential challenge has been addressed by recruiting peer-instructors who had previously completed an intercultural trainer certificate program. Results of the formative evaluation have supported this approach, with students agreeing that peer-instructors were competent guides in the learning process and peer-instructors reporting that they could apply and strengthen their facilitation skills. However, data from both peer-instructors and students did reveal challenges, including the assumed issues of managing the workload of being a student and an instructor as well as being respected as a peer and an authority. While findings suggested that
these challenges remained manageable for everyone involved, students and peer-instructors already offered ideas on how to reduce these challenges in future courses. Instead of having different instructors across workshops, peer-instructors should be paired up to complement each other in facilitation style and skills and stay with the same group of students for the entire semester, thereby allowing for higher levels of trust and comfort. In addition, being involved as a peer-instructor could be a paid teaching assistant position, formalizing their role and responsibilities as well as rewarding the time and effort they contribute. Another challenge that emerged from the data concerns the scheduling of workshop sessions in the evening. While the scheduling was done by the administrative staff to ensure the course is as accessible as possible to students of all majors, it proved to be a major challenge discussed by peer-instructors and students, both of whom felt they could have benefitted even more from the interactive format if it had been with less tiredness and exhaustion. As elective courses should be accessible to students of different programs, their scheduling tends to be challenging, but the aspect of energy level during highly interactive, experiential sessions should be considered in future courses.

Assumption 5: Benefits of reflective assignments

Finally, assumption 5 focused on reflective assignments, arguing they support the learning process by engaging students with the course content on a continuous basis as well as promote meaning-making and linking experience and knowledge. This assumption has mainly been derived from Kolb’s learning cycle (A. Kolb & Kolb, 2005; D. Kolb, 1984), arguing that reflection plays an important role for students’ meaning-making from potential learning experiences inside and outside the classroom. This assumption received support from quantitative findings showing that students agreed that reflective papers contributed to their learning. They further expressed a clear preference for reflective papers over exams. A similar picture emerged from qualitative data with results from the interviews suggesting that
reflective assignments supported the learning process, allowing for critical reflection and self-
discovery as well as for expressing very personal thoughts or experiences. In addition, an
unexpected benefit emerged from the interview data, suggesting that some students did not
only benefit in terms of intercultural learning but generally felt they improved their writing
skills. At the same time, qualitative data from both the interviews and the post-questionnaires
showed that some students perceived the questions of the weekly reflective tasks as repetitive.
Though this was intended to encourage deeper levels of reflection and taking different
perspectives, it could have been explained better. Ensuring that students understand the
relevance of the questions is important to avoid that students merely repeat what they have
written before or lose motivation.

Overall, the formative evaluation has offered support for combining faculty-led
lectures and peer-led experiential workshops, providing evidence for students’ intercultural
learning at all levels, including cognitive, affective, and behavioral learning. In the interviews,
students reported gains in knowledge about culture and cultural differences (cognitive
learning) as well as changes in their ability to reflect upon their own culture, suspend
judgment, engage ambiguity, as well as to switch communication styles (affective and
behavioral learning). The weekly reflective assignments appear to have played an important
role in the learning process, encouraging students to link knowledge and experience and
engage with the subject on a continuous basis, while reducing perceived pressure compared to
exams where performance often comes down to one moment in the whole semester. The
formative evaluation largely supported the assumed benefits and challenges of faculty- and
peer-led instruction as well as reflective assignments. Taking a data-driven approach enabled
identifying additional benefits and challenges, resulting in richer insights on potential best
practices and aspects that can be improved.
5.4.2. Ideas for Improvement of the Course Design

The second part of the research question focused on how the course design could be improved (RQ2.2). Findings from the qualitative interview data yielded various ideas for improving the course design for future use, including diversifying content, working in smaller workshop groups as well as having a grading scheme. While the specifics of the course content depend largely on the target group and context, the idea of smaller groups and grading are more general aspects that could be considered for improving the overall format. The size of workshop groups depends on how many peer-instructors can be recruited, however, even with the same number of instructors, one could take advantage of having pairs of peer-instructors in the workshops and conduct debriefings in two smaller sub-groups with one instructor each. In that case, it might be worthwhile mixing up the sub-groups across workshops to ensure a good exchange of ideas and perspectives across all participants. Another option could be to start in smaller sub-groups in the first workshops and then progress to the bigger group as students get to know each other better and feel more comfortable speaking up.

Finally, while offering the course as a pass/fail course meant less pressure and therefore contributed to the collaborative learning atmosphere, some students criticized that their efforts and commitment to the course were not sufficiently rewarded by a pass. An alternative could be to create a transparent point system (e.g. up to 100 points corresponding to 100% achievement) that rewards active attendance, submitting reflective assignments on time, as well as quality of assignments along clearly defined criteria. The latter is important to make the grading as transparent and fair as possible, especially because it generally seems difficult to compare and grade highly personal self-reflection assignments.

Overall, the main ideas for improvement included having the same pair of peer-instructors facilitate the same workshop group throughout the course, possibly breaking into smaller sub-groups whenever possible. Future courses could furthermore use a transparent point system to grade attendance and participation and reward students’ efforts and
commitment. Finally, both content and scheduling of the workshop sessions should be selected and done carefully with particular attention to the specific target group of the course.

5.4.3. Limitations of the Formative Evaluation

The main limitation is that the findings presented above have emerged from the formative evaluation of a specific course, using data from the small sample of students and peer-instructors involved in the course. The benefits and challenges identified with regard to features such as faculty- and peer-led instruction or reflective assignments are largely data-driven and cannot be generalized beyond the context of this project. Yet, this research nevertheless has offered first insights into how to use such a format for intercultural competence courses at university, both by confirming the benefits derived from prior research and by allowing a deeper understanding of potential challenges to be kept in mind when designing such courses.

Another limitation concerns the quality of interview data. Despite confidence that interviewees felt sufficiently comfortable to share their thoughts and experiences freely, it should be noted that the interviewer was the organizer of the course and teaching some of the lecture sessions. It therefore seemed to take more time for some students to open up and share critical points in the interviews. However, the fact that all interviewees discussed challenges and ideas for improvement suggests that this concern did not hinder eliciting critical feedback from participants. Furthermore, all students had the opportunity to provide anonymous written feedback in the post-test questionnaire.

5.4.4. Implications of the Formative Evaluation

Despite the limitations inherent in its exploratory nature, this research has contributed to our understanding of how to integrate peer-led instruction and experiential workshops into faculty-led university courses on intercultural competence. The formative evaluation
presented in this chapter has explored assumptions about benefits and challenges of complementing faculty-led lectures by peer-led experiential sessions and reflective assignments. In sum, the empirical evidence gathered in the formative evaluation has confirmed assumptions derived from existing theories and prior research on different forms of peer-led instruction as well as peer-mentoring. The data-driven approach to analysis furthermore allowed to identify additional benefits and challenges as well as ideas for improvement. All of these allowed insights into potential best practices and challenges to keep in mind when designing similar courses for other contexts, such as different target groups at different higher education institutions. While the specific content needs to be tailored to the target group, this research has offered a general course design with alternating knowledge-oriented lectures taught by faculty and experiential sessions facilitated by peer-instructors which in combination with reflective assignments can serve to promote students’ intercultural learning.

Furthermore, potential challenges have been explored in more depth, offering valuable insights for other institutions interested in adding peer-led instruction to their curriculum. Any instructors who consider the option of adding peer-led experiential sessions to their intercultural course should carefully think about qualification and supervision of peer-instructors, scheduling of sessions, selection of content and reflective assignment questions, as well as how to grade or reward students’ efforts. Overall, this study has offered insights into how universities can combine faculty- and peer-led instruction for intercultural learning in multicultural classrooms, in which students learn with and from each other drawing on their diverse backgrounds and experiences and connect these experiences to the theoretical concepts and knowledge acquired during lectures.
Chapter 6

Summative Evaluation
6. Summative evaluation:

Mixed methods assessment of students’ intercultural competence

While the previous chapter has evaluated the elective course “Intercultural Competence in Practice” with regard to its design features, this chapter focuses more specifically on students’ intercultural competence development throughout the course and beyond. It thus offers a summative evaluation of the course in terms of its effectiveness in achieving its overall goal of increasing students’ intercultural competence and its more specific learning objectives which were developed in the process of evidence-based course design (described in chapter 4). This part of the research also offers insights beyond the immediate context of the particular learning intervention and university by demonstrating how multi-method assessment of intercultural competence can be implemented in a university course, both by researchers and instructors.

The question of how to assess intercultural competence has attracted as much scholarly attention as the conceptualization of intercultural competence itself. On the practical side, the fact that many higher education institutions seek to promote intercultural competence among their students raises questions of how to evaluate the effectiveness of measures and how to assess students’ intercultural competence development: “Given the importance of intercultural competence within postsecondary education, it becomes imperative to more closely examine what this concept is and how to best assess it in our students” (Deardorff, 2011, p. 65).

As chapter 2.3 has already offered an extensive review of conceptualizations of intercultural competence, this chapter’s focus is on the question of how to assess students’ intercultural competence development. The next section will review literature on intercultural competence assessment in higher education as a basis for deriving the assessment plan used in this summative evaluation study. After presenting the assessment plan and methods, findings
will be described and discussed with regard to the two guiding research questions of this stage of the overall research project:

*RQ3.1: How did students’ intercultural competence develop throughout the course and beyond?*

*RQ3.2: To what extent did students achieve the specific learning objectives of the course?*

### 6.1. Assessing Intercultural Competence

Despite decades of scholarly work on assessing intercultural competence, Deardorff (2017) concluded it remains a crucial issue in higher education institutions around the world. Common pitfalls include that institutions do not clearly define what they mean by intercultural competence, fail to specify and prioritize what should be assessed, lack an assessment plan and/or blindly take tools and methods from others without adapting them to their target group, context, or ensuring they fit the specific learning outcomes of the intervention (Deardorff, 2009).

Over the past years, Deardorff and others have offered various recommendations for assessment of intercultural competence in higher education, which Deardorff (2017) recently summed up in the following five steps: (1) define intercultural competence for your context; (2) break the definitions down into specific elements and prioritize; (3) align learning outcomes, course design, and assessment; (4) identify direct and indirect evidence for achievement of learning outcomes; and (5) use evidence to improve the learning process. The following sections will discuss these steps in more detail and show how they have been used in this research project to create an assessment plan for the summative evaluation of students’ intercultural competence development in the elective course “Intercultural Competence in Practice”.
Step 1: Define intercultural competence for your context

Considering the numerous definitions and models of intercultural competence, it is indispensable to clarify what is meant by stating intercultural competence as the learning outcome of a course (Deardorff, 2011; Fantini, 2009). Ideally, this should be done by reviewing literature on intercultural competence (as done in chapter 2.3) to select and/or develop a working definition as a basis for designing an assessment plan (Deardorff, 2009).

As elaborated on in chapter 2.4, the working definition of intercultural competence has been developed by drawing upon multiple models, including Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid and Process Model, the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) by Bennett (1986), as well as the Personal Leadership methodology by Schaetti et al. (2008, 2009). In this research project and the learning intervention designed in chapter 4, intercultural competence has generally been defined as the “ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations based on one’s intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes” (Deardorff, 2006, p. 248).

Building upon this general definition and the models mentioned above, intercultural competence has been conceptualized as a multi-dimensional construct which entails affective (attitudes), behavioral (skills), and cognitive (knowledge) components which support intrapersonal (or internal) outcomes and interpersonal (or external) outcomes. Intercultural competence development is a lifelong learning process that requires continuous critical reflection to transform experience into knowledge and create meaning. This requires cultural self-awareness, developing a better understanding culture in general as well as of specific cultures, as well as ongoing critical reflection to practice intercultural competence, including being aware of one’s judgments and emotions as well as able to show empathy, perspective-taking, and flexibly adapt one’s behavior to situational cues and demands.
Step 2: Break the definition down into specific elements and prioritize

Having a general definition of intercultural competence is a necessary first step in any assessment plan, but it is not sufficient. Aiming to have ‘interculturally competent students’ by the end of the course is too vague and broad to guide assessment. Thus, in the second step, the working definition of intercultural competence needs to be broken down into learning outcomes which specify what exactly students are supposed to learn in the course (Blair, 2017; Deardorff, 2011, 2017). A common pitfall in intercultural competence assessment is trying to assess too much at once. Therefore Deardorff (2009) recommended formulating learning outcomes which are specific, measurable, and can realistically be achieved by students in the given time frame. The latter point is particularly important given that intercultural competence development has been conceptualized as an ongoing process in which students need time and space to reflect upon their experience and make sense of it.

In this research, learning outcomes have been developed as part of the evidence-based course design described in detail in chapter 4. Drawing upon the intercultural competence models mentioned above, the working definition of intercultural competence, as well as empirical data from the baseline questionnaire, the following learning outcomes have emerged: “Upon successful completion of this course, students will (1) have an in-depth understanding of how culture influences how we feel, think, and act; (2) be able to relate this knowledge to their everyday experience in a multicultural environment; and (3) be familiar with the Personal Leadership methodology and Critical Moment Dialogue (CMD) and able to apply it to their own experience.”

Step 3: Align learning outcomes, course design, and assessment

The previous two steps support higher education institutions and educators to develop a clear idea of what is meant by intercultural competence and how it translates into specific learning outcomes. This is crucial for designing learning activities and an assessment plan which are
well-aligned with the underlying concept of intercultural competence and the overall goals of
the course (Deardorff, 2009, 2017; Fantini, 2009). When it comes to assessment, instructors
and researchers not only need to decide which methods and tools to use to measure
intercultural competence, but also critically reflect upon how well they align with the learning
outcomes and underlying concept of intercultural competence. Furthermore, learning
outcomes guide course design in terms of selecting and sequencing content and learning
activities – a process that has been described in chapter 4 for the elective course designed and
evaluated in this research project.

Following the six-step process of evidence-based design by Stephan and Stephan
(2013), the course design started with defining intercultural competence and identifying the
above-mentioned learning goals from relevant theories and empirical data collected from the
target group. The learning goals, theoretical framework, and empirical evidence furthermore
guided the general design of the course as well as the selection of specific lecture content,
learning activities for the experiential workshop sessions, readings, and questions related to
the reflective assignments. Following these steps of the design process enabled aligning
learning outcomes and course design.

However, the full six-step process by Stephan and Stephan (2013) includes the
evaluation which has been split into a formative and summative evaluation in this research.
The previous chapter presented the formative evaluation, focusing on the benefits and
challenges of combining faculty- and peer-led instruction with reflective assignments. This
chapter presents the summative evaluation seeking to assess the course’ overall effectiveness
in strengthening students’ intercultural competence and achieving its specific learning
objectives (Quinn Patton, 2002). Thus, the summative evaluation required the creation of an
assessment plan for assessing students’ intercultural competence development and attainment
of learning objectives throughout the course.
Step 4: Identify direct and indirect evidence for achievement of learning outcomes

Intercultural competence is a complex construct which can hardly be measured in its entirety, especially not by any single method or instrument (Blair, 2017; Deardorff, 2009, 2011, 2017; Fantini, 2009). Thus, it is important to break intercultural competence down into measurable learning outcomes before selecting any measurement tools. This has been done in the previous steps. Concerning the question of how to collect evidence for students’ achievement of learning outcomes, most scholars agree on a multi-method approach. Already in 2006, Deardorff found consensus among leading experts in the intercultural field that intercultural competence is best assessed using a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods, including tools such as self-report instruments, interviews, analysis of reflective diaries, and observation by others (Deardorff, 2006). More recently, empirical evidence from mixed methods studies has supported this idea by showing that students’ quantitative and qualitative data do not necessarily match (Bloom & Miranda, 2015; Jackson, 2015b; Schartner, 2016). In their study on students’ intercultural sensitivity development during a four-week stay abroad, Bloom and Miranda (2015) concluded that quantitative results might reflect students’ perception of their progress while qualitative results did not support the same progress. Similarly, Jackson (2015b) found a mismatch of quantitative and qualitative findings suggesting that students tended to overestimate their intercultural competence on quantitative, self-report scales. However, research by Schartner (2016) showed that quantitative self-report does not necessarily suffer from students overestimating their intercultural sensitivity or competence. In Schartner’s (2016) study, quantitative findings suggested that students’ intercultural competence stagnated or even declined whereas qualitative results revealed that students’ actually felt more confident and culturally aware in intercultural interactions. All of these studies have supported the use of mixed methods designs to gain a more comprehensive picture of students’ progress and detect potential mismatches of quantitative and qualitative results.
While quantitative measures are valuable, especially because they tend to be relatively easy to administer in pre- and post-testing, numbers might not necessarily tell us the whole story about what students have learned and how they transfer these learnings into their daily life and intercultural interactions (Covert, 2014). This is where qualitative data can offer additional information and insights, a notion shared by Fantini (2009) who concluded that “[…] traditional paper-and-pencil tests […] taken alone, are never effective measures of intercultural competence” and argued that “[a]pproaches that incorporate portfolios, logs, observation, interviews, performative tasks, and the like are generally more valuable for assessing intercultural competence.” (Fantini, 2009, p. 462)

Another distinction has been offered by Deardorff (2011, 2017) who has repeatedly recommended to combine direct and indirect measures. Direct evidence of student learning is typically collected during the learning process, for example through reflective assignments, discussions, or observations of performance (e.g. in project work or simulations), whereas indirect evidence captures perceptions of student learning, for example via a pre- and post-test with quantitative or qualitative self-report such as questionnaires or interviews (Deardorff, 2017). Ideally, assessment plans should include both direct and indirect evidence in a mixed methods design, thus also ensuring to combine quantitative and qualitative methods.

When it comes to selecting quantitative assessment tools, instructors are faced with a diversity of available instruments and scales which have been developed and validated in prior research. Some of these can be used for free whereas others require a license or per test fee (for an overview cf. Fantini, 2009; Matsumoto & Hwang, 2013). While available resources often influence the selection of assessment instruments, it is important to make sure that selected measures fit the learning goals and overall assessment plan (Deardorff, 2009, 2017; Fantini, 2009). For this research project, the selection process of quantitative scales to measure intercultural competence has been described in detail in chapter 3. One of the guiding principles for selecting quantitative instruments was to find a scale suited to measure abilities
that can be trained (as opposed to measuring traits) – leading to choose the Test to Measure Intercultural Competence in its short form, TMIC-S (Schnabel, Kelava, van de Vijver, et al., 2015). The test is a condensed 25-item version, measuring one facet per dimension. Table 6.1 offers an overview of the six dimensions and facets measured in the TMIC-S. As described in chapter 3, the TMIC-S aligns with the multi-dimensional conceptualization of intercultural competence used in this research. It measures affective, behavioral, and cognitive aspects of intercultural competence and can be related to specific elements such as cultural self-awareness, curiosity/discovery, openness, ability to relate, ability to listen, observe and interpret, flexibility, and adaptability.

Table 6.1 Test to Measure Intercultural Competence (TMIC) dimensions and facets (adapted from Schnabel, Kelava, van de Vijver, et al., 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Facet measured in TMIC-S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Captures verbal and non-verbal aspects, including sensitivity, clarity, flexibility and perspective-taking in communication</td>
<td>Sensitivity in communication (SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Intercultural interaction often means being confronted with unknown, thus requiring willingness to learn and strategies for doing so</td>
<td>Information-seeking (IS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social interaction</td>
<td>Building personal relationships and networks with others</td>
<td>Socializing (SZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-knowledge</td>
<td>Actively reflecting upon and understanding one’s own cultural identity</td>
<td>Cultural identity reflection (CIR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-management</td>
<td>Ability to deal with challenges and problems</td>
<td>Goal setting (GS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating synergies</td>
<td>Ability to recognize potential misunderstandings and lead a group towards common goals and successful collaboration</td>
<td>Mediation of different interests (MI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned before, intercultural competence is a complex construct which cannot be captured by a single instrument. Therefore, the 10-item Short Form Cultural Intelligence scale (SFCQ) was included in the assessment plan as well. This also allowed to cross-validate
intercultural competence scales in this research. The SFCQ is based on the definition that “[c]ultural intelligence is the ability that individuals have to interact effectively across cultural contexts and with culturally different individuals” (D. C. Thomas et al., 2015, p. 1100) and captures three facets, cultural knowledge, cultural skills, and meta-cognition (see table 6.2 for dimensions and definitions). It therefore closely aligns with the underlying concept of intercultural competence in this research, including knowledge, skills, attitudes, and intercultural practice. As described in more detail in chapter 3, the SFCQ was selected over the original 20-item Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) as it furthermore seemed to better align with the target group and learning context. On the one hand, a pilot-test of the CQS revealed that students had difficulty responding to items such as “knowing the legal systems of other countries”, wondering how many of the over 100 countries represented on campus students would have to know to agree with this statement. The SFCQ items are phrased more generally and therefore seem to better fit the context of students who live and study on an international campus with more than 100 nationalities represented.

On the other hand, the SFCQ excludes the motivational facet based on the assumption that motivation is related to cultural intelligence but not necessarily part of it (D. C. Thomas et al., 2015). Students self-selected into the course by choosing it as an elective course. Regardless of whether their selection has been motivated intrinsically or extrinsically, motivation seems of secondary concern in the assessment plan for this intervention as all students were sufficiently motivated to elect the course. Instead, it seems more relevant to the overall objective of the course and the learning goals, to assess students’ progress on knowledge, skills, and metacognition throughout the course. By explicitly including knowledge and metacognition, which resembles the notion of intercultural practice in the Personal Leadership model (Schaetti et al., 2008, 2009), it complements the TMIC-S and contributes to a more comprehensive assessment plan.
Table 6.2 Short Form Cultural Intelligence Scale (SFCQ) dimensions (based on D. C. Thomas et al., 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge (K)</td>
<td>Culture-specific and culture-general knowledge, including recognizing the existence of other culture, knowledge of cultural differences, and complexity of that knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills (S)</td>
<td>Relational skills, tolerance of uncertainty, adaptability, empathy, perceptual acuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognition (MC)</td>
<td>Knowledge of and control over one’s thinking and learning activities in the specific domain of cultural experiences and strategies, measured by awareness of cultural context, conscious analysis of the influence of the cultural context, and planning courses of action in different cultural contexts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both scales have been used in the evidence-based design process presented in chapter 4, therefore contributing to deriving the learning goals. Thus, this course paid attention to alignment, though in a different order than commonly suggested. The quantitative scale mainly served to measure the multi-dimensional construct of intercultural competence over time, exploring students’ intercultural competence development throughout the course and beyond (RQ3.1). The specific learning objectives were addressed with qualitative methods, drawing upon the reflective assignments which students had to complete as part of their learning process. Thus, their learning tool simultaneously served as an assessment tool, based on the idea that critical reflection is a crucial part of developing intercultural competence and analyzing students’ reflection process can offer insights into how and what they learn. This idea has been supported by Deardorff (2006, 2011) who has argued that

“Reflection should be thought of as a critical and legitimate process for promoting and assessing learning. … Such reflection can be a rich source of data for research on students’ intercultural competence development within the curricular context and, when combined with other data sources and methods, help inform the creation of a more rigorous assessment plan” (Deardorff, 2006, p. 75).

Likewise, Wang and Kulich (2015) concluded that reflective papers can offer “a more contextualized and comprehensive way of understanding students’ intercultural competence
development” (p. 105). Thus, in this summative evaluation, students’ reflective papers were analyzed to enrich insights on students’ intercultural competence development (RQ3.1) and explore to which extent learning objectives have been achieved (RQ3.2). By combining quantitative self-report scales with qualitative data from reflective assignments, the assessment plan presented in this chapter has not only used a mixed methods approach to address the two research questions but also combined indirect (self-report) and direct (reflective papers) evidence for intercultural competence development.

**Step 5: Use evidence to improve the learning process**

The final step is based on the assumption that the collected evidence does not only serve the assessment but can also be meaningful to learners and contribute to their learning process, for example by integrating assessment throughout the course (Deardorff, 2009, 2017). In the course evaluated in this chapter, reflective assignments served as integrated assessment and students received short, written feedback on their reflective assignments in the middle and at the end of the semester.

**6.2. The Assessment Plan**

Based on the steps described above, the assessment plan depicted in figure 6.1 has emerged to capture students’ intercultural competence development throughout the course “Intercultural Competence in Practice” and their achievement of the specific learning objectives of the course. Assessment has been guided by two main research questions:

**RQ3.1: How did students’ intercultural competence develop throughout the course and beyond?**

**RQ3.2: To what extent did students achieve the specific learning objectives of the course?**
Concerning research question 3.1, some guiding hypotheses have been formulated though this mixed methods research is predominantly exploratory. The main hypothesis was that course participants will show significant increases in intercultural competence on both measures (i.e. TMIC-S and SFCQ) from the beginning to the end of course (H1a) and that this development will be sustainable (H1b), i.e. not decreasing significantly until 10 months after completion of the course (t3).

H1a: Participants will show significant gains in intercultural competence, as measured by the TMIC-S and SFCQ, at the end of the course (t2).
H1b: Participants’ gains in intercultural competence will remain stable over time, as measured by the TMIC-S and SFCQ in the follow-up 10 months after completion of the course (t3).

As described in more detail in chapter 3, all questionnaires used in this research project additionally included a measure of perceived self-efficacy, based on the assumption that it might be related to intercultural competence. Perceived self-efficacy, i.e. “people’s beliefs about their capabilities to exercise control over their own level of functioning and over events that affect their lives” (Bandura, 1993, p. 118), has repeatedly been related to cognitive processes, motivation, and behavior, and to positive learning outcomes in general as well as to intercultural competence in specific (Briones et al., 2009; Milstein, 2005; J. Wilson et al., 2013; Yashima, 2010). On the one hand, self-efficacy could be one of the factors in explaining why people with similar knowledge and skills differ in their behavior (Milstein, 2005). On the other hand, various authors have suggested that those with higher self-efficacy might be more likely to seek intercultural contact, experience less anxiety in intercultural interaction, and find it easier to adapt to new cultural environments (Briones et al., 2009; Milstein, 2005; Yashima, 2010). Furthermore, any experience of successful intercultural interaction might contribute to greater confidence in one’s ability to do so, therefore increasing people’s perceived self-efficacy (Milstein, 2005; Yashima, 2010). To be able to further explore this assumed interrelationship between intercultural competence and perceived self-efficacy, the following hypothesis has been added:

H2: Self-efficacy will be positively related with intercultural competence as measured by the TMIC-S and SFCQ at the time of the pre-test (t1), post-test (t2), and follow-up (t3).

To address the first research question on how students’ intercultural competence developed throughout the course and beyond, quantitative data was used to explore students’ intercultural competence development and address the hypotheses presented above. This
approach was complemented by using qualitative data from the reflective assignments to
enrich the numbers and see how both types of data complement each other.

Concerning research question 3.2 on the extent to which students achieved the specific
learning objectives of the course, the general hypothesis was that students will demonstrate
evidence for achieving the three learning objectives across their reflective assignments. To
address this question, a qualitative approach was used, analyzing students’ reflective
assignments with regard to the learning objectives. This approach was complemented by
exploring if further evidence for achieving the learning objectives can be found in the
quantitative data. The subsequent methods section offers more details on this mixed methods
approach and how data has been collected and analyzed. The main aim of this chapter was to
evaluate the course “Intercultural Competence in Practice” by exploring how intercultural
competence of enrolled students developed over time and if they have achieved the learning
objectives. Using a mixed methods approach that combines quantitative and qualitative
methods and integrates direct and indirect evidence, this chapter furthermore aimed to offer
insights and recommendations for assessing students’ intercultural competence in higher
education. Finally, this chapter included exploring the potential role of self-efficacy in
intercultural competence development of students enrolled in a semester-long elective course.
Thus, this evaluation study might provide starting points for further research on the
relationship between perceived self-efficacy and intercultural competence, using more
appropriate samples (i.e. larger, representative samples).

6.3. Methods

The summative evaluation presented in this chapter draws upon different types of data
collected in the longitudinal, parallel mixed methods research design of the overall
dissertation. The overall research design has been described in chapter 3. This part of the
evaluation has used both quantitative and qualitative data to assess students’ intercultural
competence development (RQ3.1), the achievement of learning objectives (RQ3.2), and to provide an example of how to implement mixed methods assessment in intercultural competence courses.

6.3.1. Quantitative Strand

The quantitative strand mainly served to address research question 3.1 on assessing students’ intercultural competence development throughout the course and beyond, including testing the specific hypotheses derived above. To do so, students’ intercultural competence and additional variables (such as self-efficacy) have been measured at various time points, i.e. in the first session of the course (t1), the last session of the course (t2), and ten months after completion of the course (t3).

Sample and data collection

All students (n=34) enrolled in the course were asked to complete a paper-and-pen questionnaire in the first (t1) and last session (t2) of the course. As explained above, the questionnaire included two measures of intercultural competence, the 25-item short form of the Test to Measure Intercultural Competence (TMIC-S; Schnabel, Kelava, van de Vijver, et al., 2015) and the 10-item Short Form Cultural Intelligence Scale (SFCQ; D. C. Thomas et al., 2015). The questionnaire further included measures of self-efficacy (GSES; Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995), subjective well-being (Flourishing; Diener et al., 2009), as well as personality traits (TIPI; Gosling et al., 2003). As described in more detail in chapter 3, the questionnaire included additional scales that might relate to the third learning objective on familiarity with the Personal Leadership methodology. These scales entailed measures of integrated self-knowledge (ISK; Ghorbani et al., 2008), mindfulness (MAAS; K. W. Brown & Ryan, 2003), and emotion recognition and regulation (selected items from the ERQ by Gross & John, 2003; and EIS by Schutte et al., 1998). As described in the previous chapter, the post-
test (t2) included 15 evaluation items about the course and an open question asking students what they liked and disliked about the course design. To ensure confidentiality, an identifier code was used to match data across time. A follow-up test (t3) was administered 10 months after the end of the course using the online platform Unipark, inviting all course participants to fill in the same measures as before, five additional evaluation items, as well as an open question on what they have learned in the course (see Appendix A for questionnaires).

Data analysis
All data were entered into SPSS 24, cleaned and matched over time. The pre- (t1) and post-test (t2) were completed by n=33 students (response rate 97%) and could be matched successfully for a total of n=24 (71%) students completing the online follow-up questionnaire (t3). Overall, reliability of the main scales of interest was satisfactory (see table 6.4 in the results section). To explore patterns in the data and address the research questions and hypotheses described above, correlations and repeated-measures ANOVAs have been computed using SPSS 24.

6.3.2. Qualitative Strand
The qualitative strand served two purposes. On the one hand, it allowed to address research question 3.2 by exploring to what extent students have achieved the learning goals throughout the course. On the other hand, it enabled gathering more direct evidence on students’ intercultural competence development, thereby adding another layer to the quantitative measures described above. Those quantitative measures mainly served to address research question 3.1, representing more indirect, self-reported evidence for students’ intercultural competence development. Based on the idea that reflective papers can be both a learning and an assessment tool (Deardorff, 2006, 2011), this part of the research focused on how to use
students’ reflective assignments as direct evidence for their intercultural competence development (RQ3.1) and achievement of learning objectives (RQ3.2).

**Sampling and data collection**

Qualitative data used in this part of the study was selected from students’ reflective assignments which comprised a total of twelve papers by \( n=34 \) students. Aiming to draw upon the richness of this body of qualitative data while ensuring its analysis is feasible, the first step involved sampling and selecting which materials to include in the analysis. In terms of assessment, it seemed crucial to include all students in the sample and narrow the data down by selecting relevant assignments. Out of a total of twelve papers, eight were selected, including the midterm and final term paper as well as six smaller weekly assignments. The excluded assignments had prompts specific to Personal Leadership, with either different tasks across students or extremely personal reflections with relatively little relevance for the overall research question. Following selection of material, all chosen materials were imported into MaxQDA for analysis.

**Data analysis**

The purpose of analysis was two-fold: (1) identify evidence for achieving the learning objectives of the course (RQ3.2), and (2) assessing students’ intercultural competence development to enrich quantitative findings about that (RQ3.1). The approach to analysis has been data-reductive coding guided by these two main topics, allowing for an initial deductive development of the coding frame. For the learning objectives, each learning objective presented one category in the coding frame. For intercultural competence development, categories were deductively derived from the dimensions of the quantitative instruments to allow for synthesizing the quantitative and qualitative strand. For this reason, the coding
frame entails all dimensions of the SFCQ and TMIC-S. Table 6.3 shows the initial coding frame.

Table 6.3. Deductively derived coding frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Learning Objectives (LO)</th>
<th>2. Intercultural Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 LO1 – in-depth understanding of culture</td>
<td>2.1 SFCQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 LO2 – relate knowledge to own experience</td>
<td>2.1.1 SFCQ_knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 LO3 – understand and apply PL</td>
<td>2.1.2 SFCQ_skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.3 SFCQ_metacognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 TMIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.1 TMIC_communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.2 TMIC_learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.3 TMIC_socialinteraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.4 TMIC_selfknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.5 TMIC_selfmanagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.6 TMIC_creatingsynergies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To benefit from the richness of the qualitative data, subcategories were inductively added to the learning objective categories during the coding process. This allowed gaining deeper insights into how students attained the learning objectives in more specific terms. With this combined deductive and inductive approach to coding, several cycles of coding, re-coding, categorizing and re-categorizing took place. The final list of codes can be found in Appendix H. More details and quotes from the data will be provided when presenting the results. It is important to note that coding was selective in that it focused on the two main topics, thereby neglecting additional topics that could emerge from the data. This decision was made based on the research objectives of this evaluation study, but it is important to keep in mind that this represents a reductive approach to qualitative data. Another decision was to choose a combination of deductive and inductive coding over more systematic qualitative content analysis (QCA). On the one hand, it seemed difficult to segment the material in a way that
would satisfy criteria such as mutual exclusive categories within one dimension. Even if material were segmented by units of ideas, the same segment could possibly be coded as “SFCQ_Knowledge” and “SFCQ_Skills”. On the other hand, coding provided more flexibility in the analysis which was preferred over a more systematic approach. While the initial categories of the coding frame were derived deductively from the quantitative scales, subcategories mainly emerged inductively from the data in a multi-step process of coding and re-coding.

