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This study examined college undergraduates’ intercultural experiences and attitudes at the beginning and the end of a semester-long course on multicultural issues. Participants were 290 undergraduate college students at the University of North Texas, 202 of whom were enrolled in one of the university’s core global studies, cross-cultural, or diversity courses for the fall 2001 semester, and 88 of whom were enrolled in courses outside the core. It was hypothesized that the multicultural group’s Positive Inventory of the Consequences of Multicultural Experiences scores would increase and Social Dominance Orientation Scale scores would decrease more than they would for the control group. Findings did not support these hypotheses.
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INTRODUCTION

As our society becomes increasingly multicultural, intercultural competence is becoming a more important and useful construct to measure. For instance, more and more employers are multinational and require their employees to relocate to foreign countries. This makes it beneficial for students to study abroad in order to prepare themselves for future job opportunities all over the world.

Even within one’s native country, encountering people, customs, and communications from cultures other than one’s own is becoming the norm rather than the exception. The United States is quickly becoming a country in which most of the citizens come from various minority groups. The ability to respond in adaptive ways to these encounters and experiences can greatly enhance an individual’s work performance, social network, and enjoyment and understanding of her or his environment. In today’s multicultural society, therefore, intercultural competence can be an important component of psychological health whether in one’s native country or abroad.

Many diversity training programs have been developed to help individuals to achieve intercultural competence, but there has been very little research conducted on the effectiveness of these programs (D’Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991; Deshpande & Viswesvaran, 1992). The literature on diversity training programs will be reviewed here, followed by a description of the literature on the process of adapting to unfamiliar cultures and the stages of this process that should be influenced by multicultural courses.

Training Programs Aimed at Increasing Intercultural Competence

The increasing importance of intercultural competence has led to the development of many types of training programs designed to prepare individuals for contact with a new culture. The anticipated contact can take the form of travel or relocation to a foreign country, immersion
in an unfamiliar subculture of one’s native country, intercultural marriage, a diverse work environment or place of residence, or the general contact that occurs between members of a diverse society.

Preparation courses have been developed by the military, international service organizations such as the Peace Corps, government organizations, and high school and university study-abroad programs. In addition, many universities include courses that cover multicultural information and issues in their required curricula in the hope that these courses will facilitate students’ successful intercultural interactions in the future. Increasing intercultural awareness may decrease negative social factors such as prejudice, discrimination, and violence (Geartner, Rust, Dovidio, Bachman, & Anastasio, 1996). In addition, many studies have found a significant positive relationship between cross-cultural training and self-development (Deshpande & Viswesvaran, 1992).

Intercultural adaptability “implies attitudinal flexibility enabling the individual to exploit the full educational potential of new surroundings” (Brislin & Pedersen, 1976). Thus, the individual becomes better equipped to experience personal growth in many different situations. It follows that it would also increase general and specific social skills so that the culturally competent person will have more positive, more frequent, and longer-term interactions with individuals of a different culture from him-or-herself. This also maximizes the opportunity for learning and competency, as well as strengthening social support, an important factor in mental health.

Attempts to measure the effectiveness of cross-cultural orientation programs began with the efforts of the Peace Corps and the U.S. military in the 1960s (Harris, 1977). Very little empirical research has been completed in the area (D’Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991;
Even less research has been done on the change in cross-cultural adaptability intercultural proficiency upon completion of a “multicultural” course.

The various types of measures of the effectiveness of multicultural classes explore the changes in students’ specific abilities, rather than their general intercultural adaptation skills. These include evaluating videos of role play activities, testing students’ knowledge of a specific culture or of the content needed for general adaptability, measuring the decrease in prejudice using self-report methods, and evaluating specific technical skills. In addition, measures of personality, such as the Rorschach Inkblot Test™, the Thematic Apperception Test™, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory™, structured interviews, and various paper-and-pencil personality inventories, were once used by the Peace Corps, but they were found to have little predictive validity for the performance of individuals who are immersed in a foreign culture for a significant period of time (Harris, 1977).

There are, however, many theories about what skills should be developed in a multicultural class program. These include knowledge about the new culture(s), flexibility in thinking, problem-solving, and attitudes, and awareness of the subjective values of one’s own and other cultures, decreased attitudinal rigidity, an increased ability to accurately predict individuals’ behaviors and their motivations when the individual is from another culture, an increased ability to deal with the feelings created by intercultural value conflicts, a balance of cognitive and affective ways of gleaning information from the environment, recognition of the boundaries and differences between one’s own and other cultures, and acceptance and utilization rather than denial of the assessment of these boundaries. D’Andrea, Daniels, and Heck (1991), in a review of the literature on skills that should be strengthened in multicultural counseling classes, found the highest degree of consensus on the need to target the following abilities: acquisition of
cross-cultural communication skills, increased awareness of one’s own attitudes toward ethnic minorities, and increased knowledge about specific minority populations.

Clearly, some of these skills can be taught in culture-general ways, but some must be taught in a culture-specific manner. There is a debate about which type of training is more effective or more important, depending on the ultimate goal of the training in question. For a review of the proponents of each side and their corresponding arguments, please see Brislin and Pedersen, 1976.

The general consensus about topics and skills that are important for multicultural university course is that they should provide experiences in both the cognitive and affective realms (Trifonovitch, 1977). Examples of cognitive experiences include assigned readings, research papers and presentations, and lectures. Affective activities include experiential activities such as immersion experiences or role plays. It is believed that utilizing both cognitive and affective experiences in a multicultural classroom will more closely replicate real-life contact between cultures than using cognitive experiences alone, as many multicultural university courses do.

Many theorize that the closer the course can come to actual field experience, the more positively class members will feel about their abilities to interact successfully with members of other cultures (e.g., Hautauloma & Kaman, 1977; Harris, 1977; and Trifonovitch, 1977). This will probably increase the frequency of their multicultural interactions in the future and become a self-fulfilling prophecy; they will become more and more interculturally competent throughout their lives. A similar opinion is that multicultural courses should focus on teaching students how to maintain and/or increase skills learned in the course so that the can generalize information learned in the classroom to “real life” (Trifonovitch, 1977).
Another important aspect of a successful multicultural course is the utilization of the cultural resources that are available among the students. Exploring the cultural nuances of each student’s background, even if they are not of a minority race or cultural group, can give students a sense of interest in cultural differences and can be a more comfortable transition from cultural monopolarization to cultural relativism. In addition, this approach models positive and effective ways of discussing cultural differences so that students will be less likely to avoid these discussions in their future interactions, with the eventual goal of learning to appreciate and celebrate diversity (Brislin & Pedersen, 1976).

