2006

United States American students' experience with and orientation toward international diversity in a Midwestern comprehensive university setting

Olga V. Kostareva
University of Northern Iowa

U.S. AMERICAN STUDENTS' EXPERIENCE WITH AND ORIENTATION TOWARD INTERNATIONAL DIVERSITY IN A MIDWESTERN COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITY SETTING

A Dissertation

Submitted

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

Approved:

Radhi H. al-Mabuk

Dr. Radhi Al-Mabuk, Chair

Susan Etscheidt

Dr. Susan Etscheidt, Committee Member

A J Meier

Dr. Ardith Meier, Committee Member

Kurt Meredith

Dr. Kurt Meredith, Committee Member

Barry J Wilson

Dr. Barry Wilson, Committee Member

Olga V. Kostareva

University of Northern Iowa

December 2006

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

U.S. AMERICAN STUDENTS' EXPERIENCE WITH AND ORIENTATION TOWARD INTERNATIONAL DIVERSITY IN A MIDWESTERN COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITY SETTING

An Abstract of a Dissertation

Submitted

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

Approved:

Radhi H. Al-Mabuk

Dr. Radhi Al-Mabuk, Committee Chair

Susan J. Koch

Dr. Susan J. Koch
Dean of the Graduate College

Olga V. Kostareva

University of Northern Iowa

December 2006

ABSTRACT

The growing phenomenon of globalization has directly affected all levels of postsecondary institutions as evidenced by the strong emphasis colleges and universities place on internationalizing their campuses. Among the forthstanding efforts toward campus internationalization is attracting international students to American colleges and universities. Numbers of international students enrolled in U.S. colleges and universities have indeed been very high, placing this country in the leading position for hosting students from abroad. However, the role international students play in the overall process of internationalization has rarely been addressed. While the presence of international students is believed to contribute significantly to the intellectual life of a university and provide a setting where American students learn to interact with people from different cultures, studies have found a lack of genuine interaction between non-international and international students (Altbach, 2002; Skolnikoff, 1993; Shoorman, 2000; Siaya & Hayward, 2003).

To develop a better understanding of the role of international students as perceived by American students, this study investigated the amount and nature of interactions between non-international and international students at a Midwestern comprehensive university and measured the attitudes of domestic students toward internationally diverse cultures and people. A sample of 724 non-international full-time students enrolled in the University during Fall 2005 completed an electronic survey that inquired about the amount and nature of interactions domestic students had with international students since the beginning of the semester and measured the universal-

diverse orientation employing the M-GUDS-S instrument (Fuertes, Miville, Mohr, Sedlacek, & Gretchen, 2000). A variety of quantitative techniques was used to analyze the data.

Results of the survey revealed that most non-international students do interact with international students during the academic semester. The interactions between international and non-international students take place primarily at on-campus locations, mainly in class. Conversations between the two are most likely to last less than 30 minutes and occur from one to three times a week. Fifth year seniors and graduate students have significantly more contact with international students. They also talk to international students longer and more frequently compared to their counterparts in lower years of school. Results of the attitude analysis indicated that, overall, students at a Midwestern comprehensive university have supportive attitudes toward international diversity. On the range of scores from 15 to 90 (least to most positive attitude), the surveyed students' score mean was 65. Significant variations in attitude scores were observed in relation to participants' gender, academic major, age, size of home community, and ethnicity. Theoretical implications and recommendations for practice drawn from the study findings were discussed.

To my family

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In this the most enjoyable and at the same time the most challenging part of the dissertation, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to so many people, who have helped me to make this project happen. I have been fortunate to be guided in this journey by five professors, who are not only true experts in their areas, but also very understanding and supportive individuals. I thank each and all of my dissertation committee members, Dr. Al-Mabuk, Dr. Etscheidt, Dr. Meier, Dr. Meredith, and Dr. Wilson, for their individual contributions and, more importantly, for their ability to work in a team to offer me the best mentorship in this endeavor. Warm smile and encouragements from Dr. Radhi Al-Mabuk seemed to melt away all the worries that I had at times. Deep knowledge of the dissertation writing process and much needed support from Dr. Susan Etscheidt have made her contributions to this work really priceless. Critical insights, prompt feedback, editing, and foremost, Dr. Ardith Meier's genuine excitement about my personal and academic growth have set a high standard for my own professional conduct. Unique international education experience and expertise offered by Dr. Kurt Meredith have helped me to look at my study from the angles that I had not looked before. Knowledge in survey research shared by Dr. Barry Wilson has helped me tremendously in designing this study and analyzing the results.

My appreciation extends to many wonderful people, who have supported me in various ways during the entire process of this research. I cherish the help

and advice I received from the University of Northern Iowa faculty and staff. I am particularly thankful to Patti Rust, Lori Seawel, and Janet Witt for the great help in completing this project.

I wish to express my profound gratitude to my parents, Valerii and Maria, for all kinds of support I received from them; to my sister Lubov and my brother Alexander for always believing in me; to my in-laws for coming to help so that my outside-of-the-dissertation life would not wreck; to my dearest friends, Dr. Alina Slapac, Stela Slapac, Dr. Gail Grimm, Martha Hernandez, and Dr. Peter Sternberg for their emotional support and advice.

If not for my husband, Dr. Sangmin Kim, I would not set my goals high and would not enroll in the doctoral program. Only with his love and support could I finish it. Finally, the love and admiration of my son, Maximilian, have been essential. Max is almost a twin of this dissertation since his life started at about the same time when the idea for this project came. Of course, he thinks that he is a more important twin and he cannot be more right on that.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Rapid economic and social changes in the contemporary world have found their reflection in higher education. The growing phenomenon of globalization has directly affected all levels of postsecondary institutions as evidenced by the strong emphasis colleges and universities place on internationalizing their campuses. Indeed, globalization and internationalization are concepts familiar to many and few aspects of life remain unaffected by these trends. The world is becoming more and more internationally interdependent and progressive citizens of different nations understand that sooner or later they will have to possess the skills necessary for effectively interacting with people of other cultures. Many of these skills have the potential for being developed in international contexts in higher education. In fact, many universities throughout the world are placing the process of internationalization high on their agendas. The International Association of University Presidents (IAUP), founded in 1964, is claimed to be formed around the crucial issues of peace and understanding among different nations. The mission of the association is outlined in the following actions: "to reduce the economic and social differences between countries as well as between people; to reduce inequality between races and between sexes; to improve competence and knowledge globally and in distinct parts of the world; to increase mutual understanding, tolerance and respect between peoples; to create instruments and form attitudes that can reduce conflicts in the world and contribute to a more peaceful global society" (IAUP, n.d).

Kameoka (1996) maintains that the need for the inclusion of an international dimension in higher education is driven by both external and internal factors. External factors, including changes in the labor market and governments' growing demand in international expertise ranging from foreign-policy interests to concerns of domestic economic development, require higher education institutions to prepare students to be competent in an increasingly interdependent world. With regard to internal considerations, higher education institutions are interested in internationalization for a number of reasons. Among the common reasons for internationalizing education are pragmatic concerns for improving research, maintaining faculties, and increasing enrollment rates. In addition, such factors as interest in establishing and maintaining an environment of discovery that is fostered through international exchange, as well as environmental concerns and international conflicts make higher education institutions more aware of the importance of enhancing the international understanding and skills of students.

Higher education stakeholders, now more than ever, realize the importance of bringing an international dimension to their campuses. Specific actions toward higher education internationalization are manifested by efforts to include a global component in curricular and extracurricular programs, establish study-abroad programs, and enhance a global ethos of the campus by attracting international students and scholars (Larsen, 2002; Straight & Krebs, 2002; Williamsen, 2002). Traditionally, however, only the first two components (curriculum internationalization and study-abroad programs) have been addressed in a coherent and comprehensive manner, whereas the third component (global

ethos of the campus) has often been regarded only in terms of the number of international students enrolled in a particular university. The numbers of international students enrolled in U.S. colleges and universities have indeed been very high, placing this country in the leading position for hosting students from abroad. Despite a slight decrease in international student enrollments over the past years since the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, the United States remains the premier destination for students from other countries (Institute of International Education, 2005). Regretfully, however, the number of international students has always been used as an indicator of campus internationalization, whereas the role these students play in the overall process of internationalization is rarely addressed.

International students, if properly integrated into the campus culture, can become a catalyst for other desired changes related to internationalization in the curriculum and throughout the institution. International students are believed to have a vast potential in offering cultural expertise to domestic students, which is beneficial for the overall process of education (Althen, 1994; Cavusgil, 1991; Ellingboe, 1997; Skolnikoff, 1993). Encountering cultures different from their own, students will hopefully expand their thinking and ability to be open-minded to understand the perspectives of others (Marden & Engerman, 1992). Stoddard and Cornwell (2003) argue that for students to become patriotic citizens, they need to possess information and critical and deliberative reasoning skills to make good decisions. Being a patriotic American, they believe, entails being a citizen of the world who is equipped with intercultural skills and who can assess a situation from multiple viewpoints. And if a curriculum represents diverse points of view,

but more importantly, if a campus environment is created where students and faculty have different life experiences and different world perceptions, college can better prepare its students for global citizenship. Althen (1994) views foreign students as essential contributors to the teaching and research that takes place on American campuses. Likewise, Skolnikoff (1993) asserts that the presence of international students contributes significantly to the intellectual life of the university and provides a setting where American students learn to interact with people from different cultures, an aspect of higher education that is important in preparation for careers in an increasingly globalized world. Altbach (2002), however, contends that this resource is oftentimes overlooked and not effectively utilized. Higher education administrators often mistakenly believe that the mere presence of students from different countries enhances knowledge of and interest in global issues by domestic students (e. g., Shoorman, 2000). Research in the field of intercultural communication, however, suggests that physical proximity does not necessarily lead to interaction. The presence of international students on campus has little impact on the process of internationalization without genuine interaction between non-international and international students (Siaya & Hayward, 2003).

Interaction between people belonging to different cultural groups has been identified as inherently problematic due to the human tendency for negative stereotyping and prejudice (Chen & Starosta, 1998; Gudykunst & Kim, 2003; Samovar, Porter, & Stefani, 1998; Stephan, 1999). People are likely to seek contact with individuals who share their cultural norms, avoiding interactions with those whose values and traditions are foreign. Contact with members of different cultural groups, however, is believed to

have the potential to reduce cultural and ethnic stereotyping and prejudice and lead to a better understanding of global perspectives (Allport, 1954; Cook, 1984; Miller & Brewer, 1984; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000; Stephan, 1985). Although not sufficient by itself since certain other conditions are necessary (equal status between the participants in the interaction, common goals, mutual interest in collaboration, and authority sanction for the contact), contact is a necessary element in the process of facilitating intergroup understanding (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1997). Thus, contact between non-international and international students on a campus is highly desirable for promoting international knowledge and intercultural competence, a component of higher education that has been gaining importance as a result of globalization.

Statement of the Problem

Understanding the general trend of globalization, many higher education institutions (including U.S. colleges and universities) have begun to address the issue by internationalizing higher education. Many attempts to provide students with a genuine international experience have been made (Siaya & Hayward, 2003). While the importance of internationalization is realized by most stakeholders, Altbach and Peterson (1998) warn that internationalization is more of a rhetoric than a deep-seated reality for most colleges and universities. Hayward (2000) similarly states that current efforts to internationalize higher education are more symbolic than real. On the basis of the data collected about undergraduate internationalization, Hayward concludes that "in spite of an apparent growing national interest in international education, relatively few undergraduates gain international or intercultural competence in college" (p. 1). The

author also notes that despite stressing the importance of internationalizing a university, campus administration lacks the coherent strategic direction that would provide links among various aspects of internationalization. Most colleges and universities attract international students and expand their study abroad programs, but for genuine internationalization to occur, various components pivotal for success must be incorporated and nurtured.

Recent reports show that regardless of efforts to bring about change in American students' attitudes towards internationalization, public interest in studying foreign languages and cultures, traveling abroad, and reading international news remains rather low (Siaya & Hayward, 2003; Siaya, Porcelli, & Green, 2002). Paradoxically enough, the number of foreign students studying in the U.S. remains very high, placing this country in first place for foreign student enrollment.

Along with contributing to the American economy and balance of trade, international students in the United States are believed to be an important academic resource for institutions of higher education (NAFSA, n.d.). However, due to the nature of human relationships, interactions between international and non-international students are highly unlikely. Therefore, when bringing international students on campus, higher education officials need to ensure that the optimal context is provided for domestic students to interact with foreigners. Contact with people of different cultural backgrounds has the potential to reduce stereotypes and prejudice toward the culturally different and lead to a better understanding of global perspectives (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000; Stephan & Stephan, 1984). Thus, in order to create a campus

climate conducive to the understanding of global perspectives, it is imperative that colleges and universities assess the extent to which American college students value international diversity on campus and investigate whether the amount and nature of contact between international and local students is associated with the attitudes of American students toward cultural differences.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to measure the extent to which American students at a Midwestern comprehensive university experience international diversity and desire to be involved with internationally diverse cultures and people. The researcher seeks to understand and draw conclusions from the perceptions of college students regarding the importance of an international dimension in their college education and whether the presence of international students on campus facilitates interactions between domestic and foreign students.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1a. What is the amount of contact between international and non-international students in a comprehensive university setting?

1b. Are there any significant differences in the amount of contact between international and non-international students according to demographic variables?

2a. What is the nature of contact between international and non-international students in terms of duration of the interaction, location of the interaction, type of

relationship with an international student, and frequency of interacting with an international student?

2b. Are there any significant differences in the nature of contact between international and non-international students according to demographic variables?

3a. What are the attitudes of non-international students toward international diversity, as operationalized by the M-GUDS-S, on a comprehensive university campus?

3b. Are there any significant differences in the attitudes of non-international students toward international diversity according to demographic variables?

4. Is the amount of contact between international and non-international students correlated with the attitudes of non-international students toward international diversity on a comprehensive university campus?

Significance of the Study

Most research in the field of intercultural communication concerns the experiences of international individuals in a foreign country. However, the process of campus internationalization initiated by many institutions of higher education in the U.S. involves attracting foreign students with the stated purpose of providing immediate international experience for domestic students to benefit from their college education. Hence, it is important to measure the dispositions and orientations of American students toward international diversity on campus in order to understand both the strengths and weaknesses of current education programs that include an international dimension.

To develop a better understanding of the role of international students as perceived by American students, this study intends to investigate the process of

internationalization at a Midwestern comprehensive higher education institution, henceforth referred to as "the University." According to the most recent statistics for the academic year 2005-2006, the University is home to a total number of 12,513 students (10,952 undergraduate and 1,561 graduate students). Of the total students enrolled in the University in 2005-2006, 422 were international students (230 undergraduate and 192 graduate students), comprising 3.4 percent of the total student enrollment and representing 73 countries (Hart & Kumar, 2006). In fact, the number of international students enrolled is one of the performance indicators outlined in the strategic plan of the University. Attempts to internationalize the university have been clearly made, as evidenced by a study-abroad program established at the University and by the increasing numbers of international students enrolled in the University. However, it is important to investigate the attitudes of the mainstream (non-international) students enrolled in the University toward their international experience there.

Implications of the Study

The results of this study may help colleges and universities embrace students' perspective on internationalization. In addition, opinions of college students regarding the international dimension of their education may provide valuable insights into the benefits and drawbacks of currently existing international education programs at a given institution. Such an understanding might help university decision-makers recognize important factors in developing educational curriculum for the preparation of students to function effectively in an interdependent, globalized society. Insights into domestic students' attitudes toward international diversity as well as current interaction patterns

between local and international students can provide a better understanding of how situations must be structured in order to promote intercultural interactions that would foster positive intercultural perceptions and relations.

Conceptual Framework

This investigation was guided by a conceptual model derived from three sources: (1) intercultural communication theories on stereotypes and prejudice, (2) studies investigating the impact of contact on reduction of stereotypes and prejudice, and (3) a conceptualization of the universal-diverse orientation (UDO) construct.

Stereotypes and Prejudice

To make sense of the countless number of social and physical events in the environment, humans have a general tendency to construct categories that allow them to place objects as well as other humans in certain groups (Chen & Starosta, 1998). Tajfel and Forges (2000) identify two features of categorization. First, humans construct categories to place objects that display coherent and non-random patterning of characteristics, which in turn eases the task of processing the information. Secondly, these categories become our points of reference affecting our perceptions and interpretation of incoming information. Stephan and Stephan (2001) explain that, regarding social categories, humans employ group labels, thereby highlighting the similarity of people within the category and the difference of this category from other groups. Stephan (1999) asserts that while categorization is a natural part of social information processing, the mere act of categorizing people into ingroup and outgroup members can result in negative attitudes toward the dissimilar. Tajfel and Forgas (2000)

add that "social categorization entails much more than the cognitive classification of events, objects or people. It is a process impregnated by values, culture and social representation, which goes beyond the purely analytic classification of information" (p. 49). Rigid categorization of people according to certain perceived characteristics forms stereotypes. In intercultural encounters stereotypes often hinder communication when interaction with strangers is based on negative expectations that may stem from biased categorization.

Negative stereotyping that is resistant to evidence that would disprove the existing negative assumption creates prejudice (Allport, 1954). Prejudice always involves values which dictate response to a given group of people or event in a consistent (usually negative) way. All people are prejudiced to a certain degree. However, the lower the degree of prejudice the more open people are to interactions with strangers (Gudykunst, 2004). Thus, in college settings where the presence of international students is claimed to promote global understanding in domestic students, low degrees of prejudice are desirable in order for students belonging to different cultural groups to be open to interactions with each other and expand their own world perspectives.

Intercultural Contact

As noted above, in interactions with people from other cultures, low degrees of prejudice are desirable. Many believe that in order to reduce prejudice people have to be exposed to diversity. Gordon Allport (1954) was among the first to formulate the contact hypothesis, the premise of which lies in the argument that intergroup contact leads to reduced intergroup prejudice. Allport further identified four optimal conditions under

which contact leads to a reduction of prejudice: (1) participants share a sense of equality in social status, (2) participants pursue common goals, (3) participants are mutually interested in collaboration, and (4) the community/authority sanctions the contact. The contact hypothesis by Allport gave rise to extensive subsequent research and the original four conditions have been expanded to many more characteristics considered necessary for intercultural contact to reduce prejudice (e. g., Cook, 1984; Miller & Brewer, 1984; Stephan, 1985). However, after conducting a meta- analysis of 515 studies that investigated contact theory in various social disciplines employing a wide range of research methods, Pettigrew and Tropp (2000) conclude that despite the fact that many researchers suggest additions to Allport's original list, all that is needed for greater understanding between groups is contact. In other words, contact, even in situations when not all the optimal conditions are met, still promotes positive intergroup outcomes.

Universal-Diverse Orientation (UDO)

Studies in psychology and intercultural communication have suggested that humans tend to build interactions with others based on perceived similarities (Chen & Starosta, 1998; Gudykunst & Kim, 2003; Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988; Samovar, Porter, & Stefani, 1998). Such perceptions are often based on physical appearance and ethnolinguistic attributes of the participants. Thus, similarities in skin color, race, or nationality are among the strongest stimuli to one's willingness to initiate interaction with another person.

Vontress (1996) argues that, in reality, human similarities and differences are vague. People are the products of several cultures that interact with each other, which

consequently makes one simultaneously alike and different from other human beings. Vontress has introduced the notion of universal culture to refer to the commonalities in the biological makeup of human beings. He further suggests that in building interactions with others we need to create the basis for commonalities, and remembering that all humans experience the same basic biological processes such as eating, sleeping, reproducing, and eventually dying establishes the common ground that allows for further exploration of other similarities and differences among us. While all humans are fundamentally similar, cultural experiences based on race, gender, socioeconomic status among other factors make people diverse. Thus, in social interactions both basic similarities and cultural differences are important to acknowledge. Being able to communicate successfully with other people necessarily involves an awareness that all human beings are members of universal culture and share many commonalities with each other and that at the same time all people have important differences that are based on cultural and individual factors.

To describe an attitude of awareness and acceptance of both the similarities and differences among people, Miville (1992) introduced a construct, universal-diverse orientation (UDO), the basis of which lies in the recognition that people are simultaneously similar to and different from each other. UDO includes interrelated cognitive, behavioral, and affective components. The cognitive component reflects acceptance of the similarities and differences among people. The behavioral aspect involves both previous and intended behaviors relevant to an interest in contact with

different people. Finally, the affective component demonstrates how comfortable one feels in interacting with diverse individuals.