The coding so far has allowed to address research question 3.2. Another analysis step was done to allow for better integration of quantitative and qualitative data with regard to research question 3.1. All coded segments within the codes and subcategories of the SFCQ and TMIC-S were revisited to find ways to quantify them beyond merely stating whether they were present or not present in the qualitative data. For the SFCQ, definitions and items of each dimension of the quantitative scale (i.e. knowledge, skills, metacognition) were used to re-code text segments and quantify them. For example, the SFCQ dimension knowledge pertains to both culture-general and culture-specific knowledge. While this distinction has not been accounted for in the initial coding frame, it was used to re-code segments coded as “2.1.1. SFCQ_knowledge” as “culture-general”, “culture-specific” or “both” as a basis for quantifying them. For the TMIC-S, text segments within each subcategory were screened for inductively emerging topics, thereby adding more depth to the quantitative scale. Visual data display tables were created to merge quantitative and qualitative data that pertain to research question 3.1 which will be presented in the subsequent results section.

6.4. Results

This section first presents results pertaining to research question 3.1, followed by results for research question 3.2.
6.4.1. RQ3.1: Students’ Intercultural Competence Development

Table 6.4 shows the Cronbach’s alpha for the two scales to measure intercultural competence, i.e. the TMIC-S and SFCQ, as well as for additional scales such as the GSES used to measure perceived self-efficacy and the Flourishing scale used to measure subjective well-being. The TIPI has not been included in this table as it conceptually did not make sense to calculate reliability across five different personality traits. Likewise, there seemed rather little use in calculating Cronbach’s alpha per trait as there were only two items per personality trait.

Overall, across time points, the reliability of all scales was satisfactory to excellent.

Table 6.4. Reliability analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Pre-test (t1)</th>
<th>Post-test (t2)</th>
<th>Follow-up (t3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TMIC-S</td>
<td>25 items</td>
<td>n=25, 0.85</td>
<td>n=27, 0.91</td>
<td>n=25, Cronbach’s alpha=0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFCQ</td>
<td>10 items</td>
<td>N=32, 0.80</td>
<td>N=32, 0.84</td>
<td>n=22, Cronbach’s alpha=0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSES</td>
<td>10 items</td>
<td>32, 0.87</td>
<td>30, 0.86</td>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha=0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flourishing</td>
<td>8 items</td>
<td>31, 0.72</td>
<td>33, 0.82</td>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha=0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the predominantly exploratory nature of this research, first Pearson product-moment correlations were computed to explore any potential relations between different variables.

Table 6.5 offers an overview of significant correlations between measures of intercultural competence, personality traits, self-efficacy, and subjective well-being across the three points of measurement. The two measures of intercultural competence, TMIC-S and SFCQ, showed a significant positive correlation for the pre-test ($n = 33, r = 0.75, p < 0.01$), post-test ($n = 33, r = 0.61, p < 0.01$) and follow-up ($n = 24, r = 0.62 p < 0.01$), supporting their validity in measuring the same underlying construct though with slightly different foci. Summarizing the
results displayed in table 6.5, it seems noteworthy that self-efficacy (measured by the GSES) was significantly and positively correlated to both measures of intercultural competence at all three points in time, i.e. pre-test (for TMIC-S: $r = 0.74, p < 0.01$; for SFCQ: $r = 0.61, p < 0.01$), post-test (for TMIC-S: $r = 0.59, p < 0.01$; for SFCQ: $r = 0.43, p < 0.05$), and follow-up (for TMIC-S: $r = 0.76, p < 0.01$; for SFCQ: $r = 0.52, p < 0.01$), lending support to hypothesis 2 about a potential relationship between intercultural competence and self-efficacy. Interestingly, at times, the correlation between the TMIC-S or SFCQ and GSES were as strong as the correlation between the two measures of intercultural competence. This observation is further explored in the discussion section below.

The correlations also served to explore potential relationships between variables beyond the ones hypothesized. As shown in table 6.5, there was a significant positive relationship between both measures of intercultural competence and Flourishing (as a measure of subjective well-being) at all time points. Concerning the short personality measure (TIPI), openness was the only factor that was significantly and positively related to both measures of intercultural competence at the pre- and post-test and to the TMIC-S at the follow-up. With the exception of a significant positive correlation between conscientiousness and both the SFCQ and TMIC-S at $t_3$, as well as a significant positive relationship between emotional stability and the TMIC-S at $t_3$, there were no further significant correlations between measures of intercultural competence and personality.
Table 6.5. Pearson product-moment correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre_ TMIC</th>
<th>Pre_ SFCQ</th>
<th>Pre_ Flourishing</th>
<th>Pre_ Self-efficacy</th>
<th>Pre_ Openness</th>
<th>Post_ TMIC</th>
<th>Post_ SFCQ</th>
<th>Post_ Flourishing</th>
<th>Post_ Self-efficacy</th>
<th>Post_ Openness</th>
<th>FollowUp_ TMIC</th>
<th>FollowUp_ SFCQ</th>
<th>FollowUp_ Flourishing</th>
<th>FollowUp_ Self-efficacy</th>
<th>FollowUp_ Openness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre_ TMIC</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_ SFCQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.4**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_ Flourishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_ Self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.85*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post_ TMIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post_ SFCQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post_ Flourishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post_ Self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FollowUp_ TMIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FollowUp_ SFCQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FollowUp_ Flourishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FollowUp_ Self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p<.05, ** *p<.01

Please note: The table only displays correlations which have been significant at least at the 5% level.
In the next step, students’ development of intercultural competence over time was assessed by comparing group means on both scales, i.e. the TMIC-S and the SFCQ, using the repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) with time as within-subject factor (time with three levels: pre-test, post-test, follow-up). As intercultural competence has been measured by two scales, the TMIC-S and the SFCQ, analysis of variance (ANOVA) has been computed for both scales. The main effect of time was significant for both scales, with results for both measures shown in table 6.6.

Table 6.6. Results from two repeated-measures ANOVAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Within-subject effects</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$p_{two-tailed}$</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME(TMIC)</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.212</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME(SFCQ)</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.726</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: df degrees of freedom, MS mean square

In the next step, the ANOVA was followed-up with pairwise comparisons corrected for using Bonferroni’s adjustment. Means and standard errors at each time point are shown in table 6.7. Pairwise comparison revealed that the difference in means was significant from pre- to post-test for both, the TMIC-S (Mdifference=0.258, Std. Error=0.059, $p=0.001$) and the SFCQ (Mdifference=0.299, Std. Error=0.092, $p=0.011$). In contrast, neither the difference in means from post-test to follow-up nor from pre-test to follow-up was significant.
Table 6.7. Mean and standard errors for pairwise comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TMIC-S (6-point scale)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFCQ (7-point scale)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>0.146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings are illustrated in figure 6.2 for TMIC-S and figure 6.3 for SFCQ. The results support hypothesis 1a, suggesting that there has been a significant increase in means on both the TMIC-S and SFCQ from pre- to post-test, i.e. over the time of students’ participation in the course. Given that the results show a significant increase from pre- to post-test, but not from pre-test to follow-up further support that the increase in intercultural competence was related to participation in the elective course. The findings also support hypothesis 1b by offering evidence for stable, sustainable gains in intercultural competence as scores on either of the scales measuring intercultural competence neither increased or decreased significantly from post-test to follow-up.
As described in chapter 3, the TMIC-S not only includes self-report items for each of the six facets measured, but also a situational judgment test (SJT) per facet. SJTs have been adapted to the context of the students in this research, presenting them with six critical incident
scenarios (see questionnaires presented in Appendix A) with four ordinally ranked answers. Similar to assessment centers, SJTs seek to capture how individuals would behave in such scenarios (Schnabel, 2015). Table 6.8 provides the descriptive statistics of each SJT for the pre-test (t1) and post-test (t2). Two things seem noteworthy: First, means have already been relatively high for most facets in the pre-test. Second, on average, means all have gone up from the pre- to post-test. However, t-tests have shown that none of the means increased significantly from pre- to post-test.

Table 6.8. Descriptives for TMIC-S situational judgment tests (SJT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test (t1)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Post-test (t2)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SJT Sensitivity in communication</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT Information-seeking</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT Socializing</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT Goal-setting</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT Mediation of interests</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT Cultural identity reflection</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In her thesis, Schnabel (2015) has noted that most, but not all of the SJTs were significantly correlated to the appropriate self-report facet, though with rather small correlations. Schnabel (2015) has referred to other authors who have already argued that SJTs rarely are clearly unidimensional. Table 6.9 shows significant correlations between SJTs and self-report items of the TMIC-S for the pre-test. While there were significant positive correlations between some SJTs and self-report items, the dimensions hardly ever matched, confirming doubts that SJTs can be unidimensional and clearly aligned with the corresponding self-report dimensions.
Table 6.9. Pearson product-moment correlations for pre-test data from situational judgement tests (SJTs) and self-report items from the TMIC-S

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TMIC_SC</th>
<th>TMIC_IS</th>
<th>TMIC_SZ</th>
<th>TMIC_GS</th>
<th>TMIC_MI</th>
<th>TMIC_CIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SJT_SC</td>
<td></td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT_IS</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT_SZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT_GS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT_MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT_CIR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p \leq .05 \), ** \( p \leq .01 \) / Please note: The table only displays correlations which have been significant at least at the 5% level. / Abbreviations: SC=Sensitivity in communication, IS=Information-seeking, SZ=Socializing, GS=Goal-setting, MI=Mediation of interests, CIR=Cultural identity reflection.

Table 6.10 displays significant correlations between SJTs and self-report items of the TMIC-S for the post-test. In the post-test, significant positive correlations between SJTs and their corresponding self-report dimensions could be found for half of the six dimensions of the TMIC-S. However, two of those showed positive significant correlations to other self-report dimensions, reinforcing that SJTs hardly showed clear alignment with the self-report items.

Table 6.10. Pearson product-moment correlations for post-test data from situational judgement tests (SJTs) and self-report items from the TMIC-S

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TMIC_SC</th>
<th>TMIC_IS</th>
<th>TMIC_SZ</th>
<th>TMIC_GS</th>
<th>TMIC_MI</th>
<th>TMIC_CIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SJT_SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT_IS</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT_SZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT_GS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT_MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT_CIR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p \leq .05 \), ** \( p \leq .01 \) / Please note: The table only displays correlations which have been significant at least at the 5% level. / Abbreviations: SC=Sensitivity in communication, IS=Information-seeking, SZ=Socializing, GS=Goal-setting, MI=Mediation of interests, CIR=Cultural identity reflection.
Adding qualitative data to the picture

In the next step, qualitative data were used to enrich the quantitative data. Table 6.17 (shown in the supplementary materials at the end of this chapter) provides an overview of all three SFCQ dimensions (i.e. knowledge, skills, metacognition), including their definitions, the number of participants who showed evidence for any element of these dimensions in their reflective papers, and quotes from or summaries of the qualitative data.

For the knowledge dimension, students mentioned culture-specific \( (n = 13) \), culture-general \( (n = 8) \) or both types of knowledge \( (n = 11) \), with a total of 32 (out of 34) students demonstrating some level of culture-specific and/or culture-general knowledge in their reflective assignments. As the SFCQ knowledge dimension also refers to complexity of such knowledge, text segments initially coded as “SFCQ_knowledge” were re-coded and grouped by level of complexity, distinguishing between basic, medium, and high complexity of knowledge. While a basic level of complexity pertained to anecdotal descriptions of cultural differences, medium and high complexity captured more systematic and eventually more critical discussions of cultural differences. Overall, 12 students demonstrated basic complexity of knowledge only, 10 progressed from basic to medium across their assignments, 8 showed evidence of medium complexity of knowledge, and 2 progressed from medium to high complexity across their assignments. There were no students regressing on the knowledge dimension, but it should be kept in mind that 12 students stayed at a basic level of complexity throughout their assignments and two students did not show any evidence to be coded as “SFCQ_Knowledge”.

The SFCQ skills dimension entails relational skills (referred to by \( n = 11 \) students), tolerance of uncertainty (mentioned by \( n = 13 \) students), adaptability (discussed by \( n = 10 \) students), empathy (mentioned by \( n = 11 \) students) and perceptual acuity (discussed by \( n = 1 \) student). Students’ reflections upon their relational skills ranged from discussing their general appreciation of being able to meet others from all over the world on campus and learn about
their cultures and languages to reflecting upon their own ability to establish meaningful relationships and find points of connection. When reflecting upon tolerating uncertainty in intercultural encounters, students described how they increasingly felt able to accept differences in ways of doing things (e.g. group work) without judging them based on their own standards and without feeling offended. In their discussions of adaptability, students offered examples of how they adapted their behavior, including trying to make more eye contact to appear approachable, adapt to the communication style of the interaction partner, or being sensitive to different preferences concerning personal space and emotional expressiveness. With regard to empathy, students mainly reflected upon the importance of putting themselves into someone else’s shoes and take different perspective when trying to make sense of cultural differences. While perceptual acuity seems close to empathy, it has been coded only if students offered very detailed descriptions of how they sensed another person’s feelings, as shown in the quote displayed in table 6.11. Overall, 26 out of 34 students showed evidence for any of the skills included in the SFCQ skills dimension. Half of those students reflected upon one skill only, six each showed evidence for two or three skills, and one student mentioned and reflected upon four skills across the assignments.

Finally, concerning the SFCQ metacognition dimension, a distinction has been made between awareness of cultural context, analysis of this context, and planning one’s interactions with culturally different others. Almost all students demonstrated awareness of the cultural knowledge they used, for example when discussing cultural differences they observed in interactions on campus (33 out of 34 students). Most of them also explicitly analyzed to what extent their own behavior and/or that of the interaction partner could be explained by cultural influences (29 out of 34 students). In contrast, only half explicitly described how they changed or intended to change their behavior in interaction with culturally different others (17 out of 34 students).
Table 6.18 (also provided at the end of this chapter) displays a similar overview for the TMIC-S dimensions, including their definitions, and summary of the qualitative data segments associated with each dimension. For ‘sensitivity in communication’, text segments from 16 students could be grouped in awareness of differences in verbal and nonverbal behavior, ability to name strategies to be sensitive in communication (such as mindfulness, emotion management, perspective-taking, and switching communication styles), and discussing specific examples of using such strategies. For ‘information-seeking’, 15 students offered insights into their different ways of gathering information about other cultures, including interacting with culturally different others on campus and asking them questions, learning new languages, traveling and immersing oneself in other cultures, using the Internet or books to find information on other cultures, watching movies from other cultures, observing people, or attending campus events on different cultures or intercultural topics.

In terms of ‘socializing’, text segments by 13 students were coded with this label and could be grouped into statements of generally enjoying contact with people from other cultures, reflections on establishing meaningful contact, and reflections on having found ways to make friends across cultures, even if it that might have seemed challenging in the beginning. Only two students discussed ‘goal-setting’, in both cases within the context of using Personal Leadership to set goals and work towards achieving them. The text segments pertaining to ‘mediation of interests’ came from eight different students and were grouped into discussing how to find a compromise between one’s own position and those of others, reflecting upon one’s ability to speak up when feeling offended and resolve the situation, and situations in which one acts as a mediator when two or more other parties have different points of view.

Finally, all students frequently showed signs of ‘cultural identity reflection’ – a finding that seemed hardly surprising given that writing prompts of the reflective assignments repeatedly encouraged students to reflect upon their cultural identity and preferences.
Students’ cultural identity reflection differed in depth, ranging from more superficial ways of describing one’s cultural background to deeper levels of critically reflecting upon how much one identifies with one’s cultural background and the extent to which it influences one’s values, thinking style, communication style, and other preferences. In most cases, the code ‘cultural identity reflection’ co-occurred with the code for learning objective 2, i.e. ‘reflect upon own cultural identity’, suggesting that in about 90% of segments coded with both codes, students engaged in deeper level cultural identity reflection.

**Integrating quantitative and qualitative findings – the bigger picture**

The previous step enriched quantitative results by adding insights from qualitative data gathered from students’ reflective assignments. To further integrate quantitative and qualitative findings, the next step was to create a matrix to summarize some of the key demographics as well as quantitative and qualitative results for each student of the course (see Table 6.11). While analysis of potential patterns in this matrix was beyond the scope of this dissertation, some observations seem noteworthy with regard to research question 3.1 of how students’ intercultural competence has developed from the beginning to the end of the course.
### Table 6.11. Overview of each student’s intercultural competence development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Monocultural</th>
<th>Monolingual</th>
<th>Abroad</th>
<th>SFCQ</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>TMIC-S</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>1 parent from other culture</td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.20-5.20</td>
<td>K: none S: none MC: 1</td>
<td>4.40-3.92</td>
<td>Complexity: 2 SZ, CIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.90-5.40</td>
<td>K: basic S: 2 MC: 3</td>
<td>4.24-4.08</td>
<td>Complexity: 3 SC, CIR, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>1 parent from other culture</td>
<td>Multilingual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.70-5.80</td>
<td>K: basic S: 1 MC: 2</td>
<td>4.44-5.13</td>
<td>Complexity: 3 SC, IS, CIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.00-5.90</td>
<td>K: medium S: 2 MC: 2</td>
<td>4.60-5.32</td>
<td>Complexity: 2 SC, CIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.50-5.40</td>
<td>K: basic-medium S: 2 MC: 3</td>
<td>4.24-4.16</td>
<td>Complexity: 1 CIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Multilingual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.20-5.60</td>
<td>K: basic-medium S: 3 MC: 3</td>
<td>4.42-4.60</td>
<td>Complexity: 4 SC, IS, SZ, CIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Multilingual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.80-6.00</td>
<td>K: basic-medium S: 1 MC: 0</td>
<td>4.50-4.88</td>
<td>Complexity: 2 IS, CIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Multilingual</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.00-5.90</td>
<td>K: basic S: 1 MC: 2</td>
<td>4.56-4.64</td>
<td>Complexity: 2 IS, CIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.00-5.30</td>
<td>K: medium-high S: 4 MC: 3</td>
<td>5.38-5.67</td>
<td>Complexity: 2 IS, CIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1 parent from other culture</td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.70-5.70</td>
<td>K: basic S: none MC: 1</td>
<td>4.96-4.88</td>
<td>Complexity: 1 CIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.50-5.40</td>
<td>K: basic S: none MC: 3</td>
<td>4.40-5.08</td>
<td>Complexity: 1 CIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Born in another country than both parents</td>
<td>Multilingual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.00-5.90</td>
<td>K: medium</td>
<td>S: none</td>
<td>MC: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.40-5.00</td>
<td>K: basic-medium</td>
<td>S: none</td>
<td>MC: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.50-5.80</td>
<td>K: basic-medium</td>
<td>S: 3</td>
<td>MC: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.80-5.70</td>
<td>K: basic</td>
<td>S: 2, MC: 2</td>
<td>4.72-4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Multilingual</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.20-4.60</td>
<td>K: basic</td>
<td>S: 3</td>
<td>MC: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Multilingual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.90-6.30</td>
<td>K: none</td>
<td>S: 1</td>
<td>MC: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Multilingual</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.60-6.30</td>
<td>K: basic</td>
<td>S: none</td>
<td>MC: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.60-4.80</td>
<td>K: basic-medium</td>
<td>S: 1</td>
<td>MC: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.90-5.40</td>
<td>K: basic</td>
<td>S: 1</td>
<td>MC: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.90-5.70</td>
<td>K: medium</td>
<td>S: 1</td>
<td>MC: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.10-5.40</td>
<td>K: basic-medium</td>
<td>S: 3</td>
<td>MC: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Multilingual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.60-6.00</td>
<td>K: basic-medium</td>
<td>S: 1</td>
<td>MC: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Cultural Background</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>K:</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>MC:</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.00-5.90</td>
<td>K: medium</td>
<td>S: none</td>
<td>MC: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.70-6.40</td>
<td>K: medium</td>
<td>S: 2</td>
<td>MC: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Multilingual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.20-5.50</td>
<td>K: medium</td>
<td>S: none</td>
<td>MC: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Multilingual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.30-6.60</td>
<td>K: basic</td>
<td>S: 1</td>
<td>MC: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.70-5.20</td>
<td>K: medium</td>
<td>S: 1, MC: 3</td>
<td>3.96-4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.20-5.67</td>
<td>K: basic-medium</td>
<td>S: 3, MC: 3</td>
<td>4.08-4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7.00-7.00</td>
<td>K: basic</td>
<td>S: 1, MC: 1</td>
<td>5.04-5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Monocultural</td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.00-5.00</td>
<td>K: basic</td>
<td>S: 1, MC: 2</td>
<td>3.56-4.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: K=Knowledge, S=Skills, MC=Metacognition, SC=Sensitivity in communication, IS=Information-seeking, SZ=Socializing, CIR=Cultural identity reflection, GS=Goal-setting, MI=Mediation of interests
The quantitative analysis has suggested that on average students made significant gains in intercultural competence on both scales from pre- to post-test. However, the matrix offers insights into the diversity of individual experiences within the group. While the majority of students self-reported higher scores of intercultural competence in the post-test, some ended up with lower scores. Did these individuals indeed regress in their intercultural competence? A closer look at the qualitative findings summarized in the matrix suggests otherwise, showing that most of those with rather low quantitative scores and/or decreases over time displayed direct evidence for having attained certain levels of intercultural competence in their reflective assignments. Student 9, for example, showed a decrease on the SFCQ scale—however, analysis of that student’s reflective papers revealed that student 9 was among the small group that progressed from medium to high complexity of cultural knowledge, displayed evidence for four of the five skills captured in the SFCQ skills dimension, and showed evidence for not only being aware of cultural influences and consciously analyzing their impact, but even planning how to act in intercultural situations. At the very least, this case demonstrates how pronounced the mismatch between quantitative and qualitative findings can be. Based on the distinction between direct and indirect evidence, one could go further and argue that the direct evidence from the reflective papers shows that student 9 made strong progress in intercultural competence development. Thus, it seems that student’s progress could not be captured accurately in the indirect self-report on the SFCQ scale.

Another example is student 16 who scored comparatively low on both the SFCQ and TMIC-S and decreased on both from pre- to post-test. However, analysis of that student’s reflective papers has revealed that this student has achieved quite some level of intercultural competence. Student 16 progressed from basic to medium complexity of knowledge, explicitly discussed two skills of the SFCQ, and metacognition was evident up to the highest stage of planning how to behave in different cultural settings and intercultural encounters. Likewise, the student displayed evidence for cultural identity reflection and sensitivity in
communication concerning TMIC-S dimensions. That the mismatch of quantitative and qualitative findings can go either way is shown by the case of student 32. While student 32 scored the highest possible score of 7 on the SFCQ for both the pre- and post-test, qualitative analysis has led to a more modest picture with basic complexity of knowledge, one SFCQ skill discussed, and metacognitive abilities limited to being aware of cultural knowledge and context.

Clearly more systematic and detailed analysis is needed to back up and extend claims made based on the integration of quantitative and qualitative findings in the matrix. However, it can be noted as a first observation that students’ indirect, self-report evidence and direct, reflective paper evidence did not necessarily converge. Some students displayed relatively high levels of intercultural competence in their reflective assignments, but had comparatively low scores on the quantitative, self-report scales and/or decreased in their scores from pre- to post-test. In contrast, other students seemed to have overestimated their intercultural competence on the self-report, achieving higher scores than one would expect from the levels of intercultural competence displayed in the reflective assignments.

6.4.2. RQ3.2: Achievement of Learning Objectives

To answer research question 3.2 and summarize findings from students’ reflective assignments with regard to attaining the learning objectives of the course, two steps were carried out. First, a more quantitative approach to data analysis was taken. For each student, coded segments for each learning objective were summarized into one score, dichotomizing into whether the learning objective was generally attained or not. All 34 students demonstrated clear evidence for achieving learning objective 1 (“in-depth understanding of how culture influences how we feel, think, and act”) across their assignments. Likewise, all students showed that they were able “to relate this knowledge to their everyday experience in a multicultural environment”, thus achieving learning objective 2. Concerning learning
objective 3 (“be familiar with the Personal Leadership methodology and Critical Moment Dialogue (CMD) and able to apply it to their own experience”), 32 out of 34 students demonstrated an understanding of Personal Leadership in their analyzed assignments. Yet, for this learning objective, it is important to keep in mind that most of the Personal Leadership-related assignments have been excluded from the analysis as described above.

In the second step, subcategories that emerged inductively for each learning objective were added to the coding frame to gain a deeper understanding of what students learned. Table 6.12 shows the most frequently mentioned subcategories out of 14 subcategories which have emerged for learning objective 1. While the list of codes in the appendix (Appendix H) offers details on all 14 subcategories, this chapter focuses on those referred to by at least half of the students enrolled in the course. With regard to learning objective 1 (i.e. in-depth understanding of how culture influences how we feel, think, and act), all students discussed their emerging and deepening understanding of how culture influences how we feel, think, and act. Students’ reflection ranged from a general understanding of how culture shapes our perception and interpretation of the world to discussing specific differences in thinking styles, values, and what is considered appropriate behavior:

“All human cultures exist in their specific ways and environments; hence there are differences among them. For instance, when I was in Ghana for my high school years, giving things to others with left hand was very offensive so you always had to use your right hand. On the contrary, you can use both hands in Ethiopia to give things to others. In a nutshell, culture is a very significant part of human beings that defines who we truly are and where we belong more often than not.” (student 33)

Likewise, all students discussed aspects of intercultural communication, ranging from potential language barriers and differences in verbal and nonverbal communication to strategies for coping with misunderstandings. What seems noteworthy is that while some
students remained on a more theoretical level, summarizing the course reading or session content, most were able to connect it to their own experience and observations:

“The use of gestures is highly universal, but the gestures themselves, and their frequency of use, is not. A rather humorous example of gesture miscommunication is when President Bush visited Australia and unknowingly displayed the reverse peace sign—which is offensive in Australia—to a parade of people. While amusing, such accidents are frequent across the world, and some are interpreted more harshly than Bush’s actions. The power of voice, not the meaning of the words themselves, is also frequently misinterpreted. For example, Americans often believe Germans are intermittently angry simply because of the guttural and rough sounds of the language; which could, unfortunately, lead to negative judgments.” (student 20)

Almost all students reflected upon their understanding of what it means to be interculturally competent. However, systematically analyzing their subjective definitions of intercultural competence exceeded the scope of this research and was outside its main focus. However, the following quote offers one example of how students reflected upon the topic of intercultural competence:

“Understanding that people of different culture have different ways of thinking was very important for me as a student in Jacobs University. This has taught me to be less judgmental and has helped me avoid many misconceptions and needless arguments. Being interculturally competent does not mean to disregard your own culture but to be more aware of others as the world is becoming more and more global. For me this was somewhat difficult as in Bulgaria where I come from there is no such intercultural environment everyone I know is from the same nationality as me and shares the same beliefs. Coming to Jacobs I had to learn to be more open-minded.” (student 16)

Another dominant topic was students’ emerging understanding of the complexity of the concept of culture. It involved aspects such as the notion that culture can refer to both, visible and invisible aspects of life and that it goes beyond national culture, capturing the idea that different groups can have culture. The latter point has frequently co-occurred with students’
reflecting upon their own multiple identities and how belonging to different cultural groups (e.g. local region, country level, religious group) has influenced them:

“In my opinion, culture is not limited to race or country. There can be a culture centered on a religion, e.g. a Muslim or a Christian culture, or abstract concepts like nerd culture or coffee culture. As mentioned in this week’s reading, being part of a culture allows groups of people to ‘derive meaning from life’, and what you believe in plays a big role in trying to derive meaning from life. While this might sound too heavy for rather not-so-serious concepts like nerd culture or coffee culture, maybe believing in a good cup of coffee to start the day with or believing in superheroes in comic books can bind a group of people together and identify with each other – and from this they build up a culture and find meaning from life through the beliefs they share as a culture.” (student 21)

Another frequently mentioned topic was students’ understanding of cultural differences, often in terms of students contrasting their newly gained knowledge on other cultures with their own culture:

“Around Asians I would feel a little too forward as if I am getting into their personal space and crossing a line while Spanish or Latin Americans would sometimes take me by surprise when kissing my cheek just to greet me. Saying what is considered politically correct in Bulgaria would not always account as the right thing to say here. I came to realize how everyone had this different way of seeing the world.” (student 14)

Students also showed evidence of being aware that culture is only one influence and that personal or situational factors can also shape behavior. This subcategory included comments on resisting the temptation to explain everything by culture as well as students reflecting upon the extent to which their own behavior is shaped by cultural, personal, and situational factors:

“Having grown up in an internally segregated country like Egypt, I acknowledged how distinct outlooks can be and how a culture is not determined only by the country of origin, but by religion, family, financial status and much more. … There are infinite cultures out there that
surpass the established confinement of countries. Beauty and admirable traits can be found in all of them.” (student 9)

Another facet of students’ understanding of culture included its origins, conceptualizing culture as a way of organizing group living and ensure survival in response to the environment and factors such as climate, population density, and resources:

“…immediate surroundings play a very essential role in the evolution of a culture altogether. … Since time immemorial, humans have displayed the ability to adapt to the various environments, … This indeed seems true as the way people live are determined by various factors such as climate, type of land for cultivation, or population size etc. The way people dress themselves, the food people eat, the way they work, the required housing arrangements, and numerous other examples stand as a proof to the statement. For instance, a lot of examples can be seen in the country India. In the peninsular region, the climate is nearly moderate. In summers, the mercury easily soars up to 40 to 45 degrees and in monsoons, the region receives a good amount of rain. Interestingly, it can be noticed that the staple food available is mostly rice and yellow lentils, the clothes worn are only made of cotton and most of the houses in the region have very thin walls, and sloppy rooftops. Thus, it is clear from the example that the climatic conditions play a very important role.” (student 26)

Likewise, the majority of students reflected upon how culture is learned and acquired through socialization, giving individuals some choice on what to accept and reject:

“While we have a much greater capacity to learn ‘from scratch’ than other animals, we do have some basic knowledge on how to adapt to this world; even as infants. This essentially made me realize that no culture can be ‘found within’ us at birth. It is for us to grow into a culture and allow it to shape us.” (student 32)

On average, students discussed about nine of these topics (Mean = 9.56, SD = 1.19) with a range of mentioning at least seven different topics up to a maximum of 12 (out of 14 in total).
Table 6.12. Main subcategories within the Code LO1: in-depth understanding of culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Number of participants referring to it (out of n=34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture influences how we feel, think, and act</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural communication</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural competence</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex concept</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of cultural differences</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture is one influence, not the only one</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origins of culture</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture is learned</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning learning objective 2 (linking knowledge to own experience), emerging subcategories included students reflecting upon their own cultural identity (on a superficial vs. a deeper level), thinking style, intercultural competence, and communication style. Table 6.13 displays the frequencies for these subcategories. While some students started out with more superficial reflections upon their own cultural identity, the majority progressed to deeper reflections throughout their assignments (with the exception of two students). Superficial reflections were those that stayed on a descriptive level, describing one’s national culture without critically reflecting upon to what extent in and in which ways one’s own perception and behavior are shaped by it:

“My country’s culture is the Peruvian culture. I think Peru is known for its delicious food, places, history and festive people. To describe Peru it is needed to say that it is a very diverse mixed country with a lot of inequality. … Peruvians are generally very festive, warm and open once they let their ward down. I think that this defense mechanism is because since we are very young we have been taught to be very vigilant about people’s intentions due to the fact of the security problem.” (student 3)

In contrast, deeper reflection included reflecting upon how one engages with one’s culture and upon multiple cultural identities, such as exploring how much students embraced the
culture they grew up in and how they created and constructed their own identities, also based on their experience in other cultures:

“When being asked where do I come from, my answer is without a doubt Taiwan. In truth, it remains debatable as to how much I really identify with being a Taiwanese. My father and mother are from Hong Kong and Taiwan respectively, and I was born and raised in Taiwan for a total of eleven and a half years. Without question it is where I feel the most connected to, enough to stimulate patriotic feelings. I have also lived in the UK and Singapore. I feel, however, that the countries that I have resided in had little effect on my cultural identity. Instead, it was the schools that I have attended. Since school was such a big part of my life, attending an international school of a certain country, even if I’m living in another country, puts me in close contact with the culture of the school’s country. I have experienced Canadian, British, and American international schools for nine years since I was nine years old. At such a young age one would already have a fairly strong sense of cultural identity, enough to recognize the cultural difference between one and the others. However, it is not strong enough to allow the child to remain unaffected. My Taiwanese cultural identity back then was so volatile that foreign ideas and way of life would always slip in unnoticed. After a few years I found myself drifting away from my childhood best friends in Taiwan, not entirely because of the lack of time we spent in each other’s company but because I have noticed such fundamental cultural differences in thinking between us. I understand that people change, but I still attribute the main factor in our difference in that I have grown more individualistic whereas my friend’s views develop in according to the collectivist thinking of Taiwanese society. However, having different cultural views does not mean that I don’t understand the ideas of another culture. Having lived in so many different cultures allowed me to observe and learn their different dynamics, and I can easily adjust to the difference paces of cultures. Yet the problem of having characteristics of different cultural identities in me is that I rarely have a sense of ‘belonging’.” (4)

All students reflected upon their own thinking style. However, this finding hardly came as a surprise given that one of the assignments explicitly asked students to relate a reading on
analytic and holistic thinking to their own upbringing and preferences. What seems noteworthy though is that all students were able to give specific examples of how a certain thinking style was promoted at home or in school:

“In the ninth grade, when I shifted to the American system of education, I noticed that English class was quite different to what I was accustomed to until then. I knew that syntax, structural and grammatical features contributed to the overall meaning of a poem, but I wasn’t used to spending entire classes on the discussion of individual structural features and grammatical choices in a poem. Until then, in the schools I’d attended in India, we would spend more time focusing on the message of a work, or the authors intent. Structure always came up with reference to a thematic message, but we didn’t usually take an individual structural element and analyze it to find the meaning it contributed to. I suppose that the result of both approaches is the same, the components of a work in relation to its overall meaning. However, in India, I had focused more on how the parts contribute to the whole, whereas, in my new school, the emphasis was on how the whole is built up from individual parts.” (student 32)

In contrast, there were no explicit prompts asking students to reflect upon their intercultural competence or communication style, though there were various assignments that could be used to reflect upon those topics. The majority of students reflected upon their own intercultural competence, as mentioned when presenting findings on learning objective 1 and as also exemplified in the following quote:

“Learning is a continuous process and people learn for different reasons. I believe that what I learn in the classroom is for a good reason, however, all the learned material will go to waste if I do not try to use what I have learnt in class, outside the classroom. … I have been privileged enough to be in a multi-cultural environment like Jacobs University. The kind of cultural things I learn here are priceless. Coming from multicultural environment too, I thought I was very prepared for Jacobs; but little did I know. Africa has a lot of countries with different cultures, however, there are some similarities among these cultures. It is worth knowing the African cultures differ a lot from the Western ones. I never took time to inform myself about Western cultures till I came here, and certain things I saw in my first two weeks
still give me questions in my head. But all of that is in the past. I have learned to be my own leader. Without knowing, I used to do a lot of things that were associated with the six practices of Personal Leadership. … Because of these practices, I have become the person I am today…I am not perfect and I know that. That is why I will use my personal leadership skills and practices to become a better person.” (student 15)

