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**Introduction and Background Information**

Table Wisdom is a two-fold program which aims to reduce social isolation in elderly adults and help international students become better-prepared for academic life in America. It does this by pairing incoming international students with mature adults for informal mentoring and conversational English sessions.

As of 2016 the number of international students enrolled in the United States exceeded 1.4 million, which constitutes 5.2% of students in higher education (Institute of International Education, 2016). According to a report by Population Reference Bureau, there are approximately 46 million mature adults (adults over the age of 65) in the United States (Mather, Jacobsen & Pollard, 2015). According to Strauss, Tranel, & Caddell (2013:2) annually 3,000 - 6,000 foreign-born immigrants make their way to St. Louis Metropolitan Statistical Region (MSA) each year. U.S. Census Bureau indicates that the ratio of foreign-borns is 6.7% of the population in St. Louis. Saint Louis University alone attracts nearly 1,000 students from 78 countries across the globe (Saint Louis University, 2017). In accordance with the data provided by Think Health website, a data dashboard that provides health and demographic statistics for the St. Louis region, 176,458 people are above the age 65 and this number comprise 17.56% of the population in St. Louis. If one expands this age group and includes 55-64-year-olds, as Table Wisdom program does, the number almost doubles to 318,972 and the ratio dramatically rises to 31.74%.

**Literature Review**

Research has shown that international students are prone to experience difficulties due to a variety of factors including language and cultural barriers, psychological problems, racial discrimination, loss of social support and alienation (Yeh & Inose, 2003). In comparison with American students, international students are more likely to experience psychological problems (Leong and Chou, 1996; Mori, 2000; Padilla et al., 1986; Pedersen, 1991; Sandhu & Asrabadi, 1994). However, Mori (2000) addresses that among all other challenges international students experience language is the most challenging one (Lin & Yi, 1997; Yeh & Inose, 2003). Andrade (2006) also identifies language as one of the most significant academic and social adjustment factors for international students. Linguistic impediments make it difficult for international students to sustain their academic standing, which in turn, hinder their psychological adaptation (Lin & Yi, 1997; Pedersen, 1991). Furthermore, difficulties with English prevent international students comfortably socially interact with their classmates (Yeh & Inose, 2003; Hayes & Ling, 1994). In a nutshell, international students experience many difficulties, especially because of linguistic and cultural barriers, that may eventually affect their social acclimatization, academic standing, and psychology in an adverse manner.

Sherry, Thomas & Chui (2010) refer to international students as a vulnerable student population for similar reasons affirmed above. A survey they conducted on 121 students at the University of Toledo confirmed that language and cultural integration hinder international students’ ability to develop a cultural understanding, adjust to a new culture and lead to social exclusion (Sherry, Thomas & Chui, 2010). As a result of their exploration, Sherry, Thomas & Chui (2010) recommend a number of improvements for the university, including a formation of informal English speaking groups to bolster international students’ confidence and language skills. Yeh & Inose’s (2003) study of 372 international students from 77 countries, in a parallel fashion, confirms that language plays a significant role on acculturative distress, meaning that international students with higher self-reported English levels have higher levels of social interactions and have higher academic performance. In this regard, one of Yeh & Inose’s (2003) suggestions is initiating counselling services for international students bolstering social networks to prevent acculturative distress. In this regard, a bulk of literature indicate that the challenges international students experience can be overcome by introducing social and language services and programs.

Social isolation, or absence of contact with other people (Victor et al, 2009), has been shown to have negative impacts on the health status of elderly people as well, according to a study in the United Kingdom (Hawton et al, 2011). This same study found that elderly people experiencing social isolation have significantly lower health statuses and health-related qualities of life (HRQL) than those in the UK general population of the same age. This holds true for elderly people across all ages, genders, and health statuses prior to being socially isolated. This is particularly concerning considering the proportion of older people in the population is increasing, and people over the age of 65 years are at greater risk of social isolation (Victor et al, 2003). In addition to physical health related consequences, social isolation might also lead to severe psychological effects such as depression and even suicide (Findlay 2003; Pettigrew 2007). Toepoel (2013) indicates that because aging and social isolation have such negative repercussions, it is extremely important to treat and prevent social exclusion among older individuals.