To measure UDO, Miville (1992) devised a 45-item, 6-point Likert-type instrument that includes three subscales reflecting the respective behavioral, cognitive, and affective components of UDO. Later this instrument became known as the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale (M-GUDS; Miville et al., 1999). The M-GUDS allows for measuring the level of prejudice present and reveal strengths and deficits in a given person or organization's diversity perspective which may then provide an important new direction for assessment in diversity programming (Singley & Sedlacek, 2004). A short form of the M-GUDS known as M-GUDS-S developed by Fuertes, Miville, Mohr, Sedlacek, and Gretchen (2000) suited the purpose of measuring non-international students' attitudes toward international diversity and thus constituted one section of the survey instrument employed in the present study.

Limitations of the Study

The results of the present study are limited to the population studied within the location of the study. Since U.S. citizenship is one of the necessary criteria for selecting participants for this investigation, naturalized citizens whose experiences are potentially different from that of the mainstream population present another limitation to this study. In addition, this study is also limited to electronic submission of the survey and subsequent responses, which means that respondents must have access to and possess skills in using information technology (Shannon, Johnson, Searcy, & Alan, 2002).

Assumptions of the Study

The following statements were assumed to be true for the study:

1. The instrument for data collection was truly and sufficiently valid and reliable.
2. The study sample fairly represented the target population.
3. Study participants responded truthfully to the survey.
4. Data analysis procedures were appropriate and accurate.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following key terms were defined:

Comprehensive universities/master's universities. Institutions that offer a wide range of master's and baccalaureate programs, and are committed to graduate education through the master's degree. Comprehensive Universities Type I awarded 40 or more master's degrees per year across three or more disciplines. Comprehensive Universities Type II awarded 20 or more master's degrees per year during the period studied (Carnegie Foundation, 2000).

Culture. The deposit of knowledge, experience, beliefs, values, actions, attitudes, meanings, hierarchies, religion, notions of time, roles, spatial relations, concepts of the universe, and artifacts acquired by a group of people in the course of generations through individual and group striving (Samovar, Porter, & Stefani, 1998).

Full-time student. An undergraduate student enrolled for 12 or more credit hours per semester and a graduate student enrolled for 9 or more credit hours per semester.

Globalization. Globalization is the influence of universal societal changes on local affairs (Arnove, 1999).

Global perspective. A global perspective is an ecological world view which promotes the unity of humankind and the interdependence of humanity, universal human rights, loyalties that extend beyond national borders (Hett, 1993).

Intercultural communication. Intercultural communication is a symbolic process in which people from different cultures create shared meanings (Lustig & Koester, 2003). For the purpose of this study, the term intercultural communication refers to the process of communication between individuals coming from different countries.

Intercultural education. Intercultural education is a highly specialized form of instruction designed to prepare persons to live and work effectively in cultures other than their own (Paige, 1993).

Intergroup contact. Actual face-to-face interaction between members of clearly distinguishable and defined groups (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000).

International education. Events, programs, and services for faculty and students that are related to an international component within international studies, international programs, and international exchanges (Scanlon, 1990).

International students. Students at U.S. American institution who do not hold U.S. citizenship or permanent resident status and arrive from other countries using a foreign student visa. The terms international student, foreign student, and student from abroad are used interchangeably.

Internationalization. A range of activities, programs, and policies that incorporate an international dimension into the university's research, teaching, and service activities (Knight, 1995).

Non-international students. All students at a U.S. American institution who hold U.S. citizenship or permanent resident status and do not arrive from other countries using a foreign student visa. The term refers to all domestic minority students as well. The terms non-international student, American student, domestic student, and local student are used interchangeably.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Higher Education Internationalization

Historical Overview

While internationalization of higher education is a seemingly novel concept, universities have traditionally been committed to the promotion of universal knowledge and understanding (Scanlon, 1990). According to Hans de Wit (1999), the initial establishment of higher education in medieval Europe was governed by the purpose of providing universal knowledge to educate a scholastic elite who would in turn produce new knowledge and contribute to society in general. The medieval university was thus rather cosmopolitan in nature. De Wit also asserted that the early European university was very international and the rationale for such internationalization could be explained by social and cultural factors. Latin and Greek, being the main medium of academic communication, required that a medieval European scholar study a foreign language. Furthermore, since different forms of information were scattered across various geographic locations, a scholar had to seek knowledge from and understanding of other cultures.

De Wit (1995) notes that beginning from the 18th century European educational systems began to be exported to colonized countries. Thus, the British model of higher education was adopted in India and other Asian, African, Caribbean, and Northern American countries which belonged to the British Empire. Higher education in former French colonies was in turn influenced by the French educational structure. At first,

universities in the United States also followed the British pattern of higher education and only later did American higher education import the German model of a research university (Mikhailova, 2003).

While universities throughout the world were initially established to promote universal knowledge regardless of national borders, with the expansion and greater availability of higher education, the preferences and concerns of postsecondary institutions shifted towards educating national citizens and contributing to nation building. According to de Wit, in the 19th and 20th centuries, higher education came to serve the interests of the nation-states, becoming essential in the development of national identity. Thus, a cosmopolitan wanderer, searching for universal wisdom, evolved into a citizen. However, the need for internationalization of higher education in the United States became evident in the middle of the 20th century, after the World War II. Knowledge about other nations and cultures became an important defense tool (Burn, 1980; Groennings, 1990). Launching of Sputnik by the Soviet Union in 1957 reemphasized the importance of understanding of other cultures for the sake of national security. As a result of this event, the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) was enacted in 1958 (Vestal, 1994). The NDEA provided funding directly to universities for foreign language programs and area studies centers (Backman, 1984; Michie, 1969; Pickert, 1992).

Knight (2004) argues that historically there are four rationales for internationalization in postsecondary institutions in Europe and the United States: academic, socio-cultural, political, and economic. De Wit (1999) follows the progression of four such rationales in chronological order. He contends that academic rationale

governed by the desire to stay in line with the contemporary international standards of quality in teaching, research, and service, has always been an underlying impetus for internationalizing higher education institutions. Political rationale, on the other hand, was prevalent during colonial expansion in the replication of European models of education. Colonized nations were politically, culturally, economically, and academically dominated by the European nations. De Wit further explains that after World War II, in the drive to maintain and expand its influence throughout the world, the United States prioritized the importance of knowledge of other cultures, languages, and systems. Until the end of the Cold War, political reasons governed internationalization of higher education in the United States. According to de Wit, the new economic and political reality of the 1990s provided an additional incentive for internationalizing higher education. Especially with the establishment of the European Union and the strengthening of Japan as an economic superpower, both of which presented a threat to the economic dominance of the USA, economic reasons became the predominant argument for higher education internationalization (Knight & de Wit, 1995).

Johnston and Edelstein (1993) and Levin (2001) argue that economic rationale presents the prevalent incentive for U.S. higher education institutions to internationalize education. Gregor (2002) explains this: "A number of changes currently taking place in universities and colleges worldwide find their origin in the belief that societies are rapidly becoming knowledge societies. The key assumption underlying this belief is that economic productivity and wealth will be increasingly dependent on the production and application of new knowledge by highly trained knowledge workers" (p. 4). Levin

(2001), on the other hand, proposes a more pragmatic explanation of the recent wave of higher education internationalization which is also rooted in economic reasons. He believes that, partially due to budget cuts, higher education institutions had to seek alternative ways to generate revenue and many of them found the potential of international students and contracts to be the most financially profitable. In addition, by recruiting international students and establishing international contracts, colleges were able to use this as a way to appeal to domestic students and thereby help increase student enrollments. Levin also notes that along with campus internationalization, colleges sought partnerships with business and industry to train future workers in exchange for tuition fees and established associations with the private sector, accepting monetary or goods donations for either publicity or tax benefits. Thus, according to Levin, a new economic reality prompted colleges to work in close collaboration with the private sector. Such a partnership, in turn required colleges to alter curricula in order to meet the interests of businesses and industries oriented towards specialized skills rather than liberal education. Levin suggests that the marriage between colleges and businesses resulted in increased productivity and efficiency where "doing more with less" became a slogan at many higher education institutions. Faculty and staff downsizing and layoffs, larger class sizes, distance education delivery, increased reliance on electronic technology for work, dependency upon resource providers, and an increased focus on the private sector marketplace became necessary if colleges were to cope with the economic alterations brought by globalization. As Levin points out, college curriculum became oriented toward the market and economic benefits. Developing "employability skills"

and preparing students for the workplace became the de facto mission of most community colleges, in particular. The state was no longer the principal resource provider. Moreover, state government, through its policies of reduced funding, reinforced the neoliberalist ideology stimulating colleges to become more market oriented. Thus, globalization had a direct impact on colleges during the 1990s as reflected in increased commodification of education (Levin, 2001). Along with the drawbacks, however, globalization has benefited postsecondary institutions. Levin (2001) identifies the gains resulting from globalization as sharpened practice of college management, college's responsibility to offer education and services to fit the needs of time, place, and practical application, as well as increased sophistication in marketing and programming, which has positively altered the image of many colleges externally.

Globalization of trade and communication made it evident that future leaders and citizens needed to be equipped with international knowledge and understanding. More and more companies in both private and public sectors preferred their employees to be proficient in a foreign language and culture (Hayward, 2000). Indeed, as claimed by Altbach (2002), the imperatives of the market started driving internationalization trends worldwide. Levin (2001) points to the irony of internationalization trends in U.S. community colleges, which as he argues, historically have been characterized by their local orientation but now have to alter their practices to be able to fit into and compete in the global market. While traditional community college principles, such as providing access to postsecondary education opportunities and a comprehensive curriculum, are

still in place, colleges are increasingly assuming the role of fulfilling government, business, industry, and student economic demands.

Thus, in part answering the demand of the market, colleges and universities placed internationalization high on their agendas. Paradoxically, however, the greater interest in internationalization that developed in the 1990s within postsecondary institutions themselves was accompanied by a decline in federal funding in the United States. The decline in federal funding includes support for exchanges, student support, faculty research and other direct and indirect support for international programs. As demonstrated by the Internationalization of U.S. Higher Education: Preliminary Status Report (Hayward, 2000), federal funding for academic exchanges in 1999 declined dramatically since its highest point in 1994. Fulbright program funding, for example, was reduced to 101.50 million dollars compared to its greatest funding of 180.20 million dollars in 1993. The only program that has not been significantly affected much by the general federal funding cuts is the National Security Education Program (NSEP). Hayward (2000) claims in the report that since the end of the Cold War era, the overall emphasis of federal funding has been placed on short-term, practical interventions to address crises related to development, health and family planning, education, human rights, and civil liberties.

Green (2002) explains that despite some sporadic attempts to prioritize international education, federal spending on internationalization amounts to less than 1 percent of the U.S. government's discretionary expenditures for higher education. Financial constraints along with competing reform agendas and the absence of public and

student insistence paint a not particularly encouraging picture of campus internationalization. Data collected over the previous years by the American Council on Education suggest that foreign language enrollments continue to decrease. The data also indicate that the percentage of four-year institutions with language degree requirements has also declined drastically. Only 6 percent of all language enrollments are in Asian languages and less than 2 percent in Arabic and Hebrew combined. Only 3 percent of students study abroad before they graduate, and only 14 percent of students take at least four credits of internationally focused coursework. Such findings, Green maintains, go against national and institutional rhetoric where 75 percent of four-year institutions highlight their international education programs, activities, and opportunities in student recruitment literature.

The tragic events of September 11, 2001, to a certain degree, reemphasized the importance of including a socio-cultural dimension in the internationalization of higher education. As Peterson (2002) noted, September 11 brought awareness that U.S. as a nation was ill-equipped to understand the rest of the world, which in turn brought the higher education internationalization to the forefront. She further asserts that in light of September 11, the perspective on internationalization of higher education embraced two dialectically opposing views. On the one hand, national security was undermined by the "evil" actions of international students. On the other hand, higher education institutions realized the need to make international experience genuinely educational. Nine weeks after September 11, 2001, President George W. Bush said:

> ... We must also reaffirm our commitment to promote educational opportunities that enable American students to study abroad, and to encourage international

> students to take part in our educational system. By studying foreign cultures and languages and living abroad, we gain a better understanding of the many similarities that we share, and learn to respect our differences. The relationships that are formed between individuals from different countries, as part of international education programs and exchanges, can also foster goodwill that develops into vibrant, mutually beneficial partnerships among nations. (as quoted in NAFSA, 2003, p. 3)

Hans van Ginkel, rector of the United Nations University, in his speech on internationalization in higher education (April, 2002) pointed out that "[t]he fight against terrorism starts with ourselves sharing with and caring for all other people, helping other people living in desperate conditions." Thus, the events of September 11 marked a new era in higher education internationalization.

Green (2002) contends that at different periods of higher education in American history the need for internationalization received varying degrees of attention. Historically, the author argues, the impetus to put more funding and effort into internationalization has been prompted by some sort of crisis. As already noted above, historic events such as World War II, launching of Sputnik by the Soviet Union, the Cold War, and finally September 11 all have drawn increased attention to the process of internationalization of American higher education.

The results of a public opinion poll targeted at identifying public attitudes about international education since September 11 suggested that the overall public support for internationalization of postsecondary institutions was rather high (Siaya, Porcelli, & Green, 2002). The survey authors drew the following conclusions:

> (1) Overall public, student, and faculty support for international education and language training remains very high. Survey results indicate that the decrease in public support many feared would happen after September 11 generally has not occurred. Public support for foreign language learning is particularly strong, even

> when asked if they would support an increase in state funding for foreign language learning; (2) The public, students, and faculty are very supportive of international course requirements, including foreign language and international course requirements; and (3) Not only has overall support remained strong and steady, but also the intensity of support has increased in several areas, including foreign language training. (p. 1)

The findings of the survey, therefore, indicate that the American public understands the importance of and supports the process of postsecondary internationalization.

Definition and Components of Higher Education Internationalization

Internationalization of higher education is often described as a process (Harari, 1992; Knight, 1995). Knight (1995) describes the process of higher education internationalization as "a range of activities, programmes, and policies that incorporate an international dimension into the university's research, teaching, and service activities" (p. 99). Green (2002) believes that intentions to internationalize should be supported by such essential components as: (1) an intentional, integrative, and comprehensive approach, (2) strong leadership at the top, (3) committed leadership throughout the institution, (4) widespread faculty engagement, (5) a commitment to meet student needs, (6) an ethos to internationalization, and (7) supportive structures and resources. Internationalization should be broad and deep, supported by the institutional presidents and chief academic officers who are able to utilize such strategies as persuasion, exhortation, and rewards. Green further asserts that widespread faculty and administrative commitment and engagement in decision making are also essential. She also maintains that in attempts to internationalize education, students' needs have to be central to institutional policies and practices. Students' interest and engagement in

internationalization, Green notes, should not be hindered by language classes, for example, that use the "drill and kill" method of instruction, or policies that make it impossible for students to graduate in four years if they study abroad. Green emphasizes that, overall, institutions should try to create an environment where internationalization is interwoven into every aspect of academic and extracurricular activities. The author finally asserts that establishing partnerships with businesses and other organizations is incremental for generating financial and human support necessary for implementation of good ideas and sound curriculum development. Measurements of success should go beyond traditional statistics reflected by the number of international students on campus, students studying abroad, or foreign language enrollments and expand to the evaluation of learning goals, course content, pedagogy, campus life, enrollment patterns, and institutional policies and practices in order to get a more complete picture of the performance (Green, 2002).

Among some higher education institutions considered to have experienced success in campus internationalization is Appalachian State University located in Boone, North Carolina. Williamsen (2002), who has studied the process of internationalization at Appalachian State University notes that this university takes as its goal of international education to provide all students with a global perspective and in-depth intercultural understanding. The university attempts to accomplish this goal by increasing the amount of course work that incorporates global perspectives, expanding the amount of co-curricular programming devoted to international topics, intensifying the global ethos of the campus, and increasing the availability of opportunities for education outside the

United States. According to Williamsen, one of the major contributing factors in the success of campus internationalization is its centralized nature. The associate vice chancellor for international programs accordingly reports directly to the provost/executive chancellor for academic affairs. In addition, the university is integrating performance criteria into its standard cycles of strategic planning and annual performance reporting. The university takes pride in its co-curricular programs that promote international understanding and interactions, its short-term study abroad program that provides students with the opportunity to spend a summer overseas, its semester and academic year abroad program that allows for a cost-effective method of gaining invaluable international experience, its programs that allow hosting international students and scholars, and finally its technology and telecommunications networks that provide global connections with educators and allow for two online courses taught by education professors in the Netherlands and Poland. Williamsen further noted that despite positively rating its efforts to internationalize, the university recognized three challenges that impeded internationalization to a certain degree: institutional orientation, financial support, and administrative leadership and coordination. The university needed a new institutional orientation that would place internationalization front and center in Appalachian's development and become integrated into the educational mission of the university. Similarly, developing adequate financial support posed a challenge for internationalization. Finally, the absence of universal commitment to internationalization at Appalachian created numerous administrative problems. Greater administrative centralization would provide clearer focus, stronger advocacy, better assessment, and

more effective curricular and faculty development. Williamsen asserts that recognizing its achievements and challenges, the university is determined to bring the following action items to future planning and institutional change: clearly articulate internationalization in the mission statement and highlight immediate goals and objectives; add international criteria to considerations for new hires and for merit, promotion, and tenure decisions; establish an international recruiting element within the enrollment services division to bring more international students on campus; establish endowed foundation accounts to support multifaceted international programs; foster institutional cooperation on the grounds of internationalization; establish internationalization committees in each college and school to assist in faculty development, international mobility, curricular adaptation, and international programs for students.

Another case of promising practices of campus internationalization is outlined by Larsen (2002), who has analyzed the attempts to bring an international dimension to higher education by Arcadia University located in Glenside, Pennsylvania. Larsen reports that Arcadia University is committed to making internationalization its chief distinguishing characteristic. This goal was pursued by focusing on the following objectives: (1) increasing the number of students studying abroad, (2) integrating internationalism throughout the curriculum, (3) creating an international outlook among faculty and staff, (4) creating an international milieu on campus by increasing the recruitment of international students, and (5) clarifying and solidifying the role of the Center for Education Abroad in the university's efforts at internationalization. Larsen

further contended that while internationalization was coordinated in a relatively centralized manner, centralization was hoped to be enhanced in future. Among the challenges facing internationalization at the university, size and financial support were rated the highest. At the time of Larsen's article, internationalization efforts by the faculty were not formally recognized, but the university was intending to review its promotion and tenure criteria with an eye toward recognizing significant international involvement. Other steps for internationalization included hiring faculty and staff with international credentials, a newly created position of associate dean for internationalization, increasing the enrollment, which in turn would contribute to additional internationalization opportunities, and bringing more publicity to the internationalization efforts and success throughout the university and the nation (Larsen, 2002).

Similarly, internationalization has been one of three overarching institutional priorities since 1995 at Binghamton University located in New York (Straight & Krebs, 2002). The following set of specific objectives was established: (1) develop course offerings, research opportunities, and extracurricular programs that prepare students to be leaders with a global vision, (2) provide students with international experiences in every academic program, (3) provide opportunities for students to develop and increase their foreign language proficiency, (4) increase the number of international students on campus. Straight and Krebs (2002) identified the following results of the institutional efforts to internationalize education: (1) new programs have been developed in collaboration with universities in seven foreign countries, (2) students from 42 of 45 undergraduate major

programs study abroad, (3) forty percent of students take a foreign language while in their study-abroad program, (4) faculty is increasingly involved in the development of study abroad, (5) the university cooperates with other State University of New York (SUNY) schools to provide access to an additional 260 international programs. To recognize exceptional contributions to internationalization, an annual award with a $1,000 honorarium has been created by the president. Straight and Krebs explain that next steps for internationalization at the university are targeted at improving communication about existing international opportunities on and off campus, enhancing the relationship between the diversity of Binghamton University's student body and internationalization, and improving the curricular integration of internationalization.