Furthermore, almost half of the students explicitly reflected upon their communication style and to what extent their preferences might be influenced by culture:

“I would like to talk about how my culture influenced communication at Jacobs university. … In Nepal people don’t hug each other a lot. You hug someone if you are meeting him/her after a long time. Even though this trend is changing and people have started hugging in normal situations, it is still considered a sign of serious affection. My grandmother wouldn’t like to see me hugging a guy friend of mine. However, hugging is quite normal at Jacobs or Western countries in general. Living in a multicultural environment here has made me feel comfortable with hugging people a lot. Talking about verbal communication, one serious challenge I face is the way westerners address teachers or elders versus how South Asians address them. In the latter countries, we attach a relationship while addressing someone. We say uncle and aunty to friends’ parents and ‘Sir’ and ‘Ma’am’ to teachers, but in western society you address them by saying Mr. and Mrs. I am not used to doing what westerners do, but I have to say Mr. and Mrs. because the people I am talking to will find it weird if I call them aunty or uncle.” (student 27)

Table 6.13. Subcategories within the Code LO2: linking knowledge to own experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Number of participants referring to it (out of n=34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflect upon own cultural identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Superficial</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Deeper</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect upon own thinking style</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect upon own intercultural competence</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect upon own communication style</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis of evidence on learning objectives 1 and 2 further entailed checking for frequently appearing co-occurrences of codes across these learning objectives. As shown in table 6.14, such co-occurrences included the L1 code “culture influences how we feel, think, and act” frequently co-occurred with L2 code “reflect upon own thinking style” for n=31 students. An example is shown in the following quote from one student’s assignment:

“I think that at home, I am more influenced by holistic thinking, but in my English-speaking schools I was taught in analytical thinking. I am from Taiwan, and … I believe that our language itself has more holistic traits than English. From my understanding holistic thinking is to perceive objects in relations to the others, instead of perceiving it by itself as described in analytical thinking. In Mandarin Chinese, one usually addresses an older or more authoritative by their relationship or identity to oneself. For example, an uncle will be addressed as “uncle” (and there are different names for different uncles, depending on his relationship to one’s parents), and older siblings will for sure be addressed by “older sister” or “older brother”, as oppose to addressing them by name in Western cultures. … Furthermore, a teacher will be addressed as “teacher”, instead of Mrs./Ms/Mr. XXX like in Western cultures. …. Even now I have a little trouble addressing those who are older than me, such as my host mother, by her first name, as in Taiwan, one can address any older lady in their mother’s generation as aunt(y).” (student 4)

For n=28 students, the L1 code “culture influences how we feel, think, and act” co-occurred with the L2 code “deeper reflection upon own cultural identity”:

“… having spent all of your life in the same place, with a homogeneous population, comes with consequences. On a positive note, I can easily identify with the Albanian culture, because everyone around me for 18 years belonged to the same culture. However, having only been in contact with that particular culture, makes me think that people from other cultures behave the same way I do. I wouldn’t say it is cultural illiteracy, because I respect all other cultures and I know about some different customs or traditions …. It’s mostly a matter of perception of what I am used to. For instance, before I came to Jacobs I thought that every new person I would meet would be as friendly as I am (and as most Albanians are), smiling, saying hi and trying to
make nice conversations …. Because I had been surrounded by Albanian youngsters all my life, … I thought friendliness and smiles were a universal thing. Turns out I was wrong, as many other nationalities didn’t return that friendliness or the smiles, behaving in a much serious way, and probably thinking I was overly friendly in asking them about their life stories with a smile on my face or invading their personal space by hugging them. Similarly to how they probably found me much too friendly, I found them closed in themselves, cold, and some people even sort of rude in certain moments. My culture influenced my perception of people, because growing up in a friendly, over-excited and loud culture, made me a warm and affectionate person, who contrasted a lot with some more reserved and cold cultures, and initially perceived them as just as amiable. However, I was able to recognize that most people did not act that way on purpose. It was just the way they were brought up and influenced by their culture, the same way I was influenced by mine.” (student 30)

Similarly, the L2 code “deeper reflection upon own cultural identity” frequently co-occurred with other L1 codes such as “culture is learned” (for $n = 18$ students):

“Most generally, as an “American”, concepts like individualism and freedom of opportunity are ingrained in my culture; but, as I age, I am learning to take everything, even my own culture, together with a grain of salt. … I grew up in a large family of seven, prompting me to quickly learn the concepts of “sharing” and “toleration”. Aside from my parents and siblings, I was raised by a devoted family friend who brought to us, and to me, her own culture. A Gujarati-speaking Indian and a daughter of immigrants, she influenced us to celebrate holidays like Deepavali, and, more importantly, to be more accepting of other cultures and peoples. Her influence on my own culture is outstandingly substantial, and I have mostly her to thank for understanding the importance of an open mind. I have a strong sense of cooperation despite my country’s stress on individual work ethic and a self-confident attitude. … One of my most influential subcultures is gaming culture. More specifically, video game culture and the virtual community. … I am quite accustomed to what can be called “game language” and am often aware of trending pop culture. Many of my connections have been established over online gaming and social media, exposing me not only to gaming culture, but to cultures of various
different states and countries. … Gaming has also, quite impressively, enhanced my dedication to cooperation. Quite possibly one of the most difficult subcultures for me to discuss, is the influence of gay culture on my life. Growing up as a homosexual often brought me face to face with inner, and even painfully real, demons. Constant societal pressure made me constantly doubt who I am, and I always struggled to fit into the mold of masculinity. I often shunned, and frankly still shun, gay culture. I respect it, and those who associate with it, but I have never embraced it for myself. I resent most of the stereotypes associated with gay culture, and I often work to disassociate myself with these stereotypes; but, I remain open and respectful to those who don’t share my opinions. This has made me realize how one can disagree with a culture, but still respect and understand it.” (student 20)

The L2 code “deeper reflection upon own cultural identity” also co-occurred with the L1 code “cultural differences” (for \( n = 14 \) students), with students reflecting upon their cultural identity by contrasting their preferences and behaviors with those of others from other cultures:

“I am almost always punctual but many other people only show up 15 to 30 minutes later, which is really annoying for me because I have a fixed schedule and want to stick with it. Looking at time in this way is strongly embedded in the German culture, possibly coming from the big differences between the seasons regarding warmth and length of the days that require a lot of planning in advance. … Asians also tend to be more indirect in their communication, sending more discreet messages using body language and the context of the conversation (high-context cultures). In this respect, I behave more like Asians and I do have trouble with other Westerners who do not always understand what I want if I don’t tell them directly. This happened when I had write a lab report with a German friend on a weekend. She was asking me whether she could go home for the weekend. Although I didn’t want to prevent her from going home I would have liked her to stay to work together. So I tried to signal that I really needed her but she did not understand. A friend from Pakistan usually understands these signals much better.” (student 2)
In a similar way, the L2 code “deeper reflection upon own cultural identity” co-occurred with the L1 code “culture is one influence” (for \( n = 14 \) students). In this case, students reflected upon their own identity and preferences by differentiating how much of it has been shaped by their culture and to what extent other factors played a role:

“Egyptian culture is an inevitable and unavoidable part of me. …. My efforts to step out of the prescribed lifestyle are continuous and strenuous. …. However, despite my culture’s crucial role in my life so far, I would argue that my Egyptian background does not solely influence how I perceive my surroundings, but rather my collective experiences that have allowed me to shape a separate culture. Bearing this in mind, the relevance of my perception’s evolution can be acknowledged and evaluated to better understand who I am today.” (student 9)

“In conclusion, in as much as culture shapes our personality and provides a sense of belonging, it does not necessarily direct as in a certain distinct way of viewing the world. … When we think about each individual’s background, everyone has unique cultural settings that surround them and most likely have affected them. Therefore, I feel that culture and its influences are way over-generalized. As from my own experience, I often find myself being caught in between different cultures and cannot identify with any one major culture. I have lived in Ethiopia, Ghana and now I am living in Germany and I can say that I have had three cultural experiences hence I do not blindly follow my own culture. I rather blend all the cultural experience I have had so far and make the best out of them by viewing the world from my own point of view.” (student 33)

Overall, these co-occurrences have provided additional evidence for students’ ability to make connections between the course content and their own experience, as stated in the second learning objective.
Table 6.14. Co-occurrence of L1 and L2 codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategories</th>
<th>Number of participants referring to it (out of n=34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 “culture influences how we feel, think, and act” + L2 “reflect upon own thinking style”</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 “culture influences how we feel, think, and act” + L2 “deeper reflection upon own cultural identity”</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 “deeper reflection upon own cultural identity” + L1 “culture is learned”</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 “deeper reflection upon own cultural identity” + L1 “cultural differences”</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 “deeper reflection upon own cultural identity” + L1 “culture is one influence”</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, concerning learning objective 3, almost all students showed an understanding of the two principles and six practices of Personal Leadership \((n = 32)\) and the majority was able to apply it to their own experience \((n = 26)\). The latter ranges from illustrating how one applies certain practices such as cultivating stillness (e.g. through walking, music or meditation) to using the full process in critical moments, e.g. in conflicts occurring during multicultural group work. It seems that quite a few students were able to reflect upon Personal Leadership as a way of practicing intercultural competence, as shown by co-occurrences of PL-related codes with the L1 code “intercultural competence” \((n = 17\) for understanding PL; \(n = 10\) for applying PL) and with the L2 code “critically reflect upon own intercultural competence” \((n = 5\) for understanding PL; \(n = 8\) for applying PL). The following quote offers one example of how students used what they have learned in the course to cope with challenges in intercultural encounters:

“When I think of my first working group for a presentation here at Jacobs, we been two Germans, an African and an Asian (Chinese) person. This was quite tricky since the African person come some minutes late which made us all first in a bad mood, because we wanted to start and this is as a German kind of bad in a way since we saw it as disinterest and inappropriate. We did not really think about the fact that it is a cultural thing which is not to
seen in such a way, we already were aware of the fact that it wasn’t like we thought first but at the beginning here it was quite difficult to made a difference in relation to that. Another barrier were the group work it itself. It felt like we had to persuade the Asian person to take an exercise in the work, but just later we realized that it was obviously just gentle of her, while it felt like she did not want to, for us in the first moment. This were some problems I had to deal with at the beginning even when I had the intercultural training, which gave me a first hint on how to deal with such situations, but I think it just take a while to develop the skills, by now I don’t have a problem with this anymore I just catch myself thinking about a situation wrong when I am concentrated or stressed. This is also why I would say that the Intercultural Competence in Practice course has succeeded, since I feel more able and comfortable working with people of different cultures etc., the course really trained my abilities to do so every week of the second semester. It was also great to have such a course in the second semester since we all had experienced some things before then. A point that I also mentioned before in my assignments is that the workshops we had during the semester were very helpful, also to practice our knowledge and abilities in intercultural competence. The practice of the Critical Moment Dialog was one of the most helpful exercises of this course with I can really directly apply to my everyday life at Jacobs.” (22)

To further explore the third learning objective and possible links between measures of intercultural competence and measures related to Personal Leadership, such as mindfulness, integrated self-knowledge, and emotion recognition and regulation, quantitative data from the related scales were analyzed. However, TMIC-S scores in the pre-test did not show any significant correlation to measures of mindfulness and integrated self-knowledge. Concerning emotional intelligence measures, TMIC-S scores in the pre-test were significantly correlated to the recognition facet of the Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS; \( r = 0.4, p < 0.05 \)) but not to its regulation facet or any of the facets of the Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ). Similarly, SFCQ scores in the pre-test were significantly correlated to the recognition facet of the Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS; \( r = 0.45, p < 0.01 \)) and the Cognitive Appraisal facet of
the Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ; \( r = 0.41, p < 0.05 \)), but not to the ERQ’s Expressive Suppression facet, mindfulness, or integrated self-knowledge. Likewise, none of the post-test measures of intercultural competence showed any significant correlations to mindfulness or integrated self-knowledge. Concerning measures of emotional intelligence and regulation, TMIC-S scores of the post-test were significantly correlated to the recognition \( (r = 0.36, p < 0.05) \) and regulation \( (r = 0.36, p < 0.05) \) facet of the EIS, while SFCQ scores of the post-test were only significantly correlated to the EIS recognition facet \( (r = 0.41, p < 0.05) \).

Likewise, statistical tests to compare means over time failed to show any significant changes in measures of mindfulness, integrated self-knowledge or emotional intelligence.

**Additional evaluation items**

As mentioned in the methods section, the follow-up questionnaire included five additional items asking students to indicate their agreement with different statements about the course. These items have been constructed specifically for the evaluation of the course designed in this research. Table 6.15 shows the descriptive statistics for all five evaluation items for which \( n = 22 \) students provided data. Items were scored on a 7-point Likert scale and one item has been reverse coded. Reliability across items was good with Cronbach’s alpha = 0.898. Using a composite evaluation score with all items weighed equally, it can be concluded that on average students evaluated the course positively in the follow-up test \( (\text{Mean} = 5.48, \text{SD} = 1.14) \).
Table 6.15. Descriptive statistics for evaluation items in the follow-up questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating in the course helped me developing my intercultural competence.</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the course, I sometimes thought back to what I have learned in the course.</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can apply my learnings from the course to everyday life at Jacobs.</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By now, I forgot most of the things we have discussed or learned in this course.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes observe that I react or act differently based on what I have learned in this course.</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the results shown in table 6.15, it seems that on average, students who filled in the follow-up questionnaire ten months after the course agreed that it helped their intercultural competence development. Students furthermore seemed to still remember what they had learned in the course and were able to apply it to their everyday life at Jacobs University Bremen. Finally, they seemed to be able to observe differences in their own behavior related to what they have learned from participating in the course “Intercultural Competence in Practice.”

6.5. Discussion

This section discusses findings of the summative evaluation, first focusing on students’ intercultural competence development throughout the course and beyond (RQ3.1), followed by addressing students’ attainment of the specific learning objectives of the course (RQ3.2). This section furthermore seeks to derive more general insights about using a mixed methods approach with direct and indirect evidence on students’ intercultural competence. It thereby adds to the emerging understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of different ways of measuring intercultural competence development and how they can complement each other.
Based on these insights, this chapter closes with discussing limitations and contributions of the summative evaluation of the course “Intercultural Competence in Practice”.

6.5.1. RQ3.1: Students’ Intercultural Competence Development

Concerning research question 3.1, the summative evaluation has found strong evidence for students’ development of intercultural competence from the beginning to end of the course, which seems to have remained stable over time. Thus, findings have offered support for hypothesis 1a and 1b. However, indirect evidence from the quantitative self-report seemed insufficient to prove positive impacts of the intervention on students’ intercultural competence (Deardorff, 2006, 2011, 2017). While such self-report instruments have frequently been used in pre- and post-testing to measure intercultural competence as an outcome of an intervention, it seems questionable to what extent they accurately reflect students’ intercultural competence development. It cannot be ruled out that results are at least partly influenced by other factors, such as social desirability or over-rating one’s intercultural competence.

As presented above, the assessment plan therefore included qualitative methods as well, i.e. analysis of students’ reflective assignments, to enrich the quantitative findings and include more direct evidence of students’ intercultural competence development. After analyzing both types of data separately, qualitative findings were used to add more depth to the numbers on the scale and gain more insights into what students learned throughout the course. More specifically, quantitative and qualitative findings were merged with the purpose of complementarity, using qualitative results to enrich and illustrate quantitative results. Therefore, the following sections discuss qualitative findings to provide additional insights into students’ intercultural competence development. The first part of the discussion is structured along the conceptual framework of intercultural competence, distinguishing knowledge, attitudes, and skills (Deardorff, 2006) and intercultural practice (Schaetti et al., 2009). An overview relating empirical findings to the conceptual framework is shown in table
6.16. Following the discussion of findings along the lines of the conceptual framework, subsequent sections seek to draw conclusions about students’ intercultural competence development throughout the course (addressing hypothesis 1a) and beyond (hypothesis 1b) as well as derive insights on the relationship to perceived self-efficacy (hypothesis 2).

Table 6.16. Conceptual integration of empirical findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>SFCQ</strong> (D. C. Thomas et al., 2015)</th>
<th><strong>TMIC-S</strong> (Schnabel, Kelava, van de Vijver, et al., 2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Knowledge:</td>
<td>Sensitivity in Communication:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Deardorff, 2006;</td>
<td>- Culture-general</td>
<td>- Culture-general differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaetti et al., 2009)</td>
<td>- Culture-specific</td>
<td>- Culture-specific differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td>Metacognition:</td>
<td>Cultural Identity Reflection:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Deardorff, 2006)</td>
<td>- Awareness of cultural context</td>
<td>- Cultural self-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information-Seeking:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Curiosity/discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills</strong></td>
<td>Skills:</td>
<td>Socializing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Deardorff, 2006)</td>
<td>- Ability to relate</td>
<td>- Ability to relate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Empathy</td>
<td>Sensitivity in Communication:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Perceptual Acuity</td>
<td>- Adaptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tolerating uncertainty</td>
<td>Mediation of Interests &amp; Goal-Setting:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Adaptability</td>
<td>- Listen, observe, interpret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metacognition:</td>
<td>- Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Analysis of cultural context</td>
<td>- Adaptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercultural Practice</strong></td>
<td>Metacognition:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Schaetti et al., 2009)</td>
<td>- Analysis of cultural context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Planning of action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Intercultural competence: Knowledge**

Following the definition of the knowledge dimension of the SFCQ, a distinction has been made between culture-general and culture-specific knowledge, similar to the conceptualization offered by Schaetti et al. (2008, 2009). Qualitative findings offered evidence that students gained both, culture-general and culture-specific knowledge. However, there was quite some variety in the complexity of that knowledge, ranging from anecdotal descriptions of cultural differences to more systematic and critical discussions of such differences. While some students progressed from low to medium or medium to high levels of complexity, others stayed at a rather basic level concerning the complexity of their intercultural knowledge.

In the TMIC-S, none of the dimensions exclusively focuses on knowledge-related aspects of intercultural competence. Yet, within the dimension ‘sensitivity in communication’, data-driven subcategories included awareness of differences in verbal and nonverbal behavior as well as knowledge about strategies for sensitive and successful intercultural communication. Both of these subcategories can be related to Deardorff’s (2006) knowledge dimension, providing evidence for students’ gains in culture-general knowledge about the specifics of intercultural communication.

**Intercultural competence: Attitudes**

Within the SFCQ, the metacognition dimension entails awareness of cultural context, analysis of cultural context, and planning one’s interactions with culturally different others. The aspect of awareness of cultural context can be related to cultural awareness in Deardorff’s (2006) model, with qualitative findings suggesting that almost all students showed evidence of such awareness. Cultural awareness is also covered in the TMIC-S dimension ‘cultural identity reflection’ which focuses on cultural self-awareness. As presented in the results section, analysis of qualitative data revealed strong evidence for ‘cultural identity reflection’, showing
that most students demonstrated evidence of increasingly deeper levels of cultural self-awareness. While the large amount of segments pertaining to ‘cultural identity reflection’ might partly be related to the nature of the reflective assignments and their writing prompts, the finding of increasingly deeper cultural self-awareness has offered additional support for students’ progress in that regard.

Furthermore, the TMIC-S dimension ‘information-seeking’ can be related to Deardorff’s (2006) aspect of curiosity/discovery. Qualitative findings on that dimension have revealed students’ specific strategies of learning about other cultures, ranging from using the Internet, books, or movies, to seeking intercultural contact and experiences, for example on campus or through travel.

**Intercultural competence: Skills**

For the skills dimension of the SFCQ, findings have revealed evidence for all five skills captured in the SFCQ, i.e. relational skills, tolerating ambiguity, empathy, adaptability, and perceptual acuity. Students’ reflective assignments offered more specific examples of different aspects of these more abstract skills. Concerning tolerating ambiguity, for example, students discussed increasingly feeling able to accept cultural differences without judging them based on their own standards and without feeling offended if others do things differently. Likewise, for adaptability, qualitative findings included specific examples of how students adapted their behavior in intercultural encounters, including making more eye contact to appear approachable, adapting to the communication style of the interaction partner, or being sensitive to differences in personal space preferences or emotional expressiveness. Overall, qualitative findings served to add more details on how students reflected on their intercultural skills and progress in developing them further. However, it is important to keep in mind that there probably would have been more appropriate ways of assessing skills development than reflective assignments. While it was possible to identify
some evidence in the materials sampled from students’ reflective assignments, observation might have offered more comprehensive and direct insights into how students practice and develop intercultural skills such as empathy or adaptability.

Likewise, TMIC-S dimensions which can be related to the skills dimension in Deardorff’s (2006) model offered comparatively less evidence for specific skills linked to ‘mediation of interests’, ‘goal setting’ or ‘sensitivity in communication’. Despite the lower number of text segments pertaining to those dimensions, it nevertheless was possible to identify some evidence that students reflected upon their adaptability to different communication styles and ability to mediate between different interests. This entails being able to listen, observe, and analyze in intercultural interactions, an aspect that is also captured in the SFCQ dimension metacognition and its subcategory of analysis of cultural context. Most students demonstrated evidence for analysis of cultural context, therefore reinforcing the finding of having made some progress with regard to intercultural skills.

**Intercultural competence: Intercultural practice**

The notion of intercultural practice put forward by Schaetti et al. (2009) is mainly captured in the metacognition dimension of the SFCQ. While it could be related to intercultural skills, it is less concerned with specific intercultural skills but rather with the question of how to transfer one’s knowledge and motivation into practice through self-reflection. The SFCQ dimension metacognition includes awareness of cultural context (attitudes), analysis of cultural context (skills, intercultural practice), and planning one’s interactions with culturally different others (intercultural practice). While qualitative findings have suggested that almost all students showed evidence of awareness and analysis of cultural context, about half of the students displayed evidence of planning in the reflective assignments. Overall, qualitative findings demonstrating students’ ability to analyze cultural contexts and plan how to succeed in intercultural encounters can be seen as evidence on their development of some level of an
First conclusions on students’ intercultural competence development (H1a).
Overall, quantitative and qualitative findings have offered evidence in support of hypothesis 1a, demonstrating that students made progress in intercultural competence as captured by the TMIC-S and SFCQ. Quantitative analysis has revealed a significant increase for both scales from pre- to post-test, suggesting students made gains in intercultural competence as measured by each test. Qualitative findings have offered additional insights into what students have learned within the specific dimensions covered by these scales. However, in conceptual terms, these predominantly align with Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence, focusing on aspects of intercultural competence rather than its development over time.

In chapter 2.3, the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) has been presented to complement the conceptual framework of intercultural competence for this dissertation. As the related assessment tool, the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) could not be used in the assessment plan⁹, the DMIS has mainly served to inform the design process. Coding of qualitative data from students’ reflective papers was based on the dimensions of the two scales used to measure intercultural competence. Thus, the data was not explicitly coded with regard to the DMIS. However, reviewing the evidence emerging from the qualitative analysis might support interpreting the findings as demonstrating that students have progressed to acceptance and adaptation. Overall, there was strong evidence that students were increasingly aware of cultural differences (SFCQ_metacognition: awareness), able to identify and describe them (SFCQ_knowledge, SFCQ_metacognition:

---
⁹ In addition to a per test fee, the IDI requires completion of a cost-intensive qualifying seminar as it is only allowed to be administered by licensed individuals. Thus, it was considered to neither be suited nor feasible for use in a doctoral research project.
(SFCQ_metacognition: planning, SFCQ_skills: adaptability; TMIC-S: sensitivity in communication). Furthermore, evidence supported that students adopted a more ethnorelativist view, as shown in their increasingly deeper levels of ‘cultural identity reflection’ (TMIC-S), but also other aspects such as ‘sensitivity in communication’ (TMIC-S). All of these aspects could be interpreted as supporting that the majority of students attained acceptance and adaptation stages within the DMIS. Generally, both quantitative and qualitative evidence supported hypothesis 1a, offering insights into students’ intercultural competence development throughout the course.

A closer look at diverging cases

As described above, in the second step of merging qualitative and quantitative data, qualitative findings were quantified and displayed in a matrix with the quantitative results for each student to explore if findings from both types of data converge or diverge. A first look at the matrix has revealed diverging cases of students whose quantitative scores suggested a stronger progress in intercultural competence than the evidence from their reflective papers would support. This is in line with previous research demonstrating that students might overestimate their intercultural competence on self-report measures (Bloom & Miranda, 2015; Jackson, 2015b). At the same time, this research included cases of students where the mismatch works the other way around. Those students showed stagnating or decreasing scores on the quantitative scales while demonstrating strong evidence for various aspects of intercultural competence across their reflective papers. This supports previous findings from a mixed methods study by Schartner (2016) who found a similar pattern.

Generally, this research has contributed to the emerging understanding of how findings from mixed methods studies can be integrated to obtain a more detailed picture of students’ intercultural competence development. In contrast to most prior research, this
research project went a step further, displaying findings for each student individually in a matrix. This matrix has allowed to identify diverging cases among the group of students participating in the course and the evaluation research. While more systematic analysis is needed to fully take advantage of this matrix, it could offer preliminary evidence for two possible patterns for diverging cases. One pattern seemed to confirm the skepticism about how well self-report scales can capture intercultural competence (cf. e.g. Deardorff, 2006), showing that some students scored higher on those scales than analysis of their reflective papers would support. As the latter offered more direct evidence of students’ intercultural learning, it seems that those students overestimated their intercultural competence. This might be explained by social desirability and heightened awareness of which answers could be the more competent ones. However, students’ scores might as well reflect their perceived intercultural competence which could be lower than their actual competence as indicated in their reflective papers. A possible explanation to be explored in future research could be that students who progressed from low to medium levels of intercultural competence experienced a boost in knowledge and perceived self-efficacy and therefore felt more – or overly – confident in their intercultural competence.

In contrast, the opposite pattern has been exhibited by cases of students who showed strong evidence for progressing to high levels of intercultural competence in their reflective papers, but stagnated or even decreased in scores on self-report scales. A possible explanation could be that in contrast to their counterparts experiencing a boost in confidence, they might have started out with a lot of confidence, only to realize how much more there is to learn. This is illustrated in the following quote by one student for whom qualitative findings have suggested stronger intercultural competence development than the quantitative results would suggest:

“Coming from multicultural environment too, I thought I was very prepared for Jacobs; but little did I know. Africa has a lot of countries with different cultures, however, there are some
similarities among these cultures. It is worth knowing the African cultures differ a lot from the Western ones. I never took time to inform myself about Western cultures till I came here, and certain things I saw in my first two weeks still give me questions in my head.” (student 15)

Similarly, the following student has reflected upon his learning process:

“Having grown up in an internally segregated country like Egypt, I acknowledged how distinct outlooks can be and how a culture is not determined only by the country of origin, but by religion, family, financial status and much more. The aforementioned ideological conflicts I witnessed on a daily basis through discussions at school, arguments in local cafes, or fistfights in the street all highlighted how relative culture is. Nothing can really be set in stone and adaptability is crucial for peace. For a long time, I stuck to what I know and found solace in the familiarity. Stepping out of my comfort zone and acknowledging the possibility that my approach towards life, values and beliefs required enormous emotional and mental flexibility, which until now leaves me more confounded than I would ever want to be. This irreparable and unresolvable confusion, however, places me in a grey area where I no longer feel the need to adopt an identity but can reconstruct a new understanding of myself. There are infinite cultures out there that surpass the established confinement of countries. Beauty and admirable traits can be found in all of them and realizing that we can pick and choose the pieces that stand out to us is the only culture I can identify with.” (student 9)

While more research is needed to further explore this assumption, one could argue that students like the ones quoted above increasingly understood the complexity of intercultural competence and realized that its development is a lifelong process. They might have become more skeptical of their own competence when answering the post-test, therefore stagnating or scoring lower compared to the pre-test where they might have been more confident and less critically reflective about their intercultural competence. Within the conceptual framework of the DMIS, one could argue that students who have progressed to acceptance might tend to over-estimate their intercultural competence, fueled by the shift to a more positive perception of cultural differences and curiosity about other cultures. In contrast, as students have made
the shift to adaptation, they might initially tend to be more self-aware and critical about their intercultural competence. Development within adaptation might also involve times of heightened anxiety or uncertainty of being aware of fundamental cultural differences but unsure how to interact both effectively and appropriately.

Overall, these preliminary insights have reinforced claims by Deardorff (2011, 2017) that intercultural competence assessment should combine direct and indirect evidence. While this distinction is not synonymous with qualitative and quantitative methods, using a mixed methods design might enable a good balance of depth and breadth as well as integrating indirect and direct evidence. As demonstrated in this chapter, an assessment plan that uses a mixed methods approach and integrates both direct and indirect evidence for students’ intercultural learning can offer richer and broader insights into something as complex as students’ intercultural competence development. Furthermore, the preliminary insights from merging quantitative and qualitative findings in a matrix that displays each student’s results has offered starting points for further research. Thus, a contribution of this research is providing ideas for further research on how to implement mixed methods assessment of intercultural competence. Insights from merging qualitative and quantitative findings might also help to improve self-report scales. Such self-report scales tend to be very appealing to higher education instructors as they are relatively easy to administer and more feasible for larger courses than analyzing reflective papers. Yet, future research should explore further how results from such scales could be interpreted, possibly with complementary direct evidence from students’ learning process. One question emerging from the findings of this research is whether a significant increase on self-report scales really supports the hypothesis of a positive impact of the intervention on intercultural competence – or if stagnation or decreases in scores would rather support the hypothesis that students made progress and thus became more self-critical of their own intercultural competence.
Intercultural competence development beyond the course (H1b)

Results from the quantitative analysis offer evidence that there was no significant decrease of intercultural competence scores on either of the scales ten months after the course. This finding generally supports hypothesis 1b. However, there has also not been any significant increase in students’ intercultural competence scores from the post-test to follow-up. On the one hand, one could argue that this speaks in favor of interventions like the elective course as it seems that students did not progress further without structured learning activities and guided self-reflection. On the other hand, this might as well imply that the elective course presented in this dissertation did not sufficiently spark independent intercultural learning after the course. Another possible explanation for the lack of progress could be that students already reached relatively high scores on both scales, leading to some sort of ceiling effect. Likewise, students might feel more hesitant to tick the highest number on the scale, possibly due to heightened awareness that intercultural competence is a lifelong learning process and more critical evaluation of their own intercultural competence as exemplified in the following quote from one of the interviews with students after the course:

“I think I’m taking away definitely a better understanding of how little I actually know. Because before this class like I had done a like three-day intercultural competence training before my exchange year and then the intercultural training in o-week and I was like, I think I know stuff. But then throughout this course I was like, I do know some things, but I really don't know a lot of things. And especially with the accepting ambiguity or embracing ambiguity in the Personal Leadership, I think one of the biggest things I have come to realize is that I am not going to know everything. And that I can use other parts of what I have learned to try to make that ok and not cause problems with it.”

While more research is needed to explore such explanations, the results generally support hypothesis 1b that students’ gains in intercultural competence were stable until ten months after the course.
Intercultural competence and perceived self-efficacy (H2)

Quantitative findings furthermore support hypothesis 2, showing that perceived self-efficacy was positively and significantly correlated to both measures of intercultural competence at all three points in time. Interestingly, the correlation between measures of intercultural competence and perceived self-efficacy was about as strong as between the two measures of intercultural competence. As presented before, other researchers have already discussed how intercultural competence and self-efficacy might be related. Individuals with higher perceived self-efficacy might be more likely to seek intercultural contact, experience less anxiety about it and find it easier to experiment with new behavior. Likewise, each successful intercultural encounter might boost perceived self-efficacy which in turn might make it more likely to seek such encounters in the future and succeed in them. (Briones et al., 2009; Milstein, 2005; J. Wilson et al., 2013; Yashima, 2010)

The strong correlation between measures of perceived self-efficacy and intercultural competence found in this research raises the question to what extent perceived self-efficacy might be a component of intercultural competence rather than a related construct. However, the small sample in this research did not allow for more elaborate testing or modelling which furthermore is beyond the focus of the summative evaluation. Nevertheless, the strong correlation between the two is an interesting observation which future research could investigate further to explore if perceived self-efficacy should possibly become part of scales to measure intercultural competence.

6.5.2. RQ3.2: Achievement of Learning Objectives

While research question 3.1 focused more generally on students’ intercultural competence development, research question 3.2 addressed the achievement of the specific learning objectives of the course. Overall, qualitative findings suggested that students have achieved the three learning objectives of the course, demonstrating an in-depth understanding of how
culture influences how we feel, think, and act, an ability to link that to their own experience, and being familiar with the Personal Leadership methodology.

Analyzing selected material from students’ reflective assignments allowed to check for evidence on achievement of the three learning objectives and enabled a deeper understanding of what exactly students learned regarding those overall objectives. The first learning objective has stated that students should develop an in-depth understanding of how culture influences how we feel, think, and act. While all students demonstrated evidence for achieving that learning objective, themes that emerged inductively from the data allowed for deeper insights into what students learned more specifically about the concept of culture and its influence on us. Students did not only gain a general understanding of how culture shapes our perception and interpretation, but also acquired more specific knowledge on cultural differences in thinking styles, values, preferences, and what is considered appropriate behavior. Furthermore, students gained a better understanding of specifics of intercultural communication, such as differences in verbal and nonverbal communication. At the same time, students seem to have acquired a deeper understanding of the concept of culture, including recognizing its complexity and limits. Examples of that include students discussing a broad understanding of culture beyond national culture as well as them expressing awareness that culture is one of many influences on our perception, interpretation, and behavior which also are shaped by personal and situational factors.

Likewise, all students showed evidence for the second learning objective of being able to link such knowledge to their own experience. Again, data-driven subcategories allow for deeper insights into the connections students made between the course content and their own experience. As already discussed when addressing research question 3.1, students reflected a lot upon their own cultural identity. In addition, findings on achievement of the second learning objective suggested that students reflected upon their thinking style, intercultural competence, and communication style preferences and to what extent these are shaped by
their cultural identities. Results from the analysis of co-occurring codes further supported the finding that students were able to create meaningful connections between the course content and their own experience.