In connection with physical and psychological health consequences of isolation, it is highly costly for governments and individuals due to higher healthcare costs arising from isolation (Toepoel 2013). Additionally, as the baby boom generation starts to get older and birth-rates continue to fall, this will continue to put further pressure on budgets especially in terms of public expenditure on medical care for this cohort (Toepoel 2013). Bowling & Gabriel (2004) suggest that improving quality of life for mature adults is a way that might abate such medical costs. In this respect, it is also in the government’s interest to find a solution to social isolation of elderly people in order to reduce public expenditure on high medical costs.

Further study from Thomas Glass et al (1999) shows that three kinds of activities – social, fitness, and productive – can lower the risk of mortality and extend the lifespan of elderly adults. Social activity consists of activities that put someone in contact with other people, such as attending church, travelling, or playing cards and board games. Fitness activities include physical and exercise activities such as walking or active sports. Productive activities include activities such as gardening, cooking, and volunteer work. Participation in any three types of activities were equally effective in reducing mortality in elderly people. For the purposes of this literature review, it’s most important to note that elderly people who had a high level of participation in social activity had a 53.7% mortality rate after 13 years; elderly people who had a low participation rate in social activities had a 74% mortality rate after 13 years. This is a 20.3% decrease in the mortality rate between elderly people who have a low participation in social activities and those that have a high participation in social activities (Glass et al, 1999).

Rowe & Kahn (1998) indicate that continuous social activities are pivotal for “successful aging”. Based on analysis of data on 3,005 people between the ages of 57 and 85 from the National Social Life, Health, and Aging Project (NSHAP), Cornwell, Laumann & Schumm (2008) reveal that old age and smaller social networks are positively correlated and people who involve in voluntary activities have larger interpersonal social networks. Vera Toepoel (2013) similarly reflects on the role of leisure activities on social connectedness through 5,901 mature adults and one of the most interesting findings of this research is that programs facilitating intergenerational contact may be more useful in mitigating social isolation. Toepoel (2013) recommends that local communities to utilize connections between voluntary work and social inclusion and introduce social programs enhancing lives of elderly people.

Taken together, these studies clearly show several major findings for both international students and elderly people. Initially, literature reveals that international students experience many challenges during their studies abroad mainly due to language and cultural barriers. Due to such challenges, their academic standing and psychology is negatively affected. However, the literature suggests that through counselling services and social activities, it is possible to remove social isolation of these students. Similarly, social isolation can have serious negative consequences on the overall health of elderly people. However, participating in social activities, especially ones involving intergenerational contact, can improve the health and increase the lifespan of elderly people hence decrease governmental and individual spending on healthcare. Table Wisdom is a program that brings both international students and elderly people to the table. In this respect, it delivers international students necessary linguistic and cultural support to alleviate depression and social exclusion and at the same time it provides elderly participants – the mentors – with an opportunity for regular and consistent social interaction with other people, thus potentially leading to healthier, happier and longer lives.

**Methods**

Using video conferencing technology (i.e. FaceTime or Skype), we surveyed a total of six out of the ten current participants in the Table Wisdom program: two mentees and four mentors. Each participant was given two surveys: a retrospective pre-test and a mid-participation survey (detailed below).

Collection of two types of data for each of the two participant groups were useful in assessing the impact of the program. Ideally, a pre-participation survey would be given to participants before they begin the program. The pre-participation survey should gauge not only the prior condition of the participants with respect to factors this program is aimed at affecting, but also attitudes and expectations of the participants anticipating involvement in the program (Kormos & Csizér, 2008). However, since all participants had already begun their participation, we opted to use a retrospective pre-test for both mentees and mentors. For students and mentors already participating in the program at the time these protocols are adopted, a retrospective pre-test can be administered to substitute for true pre-test data (Davis, 2002). We then used a mid-participation survey to gauge their current attitudes regarding the program and their ongoing participation.

A separate survey should be used to evaluate the progress of participants in the specific factors that the program is seeking to influence. It should be compatible with the section of the pre-test dealing with these factors and can be administered more than once during the course of participation in the program at an interval consistent with the reporting needs of program directors.