The aforementioned cases of campus internationalization present a pragmatic perspective regarding how higher education institutions might structure their efforts towards bringing an international dimension to higher education. These three particular schools value the centralized nature of the internationalization process occurring on their campuses. The other common elements that each of these three universities considers essential for the success of campus internationalization include the following: curricular and extracurricular programs that incorporate global perspectives, study-abroad programs, and a global ethos of the campus enhanced by the presence of international students.

Skolnikoff (1993) has similarly identified three issues that need to be addressed during the process of internationalization: internationalization of the curriculum; economic competition and the flow of knowledge across borders as essential conditions for maximum progress in scientific achievements; and the number and role of foreign

students. While the first two issues are more or less addressed by campus administration seeking to internationalize their campus, reflected by international courses and foreign language requirements, and study abroad and faculty exchange programs, the third issue regarding the role of foreign students, has not been traditionally given sufficient focus in terms of investigating the core influence that the presence of international students on campus may have on domestic students' educational development. The number of international students has always been an indicator of campus internationalization; however, the role these students play in the overall process of internationalization is rarely addressed.

Ellingboe (1997) argues that while internationalizing a campus, it is important to consider various approaches and resources and one of the significant resources, the author identifies, is the presence of visiting scholars and international students. The author claims that this resource is able to offer a cultural comparison by presenting individual cultural perspectives on world issues; therefore, faculty members should consider integrating international scholars or student guest speakers into their own courses.

Number and Role of International Students in the U.S.

Althen (1994) maintains that, in contrast to several decades before his publication, when students from other countries were viewed as "relative oddities", they now are "familiar fixtures" on many American campuses. In fact, according to Open Doors 2005, the annual report on international education published by the Institute of International Education (IIE), the enrollment of foreign students in the U.S. colleges and universities

reached a total of 565,039. Regardless of the fact that the number of international students enrolled in U.S. higher education institutions has been decreasing since 2001, after a steady growth in the preceding five years, the United States remains the leading country hosting students from abroad. The IIE President and CEO Allan Goodman maintains that the U.S. is consistently seen as the premier destination by international students. Johnson (2006) – the executive director and CEO of NAFSA: Association of International Educators, however, warns that seeing the benefits of hosting international students, many other countries have begun aggressively attracting them. She further urges for a national strategy that would ensure American competitiveness in attracting students from other countries and maintaining the leading position in hosting international students. American campuses, believing that the presence of international students promotes understanding of global issues and facilitates quality education, welcome them in record numbers. Not only international students studying in the United States contribute to the American economy and the United States balance of trade, but they also have become an important academic resource for institutions of higher education (Institute of International Education, 2004). Althen (1994) views foreign students as essential contributors to the teaching and research that takes place on American campuses. Likewise, Skolnikoff (1993) asserts that the presence of international students contributes significantly to the intellectual life of the university and provides a setting where American students learn to interact with people from different cultures, an aspect of higher education that is important in preparation for careers in an increasingly globalized world. International students can thereby be viewed as a

potential resource of international expertise and experience for American students. Altbach (2002), however, contends that this resource is oftentimes overlooked and not utilized effectively. A survey conducted by Blankenship (1980) reports the perceived extent of cultural impact of international students on community and academic environment in junior colleges in Florida. Among administrators, faculty, and students surveyed, only college administrators rated the impact of international students very highly. American college students, and, to a certain degree, faculty members, did not find the presence of international students on campus very beneficial for their personal educational experience. Such results might suggest that while the role of international students is highly valued by campus administrators, faculty and students do not see the role of international students as particularly valuable in their education. Therefore, the purpose of bringing international students to their institutions is not effectively communicated.

Shoorman (2000) conducted a case study at a large Midwestern university with the purpose of investigating the impact of an institutional mission to internationalize on the daily educational experiences of higher education faculty and students, and investigating the role of international students in the internationalization process. Interviews with administrators, faculty, foreign students as well as an analysis of institutional strategic plan documents revealed some disparities between the institutional rhetoric to internationalize education and actual actions undertaken to implement that mission. Despite the widespread endorsement of internationalization, its implementation was limited by the lack of a detailed strategic plan, by a shortage of qualified faculty and

administrators, and by a lack of a clear vision of what internationalization of the university should entail. With regard to the role of international students in the internationalization process, despite the unanimous responses that the presence of international students was beneficial for students' education, any specific impact on the educational process remained quite ambiguous. Many faculty and administrators reported that they believed the mere presence of international students on campus was enough to fulfill the purpose of internationalization. Only a few faculty members reported deliberately trying to incorporate international students into the everyday pedagogical process. Overall, Shoorman concluded that internationalization is a complex, multifaceted concept embracing diverse perspectives of organizational members. In order to facilitate the process of higher education internationalization, an ongoing discussion among educators on the meaning, purpose, and the process of internationalization needs to be encouraged.

Heydari (1988) conducted a study investigating the role of international students from domestic students' perspective. Specifically, Heydari attempted to measure the level of social interaction between American and international students. The results of that study revealed that as American students' interaction with international students increased, the social distance between those groups of students decreased (Heydari, 1988). Interestingly enough, the same study reports that American students who attend church regularly, tend to keep more distance from international students. The author interpreted such results as indicative of a negative impact of high religiosity on attitudes and desire to interact with people of other nationality, ethnicity, culture, languages, and religion.

Female students in Heydari's study were found to be more open to interactions with international students and maintain less social distance from them than did male students. Students with a greater perception of scarce resources, such as competition for grades, exhibited a greater degree of social distance from international students.

More recent results of opinion polls provide additional insights into the perceived role of international students in the United States. According to a public opinion poll (2002), 80% of survey respondents agree that the presence of international students on campus enriches learning experiences for American students. However, when asked if they would support an increase in the number of international students and scholars at their local college, only 25% answered in the affirmative. Age and ethnicity were shown to be quite influential in their responses. A public opinion poll targeted at identifying public attitudes towards internationalization since September 11, suggests that people under 30 and minorities were most likely to support an increase in the number of international students and scholars. After conducting a literature review on the topic of relationship between international and domestic students in different countries, Ward (2001) concludes that while domestic students hold relatively favorable perceptions of international students, they are "largely uninterested in initiating contact with their international peers" (p. 17). Thus, the most recent data indicate that the attitude toward internationalization is dual. The public understands the significance of internationalization; on the other hand, however, people feel somewhat indifferent about international students on campus. Although following Skolnikoff's (1993) claims that genuine internationalization will take place only if all the components are nurtured, mere

numbers of international students do not alone contribute to the progress of higher education internationalization (Gagliano, 1992). International students need to be integrated into the campus culture in order to provide a setting conducive to international experience for American students.

Interactions Between International and Non-International Students

Intercultural Communication

While many U.S. colleges and universities recruit international students with the purpose of facilitating the international educational experience of American students, research suggests that the presence of international students on campus has little impact on the process of internationalization because of the lack of genuine interaction between non-international and international students (Siaya & Hayward, 2003). Burn (1980) similarly asserts that international students often form subcultures that rarely relate to the mainstream student populations. The patterns of student interaction in general inhibit communication with individuals coming from different cultures. Thus, after reviewing research on interaction patterns of people belonging to different groups, Gudykunst and Kim (2003) explain that it is quite natural for people to build interactions with others on perceived similarities, which they define as "the degree to which people think they are similar to others" (p. 133). Such perceptions are often based not on similaritiesin interests and worldviews between the participants but rather on physical appearance and ethnolinguistic attributes. As Chen and Starosta (1998) note, all social and physical events humans encounter have shape, color, texture, size, and intensity. Chen and Starosta further explain that when categorizing strangers, humans group them according

to aspects they have in common and ignore aspects they do not have in common. In initial social interaction people tend to pay more attention to skin color, race, or nationality subconsciously classifying these categories according to similarities/differences with one's own membership in such groups. Thus, similarities in skin color, race, or nationality are among the strongest factors in one's willingness to initiate interaction with another person (Chen & Starosta, 1998).

Stereotypes

While categorization is a natural part of social information processing, the mere act of categorizing people into ingroup and outgroup members can result in negative attitudes toward the dissimilar (Stephan, 1999). Rigid categories of people according to certain perceived characteristics form stereotypes. Stephan and Stephan (2001) assert that the basis of stereotyping is categorization. Stereotypes present a complex form of categorization that entails a mental organization of our perceptions of a particular group of people, thereby impacting our behavior toward them (Samovar, Porter, & Stefani, 1998). Stephan and Stephan (2001) argue that in social categories humans employ group labels thereby highlighting the similarity of people within the category and the difference of this category from other groups. Similarly, Hewstone and Brown (1986) identify three essential aspects of stereotypes: (1) categorizing others according to easily identifiable characteristics, (2) assuming that most people in a particular category possess common set of attributes which differentiates them from people in other categories, and (3) assuming that individuals within a particular category possess the attributes associated with their groups.

Stangor and Schaller (2000) emphasize that if stereotypes were only the "pictures in the head" of the individuals trying to make sense of the social environment, they would not pose any problem. In reality however, stereotypes are often shared within a society and affect entire groups of people in a common way: "Stereotypes only have meaning to the extent they are culturally shared" (Stangor & Schaller, 2000, p. 65). Samovar et al. identify several reasons why stereotypes hinder intercultural communication. First, stereotyping overlooks individual characteristics making people operate on an erroneous assumption that all members of a group have exactly the same traits. In addition, being oversimplified, overgeneralized, and exaggerated, stereotypes create distorted, inaccurate pictures of the individuals belonging to the outgroup, thereby inhibiting successful communication. Finally, stereotypes repeat and reinforce distorted beliefs until they often become taken for "truth," which presents an impediment to communication. In communicating with both strangers and non-strangers people tend to have certain expectations from the encounters. Communication with strangers is often based on negative expectations which might stem from biased stereotyping. Hewstone and Giles (1986) contend that stereotypes influence the way people process information, and thus, the information about ingroups is perceived more favorably than the information about outgroups. In fact, stereotypes of ingroup members are more accurate than stereotypes of strangers' groups. Hewstone and Giles explain that, in general, humans have a tendency to overestimate the degree of association between group memberships and psychological attributes. While more positive characteristics are attributed to members of the group that people personally associate with, strangers or people belonging to other groups are likely

to be seen in a more negative light. Gudykunst (2004) cites prejudice, ethnocentrism, ageism, sexism, and so forth as influencing the positiveness or negativeness of views of other group members.

Ethnocentrism and Prejudice

In communication with people from different countries, ethnocentrism and prejudice have been found to play a significant role in the willingness to seek contact with strangers. Chen and Starosta (1998) characterize ethnocentrism as a quality that "leads group members to tie themselves tightly together and be proud of their own heritages by subjectively using their cultural standards as criteria for interpretations and judgments in intercultural communication" (p. 27). Gamble and Gamble (1996) cite ethnocentrism as the key factor in failed intercultural communication efforts. They assert that seeing one's own culture as superior to all others makes people experience great anxiety when interacting with individuals from different cultures and results in a tendency to blame others for problems and distancing oneself from them. Ethnocentrism, however, is natural and unavoidable (Gamble & Gamble, 1996). Samovar et al. (1998), for example, believe that like culture itself, ethnocentrism is learned at the unconscious level and serves as a scale for measuring and rating other cultures in reference to one's own culture. Thus, the authors emphasize that all humans are ethnocentric to a certain degree. But it is the degree of ethnocentrism that creates either positive or negative effects from interactions with other groups. They mention that unless ethnocentrism is carried to an extreme it can have positive effects by being a source of cultural and personal identity. But when ethnocentrism is used for derogatory evaluations and serves

as a barrier to being open to other people's views and beliefs, it takes on a negative effect and becomes destructive. In more subtle ways, ethnocentrism causes the alienation of co-cultures from the dominant culture, or one group from another (Samovar et al., 1998).

The opposite of ethnocentrism is cultural relativism. People practicing cultural relativism try to understand the behavior of others depending on the context instead of inferring judgment from one's own preexisting frame of reference (Gamble & Gamble, 1996). Gudykunst (2004) argues that some degree of cultural relativism is necessary in order to understand strangers' behavior. The higher the degree of ethnocentrism, the greater the anxiety is when interacting with people of other cultures. Conversely, individuals with higher degrees of cultural relativism try to understand strangers' behavior which, in turn, allows for more accurate predictions and explanations of other people's ways of acting and thinking (Gudykunst, 2004).

Another factor influencing communication with other cultural groups is prejudice. Allport (1954) defines prejudice as "an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group as a whole, or toward an individual because he [or she] is a member of that group" (p. 9). In other words, prejudice involves making a prejudgment based on membership in a social category. Following the etymology of the word *prejudice*, Allport (2000) distinguishes three stages in the transformation of the meaning of the original Latin noun *praejudicium*. It initially meant a "judgment based on previous decisions and experiments" (p. 22). When the term entered English, it had the meaning of "a judgment formed before due examination and consideration of the facts – a premature or hasty judgment" (p. 22).

Later, the term acquired "its present emotional flavor of favorableness or unfavorableness that accompanies such a prior and unsupported judgment" (p. 22).

Elaborating on the notion of what Allport called "favorableness" or "unfavorableness," Gudykunst (2004) makes a distinction between positive and negative prejudice and further notes that there is a tendency to view prejudice in negative terms. Such a view is also shared by Gordon Allport (2000), who states that while "biases may be pro as well as con, it is none the less true that ethnic prejudice is mostly negative" (p. 22). Allport (1954) explains that while all humans tend to overgeneralize because it is impossible to weigh each object in the world by itself, "not every overblown generalization is a prejudice" (p. 9). Allport further distinguishes between prejudgment and prejudice. In contrast to prejudgments that can be reversed when a person is exposed to new knowledge, a prejudice is resistant to any evidence that would disprove the existing assumption.

Chen and Starosta (1998) explain that stereotypes and prejudice often occur together: if one holds beliefs about people belonging to a certain group, one also tends to have prejudice about them. The authors state that prejudice always involves values which dictate response and behavior to a given group of people or event in a consistent (usually negative) way. Similar to ethnocentrism, prejudice varies along the continuum of intensity. Brislin (1981) and Klopf (1995) identify five common forms of prejudice in terms of intensity: verbal abuse, physical avoidance, discrimination, physical attack, and massacre (as cited in Chen & Starosta, 1998, p. 41). Referring to the five forms of prejudice identified by Brislin and by Klopf, Chen and Starosta clarify that verbal abuse

is often manifested in ethnic jokes and name-labeling. Physical avoidance is characterized by dislike of a group of people because of different religious beliefs, language systems, behavioral patterns and so forth, which in turn results in intentional unwillingness to make friends, go out, study, or work with certain people. Discrimination, Chen and Starosta note, involves the denial of equal opportunities to outgroup members. As the degree of discrimination intensifies, physical attack against the disliked people becomes inevitable. The most extreme result of prejudice is massacre (Chen & Starosta, 1998). Van Dijk (1984) classifies prejudiced communication into four clusters: (1) "they are different (culture, mentality)"; (2) "they do not adapt themselves"; (3) "they are involved in negative acts"; and (4) "they threaten our (social, economic) interests" (as cited in Gudykunst, 2004, p. 141). Gudykunst (2004) states that prejudice and racism are communicated in everyday talk and behavior but people are usually not aware of manifesting their own prejudice.

In sum, one cannot be either prejudiced or not prejudiced. All people are prejudiced to a certain degree. As with ethnocentrism, prejudice is natural and unavoidable. Most people prefer to interact with people who are similar to themselves because such interactions are more comfortable and less stressful than interactions with strangers. However, the lower the degree of prejudice, the more open people are to interactions with strangers (Gudykunst, 2004). Stangor (2000) explains that "stereotyping and prejudice are integrally related to the most central topics is psychology, including attitudes, social cognition, person perception, conformity, group behavior, and aggression" (p. 1).

Intercultural Contact

In interactions with people from other cultures, low degrees of ethnocentrism and prejudice are desirable. Many believe that in order to reduce ethnocentrism and prejudice people have to be exposed to diversity. Halualani, Chitgopekar, Morrison, and Dodge (2004) assert that not only being exposed to, but actually having encounters with racially/ethnically different people is essential for understanding of other cultures. A study by Halualani et al., aimed at investigating frequencies and the nature of contact among different ethnic and racial groups of students in a context of a multicultural university, revealed intriguing findings. On the one hand, it was found that students, in general, valued diversity and intercultural interaction rather highly. On the other hand, however, the respondents reported having very limited contact, or no contact at all, with those outside their racial or ethnic group. The researchers attribute such discrepancies to the explanation that individuals may express support for diversity because of the need for social approval and the larger societal emphasis on such issues. It is further assumed that demographic diversity may, in fact, prevent intercultural contact from occurring. Societal emphasis placed on diversity may, paradoxically enough, "be growing into a type of ideological common sense that exempts (and justifies) individuals from having to participate in actual intercultural contact" (Halualani et al., 2004, p. 367).

Stephan and Stephan (1984), analyzing the role of ignorance in intergroup relations, draw the following circular connection between contact and prejudice: Ignorance causes prejudice, and lack of contact with outgroup members causes ignorance. Under the proper conditions, the researchers further argue, contact with outgroups can

reduce ignorance consequently reducing prejudice. However, in order to lead to a positive attitude change toward a certain social group contact needs to be characterized by particular qualities.

Gordon Allport (1954) was among the first to formulate the so-called "contact hypothesis," the premise of which lies in the argument that intergroup contact leads to reduced intergroup prejudice. However, as proposed by Allport, prejudice can be reduced only when the contact situation occurs under the following conditions: (1) participants share a sense of equality in social status, (2) participants pursue common goals, (3) participants are mutually interested in collaboration, and (4) the community/authority sanctions the contact.

In like manner, Cook (1984) identifies five conditions necessary for reducing prejudice in intergroup contact: (1) individuals should have equal status, (2) negative outgroup stereotypes should be disconfirmed, (3) a cooperative relationship should exist, (4) the contact situation should have high acquaintance potential, and (5) there should be a supportive social climate. Similarly, the reconsidered and expanded version of Allport's contact hypothesis by Miller and Brewer (1984) suggests that meaningful contact between members belonging to different cultural groups occurs only in circumstances when: (1) all the participants have relatively equal social status, (2) opportunity to learn stereotype-inconsistent information is maximized, (3) interaction encourages or even requires a mutually interdependent relationship, (4) the contact situation promotes the desire to learn specific details about the members of the out-group in order to see them as individuals rather than persons with stereotyped group

characteristics, (5) norms favoring intergroup equality and expression of individuality are salient, and finally (6) other structural features (e. g., history and intensity of intergroup conflict, personal characteristics and prior experience of the participant) can be potentially manipulated or controlled. Stephan (1985) extends the list of optimal condition to 13 characteristics that include cooperation, equal status, similarity in values and beliefs, similarity in competence, positive outcomes of the interaction, institutional support, potential to extend the contact beyond the immediate situation, emphasis on individuation of group members, mutual disclosure of information, mutual interest in the interaction, variety of contexts with a variety of in-group and out-group members, duration of the interaction, and an equal number of ingroup and outgroup members.

Interestingly enough, after conducting a meta-analysis of 515 studies that investigated contact theory in various social disciplines employing a wide range of research methods, Pettigrew and Tropp (2000) conclude that despite the fact that many researchers suggest additional characteristics to the original list compiled by Allport in his contact hypothesis, contact, even in situations when not all the optimal conditions are met, still promotes positive intergroup outcomes. This meta-analysis study allowed for a number of inferences. Most importantly, Pettigrew and Tropp (2000) emphasized a distinct relationship between face-to-face interaction and reduced prejudice. They further noted that while any face-to-face interaction is negatively correlated to the levels of prejudice, situations in which intergroup contact was structured to meet most or all the key conditions outlined by Allport in his contact hypothesis, lead to a higher effect size between contact and prejudice, meaning that a larger positive effect can be reached when

optimal conditions are present. The findings of this meta-analysis study were used to suggest implications for the programs aimed at reducing intergroup prejudice. Pettigrew and Tropp recommend a careful structure with the inclusion of Allport's optimal conditions and consideration of the perspectives of both groups involved in the interaction in order to promote intergroup understanding. In addition, researchers argue for structural alterations within an institution to ensure that optimal conditions for intergroup contact are imbedded in the routine life of that institution.