The most frequent criticism about the effectiveness of university courses aimed at increasing intercultural competence is that they focus too much on the cognitive aspects of learning about other cultures and not enough on the interpersonal relations involved in successfully interacting with people of cultures different from one’s own. Several studies have shown that book learning alone does not increase interest in or positive feeling toward members of another culture, even when the content of the reading material has a very positive slant (Harris, 1977). Some argue that this cannot be accomplished at all in the classroom setting, but perhaps role plays, mini-immersion experiences, and guest speakers could achieve this goal. However, it may be more difficult and/or time consuming to strengthen students’ actual interaction skills than it is to increase their cross-cultural awareness and knowledge (D’Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991). It may be that multicultural college courses are best suited to providing knowledge about how, precisely, to undertake one’s own journey into intercultural awareness by providing models for the discussion and eventual appreciation of differences which will, in turn, lead to more frequent and more positive intercultural interactions over the course of the life span.
While there are many different types of training programs aimed at increasing students’ intercultural competence and with a variety of ultimate goals and methods, there has been very little research done on the effectiveness of these programs. According to D’Andrea, Daniels, and Heck (1991), much more research needs to be done in this area. The lack of research on the effectiveness of these training methods is largely due to a dearth of available evaluative instruments on the change in students’ intercultural skills. The Inventory of the Consequences of Multicultural Experiences (ICME) may serve this need.

However, one drawback of using attitudes questionnaires and a repeated-measures design to assess changes in students’ attitudes during a multicultural course is that students’ intercultural competence may develop in the following stages, as suggested by Lopez, Grover, Holland, Johnson, Kain, Kanel, Mellins, and Rhyne (1989). First, many students may be unaware of cultural issues and may rate their attitudes and experiences as more interculturally competent than they actually are. As they learn more about multicultural issues, they develop a heightened awareness of culture. At this stage, they may become more aware of their socially undesirable or covert attitudes about intercultural issues and interactions. Thus, although students may have taken a positive step toward intercultural competence in becoming more self-aware, they may rate themselves more negatively at the end of a multicultural course than at the beginning. Achieving the final stage, cultural sensitivity, is likely to be the work of more than one semester, and will probably not be captured by the current study.
Adaptation to Contact with an Unfamiliar Culture

When an individual experiences significant contact with members of and/or ideas from a different culture, she or he typically undergoes a period of adjustment to the new ways of thinking, feeling, and behaving to which she or he has been exposed. This adjustment process, generally referred to as culture shock, can be distressful. Individuals who adjust quickly and effectively to the cross-cultural contact possess a high level of intercultural adaptability. These individuals experience a lower degree and duration of culture shock, and they achieve intercultural competence more quickly and fully. According to a review of the literature by Deshpande and Viswesvaran (1992), cross-cultural training has consistently been found to increase cross-cultural adjustability. Therefore, a discussion of the theoretical underpinnings and the empirical literature on the continuum of intercultural adjustability, from culture shock to intercultural competence, will facilitate an understanding of the possibilities offered by multicultural courses as well as the goals to which they aspire.

Culture Shock

When cross-cultural contact results in confusion in formulating adaptive responses to the new environment, the individual may experience the cognitive, psychological, and/or emotional distress known as culture shock. Culture shock is a negative experience that results from the numerous stressors that occur from contact with an unfamiliar culture. It can occur for immigrant groups, business people on overseas assignments, foreign exchange students, as well as dominant and minority subcultural groups within their native countries. Culture shock can even afflict individuals living in countries in which there is very rapid sociological or technological change (Winkelman, 1994). Its severity is a function of both intercultural adaptability and the duration and pervasiveness of cross-cultural contact.
Culture shock is commonly conceptualized as a normal part of the process of adapting to contact with a new culture (Adler, 1975; Oberg, 1960). The more effectively an individual functions within the context of an unfamiliar culture, the less acute and prolonged his or her experienced culture shock should be. Thus, a theoretical understanding of culture shock and its effects is helpful in conceptualizing the construct of intercultural competence, and both are necessary to a discussion of whether multicultural college courses are “doing their job.”

Understanding how people react to cross-cultural contact is the first step in conceptualizing what types of preparation are most likely to improve an individual’s intercultural skills. According to theorists (e.g., Adler, 1975; Oberg, 1960), it is normal to experience culture shock as a part of the transition to acquiring the skills to interact successfully within the new cultural framework. The ability to cope effectively with culture shock leads to a more rapid transition to intercultural competence and fewer adverse effects on mental and physical health (Hsiao-Ying, 1995). Therefore, a brief discussion of culture shock and theories of how people adapt to contact with a new culture is necessary before delineating the goals of intercultural effectiveness training.

Culture shock was first conceptualized as a psychological condition resulting from the strain and anxiety caused by contact with an unfamiliar culture and the feelings of loss, confusion, and impotence resulting from the loss of accustomed cultural cures and social rules (Oberg, 1960). This initial view of culture shock as a psychological condition has been extended by Adler (1975) as a crisis of personality or identity. The individual may experience an erosion of some or all of the familiar bases of her or his self-concept. The adaptive response to this disruption is to create a new, transcultural, self that is integrated with the old self. In other words, the individual experiences culture shock but then adapts to the new cultural environment.
A further generalization of Adler’s personality adaptation model is that cultural adaptation is a learning process that is based either solely on mastery of the foreign culture’s language (Ruben & Kealey, 1979, as cited in Lewthwaite, 1996) or on a combination of communication skills and behavioral adaptation to the new culture’s norms. Bennett (1986) defined the cultural adaptation model as consisting of learning and recovery. This process takes the cross-cultural explorer from “ethnocentrism to ethno-relativism,” (Bennett, 1986). Furthermore, although culture shock has traditionally been viewed as a psychological and cognitive reaction to the new environment, it is important to realize that it is also a reaction to the loss of the familiar cultural environment (Rhinesmith, 1985, as cited in Winkelman, 1994).

According to Winkelman (1994), culture shock stems mainly from cognitive overload and behavioral inadequacies. Reactions can include physiological, emotional, interpersonal, cognitive, and social components, as well as the effects resulting from changes in sociocultural relations, cognitive fatigue, role stress, and identity loss (Winkelman, 1994). Dyal and Chan (1985) found that international students in China experienced more health problems, both physical and mental, than did native students. Furthermore, these adverse effects on health were reported to have the greatest impact on females. In addition, Church (1982) estimated that 15 to 25% of all international students could be suffering from ill health stemming from experienced culture shock. However, Klineberg and Hull (1979) discovered that foreign exchange students who quickly established positive social relationships with natives of the host country reported fewer adverse effects on their health, as well as higher satisfaction with their experiences.
Intercultural Competence

Unfortunately, although intercultural competence, also called intercultural effectiveness or intercultural adaptability in the literature, is becoming an increasingly important construct to measure, its conceptualization is widely divergent across studies (Deshpande & Viswesvaran, 1992). Furthermore, ideas about the process of becoming interculturally competent differ as well (D’Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991). This makes it difficult to integrate the findings of the various cross-cultural studies of the past. Instead, a brief description of the major schools of thought follows.