The stated evaluation goals for the program received by this evaluation team were:

1. Are the Table Wisdom students better prepared academically and living in St. Louis?
2. Did the mentors find the volunteer activity purposeful?
3. How many developed meaningful relationships (i.e. became friends)?
4. What unexpected benefits, if any, did the students receive (eg less mental stress)? How about the mature adults?
5. How can we improve the program?
6. What quantifiable changes can be observed from the Table Wisdom students? (Below are examples):
7. Increased class participation
8. Increased number of non-Asian friends
9. Better preparation for career-related items (e.g. job interview, resume writing, etc)
10. Better acculturation to St. Louis

All of the above goals were accounted for in the final instrument(s). In addition, a general set of initial recommendations for the kinds of data both surveys should solicit is as follows:

Unique to the pre-test were questions meant to determine attitudes and expectations. For students, questions related to:

1) their view of American culture

2) their perception of the benefits of becoming proficient in English

3) their interest level in cultural products

4) confidence level in improving at English

5) their level of anxiety in using English in everyday interactions

6) their level of motivation.

For mentors, questions should relate to

1) their current level of social support/interaction

2) their general health

3) their disposition toward mentorship

4) their comfort level communicating with English learners

5) their perception of American culture relative to origin countries of potential mentees

6) their interest level in inter-generational communication.

In the case of retrospective pre-tests, many of the same questions could be asked while simply prefacing them with, “Before I started this program, I thought (or felt, etc.)...”

Questions common to both pre-tests and mid-/post-tests should relate directly to the goals of the program. The specifics of these question sets are largely contingent on further consultation with program directors, but follow the general format of inquiring about specific effects of participation on other aspects of daily life. For example, students can be asked to rate their improvement in listening comprehension in class while mentors may be asked about satisfaction levels during and after mentoring sessions.

Unique to mid-/post-tests are items requesting information from students about their individual mentors and from mentors about their individual students. These can be used to develop matching criteria for future participant pairs.

All surveys are of limited length, no more than 20 items. Translation services may be needed for some student surveys. Survey data should be stored for 3 - 5 years

**Results**

The following are examples of data collected from participants along with some possible interpretations of the qualitative portions. Because of the small cohort in this first population of participants, the quantitative data cannot be used to draw meaningful statistical conclusions. As data accumulate over time, across future cohorts, statistical analysis will become practical.

Mentor #1 Retro Pre-Test

Interviewer: Tell me about how you chose to participate in the program.

**Mentor:** Rey came to the Willows and gave a management-approved presentation during a longer meeting of residents.

Interviewer: Describe your expectations for the program before you started.

**Mentor:** I have been an ESL instructor for 20 years so I just expected Rey to provide me with students who want to learn English.

[Analysis: This mentor is already familiar with this kind of interaction. She may be considered an outlier for purposes of formulating recommendations. Table Wisdom also may wish to actively seek out mentors like her in the future.]

Interviewer: How much knowledge of your partner’s home country/culture did you have before starting the program?

**Mentor:** I’ve had 4 mentees, 3 from China whose culture I am familiar with, 1 from Costa Rica which I didn’t know much about but it is Hispanic so… (Interviewer note: meaning, I think, everyone has at least a decent idea what Central/South American cultures are about)

Interviewer: What concerned you most about working with international students before you started the program?

**Mentor:** Nothing. Been doing it a long time.

Interviewer: How much experience did you have with the program’s technology before you started?

**Mentor:** Skype was very new to me when I started.

Interviewer: How often did you expect/hope to meet with your program partner before you started? Why?

**Mentor:** Once per week because that is pretty standard.

[Analysis: This mentor, because of her experience, had no trouble managing 4 mentees. Table Wisdom may consider distinguishing clearly between mentors capable of this and mentors who might be overwhelmed]

|  |
| --- |
| **Before I started the program I thought…** |
| Mentorship, in general, provides great value to its recipients. **Strongly Agree** |
| Communicating with members of other generations came easily to me. **Agree** |
| Understanding features of other cultures could benefit me. **Strongly Agree** |
| People around the world were more alike than different. **Agree** |
| Learning English would be difficult if I did not already speak it. **Strongly Agree** |
| I interacted daily with many different people. **Agree** |
| There were people in my life I could count on when I needed help. **Strongly Agree** |
| My overall health was very good. **Agree** |

Mentor #1 Post-Test

Interviewer: How has your experience of the program compared to your expectations?