Finally, almost all students showed an understanding of the principles and practices of Personal Leadership and most of them seemed abled to apply it to their own experience. Thus, there was evidence that students achieved the third learning objective. Again, inductively emerging subcategories added insights on how students applied their understanding of Personal Leadership to their own lives, such as when cultivating stillness through different activities (e.g. walking or meditation) or using the full reflection process in critical moments. Analysis of co-occurring codes showed that Personal Leadership-related codes tended to co-occur with codes related to understanding intercultural competence and critically reflecting upon one’s own intercultural competence. Thus, it seems that Personal Leadership offered at least some students a way of practicing intercultural competence. Generally, there were no noteworthy results from the scales used to measure variables that might reflect Personal Leadership-related factors such as mindfulness, self-knowledge, or emotional intelligence. However, findings from the qualitative analysis of students’ reflective assignments supported that students gained an understanding of Personal Leadership, were able to apply it to their experience and use it to practice intercultural competence in critical moments.

Overall, it can be concluded that qualitative findings have offered strong evidence supporting that students achieved the three learning objectives of the course. Therefore, it seems that the course was effective in achieving its aims and supporting students in gaining a deeper understanding of culture, connecting their knowledge to their own experience, and becoming familiar with Personal Leadership as one tool for practicing intercultural competence through self-reflection. As writing prompts guided what students reflected on, one could conclude that the course content, readings, and writing prompts aligned well with the course’s learning objectives. However, it also has to be kept in mind that the analysis used
a data-reductive approach, explicitly coding along the lines of the learning objectives and not exploring any additional topics that could have emerged from the data. This approach has been chosen to manage the vast amount of data, but it also means that the richness of the data was not fully exploited. It furthermore points to a general challenge when integrating reflective assignments as a learning and assessment tool. As demonstrated in this chapter, it was necessary to find a feasible approach to analyzing data sampled from the reflective assignments. Instructors of regular university courses might not even have the time and resources that were available in this doctoral research project. However, this does not mean they should skip the use of reflective assignments as an assessment tool altogether. Instead, they might want to opt for an even more reductive approach which has been described in a shorter publication on this research in a case study collection by Deardorff and Arasaratnam-Smith (Binder, 2017). In that publication, Binder (2017) suggested that instructors simply tick off evidence for any of their learning objectives as they read through the assignments as part of their regular grading procedure. This could allow to create a more simplified overview of evidence supporting the achievement of learning objectives for each student in the course and can add to the overall assessment of their progress, albeit in a form that boils the richness of the reflective papers down to its essential core.

6.5.3. Limitations

The discussion so far has already addressed some limitations of the summative evaluation presented in this chapter. In addition, there were more general limitations that need to be acknowledged and addressed before drawing conclusions about the contributions of the summative evaluation. A major limitation of this research was the lack of a control group. While I was able to collect data from a small convenience control group sample at the end of the course, this data could only be matched to baseline data (i.e. the time when data were collected for the course design) as data collection at the time of the pre-test suffered from a
very low response rate among the potential control group. Regardless of that challenge, a preliminary analysis of data from the control group showed that on average, their intercultural competence scores at t2 (i.e. the end of the course) were lower than those of the course participants at t1 (i.e. the start of the course). Thus, there seems to be a risk of self-selection into the course, supporting the assumption that those who elect such a course already have a certain level of intercultural competence. However, this limitation mainly concerned the quantitative findings which in turn is even more reason to use a mixed methods design in which qualitative data offer deeper insights into students’ learning.

Another limitation was the small sample size as the sample for the summative evaluation was naturally limited to the students who enrolled in the course. Again, this limitation mainly concerned the quantitative part of the summative evaluation as it restricted the options for statistical analysis. Concerning the qualitative part of the evaluation, an aspect to keep in mind is that data was selected from reflective assignments, thereby using material that was influenced by the writing prompts asking students to reflect upon certain topics. In addition, as mentioned before, it was not possible to analyze all the material from the reflective assignments in depth and make full use of the richness of the data.

Another limitation inherent in the assessment plan of this course has already been addressed above. Despite agreement that intercultural competence entails attitudes, knowledge, and skills, the latter has received least attention in empirical research and might be the most difficult to measure (Van de Vijver & Leung, 2009). As discussed above, the assessment plan included indirect evidence from self-report scales as well as direct evidence from analysis of students’ reflective assignments. These measurement tools complemented each other to provide insights into students’ intercultural competence development and achievement of learning objectives. However, they could only offer limited insights into students’ skills development, an aspect for which observations might have been more suited. Likewise, the assessment plan did not include a multi-perspective approach. Such an approach
has been suggested as intercultural competence does not only reside in the individual but manifests itself in interaction. Therefore, it is assumed that assessment of intercultural competence is enriched further by capturing the interaction partner’s perspective as well (Deardorff, 2011; Fantini, 2009; Klafehn, Li, & Chiu, 2013). Hiller and Wozniak (2009) have offered an example of how to include observation and a multi-perspective approach. In their publication, they describe a simulation role-play called Archivum 2060 that serves as a learning activity and assessment tool at the same time, allowing to observe and assess two selected skills (behavioral flexibility, empathy) using a peer-assessment approach (Hiller & Wozniak, 2009). On might consider it a limitation of the assessment plan used for the summative evaluation of this course that it did not explicitly focus on skills nor follow the example of Hiller and Wozniak (2009) for using observation of students’ performance in a simulation role play to assess skills such as empathy. However, developing or adapting and implementing such a learning and assessment tool for one’s target group and learning goals would have required time and resources that were beyond the scope of this dissertation. Furthermore, the learning outcomes of the course evaluated in this chapter did not explicitly focus on skills and thus, other assessment methods were given priority when designing the assessment plan. Within the scope of this research, analysis of reflective papers seemed more appropriate for a course that focuses on supporting student in developing a deeper understanding of their own culture and that of others through critical reflection on own experiences and how to link them to course content.

6.6. Concluding Remarks

This chapter concludes the six-step process of evidence-based design described by Stephan and Stephan (2013) by presenting the summative evaluation. Overall, the summative evaluation has shown that the course was effective in promoting students’ intercultural competence development and in achieving its specific learning objectives. Thus, both the
formative evaluation presented in the previous chapter and the summative evaluation presented in this chapter have supported the course design resulting from the evidence-based design process. The evaluation stage furthermore revealed valuable insights on how to improve future courses on intercultural competence at Jacobs University and beyond. While the learning goals and associated course content were specific to the target group and its context, other higher education institutions can benefit from this research as well. As discussed in the previous chapter, this research has demonstrated how to use an evidence-based approach to designing and evaluating intercultural learning interventions. It furthermore has offered insights into the potential benefits of integrating peer-led experiential sessions and using reflective assignments, both as a learning and assessment tool.

As demonstrated in this chapter, reflective assignments could make an important contribution to the assessment plan for measuring students’ intercultural competence development. Overall, the summative evaluation presented in this chapter has offered an example for higher education instructors on how to create an assessment plan that is based on a clear concept of intercultural competence and specific learning goals. It has demonstrated how reflective assignments can be used to add direct evidence of students’ intercultural learning to enrich insights from frequently used quantitative self-report scales in pre-/post-test designs. As a practical contribution, this included ideas on how to make the use of reflective assignments as an assessment tool feasible for regular university course which might not benefit from the same resources as a doctoral research project.

On a more theoretical level, this summative evaluation has made another contribution beyond the immediate context of the course evaluated in this chapter. By demonstrating how to integrate quantitative and qualitative findings in a mixed methods evaluation study, this research has added to the field of mixed methods research as researchers often fail to fully exploit the potential for mixing (Plano Clark et al., 2010). On the one hand, this chapter has offered an example of how to mix quantitative and qualitative data with the purpose of
complementarity and triangulation (Johnson et al., 2007). Mixing for complementarity was done when using qualitative findings from the analysis of reflective assignments to enrich and illustrate quantitative results on students’ intercultural competence development. Mixing with the purpose of triangulation has been done when creating a matrix that displays individual results for each student, drawing upon quantitative and qualitative findings to see if results converge or diverge. On the other hand, this chapter has shown how to not only mix in the discussion by jointly discussing overall findings, but how to create joint displays of results and how to quantify qualitative data for joint display in a matrix (Kuckartz, 2014; Plano Clark et al., 2010). As discussed above, it was beyond the scope of this research to proceed to using transformed data for further statistical analysis. However, this could be done in future work with the existing data set. It can also serve as inspiration to others who might opt to take a similar approach and thereby not only gain deeper insights into students’ intercultural competence development but also into the potential use and interpretation of existing scales and assessment tools. Thereby, this evaluation study and future research can make important contributions to the development of reliable and valid scales to measure intercultural competence.
Table 6.17. Quantifying qualitative data on SFCQ dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SFCQ dimension</th>
<th>Elements of the definition / subcategories</th>
<th>Number of participants referring to it (out of N=34)</th>
<th>Qualitative data examples and/or definitions (numbers in brackets indicate participant number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>“I also take group work serious and sometimes had to discover that I was the only person with such an attitude. Some people were never showing off for any meeting and submitted their part often only minutes before the deadline. Many times I couldn’t understand why they were so frivolous and uninterested but I also felt that I couldn’t say anything against it because I never had to be clear or direct before and therefore I never learned how to express myself and my concerns in such a way that the other person could understand my situation. In the beginning, I felt really impolite when being more direct but then I realized that some people felt different about it and were perhaps thankful for such a clear statement. At this moment, I felt for the first time that my culture really influenced my life and that it was really difficult for me to overcome this kind of barrier I was used to for the major time of my life. From the last reading task, I learned that it might be better if I would have tried to communicate in their way which was probably the more direct communication in this case. Perhaps the group work would have worked out better if I had told them what disturbed me. They perhaps assumed that I would have told them if there had been any problem for me.” (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined as:</td>
<td>“culture-specific and culture-general knowledge, including recognizing the existence of other culture, knowledge of cultural differences, and complexity of that knowledge”</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>“During the first semester at Jacobs, I would notice certain behaviors amongst other individuals, which according to my standards were weird or annoying. However, I left it at that, and never tried to understand...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture-general</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture-specific</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
why they did that or acted that way, but now after taking this course, I have a deeper understanding of people’s behaviors and actions, and try to think of whether the action is resulting from their own culture or the way they were brought up. An example would be this, one of my Chinese friends, whenever she wanted something from me, or even if she wanted to hang out, would have a very indirect manner of conveying the message to me, which would annoy me a lot. I would always get frustrated at why she just couldn’t be direct and ask me what she wants to do, so it’s more clear to me. However, after taking this course, I learned that indirect speech is a part of Asian cultures, and that Asians often think they are being polite when using indirect speech, therefore with this understanding that I gained from this course, I learned to compromise with this behavior of my friends, as I knew the reason behind such behavior.” (31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complexity of knowledge</th>
<th>Description of each level based on the data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Basic complexity of knowledge entails anecdotal descriptions of cultural differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic – medium</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium – high</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| includes relational skills, tolerance of uncertainty, adaptability, empathy, perceptual acuity | 26 | Ranges from generally appreciating meeting different people and learning about each other’s culture and language, to getting to know people on a deeper level (learning about what makes them unique, what connects them):

“For me intercultural competence is all about talking and listening, to each and every person you can, and always working to remember that culture isn’t something that can be summed up in a sentence and that it is unique to every person out there, so I should just embrace that I cannot define it or explain it and just listen as others try to share their cultures too, because here, among all these international students, there is no end to what I can learn.” (participant 11)

“Right from O-week, I was very happy about the talks we could have with each other about our countries that are so far away from each other but have so many things in common. For instance, a lot of the people I talked to come from tropical countries like me, but from different continents, like Africa. It was really nice being able to relate to each other about how it’s so strange that the sun is infrequent in Bremen and how we can always take it for granted back home and often base our days’ activities around staying out of the heat. This again ties in to the impact of geography on the development of cultures; in this case Ethiopian and...” |
Indian cultures. It was equally interesting then to talk to other German students and have them explain the weather that they are accustomed to and how they consciously try to get as much sunlight as possible, especially in the winter. These were just some of the examples of the different cultures I got to learn about straight after coming here, and I think that this is quite a rare experience to have. I don’t think it would be possible to talk so openly about our diverse cultures and how they affect our day-to-day lives in any other setting. Wanting to know about other people’s cultural backgrounds, or range of cultural backgrounds, and wanting to share mine with them as well, was the driving force in many interactions that I had with people in the first few weeks, and really was the starting point for a lot of friendships made thereafter.” (participant 32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tolerance of uncertainty</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Includes students reflecting upon how to accept that things are not done their way, be more relaxed about these differences, try to respect them and see why another person is behaving differently instead of judging based on own standards and feeling offended:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I do not think that I am however, at the point where I am done learning though because there are so many things more to discover and understand and so many more habits and customs to get used to. But it is definitely comforting to know that whatever comes my way in terms of new phenomenon’s and values, I will be ready to look at them with a neutral and empathetic instead of a biased and narrow eye and if not adapt to certain customs then at least be respectful to them.” (participant 10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“In order to embrace ambiguity, I want to work to relinquish the leadership and planning role that I often take on when doing anything with my friends and allow myself to just go along and not know everything that will happen and just enjoy and be okay with that. This is, of course, a very small step, but I think it is a good first step to help lead me towards embracing ambiguity in larger and more dramatic ways in my life as well.” (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| “Attending to judgment reminds me that in an intercultural setting one can never be sure of a reason for the other’s behavior if they come from different cultures. This is due to the fact that some actions that are polite
for me might be thought of as rude by others. Therefore I really want to implement attending to judgment as I have to think first of all that if I am offended by somebody else’s actions or words they might not have intended it like this. For instance I would abstain from judgment if somebody wears clothes that I consider not that normal and are rather weird to me. This could be because his or her parents insisted on them wearing this or because this style is fashionable in his or her country.” (16)

| Adaptability | 10 | In differing degrees of detail discussing in which ways they adapt their behavior, e.g. not liking eye contact but trying to do more to appear more approachable, or adapt communication style to interaction partner, or try different behaviors, one very detailed example:

“I would smile at people without even knowing their names, just to make them feel less lonely in a completely new environment for them, hoping they would do the same for me. I would say hi and ask how people’s days had been after having talked to them only once. For some people it worked, and they would smile back or ask how my day had been as well. For others, not as well as I thought. These individuals would not smile back at all and would answer very shortly (and some of them still do). So while the friendly approach influenced by my culture which I used to get close to people worked for some, it had no effect for others. I had to find new ways of interacting with them, smiling less and not invading their personal space by hugging and being over-friendly, but asking casual questions about whether they had liked their classes. The result: it worked! And now I am friends and can freely talk to people whom I initially disliked for being cold, impolite or arrogant and didn’t think I would ever talk to during my first days here.” (30)

| Empathy | 11 | Taking perspective, putting oneself in the other person’s shoes:

“Most of the times, whenever someone sees things differently from me, I used to think there was something wrong with them, but rather there was something wrong with me for not putting myself in their shoes and seeing things from their perspectives.” (15)
“Another important aspect that cannot be stressed enough when it comes to being intercultural competent is being empathic. That is something I learned through the workshops and specially through the introduction of the concept of personal leadership. It is impossible to completely get rid of your own cultural shaped glasses. … Through intercultural competence we cannot get rid of these glasses in my perspective because the influence on your way of thinking in your first years as a child cannot be made undone and you will never fully be able to be completely objective. However, through techniques and tools like the “Critical Moment Dialog” and especially the “Concept of Personal Leadership” your glasses can be sharpened and you can better reflect your own behavior and through the empathy you learn through the “Concept of Personal Leadership” you can better understand how your own behavior is perceived by people from another cultural background and what their intentions and messages are behind the way they are acting or the phrases they are saying. This is an important aspect since I really learned in the seminars that saying something can be completely differently perceived than the actual meaning or message behind the sentence that the sender tries to send. One really has to try to put oneself into the perspective of the sender from the message in order to examine how he or she meant it.” (5)

Perceptual acuity 1

“One such example was recently with my roommate who turned out to be one of my closest friends as the end of my first year approaches. It was my turn to clean the bathroom, she cleaned the bathroom 3 days ago, and left for the weekend, when she came back on Monday, she cleaned the entire bathroom by herself again, and then yelled at me for not cleaning the bathroom. I tried explaining that she only cleaned it 3 days ago therefore I wanted to wait till a week to clean it again, but she was just so mad and kept yelling at me. I immediately realized this was a CMD and held myself back, and apologized for it, without arguing about it. Things were so much better, she accepted my apology and wanted to go to dinner with me later. Had I not done a personal reflection on a somethings up situation, my reaction would have probably been so much different, I would have picked up a fight saying that the original agreement was to clean the bathroom once a week, taking turns and it had only been 3 days, not enough for a week to clean the bathroom. But I understood that she was disgusted at the state of the bathroom and that she had to do it all by herself,
therefore I withheld myself and apologized knowing that she was just having an emotional outburst and didn’t mean anything harmful.” (31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of skills mentioned</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One only</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metacognition</th>
<th>33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

"knowledge of and control over one's thinking and learning activities in the specific domain of cultural experiences and strategies", measured by awareness of cultural context, conscious analysis of the influence of the cultural context, and planning courses of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Awareness of cultural differences (e.g. being aware of differences in communication styles):

“Culture alters our perception of the world. One could imagine this as a special from of “culture-colored glasses” we are automatically wearing and viewing the world through. It is impossible to totally get rid of the glasses, since we can’t withdraw what happened to us in the first years of our live and how our parents raised us. We can only sharpen the glasses by trying to understand the perspectives from other cultures and by trying to follow an approach that is as neutral and value-free as possible if we want to engage in an insightful dialog with other cultures.” (5)

“The words intercultural competence did not mean much to me before taking this course. I had very little understanding of how very different peoples and my own attitudes could be when the interactions are based on much more than what we are normally used to. When put outside my comfort zone, the differences in cultures and backgrounds that exist between people at university really gave me a reality check. Hence, when I took this course, I learned that the word intercultural is actually best described by Jacobs University
“The way I perceived the world has been completely influenced by my family, and with it, my culture back home. This is the case for everyone else, everyone here comes from such distinct places. In other terms, when I refer to a day to day basis I mean simple little behaviors that people have that sometimes upset because I really believe it is not right. It can be as simple as laughing at certain jokes, or saying things that might upset someone but you just don’t realize. The whole point here is that, I am aware of how I perceive the world, but at the same time I understand that, and am aware of, the fact that everyone else perceives it differently. There is no one right way, but many.” (24) 

“Reflecting back on the workshop in week 2, I got the chance to actually sit and talk with my friends from various countries with whom I had never talked about their religion, country, their interests, and what challenges, pre-conceived notions or bitter comments they had to face by coming together with people from different backgrounds here at Jacobs. It was interesting to hear the stereotypes people make regarding certain groups of people. I realized that everyone had challenges in the beginning but slowly they adapted to it, and also other people around them understood differences and changed their behavior accordingly.” (27)

Analysis of how culture influences own and others’ behavior (e.g. explicitly reflecting upon a situation and how own preferences are culturally influenced or why others might behave different from oneself):

“I have encountered such difficulties myself when speaking German since in English we have no polite form of “you” I often forget to use “Sie” or when I remember I am unsure if I should use it. These sorts of confusion can lead to unintentional insults or confusion between people of different cultural backgrounds. Some have argued that these hierarchies of address can even lead to confusion among people of the same culture and language.” (11) 

“As we learnt in the lecture, Asians often never tend to ask something directly. We saw a text message conversation between an Asian woman and an American woman as an example in class. At Jacobs, some of
my Asian friends never ask anything they want from me directly. Since I lived in Asia, I knew they wanted something but I always decided to wait until they asked directly, and when they didn’t I would always be annoyed. However, the lecture enlightened me that it is not their fault, and they do this as they consider it polite according to their culture. This made me more accepting to their indirect requests.” (31)

“Knowing this, it is rewarding to talk to other people and see how they feel about being here and how it’s different from what they were accustomed to before. It is also nice to monitor my own changes in perspective as a result of being here and living independently with friends from so many different backgrounds. While I am learning to stay mindful of their different cultures while talking to people, that mindfulness is becoming more and more subconscious and natural. It is no longer something that needs to be consciously considered, but rather a natural reflex. I think this course has helped this happen, and I hope to continue developing my intercultural competence in the next two years of my education at Jacobs, and carry it forward with me in life thereafter.” (32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Reflecting back on the workshop in week 2, I got the chance to actually sit and talk with my friends from various countries with whom I had never talked about their religion, country, their interests, and what challenges, pre-conceived notions or bitter comments they had to face by coming together with people from different backgrounds here at Jacobs. It was interesting to hear the stereotypes people make regarding certain groups of people. I realized that everyone had challenges in the beginning but slowly they adapted to it, and also other people around them understood differences and changed their behavior accordingly.” (27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.18. Quantifying qualitative data on TMIC dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TMIC-S dimension</th>
<th>Elements of the definition / subcategories</th>
<th>Number of participants referring to it (out of N=34)</th>
<th>Qualitative data examples and/or definitions (numbers in brackets indicate participant number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication: Sensitivity in communication</td>
<td>Awareness of differences in verbal and nonverbal behavior</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>“Asians also tend to be more indirect in their communication, sending more discreet messages using body language and the context of the conversation (high-context cultures). In this respect, I behave more like Asians and I do have trouble with other Westerners who do not always understand what I want if I don’t tell them directly. This happened when I had write a lab report with a German friend on a weekend. She was asking me whether she could go home for the weekend. Although I didn’t want to prevent her from going home I would have liked her to stay to work together. So I tried to signal that I really needed her but she did not understand. A friend from Pakistan usually understands these signals much better.” (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To put oneself in the position of another person during communication in order to understand him or her better; high sensibility for verbal and nonverbal communication aspects</td>
<td>Ability to name strategies to be sensitive in communication, such as mindfulness, emotion management,</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>“Now I’m conscious about how different cultural customs people have when communicating. Non-verbal can specially have misinterpretations between cultures. For example, in some cultures to look someone straight in the eye while they are talking is a sign of respect, while in others it is not. Also, signs, expressions and pitches are used differently. Some cultures are more expressive than others, and also use high voices to communicate, while others use the lower voice. This can make some misunderstandings likely when intercultural communication happens. The use of mindfulness will help us to analyze our thinking and judgments, and thus to not act impulsively. We can differentiate that stereotypes of actual fact and see a person for his or her own personal characteristics. It also helps us to be conscious about”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective Taking, and Switching Styles</td>
<td>[ \text{discrepancies that could occur, when to use act a certain way, when to say something, what gestures to make and so on. Then, uncertainty reduction is done when we decipher a message, and after that we interpret it. If we do not do that, we would be communicating with a lot of ambiguity and understanding between people would not be possible. It is important to know how our thoughts influence our emotions so that we can control what we think and what we do.}] [3]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing how one is actually doing it</td>
<td>[ \text{“For instance, this course (Intercultural Competence in practice) is a good way to be aware of all of the differences between the cultures in the world and to be able to cope with them while still being attached to yours. Studying and living in Jacobs University, a really diverse and heterogeneous environment, forces me to practice intercultural competence everyday (except if I do not leave my room) without even noticing it. I learned to think about what I am about to say or do, and how it might affect the people I am interacting with. I also can now recognize if someone has a more direct or indirect style and I now know how to respond to the different styles I come across. As a first year student, I can say that my experience is far from over, and there is still room for improvement when it comes to my intercultural competence skills. But, I think I will not let things offend me as easily as they used to, and I definitely already see how I manage to talk to people with different backgrounds without hurting their feelings. Even though that can also be attributed to the fact that I am now closer to most of my friends, and I know them a little better, I am pretty sure that what I learned in this course is also helping me. My biggest problem is that I am shy and introverted and it can be hard for me to talk to people I do not know. I have been trying to use a little bit of my newly acquired intercultural competence when I am around more people, and it has helped reduce the awkwardness of just meeting someone and having a conversation with them.”}] [28]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning: Information-seeking</td>
<td>[ \text{Different ways of gathering information, e.g.:} ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposeful collection of information about a</td>
<td>[ \text{“For instance, I do not understand why Muslims do not eat pork. After a short research it seems to me that pork differs from other meat simply because it is “impure” as stated in the Quran. This may make little sense to me, and although it is a little baffling to me, I do not discriminate against them, but simply respect this practice.”} ] [4]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Foreign Country or Another Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interacting with culturally different others on campus</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning languages</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel, immerse in other cultures</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet (e.g. YouTube)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies from other cultures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading about other cultures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus events</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing people</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“I try to learn about other cultures as much as possible. I spent a great amount of my free time researching culture differences on YouTube or on the Internet in general, just to learn more about other people.” (28)

“Jacobs University is a place where we can meet people from different areas and that makes it diverse. I didn’t expect to live in such a multicultural environment and for the short period I have been here I learned more than I could in a year back home. I did not only discover some countries and their locations but also about my friend’s culture. As I mentioned in our first workshop some people don’t know that much about Africa and think that it is a country instead of a continent. We were able to share knowledge between us through discussions and debates.” (29)

### Social Interaction: Socializing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enjoying interacting with people from other cultures</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“I chose Jacobs because it’s diverse and it reminds me of home, and allows me to interact and learn about different cultures and about different countries. I was not sure what to expect, but after I came here I found that I worried for nothing. The one thing I would like to thank Jacobs’s instructors and students is for their welcoming spirit. I came a semester late so everyone was already integrated and I thought I might not find friends or fit in. But now I have so many friends.” (8)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cultures quickly and easily</th>
<th>Establishing deeper, meaningful contact</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>“For example, I can see the difference between the conversations that I used to have the way I talk now. My conservations are much less about talking now and much more about listening to what other people have to say. This has certainly led me to actually get to know the people that I interact with at a much deeper level rather than casual small talk. Most importantly, I now know that people may be different in many ways and similar in many ways but there is a way to connect with all of them.” (10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having found ways to make friends across cultures</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>“I try to get a taste of different cultures on campus for which the workshop was really helpful, because normally it is not that often that we talk about our different cultures and this was such a great opportunity to ask all the question that we had but never asked. Since I am here at this University I can say that I changed myself in relation to intercultural situations. At the beginning it was sometime a little bit confusing to interact with so much different people from different culture but it was also fun and very interesting.” (22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Management: Goal-setting</strong></td>
<td><strong>Using Personal Leadership to set and achieve goals</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>“When I set goals or decide on things I check to see what I can do to make the right choice more right or to help those that work with me more comfortable. The one thing I always do is I try to learn basic etiquette of that culture, some rules of dos and don’ts, what is culturally accepted and what is not. I lead myself and shape it in a way that is open to new things, not quick to conclude and easy to approach and trust. … If being interculturally competent is my goal then I will make this part of my goals and lead myself to that direction. After all I can learn about it a million times but if I don’t try to apply it constantly, then what’s the point of learning it in the first place.” (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synergies: Mediation of interests</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mediating between parties in order to achieve the greatest</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possible benefit from different approaches</td>
<td>Finding compromise between own viewpoint and others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>“Throughout the semester my understanding of the term “Intercultural Competence” broadened and I was going through a continuous learning process one of the main insights I learned was that ‘Intercultural Competence’ does not only have to do with how you react and feel. It is not sufficient if you reflect on the challenging the situation and come to the conclusion that you could handle it in a way that you felt comfortable with. Intercultural Competence is about how interact with your environment and how you and (!) your environment react and feel about the situation. … That is why I would define Intercultural Competence as the ability to master a challenging situation in a way that you and the affected environment (person, group of people) are not harmed in their personal and cultural identity and ideally transfer it to a process in which both sides benefit and learn from the experience. Of course this is easier said than done a requires a high degree of self reflection and a continuous thinking process of how one can enhance and improve one’s reactions.” (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking up when offended &amp; resolve</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“At Jacobs, a university full of people from all over the world with all sorts of ideas of what is okay to say and what is not okay to say or what is okay to wear or to joke about and what is not, I think the hardest thing is to be willing to admit you’re offended and to also hear that from others. In such a young and “cool” community it can be hard to admit that a joke or a comment crossed a line in your opinion because you may get called out for being over sensitive or overly politically correct or just boring or no fun, and no one wants to hear those things. It’s hard to be willing to set yourself up for this ridicule, it’s much much easier to be silently offended and just move on, but in that situation no one is learning or growing or anything. So we need to speak up, but we also need to listen and not shoot people down for having feelings and for getting offended because they have different worldviews.” (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Acting as a mediator

“Here at Jacobs, I feel like I lack the willingness to involve myself with certain controversial conversations with strongly conflicting opinions. I could act as a mediator with a certain level of understanding and openness. Such an attitude would allow me to acknowledge both the strengths and weaknesses and pros and cons in the points others try to make.” (9)

“I genuinely love to listen to another person’s opinions and ideas, as I believe anyone can aid in solving a problem. I perceive everyone as having a voice, no matter how big or small. Simply being in the presence of others encourages me to work harder for them, and I am quick to try and diffuse any rising conflicts between people around me.” (20)

### Self-Knowledge: Cultural identity reflection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensively and constantly reflecting upon one’s own cultural character</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Superficial vs. deeper reflection | 34 | Usually co-occurred with the code “LO2 – reflecting upon own cultural identity” with 81 segments coded as in-depth and 9 as superficial (of those also coded with TMIC self-knowledge), thus approx. 90% of text segments coded in this subcategory were deeper reflection on how one’s own cultural background influences values, thinking styles, communication styles, and other aspects:

“There are very many distinct and important ways in which my culture influences how I perceive and think about the world around me. One of these ways manifests itself in my idea of what is acceptable for different people to say. Growing up not only in the US but in a very liberal, albeit predominantly white, neighborhood and environment, has caused me to have very defined ideas about what is offensive to what degree. I do not mean to say that I put great importance on generally always being politically correct, but I mean to say that there are just some words, phrases, insinuations, etc. that are purely out of bounds… The best example of this would be the “n-word”. For me this is a word that should be avoided at all costs, I do not think that the average person should use it in conversation, especially if they are not of African-American descent. I understand that for many African-Americans the “n-word” has become a part of their culture and their identity and I would never strive to take that away from them. But for those individuals who belong to cultures that are not African-American, be it white Americans, the original oppressors and...
user of the “n-word” as a racial slur, Asian-Americans, Latino-Americans, or anyone else, from America or not, I cannot justify to myself that they can use the “n-word”. I find it offensive and ignorant and inconsiderate. Non-Americans often do not appreciate just how charged of a word it is, but to me at least, it is a very clear example of how my culture has affected my view of the world. Expanding on the whole effects of growing up how and where I did, since a very very young age I was always taught to call people of color in the US African-Americans. There are a lot of things about this that I am only realizing now have affected my perception of people. I have caught myself, multiple times, referring to Africans, or other people of African heritage but not necessarily from Africa, here at Jacobs as African-Americans. This is ridiculous! These people are from Africa, they are actually African, just African. They don’t need this little disclaimer on the end about how they are American, because they are not. But for me, whenever I refer to a person, any person, of color, I instinctively call them African-American, because that is what I say, that is what my culture has told me and taught me to say. I would never just call someone “black” when describing them. I describe someone as “the African-American with the red shoes”, never “the black man with the red shoes”. But here, at Jacobs, I have realized just how much I need to think about what I’m saying, just how ingrained this substitution “black” or “half black” or whatever for “African-American” is in my mind.” (11)

“Throughout my life I have not really reflected on how my culture would affect me in my life. However since I have arrived in Jacobs university I have come to realize to what extend my culture shapes who I am today. I still remember the first day I arrived- apart from the excitement, I had to go through a huge intercultural shock. People’s behavior, approach towards different aspects of life and mentality as a whole were so different from what I was used to that I finally understood what was all the fuss about when talking about studying abroad. From their behavior in class, to their actions during the parties—everything was new and strange to me. Now that I have been here for several months I am able to distinguish why people behave in certain way and to what extend their actions are influenced by their culture rather than by anything else. It is redundant to say that the way you are brought up in your culture shapes your vision of the world today. That of course does not mean that there is no place for divergence from the destined path
your culture has set for you. … I feel like this environment has already influenced me. For instance I see my people as really narrow minded –about different races, peoples, countries. They know just one thing and there is no other way to see it. I used to be like that but not anymore –I feel like this place has empowered me with freedom, it has given me the chance to … see that there are so many routes ahead of me rather than just one. I can dream, try, fail and try something some more.” (14)

“Culture can influence how we perceive and think about the world around us. People have different cultures and that I could realize it at Jacobs even with the background I have. As I mentioned in my previous work, Senegal is a country of hospitality, people are very friendly but conservative in terms of traditions. I sometimes face situations based on my beliefs and traditions …. As a Muslim I don’t have the right to drink alcohol and that is kind of a challenge when I’m surrounded by people who are allowed to drink. The people I have met here don’t only have a different culture but the way we think also differ which is quite normal and we to try to understand each other. Just like the matter of drinking, there are other things that people here do which are not allowed to me in my country and vice versa. Adults are well respected and the way we were educated we don’t even look at them directly and that is something we are used to. That also doesn’t mean you cannot share your point of view with them that is just a sign of respect for us. I remember having an American teacher in high school telling us that we should look at him even though we were not educated in that way. While that is considered as a sign of respect for us, for him it was something that could prevent him from knowing the truth when we talk to him in a specific situation. We also have to kneel when greeting an old person which is something we can’t do here because people won’t understand. It is quite challenging because we have to leave some of our cultural aspects and acquire it again once we go back home. As I said in the workshop, greeting is important for us which is not the case for many of the people I have met here. We might consider disrespectful when people know you and act like they don’t. We are so used to it now that we became careless which I think is a consequence of the intercultural exchange that occurs here. We all learn about each other culture and try to be comprehensive.” (29)
Chapter 7

Conclusion
7. Conclusion

The final chapter first summarizes the research project presented in the previous six chapters, followed by a discussion of limitations and contributions of the dissertation.

7.1. Summary of Key Steps and Findings

This longitudinal mixed methods research project has been conducted to contribute to our understanding of how higher education institutions can promote students’ intercultural competence development through formal curriculum interventions. While intercultural competence is increasingly perceived as a must-have for university students, higher education institutions often have failed to specify what exactly they expect their students to achieve and learn, how to foster these desired learning outcomes, and how to assess to what extent they have been attained. Thus, this dissertation has started with a review of intercultural competence models to develop a conceptual framework for the empirical stages of the project.