Similarly, after reviewing research on campus racial and ethnic diversity, Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen (1998) conclude that while increasing racial and ethnic diversity of an institution is an important initial step toward improving the climate, increasing minority enrollments without implementing structural changes whereby all students feel that they are valued, is likely to produce problems for both White and minority students at these institutions. Such problems, the authors suggest, might be rooted in competition over limited resources between ethnic minority and majority groups. The researchers further emphasize the role of faculty and administrators in creating "student-centered" environments to minimize racial tension and competition among groups.

Helms (1984) contends that an individual may pass through five stages when coming into contact with a person from another culture: (1) contact stage involving only minimal awareness of cultural and racial differences between the groups, (2) disintegration stage where individuals acknowledge unequal power relations between majority and minority cultures, (3) reintegration stage where the minority group is seen as

a cause of problems for the majority group, (4) pseudo-independence stage where the majority group becomes interested in understanding cultural differences between the groups, and finally (5) autonomy stage involving genuine understanding and appreciation of cultural differences.

Similarly, Bennett (1986, 1993), in his Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS), identifies six stages that individuals seem to move through as they progress from a highly ethnocentric to the most developed ethnorelative frame of reference in viewing cultural differences. The first stage in this continuum is denial. At this point of the development, an individual refuses to acknowledge cultural differences within his or her community. Various types of physical and social isolation and separation foster the denial of the existence of differences. The second stage is defense, involving realization of the existence of cultural differences and development of defense mechanisms against perceived threats to one's own culture. Such defense mechanisms are commonly manifested by negative stereotyping of the culturally different and emphasizing the superiority of one's own cultural group. The third and final stage in the ethnocentric phase is minimization. At the stage of minimization, an individual starts to believe that while cultural differences do exist, they are not important because similarities among all people are much more profound. Passing the minimization stage, an individual enters the ethnorelative phase in Bennett's DMIS. Thus, the fourth stage in the continuum is acceptance, characterized by respect for behavioral and value differences. The fifth stage is adaptation when new skills necessary for dealing with a different worldview are acquired. At the stage of adaptation an individual internalizes more than

one culture and is able to view the world employing multiple cultural frames of reference. Finally, the developmental process culminates with integration, which is identified as the sixths stage in the DMIS. The integration stage involves the ability to integrate various aspects of one's identity into a new whole, which would allow an individual to abandon the constraints of any particular culture. Bennett characterizes this final stage as highly self-reflective. Bennett writes that "the integrated person understands that his or her identity emerges from the act of defining identity itself. This self-reflective loop shows identity to be one act of constructing reality, similar to other acts that together yield concepts and cultures" (1993, p. 60).

Universal-Diverse Orientation (UDO)

As suggested by the research previously reviewed in the present study, for effective communication with people from other cultures, low degrees of prejudice are desirable. It is also assumed that intercultural contact, under certain conditions, leads to reduced intergroup conflict (e. g., Allport, 1954; Cook, 1984; Miller & Brewer, 1984; Stephan, 1985). Kim (2005), in her model of intercultural identity development, suggests that through the process of being exposed to a multitude of different cultures, an individual's identity becomes increasingly inclusive. Consequently, an individual starts to make deliberate choices for action based on a specific situation rather then relying on prevailing stereotypes of his or her own culture. Thus, "an individual's original cultural identity gradually undergoes a transformation in the direction of individualization and universalization" (Kim, 2005, p. 332).

Similarly, Brewer and Miller (1988) assert that effective communication with strangers is based on individual characteristics rather than stereotypical categories in which we place them. Thus, even intercultural communication is interpersonal rather than intergroup. Interactions with strangers, thus need to be decategorized and personalized. The authors suggest that personal rather than social identities should take on more importance in any type of communication. If we focus on strangers' personal identities we can decrease the degree to which their group identities affect our expectations which changes the way how we process the information.

Vontress (1996) points out that all humans have a common biological makeup that conditions people to maintain physical existence (e.g., eat, sleep, and reproduce) as well as face its end through death. Thus, Vontress (1996) introduces the term "universal culture" to refer to "the all encompassing humanities in each of us which pervades all cultures. No matter what the conditions are under which people live, they must adjust to the fact that they are human beings" (Vontress, 1996, p. 164). Still, cultural experiences based on race, gender, socioeconomic status among other factors make people infinitely diverse. Therefore, understanding fundamental similarities to be able to connect people on the basis of commonalities while at the same time accepting and valuing cultural and individual differences are essential factors in intercultural encounters (Vontress, 1996).

To reflect an attitude of awareness and acceptance of both similarities and differences among people, Miville (1992) introduced a universal orientation construct. Universal orientation is defined as "an attitude toward all other persons which is inclusive yet differentiating in that similarities and differences are both recognized and accepted;

the shared experience of being human results in a sense of connectedness with people and is associated with a plurality or diversity of interactions with others" (Miville, 1992, p. 41). Miville, in her later works, used the term universal-diverse orientation (UDO) to better reflect the essence of the construct. The author explains that UDO reflects the interrelatedness of cognitive, behavioral, and affective components. Thus, for example, a person with UDO may seek interactions with others (behavioral) because this person values both similarities and differences with others (cognitive), which in turn might reinforce UDO values and result in a sense of connectedness with others (emotional). Thus, a person expressing UDO appreciates the similarities between all humans, while at the same time valuing the diversity of beliefs and experiences and seeking opportunities to explore the multitude of views by meeting people of different backgrounds. Miville et al. (1999) maintain that "such an attitude is probably critical for helping to establish healthy relationships with other people that, at the same time, allow for the uniqueness of oneself and the other person to be perceived and accepted" (p. 304). Thus, UDO expresses an individual's general desire to be involved with diverse cultures and people.

To measure UDO, Miville (1992) devised a 45-item, 6-point Likert-type instrument that includes three subscales reflecting the respective behavioral, cognitive, and affective components of UDO. Later this instrument became known as the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale (M-GUDS; Miville et al., 1999), which is designed to measure the level of prejudice and reveal strengths and deficits in a given person or organization's diversity perspective, which may then provide an important new direction for assessment in diversity programming (Singley & Sedlacek, 2004).

Summary

As literature in the field of internationalization suggests, public opinion about internationalizing higher education is somewhat ambiguous. Generally, the need for international education experience is well understood and supported. However, actual interest demonstrated by involvement in international experience remains rather low. Many postsecondary institutions place internationalization high on their agendas and one of the means they most often use to enhance the process is attracting international students to their campus. While, as evidenced by the most recent data in the field, there is no shortage of international students in the U.S., their role in the overall process of internationalization is questionable.

Due to the nature of human communication patterns, interactions between different cultural groups are very unlikely. Thus, foreign and domestic students prefer to seek communication with representatives of familiar cultures avoiding interactions with strangers. In order to break this pattern and optimize interactions between international and non-international students for educational purposes, not only do colleges and universities need to carefully structure their efforts to internationalize at an organizational level, but they also need to understand what elements of intercultural communication are important to nurture. College years should be full of opportunities to meet and get to know different people, thereby reducing stereotypes and prejudices towards the culturally different. Such encounters, however, should be optimized by higher institutions' efforts to not only make claims of cultural diversity by providing statistics on student enrollment and faculty from a variety of backgrounds, but also to structure educational activities that

would help students to understand the core of intercultural and interpersonal relationships and move beyond categories of skin color, ethnicity, or nationality when interacting with others.

In order to provide effective programs aimed at developing intercultural competence, it is essential to first be aware of the type of interaction and attitudes that exist in the context of international communication on campus. Assessing the extent to which college students value international diversity on campus and investigating whether the amount and nature of contact between international and domestic students leads to reduced levels of prejudice is imperative to understanding both the strengths and weaknesses of current education programs that include an international dimension.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to measure the extent to which American students at a Midwestern comprehensive university experience international diversity and desire to be involved with internationally diverse cultures and people. The study was guided by the following research questions:

1a. What is the amount of contact between international and non-international students in a comprehensive university setting?

1b. Are there any significant differences in the amount of contact between international and non-international students according to demographic variables?

2a. What is the nature of contact between international and non-international students in terms of duration of the interaction, location of the interaction, type of relationship with an international student, and frequency of interacting with an international student?

2b. Are there any significant differences in the nature of contact between international and non-international students according to demographic variables?

3a. What are the attitudes of non-international students toward international diversity, as operationalized by the M-GUDS-S, on a comprehensive university campus?

3b. Are there any significant differences in the attitudes of non-international students toward international diversity according to demographic variables?

4. Is the amount of contact between international and non-international students correlated with the attitudes of non-international students toward international diversity on a comprehensive university campus?

This chapter describes the procedure used in collecting and analyzing the data and presenting the results.

Design

The design of this study was focused on survey research. According to Isaac and Michael (1990), survey is one of the most widely used techniques for data collection in the field of education and behavioral sciences. The authors maintain that a survey generally describes "what exists, in what amount, and in what context" (p. 128). Another benefit of survey research is the generalizability of information obtained from a relatively small number of people to an extremely large population (Alreck & Settle, 1995). For these reasons, a survey design was an appropriate choice for addressing the questions considered in this study.

Quantitative methodology was used to collect and analyze the data. A 28-item survey instrument was administered via the Internet to all non-international, full-time students enrolled in the University during the Fall 2005 semester. Descriptive and inferential statistics was used to analyze the results.

Participants

This study was conducted at a Midwestern comprehensive university. According to the most recent statistics for the academic year 2005-2006, the University is home to a total number of 12,513 students. Among all the students enrolled in the University in

2005-2006, there were 422 international students (230 undergraduate and 192 graduate students), comprising 3.4 percent of the total student enrollment and representing 73 countries (Hart & Kumar, 2006).

The university is comprised of 5 academic colleges (Business, Education, Humanities and Fine Arts, Natural Sciences, and Social and Behavioral Sciences). Of the total number of students, 20% (n = 2,531) major in business, 23% (n = 2,863) in education, 17% (n = 2,078) in humanities and fine arts, 13% (n = 1,652) in natural sciences, 16% (n = 1,984) in social and behavioral sciences, and 11% (n = 1,405) associate themselves with no particular major. Undergraduate students make up 88% (n = 10,952), while graduate students make up only 12% (n = 1,561) of the total enrollment. With regard to ethnic composition, the student body is predominantly Caucasian (87%). Ethnic minorities (excluding international students) are represented by 3% African American/Black, 1% Asian/Pacific Islander, 2% Hispanic American/Latin American, and .2% by Native American students (Hart & Kumar, 2006).

The University provides 10 student dormitories on its campus. In addition to the dormitories, the University provides on-campus apartments for students with dependents, graduate students, or students more than 23 years old. Students also have an option to live at off-campus locations. In terms of the international–domestic student ratios of each dormitory, the highest percent of international students live in BTL Hall (18%), followed by 6% living in LTH Hall. DNC Hall, NRN Hall, and RTH Hall are home to only 3% of international students each. Of the total number of residents in the BND Hall, only 2% are international students. And the smallest percentage (1%) of international students

reside in CML Hall, HGM Hall, RDR Hall, and SHL Hall (J. Wiesley, personal communication, May 25, 2006).

For the purpose of this study, only full-time non-international students (n = 9,144) were selected as a potential pool of participants. Neither international, nor part-time non-international students could obtain access to the survey. The students received no incentive to take part in this study.

The survey instrument was distributed among 9,144 students via the University operated online system. Of the 9,144 survey instruments distributed, the survey was completed and returned by 742 participants. However, 18 returned questionnaires had missing responses and thus had to be eliminated from the analysis, leaving the total usable N = 724 (return rate = 6.6 %).

Instrumentation

The survey instrument used for this research (Appendix A) consists of three sections: (a) a 15-item modified version of a short form of the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale (M-GUDS-S), (b) a series of 5 items regarding interactions with international students adapted from a study by Halualany et al. (2004), and (3) a series of 8 questions addressing the demographic data.

M-GUDS-S

The M-GUDS-S (Fuertes, Miville, Mohr, Sedlacek, & Gretchen, 2000) is a 15-item, 6-point Likert-type (1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree) scale developed to measure universal-diverse orientation (UDO). The M-GUDS-S yields a total scale score from three distinct but modestly interrelated 5-item subscales (15 items, possible range of

scores is from 15 to 90). Three subscales reflecting the respective behavioral, cognitive, and affective components of UDO are known as: (a) Diversity of Contact (5 items, possible range of scores is from 5 to 30), (b) Relativistic Appreciation (5 items, possible range of scores is from 5 to 30), and (c) Comfort with Differences (5 items, possible range of scores is from 5 to 30). The Diversity of Contact subscale reflects interest in participating in diverse, internationally focused social and cultural activities. The Relativistic Appreciation subscale measures whether a respondent recognizes similarities and differences in others, and whether these similarities and differences are considered by the respondent important for personal growth. The Comfort with Differences subscale measures emotional comfort in contact with culturally diverse others. Subscales have been found to be moderately intercorrelated with each other, as well as with the full scale score (Fuertes et al., 2000). The full scale score indicates respondent's overall orientation toward diversity.

The M-GUDS-S is a short form of the 45-item Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale (M-GUDS). The total scale scores of the M-GUDS and M-GUDS-S were found to have a high correlation ($r = .77$), meaning that both measures are appropriate for assessing UDO (Fuertes et al., 2000). However, Fuertes et al. (2000) report that M-GUDS-S has a number of advantages over its longer version. Particularly, the M-GUDS-S more clearly delineates the factor structure of scores and the relationship among its scales. In addition, each subscale of the M-GUDS-S yields a score that allows measuring distinct aspects of UDO, thus leading to a more complete analysis of the

construct. And finally, since the M-GUDS-S is shorter it can be administered more quickly than its original form (Fuertes et al., 2000).

In the present investigation, several modifications with regard to terminology were made to the M-GUDS-S to better fit the purpose of the study. The changes are as follows: In items number 3 and 4 the original word 'cultures' was replaced with the word 'countries.' In question number 5 the phrase 'racial background' was changed to the word 'countries.' In item 6 the term 'person with disabilities' was replaced with the term 'international student.' In questions 7 through 11 the term 'person from another country' was substituted for the terms 'someone,' 'a person,' or 'other people.' In items number 12, 13, and 15 the term 'race' was replaced with the term 'nationality.'

Contact with International Students

This section of the survey instrument measures the amount and nature of contact between non-international and international students at the University. The questions were adapted from the study by Halualani et al. (2004), which analyzed the interactional frequencies and patterns of intercultural contact among racially/ethnically different students at a multicultural university. Five items in this section were based on memory-recall close-ended questions about the frequency and nature of contact with an international student within the last two months. The two-month time period was used to provide a more realistic recall period that would more accurately capture the extent of an individual's interactional routine. It was also assumed that two months from the beginning of the semester was especially necessary for freshmen and transfer students to

adjust to a new environment and establish some experience and patterns relevant to this study.

In this section of the instrument, participants were first asked how many conversations they had since the beginning of the semester with an international student. Those who selected the option "none" were instructed to skip a set of four questions and proceed to the demographics section. Respondents who indicated they had conversations with an international student since the beginning of the semester, were asked to recall the most memorable conversation with an international student and then were led through the following series of four close-ended questions about the nature of the interaction: (a) duration of the interaction, (b) location of the interaction, (c) type of relationship with the international student, and (d) the frequency of interacting with the international student.

The purpose of including these questions in the survey instrument was twofold. Firstly, presence of international students in American colleges and universities is often an indicator of the effectiveness of the internationalization process at a particular institution of higher education. However, it is rarely addressed whether international students come in contact with domestic students and whether this impacts the process if campus internationalization. Hence, this study attempted to examine the amount and nature of interactional encounters between international and non-international students. Secondly, the researcher sought to investigate the correlation between the amount and nature of intergroup interactions and the UDO score, to analyze whether increased contact with international students is associated with a more positive orientation toward international diversity on campus.

Demographic Data

Eight items addressing relevant demographic information of the respondents were included in this section. Selected demographic characteristics were American citizenship, gender, year of school, degree program, age, size of home community, current place of residence, and ethnicity.

To establish content and face validity, the survey instrument was given to a panel of experts at the University of Northern Iowa. The panel of experts consisted of 5 faculty members of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, the Department of Educational Psychology, the Department of English Language and Literature, and the Department of Special Education. Based on suggestions from the panel of experts, one demographic question asking respondent's current living location was added to the survey instrument. This question was included in the survey with the purpose of determining whether residents of college dormitories with a higher population of international students would have any different attitudes toward diversity on campus compared to those respondents who live in dormitories with fewer numbers of international students and those respondents who do not live in college dormitories.

Data Collection

The survey instrument was distributed among all non-international, full-time students enrolled in the University in Fall 2005. Since American citizenship and full-time enrollment in the University were the two criteria for selection of the study participants, the University Registrar's Office was contacted with a request to generate a list of students who would respond to these two criteria. The University Registrar's

Office administrator then submitted the list to the University Information Technology Services staff member who was responsible for distributing and collecting online surveys. The survey was administered via the University operated web-based system. Each student enrolled in the University has an e-mail account and an individually customized portal provided by the University. A message inviting students to complete the web-based survey and containing a link to the survey was sent to the individual portal on November 5, 2005. The Fall 2005 semester started on August 22, 2005 and a minimum of a two-month period was necessary for students to respond to the questions addressing the amount and nature of contact with international students within the last month. Hence, the researcher thought it reasonable to start the survey process in November 2005. The online survey remained active during the time period of November 5, 2005 through December 12, 2005, meaning that the selected participants could access and complete the survey at any time within this period. A completed and returned questionnaire could not be accessed again.

In addition to the message with the link to the survey that appeared in the individual portal from November 5, 2005 through December 12, 2005, the researcher published an announcement in the University online news source distributed every week during the academic year and delivered to the University provided e-mail accounts. This announcement reminded students about the online survey and contained a link to the questionnaire. While this announcement was distributed among all the students, the link was accessible only to non-international, full-time students. In compliance with the publisher's requirements, the announcement was sent two times during the five-week

period of data collection. Completion of the survey constituted a respondent's consent to participate in the study.

All survey responses were recorded and compiled into a master file. Once the online survey was deactivated, the survey responses were converted into a data file. The researcher could gain access to the data file only.

Data Analysis

Of the 742 completed and returned questionnaires, 18 had missing responses and therefore were eliminated from the analysis. This left a total usable $N = 724$ (return rate = 6.6 %). All the data were compiled into a database and analyzed with the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 13 for Windows. Items 11 through 15 (Comfort with Differences subscale of the M-GUDS-S) were reverse scored. First, the M-GUDS-S three subscale item scores were aggregated to yield scores for the Diversity of Contact, Relativistic Appreciation, and Comfort with Differences subscales. The aggregate range of scores for the 5 items in each subscale was from 5-30. Then the three subscale scores were totalled to provide the composite UDO score. The possible aggregate range of scores for UDO was from 15-90. Larger scores implied a more supportive attitude toward international diversity.

The first set of analyses generated psychometrics of the M-GUDS-S instrument that measured the UDO. Cronbach's alpha coefficient established reliability at $\alpha = .86$ ($n = 15$) for the overall M-GUDS-S. If the coefficient alpha equals or exceeds .80, a satisfactory level of internal consistency is believed to be achieved (Benson & Clark, 1982). Alpha's for the subscales were .78 (Diversity of Contact), .80 (Relativistic

Appreciation), and .82 (Comfort with Differences), demonstrating moderate to high levels of reliability (Trochim, 2000). Descriptive statistics were used to address research questions 1a, 2a, and 3a. Inferential statistics were used to answer the research question 4 as well as research questions 1b, 2b, and 3b in their relation to the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

A one-way ANOVA was carried out to determine if differences related to demographic variables existed in the number of contacts with an international student, in the duration of conversations, in the frequency of contacts with the same international student, and in the UDO score as well as its three subscale scores. Cross-tabulations with the chi-square test of independence were run to identify any differences in the location of interaction with an international student and relationship type with the international student by demographic characteristics of the participants. Finally, a Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to assess the level of relationship between students' UDO score and the amount of contacts with an international student. The three subscale scores (Diversity of Contact, Relativistic Appreciation, and Comfort with Differences) were also analyzed in their degree of association with the number of interactions with an international student.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to measure the extent to which American students at a Midwestern comprehensive university experience international diversity and desire to be involved with internationally diverse cultures and people. The study also sought to determine if any differences exist among selected demographic variables (gender, year of school, degree program, age, size of home community, current place of residence, and ethnicity) in the extent to which American students at a Midwestern comprehensive university experience international diversity and desire to be involved with internationally diverse cultures and people. The findings of the study are reported in this chapter.