The U-Curve Model

The most widely-used model of the process of adapting to a new culture is Lysgaard’s (1955) model based on a U-shaped curve. Lysgaard conceptualized the initial stages of immersion in a foreign culture as being characterized by a “honeymoon high.” Once the pleasure in the newness of the surrounding wears off, a bottoming out resulting from poor adjustment to the new culture occurs. This stage is followed by acceptance of the host culture and adaptation to the new environment. Although this has been a popular theory, Church, in his 1982 review of studies on the effects of significant exposure to a foreign culture, described the support for Lysgaard’s U-curve hypothesis as, “weak, inconclusive, and overgeneralized.”

The International Business Perspective

The increased contact between individuals of different cultures in today’s society has led many researchers to focus on the concept of intercultural adaptability and how it can be achieved. Much of this work has been done in the field of international business studies, as the rate and costs of failed international assignments have necessitated more knowledge about what is essentially a psychological construct. Between 16 and 40% of all American employees sent
overseas return from their assignments early, and each premature return costs a firm roughly 
$100,000 (Black, 1988). These studies have mainly been empirically and anecdotally, rather than 
theoretically, based. According to this empirical body of literature, there appear to be five 
important dimensions that can be expected to aid or to predict intercultural adjustment. These 
include predeparture training, previous overseas experience, organizational selection 
mechanisms, individual skills, and nonwork factors (Black, Mendenhall, & Oddou, 1991).

Predeparture Training

There is a great deal of empirical evidence supporting the proposition that cross-cultural 
training has a positive relationship with intercultural adaptability (Deshpande & Viswesvaran, 
1992). According to Black and Mendenhall’s (1990) article reviewing the effects of predeparture 
training on success in the host country, the most effective training techniques included 
information about the culture itself, with specific examples of how the norms differ from those of 
the home country, as well as language training (if necessary) and advice from previous travelers 
about what feelings and reactions to expect. While increasing individuals’ knowledge about 
specific cultures with which they come into contact is generally considered to be a very 
important part of multicultural training (D’Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991), Black and 
Mendenhall’s finding that specific information about a culture is the most effective component 
of cross-cultural training applies more to travelers preparing to reside in a foreign country than to 
the average student enrolled in a multicultural college course. Rather than preparing students to 
interact more effectively with one specific culture, these courses must attempt to ready students 
for cross-cultural contact with other cultures in general.
Previous Overseas Experience

Church (1982), in a review of the empirical literature, concluded that “empirical findings support the importance of accurate prior cultural experience or prior exposure…for sojourner adjustment” (p. 549). Black (1988) found, however, that this increased level of adjustment was related to work experiences and not to general or social experiences. Torbiorn (1982, as cited in Black, Mendenhall, & Oddou, 1991) discovered that, beyond a minimal level of exposure, the length of the previous stay in the host country was not related to later intercultural adjustment. Therefore, the fact that a person has lived in another culture is more important than the amount of time that they were there. It is not yet understood whether this is due to personality features basic to people who tend to travel to foreign countries, to the exposure itself, or to a combination of both.

On the other hand, Martin (1987) found that individuals who have lived abroad longer than three months reported a significantly higher intercultural awareness and ability to communicate cross-culturally than individuals who had not lived abroad, whereas those who had lived abroad for fewer than three months did not differ significantly from non-travelers on these dimensions. Therefore, the literature on length of previous residence in a foreign country and its relevance to intercultural competence is inconclusive.

Organizational Selection Criteria and Mechanisms

As recently as 1981, American multinational corporations were selecting employees for overseas assignments based solely on their level of technical expertise. According to Tung (1981, as cited in Hannigan, 1990), fewer than 5% of American multinational companies administered any tests of cross-cultural competence in the selection process for overseas assignments. While
this has changed in the 1990s, there is still little agreement about what tests can be expected to predict successful intercultural adjustment (Deshpande & Viswesvaran, 1992).

**Individual Skills**

Many researchers have examined what personal skills should best enable sojourners to adapt to immersion in a foreign culture. Chen (1987) found that the ability to change one’s communication style to suit the new culture and the ability to engage in relationships with members of the new culture are important factors in intercultural adaptation. Mendenhall and Oddou (1985) reviewed the existing literature on this topic and summarized the necessary skills as follows: (1) the self dimension, which consists of skills that enable the individual to maintain mental health; (2) the relationship dimension, or the person’s skill at initiating and maintaining social connections; and (3) the perception dimension, which includes the cognitive abilities necessary for the accurate perception of the host country and its people.

Martin (1987), in a review of the literature, categorized important skills for intercultural competence into a cognitive, affective, and behavioral framework. Cognitive skills include knowledge about the target culture and the impact of diversity on cross-cultural communication, as well as self-awareness. Affective skills include tolerance for ambiguity, flexibility, empathy, and the ability to suspend judgment. Behavioral competencies include problem-solving skills, the ability to form relationships, and task-completion in an intercultural environment. Cui and Awa (1992) organized these abilities along a similar cognitive-affective-behavioral conceptual framework described below.

**Nonwork Factors**

The amount of cultural distance between the native and unfamiliar cultures has been found to be a contributing factor to the level of intercultural adaptability (Bochner, 1982;
Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985; Babiker, Cox & Miller, 1982; Church, 1982). Torbiorn (1982, as cited in Black, Mendenhall, & Oddou, 1991) further noted that cultural distance has its largest impact on sojourners during the first two years of their overseas stays and then diminishes somewhat. In addition, the presence and the adjustment of the sojourner’s family members constitute major factors in the success of international assignments (Black, Mendenhall, & Oddou, 1991).

**Cognitive-Affective-Behavioral Model**

Cui and Awa (1992) attempted to integrate various theories about the factors underlying an individual’s intercultural effectiveness by applying a cognitive-affective-behavioral framework to the construct. The underlying cognitive factors considered include language skills and interpersonal skills. The affective factor considered is empathy, and the behavioral factors include social interaction and managerial ability. Their results indicated that these factors were related empirically in addition to being related conceptually. In addition, personality traits (patience and flexibility) played a dominant role in determining intercultural effectiveness (Cui & Awa, 1992; Cui, van den Berg, & Jiang, 1997).