**Mentor:** Mixed results across the 4 different mentees.

Interviewer: Describe the effects of technology on the way you engage with your program partner.

**Mentor:** 3 of the mentees Skyped with me, the other in person. I am not happy with the technology because the tools I use, that I’ve developed over the years, don’t work on Skype (Ryan note: These are physical media she showed me. Maps, newspaper clippings, etc.)

[Analysis: This mentor preferred and often chose to conduct sessions in person. TableWisdom may consider whether and what guidelines are appropriate]

Interviewer: Has participating had any surprising effects for you?

**Mentor:** Not Applicable.

Interviewer: Have you met with your program partner as often as you think you should? Too seldom? Too often? Who has been more available, you or your partner?

**Mentor:** Some enough, some not enough. Two of the older mentees are already doctors.

Interviewer: How do you feel about continuing in the program? Would you recommend it to other experienced St. Louisans?

**Mentor:** Absolutely! I HAVE recommended it. Both of the other Willows residents, a male and a female, who are participating do not have ESL mentoring experience but are still enjoying it. The male was fine with Skype, the female was not. I would prefer mentees who have their own transportation so they can come to my house.

Interviewer: How would you improve any aspect of the program in order for you to recommend to your friends? Please choose all that apply.

* Mentee is a good listener
  + **Mentor:** My mentees were good listeners.
* Mentee offers to teach me his/her native language or a new skill (eg how to use Snapchat).
  + **Mentor:** None offered to teach me any of their language or computer skills, but I do ask about cultural things like Harvest Festivals, etc. to encourage conversation.
* Periodic get-togethers with local mentors
  + **Mentor:** N/A
* Other (please elaborate)
  + **Mentor:** The technology has to improve if I am going to use it.

[Analysis: There is a predictable level of resistance to the technology among some older adults. The can be addressed both through training and through improvement of the application.]

|  |
| --- |
| I understand and agree with the purpose of the Table Wisdom program. **Strongly Agree** |
| I feel I am positively affecting the lives of mentees since starting this program. **Strongly Agree** |
| Participating in this program has increased my overall level of social interaction. **Disagree** |
| I have become friends with my program partner(s). **Agree** |
| My beliefs about the home country of my program partner have changed since starting this program. **Disagree** |
| I have learned a lot about my program partner’s country or culture as a result of the program. **Agree** |
| I am more comfortable talking with someone who is not a native English speaker than before this program. **Disagree** |
| I find communicating with people from different generations enjoyable. **Strongly Agree** |
| My overall health has improved since beginning the program. **Disagree** |
| My mentoring has had a positive, useful effect on my program partner. **Agree** |

Mentor #2 Retro Pre-Test

Interviewer: Tell me about how you chose to participate in the program.

**Mentor:** I work with neighborhood programs for elder adults already. Met Rey out and about in those circles. He came and did a talk. I said, you know my background is Occupational Therapy with nonprofits so I believe if I’m going to recommend, I should try it out.

Interviewer: Describe your expectations for the program before you started.

**Mentor:** Expected to talk with mentee once a week for about an hour. I expected mutual convenient scheduling. Didn’t have specific topics, just what we both would be comfortable with. Didn’t know how long it would last, if just a month or more. I love to travel, love meeting people from other countries. I’m in awe of those who can speak multiple languages.

[Analysis: Mentor is already active and outgoing. These are good mentors to have in the program but they are in less need of additional social interaction than the elder population at large]

Interviewer: How much knowledge of your partner’s home country/culture did you have before starting the program?

**Mentor:** I already have a certain level of comfort because I’ve had many Chinese students at Wash U as professor of OT. I have had them to the house before. I have not been to china.

Interviewer: What concerned you most about working with international students before you started the program?

**Mentor:** nothing

Interviewer: How much experience did you have with the program’s technology before you started?

**Mentor:** I had skyped somewhat but not enough. Grandsons in California. Few times husband and I skyped. Comfortable enough to co-teach a class. Still things I have to work out.

Interviewer: How often did you expect/hope to meet with your program partner before you started? Why?