Demographics of the Study

Of the 9,144 surveys distributed among all non-international, full time students of the University, the total number of 724 returned questionnaires was used for the analysis, giving a response rate of 6.6%. The final section of the questionnaire (questions 21 through 28) addressed the demographic data of the participants. Students were asked to provide information on the following demographic variables: American citizenship, gender, year of school, degree program, age, size of home community, current place of residence, and ethnicity. The demographic findings are presented below in the same sequence they appeared in the questionnaire.

American Citizenship

American citizenship was a controlled variable in this study. Only students who were U.S. citizens or permanent residents were selected to participate in the survey. This demographic question, however, was included in the questionnaire to eliminate any chance of responses from a student who would not belong to this category. Asked whether they were a citizen or permanent resident of the United States, all 724 (100%) of study participants said "Yes".

Gender

Of all 724 students who responded to the survey, 532 were females and 192 were males constituting 73% and 27%, respectively.

Year of School

Twenty-seven percent (n = 198) of students identified themselves as sophomore, 24% (n = 172) as junior, followed by 16% (n = 118) of unclassified or undeclared, 15 % (n = 110) of freshmen, 10% (n = 69) of seniors, 7% (n = 50) of 5th year seniors, and 1% (n = 7) of graduate students. Thus, the overwhelming majority (99%) of this study participants were undergraduate students.

Degree Program

The distribution of the respondents according to the degree program was the following: 25% (n = 178) were students in the College of Education, 20% (n = 145) – College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, 20% (n = 141) – College of Business Administration, 18% (n = 133) – College of Humanities and Fine Arts, 12% (n = 90) –

College of Natural Sciences, and 5% (n = 37) stated that they did not associate themselves with any particular college.

Age

The large majority of students (n = 659, 91%) were under 25, while only 9% (n = 66) were over 25 years of age.

Size of Home Community

Thirty-two percent (n = 235) of the students who responded to the survey stated they had grown up in a community whose approximate population was 1,000–5,000, 21% (n = 155) stated 5,001-25,000, 15% (n = 111) stated the population of their home community was 25,001-50,000, 12% (n = 89) stated 50,001-100,000, 11% (n = 77) stated the population was over 100,000, and the remaining 8% (n = 57) stated they had grown up in a rural area or community of fewer than 1,000 people.

Current Place of Residence

This question was included in the survey with the purpose of determining whether residents of college dormitories with a higher population of international students would have any different attitudes toward diversity on campus compared to those respondents who live in dormitories with fewer numbers of international students and those respondents who do not live in college dormitories. Participants were given 12 options that would identify their current place of residence. Among the 12 options, 10 categories signified a student dormitory located on campus, one category signified single family student housing also located on campus, and one category signified all off-campus living not affiliated with the University. Of all the dormitories located on campus, BTL Hall

houses the greatest number of international students (18% of its total number of residents). The rest of the residence halls are home to a very small percentage of international students: 6% in LTH Hall; 3% in DNC Hall, NRN Hall, and RTH Hall each; 2 % in BND Hall; and 1% in CML Hall, HGM Hall, RDR Hall, and SHL Hall.

Over half of all the respondents (n = 401, 55%) stated they lived off-campus. The remaining 45% of on-campus resident responses were distributed in the following fashion: 6% (n = 45) lived in CML Hall, 6% (n = 40) lived in LTH Hall, 5% (n = 38) lived in BND Hall, 5% (n = 38) lived in NRN Hall, 5% (n = 34) lived in DNC Hall, 4% (n = 26) lived in HGM Hall, 3% (n = 25) lived in RDR Hall, 3% (n = 23) lived in SHL Hall, 3% (n = 21) lived in RTH Hall, 3% (n = 19) lived in BTL Hall, and 2% (n = 14) lived in university apartments.

Ethnicity

The large majority of students (n = 674, 93%) identified themselves as Caucasian American/White, 2% (n = 12) as African American/Black, 2% (n = 11) as Multiracial, 1% (n = 9) as Hispanic American/Latin American, 1% (n = 8) as Asian/Pacific Islander, 1% (n = 5) as Native American, and 1% (n = 5) as "other" (with such specifications provided by the respondents as "Human," "American," and "Slovak").

Summary of Results in Response to Research Questions

Research Question 1

> a. What is the amount of contact between international and non-international students in a comprehensive university setting?
> b. Are there any significant differences in the amount of contact between international and non-international students according to demographic variables?

This research question was addressed in a single question in the survey instrument. Participants were asked to select one option that would best describe the approximate number of conversations with an international student they had since the beginning of the semester (two-month time period). Response options included: none (numerical value 1), 1-2 (numerical value 2), 3-4 (numerical value 3), 5-6 (numerical value 4), 7-8 (numerical value 5), 9-10 (numerical value 6), 11+ (numerical value 7).

A substantial proportion of respondents (n = 591, 82%) reported having at least one or two conversations with an international student, while the other 18% (n = 133) stated they had not had any conversation with an international student since the beginning of the semester (two-month time period). Twenty-five percent (n = 178) of all the participants stated they talked to an international student 1-2 times, 24% (n = 175) 11 or more times, 15% (n = 107) 3-4 times, 9% (n = 67) 5-6 times, 6% (n = 41) 7-8 times, and 3% (n = 23) 9-10 times (see Table 1). The mean score of the frequency of contact between international and non-international students was 3.65 and the standard deviation was 2.24.

To examine the existence of any significant differences in the number of conversations with an international student according to demographic variables, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed. A statistical analysis was performed at .05 alpha level with the following independent variables: gender, year of school, degree program, age, size of home community, current place of residence, and ethnicity. Results are presented in Table 2.

Table 1

Frequency Distribution of the Number of Conversations with an International Student

Number of Conversations	Frequency	Percent
none	133	18
1-2	178	25
3-4	107	15
5-6	67	9
7-8	41	6
9-10	23	3
11+	175	24
Total	724	100

Table 2

Amount of Contact between International and Non-International Students by Demographic Variables (N = 724)

Demographic	*n(%)*	*M*	*SD*	$F_{a,b}$
Gender				$1.76_{1,722}$
Male	192(27)	3.84	2.32	
Female	532(73)	3.59	2.21	
*Year of School				$2.51_{6,717}$
Unclassified	118(16)	3.19	2.02	
Freshman	10(15)	3.69	2.24	
Sophomore	198(27)	3.49	2.16	
Junior	172(24)	3.77	2.32	
Senior	69(10)	3.93	2.42	
5th year senior	50(7)	4.38	2.25	
Graduate	7(1)	4.86	2.85	
**Degree Program				$3.02_{5,718}$
Business Administration	141(19)	3.33	2.15	
Education	178(25)	3.40	2.18	
Humanities/Fine Arts	133(18)	4.17	2.23	
Natural Sciences	90(12)	3.89	2.28	
Social/Behavioral Sciences	145(20)	3.78	2.35	
Undeclared	37(5)	3.24	2.07	

(table continues)

Demographic	*n(%)*	*M*	*SD*	$F_{a,b}$
Age				$1.88_{1,722}$
Under 25	658(91)	3.62	2.23	
Over 25	66(9)	4.02	2.34	
Size of Home Community				$1.53_{5,718}$
Less than 1,000	57(8)	3.26	2.18	
1,000 – 5,000	235(32)	3.59	2.29	
5,001 – 25,000	155(21)	3.83	2.32	
25,001 – 50,000	111(15)	3.40	2.21	
50,001 – 100,000	89(12)	3.70	2.13	
Over 100,000	77(11)	4.12	2.13	
**Current Place of Residence				$2.41_{11,712}$
Off-campus	401(55)	3.57	2.28	
University apartments	14(2)	3.79	1.93	
RTH Hall	21(3)	3.38	2.06	
BTL Hall	19(3)	4.89	2.33	
BND Hall	38(5)	4.26	2.37	
CML Hall	45(6)	3.13	2.00	
DNC Hall	34(5)	3.38	2.22	
HGM Hall	26(4)	3.92	2.13	
LTH Hall	40(6)	3.78	2.08	
NRN Hall	38(5)	2.82	1.79	
RDR Hall	25(3)	4.68	2.29	
SHL Hall	23(3)	4.43	2.35	
Ethnicity				$1.20_{6,717}$
African American/Black	12(2)	4.33	2.23	
Asian/Pacific Islander	8(1)	3.88	1.81	
Caucasian/White	674(93)	3.62	2.24	
Hispanic/Latin American	9(1)	4.78	2.28	
Multiracial	11(2)	4.18	2.52	
Native American	5(1)	2.20	1.11	
Other	5(1)	4.60	2.61	

Note. Numerical values assigned to the frequency of contact for a two-month period are 1 (none), 2 (1-2 times), 3 (3-4 times), 4 (5-6 times), 5 (7-8 times), 6 (9-10 times), 7 (11+ times). a = Between groups df, b = Within groups df. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

As demonstrated in Table 2, year of school, degree program, and current place of residence all had an effect on the amount of contact with an international student. One-

way ANOVA revealed a statistically significant difference for the number of interactions with an international student with regard to the year of school, $F(6,717) = 2.51, p = .02$. Post hoc analyses were performed using Tukey HSD test to identify exactly where significant differences exist. The analyses revealed that 5th year senior students differed significantly from unclassified/undeclared students. Significantly different scores, $F(5,718) = 3.02, p = .01$, were found among students of different degree programs as well. A post hoc (Tukey) test revealed that students majoring in humanities and fine arts had significantly more interactions with international students compared to students majoring in education and students majoring in business. Statistically significant differences in the number of conversations with international students, $F(11,712) = 2.41, p = .006$, were also found among students of various places of residence. The highest mean of 4.89 ($SD = 2.33$) was shown by the residents of BTL Hall. Conversely, the lowest mean of 2.82 ($SD = 1.79$) was shown by the residents of NRN Hall. A post hoc analysis using Tukey test found significant differences in the number of contacts with international students between residents of BTL Hall and residents of NRN Hall. No other demographic variables were found to have a statistically significant effect on the number of interactions with an international student for a period of two months since the beginning of the semester.

Research Question 2

> a. What is the nature of contact between international and non-international students in terms of duration of the interaction, location of the interaction, type of relationship with an international student, and frequency of interacting with an international student?
> b. Are there any significant differences in the nature of contact between international and non-international students according to demographic variables?

A series of four close-ended items in the survey questionnaire addressed this research question. In these four items students were asked to recall the most memorable conversation with an international student within the past month and state: (a) how long they talked to the international student, (b) where the conversation took place, (c) the relationship with the international student, and (d) how frequently they interacted with the international student. Respondents who previously stated that they had not engaged in any interactions with an international student since the beginning of the semester were instructed to skip these questions and to proceed to the demographics section.

A total of 591 students (82%) reported that they had had at least 1-2 conversations with an international student since the beginning of the semester. For 63% ($n = 371$) of the respondents, these conversations lasted from 0 to 30 minutes. Another 21% ($n = 124$) estimated talking to an international student for 31–60 minutes, whereas only 9% ($n = 56$) talked for 61–180 minutes, 2% ($n = 11$) talked for 181–360 minutes, and 5% ($n = 29$) talked for longer than 6 hours (see Table 3).

ANOVA performed at .05 alpha level revealed that year of school, age, and place of residence had a statistically significant effect on the duration of conversation with an international student. Results are presented in Table 4.

Follow-up tests using Tukey HSD method were performed to identify all differences between the pairs of means depending on the year of school, age, and place of residence that were found to have a statistically significant effect on the duration of the conversation ($p = .02$, $p = .02$, $p = .04$, respectively) after running ANOVA. Tukey HSD test revealed a significant difference between graduate students who had the longest

Table 3

Frequency Distribution of the Duration of Conversation with an International Student

Duration of Conversation	Frequency	Percent
0-30 minutes	371	63
31-60 minutes	124	21
61-180 minutes (1-3 hours)	56	9
181-360 minutes (3-6 hours)	11	2
more than 360 minutes (6 hours)	29	5
Total	591	100

Table 4

Duration of Contact between International and Non-International Students by Demographic Variables (N = 591)

Demographic	*n(%)*	*M*	*SD*	$F_{a,b}$
Gender				$0.04_{1,589}$
Male	160(27)	1.64	1.05	
Female	431(73)	1.66	1.06	
*Year of School				$2.48_{6,584}$
Unclassified	90(15)	1.42	0.86	
Freshman	94(16)	1.64	1.02	
Sophomore	164(28)	1.63	1.14	
Junior	141(24)	1.70	0.97	
Senior	53(9)	1.85	1.25	
5th year senior	44(8)	1.68	1.05	
Graduate	5(1)	3.00	1.41	
Degree Program				$0.36_{5,585}$
Business Administration	111(19)	1.69	1.16	
Education	138(23)	1.64	1.09	
Humanities/Fine Arts	121(20)	1.69	1.02	
Natural Sciences	75(13)	1.68	1.12	
Social/Behavioral Sciences	119(20)	1.55	0.91	
Undeclared	27(5)	1.74	1.16	
*Age				$5.83_{1,589}$
Under 25	537(91)	1.62	1.03	

(table continues)

Demographic	*n(%)*	*M*	*SD*	$F_{a,b}$
Over 25	54(9)	1.98	1.25	
Size of Home Community				$0.50_{5,585}$
Less than 1,000	45(8)	1.49	0.84	
1,000 – 5,000	186(31)	1.61	1.05	
5,001 – 25,000	128(22)	1.70	1.07	
25,001 – 50,000	85(14)	1.73	1.15	
50,001 – 100,000	77(13)	1.71	1.11	
Over 100,000	70(12)	1.61	1.01	
*Current Place of Residence				$1.86_{11,579}$
Off-campus	314(53)	1.67	1.09	
University apartments	14(2)	2.14	1.41	
RTH Hall	18(3)	1.56	0.86	
BTL Hall	16(3)	2.19	1.17	
BND Hall	31(5)	1.48	0.81	
CML Hall	36(6)	1.58	1.11	
DNC Hall	28(5)	1.21	0.50	
HGM Hall	23(4)	1.70	1.06	
LTH Hall	38(6)	1.55	1.16	
NRN Hall	30(5)	1.47	0.86	
RDR Hall	23(4)	1.52	0.85	
SHL Hall	20(3)	2.20	1.24	
Ethnicity				$1.81_{6,584}$
African American/Black	11(2)	1.73	1.27	
Asian/Pacific Islander	7(1)	1.43	0.53	
Caucasian/White	547(93)	1.64	1.05	
Hispanic/Latin American	9(2)	2.67	1.50	
Multiracial	9(2)	1.89	0.93	
Native American	4(1)	1.00	0.00	
Other	4(1)	1.75	0.50	

Note. Numerical values assigned to the duration of a conversation are 1 (0-30 minutes), 2 (31-60 minutes), 3 (61-180 minutes), 4 (181-360 minutes), 5 (more than 360 minutes). a = Between groups df, b = Within groups df. *$p < .05$.

interactions with international students (mean score of 3.0 on a 5-point scale, $SD = 1.41$) and unclassified students who had the shortest interactions with international students

(mean score of 1.4 on a 5-point scale, $SD = 0.86$). Students over 25 years of age spoke to international students significantly longer than students aged under 25 years with alpha level set at .05. (mean scores on a 5-point scale were 2.0 and 1.6, $SD = 1.25$ and $SD = 1.03$, respectively). While ANOVA test showed that respondents' place of residence had a statistically significant effect on the duration of the conversation ($p = .04$) with alpha level set at .05, Tukey HSD analysis did not detect any significant differences among the group means. The contradiction in statistical differences between ANOVA and Tukey tests can be explained by the more stringent nature of the Tukey test procedure which provides greater control over Type I errors by reducing the probability of obtaining significant results by chance (Huck, 2004; McMillan & Schumacher, 2001; Sall, Lehman, & Creighton, 2001).

To determine the most common location for interactions between international and non-international students, participants were given nine categories from which to choose: *class, campus student union, residence hall/dining center, on-campus workplace, other campus location (specify), off-campus workplace, home, neighborhood, other off-campus location (specify).* A significant majority of the respondents (79%, $n = 467$) stated that their conversation with an international student took place somewhere on campus, whereas only 21% ($n = 124$) reported having a conversation in an off-campus location. The responses were distributed as follows: 31% ($n = 182$) talked to an international student in class, 9% ($n = 55$) had a conversation with an international student in the campus student union, 12% ($n = 69$) interacted with international students in a residence hall or a dining center, 14% ($n = 84$) met an international student at an on-

campus workplace, 13% (n = 77) conversed in some other on-campus location not included in the provided options, 2% (n = 14) reported talking to an international student at an off-campus workplace, 9% (n = 53) met an international student at home, 2% (n = 12) interacted with an international student in their neighborhood, and the remaining 8% (n = 45) stated that they had a conversation with an international student in some other off-campus location (see Table 5). Library, wellness center, and campus outdoors were the most frequently specified on-campus locations. Social gatherings and events, on the other hand, were the prevailing specified off-campus locations.

Table 5

Frequency Distribution of the Location of Conversation with an International Student

Location of Conversation	Frequency	Percent
Class	182	31
Campus student union	55	9
Residence hall/dining center	69	12
On-campus workplace	84	14
Other on-campus location	77	13
Off-campus workplace	14	2
Home	53	9
Neighborhood	12	2
Other off-campus location	45	8
Total	591	100

To assess whether the location of the interaction with an international student differed significantly depending on the demographic characteristics, chi-square test of independence was performed. As location of the interaction was a categorical variable,

cross-tabulations were run between the location of the interaction and the demographic characteristics. Alpha level was set at .05. To measure the strength of association between the location of the interaction and the demographic variables, Cramer's *V* test was employed.

Initial analysis of the nine location categories by demographic variables revealed an inflated significance score for year of school, age, size of home community, and current place of residence due to a large percent of cells with expected frequency of less than 5 (Elifson, Runyon, & Haber, 1998; Kendrick, 2005; see Table 6). Since it is a fundamental requirement of the chi-square test that the expected frequency be equal to or greater than 5 in at least 80% of the cells, the original nine categories representing various locations were combined into three broader categories with the purpose of increasing the expected frequencies in the various cells (Siegel & Castellan, 1988). The three categories were class, on-campus (excluding class), and off-campus. Since in-class interactions are more structured and often times mandated by the instructor, class was separated from other on-campus locations where students themselves are more likely to initiate a conversation. On-campus location was distinguished from off-campus location. Thus, the initial nine categories representing various locations of a conversation with an international student were combined into three broader categories in the following manner: class (class), on-campus (campus student union, residence hall/dining center, on-campus workplace, other on-campus location), and off-campus (off-campus workplace, home, neighborhood, other off-campus location).

After performing a chi-square test with three rather than nine columns, results indicated that only current place of residence had a statistically significant effect on the location of interaction between international and non-international students. To detect where exactly the differences existed, an analysis of cell wise residuals in a chi-square contingency table was performed. Results revealed that residents of BTL Hall and residents of DNC met international students at on-campus locations (other than class) significantly more compared to all the other groups. On the contrary, students living off-campus reported interacting with international students at on-campus locations (excluding class) significantly less than other groups of respondents. Class was the least common place for talking to international students to the residents of BTL Hall in comparison to the rest of the participants. And finally, residents of DNC Hall indicated interacting with international students at off-campus locations significantly less than others. Summaries are presented in Table 7.