**Personality Factors Associated with Intercultural Adjustment**

Personality traits have been emphasized as important for intercultural competence in many studies, but their effects have rarely been researched vis-à-vis other behavioral attributes (Nicassio & Saral, 1981, as cited in Cui & Awa, 1992). However, Harris (1977) performed a study of American Peace Corps volunteers stationed in the South Pacific. Using lengthy interviews, and later information about which volunteers succeeded at high levels, succeeded at lower levels, or terminated early, he developed a set of 24 variables that were capable of discriminating these groups. These factors included coverage of content, responsibility, facility
with language, knowledge of subject, talents at assignment, extracurricular interest, adaptability, nature of assignment, cultural sensitivity, interest in nationals, realism of goals, acceptance of authority, agreement and compromise, inner strengths, self-reliance, patience, tolerance, perseverance, initiative, reliability, courtesy, cooperation, friendliness, general maturity, frequency of behavior problems, and overall evaluation by staff members.

Personality tests such as the MMPI™, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey™, the Gordon Personal Profile, the Edwards Personal Preference Scale, the Thematic Apperception Test™, and the Rorschach Inkblot Test™ have been studied as predictors of successful intercultural adaptation by the Peace Corps, but they were found to have little predictive validity in terms of the successful completion of assignments. Eventually, all assessment tests of personality had been dropped from the Peace Corps’ volunteer evaluation process (Harris, 1973).

Ruben and Kealey (1979, as cited in Hannigan, 1990) found a factor entitled Orientation to Knowledge to be the most accurate of seven communication behaviors in predicting culture shock, the strength of which can be seen as the extent to which a person lacks intercultural competence. Orientation to Knowledge is an attitudinal factor describing how a person perceives beliefs, values, and knowledge – as applicable to everyone generally, or as applicable only to the individual holding those beliefs, values, and knowledge.

Hammer (1987) described a similar attitudinal characteristic that he found to be important in intercultural effectiveness. He stressed the importance for the individual to have a nonjudgmental attitude when interacting with other cultures. Along the same lines, research supports the idea that an attitude of respect for the new culture is an important component of intercultural competence (Hawes & Kealey, 1981; Hanvey, 1976, as cited in Hannigan, 1990). In addition, Harris (1977) demonstrated that the traits of patience, tolerance, courtesy, and interest
in people of the foreign culture predict success of Peace Corps volunteers at adjusting effectively to their new overseas environments.

Cultural empathy, or the ability to clearly show one’s interest in other people and to form and reflect a fairly accurate sense of other people’s thoughts, feelings, and experiences was shown to have a significant effect on intercultural competence by Ruben (1976, as cited in Hannigan, 1990) and Cleveland, Mangone, and Adams (1960). Kealey (1989) found a similar construct, cross-cultural understanding, to have a significant effect on what he termed “cross-cultural effectiveness.”

**The Theory behind the ICME**

According to Jenkins and Vivero (1998), contact with an unfamiliar culture can result in positive, negative, and neutral consequences for the individual. Positive consequences include an increased interest and appreciation of customs that are foreign to one’s own, social advantages, such as an increase in cognitive flexibility when dealing with new situations, and a greater tendency to perceive differences between people as positive. Neutral consequences include multilingual skills, cross-cultural codeswitching skills, or the ability to change one’s general frame of reference to more closely mirror that of the target culture, and deculturation, or the loss of one’s sense of belonging to one’s cultural group. Negative consequences include feelings of shame or self-blame when confused about how to act in the new cultural context, feelings of being unique and misunderstood, and perceiving differences between people as negative.

Jenkins and Vivero’s theory about the consequences of multicultural experiences as used to develop the ICME self-report questionnaire to measure the abilities and effects mentioned above (Jenkins & Vivero, 1998). Many of the characteristics or experiences delineated by Jenkins and Vivero’s (1998) theory and measured by the ICME have been shown by previous
studies to be influential on intercultural adaptability. For instance, the five important factors in intercultural adaptability distilled from the international business literature by Black, Mendenhall, and Oddou (1991) are predeparture training, previous overseas experience, organizational selection criteria and mechanisms, individual skills, and nonwork factors.

The ICME is similar in that it measures the effects of previous intercultural experience as well as the individual’s perception of his or her skills. However, unlike most measures developed for the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of international business training for overseas assignments, the ICME does not specifically measure predeparture training in a specific host country’s culture and language. Rather, it assumes that individuals who possess certain underlying abilities will be equipped to assimilate the new cultural information quickly and with minimum discomfort. This assumption has been strongly supported in the literature (e.g., Chen, 1987; Cui & Awa, 1992; Cui, van den Berg, & Jiang, 1997; Harris, 1977; Martin, 1987). This makes the ICME ideal for the purpose of evaluating the change in students’ intercultural attitudes and experiences in relation to participation in a culture-general multicultural college course.

Items on the ICME also coincide with Ruben and Kealey’s (1986, as cited in Lewthwaite, 1996) theory that cultural adaptation is a learning process that is based on a combination of communication skills and behavioral adaptation to the new culture’s norms. The ICME, while not directly measuring the specific communications and behaviors necessary in the specific host country, measures the underlying attributes upon which the specific skills are likely to be based. These include a high level of comfort with and tolerance for the cultural differences of others, the feeling of being accepted by more than one ethnic or cultural group, rapid learning based on observing others, cognitive flexibility across cultures, the ability to quickly switch cultural frameworks (including language when relevant), and effective communication skills.
However, the ICME is unique in its measurement of the individual’s previous experience with being a minority. This information is important for predicting intercultural adaptability because having had the experience of being a minority suggests that the individual has already had both the opportunity for, and the necessity of, developing at least some of the multifaceted skills required for successful intercultural adaptation.

The current repeated-measures study of students’ intercultural experiences and attitudes while enrolled in multicultural college courses utilized the ICME to measure the positive, neutral, and negative consequences of exposure to unfamiliar cultures, with the expectation that the guided encounters typical of classroom learning will lead to an increase in the positive skills without a significant increase in the possible negative consequences of becoming aware of other cultures’ ways of living. The Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) Scale was used to assess participants’ attitudes about the rights of one or more groups to dominate others in terms of power. Both instruments were administered at the beginning and the end of the semester with the goal of observing how these constructs changed upon completion of the course. In addition, a pretest demographics questionnaire and a posttest experiences questionnaire were administered. Finally, a qualitative, one-on-one interview was conducted by the examiner with those students who volunteered for this extra step in the data collection process. The questions in the interview elicited participants’ opinions about whether the questionnaires successfully captured their intercultural attitudes and experiences and their suggestions for improvement.