Conceptual framework

Drawing upon Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence, intercultural competence has been conceptualized as a multi-dimensional construct, consisting of affective (attitudes), behavioral (skills), and cognitive (knowledge) components which support intrapersonal (or internal) outcomes and interpersonal (or external) outcomes. The design and evaluation phase of the formal curriculum intervention paid attention to this multi-dimensional structure when selecting learning activities and assessment tools. Another distinct feature of intercultural competence as a learning outcome is its complexity with various aspects within each of the dimensions. While Deardorff’s (2006) Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence has offered a list of possible aspects to focus on in the intervention, research has highlighted the need to be open to context-specific elements emerging from students’ subjective understanding of intercultural competence and their perceived needs.
This conceptual framework has been complemented by the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS). The DMIS has been introduced by Milton Bennett (1986) in the late 1980s, primarily as a tool for intercultural training design. As presented in detail in chapter 2, the DMIS describes six stages of increasing intercultural sensitivity in terms of dealing with cultural differences. The DMIS can be used to guide the design of learning interventions by offering insights into how students learn to adopt a more ethnorelativist mindset and become increasingly capable of adapting to cultural differences. It thereby can contribute to the selection of specific content and learning activities that balance the level of challenge and support to foster students’ intercultural learning without overwhelming them.

Since students in this research chose to study at an international university and selected a course on intercultural competence as an elective class, it has been assumed that they already have some level of curiosity and positive attitudes towards cultural diversity. Based on the Pyramid Model of Intercultural Competence (Deardorff, 2006) and the DMIS (M. J. Bennett, 1986), intercultural competence as a learning outcome has been conceptualized with a focus on cultural self-awareness, open-mindedness and curiosity (affective dimension), complex understanding of cultural differences (cognitive dimension), as well as ability to observe, reflect, take different perspectives, and adapt to different interaction partners and contexts (behavioral dimension).

This conceptual framework has been complemented by the notion of intercultural practice as put forward in the Personal Leadership methodology by Schaetti et al. (2008). Intercultural practice is concerned with how to transfer culture-specific and culture-general knowledge into interculturally competent behavior through deliberate self-reflection, especially in moments where intercultural encounters might be challenging or frustrating. This concept has contributed to the emphasis placed on encouraging reflective processes in the course designed as part of the empirical stages of this project.
Reviewing research on university students’ intercultural competence

The need to promote self-reflection and meaning-making to foster intercultural learning has been documented in the empirical research reviewed in chapter 2. Generally, research has offered strong evidence busting the myth that exposure equals competence and demonstrating the need to promote and facilitate intercultural contact among students. For decades, such research has mainly focused on student mobility, exploring the potential impact of study abroad participation on intercultural competence. Those studies have provided support for the positive impact of study abroad on students’ intercultural competence. However, they have identified potential factors influencing this relationship, including duration of the program, opportunities for guided reflection, and intercultural training before, during, and after the study abroad experience.

For the past decade, scholars and educators have increasingly become interested in the intercultural competence development of both local and international students, captured in the concept Internationalization at Home (IaH). Research on how to promote intercultural learning for local and international students can be split into studies on informal and formal curriculum interventions. A review of informal curriculum intervention studies such as buddy programs and on-campus events has found strong support for the potential role of more advanced peers in the intercultural learning process. This finding has been taken up in this dissertation with the aim to explore how the peer-learning component can be brought into a more structured learning intervention that is part of the formal curriculum. Given this dissertation’s focus on the formal curriculum, chapter 2 has continued with reviewing research on formal curriculum interventions. This review has found support for the role of experiential learning and guided reflection in fostering students’ intercultural competence. It has furthermore identified the need for evidence-based design of such interventions to ensure they are grounded in what is already known about intercultural learning at higher education institutions. Finally, it has supported the use of mixed methods approaches to measuring
students’ intercultural competence development. This can for example be done with the purpose of complementarity, i.e. gaining a more comprehensive picture, and triangulation, i.e. exploring to which extent quantitative and qualitative findings converge or diverge. Building upon that, chapter 3 has offered more details on the mixed methods approach and design used in this dissertation, including an overview of how and when quantitative and qualitative data have been mixed and why. The overall research process has been divided into three stages, i.e. the evidence-based design process, the formative evaluation, and the summative evaluation.

**Stage 1: Evidence-based design process**

In the first stage of this research project two empirical studies have been conducted to inform the evidence-based design process. Chapter 4 has demonstrated how to implement the evidence-based process to intercultural program design by Stephan and Stephan (2013) to design an elective course for first-year university students. In doing so, it did not only draw upon existing theory and research (as suggested by Stephan & Stephan, 2013) but also empirical data gathered from the target group. The resulting course design has integrated peer-led experiential sessions to complement more traditional faculty-led knowledge-oriented sessions and replaced exams with reflective assignments to support students’ learning process throughout the semester. While the learning goals and activities have specifically been selected for the target group and context, the overall course design can serve as a general framework which instructors at other higher education institutions can adapt to their target groups.

**Stage 2: Formative evaluation**

The formative evaluation presented in chapter 5 has explored benefits and challenges of faculty- and peer-led instruction as well as reflective assignments as a learning tool. The predominantly qualitative evaluation found support for assumed benefits of the course design
and added insights into potential challenges. The findings suggested that peer-led experiential sessions can complement faculty-led knowledge-oriented sessions by creating a safe learning space in which students feel comfortable to share experiences and ideas and learn with and from each other. Findings have shown that peer-instructors were perceived as competent guides and role-models who shared students’ experience and had a genuine interest in their contributions in class. Results furthermore have supported the assumption that peer-instructors benefit as well, gaining confidence and improving their communication and facilitation skills.

However, findings have also revealed challenges such as the two-sided nature of the intimacy of the peer-group which both enabled and limited sharing of experiences and ideas. That was one reason why reflective assignments were found to be an important addition to the learning process, allowing students to express themselves in written. The formative evaluation furthermore identified ideas for improvement of the course design. Findings have highlighted aspects that might be relevant for educators at other institutions, including scheduling of experiential and interactive sessions, pairing and supervision of peer-instructors, as well as how to grade students’ efforts in the course. Overall, the formative evaluation has found support for the course design developed in chapter 4, reinforcing the contribution made in terms of providing a framework which other institutions can take and adapt to their context.

**Stage 3: Summative evaluation**

Finally, chapter 6 has added the summative evaluation, exploring the effectiveness of the course in promoting students’ intercultural competence and achieving its specific learning objectives. Quantitative results have supported the course’s effectiveness in increasing students’ intercultural competence from the beginning to the end of the course. They furthermore have shown that gains in intercultural competence remained stable until ten months after the course. Qualitative findings have enriched these results by providing insights
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into what students have learned within the facets of intercultural competence covered in the two quantitative scales. Further mixing has been achieved by quantifying qualitative findings and displaying them in a matrix with the original quantitative scores for each student. This has enabled identifying diverging cases of students whose results from both strands of the evaluation do not match. Preliminary insights from these cases have offered ideas for further research. On the one hand, preliminary findings on diverging cases have reinforced the need to complement indirect evidence from widely used self-report scales by more direct evidence, for example from analysis of reflective assignments. The latter have also been a major source of evidence to demonstrate the course’s effectiveness in achieving its learning objectives. On the other hand, findings have shown that more research is needed to explore different ways of interpreting results from self-report scales.

Across all chapters, this dissertation has demonstrated how to design and evaluate a formal curriculum intervention that could support students’ intercultural competence development, using an evidence-based approach and mixed methods assessment plan. The concluding section of this chapter will summarize the major contributions of this research. However, the next section will first review limitations of this project.

7.2. Limitations

While the summative evaluation has supported the course’s effectiveness in increasing students’ intercultural competence, some limitations have to be kept in mind. As mentioned before, data from a control group were not suited for inclusion in the study. However, their preliminary analysis has suggested that students participating in the course on average had higher intercultural competence scores at the beginning of the course than the control group had at the end of it. This seems to support the potential self-selection bias into the course. In this project, random assignment of students into the intervention and control group has not been possible. Thus, it seems that students who chose the course as their elective might have
already had higher levels of intercultural competence than those who did not enroll in the course. Despite this limitation, the summative evaluation has shown that even if students started out with quite high scores on average, the course contributed to them progressing even further in their intercultural competence. The mixed methods approach has been crucial to address potential limitations of the quantitative strand, including the lack of a control group as well as the small size of the sample. Qualitative findings have helped to gain deeper insights into students’ learning process and have demonstrated that students were able to increase their intercultural competence.

Looking back at the entire research process, it furthermore seems that the quantitative questionnaires could have been more focused on variables directly related to the research questions. Intercultural competence is a complex construct and there are many factors that might be related to it, such as perceived self-efficacy, personality traits, or subjective well-being, but also mindfulness, integrated self-knowledge, or emotional intelligence. The inclusion of such variables has allowed exploring their relationship to intercultural competence, generating preliminary insights to be investigated further in the future. However, they also contributed to the complexity of the data set. In combination with the resource- and time-consuming nature of mixed methods research, this meant that oftentimes it was beyond the scope of this dissertation to fully make use of the richness of the data collected across the various empirical stages.

Finally, it should be kept in mind that this research has been conducted with one cohort of students at one specific university in Northern Germany. Though this research has been able to make contributions beyond that immediate context, it would be highly interesting to continue evaluating the elective course with different cohorts at the same university as well as to adapt, implement, and evaluate it elsewhere.
7.3. Contributions to Theory and Practice

Acknowledging the limitations presented above, this research project has created an evidence-based elective course on intercultural competence for students at Jacobs University Bremen. The course has proven to be effective in fostering students’ intercultural competence and achieving its learning objectives of enabling students to (1) have an in-depth understanding of how culture influences how we feel, think, and act; (2) relate this knowledge to their everyday experience in a multicultural environment; and (3) be familiar with the Personal Leadership methodology and Critical Moment Dialogue (CMD) and able to apply it to their own experience. Beyond that, this research has made three major contributions to (1) our general understanding of designing formal curriculum interventions for intercultural learning, (2) the benefits of including peer-led experiential sessions and reflective assignments, as well as (3) assessing students’ intercultural competence development.

Concerning the design of formal curriculum interventions for intercultural learning, this project has demonstrated how to implement an evidence-based approach to designing an elective course on intercultural competence. It has offered a comprehensive review of relevant theories and research resulting in a course design that can be transferred and adapted to other higher education institutions. The particularities of that design include complementing traditional faculty-led instruction with peer-led sessions that put emphasis on experiential learning and encourage reflection. In addition, reflective assignments have served as a learning and assessment tool. On the one hand, this research can serve as an example to others offering a detailed description of how to derive learning objectives for one’s target group and align those with relevant theories, learning processes, and activities, as well as the assessment plan. On the other hand, this research has expanded the evidence-based approach presented by Stephan and Stephan (2013) by not only drawing upon evidence from existing theories and research but adding evidence from empirical data collected from the target group.
The second contribution of this research has emerged from generating insights into the benefits and challenges of including peer-led experiential sessions and reflective assignments in a course on intercultural competence. It thereby has confirmed previous findings from research on other types of peer-led instruction and offered support for the use of peer-led instruction in the context of intercultural learning. It furthermore has pointed to additional benefits, such as encouraging socializing and relationship-building in multicultural classrooms. At the same time, this part of the research has revealed potential challenges that need to be addressed when implementing the specific course design, including scheduling of sessions, support for peer-instructors, and grading. Overall, the formative evaluation of the course designed in this dissertation has contributed to literature on peer-led instruction as well as offered practical insights for those seeking to implement a similar design in other settings.

Finally, this research has contributed to the question of how to assess intercultural competence development among students and evaluate the effectiveness of intercultural learning interventions. It has found support for using a mixed methods approach that not only mixes quantitative and qualitative research methods but also combines indirect and direct evidence of students’ intercultural learning. In providing an example of how to design and use such an assessment plan, this research has confirmed that reflective assignments can be a valuable tool serving a double purpose as a learning and assessment tool. It furthermore has offered insights into how to make more use of the potential of mixing in mixed methods research, for example with the purpose of complementarity or triangulation. This has yielded first insights into how to improve scales to measure intercultural competence, such as by adding items to capture perceived self-efficacy, by re-thinking how to interpret increases or decreases over time on these scales, and by showing to complement the numbers with more direct evidence from reflective assignments.

Overall, this research has added to our understanding of how to promote and assess university students’ intercultural competence development in formal curriculum interventions,
of how to implement evidence-based approaches to designing such interventions, and of how to create assessment plans that allow comprehensive insights into students’ intercultural learning. In doing so, it has also made contributions on the practical level, encouraging other educators to complement their courses with peer-led instruction, experiential learning activities, and reflective assignments to foster and track students’ intercultural competence development.
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Appendix A

Baseline questionnaire and variations for questionnaires used at other time points

Study on Intercultural Services at Jacobs University Bremen

This survey is part of a longitudinal study which means that you will be asked to fill in another questionnaire at the end of the course.

To guarantee confidentiality of your data, you will first create a personal code by following the instructions below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Enter your letter/number here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last letter of last name (e.g. Miller – R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last digit of year of birth (e.g. 1994 – 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First letter of first name (e.g. Jon – J)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first digit of your month of birth (e.g. born in July – 7; born in December – 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please remember that your input on all questions is highly valued. Should you, however, feel that you cannot or do not want to answer any of the questions, please skip it and proceed with the next question.
Please indicate how much the following statements apply to you. Remember that there is no right or wrong answer as this is about your unique experience and preferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before I travel to another country I read a lot about it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am good at finding compromise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think about what makes up my culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I notice immediately when the behavior of the person I am speaking to does not match what they are saying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to prepare for a stay abroad I systematically gather information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a group I am the person who unites differing approaches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I notice quickly when conflict is beginning to develop.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always focus on my aims.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use a large part of my free time in order to cultivate social contacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think about my cultural identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I notice quickly when there is a problem between two people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to develop personally I set myself specific aims.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take part in different types of activities to make new social contacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how other people feel without them having to tell me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am good at mediating between people with conflicting interests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I pursue an aim I concentrate fully on achieving it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make an effort to understand to what extent my behavior is shaped by culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it easy to interpret the mood of a conversation through the behavior of the person I am speaking to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When planning a trip abroad I use various sources of information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I actively contribute towards building social contacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I comprehend the feelings of others well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I plan something I usually then go on to achieve my aim.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it easy to adopt a mediating role when differing opinions arise during discussions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strive to meet new people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think about the extent to which my views are determined by my cultural background.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below is a collection of statements about your everyday experience. Using the scale below, please indicate how frequently or infrequently you currently have each experience. Please answer according to what really reflects your experience rather than what you think your experience should be.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I could be experiencing some emotion and not be conscious of it until some time later.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I break or spill things because of carelessness, not paying attention, or thinking of something else.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it difficult to stay focused on what's happening in the present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tend to walk quickly to get where I'm going without paying attention to what I experience along the way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tend not to notice feelings of physical tension or discomfort until they really grab my attention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I forget a person's name almost as soon as I've been told it for the first time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It seems I'm &quot;running on automatic&quot; without much awareness of what I'm doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rush through activities without being really attentive to them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get so focused on the goal I want to achieve that I lose touch with what I am doing right now to get there.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do jobs or tasks automatically, without being aware of what I'm doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find myself listening to someone with one ear, doing something else at the same time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get to places on &quot;automatic pilot&quot; and then wonder how I went there.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find myself preoccupied with the future or the past.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find myself doing things without paying attention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I snack without being aware of what I'm eating.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate your agreement with the following statements in terms of how much they apply to you or describe your preferences. Remember that there is no right or wrong answer as this is about your unique experience and preferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as extraverted, enthusiastic.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I lead a purposeful and meaningful life.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as critical, quarrelsome.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My social relationships are supportive and rewarding.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the ways in which cultures around the world are different.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am engaged and interested in my daily activities.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as dependable, self-disciplined.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By thinking deeply about myself, I can discover what I really want in life and how I might get it.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can give examples of cultural differences from my personal experience, reading, and so on.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I actively contribute to the happiness and well-being of others.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as anxious, easily upset.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I have learned about myself in the past has helped me to respond better to difficult situations.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy talking with people from different cultures.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am competent and capable in the activities that are important to me.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I need to, I can reflect about myself and clearly understand the feelings and attitudes behind my past behaviors.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the ability to accurately understand the feelings of people from other cultures.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a good person and live a good life.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as open to new experiences, complex.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While I am in the middle of a personal problem, I get too involved that I just cannot at the same time rise above the situation and clearly examine what I am thinking or feeling.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes try to understand people from another culture by imagining how something looks from their perspective.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time, I get so involved in what is going on that I really cannot see how I am responding to a situation.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am optimistic about my future.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often, I am unaware of my thoughts and feelings as they are happening, and only later get some idea about what I may really have been experiencing.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as reserved, quiet.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People respect me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I get upset, I immediately react without any clear awareness of what I am doing.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can change my behavior to suit different cultural situations and people.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often my feelings about an experience are so complex and contradictory than I don't even try to understand them as they are going on.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself sympathetic, warm.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I accept delays without becoming upset when in different cultural situations and with culturally different people.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During a demanding experience, I never even try to understand the thoughts and feelings that are flowing through me because it is all too confusing.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can usually handle whatever comes my way.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as disorganized, careless.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In some situations, I almost never can understand why I have behaved in particular ways, so I usually don't even try.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with someone from another culture.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next, please read through the following six situations and tick the answer that best describes how you would react or behave in this situation. Do not overthink your answer but provide your intuitive preference in any of the given situations.

**Situation 1:**
For one of your courses, you are working on a project with a student from another country. Just like you, the student has just arrived at Jacobs University and you soon notice that he or she does not seem to feel comfortable in the new environment. How do you deal with this situation?
- I ask how the student is feeling and observe the reaction.
- I can sense the student’s insecurity, but do not know how to approach it.
- As we are only working together on this project, I do not address it.
- I try to win the student’s trust and then carefully ask about the student’s feelings.

**Situation 2:**
You have been accepted to go to study abroad for one semester at a university in a country that you have not yet lived in or visited. How are you most likely to prepare for this?
- As I am always polite and friendly, I do not expect major conflicts in the new country.
- I am well-prepared with my travel guide and feel optimistic about the new culture.
- I do not prepare in a specific way, I just immerse myself in the new situation and culture.
- I try to gather as much information as possible about the new location and culture before departure.

**Situation 3:**
You move to a new city for an internship and do not yet know anyone there. How are you most likely to behave in this situation?
- I concentrate on my work.
- I try to get to know new people in various free time activities.
- I have long phone calls with my friends and family during my free time to not feel lonely.
- I am friendly to everyone I meet to signal my interest in getting to know new people.
Situation 4:
You have an important course assignment that you planned to complete by the end of the month. However, after a while you realize that you have hardly made progress. How are you most likely to behave in such a situation?
☐ I focus on the parts of the assignment that are going well.
☐ I delay completion of the assignment to the last minute.
☐ I clearly define what I must achieve at which time to complete the assignment as planned.
☐ I try to identify and eliminate the reasons responsible for my lack of progress so far.

Situation 5:
You are working on a group assignment for one of your classes and there are five different cultures represented in your group. While working on a problem-solving task, there is a heated discussion between people of different opinions. How do you react?
☐ I carefully observe the situation and try to soothe the discussion.
☐ I actively join the discussion to assert my solution.
☐ As such discussions quickly get too much for me to handle, I leave the room.
☐ I offer to moderate the discussion to collect ideas for solutions and jointly weigh the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative.

Situation 6:
You are studying at a university in a foreign country for a semester abroad. You are expected to write a report on how academics and teaching at your host university differ from that at Jacobs University Bremen. You soon notice many differences, also concerning the two cultures in general. How to you deal with this situation?
☐ As the focus is on academics, I exclusively focus on the academic life and not the country’s culture.
☐ I learn about cultural values and norms of both countries to be able to judge whether differences in academic culture could be based on cultural differences.
☐ I am asking intercultural services for advice as I do not know much about cultural differences.
☐ I am aware of the cultural similarities and differences of the two countries and I can integrate this knowledge into my report.

If you have any additional comments on the situations above, you can note them down here:
________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________
Finally, there are some questions about your emotional life, in particular, how you control (that is, regulate and manage) your emotions. The questions below involve two distinct aspects of your emotional life. One is your emotional experience, or what you feel like inside. The other is your emotional expression, or how you show your emotions in the way you talk, gesture, or behave.

For each item, please use the scale provided to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When I want to feel more positive emotion (such as joy or amusement), I change what I'm thinking about.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I keep my emotions to myself.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I want to feel less negative emotion (such as sadness or anger), I change what I'm thinking about.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I am feeling positive emotions, I am careful not to express them.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I'm faced with a stressful situation, I make myself think about it in a way that helps me to stay calm.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I control my emotions by not expressing them.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I want to feel more positive emotion, I change the way I'm thinking about the situation.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I control my emotions my changing the way I think about the situation I'm in.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I am feeling negative emotions, I make sure not to express them.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I want to feel less negative emotion, I change the way I'm thinking about the situation.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of my emotions as I experience them.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I experience a positive emotion, I know how to make it last.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know when my emotions change.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I seek out activities that make me happy.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I easily recognize my emotions as I experience them.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have control over my emotions.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baseline additionally included:

Please describe in your own words what ‘intercultural competence’ means to you:
_______________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________
You are almost finished, please answer these short demographic questions:

I identify myself as:  □ female  □ male  □ other  □ do not want to say

Please specify your age: ____________ (in years)

Please indicate your study focus area:  □ Mobility  □ Health  □ Diversity  □ other: ______________

Country of birth: _________________________________________________________________

Nationality (i.e. citizenship): ________________________________________________________

Mother tongue(s): _________________________________________________________________

Country of birth of mother: _________________________________________________________

Country of birth of father: __________________________________________________________

Language(s) spoken at home: _________________________________________________________

Did you ever live in any other country different from the one you were born in (before coming to Jacobs University in Bremen, Germany)?
 □ no  □ yes, please name the countries and how long you lived there:

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

Did you participate in any other intercultural training before coming to Jacobs University Bremen?
 □ no  □ yes, please specify:

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your participation!
(last page of post-test)

You are almost finished, please answer these questions on the course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The course enabled me to develop my own intercultural competence further.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have learned things that I can apply to my everyday life at Jacobs.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I liked the workshops.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I liked the lectures.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lectures helped me to gain more knowledge on intercultural topics.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workshops allowed me to practice intercultural competence.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workshops allowed me to get to know my peers better.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workshops allowed me to learn more about myself.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The peer trainers were competent instructors.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The peer trainers were credible role models.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt comfortable sharing my experience and thoughts in the workshops.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reflective papers (homework) contributed to my learning.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would have preferred to have an exam instead of the reflective papers.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I have not learned anything useful in this course.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend this course to others.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please write down what you think about the benefits and challenges of having the workshops facilitated by peer trainers. (bullet points are sufficient)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits / things that I liked</th>
<th>Challenges / think that I did not like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Thank you for your participation!
Follow-up questionnaire (online-based using Unipark)

1 Start_Consent

Study on Intercultural Competence Course at Jacobs University Bremen

Thank you for having participated in the course "Intercultural Competence in Practice" in spring 2016 which is part of my PhD research at the Bremen International Graduate School of Social Sciences (BIGSSS). I am hoping for your support once last time to assess the long-term impacts of this course as part of my scientific evaluation.

There is no right or wrong answer to any of the questions and you can withdraw participation at any time. Every contribution and input is highly valued and I am very grateful for your participation.

By clicking on the button below, you agree to participate in this study. Filling in the questionnaire will take about 10 minutes. If you have any questions or comments, feel free to contact me via e-mail (n.binder@bigss-bremen.de or n.binder@jacobs-university.de).

Thanks for your support and all the best for your studies this semester,

Nadine Binder (PhD Fellow)

2 P1_IdentifierCode

To be able to match data over time while guaranteeing confidentiality of your data, please first re-create your personal code by following the instructions below:

1. Last letter of last name (e.g. Miller – R)
2. Last digit of year of birth (e.g. 1994 – 4)
3. First letter of first name (e.g. Jan – J)
4. The first digit of your month of birth (e.g. born in July – 7; born in December – 1)

3 P2_TMIC

Please indicate how much the following statements apply to you.

Remember that there is no right or wrong answer as this is about your unique experience and preferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Does not apply at all</th>
<th>Does not apply</th>
<th>Does rather not apply</th>
<th>Does rather apply</th>
<th>Does apply</th>
<th>Fully applies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before I travel to another country I read a lot about it.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am good at finding compromise.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think about what makes up my culture.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I notice immediately when the behavior of the person I am speaking to does not match what they are saying.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to prepare for a stay abroad I systematically gather information.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a group I am the person who unites differing approaches.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I notice quickly when conflict is beginning to develop.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always focus on my aims.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use a large part of my free time in order to cultivate social contacts.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think about my cultural identity.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX

#### 4 P3_TMIC

Please indicate how much the following statements apply to you.

Remember that there is no right or wrong answer as this is about your unique experience and preferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Does not apply at all</th>
<th>Does not apply</th>
<th>Does rather not apply</th>
<th>Does rather apply</th>
<th>Does apply</th>
<th>Fully applies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I notice quickly when there is a problem between two people.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to develop personally I set myself specific aims.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take part in different types of activities to make new social contacts.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how other people feel without them having to tell me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am good at mediating between people with conflicting interests.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I pursue an aim I concentrate fully on achieving it.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make an effort to understand to what extent my behavior is shaped by culture.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it easy to interpret the mood of a conversation through the behavior of the person I am speaking to.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When planning a trip abroad I use various sources of information.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I actively contribute towards building social contacts.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5 P4_TMIC

Please indicate how much the following statements apply to you.

Remember that there is no right or wrong answer as this is about your unique experience and preferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Does not apply at all</th>
<th>Does not apply</th>
<th>Does rather not apply</th>
<th>Does rather apply</th>
<th>Does apply</th>
<th>Fully applies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I comprehend the feelings of others well.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I plan something I usually then go on to achieve my aim.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it easy to adopt a mediating role when differing opinions arise during discussions.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strive to meet new people.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think about the extent to which my views are determined by my cultural background.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6  P5_TIPI-SFCQ-GSES-Flourishing

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements in terms of how much they apply to you or describe your preferences.

Remember that there is no right or wrong answer as this is about your unique experience and preferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as extraverted, enthusiastic.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I lead a purposeful and meaningful life.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as critical, quarrelsome.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My social relationships are supportive and rewarding.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the ways in which cultures around the world are different.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am engaged and interested in my daily activities.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as dependable, self-disciplined.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7  P6_TIPI-SFCQ-GSES-Flourishing

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements in terms of how much they apply to you or describe your preferences.

Remember that there is no right or wrong answer as this is about your unique experience and preferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By thinking deeply about myself, I can discover what I really want in life and how I might get it.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can give examples of cultural differences from my personal experience, reading, and so on.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I actively contribute to the happiness and well-being of others.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as anxious, easily upset.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I have learned about myself in the past has helped me to respond better to difficult situations.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy talking with people from different cultures.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am competent and capable in the activities that are important to me.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I need to, I can reflect about myself and clearly understand the feelings and attitudes behind my past behaviors.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 8 P7_TIPI-SFCQ-GSES-Flourishing

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements in terms of how much they apply to you or describe your preferences.

Remember that there is no right or wrong answer as this is about your unique experience and preferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have the ability to accurately understand the feelings of people from other cultures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a good person and live a good life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as open to new experiences, complex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While I am in the middle of a personal problem, I get so involved that I just cannot at the same time rise above the situation and clearly examine what I am thinking or feeling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes try to understand people from another culture by imagining how something looks from their perspective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time, I get so involved in what is going on that I really cannot see how I am responding to a situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am optimistic about my future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often, I am unaware of my thoughts and feelings as they are happening, and only later get some idea about what I may really have been experiencing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# 9 P8_TIPI-SFCQ-GSES-Flourishing

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements in terms of how much they apply to you or describe your preferences.

Remember that there is no right or wrong answer as this is about your unique experience and preferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as reserved, quiet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People respect me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I get upset, I immediately react without any clear awareness of what I am doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can change my behavior to suit different cultural situations and people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often my feelings about an experience are so complex and contradictory that I don't even try to understand them as they are going on.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself sympathetic, warm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I accept delays without becoming upset when in different cultural situations and with culturally different people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During a demanding experience, I never even try to understand the thoughts and feelings that are flowing though me because it is all too confusing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### P9_TIP1-SFCQ-GSES-Flourishing1

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements in terms of how much they apply to you or describe your preferences.

Remember that there is no right or wrong answer as this is about your unique experience and preferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as reserved, quiet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People respect me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I get upset, I immediately react without any clear awareness of what I am doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can change my behavior to suit different cultural situations and people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often my feelings about an experience are so complex and contradictory that I don’t even try to understand them as they are going on.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself sympathetic, warm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I accept delays without becoming upset when in different cultural situations and with culturally different people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During a demanding experience, I never even try to understand the thoughts and feelings that are flowing through me because it is all too confusing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### P9_TIP1-SFCQ-GSES-Flourishing2

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements in terms of how much they apply to you or describe your preferences.

Remember that there is no right or wrong answer as this is about your unique experience and preferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can usually handle whatever comes my way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as disorganized, careless.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In some situations, I almost never can understand why I have behaved in particular ways, so I usually don’t even try.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with someone from another culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending time to know and understand my thoughts and feeling has almost never helped me to know myself better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as calm, emotionally stable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think a lot about the influence that culture has on my behavior and that of others who are culturally different.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anytime I try to analyze my contributions to a problem, I get confused.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as conventional, uncreative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware that I need to plan my course of action when in different cultural situations and with culturally different people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12 P_EmotionIItems

Next, there are some questions about your emotional life, in particular, how you control (that is, regulate and manage) your emotions. The questions below involve two distinct aspects of your emotional life. One is your emotional experience, or what you feel like inside. The other is your emotional expression, or how you show your emotions in the way you talk, gesture, or behave.

For each item, please use the scale provided to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Fully agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When I want to feel more positive emotion (such as joy or amusement), I change what I'm thinking about.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I keep my emotions to myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I want to feel less negative emotion (such as sadness or anger), I change what I'm thinking about.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I am feeling positive emotions, I am careful not to express them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I'm faced with a stressful situation, I make myself think about it in a way that helps me to stay calm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I control my emotions by not expressing them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I want to feel more positive emotion, I change the way I'm thinking about the situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I control my emotions by changing the way I think about the situation I'm in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I am feeling negative emotions, I make sure not to express them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I want to feel less negative emotion, I change the way I'm thinking about the situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of my emotions as I experience them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I experience a positive emotion, I know how to make it last.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know when my emotions change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I seek out activities that make me happy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I easily recognize my emotions as I experience them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have control over my emotions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 P10_SJT_Intro

You are almost done - to finish, please read through the following six situations and tick the answer that best describes how you would react or behave in this situation.

*Do not overthink your answer but provide your intuitive preference in any of the given situations.*

14 P10_SJTs

For one of your courses, you are working on a project with a student from another country. Just like you, the student has just arrived at Jacobs University and you soon notice that he or she does not seem to feel comfortable in the new environment. How do you deal with this situation?

1. I ask how the student is feeling and observe the reaction.
2. I can sense the student's insecurity, but do not know how to approach it.
3. As we are only working together on this project, I do not address it.
4. I try to win the student's trust and then carefully ask about the student's feelings.

You have been accepted to go to study abroad for one semester at a university in a country that you have not yet lived in or visited. How are you most likely to prepare for this?

1. As I am always polite and friendly, I do not expect major conflicts in the new country.
2. I am well-prepared with my travel guide and feel optimistic about the new culture.
3. I do not prepare in a specific way. I just immerse myself in the new situation and culture.
4. I try to gather as much information as possible about the new location and culture before departure.
15 P11_SJTs

You move to a new city for an internship and do not yet know anyone there. How are you most likely to behave in this situation?

- I concentrate on my work.
- I try to get to know new people in various free time activities.
- I have long phone calls with my friends and family during my free time to not feel lonely.
- I am friendly to everyone I meet to signal my interest in getting to know new people.

You have an important course assignment that you planned to complete by the end of the month. However, after a while you realize that you have hardly made progress. How are you most likely to behave in such a situation?

- I focus on the parts of the assignment that are going well.
- I delay completion of the assignment to the last minute.
- I clearly define what I must achieve at which time to complete the assignment as planned.
- I try to identify and eliminate the reasons responsible for my lack of progress so far.

16 P12_SJTs

You are working on a group assignment for one of your classes and there are five different cultures represented in your group. While working on a problem-solving task, there is a heated discussion between people of different opinions. How do you react?

- I carefully observe the situation and try to soothe the discussion.
- I actively join the discussion to assert my solution.
- As such discussions quickly get too much for me to handle, I leave the room.
- I offer to moderate the discussion to collect ideas for solutions and jointly weigh the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative.

You are studying at a university in a foreign country for a semester abroad. You are expected to write a report on how academics and teaching at your host university differ from that at Jacobs University Bremen. You soon notice many differences, also concerning the two cultures in general. How do you deal with this situation?

- As the focus is on academics, I exclusively focus on the academic life and not the country’s culture.
- I learn about cultural values and norms of both countries to be able to judge whether differences in academic culture could be based on cultural difference.
- I am asking intercultural services for advice as I do not know much about cultural differences.
- I am aware of the cultural similarities and differences of the two countries and I can integrate this knowledge into my report.

17 P_CourseEval

You are almost finished, please answer these few questions on the course by indicating your agreement with each of the statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Fully disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Fully agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating in the course helped me developing my intercultural competence.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the course, I sometimes thought back to what I have learned in the course.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can apply my learnings from the course to everyday life at Jacobs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By now, I forgot most of the things we have discussed or learned in this course.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes observe that I react or act differently based on what I have learned in this course.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, please state anything you still remember from the course or that has been useful in your private and/or academic life after the course. BLock points are fine, please provide examples whenever you can.

If you have any additional comments, you can type them down here. You can submit your data by clicking the button below.

Thanks a lot for your participation!

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Nadine Binder (nbinder@bigsss-bremen.de).
Appendix B

Interview guide (for pre- and post-interviews with n=10 students)

Interview Guide – Pre-Interview

Thanks a lot for volunteering to participate in this interview. I have prepared some questions on your reasons for taking the class and your expectations and then I would like to hear more about your experience here at Jacobs. There is no right or wrong answer to any of the questions, I just want you to tell me anything that comes to your mind. If you are not sure about a question or do not want to answer it, just let me know. Other than that, just talk as much as you like, my role is mainly to listen and learn from your experience.

Introduction, Motivation and Expectations about the Course

- Please take a moment to introduce yourself (who are you, where are you from, what do you study)?
- Why did you choose the class “Intercultural Competence in Practice”?
  - What is your motivation or reason to take it?
  - What do you expect to learn?
- What do you associate with the course title “Intercultural Competence in Practice”?
  - What does intercultural competence mean to you?
  - How can we practice intercultural competence?