**Mentor:** Once a week, from information Rey gave when he did his talk.

[Analysis: The mentor is, comparatively, very familiar with the technology having come from an academic background where it is employed. She is also already comfortable with foreign students which may be an outlier]

|  |
| --- |
| **Before I started the program I thought…** |
| Mentorship, in general, provides great value to its recipients. **Strongly Agree** |
| Communicating with members of other generations came easily to me. **Strongly Agree** |
| Understanding features of other cultures could benefit me. **Strongly Agree** |
| People around the world were more alike than different. **Strongly Agree** |
| Learning English would be difficult if I did not already speak it. **Strongly Agree** |
| I interacted daily with many different people. **Strongly Agree** |
| There were people in my life I could count on when I needed help. **Strongly Agree** |
| My overall health was very good. **Strongly Agree** |

Mentor #2 Post-Test

Interviewer: How has your experience of the program compared to your expectations?

**Mentor:** I think it definitely met my expectations. I feel lucky with the student I got. She’s appreciative, academic, and personable. Not all mentors felt the same I think. We shared articles plus personal stuff. We went to a concert and had thanksgiving dinner. For them it’s very special they’ve seen it on TV.

Interviewer: Describe the effects of technology on the way you engage with your program partner.

**Mentor:** Skype is head and shoulders above phone for the nonverbal part ability. Also have access to tools and resources even paper and pen, dictionary. Doesn’t happen as easy face to face, but face to face is easier to understand and there aren’t glitches face to face. Skype has wonderful visuals, it’s the best for what the program is trying to do.

[Analysis: The mentor reveals information about fellow mentors. This is a potential evaluation avenue. The mentor balances pros and cons of the technology, which suggests the possibility of hybrid programming]

Interviewer: Has participating had any surprising effects for you?

**Mentor:** Skype is head and shoulders above phone for the nonverbal part ability. Also have access to tools and resources even paper and pen, dictionary. Doesn’t happen as easy face to face, but face to face is easier to understand and there aren’t glitches face to face. Skype has wonderful visuals, it’s the best for what the program is trying to do.

Interviewer: Have you met with your program partner as often as you think you should? Too seldom? Too often? Who has been more available, you or your partner?

**Mentor:** N/A (already answered)

Interviewer: How do you feel about continuing in the program? Would you recommend it to other experienced St. Louisans?

**Mentor:** Not only yes but have talked to many colleagues and different organizations about TableWisdom. There’s a new lifestyle magazine for over-50s looking for articles. I suggested Rey. Excitement. Have friends all over country who do this kind of thing, in community I talk about living with purpose and gusto. Volunteering key to successful aging. Taught computer to older adults. Lifelong learners do best. This is another version of that, makes you feel alive. Merge of tech and people of all ages love that part.

Interviewer: How would you improve any aspect of the program in order for you to recommend to your friends? Please choose all that apply.

* Mentee is a good listener
  + **Mentor:** Yes
* Mentee offers to teach me his/her native language or a new skill (eg how to use Snapchat).
  + **Mentor:** Hasn’t been skills, but I asked her about reading Chinese names and asked about her family and older adults in china. Interesting her reaction to my sharing about my family. Talked about millennials in china. More about culture.
* Periodic get-togethers with local mentors
  + **Mentor:**  this was smart =- different level, wasn’t long, good to be cohort. Might be hard to do more with travel. Willing but don’t feel the need.
* Other (please elaborate)
  + **Mentor:** Rey told me in January he would set me up with a student in California who never called. Said he’d follow up. Still nothing. Disappointment. Months later we ran into each other and he was sorry and said a new group of mentees was coming. Needs to be follow up on both ends and that happened this time. So that was improved. Really important. Maintain that. Needed to make sure people are a fit for each other. His goal in spring was mentors don’t pay but mentees did. Was always curious, asked my mentee, she said she was never asked to pay. He said later that was just a pilot idea. I have had questions about organization. They should tell us more about how program is growing, let us know to keep up, keep us abreast with little shout outs, awards, not too many. Share tidbits about things that have worked which he did once. Staying connected. Had tech issues, glitches that I figured out but other mentors probably not so able. Wash U has business school students who created a computer lab program for older adults. Make available info about skype for help. Work with libraries. Practical ideas. Table wisdom can take teaching role. Don’t expect older folks to know how to use and grow with the tech, they are not risk takers, they are all at different levels of skills, even students are all different. Some might need ideas, but the ideas we were given were antiquated so I didn’t use them. Setting up safeguards. Going into homes is potential danger, etc. for both mentees and mentors. People could take advantage. Background checks. Don’t wait for an incident to occur to enact a policy.