It was hypothesized that individual and overall scores on the three Positive ICME subscales (Cross-Cultural Interest, Social Advantages, and Positive Feelings about Differences) would be higher at the posttest administration for the multicultural classes. Scores on the three Neutral (Cross-Cultural Codeswitching, Multilingual Skills, and Deculturation) and the three
Negative (Shame and Self-Blame, Feeling Misunderstood, and Negative Feelings about Differences) ICME scales were not expected to change significantly from Time 1 to Time 2. In addition, it was hypothesized that SDO scores would be lower at Time 2 for the multicultural classes. SDO scores were expected to be negatively related to all nine of the ICME subscales. It was also anticipated that women would score higher on the three Positive ICME subscales and the overall Positive ICME scale than men, and that men would score higher than women on the SDO at both administrations.

Method

Participants

Two hundred ninety undergraduate college students from the University of North Texas participated in the study. Two hundred two of these students comprised the multicultural course group and attended a semester of one of the university’s core Global Studies, Cross-Cultural, and Diversity courses for the fall 2001 semester. The control group consisted of 88 UNT undergraduates who were enrolled in a general psychology class, and who were not simultaneously enrolled in any core multicultural class. Ninety-one men (32.8%) and 199 women (66.2%) participated in this study. Participants’ ages ranged from 18 to 50 years, with 95% falling within the range of 18 to 34 years old ($M = 20.9$). One hundred ten (54.7%) participants reported no previous instances in which they had experienced significant cultural minority status. Minority experiences were considered significant if they lasted over three months. The remaining 45.3% of participants reported between one and eight separate minority experiences ($N = 180$) (Table 1). Ninety-eight participants completed both waves of data collection.
Materials

Life Experiences Questionnaire

At Time 1, participants were given a ten-question paper-and-pencil survey of their previous ethnic and cultural experiences. Examples include family traditions, important intercultural relationships, travel, and perceived frequency of intercultural contact (Appendix A).

Demographics Questionnaire

At Time 1, participants were given a short demographics questionnaire containing questions about their gender, age, race, nationality, past geographic moves, and current amount of contact with individuals from a different race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, or sexual orientation from the respondent’s own (Appendix B).

The Inventory of the Consequences of Multicultural Experiences (ICME)

At both Times 1 and 2, participants completed the ICME, a self-report questionnaire that contains 77 items and consists of three scales, each comprised of three subscales: the Positive scale and its attendant subscales (Cross-Cultural Interest, Social Advantages, and Positive Feelings about Differences), the Neutral scale and subscales (Cross-Cultural Codeswitching, Multilingual Abilities, and Deculturation), and the Negative scale and subscales (Shame and Self-Blame, Feeling Unique and Misunderstood, and Negative Feelings about Differences) (Jenkins & Vivero, 1998).

The Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) Scale

At Times 1 and 2, participants will receive Sidanius, Pratto, and Mitchell’s (1993) SDO scale, which includes 16 items on the respondent’s attitudes about the rights of one or more groups to dominate others in terms of power.
Procedure

This study was briefly presented by the experimenter to the students in each of the target classes within the first two week of the fall 2001 semester. It was explained that this study was intended to measure various life experiences and ways of thinking about the world and to determine whether and how these change over the course of the semester. The procedure, rights of participants, and means of ensuring confidentiality were explained in detail. In addition, students were informed that all participants would be entered into a drawing for one $100.00, one $50.00, and one $25.00 cash prize, to be completed at the end of the semester. In addition, students who were enrolled in a psychology course were offered extra credit for participating in the study.

Those who chose to participate in this study were given packets containing a consent form that provided details of the study, participants’ rights, and protection of confidentiality, the Life Experiences Questionnaire, the ICME, the SDO Scale, and a short demographics questionnaire, in that order. They were instructed not to write their names anywhere on the packets. Instead, each individual’s Times 1 and 2 scored were yoked together using a four-digit number of the participant’s choosing. It was suggested to the participants that they use the final four digits of their social security numbers, but they were free to use any four-digit number that they would remember. Verbal and written instructions informed participants that, by completing and returning their questionnaires, they confirmed their understanding of and agreement with the conditions of the study and their rights as participants.

Participants completed their packets at that time. Most students completed the Time 1 packet in about 40 minutes although times ranged from 25 minutes to an hour. Upon completion of the forms, participants turned them in to the examiner, wrote their names and contact
information on a separate piece of paper if they chose to be entered in the raffle, and were free to depart. Contact information was always kept separately from responses to protect participants’ confidentiality.

Time 2 packets were administered during or immediately after the class period of each target class within the final two weeks of the fall 2001 semester. These contained a short posttest experiences questionnaire, the ICME, and the SDO. The experimenter briefly described the study, the rights of participants, and confidentiality, and asked students to write their four-digit number from the first wave of data collection on their packets. In addition, she asked for volunteers to participate in a ten-minute face-to-face interview about their perceptions of the study, to be completed upon turning in their questionnaires.

When all questionnaires had been handed in, students could write their contact information on a separate piece of paper (kept apart from all responses) for the raffle drawing, and were free to leave. Only 8 students from the psychology course and 5 students from the multicultural courses volunteered to do the face-to-face interview with the examiner. They all reported that their questionnaires captured their intercultural experiences and attitudes well. None reported any information about their experiences and attitudes that was not captured by the questionnaires. The most frequent suggestions for improvement of the study were that it be shortened \( (n = 10) \), that the questions were repetitive \( (n = 4) \), and that some questions were confusing \( (n = 2) \).

Results

The initial screening of demographic, predictor, and outcome variables indicated that they fell within acceptable limits of the assumptions associated with each statistical analysis performed, namely linearity, normality, and homoscedasticity. The exceptions to this were the
Time 1 ICME Deculturation subscale, the Times 1 and 2 ICME Multilingual subscale, the Time 2 SDO measure, minority status experience, and age, all of which were positively skewed. Outliers for these variables were recoded to fall within three standard deviations of the mean. In addition, a square root transformation was performed on age so that its distribution better met the requirement of normality.

**Attrition Analyses**

Of the 290 participants, 98 had valid data for both Time 1 and Time 2. Eighty-eight participated in Time 1 only, and 104 participated in Time 2 only. Chi-square or t-tests for independent samples were performed in order to identify any differences in attrition between the experimental and control groups, male versus female gender, experience of significant minority status versus lack of minority status experience, and participants of various ages. Results indicated that gender, age, group, and minority status were not significantly different between those who withdrew from or joined the study and those who participated in both waves of data collection. However, a three-way chi-square analysis revealed that men and women withdrew at different rates from the study depending on whether they were in the experimental or the control group, with men in the control group having a higher rate of attrition than men in the experimental group or women in either group ($\chi^2 = 14.13$, $p<.01$) (Table 3). In fact, only two men in the control group participated in both waves of data collection. All of the following analyses were performed on the 98 participants who had valid data for both Time 1 and Time 2.