Experienced Intercultural Challenge

Take a moment to think about your experience at Jacobs University so far. All of us here experience challenging intercultural interactions. Try to remember a situation where you were interacting with one or several people from other cultures and experienced the situation to be challenging.

- What happened?
- Who was involved?
- What were the challenges you perceived?
- How did you feel in this situation?
  - Can you remember any particular emotions that you had?
- Sometimes people also report specific physical sensations in challenging moments, such as a tight feeling in the chest or a pumping heart. Do you by any chance remember having had specific physical sensations?
- How did you behave? What was the outcome?
- How did the other people behave?
- Why do you think they behaved this way?
- Were you satisfied with the outcome? Why/why not?
  - What could you or others have done differently to produce a more satisfying outcome?
Experienced Positive Intercultural Situation

Now take a moment to think about a particularly positive experience with one or several people from other cultures.

- What happened?
- Who was involved?
- What was positive about the experience?
- How did you feel in this situation?
  - Can you remember any particular emotions that you had?
- Sometimes people also report specific physical sensations in challenging moments, such as a tight feeling in the chest or a pumping heart. Do you by any chance remember having had specific physical sensations?
- How did you behave? What was the outcome?
- How did the other people behave?
- Why do you think they behaved this way?
- Were you satisfied with the outcome? Why/why not?
  - What could you or others have done differently to produce a more satisfying outcome?

Thanks a lot for sharing your experiences and thoughts with me.

To conclude the interview, I am interested in your thoughts on some elements of how this course is structured and done.

- What do you think about combining lectures with workshops?
  - What are pros and cons of the lectures?
  - What are the pros and cons of the workshops?
- How do you feel about the involvement of older students as instructors of the workshops?
  - Which benefits do you see?
  - Which challenges do you see?
- Instead of exams, the course work is mainly to complete these weekly tasks for your portfolio. What do you think about this?

Is there anything you would like to add or ask before we finish?
Interview Guide – Post-Interview

Thanks a lot for volunteering to participate in this interview. Like last time, there will be questions on how you experienced the course and what you think about certain elements of it. There is no right or wrong answer to any of the questions, I just want you to tell me anything that comes to your mind. If you are not sure about a question or do not want to answer it, just let me know. Other than that, just talk as much as you like, my role is mainly to listen and learn from your experience.

Overall Experience of the Course

- How was your overall experience of the course?
- If you think back to your expectations about the course, do you feel that your expectations were met? Why/why not?
- Was there anything that stood out for you?
  - Was there any topic or activity that you particularly liked?
- Was there anything that bothered you?

Specific Elements of the Course

- What do you think about combining lectures with workshops?
  - What did you like about the lectures? And what did you not like as much?
  - What did you like about the workshops? And what did you not like as much?
- How do you feel about the involvement of older students as instructors of the workshops?
  - Which benefits did you experience? Can you give an example?
  - Which challenges did you experience? Can you give an example?
- Instead of exams, the course work was mainly to complete these weekly tasks for your portfolio. How did this work for you?
  - What did you like about it?
  - What, if anything, did you find challenging?
  - How did you feel about receiving feedback on your portfolio?
- You also had readings for some of the lectures. To what extent did you find the readings useful?

Learnings and Transfer – In General

- I am interested to hear what you feel you have learned in this course. Could you describe what you are taking away from it?
- Was there anything in terms of content that you felt was missing?
  - What are your open questions after this course?
- Thinking about everything you have learned, how would you now define intercultural competence?
  - What are ingredients of intercultural competence? What do you need to be successful across cultures?
  - Do you feel that this course has helped you to develop or strengthen some of those ingredients? If so, which? If not, why not?
Learnings and Transfer – Part I on Cross-Cultural Psychology

- In the first half of the semester, we mainly dealt with how to define culture, where it comes from, how it affects our cognition and perception and how it plays out in intercultural interaction, e.g. in differences in communication styles. I would be curious what you take away from this part.
  - What did you learn?
  - What surprised you?
  - Do you feel more knowledgeable about culture and how it affects us?
- In the reflective papers, you also were encouraged to think a lot about your own cultural background. To what extent do you feel you are more aware of your own culture and how it influences you? Can you give examples of what you have learned?
- How relevant to you find these contents to the topic of intercultural competence in practice?

Learnings and Transfer – Part II on Personal Leadership

- In the second half of the semester, we mainly dealt with Personal Leadership as one tool for practicing intercultural competence. I would be curious what you take away from this part.
  - What did you learn?
  - What surprised you?
- One of the core processes of Personal Leadership is self-reflection, as done with the Critical Moment Dialogue. Which value do you see in learning about this and trying it out? Is there anything you find useful for other contexts?
- Personal Leadership encourages us to be mindful of our judgments, emotions, and physical sensations. Have you noticed any change in how mindful you are in everyday life?
- Personal Leadership also focuses a lot on holding a vision. What do you think about this?
- Another central element is cultivating stillness. What is your experience with this? Is there anything you learned that you take into your everyday life?
  - Do you have any stillness practice?
    - If yes, what does it look like? When and why did you introduce it to your life?
    - If no, which value, if any, do you see in having a stillness practice? What keeps you from having one?
- Yet another practice is being able to engage ambiguity. What is your experience with this? Is there anything you learned that you take into your everyday life?
- In general, how relevant to you find these contents to the topic of intercultural competence in practice?

To close this interview, my final question is:

- Would you recommend this course to others? Why/why not?
  - If yes: How would you describe this course to them?
  - If yes: How would you “sell” it to them?
- Do you have any final comments or remarks?
# Appendix C

Coding frame for the qualitative content analysis (QCA) of students’ definitions of intercultural competence

*Please note: Subcategories marked with an asterisk (*) are based on the items used in Deardorff’s (2006) research as summarized in table 2 in Deardorff (2006)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective Dimension</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Decision Rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Openness</strong></td>
<td>This category is applicable to statements referring to general openness to people from other cultures and to intercultural learning, using words such as “being open”, “being open-minded”, “open-mindedness”, “to open up” and the like.</td>
<td>“To me it means the ability to open up to other cultures, [...]” “Intercultural competence means to be open-minded towards foreign people and cultures.” “It is also keeping an open mind […]”</td>
<td>“Openness” is different from “Curiosity/Discovery” in that openness is coded if respondents describe a more general and passive attitude of being open to intercultural situations and people from other cultures without any explicit reference to actively seeking such interactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curiosity/Discovery</strong></td>
<td>This category is applicable to statements about being curious or wanting to learn about other cultures in general, seeking interaction with people from other cultures to learn about their culture, or wanting to discover another culture. Such statements might include words such as “curiosity” or “being curious”, “to explore” or “to discover” and the like.</td>
<td>“[…] have the curiosity to explore/understand the differences; [...]” “Exploration of different cultural backgrounds [...]”</td>
<td>In contrast to “Openness”, “Curiosity/Discovery” is applicable to statements in which respondents refer to a more proactive attitude which motivates them to actively seek intercultural contact and learn about other cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respect for Other Cultures</strong></td>
<td>An attitude of respect for other cultures and worldviews which is related to valuing other cultures and valuing cultural diversity. This category is applicable if the word “respect” is mentioned in relation to</td>
<td>“[...] remembering to respect the differences and embrace the similarities.” “Showing respect.” “[...] being able to respect those differences in social situations.”</td>
<td>To code “Respect”, the respondent needs to refer to valuing cultural diversity or other cultures (in contrast to tolerating them, in which case cultural differences are accepted but not necessarily valued) or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cultural differences, other cultures, or people from other cultures. It can also be applied to positive statements on cultural diversity (e.g. being enriching, appreciating diversity, embracing diversity).

| Tolerance/ Acceptance | Intercultural competence is the ability to accept other cultures, [...]”
| | “[...] accept that they [other cultures] can be very different from yours.”
| | “The ability to tolerate, accept and appreciate those who are different from your own.”
| | In contrast to “Respect”, “Tolerance” refers to accepting or tolerating cultural differences without explicitly considering them to be of positive value.

Valuing Own Culture

This category is applicable to references to being proud of one’s own culture or cultural identity, to value the own culture, and to not forget the own culture when interacting with people from other cultures or when moving into a different cultural environment.

- “This means to feel proud of your own culture and recognizing others but not feeling intimidated with your own.”
- “Someone doesn’t forget the original culture at the same time he/she can get used to the new one.”

This category is separate from “Cultural Self-Awareness” to distinguish statements pertaining to being aware of one’s culture and its influence on perception and behavior in general from those referring to (emotionally) valuing one’s own culture, maintaining one’s cultural identity, and being proud of one’s culture.

Behavioral Dimension

The abilities and skills that an individual can draw upon when interacting with culturally different people intercultural situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Decision Rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Ability to listen and observe | This category is applicable for references to being able to listen to culturally different people and observe or recognize cultural differences. | “Being able to observe the differences [...]”
| | | “The ability to observe cultural differences; [...]”

| *Ability to analyze, interpret, and relate | This category is used for statements on the ability to analyze, interpret, and relate information and observations of cultural differences. | “[...] the ability to assess the existing difference between two or more cultures [...]”

<p>| Ability to relate to others | This category can be used for references to building networks, making friends, mingling, connecting and building relationships with | “The ability to easily connect with people from different backgrounds.” |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Decision Rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Dimension</td>
<td>The knowledge that an individual can draw upon when interacting with culturally different people intercultural situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cultural Self-Awareness</td>
<td>This category is applicable to any statement that pertains to being aware of and knowing one’s own cultural identity or cultural programming, i.e. recognizing one’s cultural values, beliefs, and norms, as well as their influence on one’s perception and interpretation of the world.</td>
<td>“Being aware of your own cultural identity [...]”</td>
<td>This category is separate from “Valuing Own Culture” in that it pertains to references to being aware of one’s culture and its influence on perception and behavior in general without explicitly referring to (emotionally) valuing one’s own culture and being proud of one’s culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Understanding of Culture</td>
<td>This category is applicable to all statements showing an understanding and awareness of the concept of culture and that there are cultural differences in norms, values, beliefs, etc. It can be coded when respondents refer to being aware of cultural differences, understanding different cultures or cultural differences or people from other cultures. It is a catch-all category for vague statements pertaining to “understanding (people from) different cultures” or “understanding cultural differences”.</td>
<td>“Intercultural competence means that you can understand other cultures [...]”</td>
<td>This category is used whenever there is reference to cultural differences in general without explicitly mentioning specific cultures. In case of the latter, the category “Culture-Specific Knowledge” is more applicable. This category refers more generally to having an understanding of culture, cultural differences, values, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Culture-Specific Information</td>
<td>This category is used for segments relating to having specific knowledge about certain cultures, i.e. when respondents explicitly refer to knowing about rituals, norms, food, gestures, and history of specific cultures.</td>
<td>“An interculturally competent person knows the ways of behaving, the unspoken rules, all gestures of other cultures.” “For instance understanding the food, languages and preferences of certain cultures.”</td>
<td>This category is different from “Understanding of Culture” in that it requires references to specific cultures (e.g. referring to “these cultures” or explicitly naming them) or specific aspects of culture such as rituals and history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sociolinguistic Awareness</td>
<td>This category is applicable to statements that</td>
<td>Hypothetical example: “Being able to adapt your</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
demonstrate awareness of the relation between language and meaning in societal contexts as well as issues of power and language (e.g. which language is used in intercultural interaction).

**INTERACTION LEVEL**
The interaction level pertains to dimensions relevant in the actual intercultural interaction between two or more individuals (who bring their individual factors to the situation). They may be intrapersonal and interpersonal.

**Intrapersonal Dimension**
Processes occurring within the individual interaction partners in intercultural situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Decision Rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Tolerating/Engaging Ambiguity*           | This category is used for statements that show the ability to endure ambiguity in intercultural situations and being able to cope with cultural differences rather than escaping the situation. | “Feeling comfortable about most situations […]”  
“Being able to be around people from other cultures and not feeling anything odd about it.” |                |
| *Suspending Judgment*                     | This category pertains to the ability to suspend judgment and is applicable to statements on avoiding judgment, trying to not judge others, reflecting upon one’s judgments and similar. | “Secondly, the ability to discuss opinions without judging based on cultural differences is very important.”  
“[…] and don’t try to judge them […]”  
“To try to listen to other cultures and get to know them before you judge.” |                |
| *Ethnorelative View*                      | This category is applicable to statements referring to or demonstrating an ethnorelative view which means to experience one’s own beliefs and behaviors as just one of many possible ways of organizing and perceiving reality. It also pertains to statements showing that the own cultural values, beliefs, and practices are not considered to be the absolute truth and that the individual does not try to impose them on others. | “Furthermore, the person is aware that his own culture is not absolute, is able to take a point of view between the cultures. It is not ethnocentric anymore.”  
“When you meet someone not to expect that they think exactly like you.” | This category is applicable to statements that demonstrate a more general awareness about the relativity of one’s own culture and that one’s own ways of perceiving, interpreting, and reacting to the world are influenced by one’s culture and are just one of many ways. This category is different from “Cognitive Flexibility” in that it pertains to a more general worldview whereas “Cognitive Flexibility” refers to the ability to switch perspectives. |
| *Mindfulness | This category can be applied to segments concerned with “being in the moment” or “being mindful” of oneself and others in the situation, attending to one’s own assumptions, perceptions, and emotions, and reflecting upon them. It is also applicable to statements referring to being patient and considerate. | “[…] and patient with whomever you meet no matter where they are from.” |
| *Cognitive Flexibility | This category is applicable to statements pertaining to the ability to adopt different perspectives or views during an intercultural interaction, to be able to understand the situation from the other person’s perspective, and understand their way of thinking. | “Intercultural competences enable a person to understand different cultures by adopting different perspective.” “[…] use your understanding to draw new light on situations.” |
| *Cross-Cultural Empathy | This category refers to the ability to feel the experience of the interaction partner, regardless of cultural differences. | “Being able to show understanding and empathy for other cultures” “[…] empathising with others.” “You should also see whether somebody feels uncomfortable about your behavior.” |

**Interpersonal Dimension**

Processes occurring between interaction partners in intercultural situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Decision Rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Adaptability (to Different Styles or Environments)</em></td>
<td>This category can be applied to segments on being able to integrate into, adapt or adjust to a new, different cultural environment. It is also applicable to references to being able to thrive, flourish, or live in a new culture. Finally, it can also be used for statements on the ability to (temporarily) adapt one’s way of</td>
<td>“The ability to be aware of and act accordingly to your peers’ culture.” “Being able to adapt, meaning you change depending on the environment” “I think ‘intercultural competence’ means one’s ability to integrate into new cultures without much difficulty.”</td>
<td>This category is used if there is an explicit reference to empathy or empathizing with others or to being able to feel the experience of the other person. If reference is made to perspectives, “Cognitive Flexibility” might be more suited to code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning through Interaction/Syne rgies</strong></td>
<td>This category is applicable to statements on the ability and willingness to learn from and with each other in an intercultural situation. This can include telling others about one’s own culture, learning about each the culture of the interaction partners, as well as mutual learning in the intercultural situation. It is also applicable to statements on integrating the different cultures in the interaction, taking advantage from cultural diversity, creating something new or interacting in a way that benefits both sides.</td>
<td>This category is different from “Curiosity/Discovery” in that it is coded to statements concerning learning in interaction (as an outcome) and learning with and from each other while “Curiosity/Discovery” is more applicable to a general interest or desire to learn about other cultures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercultural Interaction</strong></td>
<td>This is a catch-all category for vague or general statements pertaining to being able to interact with people from other cultures.</td>
<td>If there is reference to effectiveness or appropriateness, the respective category is to be coded. If there is no further specification, this more general category is used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective Intercultural Interaction</strong></td>
<td>This category can be applied to statements on being able to interact, communicate, act, or behave in an effective way in intercultural situations or with people from other cultures. This includes explicit mentioning of the word “effective”, but also comments on being able to achieve one’s goals in the interactions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appropriate Intercultural Interaction</strong></td>
<td>This category is applicable to references to behaving, communicating, acting, or interacting in an appropriate or correct way without being perceived as offending or rude by the interaction partner. This</td>
<td>This category is different from “Harmonious Interaction” in that it pertains to behaving or communicating in an appropriate way, i.e. not violating expectations, norms, or values, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Being able to thrive and flourish in a culture that is not your own.”

“This would also mean learning about other cultures while sharing yours with them.”

“It means that one is able to live, work, and study with other cultures in a way that it can benefit both sides.”

“[…] the ability to interact with people from different countries”

“Having the ability to interact with people with other beliefs, cultures, etc.”

“Intercultural competence is being able to understand and interact with people from different cultures effectively.”

“[…] also reacting in an accurate way when facing different cultures.”

“[…] not upsetting anyone with rude words with good intentions.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harmonious Interaction</strong></td>
<td>This category is applicable to statements on harmony in intercultural situations, including references to specific interactions as well as more generally to harmonious relations with people from other cultures. It can be applied to statements on having harmonious or peaceful relations or interactions with people from other cultures or “getting along” as well as to references to making the interaction partner feel comfortable or avoiding or preventing conflict.</td>
<td>“[...] to communicate better with them without unintentional offense.” “To be able to interact peacefully” “Intercultural competence to me is having harmonious [and effective] communication with people from different cultural backgrounds.” “Anything that avoids intercultural conflicts.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict Management</strong></td>
<td>This category can be applied to statements on the ability to manage and resolve conflict, find compromises, solve cultural problems or problems with people from other cultures.</td>
<td>“To be able to [...] solve problems with people from other cultures.” “[...] having the capability to handle conflicts and arguments.” “[...] try to overcome conflicts in a way that suits all people involved.” In contrast to “Harmonious Interaction”, this category is applied to explicit references to managing, resolving or dealing with conflicts, making compromises, or solving interpersonal problems in intercultural situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Discrimination</strong></td>
<td>This category is applicable to statements on avoiding any type of discrimination of people from other cultures or cultural groups as well as not expressing racist ideas.</td>
<td>“To not discriminate in any way the different cultures.” “[...] you avoid making racist comments”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-Cultural Cooperation</strong></td>
<td>This category can be applied to statements on cooperating or collaborating with people from different cultures, either with or without reference to shared goals.</td>
<td>“[...] and cooperate with people of different cultural backgrounds.” “To [respect and] cooperate with each other.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

This appendix contains the course handbook, the syllabus and the portfolio questions containing the writing prompts for the reflective assignments.

JTBU-701211 - Intercultural Competence in Practice

Spring 2016

Course Handbook

Course Instructors: Prof. Dr. Ulrich Kühnen, Nadine Binder

Jacobs University Bremen

This handbook provides detailed outlines for all sessions, in particular the experiential training sessions, to support the instructors and peer-trainers in implementing the course “Intercultural Competence in Practice”, a 2.5 ECTS elective course which is part of the Triangle Area at Jacobs University Bremen, Germany.

The course has been designed as part of the doctoral research by Nadine Binder and will be evaluated in a longitudinal, mixed methods research design.

If you have questions about the handbook or the research project, please contact Nadine Binder (nbinder@bigsss-bremen.de).
**Introduction**

This handbook provides detailed outlines of the sessions of the course “Intercultural Competence in Practice”.

This course is concerned with understanding intercultural competence and how put it in practice to succeed in multicultural environments at Jacobs and beyond. It thus aims at supporting students in developing an in-depth understanding of how culture influences how we feel, think, and act, the ability to relate this knowledge to their everyday experience in a multicultural environment, and an intercultural practice based on the Personal Leadership methodology and Critical Moment Dialogue (CMD). More specifically, the course aims to combine theoretical and experiential sessions to engage students with two major topics – the first evolves around understanding culture and its influence on human cognition and behavior as well as cultural self-awareness; the second builds upon this and introduces the Personal Leadership methodology as a tool for developing an intercultural practice to transfer the learnings from the This part into everyday living and working in a multicultural environment like Jacobs University.

The course is targeted at first-year undergraduate students and can be taken as an elective by students of all majors.

This course combines traditional classroom instruction with experiential workshop sessions designed for interactive learning. In total, the course has seven lecture sessions (75 minutes) taught by the course instructors and six workshop sessions (2x 75 minutes) facilitated by peer-trainers (supervised by the course instructors).

This course is a pass/fail course. To pass the class, students need to attend all session and participate actively (students are allowed to miss up to two 75 min. sessions without excuse) and submit a completed portfolio that demonstrates active engagement with the activities and materials.

**Learning Objectives: Upon successful completion of this course, students will …**

- … have an in-depth understanding of how culture influences how we feel, think, and act
- … be able to relate this knowledge to their everyday experience in a multicultural environment
- … be familiar with the Personal Leadership methodology and Critical Moment Dialogue (CMD) and able to apply it to their own experience
Overview of Sessions

*Lectures take place in Seminar Room RLH.*

*Workshops take place in East Hall 1, East Hall 2.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Date and Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture 1: Introductory session</td>
<td>01.02.2016 – 11.15-12.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 1: Setting the foundation</td>
<td>09.02.2016 – 19.15-22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 2: Exploring cultural identities</td>
<td>23.02.2016 – 19.15-22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture 3: How culture influences how we feel, think and act</td>
<td>29.02.2016 – 11.15-12.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 3: Practicing cognitive flexibility</td>
<td>08.03.2016 – 19.15-22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture 4: Intercultural interaction</td>
<td>14.03.2016 – 11.15-12.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Spring Break</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 4: Switching styles – expanding the repertoire</td>
<td>05.04.2016 – 19.15-22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 6: Using the Critical Moment Dialogue (CMD)</td>
<td>03.05.2016 – 19.15-22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture 7: Wrap up session</td>
<td>09.05.2016 – 11.15-12.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lecture 1: Introductory Session

⏰ Time frame: 75 minutes

😊 Instructor(s): Nadine Binder, Prof. Dr. Ulrich Kühnen, peer-trainers

✍ Group: all students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Introduce students to all instructors and peer-trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Providing students with an overview of the course, its structure, grading components and goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Conduct the pre-test for the course evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part I: Introduction to Instructors and Peer-Trainers

The first part of the session aims to introduce students to all instructors and peer-trainers involved in delivering the course. In their introductions, instructors and peer-trainers should briefly address the following points:

- Name, cultural background, academic background
- Role in the course (instructor, peer-trainer)
- Why did you join the course?

Part II: Overview of the Course

The second part of the session serves to introduce students to the overall structure of the course, its learning objectives, the grading components, and the syllabus. Instructors can go over the syllabus and explain the information while also allowing space for questions from the students to ensure clarity.

Part III: Pre-Test

The last part of the session is reserved for the pre-test questionnaire, administered in paper-and-pen format to all course participants. Instructors explain the purpose of the research, hand out informed consent forms and questionnaires, and invite students to complete and return both forms before leaving the class.
**Workshop 1: Setting the Foundation**

- **Time frame:** 2x 75 minutes
- **Instructor(s):** peer-trainers
- **Group:** small workshop groups

### Session Goals

- Getting to know the group and team-building
- Creating a safe atmosphere for learning
- Clarifying students’ expectations

### Preparation for the Session

1. Make sure that you have the following materials: triangle handouts, markers, flipchart papers, tape to stick poster to the wall or board, set of playing cards, small ball, stop watch or phone with a stop watch function, bell or phone alarm that can make sound
2. Prepare a set of playing cards by dividing the total participant number by four and rounding it up to the next whole number (e.g. 29 participants, divided by 4 is 7.25, round it to 8). Pick this number of cards from each color (i.e. hearts, diamonds, spades and clubs) and mix all cards well.
3. Prepare one flipchart paper per topic indicating the topic and/or question and the card color (i.e. have one flipchart with a heart, one with a diamond, etc.):
   - Question 1: Why are you taking this course?
   - Question 2: What do you expect to know at the end of this course?
   - Question 3: What does intercultural competence mean to you?
   - Question 4: What is your cultural background?

### Part I: Opening the Session (5-10 minutes)

Welcome participants and introduce yourself. You might want to share with them again what motivates you to be involved in this course. Explain the goals of the session and briefly introduce the different parts to give participants an idea of what to expect during the session.

### Part II: Activity – Speed Dating (30 minutes)

*Material needed: whiteboard, whiteboard markers*
Ask participants to set up their chairs in two rows facing each other. Explain that this activity works similar to speed dating and allows participants to start getting to know each other better. While one of you explains how the activity works, the other one notes down the questions on the board. Participants are invited to talk to the person sitting opposite of them, introducing themselves and talking about the following questions:

- What is your favorite place on Earth?
  (this can be a country, a region, a city or a more specific location)
- What do most people not know about you?
  (e.g. a special hobby or interest or talent)

After three minutes, you will give a sign and one of the rows (say explicitly which one) will move one chair to the left. The person at the end goes to the empty chair on the other end of the row. Again, participants have three minutes to talk about the same questions with the next partner. This will be continued for several rounds.

Make sure to stick to the time limit of three minutes and continue this activity for 6-10 rounds, depending on participants' energy level and enthusiasm for the activity.

Close the activity and lead over to the next one by reminding participants that they might already have noticed how diverse the group is and that the next activity is intended to find what connects them.

**Part III: Activity – Triangles (30 minutes)**

*Material needed: triangle handouts and markers (one per group of three participants)*

Divide participants into groups of three (ideally people who sat next to each other in the previous activity and thus have not yet talked to each other). Give each group a handout and a marker and
explain the task: for the next five minutes, participants should fill the corners of the triangle with something that they all share – this can be any similarity they find. To illustrate the task, give one or two examples what the two of you trainers share.

Give participants the sign to start. Alert participants when there is only one minute left and make sure that every group wrote down at least two things, ideally all three.

After five minutes, ask participants to stop their conversations and gather around the whiteboard or close to an empty wall. Ask for a group to volunteer and introduce their triangle. Stick it to the whiteboard or wall for everyone to see. Next, ask another group to introduce their triangle and try to find a connection to the previous group. It might be that groups have the same point on their paper – if not, they can also find a new one. Put their triangle next to the first paper and connect them. The next group can find a connection to either of the triangles already up on the board or wall. Continue like this until all triangles have been put to the board or wall and are somehow connected with each other.

To close the activity, ask students what they notice when looking at the final picture on the board or wall. Guide them to the conclusion that there is many different ways in which we can be connected to each other, be it via shared interests, similar experiences or backgrounds, similar taste (food, books, music) etc.

BREAK – Invite students to take a break of 15 minutes

Part IV: Activity – “Hello” (30 minutes)

Material needed: set of playing cards and flipcharts (cf. preparation step 2 and 3), whistle
See also http://thiagi.net/archive/www/game-hello.html

This activity has been designed by Thiagi and is a great exercise that allows participants to interact with each other and get an idea of each other’s expectations and ideas. It also allows you as trainers to get an overview of the group and the expectations.

Introduce the activity to your participants. Explain that they will do an exercise called “Hello” to gather useful information from each other and share them. Introduce your four questions that you have noted down on the flipchart papers before the session. Make sure that all participants understand the questions.

Next, explain that once you have finished the introduction, participants will draw a playing card to be divided into four groups and each group is assigned to one of the topics. Participants should find other people with the same sign on the playing card and get the flipchart paper with the same sign. The task is to gather information on their question from all participants, including their own group members.

Before the activity starts, explain the time frame and write in down on the board:
- 3 minutes to plan how to gather information from everyone
- 3 minutes to actually gather the information
- 3 minutes to analyze the information
- 1 minute (per group) to present the results to the whole group

Now let each participant draw a card. Participants should get together in groups with people who drew the same sign and go to one corner of the room with the flipchart paper of the same sign. The flipchart paper has the question on it so that participants can easily remember it.

Give the sign to start and run the activity according to the time frame you presented earlier. Always announce what people are expected to do and how much time they have. Use the bell or some sort of sound to end one phase and move to the next.

Once all groups have presented their results, have a short debriefing discussing the results. *Please also take pictures of the results at the end of today’s workshop and upload them to the shared folder of all instructors (or e-mail them to Nadine).*

**Part V: Activity – Sharing Intercultural Challenges (40 minutes)**

*Material needed: small ball*

Invite participants to sit in a circle of chairs for the final part of the session. Explain that this course aims to support Jacobs students in developing an understanding of intercultural competence and how put it in practice to succeed in multicultural environments at Jacobs and beyond. Remind participants that in today’s session, they could see the richness of their diversity and experience and also what connects them with each other and what they share in common. Explain that the Jacobs Community is characterized by a strong belief in the enriching sides of cultural diversity, but that we probably all know from our own experience that it can also be challenging to live and study together with people from all over the world. One or both of you can briefly share an intercultural challenge that you have experienced during your time in Jacobs – make sure to tell it in a descriptive way that emphasizes that you are talking about your personal experience of the situation.

Next, invite participants to take a few moments to think about their first semester at Jacobs and about an intercultural challenge that they have experienced. Allow one or two minutes of silence so that participants can think about a situation. Explain that you will pass around a ball and whoever holds the ball can share their situation – it is up to the participants how much detail they want to give, but ask them to keep it brief enough so that everyone gets a chance to talk. If someone does not feel comfortable sharing their situation, they can pass the ball on to the next person.

Only interfere if a participant talks for too long (gently reminding them to pass on the ball) or if the tone gets too judgmental (gently ask the participant why he or she felt that way or perceived it that way).

Close the activity by thanking everyone for their stories and explaining that over the semester, the course aims to help them develop useful skills to cope with intercultural challenges and succeed in multicultural environments.
Part VI: Closing the Session (5 minutes)

Thank participants for their active participation in the session and remind them that to read the mandatory reading for the lecture in the next week. In their portfolio, they also find a question on the reading.
Lecture 2: What is Culture? – An Introduction to Cultural Psychology

Time frame: 75 minutes

Instructor(s): Nadine Binder

Group: all students

Session Goals
- Providing students with an introduction to Cultural Psychology
- Help students to develop an understanding of culture from a psychology perspective
- Introduce students to the work on values by Hofstede and Schwartz

Literature: Chapter 1 (pp. 1-33) in

The session builds upon the mandatory reading and aims at providing students with an overview of different notions of culture and develop an understanding of culture from a psychology perspective. It goes beyond what students have read in the literature by asking them to discuss different definitions of culture, introducing Dunbar’s number and discussing additional aspects related to culture.

Upon closing the lecture, remind participant to complete the task in their portfolio answering the question what culture means to them and to bring it for the workshop next week.
Workshop 2: Exploring Cultural Identities

Time frame: 2x 75 minutes

Instructor(s): peer-trainers

Group: small workshop groups

Session Goals

- Make students aware of the multiple identities and group memberships everyone has
- Helping students to develop the ability to examine and explore their own culture
- Allowing students to learn more about each other’s culture

Preparation for the Session

1. Make sure that you have the following materials: handouts for circles of multicultural self, handouts for the interview activity
2. Fill in your own “circles of my multicultural self” so you can share it with the group.

Part I: Opening the Session (5-10 minutes)

Start the session by welcoming participants and asking volunteers to share their homework with the group (the question was “What is your culture?”). Spend about 5-10 minutes on this, then wrap it up and point to the idea that there are many different definitions of culture and that today’s session will allow participants to explore their different cultures, i.e. their multiple identities, and to learn more about each other’s culture(s).

Part II: Activity – Circles of My Multicultural Self (60-70 minutes)

Material needed: handouts “circles of my multicultural self”

Introduce the activity by telling about your own circles. Make sure that participants understand that for this exercise, the concept of culture is rather broad and refers to any collective or group (e.g. national culture, university, sports club, gender, age group, …). Distribute the handouts and ask participants to fill in their circles by themselves (in silence). Allow approximately 15 minutes for this. Observe the group to see if participants have questions or need help with the task.

Ask participants to line their chairs up in two rows facing each other, just like they did in the last workshop. In the next step, participants sitting opposite of each other should spend three minutes explaining their circles to each other. They should describe their circles and why they are important to their identity. After three minutes, one of the trainers will give a signal and one of the rows will move
one seat to the left so that everyone has a new partner to exchange with about the same topic. Repeat this circle a few times – in total you should spend approximately 30 minutes on this part.

An alternative set-up for this activity is to divide participants into groups of 4-5 people and ask them to share their circles with each other (describing their circles and why they are important to their identity) for about eight to ten minutes. Then give a sign and ask participants to find a new group of people and repeat the same process.

Close the activity by the following debriefing questions:

- How did you feel during the activity?
- How easy or difficult was it for you to identify the circles of your multicultural self?
- What did you notice when sharing with your partners?

BREAK – Invite students to take a break of 15 minutes

Part III: Activity – Partner Interviews (60 minutes)

*Material needed: handouts with interview questions*

Explain that the focus will now be on the national culture that each of the participants feels most attached to and ask participants to pair up with someone from another cultural background. Distribute handouts to the group.

The task is to interview each other using the questions on the handout as a guideline. The total time frame for this is approximately 50 minutes. Inform participants when half of the time is up so that they can switch roles (interviewer, interviewee) to make sure both partners get enough time to share.

After approximately 50 minutes, stop the exercise and ask participants to share their experience. You can keep this part brief, it is enough to elicit a few responses from the group on what they have learned from the interviews.

Part IV: Closing the Session (15 minutes)

To close the session, ask participants to take a moment to think about the following three sentences and how they would complete them. Also write the sentences on the board so that participants can see them. After a moment of reflection, go around and ask each participant to finish at least one of the sentences.

- In today’s session, I learned that …
- In today’s session, I was surprised that …
- After today’s session, I want to learn more about …

Thank participants for their active participation and remind them to complete the mandatory reading and the question on it (in their portfolio) for the lecture next week.
Lecture 3: How Culture Influences How We Feel, Think and Act

⏰ Time frame: 75 minutes

💬 Instructor(s): Prof. Dr. Ulrich Kühnen

👥 Group: all students

### Session Goals

- Providing students with a general understanding of how culture influences cognition and perception
- Introducing students to cultural differences in self-concept and personal agency
- Familiarize students with the different systems of thought between Westerners and East Asians

### Literature

- Chapter 9 (pp. 346-382) in

This session addresses how culture influences cognition and perception as well as self-concept, emotions, and personal agency. In particular students will get acquainted with the different systems of thought of Westerners and East Asians. The Western mindset can be summarized as being analytic, whereas East Asians tend to think more holistically. Implications of these systems of thought will be discussed.