The next question relating to the nature of interactions between international and non-international students explored the relationship type. Participants were asked to indicate the type of their relationship with the international student with the following eight options provided: *stranger, acquaintance, classmate, conversation partner, friend, co-worker, family member/relative*, and *relational partner/spouse*. Approximately one-third of the respondents (n = 175, 30%) stated that the international student they interacted with was their classmate. Two other substantial proportions were almost equally distributed between participants who said that the international student was their acquaintance (n = 131, 22%) and those who stated that the international student was their

Table 6

Frequency Distribution of Location of Contact by Demographic Variables (N = 591)

Demographic	A(%)	B(%)	C(%)	D(%)	E(%)	F(%)	G(%)	H(%)	I(%)
Gender									
Male	45(8)	21(4)	13(2)	22(4)	29(5)	3(1)	11(2)	3(1)	13(2)
Female	137(23)	34(6)	56(9)	62(10)	48(8)	11(2)	42(7)	9(2)	32(5)
Year of School									
Unclassified	27(5)	4(1)	16(3)	7(1)	19(3)	0(0)	6(1)	5(1)	6(1)
Freshman	22(4)	13(2)	18(3)	16(3)	9(2)	3(1)	9(2)	1(0)	3(1)
Sophomore	49(8)	15(3)	21(4)	27(5)	19(3)	3(1)	14(2)	2(0)	14(2)
Junior	43(7)	14(2)	12(2)	23(4)	15(3)	6(1)	13(2)	3(1)	12(2)
Senior	18(3)	2(0)	1(0)	9(2)	9(2)	1(0)	8(1)	0(0)	5(1)
5th year senior	22(4)	6(1)	1(0)	2(0)	4(1)	1(0)	2(0)	1(0)	5(1)
Graduate	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)	2(0)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Degree Program									
Business Administration	39(7)	8(1)	6(1)	18(3)	21(4)	3(1)	7(1)	2(0)	7(1)
Education	43(7)	10(2)	18(3)	21(4)	12(2)	6(1)	12(2)	5(1)	11(2)
Humanities/Fine Arts	42(7)	13(2)	13(2)	15(3)	12(2)	2(0)	12(2)	3(1)	9(2)
Natural Sciences	19(3)	7(1)	11(2)	9(2)	14(2)	0(0)	7(1)	2(0)	6(1)
Social/Behavioral Sciences	34(6)	15(3)	15(3)	17(3)	14(2)	2(0)	14(2)	0(0)	8(1)
Undeclared	5(1)	2(0)	6(1)	4(1)	4(1)	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	4(1)
Age									
Under 25	164(28)	40(7)	68(12)	83(14)	69(12)	13(2)	46(8)	11(2)	43(7)
Over 25	18(3)	15(3)	1(0)	1(0)	8(1)	1(0)	7(1)	1(0)	2(0)
Size of Home Community									
Less than 1,000	15(3)	4(1)	12(2)	6(1)	3(1)	2(0)	0(0)	0(0)	3(1)
1,000 – 5,000	70(12)	15(3)	9(2)	23(4)	29(5)	4(1)	17(3)	3(1)	16(3)

(table continues)

Demographic	A(%)	B(%)	C(%)	D(%)	E(%)	F(%)	G(%)	H(%)	I(%)
5,001 – 25,000	30(5)	12(2)	21(4)	21(4)	18(3)	3(1)	14(2)	5(1)	4(1)
25,001 – 50,000	30(5)	5(1)	13(2)	8(1)	9(2)	1(0)	10(2)	1(0)	8(1)
50,001 – 100,000	20(3)	9(2)	9(2)	14(2)	8(1)	4(1)	5(1)	1(0)	7(1)
Over 100,000	17(3)	10(2)	5(1)	12(2)	10(2)	0(0)	7(1)	2(0)	7(1)
Current Place of Residence									
Off-campus	114(19)	33(6)	2(0)	47(8)	37(6)	11(2)	29(5)	5(1)	36(6)
University apartments	5(1)	3(1)	0(0)	1(0)	1(0)	1(0)	2(0)	0(0)	1(0)
RTH Hall	5(1)	1(0)	0(0)	3(1)	2(0)	0(0)	5(1)	0(0)	2(0)
BTL Hall	0(0)	0(0)	11(2)	1(0)	3(1)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)
BND Hall	5(1)	3(1)	7(1)	4(1)	7(1)	0(0)	3(1)	1(0)	1(0)
CML Hall	13(2)	2(0)	9(2)	6(1)	0(0)	1(0)	1(0)	3(1)	1(0)
DNC Hall	5(1)	3(1)	10(2)	0(0)	9(2)	0(0)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)
HGM Hall	7(1)	1(0)	6(1)	4(1)	2(0)	0(0)	3(1)	0(0)	0(0)
LTH Hall	6(1)	4(1)	12(2)	6(1)	4(1)	0(0)	3(1)	1(0)	2(0)
NRN Hall	9(2)	2(0)	2(0)	8(1)	4(1)	1(0)	2(0)	1(0)	1(0)
RDR Hall	8(1)	1(0)	6(1)	2(0)	4(1)	0(0)	2(0)	0(0)	0(0)
SHL Hall	5(1)	2(0)	4(1)	2(0)	4(1)	0(0)	2(0)	0(0)	1(0)
Ethnicity									
African American/Black	4(1)	0(0)	4(1)	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(0)
Asian/Pacific Islander	1(0)	2(0)	0(0)	0(0)	2(0)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)	1(0)
Caucasian/White	171(29)	49(8)	65(11)	79(13)	67(11)	14(2)	49(8)	12(2)	41(7)
Hispanic/Latin American	1(0)	3(1)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)	3(1)	0(0)	1(0)
Multiracial	4(1)	0(0)	0(0)	1(0)	4(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Native American	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Other	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(0)	2(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(0)

Note: A = class, B = campus student union, C = residence hall/dining center, D = on-campus workplace, E = other on-campus location, F = off-campus workplace, G = home, H = neighborhood, I – other off-campus location.

Table 7

Cross-Tabulation of Location of Contact by Demographic Variables (N = 591)

Demographic	χ^2_{df}	Cramer's *V*
Gender	2.12_2	.06
Year of School	16.88_{12}	.12
Degree Program	7.82_{10}	.08
Age	$.18_2$	.02
Size of Home Community	15.55_{10}	.12
**Current Place of Residence	59.25_{22}	.22
Ethnicity	11.37_{12}	.10

Note: the chi-square test was performed on three types of location (class, on-campus, off-campus) by demographic variables. $^{**}p < .01$.

friend (n = 128, 22%). The international student was a stranger to 14% (n = 84), a co-worker to 8% (n = 50), a conversation partner to 3% (n = 18), a relational partner/spouse to 1% (n = 4), and a family member/relative to .2% (n = 1) of the respondents who had a conversation with an international student since the beginning of the semester. Relationship type frequencies are presented in Table 8.

To investigate whether there existed any association between the relationship type with an international student and demographic characteristics of the respondents, cross tabulations were preformed. Table 9 contains summaries of the cross-tabulations. Since the original data were distributed among many columns and rows causing a large number of cells to have the expected frequency of less than 5, eight relationship type categories were combined into three broader categories. Combining the eight original relationship type categories into three broader ones allowed for increasing the expected frequency

Table 8

Frequency Distribution of the Relationship Type with an International Student

Relationship Type	Frequency	Percent
Stranger	84	14
Acquaintance	131	22
Classmate	175	30
Conversation partner	18	3
Friend	128	22
Co-worker	50	8
Family member/relative	1	.1
Relational partner/spouse	4	1
Total	591	100

with the purpose of receiving a more meaningful chi-square score (Siegel & Castellan, 1988). The original categories *stranger* and *acquaintance* were combined into one category representing a distant relationship with an international student. C*lassmate*, *conversation partner*, and *co-worker* were grouped together to represent a professional type of relationship where people share membership in a certain group. Finally, *friend*, *family member/relative*, and *relational partner/spouse* were combined into a category representing a close relationship with an international student.

Once the relationship type categories were combined into three, the chi-square test of independence and Cramer's *V* test were run to measure the degree of association between the type of relationship with an international student and demographic variables of the participants. Results indicate a statistically significant association between the type of relationship with an international student and respondent's year of school. A post

Table 9

Frequency Distribution of the Relationship Type with an International Student by Demographic Variables (N = 591)

Demographic	A(%)	B(%)	C(%)	D(%)	E(%)	F(%)	G(%)	H(%)
Gender								
Male	22(4)	31(5)	51(9)	3(1)	41(7)	10(2)	0(0)	2(0)
Female	62(10)	100(17)	124(21)	15(3)	87(15)	40(7)	1(0)	2(0)
Year of School								
Unclassified	16(3)	26(4)	26(4)	2(0)	17(3)	2(0)	0(0)	1(0)
Freshman	14(2)	17(3)	20(3)	2(0)	29(5)	12(2)	0(0)	0(0)
Sophomore	25(4)	36(6)	48(8)	5(1)	35(6)	14(2)	0(0)	1(0)
Junior	20(3)	31(5)	40(7)	6(1)	28(5)	14(2)	1(0)	1(0)
Senior	7(1)	11(2)	13(2)	1(0)	14(2)	7(1)	0(0)	0(0)
5th year senior	2(0)	10(2)	25(4)	2(0)	4(1)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Graduate	0(0)	0(0)	3(1)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(0)
Degree Program								
Business Administration	19(3)	21(4)	36(6)	4(1)	16(3)	14(2)	0(0)	1(0)
Education	20(3)	38(6)	34(6)	2(0)	31(5)	13(2)	0(0)	0(0)
Humanities/Fine Arts	19(3)	19(3)	43(7)	5(1)	26(4)	9(2)	0(0)	0(0)
Natural Sciences	7(1)	15(3)	26(4)	2(0)	21(4)	3(1)	0(0)	1(0)
Social/Behavioral Sciences	18(3)	26(4)	31(5)	5(1)	27(5)	9(2)	1(0)	2(0)
Undeclared	1(0)	12(2)	5(1)	0(0)	7(1)	2(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Age								
Under 25	75(13)	122(21)	150(25)	17(3)	121(20)	48(8)	1(0)	3(1)
Over 25	9(2)	9(2)	25(4)	1(0)	7(1)	2(0)	0(0)	1(0)
Size of Home Community								
Less than 1,000	3(1)	10(2)	16(3)	4(1)	10(2)	2(0)	0(0)	0(0)
1,000 – 5,000	30(5)	35(6)	63(11)	3(1)	35(6)	19(3)	0(0)	1(0)

(table continues)

Demographic	A(%)	B(%)	C(%)	D(%)	E(%)	F(%)	G(%)	H(%)
5,001 – 25,000	22(4)	26(4)	32(5)	3(1)	34(6)	10(2)	0(0)	1(0)
25,001 – 50,000	3(1)	27(5)	27(5)	4(1)	18(3)	5(1)	1(0)	0(0)
50,001 – 100,000	17(3)	16(3)	19(3)	2(0)	15(3)	7(1)	0(0)	1(0)
Over 100,000	9(2)	17(3)	18(3)	2(0)	16(3)	7(1)	0(0)	1(0)
Current Place of Residence								
Off-campus	49(8)	58(10)	108(18)	9(2)	60(10)	27(5)	1(0)	2(0)
University apartments	1(0)	4(1)	5(1)	0(0)	3(1)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)
RTH Hall	0(0)	7(1)	5(1)	1(0)	3(1)	2(0)	0(0)	0(0)
BTL Hall	1(0)	4(1)	0(0)	0(0)	8(1)	2(0)	0(0)	1(0)
BND Hall	5(1)	9(2)	7(1)	0(0)	9(2)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)
CML Hall	14(1)	11(2)	9(2)	1(0)	5(1)	5(1)	0(0)	1(0)
DNC Hall	7(1)	8(1)	7(1)	1(0)	5(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
HGM Hall	4(1)	5(1)	5(1)	1(0)	7(1)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)
LTH Hall	7(1)	10(2)	6(1)	2(0)	11(2)	2(0)	0(0)	0(0)
NRN Hall	2(0)	6(1)	10(2)	2(0)	4(1)	6(1)	0(0)	0(0)
RDR Hall	2(0)	5(1)	7(1)	0(0)	7(1)	2(0)	0(0)	0(0)
SHL Hall	2(0)	4(1)	6(1)	1(0)	6(1)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Ethnicity								
African American/Black	0(0)	4(1)	4(1)	1(0)	2(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Asian/Pacific Islander	2(0)	1(0)	0(0)	2(0)	2(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Caucasian/White	77(13)	121(20)	166(28)	14(2)	115(19)	49(8)	1(0)	4(1)
Hispanic/Latin American	3(1)	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	4(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Multiracial	1(0)	2(0)	2(0)	1(0)	3(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Native American	1(0)	2(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Other	0(0)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)	2(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)

Note: A = stranger, B = acquaintance, C = classmate, D = conversation partner, E = friend, F = co-worker, G = family member/relative, H = relational partner/spouse.

hoc test employing an analysis of cell wise residuals revealed that 5th year seniors reported interacting with an international student who was their classmate, conversation partner, or co-worker significantly more compared to participants in other years of school. No other demographic variables were found to have any significant association with the relationship type (see Table 10).

Table 10

Cross-Tabulation of Relationship Type by Demographic Variables (N = 591)

Demographic	χ^2_{df}	Cramer's *V*
Gender	2.57_2	.07
*Year of School	21.54_{12}	.14
Degree Program	14.26_{10}	.11
Age	3.38_2	.08
Size of Home Community	7.41_{10}	.08
Current Place of Residence	33.13_{22}	.17
Ethnicity	11.11_{12}	.10

Note: the chi-square test was performed on three types of relationship with an international student (distant relationship, close relationship, professional relationship) by demographic variables. $*p < .05$.

The final item in the series of questions investigating the nature of interaction between international and non-international students explored the frequency of interacting with an international student. Students were asked to state how frequently they interacted with the international student. The five response options included: *only the time the interaction occurred, less than once a week, 1-3 times a week, 4-7 times a*

week, and *more than 7 times a week.* Of the total 591 respondents, 43% (n = 257) reported interacting with the international student 1-3 times a week, another 29% (n = 169) interacted with the international student less than once a week, 18% (n = 107) talked to the international student only the time the interaction occurred, 6% (n = 37) met the international student 4-7 times a week, and the remaining 4% (n = 21) stated talking to the international student more than 7 times a week. Table 11 contains summaries of the frequency of interacting with an international student.

Table 11

Frequency Distribution of the Frequency of Interacting with an International Student

Frequency of Interacting	Frequency	Percent
Only once	107	18
Less than once a week	169	29
1-3 times a week	257	43
4-7 times a week	37	6
More than 7 times a week	21	4
Total	591	100

Association between demographic variables and the frequency of interacting with an international student was determined through the use of one-way ANOVA. With alpha level set at .05, statistically significant differences were found between students' year of school and the frequency of interacting with an international student. Tukey HSD

test revealed that the difference existed between 5th year senior students and unclassified students and sophomores, who interacted with international students significantly less frequently compared to the 5th year senior students. No other demographic characteristics were found to have any significant effect on the frequency of interaction with an international student. These results are summarized in Table 12.

Table 12

Frequency Distribution of Frequency of Interacting by Demographic Variables (N = 591)

Demographic	*n(%)*	*M*	*SD*	$F_{a,b}$
Gender				$1.15_{1,589}$
Male	160(27)	2.56	1.05	
Female	431(73)	2.46	0.95	
**Year of School				$3.38_{6,584}$
Unclassified	90(15)	2.30	1.03	
Freshman	94(16)	2.67	0.95	
Sophomore	164(28)	2.33	0.96	
Junior	141(24)	2.52	0.94	
Senior	53(9)	2.49	0.97	
5th year senior	44(8)	2.89	0.84	
Graduate	5(1)	3.00	1.58	
Degree Program				$1.79_{5,585}$
Business Administration	111(19)	2.34	1.07	
Education	138(23)	2.46	0.89	
Humanities/Fine Arts	121(20)	2.67	0.92	
Natural Sciences	75(13)	2.60	1.05	
Social/Behavioral Sciences	119(20)	2.39	1.01	
Undeclared	27(5)	2.48	0.80	
Age				$2.05_{1,589}$
Under 25	537(91)	2.47	0.98	
Over 25	54(9)	2.67	0.93	
Size of Home Community				$0.85_{5,585}$
Less than 1,000	45(8)	2.47	1.01	
1,000 – 5,000	186(31)	2.41	1.05	

(table continues)

Demographic	*n(%)*	*M*	*SD*	$F_{a,b}$
5,001 – 25,000	128(22)	2.47	0.98	
25,001 – 50,000	85(14)	2.65	0.81	
50,001 – 100,000	77(13)	2.57	0.98	
Over 100,000	70(12)	2.44	0.93	
Current Place of Residence				$0.77_{11,579}$
Off-campus	314(53)	2.44	0.96	
University apartments	14(2)	2.50	1.02	
RTH Hall	18(3)	2.39	0.85	
BTL Hall	16(3)	3.00	1.10	
BND Hall	31(5)	2.68	1.08	
CML Hall	36(6)	2.42	1.00	
DNC Hall	28(5)	2.32	1.10	
HGM Hall	23(4)	2.43	1.12	
LTH Hall	38(6)	2.63	1.00	
NRN Hall	30(5)	2.53	1.01	
RDR Hall	23(4)	2.57	0.84	
SHL Hall	20(3)	2.50	1.02	
Ethnicity				$1.49_{6,584}$
African American/Black	11(2)	3.09	0.70	
Asian/Pacific Islander	7(1)	2.14	0.90	
Caucasian/White	547(93)	2.48	0.98	
Hispanic/Latin American	9(2)	2.56	1.24	
Multiracial	9(2)	2.67	1.00	
Native American	4(1)	1.75	0.50	
Other	4(1)	3.00	0.82	

**p < .01

In sum, analyses of the responses to the series of questions investigating the nature of interactions between international and non-international students revealed the following findings. Over half of the respondents stated talking to an international student for about 30 minutes or less. Approximately one-third of the participants said that the international student they talked to was their classmate and that their conversation took place in class. The highest percent of students (43%) claimed talking to an international

student at least 1-3 times a week, followed by 29% of those who stated that they talked to an international student less than once a week.

Research Question 3

> a. What are the attitudes of non-international students toward international diversity, as operationalized by the M-GUDS-S, on a comprehensive university campus?
> b. Are there any significant differences in the attitudes of non-international students toward international diversity according to demographic variables?

The attitudes toward international diversity were measured by student ratings on 15 Likert-type questions adapted from the M-GUDS-S instrument. A total score for the 15 items was computed to assess the construct of universal-diverse orientation (UDO). The aggregate range of scores for the 15 items was from 15 to 90. Higher scores implied more positive attitude toward international diversity. The total 15-item scale consists of three interrelated 5-item subscales with each possible range of scores from 5 to 30. The three subscales measure diversity of contact, relativistic appreciation, and comfort with differences.

Results showed that the students' overall UDO score mean was 65.00, with a standard deviation of 9.79. This mean score was comprised of the three subscale scores, distributed among Diversity of Contact ($M = 19.00$, $SD = 4.42$), Relativistic Appreciation ($M = 23.00$, $SD = 3.71$), and Comfort with Differences ($M = 23.00$, $SD = 4.40$). The results of the UDO scale as well as its three subscales are reported in Table 13.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to test the differences on the UDO mean scores according to demographic characteristics. Tukey HSD test was performed to detect the differences among specific groups. Significant differences in UDO scores

Table 13

Results of Non-International Students' Attitudes toward International Diversity

Attitude Scale	*M*	*SD*
Diversity of Contact	19.00	4.42
Relativistic Appreciation	23.00	3.71
Comfort with Differences	23.00	4.40
UDO	65.00	9.79

were found between males and females, with males scoring lower than females. While ANOVA reported that year of school had a highly significant effect on the UDO score ($p = .01$), Tukey HSD test did not detect any significant differences among groups. Students' degree program was significantly associated with the UDO score ($p = .01$), where, according to the post-hoc test, students from the College of Business Administration had a significantly lower UDO score mean compared to students from the College of Humanities and Fine Arts and students from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Students under 25 years of age had a significantly lower UDO score mean compared to students over 25 years of age ($p = .0001$). Size of home community was also found to have a significant association with the UDO score ($p = .001$). Thus, respondents coming from towns with a population of 1,000 – 5,000 people had significantly lower UDO scores than participants coming from towns of more than 25,000 people. Finally, students of Caucasian origin scored significantly lower on the UDO scale compared to students of Hispanic origin ($p = .001$). Results of the UDO scores by demographic characteristics are presented in Table 14.