[Analysis: Mentee was willing to be patient while early bugs were worked out and wants increased connectedness to the program itself. If similar sentiments recur among other mentors, it is an opportunity for branding (of the non-cynical sort, of course)]

|  |
| --- |
| I understand and agree with the purpose of the Table Wisdom program. **Strongly Agree** |
| I feel I am positively affecting the lives of mentees since starting this program. **Strongly Agree** |
| Participating in this program has increased my overall level of social interaction. **Agree** |
| I have become friends with my program partner(s). **Strongly Agree** |
| My beliefs about the home country of my program partner have changed since starting this program. **No Opinion** |
| I have learned a lot about my program partner’s country or culture as a result of the program. **No Opinion** |
| I am more comfortable talking with someone who is not a native English speaker than before this program. **No Opinion** |
| I find communicating with people from different generations enjoyable. **Strongly Agree** |
| My overall health has improved since beginning the program. **Disagree** |
| My mentoring has had a positive, useful effect on my program partner. **Strongly Agree** |

Early interpretations are subject to error and should be taken with a grain of salt because of the small sample size, even in the case of qualitative data. As the stores of feedback and data grow, they will become increasingly useful and specific. Professional analysis should be employed when the total number of each type of participant, mentor and mentee, exceeds 30.

**Policy Recommendations**

Each step in the process of evaluating Table Wisdom program from its beginning until the very end made us reveal various points that needed to be addressed for a stronger and effective run of the program. In our first stakeholder meeting, one thing that immediately caught the attention of our group was the program’s vague selection criteria for its participants, especially its mentors. When we asked what the selection criteria to the program was. founder and CEO, Rey Castuciano confirmed that despite the program did not specifically define who can become a mentor he used terms like “independent living” and “upon recommendation” at the first stakeholder meeting. In a similar manner, we found out that the program lacked a pre-program survey prepared for the neighbor group of participants. In this regard, we realized we did not have enough base for comparison to be able to assess the program’s impact on its participants. This is the most important reason why we conducted a retrospective survey in our program evaluation.

Although we were limited to a small sample size in our evaluation research, Responses from both mentees and mentors expressed a fairly positive view of Table Wisdom. Both sides appear to be generally happy and content with their experiences in the program. Therefore, the current structure of the program – participants using video conferencing technology for their sessions, which begin before the mentee comes to the United States, and continues at time intervals as determined by the participants – should not change.

However, as mentioned, we were limited by a small sample size in our research. Therefore, continued research with future participants using the survey tools we developed will allow stakeholders and evaluators to gather a more sufficient and complete amount of data. This data should be used to continuously monitor participants’ levels of satisfaction with the program, and to recommend any future program modifications if necessary.

Lastly, Table Wisdom program aims to address two very important social issues – social isolation among elderly populations and difficulties with English language and social acculturation among international students – in a very unique way. Additionally, considering the academic works cited in the literature review section putting an emphasis on health improving positive effects on especially elderly people, we think that this program is a prime candidate for grants from many different organizations, especially governmental ones owing to its potential to relieve government spending on public health. Therefore, Table Wisdom program should use the data and research to pursue grants for continued expansion. Given that most of these grants want to see these improvements with specific data backed by the program itself, we feel the need to reiterate the necessity of development of a specific selection criteria for the program participants and an introduction of a pre-program assessment method/survey to be able to track and prove the program’s positive impacts on its respective participants.

**References**

Andrade, M.S. (2006). International students in English-speaking universities: Adjustment factors. *Journal of Research in International Education,* 5(2), 131-154.

Bowling, A., & Gabriel, Z. (2004). An integrational model of quality of life in older age. Results from the ESRC? MRC HSRC quality of life survey in Britain. Social *Indicators Research*, 69, 1-36.

Cornwell, B., Laumann, E. O., & Schümm, L. P. (2008). The social connectedness of older adults: A national profile. *American Sociological Review*, 73, 185-203.

Davis, Gregory A. (2002). Using a Retrospective Pre-Post Questionnaire To Determine Program Impact.  *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the MidWestern Educational Research Association (Columbus, Ohio, October 16-19, 2002).*

Findlay, R. A. (2003). Interventions to reduce social isolation amongst older people: Where is the evidence? *Ageing & Society*, 23, 647-658.