Upon closing the lecture, remind participant to complete the task in their portfolio reflecting upon their own cultural identity and how it influences them.
Workshop 3: Managing Culture’s Influence - Cognitive Flexibility

Time frame: 2x 75 minutes

Instructor(s): peer-trainers

Group: small workshop groups

Session Goals

- Students will practice to reflect upon how their culture(s) influence(s) them
- Students will become aware of how they constantly describe, interpret, and evaluate, and how these thought processes lead them to act
- Students will be able to distinguish description from interpretation and evaluation

Preparation for the Session

1. Make sure that you have the following materials: an ambiguous object, whiteboard markers, handouts for the D.I.E. activity

Part I: Opening the Session (10 minutes)

Material needed: ambiguous object, whiteboard, whiteboard markers

Welcome participants. Start by holding up the ambiguous object and passing it around so participants can look at it. Ask them: “Tell me something about this” (in this exact wording!). Record their ideas on the whiteboard in three columns distinguishing comments that are description, interpretation, and evaluation (but do not yet write or mention this distinction).

After having collected a few responses from the group, explain the difference between description, interpretation, and evaluation in the context of this activity. Add the three words to the three columns while you explain:

- **Description** is something the students do by using their five senses: see, smell, touch, taste, and hear. Description is “what I see”.
- **Interpretation** is what the students do when they suggest how the object might be used. Interpretation is “what I think” (about what I see).
- **Evaluation** is what the students do when they give an opinion as to the usefulness, appropriateness, etc. of the object. Evaluation is “what I feel” (about what I think).

Use the students’ ideas as examples for each category.

Part II: Activity - D.I.E. (Describe, Interpret, Evaluate) (60 minutes)
Material needed: D.I.E. worksheet 1

Ask students to keep in mind the distinction between description, interpretation and evaluation. Handout the first worksheet and ask students to individually note down their description of the picture, one possible interpretation and one positive and one negative evaluation for this interpretations. Allow approximately 10 minutes for this.

Next ask students to get into groups of 3-4 students and share their descriptions, interpretations and evaluations. They should come up with a shared description, three interpretations and two evaluations per interpretation (one positive, one negative). Allow groups approximately 20-30 minutes for this.

Gather everyone in the whole group and ask volunteers to share their description and one of their interpretations and evaluations. Try to get hold of as many different interpretations and evaluations as possible. For guiding the discussion, you find some possible interpretations and evaluations below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description: I see an Asian woman covering her mouth.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation #1: I think she’s burping and trying to be polite by covering her mouth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Evaluation #1: I think it’s great that she’s trying to be polite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Evaluation #2: I think that’s unnecessary. She should relax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation #2: I think she’s surprised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Evaluation #1: Covering her mouth is a natural reaction to shock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Evaluation #2: She’s being too dramatic. It’s no big deal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation #3: I think she’s smiling because she’s embarrassed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Evaluation #1: She shouldn’t be so concerned. Smiling is nice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Evaluation #2: She should be embarrassed for flirting with her smile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation #4: I think she’s yawning because she is bored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Evaluation #1: That’s ok, I don’t blame her a bit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Evaluation #2: It’s rude. She should hold back the yawn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debrief by asking the students to share the most difficult part of the activity. Students may point out that it was hard to describe the photo without jumping ahead to interpreting and evaluating. They may also mention that it was difficult to think of alternatives.

BREAK – Invite students to take a break of 15 minutes

Part III: Activity – D.I.E. with Scenarios (70 minutes)

Material needed: D.I.E. worksheet 2
Gather everyone back in the whole group and explain that the D.I.E. strategy they have learned in today's session can help to build understanding between cultures, but also in more general between everyone because each of us has their own unique perception and experience of the world.

Remind participants that they reflected upon their own perception and how this might be influenced by their culture and upbringing in their portfolio and ask volunteers to share some thoughts on this. Allow 10-15 minutes for this, depending on how much participants are willing to share.

Tell participants that all of us tend to quickly jump to evaluations which in turn influence our reaction to situations. An important part of intercultural competence is to become aware of our interpretations, evaluations and judgments and take some time to carefully and thoughtfully think about a situation to be more in control of our reactions. Make sure that participants understand that it is natural to have judgments and interpretations and that our automatic reactions are part of our psychology to deal with the complexity of the world around us. Explain that the next activity is supposed to give them more time and opportunity to practice distinguishing description from interpretation and evaluation, working with some scenarios from student life.

Ask participants to get together in pairs and handout the scenario worksheet. Briefly go over the worksheet to make sure participants understand the task. Then ask participants to work in pairs on the worksheet. Allow approximately 30-40 minutes for this and walk around to see how the pairs progress and if anyone needs help.

In the next step, ask pairs to group together with another pair. Invite each pair to share one of the scenarios they have worked on and the description, interpretations and evaluations as well as their ideas on the additional questions. Allow 10-15 minutes for this exchange.

To close the activity, gather everyone back in the whole group and debrief by the following questions:

- What did you learn from this activity?
- How do you think you can use the learnings in your everyday life?

**Part IV: Closing the Session (5 minutes)**

Thank participants for their active participation and remind them to complete the mandatory reading and the question on it (in their portfolio) for the lecture next week.
Lecture 4: Intercultural Interaction

مركبة

الفترة الزمنية: 75 دقيقة

المؤدي: الدكتور Ulrich Kühnen

المجموعة: جميع الطلاب

 цель الدورة:

- بحث التفاعل الثقافي
- جمع الطلاب في نظرة العامة على الفوارق الثقافية في الاتصال
- تشجيع الطلاب على التفكير حول كيفية تجنب هذه الفوارق الثقافية في الاتصال

الدروس الموصى بها:


بالتالي، فإن الأمر غير مفاجئ أن هذه الفوارق يمكن أن تعيق الاتصال بين الأشخاص من خلفيات مختلفة. ما هي الأسباب الأكثر أهمية في الاتصال الثقافي؟ كيف يمكن تجنب هذه العقبات؟

عندما ينتهي الدرس، حدث واعظ الفيضايض إلى اكتمال المهمة في他们的 الأشرطة – هذه المهمة تمثل استبدال التقييم الفصل وإنه يطلب منهم بمراجعة أطول بكثير في أي شيء أتلقىهم حتى هذا نقطة.
Workshop 4: Switching Styles – Expanding Your Repertoire

- Time frame: 2x 75 minutes
- Instructor(s): peer-trainers
- Group: small workshop groups

**Session Goals**
- Students will become aware of the variety of communication styles and differences in verbal and non-verbal behaviors
- Students will explore their own communication style further
- Students will expand their communicative and behavioral repertoire

**Preparation for the Session**

1. Make sure that you have the following materials: tooth picks, role cards for activity “Let’s Talk”, handout on communication style, worksheet for “Switching Styles”

**Part I: Opening the Session (5 minutes)**

Welcome participants and remind them that before spring break, they learned a lot about how culture influences how we feel, think and act, and explored their own cultural identity and that of others in the group. Introduce the goals of today’s workshop which are to become aware of the variety of communication styles and differences in verbal and non-verbal behaviors, to explore one’s own communication style, and to practice switching between different styles.

**Part II: Activity – “Let’s Talk” (45 minutes)**

*Material needed: role cards, tooth picks*

Explain that the session will start with an activity that allows participants to explore ways in which nonverbal differences affect our communication styles and how we experience the interaction with other people. Each participant will receive a role card with instructions that they are supposed to follow during the activity. Emphasize that participants should read the instructions carefully and not share their card with anyone else. Explain that in addition, everyone gets ten toothpicks. Their cards also contain instructions on when to give toothpicks to another person – these serve to visualize if someone feels offended.

Alert participants to the fact that the activity is designed in a way to make it highly likely that they receive toothpicks and that this does not mean that they did something wrong. It is rather asking them to observe carefully and try to find out why they got a toothpick.
Once everyone has received a role card and toothpicks and had a moment to familiarize themselves with the instructions, invite participants to mingle and talk to each other about some of their favorite movies and why they like them so much (or come up with other small talk topics). Participants can talk in pairs or small groups and are encouraged to move around in the room and talk to many different people. Remind them to not forget to give out toothpicks following the instructions on their cards and to keep those that they receive from others.

Give a sign to start the activity and let participants move around and talk freely for about 10 minutes.

Give a sign to close the activity and ask everyone to shake out as a visual sign of shaking off their role. Then ask all participants to take a seat for the debriefing. Ask the following questions:

- What did it feel like to participate? How did it feel to give toothpicks? And how did it feel to receive them?
- How easy or hard was it to discover why you received a toothpick?
- What does this activity tell us about how easy or difficult it can be to interact with others if you do not know the rules? What can we do to make it easier?
- What were the nonverbal differences that you encountered? In which other ways can nonverbal behavior differ?
- In what way did your role affect how you interacted with others? How did you feel?

Use the last question to lead over into the topic of personal communication style – a topic covered in the next activity. Be prepared that some participants might be frustrated about having received toothpicks or get into a competitive mood. Remind them gently of the purpose of the activity and that it can hardly be avoided to violate rules in unfamiliar situations, even if we are quite competent and have best intentions.

Part III: Activity – Discovering your Style Part I (25 minutes)

**Material needed:** video (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kClAb6hvPgY; also available as a file)

Explain to participants that the next part of the workshop is supposed to help them to explore their own communication style. To get into the topic, there is a short video summarizing the distinction between direct and indirect communication. Ask participants to take notes on what characterizes the two styles of communication while watching the video.

As an alternative to the video, you can also present the communication styles, e.g. using the whiteboard or flipchart and ask participants for what they know already about direct and indirect communication.

After the video, invite volunteers to share their ideas on what is particular about each communication style (direct and indirect). Also ask them to give examples for either style from their personal experience and what they think their own style is (reminding them that there is a continuum and they might be more or less direct or indirect in their communication).
It is likely that there are people of both styles in the group and it is important to emphasize that no style is better than the other. How we communicate has a lot to do with our upbringing, our culture, but also our personality. To demonstrate the differences between both styles, you can also ask participants to share how they would convey the following messages and gather different ways of saying it:

- Your professor asks you to give feedback to a fellow student for a presentation. You did not like that the student kept reading from the slides instead of speaking freely. How do you phrase your feedback?
- A friend asks you if you want to go to the city center for dinner on the weekend. You do not want to go. How do you communicate this?

Conclude this part with the message that there is many different ways of communicating and that it is not about which style is better or worse, but about becoming aware of one’s own style and more attentive to understanding the different styles. Announce that after the break, you will practice to switch between different styles.

BREAK – Invite students to take a break of 15 minutes

Part IV: Activity – Switching Styles (40 minutes)

Material needed: worksheet on switching styles

The second half of the workshop is dedicated to practicing how to switch styles, so how to turn what participants have learned about different communication styles into practice. For the first activity, distribute the worksheets and ask participants to get into small groups of three to four people (with at least one person self-identifying with a more direct or indirect style each).

Announce that the small groups will have about 10-15 minutes to complete the worksheet. During this time, walk around to see if groups need support and inform participants when the end of the time period approaches.

After approximately 10-15 minutes, gather everyone back in the whole group and go over the worksheet. Read out each statement and ask for suggestions about switching it to the other style. Encourage participants to share different ways of rephrasing the same sentence to demonstrate that there is not one optimal solution, but many different ways of switching styles.

When you are done with discussing the worksheet, split the group into two subgroups. Each trainer now sits in a small circle with one of the subgroups for the debriefing – this way each participant has more space to comment and express thoughts and ideas on the following questions:

- How did you feel during the exercise? How easy or difficult was it for you to switch from one style to another?
- How do you think you can use this activity in everyday life? Are the situations where it might be useful to switch styles? How can we do this?
Which challenges do you see in switching styles in real life outside this classroom? (e.g. not having enough time or mental capacity to analyze the situation and consciously switch styles, losing one’s authenticity when switching to another style, over-generalizing and expecting everyone from a certain culture to communicate in the same way, etc.)

Especially the last question is supposed to acknowledge that it is much easier to switch styles in a simplified setting like this activity, but much more challenging in real life situations. It is also supposed to alert participants to the idea that not everyone from one culture communicates in the same way and that communication preferences also depend on other factors (e.g. a German student who communicates rather indirectly, maybe because of personality or how the family communicates). Finally, a concern to keep in mind is that it is important to most people to remain authentic in their communication – there is nothing wrong with being yourself and following your communication preferences, it is more about awareness and sensitivity to other styles and an ability to understand people who communicate differently. Close the activity in the subgroups by discussing different strategies to communicate well across cultures. Invite participants to share their positive experiences and which strategies they use when communicating across cultures.

Part V: Activity – E-Mail Communication (30 minutes)

Material needed: worksheet on “e-mail communication”

In this activity, participants work individually on the worksheet which asks them to write an e-mail to a staff member in the admin, once in a more direct and once in a more indirect style. Allow participants approx. 10-15 minutes for individual work. Ask them to pair up with their neighbor and read each other’s e-mails and briefly discuss them for about 5 minutes. Then gather everyone in the big group for a debriefing:

- Which e-mail was more challenging for you to write? The direct or the indirect one?
- Which one did you write first? How did you “translate” it into the other style?
- Did you keep the receiver in mind? If so, in which way? (Would you have written differently to a professor? A fellow student?)

If time allows, you can close the discussion with talking about if and how online, written communication across cultures might be different from face-to-face communication (e.g. writing an e-mail means more time to carefully select words and adapt the style, but it also means missing out nonverbal cues).

Part VI: Closing the Session (5 minutes)

Gather everyone back in the whole group and do a quick feedback round asking everyone for their key learning of the session. Thank participants for their active participation and remind them to complete the mandatory reading and the question on it (in their portfolio) for the lecture next week.
Lecture 5: Personal Leadership – Part 1

ceu Time frame: 75 minutes
cceu Instructor(s): Nadine Binder
cceu Group: all students

Session Goals
✓ Introduce students to Personal Leadership as a tool for establishing an intercultural practice
✓ Help students understand the two principles of mindfulness and creativity and their applicability to intercultural situations
✓ Familiarize students with the six practices of Personal Leadership

Literature

This session builds upon the introductory chapter by Schaetti, Ramsey & Watanabe (2009) on the Personal Leadership methodology and provides students with an introduction to Personal Leadership as a tool for developing an intercultural practice. It interactively discusses the emotions and physical sensations we experience in challenging and inspiring intercultural situations and how the two principles of mindfulness and creativity can support us to be aware of the state we are in and to authentically shift if we want to. The session also offers a first brief introduction to the six practices of Personal Leadership and the Personal Leadership choice point.

Upon closing the lecture, remind participant to complete the task in their portfolio (write a something’s up).
**Workshop 5: Practicing Personal Leadership – Part I**

- **Time frame:** 2x 75 minutes
- **Instructor(s):** peer-trainers and Nadine Binder (trained PL facilitator)
- **Group:** whole group, two rooms available to spread out during activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Students will create a personal vision statement for their Personal Leadership practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Students will learn about the Personal Leadership process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Students will be try out the short-form of the CMD in pairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preparation for the Session**

1. Make sure that you have the following materials: caleidoscopio cards, 10 small pieces of paper per participant, vision handouts, short CMD worksheets

**Part I: Opening the Session (5 minutes)**

Welcome participants in small groups in both rooms and explain that today’s workshop is supposed to allow them to engage the practice of Personal Leadership. Briefly outline today’s session and already inform participants that they will learn more about Personal Leadership in the upcoming lecture and also the next workshop.

**Part II: Activity – Creating a Personal Vision (60 minutes)**

*Material needed:* caleidoscopio cards, vision handout, 10 small pieces of paper per participant

Spread half of the cards on two tables in the front (card set is divided across two rooms). Ask participants to look at the pictures with the following question in mind: “What do you value about cultural diversity at Jacobs?” and pick a picture that somehow visualizes their answer. If several participants chose the same picture, ask them to form a group and share the picture. Those who do not share their picture yet should group with two or three others to form a group. Ask participants to briefly share in their groups why they picked their picture and what they value about cultural diversity. To close this part, gather short answers on the whiteboard.

Gather both groups in one room. Remind participants that one of the practices of Personal Leadership is to align with one’s vision. In the last activity, participants have reflected on what they value about cultural diversity at Jacobs.
The next step is to come up with a vision for themselves as students at Jacobs. Explain that there is
different contexts for a vision, we have some higher order value, a personal vision, a professional
vision and then there is “everything we do”. They are all linked, but it is easier to write a vision for a
particular context. Our context will be being a student of Jacobs university.

Next announce that participants will now write their own personal vision following a procedure that has
proven to be useful to people in other Personal Leadership seminars all around the world. To make
sure that there is clarity on what a vision is, gather some ideas from participants. A vision is about how
we are at our highest and best.

As a first step, invite participants to share vision words, i.e. characteristics or traits of a person such as
mindful, patient, tolerant, etc. One of you can facilitate participants’ responses while the other of you
notes them down on the whiteboard. Collect at least about 15-20 words to give participants an idea of
which words they could use in their vision statement.

In the second step, distribute 10 small pieces of paper to each participant and ask them to quickly
write down one word per piece of paper – these should be vision words that spontaneously feel
relevant to everyone individually. Once everyone is done, ask participants to reduce the papers to
those five words that seem most important to them right now and remove the other five (they need to
be out of sight).

Now distribute the vision handout with a template for writing a vision statement and introduce the five
P’s of a powerful vision on a flipchart (personal, present, positive, passionate, purpose). Allow about
15 minutes for participants to write their vision statement individually.

Then ask them to pair up and read out their vision statement to each other. The partner is giving
feedback and double-checking the five P’s of a powerful vision.

To close this activity, invite a few volunteers to read out their vision statement to the whole group.
Remind participants that visions can change and that the statement they wrote now is not set in stone
forever and all times. For a quick debrief, ask participants how they feel about this activity and their
vision statement.

**Part III: Activity – Cultivating Stillness Example 1 (10 minutes)**

Remind participants that an important part of Personal Leadership is to cultivate stillness and give
ourselves moments where we deliberately slow down and open up space to be able to separate
ourselves from the internal flow of judgments, emotions, physical sensations as well as from all the
external stimulation around us.

Explain that there is more and more research on meditative states showing a positive effect on the
brain, thinking abilities and well-being and that there are many ways to cultivate stillness. Cultivating
stillness is about quieting the mind, not necessarily the body – the body can be perfectly still while
mind is running and the mind can be stilled in movement, such as in moving meditation practices.
Invite participants to share their experiences with cultivating stillness and meditation if they already have some. Next explain that in this session, you want to try out two different ways of cultivating stillness, a sitting meditation and a moving meditation. Remind participants that these are just two of many ways and encourage them to find their own way.

In this part of the workshop, invite participants to try out a moving meditation. If you know a moving meditation yourself, feel free to use that. If one of the participants knows one and feels comfortable to instruct the rest of the group, then invite them to take over. Another option is to try some of the simple moves shown in this video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EaEZVfhn07o or to use the Nirtan Chi (free movement) with music.

The point of this activity is to give participants an idea of how they can cultivate stillness and encourage them to find out what works for them personally. Following the moving meditation, do a short debriefing with the following questions:

- How did you feel during the meditation? Was it easy or difficult to still your mind?
- How do you feel now, after the meditation?

BREAK – Invite students to take a break of 15 minutes

Part IV: Activity – PL Process and Partner Short CMD (65 minutes)

*Material needed: Short CMD worksheet*

Gather all participants in one room for introducing the activity. Remind them of the PL choice point that they learned about in the lecture. Briefly introduce the PL process on the whiteboard and explain the CMD as a tool for bringing the six practices together in a reflective process.

Remind participants that they described a something’s up moment for their homework. Explain that they can use this moment to try out the CMD in its short form. This version has one question for each practice and participants are invited to go through it in pairs to explore how it works and what they think about it.

Explain the process: participants will pair up (allow them to choose their partner) and can use either of the two rooms to sit down and go through the CMD worksheet. First, one of the partners is describing his or her something’s up moment. The other partner takes the role of asking the questions and takes notes on the answers. The partner who is asking questions can choose the order of questions and should only ask the questions and write down answers, not give advice or comment (give some inoculation of statements to be avoided, e.g. “Oh, that’s messed up”, “When this happened to me, I …”). It is important to cover all questions and reflect honestly before moving on to discerning right action. After half of the time is up, you will give a signal and the partners switch roles. Each partner will have approx. 20-25 minutes.
Inform participants that they will not have to share the content of their CMDs with the group and that everything that is spoken between the partners will remain between them.

To close this activity, debrief by asking participants how they felt during the CMD and what they think about it – here are ideas for specific debriefing questions:

- How did you feel while doing the CMD? And how did you feel listening to your partner doing the CMD? Did any of you experience a PL shift (i.e. a feeling of relief, inspiration, energy, clarity)?
- Are there any open questions or comments on the CMD?
- How can you imagine using the CMD outside this classroom?

Explain that for their homework, they will do the long version of the CMD as an individual, written reflection. Ask them to pay attention to how they feel about the two versions and ways of doing it and note down any questions they have to ask them during the next lecture.

**Part V: Closing the Session – Cultivating Stillness Example 2 (10 minutes)**

To close the session, announce that you will try another way of cultivating stillness, this time a sitting meditation. Invite participants to join you by sitting on their chair, both feet on the ground and closing their eyes.

You are welcome to use the following meditation practice:

*Close your eyes and find position in which are comfortable.*

*Bring your attention to your breathing. Don’t make any effort to change it, just observe the rising and falling sensation that it creates in your body.*

*Notice where these sensations occur – be it your belly, your chest, your shoulders, or anywhere else.*

*For a few moments, focus on the quality of each breath, noting whether it’s deep or shallow, long or short, fast or slow.*

*Try to let go of your thoughts and the outside world. Focus your attention on your heart center, in the middle of your chest, and be aware of your heart as a space.*

*Resting your attention easily on your heart center, breathe gently and sense your breath flowing into your heart. Feel how your heart expands as you breathe in. Let your breath go in and out and focus on your heart center.*

*(allow people to sit and meditate for about two minutes)*

*Become aware once more of the physical feelings: of the chair beneath you, where your feet make contact with the floor, your arms and your hands resting in your lap. Notice anything you can hear, smell, taste or feel.*
When you’re ready, slowly open your eyes.

After the meditation, do a quick debriefing asking participants how they felt during the meditation and how they feel now. Also encourage them to think back to the moving meditation and compare the two experiences.

To close the session, thank participants for their active participation and remind them to complete the mandatory reading and the written CMD for the lecture next week.
Lecture 6: Personal Leadership – Part 2

-Time frame: 75 minutes
-Instructor(s): Nadine Binder
-Group: all students

Session Goals

- Help students understand the Personal Leadership process
- Provide more details on the six practices
- Discuss the theoretical foundations of Personal Leadership

Literature: Chapter 9 (pp. 121-129) in

This session follows up upon the workshop and discusses again the Personal Leadership process and the Critical Moment Dialogue (CMD). There is time for students to ask questions that they might have from doing their written CMD for the homework.

Next, the session provides students with more details on the six practices and the theoretical foundations of Personal Leadership.

Upon closing the lecture, remind participants to complete the task in their portfolio. For that, each of them gets assigned to one practice to focus on during one day of the week (and then write down the observations).
Workshop 6: Practicing Personal Leadership – Part II

Time frame: 2x 75 minutes
Instructor(s): peer-trainers
Group: small workshop groups

Session Goals
- Students will explore the six practices further via own experiences and case studies
- Students will assess their own practices and develop ideas for establishing a PL practice
- Students will reflect back on all sessions and forward of how to transfer their learnings to their everyday life

Preparation for the Session

1. Make sure that you have the following materials: instruction sheets for all six work stations, group sheet to split groups; case study handouts; self-assessment sheets
2. Before the beginning of the workshop, set up the six “work stations” in the two rooms.

Part I: Opening the Session (5 minutes)
Welcome participants and explain that today’s workshop is supposed to allow them to explore the six practices of PL further, how they might already practice them in their lives and how they might want to integrate them into their intercultural practice. The workshop will close with discussing how to establish an intercultural practice – wrapping up the workshop part of the course as this is the last workshop.

Part II: Activity – Exploring the Six Practices (70 minutes)

Material needed: instruction sheets for all six work stations, flipchart and markers at each work station

There are six “work stations” in the two rooms.

In the first step, ask participants to get-together with people who focused on the same practice for the homework and find the work station for their practice. There is a flipchart paper and markers – in their “expert” groups, participants should share their observations, ideas, questions about their practice and prepare a flipchart to summarize their discussion. Allow approx. 5-10 minutes for this.

In the second step, one member from the expert group stays at the work station while the others redistribute to the other work stations (each to a different one). In the end, each work station should have a group with at least one expert from each practice. At each work station, groups now have 10 minutes to explore the practice of their work station further. The discussion should be moderated by
the expert on this practice – the person can introduce the flipchart created by the expert group and invite ideas and comments from the other group members. A handout at the work station provides further tasks or questions the group can address.

**After 10 minutes, groups move on to the next work station.** This is repeated until all groups have worked on all work stations. To close the part, each trainer will do a quick debrief in each of the rooms with the three groups present there.

After all groups have been at all work stations, spend a few minutes on eliciting impressions and insights from the groups in your room.

**BREAK** – Invite students to take a break of 15 minutes and after the break they will continue working in their small workshop groups

**Part III: Activity – Case Studies on Practicing Personal Leadership (20 minutes)**

*Material needed: case studies*

Ask participants to form groups of four to five people and distribute one case study to each group. Explain the groups have about 15 minutes to work on their case study following the questions on the handout. Afterwards, each group is expected to share their results with the whole group. While groups work on their case study, be available for questions.

After approximately 15 minutes, get everyone back together in the whole group. Now invite groups to share their case study in a few sentences and discuss their answers to the questions.

Close the activity by summarizing that there is many ways to use Personal Leadership – a methodology initially developed for intercultural situations that has proven useful in any relationships because all of us differ in some aspects (and share similarities in others). The main aim of Personal Leadership is to allow us to be in charge of our own experience and reaction and be at our highest and best. It is up to each of us to find a way of establishing a Personal Leadership practice that supports us in being mindful and creative – what participants have learned and tried out in the past two lectures and workshops has aimed to provide a foundation for that, but it is up to every participant to see if and how they can use Personal Leadership in their own life, also beyond this course. Thus, the final part of the last workshop offers time for participants to reflect upon how an intercultural (Personal Leadership) practice can be established.

**Part IV: Activity – Taking One’s Practice Home (20 minutes)**

*Material needed: self-assessment sheets*

Hand out the self-assessment sheets and ask participants to fill them in individually. Explain that this is only for them to explore how much they engage in each of the practices already. Allow approx. 5
minutes for this. See if there are any questions before you proceed. Ask participants to now decide on one practice that they would like to “take home” and practice more in their daily life.

Next ask participants to pair up and share with their partner which practice they chose and why. The partners should then together develop two to three specific ideas on how to integrate each of their practices into their daily life. They have about 10 minutes for this.

Now invite a few volunteers to share ideas on how to take the practices home with the whole group.

Part V: Activity – How to Practice Intercultural Competence (20 minutes)

Ask participants to sit in a circle for a final debriefing to close this last workshop session. Write the following questions on the whiteboard so that everyone can see them. Then ask someone to volunteer to answer the first question and then go around the circle and have everyone share their ideas:

- What are your two-three most important learnings of this whole course?
- What is the key message that you take away from the part on Personal Leadership?
- How do you want to use these learnings in your life at Jacobs University after this course? (encourage participants to be as specific as possible)

To close this part, offer participants space for final remarks before going into the closing of the session.

Part VI: Closing the Session (15 minutes)

Stay in the circle and invite students to a final round of feedback to close the series of workshops. Ask them to take a moment to think back to all six workshops and then go around asking everyone to give an answer to the following questions:

What surprised you?
What challenged you?
What delighted you?
What deeply touched you?
Lecture 7: Wrap Up Session

-Time frame: 75 minutes
-Instructor(s): Nadine Binder
-Group: all students

Session Goals
- Wrap up the class and stimulate thinking about how to transfer learning beyond the course
- Room for clarifying task of final assignment for portfolio
- Post-test

Part I: Wrap Up

The first part of the session aims to remind students of what they have learned over the semester and how the different topics and sessions relate to intercultural competence in practice.

Part II: Final Assignment (portfolio)

The second part of the session serves to provide students with more information on the final assignment in the portfolio and give them space for asking questions if there are any.

Part III: Post-Test

The last part of the session is reserved for the post-test questionnaire, administered in paper-and-pen format to all course participants. Students are reminded of the purpose of the research, receive informed consent forms and questionnaires, and are invited to complete and return both forms before leaving the class. There will also be time for the official course evaluation on CampusNet.
Syllabus

INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE IN PRACTICE

**Instructors:** Prof. Dr. Ulrich Kühnen, Nadine Binder (BIGSSS PhD Fellow)

**Triangle corner:** Business (2.5 ECTS)

**Prerequisites:** This course is for **first-year** undergraduate students only.

**Course description**

This course is concerned with understanding intercultural competence and how to put it in practice to succeed in multicultural environments at Jacobs and beyond. It thus aims at supporting students in developing an in-depth understanding of how culture influences how we feel, think, and act, the ability to relate this knowledge to their everyday experience in a multicultural environment, and an intercultural practice based on the Personal Leadership methodology and Critical Moment Dialogue (CMD). More specifically, the course aims to combine theoretical and experiential sessions to engage students with two major topics – the first evolves around understanding culture and its influence on human cognition and behavior as well as cultural self-awareness; the second builds upon this and introduces the Personal Leadership methodology as a tool for developing an intercultural practice to transfer the learnings from the first part into everyday living and working in a multicultural environment like Jacobs University.

**General structure of the course**

This course combines traditional classroom instruction with experiential workshop sessions designed for interactive learning. In total, the course has seven lecture sessions (75 minutes) taught by the course instructors and six workshop sessions (2x 75 minutes) facilitated by peer-trainers (supervised by the course instructors).

**Grading components**

This course is a pass/fail course. To pass the class, students need to ...

- Attend all session and participate actively
  (students are allowed to miss up to two 75 min. sessions without excuse)
- Submit a completed portfolio that demonstrates active engagement with the activities and materials
  (more instructions will be provided in class)
Learning objectives: Upon successful completion of this course, students will ...

- have an in-depth understanding of how culture influences how we feel, think, and act
- be able to relate this knowledge to their everyday experience in a multicultural environment
- be familiar with the Personal Leadership methodology and Critical Moment Dialogue (CMD) and able to apply it to their own experience

Outline of sessions

Monday, February 1, 2016 – 11.15-12.30 (Seminar Room RLH)
- Introductory Session

Tuesday, February 9, 2016 – 19.15-22.00 (East Hall 1, East Hall 2)
- Workshop: Setting the Foundations

Monday, February 15, 2016 – 11.15-12.30 (Seminar Room RLH)
- Lecture: What is Culture? – An Introduction to Cultural Psychology

Tuesday, February 23, 2016 – 19.15-22.00 (East Hall 1, East Hall 2)
- Workshop: Exploring Cultural Identities

Monday, February 29, 2016 – 11.15-12.30 (Seminar Room RLH)
- Mandatory reading for the session: Chapter 9 (pp. 346-382) in Heine, S. J. (2016). *Cultural Psychology: Third Edition*. New York: Norton. Please note: You do not have to read the whole chapter, only until the top of page 382
- Lecture: How Culture Influences How We Feel, Think and Act

Tuesday, March 8, 2016 – 19.15-22.00 (East Hall 1, East Hall 2)
- Workshop: Practicing Cognitive Flexibility
Monday, March 14, 2016 – 11.15-12.30 (Seminar Room RLH)


- Lecture: Intercultural Interaction

SPRING BREAK

Tuesday, April 5, 2016 – 19.15-22.00 (East Hall 1, East Hall 2)

- Workshop: Switching Styles – Expanding Your Repertoire

Monday, April 11, 2016 – 11.15-12.30 (Seminar Room RLH)

- Mandatory reading for the session:

- Lecture: Personal Leadership – Part 1

Tuesday, April 19, 2016 – 19.15-22.00 (East Hall 1, East Hall 2)

- Workshop: Practicing Personal Leadership

Monday, April 25, 2016 – 11.15-12.30 (Seminar Room RLH)

- Mandatory reading for the session:

- Lecture: Personal Leadership – Part 2

Tuesday, May 3, 2016 – 19.15-22.00 (East Hall 1, East Hall 2)

- Workshop: Using the Critical Moment Dialogue (CMD)

Monday, May 9, 2016 – 11.15-12.30 (Seminar Room RLH)

- Lecture: Wrap Up Session
JTBU-701211 - Intercultural Competence in Practice
Spring 2016
Student Portfolio

Course Instructors: Prof. Dr. Ulrich Kühnen, Nadine Binder
Jacobs University Bremen

Student Name: ____________________________________________
Matriculation Number: ____________________________________
Instructors’ Note

This portfolio is supposed to facilitate your continuous learning over the whole semester. Starting in week 2, you find a task for each week to be completed in that week and brought to class in the subsequent session.

As a replacement for mid-term and final examinations, you also find instructions for a mid-term and a final assignment to be included in this portfolio.

As part of the required course work, please submit your portfolio tasks to Nadine Binder (n.binder@jacobs-university.de) by the deadline indicated for each task. Please submit the portfolio tasks as a .doc or .docx file with a file name following this structure: lastname_portfolio_week2.doc.

Successful completion means that your portfolio entries meet the length requirements and deadline indicated for each task and demonstrate that you have engaged with the topics and/or materials covered in this course. The portfolio’s main purpose is to facilitate your reflective practice and continuous learning.

If you have questions about the portfolio, please do not hesitate to contact Nadine Binder (n.binder@jacobs-university.de).

CHECKLIST

You can use this checklist to keep an overview of your portfolio progress and the deadlines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Submission deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 2 – Question on the mandatory reading</td>
<td>Feb 14, 2016 (8pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3 – What is culture?</td>
<td>Feb 22, 2016 (8pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4 – Question on the mandatory reading</td>
<td>Feb 28, 2016 (8pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5 – Culture and perception &amp; cognition</td>
<td>March 7, 2016 (8pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6 – Question on the mandatory reading</td>
<td>March 13, 2016 (8pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7 – Mid-term assignment: Cultural style</td>
<td>April 4, 2016 (8pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Spring Break -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9 – Question on the mandatory reading</td>
<td>April 10, 2016 (8pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 10 – Write a “Something’s Up”</td>
<td>April 17, 2016 (8pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 11 – Written CMD</td>
<td>April 24, 2016 (8pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 12 – Observation on one PL practice</td>
<td>May 1, 2016 (8pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 13 – Reflection on PL and intercultural competence</td>
<td>May 8, 2016 (8pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 14 – Final assignment: Reflective paper</td>
<td>May 31, 2016 (8pm)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WEEK 2 – READING TASK

Carefully read the mandatory reading for next week's lecture (Matsumoto & Juang, 2012, chapter 1) and write down three things you have learned about culture that you consider important. Also explain why you find these aspects important.