Table 14

Frequency Distribution of UDO Scores by Demographic Variables (N = 724)

Demographic	*n(%)*	*M*	*SD*	$F_{a,b}$
*Gender				$5.59_{1,722}$
Male	192(27)	63.56	10.63	
Female	532(73)	65.51	9.43	
**Year of School				$3.00_{6,717}$
Unclassified	118(16)	64.81	10.29	
Freshman	10(15)	64.65	7.91	
Sophomore	198(27)	64.11	10.68	
Junior	172(24)	64.26	8.89	
Senior	69(10)	66.67	11.60	
5th year senior	50(7)	68.60	7.51	
Graduate	7(1)	74.14	9.37	
**Degree Program				$3.83_{5,718}$
Business Administration	141(19)	62.69	9.86	
Education	178(25)	64.50	10.48	
Humanities/Fine Arts	133(18)	67.30	9.33	
Natural Sciences	90(12)	64.79	7.42	
Social/Behavioral Sciences	145(20)	66.21	9.74	
Undeclared	37(5)	63.51	11.05	
**Age				$17.50_{1,722}$
Under 25	658(91)	64.51	9.82	
Over 25	66(9)	69.74	8.14	
**Size of Home Community				$4.98_{5,718}$
Less than 1,000	57(8)	63.58	10.15	
1,000 – 5,000	235(32)	62.89	9.60	
5,001 – 25,000	155(21)	65.13	9.84	
25,001 – 50,000	111(15)	66.35	9.52	
50,001 – 100,000	89(12)	67.51	9.03	
Over 100,000	77(11)	67.29	10.02	
Current Place of Residence				$1.16_{11,712}$
Off-campus	401(55)	65.15	9.58	
University apartments	14(2)	69.86	9.73	
RTH Hall	21(3)	64.52	10.71	
BTL Hall	19(3)	63.68	12.00	
BND Hall	38(5)	62.24	10.80	
CML Hall	45(6)	65.82	12.04	
DNC Hall	34(5)	63.71	9.58	
HGM Hall	26(4)	65.38	8.91	

(table continues)

Demographic	*n(%)*	*M*	*SD*	$F_{a,b}$
LTH Hall	40(6)	64.75	7.27	
NRN Hall	38(5)	62.58	9.71	
RDR Hall	25(3)	66.80	9.78	
SHL Hall	23(3)	67.57	8.79	
**Ethnicity				$4.46_{6,717}$
African American/Black	12(2)	67.75	9.38	
Asian/Pacific Islander	8(1)	71.63	6.35	
Caucasian/White	674(93)	64.58	9.74	
Hispanic/Latin American	9(1)	78.44	7.57	
Multiracial	11(2)	70.18	10.14	
Native American	5(1)	66.20	3.19	
Other	5(1)	65.80	3.10	

Note. The minimum score is 15, the maximum is 90. a = Between groups df, b = Within groups df. *p < .05. **p < .01.

Since the total UDO scale score is comprised of three subscales (Diversity of Contact, Relativistic Appreciation, and Comfort with Differences), a one-way ANOVA was performed to examine whether the scores on each subscale were similar to the UDO score with regard to demographic characteristics. Tukey HSD post-hoc test was utilized to identify where exactly the differences existed. Results of the scores on each subscale by the demographic characteristics are summarized in Table 15 through Table 17.

A one-way ANOVA of the Diversity of Contact by demographic characteristics revealed results similar to the UDO score by demographic characteristics. All demographic characteristics were found to have a significant effect on the diversity of contact with alpha level of .01. Thus, females significantly outscored males. Fifth year seniors scored significantly higher than sophomores and juniors. Students majoring in humanities and fine arts had significantly higher scores on the Diversity of Contact

Table 15

Frequency Distribution of Diversity of Contact Scores by Demographic Variables (N = 724)

Demographic	*n(%)*	*M*	*SD*	$F_{a,b}$
*Gender				$9.07_{1,722}$
Male	192(27)	18.19	4.60	
Female	532(73)	19.30	4.31	
**Year of School				$2.92_{6,717}$
Unclassified	118(16)	19.17	4.47	
Freshman	10(15)	19.44	3.70	
Sophomore	198(27)	18.59	4.63	
Junior	172(24)	18.41	4.14	
Senior	69(10)	19.13	5.38	
5th year senior	50(7)	20.92	3.74	
Graduate	7(1)	21.14	4.67	
**Degree Program				$5.87_{5,718}$
Business Administration	141(19)	17.61	4.32	
Education	178(25)	18.86	4.54	
Humanities/Fine Arts	133(18)	20.31	4.49	
Natural Sciences	90(12)	18.88	3.69	
Social/Behavioral Sciences	145(20)	19.54	4.25	
Undeclared	37(5)	18.57	4.72	
**Age				$12.86_{1,722}$
Under 25	658(91)	18.82	4.41	
Over 25	66(9)	20.85	4.07	
**Size of Home Community				$4.35_{5,718}$
Less than 1,000	57(8)	18.30	4.41	
1,000 – 5,000	235(32)	18.18	4.27	
5,001 – 25,000	155(21)	19.14	4.55	
25,001 – 50,000	111(15)	19.22	4.33	
50,001 – 100,000	89(12)	20.17	4.00	
Over 100,000	77(11)	20.13	4.68	
**Current Place of Residence				$2.22_{11,712}$
Off-campus	401(55)	18.69	4.41	
University apartments	14(2)	22.67	5.15	
RTH Hall	21(3)	18.48	4.55	
BTL Hall	19(3)	20.11	5.03	
BND Hall	38(5)	18.34	4.00	
CML Hall	45(6)	20.38	4.73	
DNC Hall	34(5)	17.88	4.40	

(table continues)

Demographic	*n(%)*	*M*	*SD*	$F_{a,b}$
HGM Hall	26(4)	19.19	4.07	
LTH Hall	40(6)	19.10	4.01	
NRN Hall	38(5)	18.97	3.73	
RDR Hall	25(3)	20.08	4.58	
SHL Hall	23(3)	20.43	4.13	
**Ethnicity				$3.94_{6,717}$
African American/Black	12(2)	19.58	4.89	
Asian/Pacific Islander	8(1)	21.38	3.58	
Caucasian/White	674(93)	18.84	4.39	
Hispanic/Latin American	9(1)	24.56	2.96	
Multiracial	11(2)	22.00	4.38	
Native American	5(1)	20.00	2.35	
Other	5(1)	19.20	3.90	

Note. The minimum score is 5, the maximum is 30. a = Between groups df, b = Within groups df. **p < .01

subscale than did students majoring in business and education, and students majoring in social and behavioral sciences had higher scores than students majoring in business. Participants from larger cities (population more than 50,000) had significantly higher Diversity of Contact mean scores compared to participants coming from towns with the population of 1,000 – 5,000 people. Residents of university apartments scored significantly higher than residents of DNC Hall. Finally, in line with the ANOVA findings for the UDO scale, students of Hispanic origin had significantly higher scores compared to students of Caucasian origin.

ANOVA of the Relativistic Appreciation by demographic characteristics revealed that only gender, age, and ethnicity had a statistically significant association with the subscale score. The results were quite similar to the UDO score, where females had

significantly higher mean scores than males, students over 25 had significantly higher Relativistic Appreciation scores than students under 25, and students of Hispanic origin scored significantly higher than Caucasian students on this subscale.

Table 16

Frequency Distribution of Relativistic Appreciation Scores by Demographic Variables (N = 724)

Demographic	*n(%)*	*M*	*SD*	$F_{a,b}$
*Gender				$7.73_{1,722}$
Male	192(27)	22.36	4.18	
Female	532(73)	23.23	3.50	
Year of School				$2.07_{6,717}$
Unclassified	118(16)	23.14	3.54	
Freshman	10(15)	22.77	3.24	
Sophomore	198(27)	22.69	4.11	
Junior	172(24)	22.80	3.36	
Senior	69(10)	23.59	4.26	
5th year senior	50(7)	23.84	3.48	
Graduate	7(1)	26.29	3.86	
Degree Program				$1.12_{5,718}$
Business Administration	141(19)	22.69	3.53	
Education	178(25)	22.95	3.88	
Humanities/Fine Arts	133(18)	23.43	3.58	
Natural Sciences	90(12)	22.72	3.44	
Social/Behavioral Sciences	145(20)	23.32	3.82	
Undeclared	37(5)	22.32	4.14	
*Age				$5.80_{1,722}$
Under 25	658(91)	22.90	3.73	
Over 25	66(9)	24.05	3.37	
Size of Home Community				$1.92_{5,718}$
Less than 1,000	57(8)	23.18	3.43	
1,000 – 5,000	235(32)	22.40	3.73	
5,001 – 25,000	155(21)	23.22	3.54	
25,001 – 50,000	111(15)	23.26	3.63	
50,001 – 100,000	89(12)	23.42	4.02	
Over 100,000	77(11)	23.42	3.81	

(table continues)

Demographic	*n(%)*	*M*	*SD*	$F_{a,b}$
Current Place of Residence				$0.87_{11,712}$
Off-campus	401(55)	23.02	3.69	
University apartments	14(2)	24.57	4.29	
RTH Hall	21(3)	23.62	3.73	
BTL Hall	19(3)	22.05	3.46	
BND Hall	38(5)	22.03	3.82	
CML Hall	45(6)	23.33	4.16	
DNC Hall	34(5)	22.91	3.41	
HGM Hall	26(4)	23.31	3.40	
LTH Hall	40(6)	22.53	3.66	
NRN Hall	38(5)	22.61	3.56	
RDR Hall	25(3)	23.48	3.55	
SHL Hall	23(3)	23.57	4.20	
*Ethnicity				$2.16_{6,717}$
African American/Black	12(2)	22.83	5.18	
Asian/Pacific Islander	8(1)	22.63	5.42	
Caucasian/White	674(93)	22.98	3.58	
Hispanic/Latin American	9(1)	27.11	3.14	
Multiracial	11(2)	22.64	6.45	
Native American	5(1)	22.00	2.35	
Other	5(1)	21.20	5.31	

Note. The minimum score is 5, the maximum is 30. a = Between groups df, b = Within groups df. *p < .05. **p < .01

Finally, ANOVA results showed that year of school, age, size of home community, and ethnicity were all associated with the score on the Comfort with Differences subscale. Just like in the case with the UDO score, ANOVA reported statistical significance at .05 alpha level for year of school and Comfort with Differences score. However, Tukey HSD test did not detect any significant differences among groups. Consistent with the findings for the UDO score, older students had a significantly higher Comfort with Differences score than younger students (M = 24.85 and M = 22.81,

Table 17

Frequency Distribution of Comfort with Differences Scores by Demographic Variables (N = 724)

Demographic	*n(%)*	*M*	*SD*	$F_{a,b}$
Gender				$0.00_{1,722}$
Male	192(27)	23.01	4.52	
Female	532(73)	22.99	4.35	
*Year of School				$2.30_{6,717}$
Unclassified	118(16)	22.50	4.63	
Freshman	10(15)	22.45	4.04	
Sophomore	198(27)	22.83	4.74	
Junior	172(24)	23.11	4.11	
Senior	69(10)	23.94	4.94	
5th year senior	50(7)	23.84	3.80	
Graduate	7(1)	26.71	1.97	
Degree Program				$1.38_{5,718}$
Business Administration	141(19)	22.39	4.74	
Education	178(25)	22.75	4.69	
Humanities/Fine Arts	133(18)	23.56	4.10	
Natural Sciences	90(12)	23.19	3.94	
Social/Behavioral Sciences	145(20)	23.36	4.24	
Undeclared	37(5)	22.62	4.14	
**Age				$13.07_{1,722}$
Under 25	658(91)	22.81	4.43	
Over 25	66(9)	24.85	3.60	
**Size of Home Community				$3.81_{5,718}$
Less than 1,000	57(8)	22.11	4.93	
1,000 – 5,000	235(32)	22.32	4.41	
5,001 – 25,000	155(21)	22.83	4.37	
25,001 – 50,000	111(15)	23.87	4.24	
50,001 – 100,000	89(12)	23.92	3.93	
Over 100,000	77(11)	23.74	4.32	
Current Place of Residence				$1.58_{11,712}$
Off-campus	401(55)	23.43	4.21	
University apartments	14(2)	22.71	3.52	
RTH Hall	21(3)	22.43	5.19	
BTL Hall	19(3)	21.53	5.57	
BND Hall	38(5)	21.87	5.11	
CML Hall	45(6)	22.11	5.19	
DNC Hall	34(5)	22.91	4.21	

(table continues)

Demographic	*n(%)*	*M*	*SD*	$F_{a,b}$
HGM Hall	26(4)	22.88	4.13	
LTH Hall	40(6)	23.13	3.55	
NRN Hall	38(5)	21.26	4.94	
RDR Hall	25(3)	23.24	3.63	
SHL Hall	23(3)	23.57	4.36	
**Ethnicity				$4.47_{6,717}$
African American/Black	12(2)	25.33	4.01	
Asian/Pacific Islander	8(1)	27.63	1.69	
Caucasian/White	674(93)	22.78	4.40	
Hispanic/Latin American	9(1)	26.78	3.15	
Multiracial	11(2)	25.55	2.98	
Native American	5(1)	24.20	2.17	
Other	5(1)	25.40	3.13	

Note. The minimum score is 5, the maximum is 30. a = Between groups df, b = Within groups df. *p < .05. **p < .01.

respectively). Students from towns with the population range from 25,000 to 100,000 had significantly higher scores compared to students from towns of 1,000 – 5,000 people. And, interestingly, participants of Asian origin had significantly higher Comfort with Differences score compared to their peers of Caucasian origin.

In general, analysis of UDO measurements suggests that surveyed students report having a supportive attitude toward international diversity. Scores on the Relativistic Appreciation and Comfort with Differences subscales were higher than scores on the Diversity of Contact subscale of the UDO instrument. Females were found to have more positive attitudes than males. Similarly, older students tended to score higher than younger students on all of the three subscales. In line with the participants' age, 5th year senior and graduate students had higher mean scores on the UDO scale as well as on two

subscales (Diversity of Contact and Comforts with Differences). While year of school was reported significant at .01 alpha level for the UDO score and the Diversity of Contact score and at .05 alpha level for the Comfort with Differences score, when the post hoc test was run, the significance was lost. However, Tukey HSD test showed that 5th year senior students differed from sophomore and junior students on the Diversity of Contact score with the first group scoring significantly higher. Ethnicity was consistently found to have a significant effect on the UDO score and all the subscale scores. Interestingly, however, students of Hispanic origin significantly outscored students of Caucasian origin on two subscales (Diversity of Contact and Relativistic Appreciation) and the UDO scale as a whole, while students of Asian origin significantly outscored students of Caucasian origin on the Diversity of Contact subscale. In addition, size of home community had a statistically significant effect on the UDO score and the Diversity of Contact and Comfort with Differences scores. Findings indicated that participants from larger cities generally had a more positive attitude toward international diversity compared to participants from smaller towns. Another demographic variable that was reported statistically significant in association with the attitude was students' degree program. Thus, participants whose major was in the College of Humanities and Fine Arts and in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences tended to have higher overall UDO scores than did their peers from the College of Business Administration. Similarly, students majoring in humanities and fine arts had significantly higher scores on the Diversity of Contact subscale than did students majoring in business and education, and students majoring in social and behavioral sciences had higher scores than students majoring in business. And finally,

respondents' place of residence was reported significant at .01 alpha level in effect on the Diversity of Contact score. Here, students living in university apartments had significantly higher scores than students living in DNC Hall.

Research Question 4

> Is the amount of contact between international and non-international students correlated with the attitudes of non-international students toward international diversity on a comprehensive university campus?

To address this research question, Pearson correlation analysis of the UDO score by the number of interactions with an international student was performed. The UDO subscale scores (Diversity of Contact, Relativistic Appreciation, and Comfort with Differences) were also analyzed in relation to the number of interactions between international and non-international students. Results revealed that the UDO score and the number of contacts with an international student correlated only .305, thereby indicating that the two measures were largely independent ($r^2 = .09$), although statistically significantly related ($p = .001$). A relatively weak, yet statistically significant positive association was reported between the number of interactions and each of the three subscale scores, as well. Thus, the amount of contact correlated with the Diversity of Contact score .278 ($r^2 = .08$), with the Relativistic Appreciation .173 ($r^2 = .03$), and with the Comfort with Differences score .258 ($r^2 = .07$).

A one-way ANOVA of the UDO score and the amount of contacts with an international student revealed some significant findings, $F(6,717) = 14.28$, $p = .01$. The analysis showed that students who had not had a single contact encounter with an international student had the lowest UDO score means. Post hoc analysis using Turkey

HSD test confirmed that the group of students who reported not having any interactions with international students differed significantly from all the other groups who had more than two conversations with international students since the beginning of the semester. ANOVA results are summarized in Table 18.

Table 18

Frequency Distribution of UDO Scores by the Amount of Contact (N = 724)

Number of Interactions	*n(%)*	*M*	*SD*
None	133(18)	59.97	10.64
1-2	178(25)	63.10	8.07
3-4	107(15)	65.09	9.28
5-6	67(9)	67.96	6.79
7-8	41(6)	67.10	9.49
9-10	23(3)	66.52	9.56
11+	175(24)	68.83	10.08

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study had several purposes. The first purpose was to investigate whether and how often non-international students come in contact with international students in a comprehensive university setting. The second purpose was to explore the nature of interactions between international and non-international students in terms of duration, location, and frequency of interactions and type of relationship with the international student. The third purpose was to assess the attitudes of non-international students toward international diversity as operationalized by the M-GUDS-S scale. And the fourth purpose was to determine whether the frequency of contact between international and non-international students correlated with the attitudes of non-international students toward international diversity on a comprehensive university campus. The study also sought to determine if any differences exist among selected demographic variables (gender, year of school, degree program, age, size of home community, current place of residence, and ethnicity) for the number of contacts with international students, nature of conversations, and the attitudes toward international diversity.

Results were obtained from a survey of 724 non-international students enrolled in a Midwestern comprehensive university full-time during the Fall 2005. The subjects for this study were predominantly white undergraduate females under the age of 25 who grew up in communities of 1,000 – 25,000 population and were currently living off-campus. The representation of different degree programs (business, education, humanities and fine arts, natural sciences, social and behavioral sciences, and undeclared)

was fairly even with the largest proportion of subjects majoring in education. The survey instrument consisted of the modified version of the M-GUDS-S scale, a series of questions addressing the number and nature of contacts with international students, and a demographic questionnaire. The M-GUDS-S scale was meant to assess an individual's attitude toward diversity and to provide a numerical index to represent current levels of the Universal-Diverse Orientation (UDO). A series of questions related to the frequency and nature of contacts between international and non-international students inquired about the number, duration, location, and frequency of interactions and the type of relationship with an international student. Finally, the demographic questionnaire was designed to gather descriptive characteristics of the subjects.

ANOVA, chi-squire, Pearson correlations, and descriptive statistics including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were used to answer the research questions posed for this study. Results of inferential analysis were considered significant at the .05 level. This chapter presents a discussion and conclusions based upon the study findings.

Discussion

Contact with International Students

Results of this study revealed that most non-international students do, indeed, interact with international students during the academic semester. Of all the respondents only 18% reported not having a single conversation with an international student since the beginning of the semester (two-month period). The interactions between international and non-international students take place primarily at on-campus locations, mainly in

class. The conversations are most likely to last less than 30 minutes and occur from one to three times a week, thereby pointing to an interaction pattern that would be more likely to occur in class. Fifth year senior and graduate students have significantly more contact with international students. They also talk to international students longer and more frequently compared to their counterparts in lower years of school. On the same token, students over 25 years of age talk to international students longer than their younger counterparts. This finding may be interpreted in two ways. First, one may assume that college does, indeed, play a significant part in evoking students' interest to seek contact with international peers. As students stay on campus longer, they become more accustomed to seeing international diversity around them and become more comfortable talking to international students. By their senior year, students might have already established some friendly relationships with their international fellows and thus have some common conversation topics, which explains the longer duration of the interactions between international and non-international students. Also, as students stay on campus longer, the amount of shared experiences increases and thus international and domestic students have more in common and thus more to talk about. Another explanation of this finding might lie in the argument that as people grow chronologically more mature, they naturally develop more curiosity about the outside world. Having more experience with different people and more knowledge about various aspects of life allows more mature individuals to find some common ground with diverse people, which in turn, keeps the contact episode longer.