Glass, T.A., de Leon, C.M., Marottoli, R.A., & Berkman, L.F. (1999). Population based study of social and productive activities as predictors of survival among elderly Americans. British Medical Journal, 319 (7208), 478-483.

Hawton, A., Green C., Dickens, A.P., Richards, S.H., Taylor, R.S., Edwards, R., Greaves, C.J., & Campbell, J.L. (2011). The impact of social isolation on the health status and health-related quality of life of older people. Quality of Life Research, 20(1), 57-67.

Hayes, R.L., & Lin, H.R. (1994) Coming to America: Developing social support systems for international students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 22, 7–16.

Institute of International Education. (2016). "International Student Enrollment Trends, 1948/49-2015/16." *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. Retrieved from<http://www.iie.org/opendoors>

Kormos, J., & Csizér, K. (2008). Age-Related Differences in the Motivation of Learning English as a Foreign Language: Attitudes, Selves, and Motivated Learning Behavior. *Language Learning*, *58*(2), 327-355. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2008.00443.x

Leong, F.T.L. & Chou, E.L. (1996) Counseling international students. In P. B. Pedersen, J.G. Draguns, W.J. Lonner, & J.T. Trimble (Eds.), Counseling across cultures (4th ed., pp. 210–242). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lin, J.-C.G. & Yi, J.K. (1997) Asian international students’ adjustment: Issues and program suggestions. *College Student Journal,* 31, 473–479.

Mather, M., Jacobsen, L.A., & Pollard, K.M. (2015) “Population Bulletin” *Population Reference Bureau*. Retrieved from<http://www.prb.org/pdf16/aging-us-population-bulletin.pdf>

Mori, S. (2000) Addressing the mental health concerns of international students. Journal of Counseling and Development, 78, 137–144.

Padilla, A.M., Alvarez, M. & Lindholm, K.J. (1986) Generational status and personality factors as

predictors of stress in students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 8, 275–288.

Pedersen, P.B. (1991) Counseling international students. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 19, 10–58.

Pettigrew, S. (2007). Reducing the experience of loneliness among older consumers. *Journal of Research for Consumers*, 12, 1-4.

Saint Louis University (2017) Global SLU. Retrieved from<https://www.slu.edu/admission/international/>

Sandhu, D.S. & Asrabadi, B.R. (1994) Development of an acculturative stress scale for international students: Primary findings. *Psychological Reports*, 75, 435–448.

Sherry, M., Thomas, P., & Chui, W.H. (2010) International students: a vulnerable student population. *Higher Education* 60, 33-46.

Strauss, J., Tranel, M., & Caddell, J. (2013). Immigration Recommendations for St. Louis Region: How can we Jump-Start Growth? *Saint Louis University*. Retrieved from<http://citiesofmigration.ca/elibrary/immigration-recommendations-for-st-louis-regionhow-can-we-jump-start-growth/>

Think Health (2017) 2017 Demographics Retrieved from<http://www.thinkhealthstl.org/index.php?module=demographicdata&controller=index&action=index&id=1630&sectionId=942>

Toepoel, V. (2013) Ageing, Leisure, and Social Connectedness: How could Leisure Help Reduce Social Isolation of Older People? *Social Indicators Research* 113 (1), 355-372.

U.S. Census Bureau (2017) Quick Facts Retrieved from<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/stlouiscountymissouri/POP645215#viewtop>

Victor, C., Scambler, S., & Bond, J. (2009). The social world of older people: understanding loneliness and social isolation in later life. The British Journal of Social Work, 39(6), 1175-1176.

Victor, C., Bowling, A., Bond, J., & Scambler, S. (2003). Loneliness, social isolation and living alone in later life. Economic and Social Research Council, 17.

Yeh, C.J., & Inose, M. (2003) International students’ reported English fluency, social support satisfaction, and social connectedness as predictors of acculturative stress. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly* 16(1), 15-28.