In total, write about 300-500 words on this.

Submit by February 14, 2016 (8pm).

WEEK 3 – REFLECTION TASK

Building upon what you have learned in class so far, answer the following question:

“What is your culture?”

This question does not require an academic answer – it rather invites you to reflect upon how you would describe your culture (i.e. the one you identify with).

Write at least 500 words on this.

Submit by February 22, 2016 (8pm).
WEEK 4 – READING TASK

Carefully read the mandatory reading for next week’s lecture (Heine, 2016, chapter 9) and answer the following question:

“Think back to how you grew up as a child and what you were taught at home and in school: Are you more used to an analytic or holistic thinking style? Provide examples to demonstrate why you think you are more used to the one or the other (or both)."

In total, write between 300-500 words.

Submit by February 28, 2016 (8pm).

WEEK 5 – REFLECTION TASK

Building upon what you have learned in class so far, answer the following question:

“How does your culture influence how you perceive and think about the world around you?”

To answer this question, you can build upon your writings from weeks 3 and 4 where you reflected upon your culture and whether you were socialized in a more analytic or holistic thinking style. To discuss how your culture influences your cognition and perception, you can think back to the intercultural challenge you shared in the workshop in week 2 and reflect upon how your might have been influenced by your culture. You can also come up with other examples or situations that you have experienced to address the question.

Write at least 500 words on this.

Submit by March 7, 2016 (8pm).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK 6 – READING TASK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carefully read the mandatory reading for next week’s lecture (Matsumoto &amp; Juang, 2012, chapter 9) and answer the following question:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“What are challenges in intercultural communication and what can we do to overcome them?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In total, write between 300-500 words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit by March 13, 2016 (8pm).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK 7 – REFLECTION TASK (MID-TERM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building upon what you have learned in class so far, answer the following question:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“How does your culture influence your experience and interaction with others in the multicultural environment at Jacobs University?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This question builds upon your earlier reflection tasks and asks you to expand on your work from week 5 by taking into account everything you have learned until this point (including lecture 4 on intercultural interaction). You are welcome to re-use the intercultural challenge you shared in the workshop in week 2 and you can also come up with other examples or situations that you have experienced to address the question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write about 700-1000 words on this. You are also free to be creative and add visual materials (pictures, drawings) to your work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit by April 4, 2016 (8pm).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WEEK 9 – READING TASK

Carefully read the mandatory reading for next week’s lecture (Schaetti, Ramsey, & Watanabe, 2009) and answer one of the discussion questions at the end of the chapter (p. 137).

You can choose any one of the six available questions and write 300-500 words on it.

Submit by April 10, 2016 (8pm).

WEEK 10 – REFLECTION TASK

As a preparation for the next workshop, think about a “something’s up” that you have experienced in the past. If you have difficulty to come up with something, think about the last time you were annoyed by something or had an argument with someone (it does have to be from the Jacobs context, it can also be something that happened with people outside of Jacobs or before you came here).

It should be something that you remember well enough to work with it in class and something that you feel comfortable sharing with others.

Describe the “something’s up” in sufficient detail (i.e. about half a page or more) and remember to keep it descriptive (avoiding interpretations and evaluation at this point).

Submit by April 17, 2016 (8pm).
WEEK 11 – REFLECTION TASK

Below you find the CMD questions that you have already worked with in the workshop. Think about a “something’s up” you have experienced, briefly describe it and then do the CMD in written (similar to the example worksheet you have received in the workshop).

Submit by April 24, 2016 (8pm).

Summary of the Something’s Up critical moment

What are the circumstances? What happened?

Attending to Judgment

What is the positive or negative judgment I am having about myself, or about the other person or situation I am facing?

What positive or negative assumptions am I making about myself, the other person, or the situation I am facing?

What was I expecting? What is motivating me in this situation? What do I think is motivating the other people involved?

Attending to Emotion

What are the positive or negative emotions I am having in this situation? What are the qualities and characteristics of my emotions?

What information are the emotions offering me?

Why do I care about this critical moment situation so much? Which of my values are involved?

Attending to Physical Sensation

What is the physical sensation I am experiencing in this critical moment situation? Where is the sensation located in my body?

What is the sensation about? What is it communicating to me?

What do I need to do to feel physically at ease and balanced again?
Cultivating Stillness
What additional questions, focusing on any of the practices, do I need to ask myself?
Taking a breath, what insights come from the silence within?
What can I learn about myself from this critical moment situation?

Engaging Ambiguity
What do I not know?
What more can I not know?
What can I do to become more comfortable with the ambiguity and/or to get some clarification?

Aligning with Vision
Where are the gaps between my current reality and my vision of myself at my highest and best?
How does this situation confirm my vision? What aspects of my vision does it confirm?
How, if at all, does this critical moment experience suggest I change or refine my vision?

And then ... Discerning Right Action
What might I do to bring my current reality into alignment with my vision?
What action might best move me towards my highest hopes and enhance the creative potential of this interaction, relationship, or situation?
What, if anything, is the right thing for me to do? To say? To whom? How?
WEEK 12 – REFLECTION TASK

As a preparation for the next workshop, pick a day during which you pay special attention to the practice that you were assigned to in class (or via e-mail by the instructor if you missed class).

Write down your observations and thoughts at the end of the day. What did you notice about the practice you focused on? Are you already doing it or is it something that is new for you? Do you find it useful to pay attention to it and why/why not?

Write about 200-300 words on it.

Submit by May 1, 2016 (8pm).

WEEK 13 – REFLECTION TASK

To conclude the part on Personal Leadership, reflect upon the following question:

“In your opinion, how can you use Personal Leadership (or parts of it) to develop your own intercultural competence and practice it?”

Write about 300-500 words on this.

Submit by May 8, 2016 (8pm).
**WEEK 14 – REFLECTION TASK (FINAL ASSIGNMENT)**

For your final reflective assignment, answer the following question:

“What have you learned about intercultural competence in practice and how can you transfer these learnings to your everyday life at Jacobs University?”

When answering this question, make sure that you explain (1) what your understanding of intercultural competence is, (2) what you have learned about practicing intercultural competence in this course, and (3) how you can apply these learnings to your life at Jacobs University.

While your answer to this question is highly personal and requires more reflection than traditional academic writing, we expect that you include references to the materials covered in class as well as examples from your intercultural experience to support your ideas.

In total, write 1000-1500 words on this.

*Submit by May 31, 2016 (8pm).*
Appendix E

Topic guide for focus groups

Set-up of the room

- Set up room with coffee, tea, cake, sweets / provide cups and plates
- Set up table with chairs, consent forms, blank paper and markers

Upon participants’ arrival

Welcome participants and invite them to take coffee/tea and snacks and then get seated around the table.

Procedure / questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Activity/question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>Officially welcome all participants, introduce the project and consent forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>Explain the procedure and the ground rules of the group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>Introduce the icebreaker task: at each table, participants should use the markers and paper provided to draw their intercultural superhero – there are no other rules, just be creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 minutes</td>
<td>Announce end of the drawing task and invite participants to sit in a circle of chairs. Ask groups to present their drawing to the whole group. (time limit: 3-5 minutes per group)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 20-25 minutes | Free discussion among participants
Input/questions from the moderator:
- Nowadays, intercultural competence has become a buzzword in business, but also in higher education. Who needs intercultural competence? Why?
- How can we develop intercultural competence (at Jacobs)?
- Think about a person you know who you think is really interculturally competent, how would you describe this person? What does he or she do, say, …?
- Think about a person you know who you do not consider interculturally competent, how would you describe this person? What does he or she do, say …?
- Think about a situation in which you had to demonstrate intercultural competence. Briefly describe the situation and what you did. |
5 minutes | Closing of the discussion, thank all participants for their contributions, allow space for final comments

**Additional questions (use as needed):**

**Scenario questions**

- How can we develop intercultural competence at Jacobs?
  - Think back to the intercultural training during orientation – do you think that this helps developing students’ intercultural competence?
  - There is the idea of offering a semester-long, credit course on intercultural competence. What do you think about that? What would you expect from such a course? What should it look like?
    - Who should do the course – faculty, external trainers, or peers as in the orientation?
  - Some universities use buddy-programs, pairing local and international students or more senior and freshmen students. Do you think this could support intercultural competence development of students?

“Devil’s Advocate”

- In another discussion, a student argued that Jacobs students anyways already have very high intercultural competence and do not need any support or training. What do you think about that?

- In business, people often feel that intercultural competence is all about reaching their own goals, e.g. when negotiating with people from another culture.
Appendix F

Coding frame for analysis of qualitative data from post-test questionnaires and semi-structured student interviews conducted in the beginning and at the end of the course.

Codes marked with an asterisk (*) have been inductively derived from answers to the open question in the post-test questionnaire. Codes without an asterisk have emerged inductively from the student interviews. Headings of groups of codes represent the categories deductively derived from the assumptions and interview guide.

Peer-led workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits of peer-instructors</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared experience*</td>
<td>Age mates/peers; have gone through the same experience; can understand the students better</td>
<td>“They can relate to us better as fellow JUB students with plenty of their own experiences”(*)</td>
<td>Often related to “Easier to share with”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Because I don't have any reason to keep quiet when she has shared her story when she got here about the cultural differences. Because they are not perfect when they got here, all their stories, they began in a negative way, but they end in a positive way.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easier to share with*</td>
<td>Easier to share with peers as they are same age/on eye level, won’t judge, have also made same “mistakes”</td>
<td>“Because you are more likely to share also private insights that you experienced. So you are not overthinking your reactions, you are just giving it away more easily.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“That was very smart idea because we can actually talk to them and they would explain properly, it's not like they would judge us because they know that we have been through this, they have been through this, so it's good.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competent teacher/guide*</td>
<td>Are competent in what they do, can explain</td>
<td>“I also thought it was beneficial because they</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>things, guide/facilitate, comments saying they were good, well-chosen</strong></td>
<td><strong>had a different style of you know giving the information towards us or handing it from your end to our end. And I think that I learned faster different things because they just, they were closer to being a student themselves”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friendly/ approachable</strong></td>
<td><strong>Are friendly, approachable</strong>&lt;br&gt;“All of them were approachable and friendly, I mean you can just go, speak to them.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role models</strong></td>
<td><strong>Can share their experience, be role models inside the classroom and beyond (in everyday campus life)</strong>&lt;br&gt;“You get to have role models”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open-minded</strong></td>
<td><strong>Open-minded to listen to the students</strong>&lt;br&gt;“They are going to be very open to hearing new perspectives because they are still in the process. Not that it ever ends, but I just feel like they are more eager to listen.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenges of peer-instructors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Less professional/ knowledgeable</strong>&lt;br&gt;“It was hard, sometimes, to ask questions and get answers”&lt;br&gt;“Well sometimes the task or the exercise didn't really work out. Because one could still see that they were still pretty dependent on the written instruction. And if it wasn't really working out the way it should be, then you could see, ok, we better skip this exercise now or there was a degree of uncertainty about it.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authority issues</strong></td>
<td><strong>How to be a peer and a respected authority at the same time; for example being too strict vs. not pushing through with an activity when students complained</strong></td>
<td><strong>A few of them did not handle the whole having power as an instructor but still being a peer dynamic very well. They were ineffective peers because they cared too much about being in control.”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>Trainers also commented on their uncertainty due to not attending lectures + not having designed the session themselves</strong> | <strong>Most comments add that it was less professional but that this was not really a problem as one could also ask the lecturers</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small community/confidentiality*</td>
<td>Some are friends, so difficult to share very personal things; confidentiality issues (afraid that personal stories get shared amongst peers); might influence how one is perceived outside the classroom</td>
<td>“And also that sometimes it was hard to grant them the authority that they were supposed to have.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Some of them are friends, harder to share personal thoughts”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“You could never be really sure to what extent they actually keep their confidentiality. I mean they do, but at the same time they know you differently and more intimate maybe in some situations and that's how they automatically think of you outside the classroom as well, I mean it's unavoidable. And you do interact with them outside the classroom.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of transparency/consistency</td>
<td>Lack of consistency in how peer-trainers approached their role (e.g. some more like friends, others more strict and distanced); change in enthusiasm over time; lack of transparency about why certain activities were done</td>
<td>“At the beginning I also found that in the workshop, the peer-trainers were more enthusiastic and towards the end, it was just, they didn't want to do it, like some of them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some of the peer-trainers approached it more as like they are peers and they are like our friends and then some of them approached it more like we are in charge and then that was just, it was hard, like because we had different ones each workshop, and it was sometimes hard to understand how we were supposed to talk to them, how they were expecting to be treated.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop format pros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low pressure/comfortable environment*</td>
<td>Low pressure, relaxed atmosphere Comfortable,</td>
<td>“I was able to express myself without any fear.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to practice*</td>
<td>Apply concepts and theories, apply learnings in the workshop</td>
<td>“Really helped practice what we learned.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Because often those times when I felt like I don't understand how this is relevant to me in the lecture, we would do something in the workshop that would then make it more relevant.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“It's like first you learn something through the lecture and then you can use it during the workshop.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyable learning*</td>
<td>Fun activities, enjoyable sessions</td>
<td>“We had fun and learned at the same time.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I think it's a course that you can both have fun and learn something that I am personally really interested in.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn from each other</td>
<td>Learn about other people’s experience, how</td>
<td>“Because some of us would read a question or...”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
they perceive things, feel and act; listening to each other’s stories; interesting discussions among students

something we are supposed to give our opinion on and like I have one understanding of what the question was even asking, but then other people would have other understandings and it like facilitated really good discussion.”

“Because in our workshops, there were many people and most of them were from very different cultures and you got to talk to all of them during the workshops, so it taught me how they act, how they feel because not only I notice myself, they also expressed it.”

“I think everyone was clearly coming from a different place, I don’t mean country, I just mean like a different mental state. And I think this dynamic worked out well because everyone was intrigued and everyone was curious to listen.”

Interactive* Being interactive; being in smaller groups and encouraged to talk

“It is done in smaller groups. And when you are in smaller groups, you actually do kind of speak up and the trainers motivate you and try to engage you in the conversation”

“And the workshops were also great because it gave people a break from reading and being in class and listening to it and they actually participated in it.”

Make friends* e.g. also with people outside one’s usual circles / get to know people in more depth

“I got to know people I had never talked to before”
“I really liked the small group of people getting really close to each other. Especially because the people that signed up for this course were from all different majors and some of these people, like I showed up the first day, I was like, I didn't even know you went to Jacobs and this is a pretty small school.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gain knowledge*</th>
<th>General remarks on gaining knowledge on theories and models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflection space*</td>
<td>e.g. on self and cultural background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It was a low pressure environment that encouraged reflection without being too formal.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility of format</td>
<td>e.g. flexible handling of breaks (shorten breaks and end earlier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting*</td>
<td>Interesting sessions/workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop format cons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing*</td>
<td>Too late, too long, hard to stay focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A few of the workshops were too long and it was hard to remain engaged throughout at the end of the day.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Just simply the timing of it I guess was a bit unfortunate.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 of the 9 in interview commented he liked the timing as closing of day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not wanting to share/differences in active participation*</td>
<td>Not everyone shared same enthusiasm / not wanting to share personal things with the group / people not speaking up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It was hard to talk about personal things”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I think sometimes they wanted us to talk a lot more than we wanted to talk about some topics.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Obviously not all of the people would raise their hands because maybe they talked about something very personal and they wouldn't want to share it or they were just tired.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too superficial*</td>
<td>Not in depth enough</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Faculty-led lectures

### Benefits faculty-led lectures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informative/knowledge</td>
<td>Comments on the lectures being informative, interesting, conveying knowledge (e.g. theoretical background, specific content, concepts).</td>
<td>“I thought it was really interesting to have this theoretical understanding, like these little aspects that you can just, you know, you learn them and then you go, 'oh, I noticed this before', like this totally makes sense”</td>
<td>“I learned about many, many concepts, many different approaches. I haven't heard a single one of them before, that's why like all of these approaches were brand new.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-structured</td>
<td>Comments such as being close to reading, easy to follow, and well-structured</td>
<td>“… if you have a reading that you can prepare for the lecture, so you are not so lost when the teacher (…) tries to tell you something about it (…), so you have kind of like a preparation or preparatory feeling towards the lecture (…))”</td>
<td>“Lectures were very well-structured, they were very straight-forward and easy to understand”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged critical thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having different lecturers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges lecture format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of examples/relevance</td>
<td>Comments on lack of examples to relate to or to grasp the relevance of the lecture content for one's own experience</td>
<td>“In the lectures, I sometimes (…) felt like we were learning a lot of things sometimes without examples that we could always refer to. Because a lot of the studies, it seemed like didn't necessarily apply to us and then it was harder for me to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
understand why this was important"

| Too much theory/ too complex
| Repetitive content* |

### Reflective assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Reflective assignments pros</strong></th>
<th><strong>Definition</strong></th>
<th><strong>Example</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supported learning process</td>
<td>Comments on learning something (e.g. about oneself), finding them useful, supporting the learning process, realizing that one was writing something one was not even aware of before</td>
<td>“(…) but we have to really tell and identify our own cultures, so I actually did some research about my own culture. And then I just think like these essays really helped, like in the learning process of this course.”</td>
<td>“Because with me, I would start typing and like halfway through I would realize that like I was saying something that I hadn't even meant to say, but like it was totally true. And I really liked that because especially in my major, I don't get a lot of opportunities to do writing like this.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical reflection/self-discovery</td>
<td>Being encouraged to critically reflect on readings and class content; being “forced” to sit down and reflect upon one’s own experience and identity and thereby discovering new things</td>
<td>“Well a lot of them were related to the readings (…) and I feel like with these reflections, it was not expecting me to just reiterate what was written in the text, but rather bring in my own thoughts and relate it to.”</td>
<td>“Because I mean, you were kind of forced to think about it and it wasn't just like a subconscious thing that was going on (…). But it was just something that you were actively”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
thinking about and really trying to go like on a deeper level and then another level and then see and try to discover what actually lies you know beneath all of it.”

“Well the purpose of the reflective paper, I actually liked the concept because it kind of builds in from your own thoughts and it goes back to your own memories, so basically that's really good because what you are learning now and you relate it to your past and you actually think ok, yes, this is what it means.

Being able to express personal things *(4 interview)*

Comments on being able to freely express themselves on paper but also on being able to share very personal stories they would not share in the classroom

“Written is definitely easier for me because I am writing to myself. And I think it is always easier to talk to yourself in a way. (...) But I still was ok, like I could express my thoughts, just with less personal examples in the workshops.”

“I mean definitely writing something down instead of saying it out loud, whether it is just for you, like whether you reflect upon yourself or whether you try to confront somebody, it is always easier of course to not do it in person. But I think that it did kind of help to know that only you were reading it. Because if (...) for whatever reason if they were reading it, I for sure would not have written things that I did because I know them (often linked to “confidentiality/ small community”)}
| **Improve writing skills**  
* (4 interview) | Comments on how having to write every week helps improve writing skills, type faster, look up words and improve vocabulary | “And I also feel like it actually improves my writing skills.”  
“And it also really practices your writing skills.” |
| **Less pressure in the end (1 interview)** | Less pressure than when there is a final exam as you already did all the work throughout the semester | “And it was very good to have something like that to work systematically and not to worry in the end or stress over it in the end.” |

### Reflective assignments cons

| Too repetitive* | Questions/prompts too similar, seemed to ask for same thing | “Reflections seemed to ask the same questions but in different words”  
“It's hard to write something unique and interesting every week and then on top of that some of the prompts felt like they were kind of just merging into answering the same thing multiple times, so I think that was probably my largest issue with the class.” |
| Deadlines/time management | Comments on sometimes forgetting about it and then having to finish it quickly | “It’s just sometimes you get really busy in the week and suddenly on Sunday you realize you have an assignment.” |
| Being honest/reflecting is challenging |  | “I think at the beginning, I was a bit hesitant about being just blatantly honest and opening up about things. But as the course went on and I came to terms with the fact that this is a really good way to express yourself.”  
“I think reflecting in general is challenging, (…) but it was also enjoyable for me.” |
### Intercultural learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural self-awareness</td>
<td>Comments on how they have learned about themselves, their own culture, what it means, how it influences them, what they identify with</td>
<td>“I remember that for one statement we were asked about that and then for the next statement like a similar way. And in the first statement I said that I wasn't, like I don't define myself with the German culture that much. But then in the next statement we had to reflect from a different angle and I was like, oh, wait a minute, I am a little bit German, I cannot deny it. So I mean, that was definitely an interesting thing to see through those reflective statements, to discover about myself.”</td>
<td>Most also commented on how this is the basis for ICC (you need to know yourself first)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“‘Well in the beginning, like if someone asked me like 'hey, what's your culture?’, I would just say, 'I don't know, Indian Muslim' or something. But now I have realized that culture is not like something which has boundaries to it, you know the definition does not have boundaries. So basically it's everything, it can be anything, even the way you dress, the way you eat, what you eat, how you, I mean that's everything, I mean your habits, your traditions, so that's culture. So for, I actually realized that culture is not a unidimensional thing, it's a multidimensional thing. (...) And now I actually could relate to myself and I mean I could find out my family values, I could relate everything, my family values, how
| ICC understanding | General code to capture how participants now define ICC | “I am taking away definitely a better understanding of how little I actually know. Because before this class, I had done like a three-day intercultural competence training and then the intercultural training in o-week and I was like I think I know stuff. But then throughout this course, I was like, I do know some things, but I really don’t know a lot of things.” |
| Understanding culture & its influence | Comments confirming that participants feel they have a better understanding of culture and how it influences us in general or specifically e.g. perception, thinking styles, and communication styles. | “And especially having the historical background and the reasons why people may behave like the way they behave because where they are from or how they have been raised in that culture or something, that definitely helps, helps a lot also outside the Jacobs environment.” |

Many different answers, interesting is that many realized that ICC means continuous learning.
| Broad definition of culture/complexity | Having learned that culture in its broad definition encompasses more than national culture, e.g. also subcultures within a nation, other social groups, origin of culture (influenced by geography, climate, …), linguistic or religious communities, having multiple identities | “I also liked the fact that throughout this course I realized how culture is not limited by countries, but also on a very individual basis and how within one country, there could be subcultures as well.” “Also the reading for that class I found the most interesting because it gave the most background on how culture actually may define themselves and then for the first time I actually also thought that a culture, I mean I knew it could be country or religion or you could have different cultures within a country that either do or do not live peacefully together, but I did not think that for example sexual orientation or just different backgrounds or something could also be defined as a culture.” |
| PL methods | Comments on having gained an understanding of PL and how it is useful in intercultural situations (and beyond them) | “I thought that it was the more interesting to see how much you can actually do by just reflecting upon yourself and how much you can learn from that. (…) And you don’t necessarily have to read a textbook about their culture to reach the same level of understanding, I think.” “The content which I really liked, (…) the Personal Leadership thing where I mean I was going through a phase at that point of
IC skills/communication skills

| Time and it was actually happening, so I could relate to it and I could actually understand what I should do.”
| “Because especially in an environment in Jacobs, you do have the whole cultural diversity itself already, but knowing to get the best out of it, how to really be in enriching discussions and enriching social contacts, I think this can be a very, very practical and good tool. Because especially for first-years, me included, I had some difficulties to eliminate certain cultural borders and this course helped me to jump over these borders.”
| “I know how to talk to different people from different cultures. That's the core I think that we learned from this course.”
| “And I think having it at the beginning definitely eases the way and it helps you to navigate better through your Jacobs experience and to get more out of it as well and to be less hung up on situations where like, I mean why is this person doing this? And then you know, ok I know why they are doing it, so I can move on now, like I am done with it.”
| “Well overall what I am taking out of this course is basically how to manage situations, like recently the problem in my group dynamics, I actually took a lot from

| | | | |
| Changed oneself – specific examples | This code captures when participants explicitly elaborate on what they are now doing differently based on learnings from the course or give examples of a situation where they behaved differently, e.g. reflecting upon why a friend behaved this way, step by step accepting more ambiguity, etc. | “Like I would always see myself as kind of introverted and quiet person. And now sometimes I push myself like to speak more or speak up in public. And try to be the one who start a conversation with others.”

“For example in the Personal Leadership thing where, I mean I was going through a phase at that point of time and it was actually happening, so I could relate to it and I could actually understand what I should do. And I actually did find out a way and now everything in my group, my group dynamics is pretty much solved and I am kind of happy now.” |

| Accept/engage ambiguity | Being able to accept and engage ambiguity when one is out of one’s comfort zone or does not know or control everything, how the course has helped to be more ok with this | “Especially with the accepting ambiguity or embracing ambiguity (…), I think one of the biggest things I have come to realize is that I am not going to know everything. And that I can use other parts of what I have learned to try to make that ok and not cause problems with it.”

“It helps you to know how to navigate through any kind of different situation that you are in. And I think that's what our students need to have in their daily lives, to have the knowledge how to act in a way that you are in the zone that you are not used to it.” |
“I mainly would recommend it because of the reflection assignments. (…) I think that if this were to be integrated into an education system, that would actually be very valuable. It would actually make us more well-rounded. I mean I think my definition of well-rounded is not limited to being good at math and physics and knowing some political science. I think well-rounded is actually being content with yourself, not being confused, knowing how to approach these ambiguous situations and coming to terms with the idea that everything is always in a very grey area, you are never right, you are never wrong, you cannot blame anyone, you can just start to learn to cope with it.”

Suspend judgment/observe

Comments on how course helped to become more aware of judgment (and distinction between describing and interpreting) and better able to suspend it and observe the situation from a more neutral perspective

“And it helps me to be less judgy about people or situations because I tend to be a really judgmental person by nature.”

“Also don't judge too easily, don't come to a conclusion too easily, give people time they might need, give yourself time to, to get comfortable with people. And if you feel offended, then go a step back and just imagine you are in the, in the seminar and think about what the reason or what the motive or intention could be behind this, this phrase or this saying that
you just offended you. That is not, that the intention must not necessarily be to offend me or to, I don't know, be rude or impolite. “

“The real practical insight in the seminars when we were really hands on talking about how our culture is different from other cultures, how certain sentences or gestures can be perceived differently depending on the culture and that saying and meaning are really complete, two completely different, different things.”

“It actually helped me because interacting with people from other, so people from Africa and America, this actually improved I would say my knowledge.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code (suggestion)</th>
<th>Definition / examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More diverse content*</td>
<td>e.g. simulations, public speaking, more on thinking styles/psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different scheduling*</td>
<td>Schedule it in the afternoon or generally not that late in the evening, some also commented on clashes with other classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller workshop groups*</td>
<td>So people have even more comfort and space to talk and share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same trainers all semester</td>
<td>To get used to them, have more comfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading instead of pass/fail</td>
<td>To reward efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-weekly assignments</td>
<td>Offer assignment bi-weekly so students have more flexibility (can then increase word count)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less lectures, more workshops</td>
<td>More workshop sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty joining workshops occasionally</td>
<td>To answer questions and support (as peer-trainers sometimes seemed lost with activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More harmony in trainer role</td>
<td>Similar understanding of their role (as some were more like friends and others more strict and distanced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different portfolio questions</td>
<td>But also inherent in criticism of being too repetitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less workload</td>
<td>Too much workload for 2.5 ECTS (other participants did not agree when asked about it in interviews)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use short videos</td>
<td>Offer examples, visual might stick more and help to better understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better lead into PL</td>
<td>Relevance only became clear over the course of sessions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

List of codes emerging from qualitative analysis of data from group interviews with peer-instructors

Numbers in brackets indicate how many of the five peer-instructors mentioned this aspect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start of program</th>
<th>Mid-term</th>
<th>End of program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation (ALL): self-development/ strengthen skills (from Winter Academy)</td>
<td>Experience (ALL): positive experience so far (most have conducted 1-2 workshops)</td>
<td>Experience (ALL): positive experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected benefits for trainers:</td>
<td>Experienced benefits for trainers:</td>
<td>Experienced benefits for trainers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Gain confidence (2/5)</td>
<td>▪ Learning opportunities (3/5)</td>
<td>▪ Interact with first-years (3/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Apply learnings from studies (2/5)</td>
<td>▪ Apply knowledge (3/5)</td>
<td>▪ Transfer knowledge/explain things (2/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Get to know each other &amp; students (2/5)</td>
<td>▪ Gain confidence (2/5)</td>
<td>▪ Practice trainer skills in more challenging setting (3/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Have fun (1/5)</td>
<td>▪ Learn more on how to facilitate (2/5)</td>
<td>▪ Practice teaching (1/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Have experience for the CV (1/5)</td>
<td>▪ Share insights from JUB life (1/5)</td>
<td>▪ Personal growth (1/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Learn more on facilitation &amp; debriefing (1/5)</td>
<td>▪ Be more patient (1/5)</td>
<td>▪ Apply theoretical learnings from studies (1/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Get to know the students (1/5)</td>
<td>▪ Get to know the students (1/5)</td>
<td>▪ Self-presentation, communication, and facilitation skills (1/5), e.g. speaking slower and more clearly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected challenges for trainers:</td>
<td>Experienced challenges for trainers:</td>
<td>Experienced challenges for trainers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Balancing being a peer &amp; authority (2/5)</td>
<td>▪ Getting students to talk/participate (5/5)</td>
<td>▪ Very different group dynamics (5/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Balancing workload (2/5)</td>
<td>▪ Getting the group to listen (1/5)</td>
<td>▪ Spontaneous facilitation/reaction (2/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Establishing trust (1/5)</td>
<td>▪ Being tired in the evening (1/5)</td>
<td>▪ Answer questions from lectures (2/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Keeping group motivated (1/5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Being accepted as an authority (1/5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learnings (at the end):

- Not as experienced as we thought / continuous learning process
  e.g. dealing with difficult participants or situations, making mistakes or making things more complicated than necessary (e.g. splitting up groups)
- Intercultural learning: more confirming what they already learned, might even feel less confident because now more self-critical
- Might have learned more if designing activities themselves

Benefits for students:

- Allows them to practice/try things out
- Less authority gap / more credibility
- More comfortable atmosphere
- Good to have peers
- Get diverse perspectives

Challenges for students:

- Expected timing to be a challenge \(\rightarrow\) experience: yes, they are tired, but positively surprised by attendance and participation

Benefits for university:

- More interculturally competent students = happier, more open-minded, less conflict, less clustering, more exchange, better conflict resolution
- Promote nice & inclusive atmosphere
- Complements orientation week training (which is not sufficient)
- Cheaper

Challenges for university:

- Need to find enough motivated & well-trained peer-trainers (provide resources to pay them as TAs as it requires a lot of work/time commitment)

Ideas for improvement:

- Make it a paid position
- Stay with same trainers but pair trainers to complement each other in skills and style
- Change timing of workshop (e.g. to afternoon)
- Change name (connotations with “intercultural” at JUB)
- Advertise it earlier to potential peer-trainers (so they can sign up for Winter Academy, might allow a better mix of gender and nationality)
Appendix H

List of codes for analysis of reflective papers

1. Learning Objectives

*This first-level code captures the three learning objectives identified prior to the course (deductively derived second-level codes) and specific sub-categories derived from the data (inductively derived third-level codes)*

1.1. LO1: in-depth understanding of culture

1.1.1. Complex concept
1.1.2. Origins of culture
1.1.3. Culture influences how we feel, think, and act
1.1.4. Culture is learned
1.1.5. Culture is evolving and changing
1.1.6. Intercultural communication
1.1.7. Intercultural competence
1.1.8. Understanding of cultural differences
1.1.9. Culture is one influence, not the only one
1.1.10. Uniqueness of human culture
1.1.11. Scientific approach to culture
   1.1.12. Culture and language
1.1.13. Culture cannot be observed/abstract concept
1.1.14. Culture as way of life

1.2. LO2: relate knowledge to own experience

1.2.1. Reflect upon own cultural identity
   1.2.1.1. Superficial reflection
   1.2.1.2. Deeper reflection
1.2.2. Reflect upon own thinking style
1.2.3. Critically reflect upon own ICC
1.2.4. Reflect upon own communication style

1.3. LO3: understand & apply Personal Leadership (PL)/CMD

1.3.1. Knowledge of PL
1.3.2. Applying it to own life
2. Intercultural Competence Development

This first-level code captures elements of intercultural competence as derived from the quantitative measurements, the SFCQ and TMIC-S, which were used as second-level codes. Third-level codes emerged from the dimensions of these instruments as well as from the data.

2.1. SFCQ

2.1.1. SFCQ_knowledge
   2.1.1.1: culture-specific
   2.1.1.2: culture-general
   2.1.1.3: complexity
      2.1.1.3.1: basic
      2.1.1.3.2: medium
      2.1.1.3.3: high

2.1.2. SFCQ_skills
   2.1.2.1: relational skills
   2.1.2.2: tolerance of uncertainty
   2.1.2.3: adaptability
   2.1.2.4: empathy
   2.1.2.5: perceptual acuity

2.1.3. SFCQ_metacognition
   2.1.3.1: awareness
   2.1.3.2: analysis
   2.1.3.3: planning

2.2. TMIC

2.2.1. TMIC_communication
   2.2.1.1. Awareness of differences in verbal and nonverbal behavior
   2.2.1.2. Ability to name strategies for sensitivity in communication
   2.2.1.3. Discussing how to use strategies for sensitivity in communication

2.2.2. TMIC_learning
   2.2.2.1. Interacting with culturally different others
   2.2.2.2. Learning languages
   2.2.2.3. Travel/immerse in other cultures
2.2.2.4. Using the Internet (e.g. YouTube)
2.2.2.5. Watching movies from other cultures
2.2.2.6. Reading about other cultures
2.2.2.7. Campus events on cultural diversity
2.2.2.8. Observing people

2.2.3. TMIC_socialinteraction
2.2.3.1. Enjoying interacting with people from other cultures
2.2.3.2. Establishing deeper meaningful contact
2.2.3.3. Having found ways to make friends across cultures

2.2.4. TMIC_selfknowledge
2.2.4.1. Superficial cultural identity reflection
2.2.4.2. Deeper cultural identity reflection

2.2.5. TMIC_selfmanagement
2.2.5.1. Using Personal Leadership to set and achieve goals

2.2.6. TMIC_creatingsynergies
2.2.6.1. Finding compromise between own viewpoint and others
2.2.6.2. Speaking up when offended and resolving it
2.2.6.3. Acting as a mediator

Please note: More details on definitions of codes, frequencies, as well as examples from the data can be found in tables 6.11 and 6.12 in chapter 6.
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