**Group Differences**

Chi-square analyses and t-tests for independent samples were conducted to assess whether the gender, age, and minority status of participants in the control and experimental groups were distributed roughly equally. The analyses showed that there was a significantly
larger proportion of females in the control group (79.0%) than the experimental group (61.6%), ($\chi^2 \ (3) = 14.13, p < .01$), (Table 2). In addition, the mean age of participants in the experimental group ($M = 22.17$) was significantly higher than that of the control group ($M = 18.64, t \ (92.2) = -5.36, p < .001$). Finally, the students in the multicultural core classes had significantly more minority status experience upon entering the courses ($M = .53$) than those in the general classes ($M = .27, t \ (96.0) = -2.13, p = .036$).

**Associations among the Demographic and Predictor Variables**

There were no significant associations among gender, age, and minority status. Men tended to have higher scores than women on the ICME Cross-Cultural Codeswitching, Multilingual, and Unique and Misunderstood subscales at Time 1. At Time 2, women tended to score higher than men on the ICME Shame and Self-Blame subscale. Men also scored higher on the Neutral ICME scales at Time 1. There were no significant associations between age and any of the ICME scales or subscales at either Time 1 or Time 2. Participants who had reported significant minority status experience scored higher on the ICME Cross-Cultural Interest and Multilingual subscales, as well as on the Neutral ICME subscales at both Time 1 and Time 2.

**Associations among Predictor Variables**

At Time 1, the three positive ICME subscales (Cross-Cultural Interest, Social Advantages, and Positive Feelings about Differences) were significantly positively correlated with each other ($r = .55, p < .001; r = .53, p < .001; r = .63, p < .001$) and with the overall Positive scale of the ICME ($r = .83, p < .001; r = .84, p < .001; r = .86, p < .001$) (Table 4). The three neutral ICME subscales (Cross-Cultural Codeswitching, Multilingual, and Deculturation) were significantly positively correlated with each other ($r = .35, p < .001; r = .45, p < .001; r = .31, p < .001$) and with the overall Neutral scale of the ICME ($r = .74, p < .001; r = .80, p < .001; r = .73, p < .001$)
The three negative ICME subscales (Shame and Self-Blame, Unique and Misunderstood, and Negative Feelings about Differences) were significantly positively correlated with each other ($r = .42, p < .001; r = .54, p < .001; r = .46, p < .001$) and with the overall Negative scale of the ICME ($r = .82, p < .001; r = .80, p < .001; r = .80, p < .001$) (Table 6). In addition, the overall Positive ICME and Neutral ICME scales were significantly positively associated with one another ($r = .33, p = .001$), as were the overall Negative and Neutral ICME scales ($r = .45, p < .001$) (Table 7). SDO scores were negatively correlated with positive feelings about differences, feelings of shame and self-blame, negative feelings about differences, and overall Negative ICME scores (Tables 6 and 7).

**Tests of Hypotheses**

A 2 X 2 X 3 (group by time by scale) repeated-measures MANCOVA with minority status as the covariate was performed on the data to determine whether Positive ICME, Negative ICME, and/or SDO scores changed differently for the control and experimental groups between Time 1 and Time 2, with minority status experience controlled. Results indicated that there was a significant main effect for minority status experience as a covariate ($F(3,88) = 4.385, p = .006$). Main effects for group and time were not significant ($F(3,88) = 1.230, p = .304$ and $F(3,88) = 2.129, p = .102$, respectively). Interaction effects between time and minority status experience and between time and group were not statistically significant ($F(3,88) = 1.177, p = .323$ and $F(3,88) = 1.197, p = .315$, respectively). (Table 8 contains a list of mean changes in ICME and SDO scores.)

1) It was hypothesized that Time 2 scores would be significantly greater than Time 1 scores on the Positive ICME scale and subscales, while scores on the Neutral and Negative ICME scales and subscales would not change significantly from Time 1 to
Time 2. Paired-sample t-tests indicated that this was not the case. No significant differences were found between Positive or Neutral ICME scores on the two administrations. However, interestingly, scores on the Negative ICME subscale Negative Feelings about Differences decreased significantly ($t(97) = 3.80, p < .001$).

2) It was expected that Time 2 scores would be significantly lower than Time 1 scores on the SDO. A unidirectional paired-sample t-test revealed that the data did not support this hypothesis ($t(97) = -1.68, p = .096$).

3) It was hypothesized that women would score higher than men on the Positive ICME scale and subscales at both administrations. However, a one-way ANOVA did not indicate any significant differences between women and men on the Positive ICME scale or subscales.

4) It was expected that men would score higher than women on the SDO at both administrations. The data supported this hypothesis for both Time 1 ($F(1,94) = 30.54, p < .001$) and Time 2 ($F(1,94) = 16.01, p < .001$).

5) It was hypothesized that individuals with previous experience as a racial, ethnic, or cultural minority would score higher on all ICME scales and subscales and lower on the SDO than individuals without such previous experience. One-way ANOVAs revealed that the data supported this hypothesis for the positive ICME subscale Cross-Cultural Interest at both Time 1 ($F(1,95) = 5.59, p = .02$) and Time 2 ($F(1,95) = 7.79, p = .006$), and for the overall Positive ICME scale at Time 1 ($F(1,95) = 3.95, p = .05$) and Time 2 ($F(1,95) = 3.89, p = .05$). However, analyses of the other ICME scales and subscales and the SDO did not show any significant differences between those who had experienced minority status and those who had not.
Finally, it was expected that the Positive and Neutral ICME scale and subscale scores would be negatively correlated with SDO scores. This was true for the overall Positive ICME scale at Time 2 ($r = -.273, p < .001$), the subscale Positive Feelings about Differences at Time 1 ($r = -.205, p < .05$) and Time 2 ($r = -.280, p = .002$), and Cross-Cultural Interest at Time 2 ($r = -.260, p = .004$). The other Positive and Neutral ICME scale and subscale scores were not significantly associated with SDO scores at either administration.
DISCUSSION

The main focus of this study was the changes in students’ intercultural experiences and attitudes before and after attending either a multicultural or a general college course. Two major complications affected data collection and likely also the results. First, the September 11th attacks on the United States occurred during the first wave of data collection, which was then stopped. Ethical concerns for participants’ emotional welfare during this traumatic time prevented the researcher from probing them about their intercultural attitudes and experiences. Therefore, several classes that were scheduled to participate in the study were not included in the data collection. This reduced the number of participants by approximately half, and it decreased the diversity of courses from eight to four in the multicultural course group and from four to one in the control group.