**Appendix A**

**Mentee Retrospective Pre-Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Before I started the Table Wisdom program…** | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **No Opinion** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** |
| I thought it was important for me to understand American Culture. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I was confident in my English language skills. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I hoped to participate in activities outside of school while I am here. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I had good reasons to work hard and do my best. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I believed older people had valuable knowledge to share. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I experienced anxiety when I had to interact with people here. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I worried about the amount of work required to do well in my studies. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I thought this program would help me achieve my goals. |  |  |  |  |  |

**Open-Ended Questions:**

1. Tell me about how you chose to participate in the program.

2. Describe your expectations for the program before you started.

3. What concerned you most about going to school in America before you started the program? Language? Culture? Academic load?

4. How much experience did you have with the program’s technology before you started?

5. How often did you expect/hope to meet with your program partner before you started? Why?

**Appendix B**

**Mentee Mid-Participation Survey**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **No Opinion** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** |
| I feel I have become more confident in conversation with English speakers. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I feel I am better prepared academically since participating in this program. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I feel I am better prepared to live in St. Louis since participating in this program. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I have become friends with my program partner. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I experience less stress here as a student since participating in this program |  |  |  |  |  |
| My class attendance and/or participation has improved since starting this program. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I have more friends who are not from my home country since starting this program. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I understand local culture better since starting this program. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I have more confidence engaging in professional activities like job interviews since starting this program. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I have more confidence engaging in social activities since starting this program. |  |  |  |  |  |

**Open-Ended Questions:**

1. How has your experience of the program compared to your expectations?

2. Describe the effects of technology on the way you engage with your program partner.

3. Has participating had any surprising effects for you?

4. Have you met with your program partner as often as you think you should? Too seldom? Too often? Who has been more available, you or your partner?

5. How do you feel about continuing in the program? Would you recommend it to other international students?

6. How would you improve any aspect of the program in order for you to recommend it to other international students? Please choose all that apply:

a. Mentor is a good listener

b. Mentor picks me up from the airport and offers me meals at home

c. Choices of different mentors

d. Mentor recommends non-professional activities to attend (e.g. cultural events, local concerts, tourist spots, etc.)

e. Other (please elaborate)

**Appendix C**

**Mentor Retrospective Pre-Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Before I started the program I thought…** | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **No Opinion** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** |
| Mentorship provided great value to its recipients. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Communicating with members of other generations came easily to me. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Understanding features of other cultures could benefit me. |  |  |  |  |  |
| People around the world were more alike than different. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Learning English would be difficult if I did not already speak it. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I interacted daily with many different people. |  |  |  |  |  |
| There were people in my life I could count on when I needed help. |  |  |  |  |  |
| My overall health was very good. |  |  |  |  |  |

**Open-Ended Questions:**

1. Tell me about how you chose to participate in the program.

2. Describe your expectations for the program before you started.

3. How much knowledge of your partner’s home country/culture did you have before starting the program?

4. How much experience did you have with the program’s technology before you started?

5. How often did you expect/hope to meet with your program partner before you started? Why?

**Appendix D**

**Mentor Mid-Participation Survey**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **No Opinion** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** |
| I understand and agree with the purpose of the Table Wisdom program. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I feel I am positively affecting the lives of people since starting this program. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Participating in this program has increased my overall level of social interaction. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I have become friends with my program partner. |  |  |  |  |  |
| My beliefs about the home country of my program partner have changed since starting this program. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I have learned a lot about my program partner’s country or culture as a result of the program |  |  |  |  |  |
| I am more comfortable talking with someone who is not a native English speaker than before this program. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I find communicating with people from different generations enjoyable. |  |  |  |  |  |
| My overall health has improved since beginning this program. |  |  |  |  |  |
| My mentoring has had a positive, useful effect on my program partner. |  |  |  |  |  |

**Open-Ended Questions:**

1. How has your experience of the program compared to your expectations?

2. Describe the effects of technology on the way you engage with your program partner.

3. Has participating had any surprising effects for you?

4. Have you met with your program partner as often as you think you should? Too seldom? Too often? Who has been more available, you or your partner?

5. How do you feel about continuing in the program? Would you recommend it to other experienced St. Louisans?

6. How would you improve any aspect of the program in order for you to recommend it to other international students? Please choose all that apply:

a. Mentee is a good listener

b. Mentee offers to teach me his/her native language or a new skill (e.g. how to use Snapchat)

c. Periodic get-togethers with local mentors

d. Other (please elaborate)