The use of one course alone for the control group is of particular concern, especially as the subject of the class was psychology. It may be imagined that students who are interested in the field of psychology would tend to have a higher interest in other people and their similarities and differences. In addition, the instructor of this particular psychology course included discussion of cultural differences as a part of the course curriculum. Therefore, the control group in this study may not have been representative of the other non-multicultural-core classes at the University of North Texas, and any true differences on the parts of the participants in each of the two conditions may have been weakened by the limited composition of the control group.

Not only did the September 11th attacks curtail the Time 1 data collection, but they must certainly have had an effect on students’ reports of their intercultural attitudes. This may explain why the Positive Inventory of the Consequences of Multicultural Experiences (ICME) scale and
subscale scores did not increase significantly and the Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) scores did not decrease significantly over the course of the semester for either group.

In addition, the repeated-measures design combined with the relatively short time frame of the intervention may have influenced the results. Participants who attended a multicultural course may have been made more aware of prejudices held inadvertently and may have grown to perceive their intercultural skills and attitudes more negatively as a part of the healthy growth process toward true intercultural awareness and appreciation (Bennett, 1986), when they will again assess their skills and attitudes as positive. This developmental process may have masked some of the true effects of the multicultural courses, potentially accounting for the findings that Positive ICME scale and subscale scores did not increase significantly and SDO scores did not decrease significantly after the intervention.

The second complication which may have affected the results of the study was that of group differences in demographics and attrition. In particular, the fact that only two men in the control group participated in both waves of data collection precludes the interpretation of the multivariate analyses. When gender and group were analyzed simultaneously, the strikingly unbalanced cell numbers confounded experimental group and gender, thus complicating any interpretation of group differences.

Further differences between multicultural and control groups may have affected results. For instance, a larger percentage of women participated in the control that the multicultural group. As it was hypothesized that women, having experienced minority power status, would respond more similarly to those who had experienced cultural minority status, the disproportionately larger number of women in the control group may have masked the predicted differences between those who had experienced minority status and those who had not,
especially since there was a significantly larger percentage of minority status individuals in the multicultural course group.

Also, the mean age of participants in the multicultural group exceeded that of the control group. If we assume that higher age means more experience in general, and the probability of more multicultural experience, then the apparent lack of attitudinal change in the treatment group could be at least partially explained by the greater relative experience held by members upon entering the course. Furthermore, students in the multicultural courses had significantly more minority status experience at the beginning of the class. For the reasons, members of the multicultural course group may have demonstrated more advanced attitudes at Time 1, thus preempting the effects of the training intervention.

Although there were no significant associations between age and any of the ICME scales or subscales at either Time 1 or Time 2, higher numbers of significant minority status experiences were associated with higher scores on the ICME Cross-Cultural Interest, Positive Feelings about Differences, Cross-Cultural Codeswitching, Multilingual, Deculturation, and Unique and Misunderstood subscales, as well as on the overall Positive, Neutral, and Negative ICME scales at both administrations. In other words, at both waves of data collection, people who were more interested in other cultures reported having more intercultural experiences, those with more intercultural experiences were more likely to perceive differences as positive, were more skilled at switching between cultural contexts, were able to speak more languages, were less likely to identify completely with their native culture, and felt like their own cultural differences make them difficult for others to understand at times. Those with more experience as a minority reported more of the social advantages that come with this experience than those with less minority experience. This was the case at Time 1, but not at Time 2.
Finally, attrition is an issue. Men and women withdrew from the study at different rates depending on whether they were in the multicultural or the control group, with men in the control group having a higher rate of attrition than men in the multicultural course group or women in either group. As it was predicted that women (as a power minority) would answer more similarly than men to those who had experienced significant minority status, this pattern of attrition could have allowed gender differences to mask true differences in reported attitudes between the groups.

The higher rate of attrition for men in the control group combined with the fact that only two men in this group participated in both waves of data collection makes any interpretation of gender differences by group mathematically illegitimate. For example, at Time 1, men reported more flexibility at changing their cultural frame of reference, more multilingual abilities, and more feelings of being special in a negative way than women did. However, it seems likely that the responses of the 30 men who took a multicultural course, whose members reported more multicultural experience and more significant minority status experience, and who had taken more multicultural courses in the past, probably outweighed the answers of the two men from the control group. Interestingly, men’s and women’s responses were not significantly different for these scales at Time 2.

At Time 2, women tended to score higher than men on the ICME Shame and Self-Blame subscale, which indicates that they may have internalized negative feelings that arise from becoming more aware of one’s own prejudices and the ways that they affect others. Again, it is possible that this effect of gender was confounded by the attrition of men from the control group.

At Time 1, SDO scores were negatively correlated with positive feelings about differences, feelings of shame and self-blame, negative feelings about differences, and overall
Positive and Negative ICME scale scores. Participants with higher social dominance orientations tended to report fewer positive feelings about intercultural differences, and, interestingly, felt fewer feelings of embarrassment about their own cultural differences from others. It is also surprising that higher levels of social dominance orientation were associated with fewer negative feelings about differences and lower scores on the Negative ICME scale at Time 1. Perhaps these findings indicate that, when thinking about cultural differences, people with higher levels of social dominance attitudes consider their own culture to be the norm of which others fall short.

While the current study was severely limited by the tremendous historical effect of the September 11th attacks on the United States and by unequal attrition of men and women in the control and multicultural groups, several hypotheses were corroborated. First, men scored higher than women on the SDO scale at both administrations. It is unlikely that this result has been confounded by the differential attrition of men and women; in fact, since more men left the study from the control than the multicultural group, attrition would be predicted to have the opposite effect on the data, if anything, lessening the strength of this finding.

Secondly, minority status experience was associated with higher scores on the Positive ICME scale at Times 1 and 2, as well as with the positive ICME subscale Cross-Cultural Interest at both administrations. This suggests that previous experience as a minority coexisted with the perception of the beneficial effects of intercultural contact, particularly with interest in other cultures.

Finally, while the positive ICME subscale Social Advantages were not shown to be negatively correlated with social dominance attitudes at either administration, as was expected, the overall Positive ICME scale and the two remaining positive ICME subscales, Cross-Cultural Interest and Positive Feeling about Differences were. In other words, being interested in other
cultures and perceiving cultural differences in a positive light were both associated with fewer beliefs that one culture has the right to more power and resources than other cultures.

Overall, it is unclear what effects the September 11th attacks on the U.S., the differential rates of attrition between men and women in each group and other demographic factors, and the developmental effects of intercultural awareness combined with the short time span of the training intervention have had on the results of the current study. Therefore, the results should be interpreted with caution.

The ICME showed good internal consistency reliability, and it changed as predicted in several instances, providing some evidence of external validity as an appropriate measure for intercultural attitudes and experiences. Previous research also supports the ICME’s validity as a measure of intercultural attitudes and experiences (Jenkins & Vivero, 1999). Thus, it is likely that the ICME would be useful in future studies of this nature, especially those that escape large, disruptive historical effects, have appropriate numbers of participants, and have a more even pattern of attrition between genders and experimental groups.

In addition, future studies should examine the specific dimensions of the various courses tested, taking into account the types of multicultural training provided by each course. For instance, the proportions of each class dedicated to cognitive versus affective learning, the intercultural experiences and attitudes of the teacher, the number of times the class meets, and the duration of the course would all be interesting additions to the assessment of multicultural college courses.
### Table 1

**Number of Significant Minority Status Experiences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Experiences</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Significant minority status experiences include being a minority race for one’s native country, having parents of a minority race for one’s native country, moving to a foreign country (including the U.S., if not the country of birth), and living abroad for more than three months.

### Table 2

**Chi-square Comparison of the Distribution of Gender within Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Multicultural Course Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3

*Comparison of Frequencies of Men and Women by Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Multicultural Course Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1 and T2</td>
<td>T1 and T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4

*Associations among the Positive ICME Scale and Subscales at Time 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pos. ICME</th>
<th>X-Cult. Interest</th>
<th>Soc. Advantages</th>
<th>Pos. Feelings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pos. ICME</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.833**</td>
<td>.842**</td>
<td>.858**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-Cult. Interest</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.554**</td>
<td>.532**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc. Advantages</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.627**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos. Feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ** denotes alpha levels of less than 1%.
Table 5

**Associations among the Neutral ICME Scale and Subscales at Time 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Neutral ICME</th>
<th>X-Cult. Codeswitch</th>
<th>Multilingual</th>
<th>Deculturation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral ICME</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.736**</td>
<td>.803**</td>
<td>.729**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-Cult. Codeswitch</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.348**</td>
<td>.447**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilingual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deculturation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ** denotes alpha levels of less than 1%.

Table 6

**Associations among the Negative ICME Scale and Subscales and the SDO at Time 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Neg. ICME</th>
<th>Shame/Self-Blame</th>
<th>Misunderstood</th>
<th>Neg. Feelings</th>
<th>SDO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neg. ICME</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.815**</td>
<td>.797**</td>
<td>.797**</td>
<td>-.213*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame/Self-Blame</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.415**</td>
<td>.537**</td>
<td>-.235*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misunderstood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.456**</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg. Feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.201*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * denotes alpha levels of less than 5%, and ** denotes alpha levels of less than 1%.
Table 7

*Associations among the Overall ICME Scales and the SDO at Time 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pos. ICME</th>
<th>Neutral ICME</th>
<th>Neg. ICME</th>
<th>SDO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pos. ICME</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.334**</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>-.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral ICME</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.447**</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg. ICME</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.213*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * denotes alpha levels of less than 5%, and ** denotes alpha levels of less than 1%.
Table 8

*Changes in Mean ICME and SDO Scores over Time*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE ICME</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Interest</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Advantages</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feelings</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL ICME</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Codeswitch</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilingual Skills</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deculturation</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE ICME</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame/Self-Blame</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique/Misunderstood</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Feelings</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** denotes alpha levels of less than 1%.
APPENDIX A

LIFE EXPERIENCES QUESTIONNAIRE
1. When you were growing up, were the ethnic traditions of your family practiced in your home? (Check one.)
   ___ 0) No       ___ 1) Yes
   If yes, please describe:
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________

2. When you were growing up, were you significantly exposed to another culture or cultures? (e.g., by a neighbor, a close friend, a caretaker, etc.)
   ___ 0) No       ___ 1) Yes
   If yes, who was it?_____________________________________________________
   If yes, how long did you remain in significant contact with that person?________

3. How much time, if any, have you spent residing outside the country that you consider to be your home country? For each time period spent residing outside your home country:
   Where was that?    How long did you live there?    About how old were you?    For what purpose(s) did you live abroad?
   ___________________    ___________________    ___________________    ___________________
   ___________________    ___________________    ___________________    ___________________
   ___________________    ___________________    ___________________    ___________________

4. How frequently do you travel from your current country of residence to another country?______________________________________________

5. How frequently do you typically come into significant contact with people from a culture, ethnicity, and/or race different from your own?______________________________
Would you prefer the frequency of contact to (check one):

1) decrease  2) stay the same  3) increase

6. Where does this contact generally take place? (e.g., at school, work, your neighborhood, with friends, etc.)

7. What is it like for you to come into significant contact with people from a culture, ethnicity, and/or race different from your own? Describe a typical recent experience.

8. Is there any aspect of contact between yourself and people from another culture, ethnicity, and/or race that you wish could be improved? If so, what?

9. How many courses have you taken that meet the Cross-Cultural, Diversity, and Global Studies core requirement?

0) Only this course  1) One other course  2) Two or more courses

10. Would you have taken this course even if it did not meet a core course requirement?

0) No  1) Yes
APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
1. Age:____
2. Gender: ___0) Male ___1) Female
3. I am currently classified as a (Check one.):
   ___1) Freshman ___2) Sophomore ___3) Junior ___4) Senior
4. My current Grade Point Average (G.P.A.) at UNT is (Check one.):
   ___0) I have not yet received any grades at UNT.
   ___1) below 1.49
   ___2) between 1.5 and 1.99
   ___3) between 2.0 and 2.49
   ___4) between 2.5 and 2.99
   ___5) between 3.0 and 3.49
   ___6) above 3.49
5. What is your major at UNT?________________________________________________
6. Of which country or countries are you a citizen?________________________________
7. If you are a citizen of a country other than the United States of America, how long have
   you been in the U.S.?______________________________________________________
For each of the following people, please describe their race(s), ethnicity(ies), and country of birth, if you know. *Race* refers to a general, more inclusive category based on genetics, such as Asian, Black, Native American, Caucasian, etc. *Ethnicity* refers to a family’s cultural heritage, such as Jewish, Cherokee, Mexican, Kenyan, African-American, Italian, Irish-American, etc. Since people can have more than one race and/or ethnicity, list all that apply.

If you do not have this information, please answer, “Don’t know.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race(s)</th>
<th>Ethnicity(ies)</th>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Yourself:</td>
<td>___USA</td>
<td>__Other: ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_____________</td>
<td>________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Spouse/Significant Other:</td>
<td>___USA</td>
<td>__Other: ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_____________</td>
<td>________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Your Father (who raised you):</td>
<td>___USA</td>
<td>__Other: ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_____________</td>
<td>________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Your Mother (who raised you):</td>
<td>___USA</td>
<td>__Other: ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_____________</td>
<td>________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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