Another interesting finding revealed by this study is that students majoring in humanities and fine arts have the greatest amount of contact with international students. In contrast, students majoring in business and in education have the least amount of contact with international students. International student composition of the different colleges of the University suggests that there is no correlation between the number of international students enrolled in a particular college and the amount of contact between international and non-international students of the same or related academic major. Considering this fact, only one interpretation of the finding regarding the significant differences in the number of contacts with international students among the three different academic majors appears reasonable; that is, individuals gravitating toward professions in business and in education are less inclined to seek contact with international students in comparison to the individuals who choose professions in the humanities and fine arts. Combined with the findings of the UDO scores, where again, students from the College of Humanities and Fine Arts significantly outscored students from the College of Business Administration, these results suggest that individuals of different academic majors have varying attitudes toward and experience with international diversity. It is difficult, however, to pinpoint the cause of such variations among academic majors on the basis of this study's findings alone. It might be attributed to the internal curriculum of each academic major having a different emphasis on international education as a reflection of the job market or it might be that students themselves place a different value on the impact of international diversity on their own individual and professional growth. In any case, it is particularly surprising to find that

business majors, who presumably should be interculturally competent to compete in the global economy, have the least amount of contact with international students and the least positive orientation toward international diversity. This finding also contradicts previous studies by Clarke (2004) and Zimitat (2005), which revealed that students majoring in business had the most positive international attitudes and were more inclined to take opportunities to interact with internationally diverse individuals. Such discrepancies in the findings between the present study and the previous ones might be attributed to a combination of factors reflected in the differences in the geographical location, size, type of the university, and its prestige. Thus, for example, this study was conducted at a Midwestern comprehensive university, while the study by Clarke was done in New York and the study by Zimitat took place in Australia. Both Clarke's and Zimitat's studies were conducted at research institutes bigger in size than the university in the present study.

Finally, an analysis of the amount and nature of contact between international and non-international students demonstrated that residents of the dormitory with the highest population/density of international students (BTL Hall) interact with their international peers more and their conversations last longer. This finding suggests that proximity or exposure to international diversity tends to encourage contact between international and non-international students. One can speculate that as students share experiences, they develop more commonalities thereby expanding the repertoire of topics to discuss, which in turn explains the increased number of contacts. It is worth noting along these lines that the University does not provide publicly available information on the numbers of

international students residing in each hall, suggesting that students opting to live in BTL Hall do so for some other reasons than interacting with their international peers. Given the lack of research investigating interaction patterns of students with varied degrees of exposure to international diversity it is difficult to draw comparisons between this study's findings and any others.

Attitudes toward International Diversity

Analysis of the non-international students' attitudes toward international diversity was conducted through the use of the M-GUDS-S scale, which yields a score signifying an individual's universal-diverse orientation (UDO). The total UDO score is comprised of three distinct but interrelated subscale scores reflecting the respective behavioral, cognitive, and affective components of UDO (Diversity of Contact, Relativistic Appreciation, and Comfort with Differences). Results of this analysis revealed that, overall, students at the Midwestern university in question have supportive attitudes toward international diversity. On the range of scores from 15 to 90 (least to most positive UDO), the surveyed students' UDO score mean was 65. Score means on the Relativistic Appreciation and Comfort with Differences subscales were 23 each, indicating a relatively strong positive attitude, and the Diversity of Contact score mean was 19, indicating a moderately positive attitude (the range of scores for each subscale is from 5 to 30). Thus, students scored higher on the cognitive and affective components and lower on the behavioral component of UDO. This illustrates that on one level, students value international diversity and are relatively comfortable with differences; however, on another level they are not very active in seeking international related

experiences. Students might value diversity but seem to lack the intercultural communication skills necessary for carrying out effective interactions with persons from other countries. Such an imbalance among the three components of UDO might be a reflection of the approach toward internationalization that colleges and universities commonly take. Postsecondary institutions often limit their internationalization efforts to easily measurable indicators like study abroad programs, academic courses with international content, or the numbers of international students and scholars on campus. Thus, students might have developed the cognitive and affective dimensions of intercultural learning in the classroom, but they were not provided with many opportunities to practice intercultural communication skills, pointing to a need for integrating international students into the global institutional ethos. Research on international student perceptions of host nationals also indicates that international students are open to and interested in forming closer relationships with domestic students and that they expect a greater amount of contact than they actually experience (Ward, 2001). Indeed, nurturing all components of UDO is essential for global education. Not only should students possess the knowledge of other cultures (cognitive component) and understand that other cultures have reasons for operating in a certain manner (affective component), but they should also be equipped with skills necessary to act efficiently and adequately in a multicultural context (behavioral component). Clarke (2004) points to the importance of curriculum in preparing students for the future and explains that it is not so much the formal academic program as the hidden curriculum of an institution that comprises interaction behaviors and inspires the affective values of the students.

Similarly, Otten (2000), identifying cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions in the process of intercultural learning observes that outside of the classroom intercultural experience is the most involving form of learning. The author, however, emphasizes the importance of informal but facilitated group activities, as not every intercultural encounter initiates intercultural leaning effects. This recommendation goes along with the contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954), which postulates that contact with a member of another culture will be effective only if participants share a sense of equality in social status, pursue common goals, are mutually interested in collaboration, and the community/authority sanctions the contact. The role of the institutional curriculum in creating an environment with as many optimal conditions for the intercultural contact as possible can hardly be overestimated. Along with establishing study abroad programs and infusing academic curricula with international content, colleges committed to campus internationalization should ensure that structured opportunities for participation in cultural interactions are provided.

Another variable found to have an effect on students' attitudes toward international diversity was gender. Females scored significantly higher than males on the Diversity of Contact and Relativistic Appreciation subscales, resulting in a significant difference on the overall UDO score. Other studies measuring perspectives and attitudes toward international diversity and employing different measurement instruments have also found that females had more positive attitudes in comparison with males (e. g., Blankenship, 1980; Heydary, 1988; Zhai & Scheer, 2004). Similarly, Miville et al. (1999), in a study measuring UDO of ethnically diverse populations, found that women

tended to score slightly higher on the M-GUDS, ascribing this to females being more likely than males to accept differences and similarities between themselves and others. Citing other studies on male – female differences in attitudes toward diversity, the authors further explain that it could be other factors such as social values and social context rather than gender itself that affect social attitude formation. Miville et al, support this argument with the evidence that, as children, boys are more open and less hostile toward other children compared to girls, which is often attributed to team playing activities in which boys engage. As adults, however, humans begin to take on gender-specific roles where females "adopt feminine values of nurturance and social connection, ... and attitudes toward other people that are more accepting" (p. 304), while males, on the contrary, develop prejudice and negative stereotyping behavior.

As stated previously, students from the College of Humanities and Fine Arts scored significantly higher on the UDO scale than did students from the College of Business Administration. Also, older students (over 25 years old) demonstrated more positive attitudes toward international diversity compared to younger students (under 25 years old), again calling for duality in interpretation – college experience promotes cultural understanding or age maturation naturally leads to open-mindedness. In light of the study findings by Siaya, Porcelli, and Green (2002), where individuals between 18 and 29 years reported valuing international education most and were more likely to support an increase in the number of international students and scholars on campus compared to older individuals, it appears reasonable to claim that it is college experience, rather than the maturation of age itself that engenders more positive orientation toward

international diversity. In Siaya's et al. study, participants' support for an increase in the number of international students and scholars on campus negatively correlated with their age. Taking into account an increased attention to internationalization of higher education over the past years, one might suggest that all the efforts by postsecondary institutions in this direction do, indeed, leave their mark on students' views regarding the value of international education. It should be noted along these lines that the same study found that the more schooling the participants received, the more they believed that their education had given them the knowledge to fully understand current international events.

Another finding of this study revealed that students who grew up in larger cities (population over 25,000 people) had more positive attitudes toward international diversity than did students who grew up in small towns (population of 5,000 or less). This finding lends support to the argument that exposure to diversity plays a role in intercultural attitudes. Persons who have had limited contact with members outside their own culture group generally exhibit greater degrees of ethnocentrism (Paige, Jacobs-Cassuto, Yershova, DeJaeghere, 2003). Smaller towns are usually more culturally homogeneous than bigger cities, thereby presenting a challenge for their residenys to come into contact with culturally diverse individuals.

Finally, students of Hispanic origin scored the highest and students of Caucasian origin scored the lowest on the UDO scale. Various previous studies on this or a related topic have found similar results with regard to differences in diversity attitudes according to respondents' ethnic background (e. g., Blankenship, 1980; Hayward, 2000; Heydary, 1988; Siaya, Porcelli, & Green, 2002). Individuals of ethnic minorities have consistently

showed greater appreciation of and interest in cultural diversity, which might stem from the fact that ethnic minorities are automatically positioned in a context of cultural diversity by virtue of their own differences from the ethnic majority populations.

Relationship between Contact and Attitudes

A statistically significant positive correlation was found between the amount of contact with international students and the attitudes of non-international students toward international diversity, as indicated by the UDO score. Since correlation does not imply causality (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000; Kubiszyn & Borich, 2000), it is difficult to establish a causal connection and determine whether it is contact that entails a more positive attitude, or whether a more positive attitude predisposes an individual to engage in international contact. However, UDO score variations according to such demographic characteristics as age, size of home community, and ethnicity lend support to the idea that exposure to diversity does, indeed, result in a more positive universal-diverse orientation. Older individuals are more likely to have more often encountered not only internationally but also culturally diverse people. The same might be said about individuals who grew up in larger communities where population is more culturally heterogeneous compared to smaller communities. Finally, ethnic minorities have a better chance of being exposed to cultural diversity by virtue of their own cultural difference from the ethnic majority. Considering these three demographic characteristics that have been shown to affect participants' UDO score in this study, it is reasonable to argue for the contact hypothesis, which premises that intergroup contact leads to reduced intergroup prejudice.

Theoretical Implications

Based on the aforementioned findings, the following theoretical implications can be suggested:

1. Intergroup contact leads to a more positive orientation toward diversity. This statement is supported by the positive correlation between the amount of contact between international and domestic students and the UDO score.
2. Exposure to diversity leads to better attitudes toward members of other groups in general. This conclusion is based on the presumption that older individuals, residents of larger cities, and ethnic minorities have had prior encounters with intergroup members; therefore, their UDO scores are significantly higher in comparison to younger respondents, students who grew up in smaller communities, and Whites.
3. Intergroup interactions are more likely to occur in structured settings (class), which supports Allport's argument that certain conditions are necessary for intercultural contact.

Implications for Practice

The implications for practice derived from this study include the following:

1. Colleges and universities should explore strategies for integrating international students into the process of internationalization. Curricular and extra-curricular programs should offer opportunities for international and domestic students to engage in intercultural discussions. International students can be invited as guest speakers to different classes as well as preparatory courses for students intending

to study abroad, to share their expertise and experience with domestic students. By creating a climate where diverse experiences and worldviews are valued and encouraged, colleges can make their education beneficial for all students, domestic and international.

2. Colleges and universities need to provide educational sessions for faculty. Such sessions would focus on the importance of international education and strategies of incorporating international perspectives provided by international students into the course content and activities. It should be brought to educators' attention that neither domestic nor international students would necessarily be willing to initiate discussions or voluntarily form culturally mixed groups to work on class assignments. Therefore, faculty might need to deliberately invite various perspectives on a topic and assign culturally different students to study groups where each member contributes to the common goal.
3. Colleges need to provide more structured opportunities for interactions between international and domestic students that would expand beyond the classroom. Examples of such opportunities include peer-pairing (e.g., conversation partners), integrated residential programs, and recreational activities. Ideally, peer-pairing systems would operate in a way when each individual contributes equally to each other's knowledge and skills. However, situations in which a domestic student volunteers to assist an international student in adapting to a new environment still facilitate intercultural interactions and entail benefits for both parties. Integrated residential programs where domestic and international students share living space

and have to collaborate to maintain a daily routine can also serve as opportunities for intercultural encounters. Similarly, recreational activities (e.g., sports, events, trips) are also a notable example of structured opportunities for positive intergroup interaction. When designing activities with the goal of promoting intercultural contact, it should be born in mind that there are optimal factors including participants' sense of equality in social status, pursuit of common goals, mutual interest in collaboration, and the community/authority's support that lead to the enhancement of intercultural relations.

4. In order to promote contact among individuals from different countries, colleges should provide settings where students are exposed to international diversity. While not sufficient in itself for promoting positive attitudes, presence of international students on campus can stimulate domestic students' interest in learning more about other cultures and countries.
5. Colleges should guide students in developing cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions of intercultural competence. Students should not only be provided with the information about other cultures and countries, but be helped in developing culturally empathic attitudes and skills necessary for efficient communication with culturally diverse people.
6. Colleges should study interaction patterns between international and domestic students in order to better structure the international contact opportunities.
7. Internationalization should not be the responsibility of higher education institutions only. In fact, knowledge, attitudes, and skills gained earlier in life are

believed to be the most sustainable and integral to further personal development. Thus, efforts to include an intercultural dimension into education should be made by K-12 system as well. If students entering college already possess some level of intercultural competence, their college experience can be more beneficial.

Recommendations for Research

1. Further research using qualitative methods should be conducted to identify factors that promote contact between international and domestic students.
2. A longitudinal study should be conducted to follow freshmen into their graduation to ascertain what role college experience plays in shaping attitudes toward individuals from other countries.
3. Research exploring the impact of previous experiences on a student's willingness to participate in intercultural contact could provide insights into what constitutes effective intercultural communication.
4. Comparative studies exploring perceptions of both international and domestic students would enhance our understanding of the subject.

Conclusion

Educational institutions have traditionally been both mirrors and procreators of societal values and practices. Internationalization of higher education has also been initiated partially in response to the process of globalization taking place in the world and partially in an effort to produce future generation of citizens who would make our world a better place. The need to internationalize is well understood, however, given a relative novelty of the process, especially at its current scope, not much is known about how to

internationalize and even less is known about the implications of internationalization. Study-abroad programs, curriculum infused with international content, and international students and scholars on campus are the three common indicators of internationalized education. While these three elements are almost always present in the process of internationalization, their impact on students' intercultural learning is rarely measured. This study has considered four key questions related to the role of international students in internationalization. These questions included the amount of contact between international and domestic students, the nature of interactions, domestic students' orientation toward international diversity, and relationship between the amount of contact with international students and local students' orientation toward international diversity. Insights gained from this study suggest that the presence of international students on campus is important, although not sufficient in itself for promoting intercultural contact. Intercultural contact was found to positively correlate with the attitudes toward international diversity. It is therefore, the main task of a university to integrate the international community into the institutional climate reflected in academic curricula and all other social and organizational activities of educational programs. International students, if properly integrated into internationalization efforts, have a potential to motivate domestic students to step outside of their own "culture box" and explore the cultural richness of the world - a worthwhile endeavor in today's interconnected world.

REFERENCES

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison – Wesley.

Allport, G. W. (2000). The nature of prejudice. In C. Stangor (Ed.), *Stereotypes and prejudice: Essential readings* (pp. 20-48). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Alreck, P. L., & Settle, R. B. (1995). *The survey research handbook: Guidelines and strategies for conducting a survey* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Altbach, P. G. (2002, Spring). Perspectives on internationalizing higher education. *International Higher Education*, 29. Retrieved November, 15, 2002, from http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/News27/test004.htm

Altbach, P. G., & Peterson, P. M. (1998). Internationalize American higher education? Not exactly. *Change, 30*, 36-40.

Althen, G. (1994). Cultural differences on campus. In G. Althen (Ed.), *Learning across cultures* (pp. 57-71). Washington, DC: NAFSA

Arnove, R. F. (1999). Reframing comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local. In R. F. Arnove & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local* (pp. 1-24). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Backman, E. L. (1984). Internationalizing the campus: A strategy for the 1980s. In E. L. Backman (Ed.), *Approaches to international education* (pp. 330-345). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Bennett, M. J. (1986). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In M. Paige (Ed.), *Cross-cultural orientation: New conceptualizations and applications* (pp. 27-70). New York: University Press of America.

Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 21-71). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Benson, J., & Clark, F. (1982). A guide for instrument development and validation. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 36*, 789-800.

Blankenship, E. (1980). *International education in Florida community colleges: An analysis.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida.

Brewer, M., & Miller, N. (1988). Contact and cooperation: When do they work? In P. Katz & D. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism.* New York: Plenum.

Burn, B. B. (1980). *Expanding the international dimension of higher education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Carnegie Foundation. (2000). Classification. In *Carnegie classification of institutions of higher education.* Retrieved March 15, 2005, from http://www.carnegiefoundation.org

Cavusgil, S. T. (1991). Internationalization of business and economic programs: Issues and perspectives. *Business Horizons, 34*(6), 92-100.

Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (1998). *Foundations of intercultural communication.* Needham Height, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Clarke, V. (2004). Students' global awareness and attitudes to internationalism in a world of cultural convergence. *Journal of Research in International Education, 3*(1), 51-70.

Cook, S. W. (1984). Cooperative interaction in multiethnic contexts. In N. Miller & M. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact* (pp. 155-185). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

De Wit, H. (1995). *Strategies for internationalization of higher education: A comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe and the United States of America* (pp. 99-119). Amsterdam: European Association for International Education (EAIE).

De Wit, H. (1999, Spring). Changing rationales for the internationalization of higher education. *International Higher Education, 22.* Retrieved November, 15, 2002, from http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/News15/test1.html

Elifson, K., Runyon, R. P., & Haber, A. (1998). *Fundamentals of social statistics* (3rd ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Ellingboe, B. J. (1997). *The most frequently asked questions about internationalization.* Retrieved March 25, 2004, from University of Minnesota, College of Education and Human Development, International Education Web site: http://education.umn.edu/IntEduc/Int.FAQs.html

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2000). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (4th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Fuertes, J. N., Miville, M. L., Mohr, J. J., Sedlacek, W. E., & Gretchen, D. (2000). Factor structure and short form of the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 33*(3), 157-169.

Gagliano, F. V. (1992, Spring). Globalization of the university. *North Central Association Quarterly, 67*, 325-334.

Gamble, T., & Gamble, M. (1996). *Communication works.* New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Green, M. (2002). Internationalizing undergraduate education: Challenges and lessons of success. In D. Engberg & M. Green (Eds.), *Promising practices: Spotlighting excellence in comprehensive internationalization* (pp. 7-20). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Gregor, A. D. (2002). *Globalization, trade, liberalization and higher education: Research areas and questions.* Centre for Higher Education Research and Development: The University of Manitoba. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 468 374)

Groennings, S. (1990). Higher education, international education, and the academic disciplines. In S. Groennings & D. S. Wiley (Eds.), *Group portrait: Internationalizing the disciplines* (pp. 11-31). New York: The American Forum.

Gudykunst, W. (2004). *Bridging differences: Effective intergroup communication.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gudykunst, W., & Kim, Y. (2003). *Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gudykunst, W., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). *Culture and interpersonal communication.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Halualani, R. T., Chitgopekar, A., Morrison J., Dodge, P. (2004). Who's interacting? And what are they talking about? – Intercultural contact and interaction among multicultural university students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 28*(5), 353-372.

Harari, M. (1992). The internationalization of the curriculum. In C. B. Klasek (Ed.), *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing higher education* (pp. 52-79). Carbondale, IL: Association of International Education Administrators.

Hart, P., & Kumar, T. (2006). *UNI fact book: 2005-2006.* Cedar Falls, IA: Office of Institutional Research.

Hayward, F. M. (2000). *Internationalization of U.S. higher education: Preliminary status report.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Helms, J. (1984). Toward a theoretical explanation of the effects of race on counseling: A black and white model. *Counseling Psychologist, 12*, 153-164.

Hett, E. J. (1993). *The development of an instrument to measure global mindedness.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego.

Hewstone, M., & Brown, R. (1986). Contact is not enough. In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Hewstone, M., & Giles, H. (1986). Stereotypes and intergroup communication. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Intergroup communication.* London: Edward Arnold.

Heydari, A. (1988). *An empirical test of two conceptual models concerning American students' social distance from international students.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, South Dakota State University.

Huck, S. W. (2004). *Reading statistics and research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., & Allen, W. R. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *The Review of Higher Education, 21*(3), 279-302.

Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1990). *Handbook in research and evaluation for education and the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). San Diego, CA: Edits Publishers.

Institute of International Education. (2004). *Open doors 2004: International students in the U.S.* New York, NY.

Institute of International Education. (2005). *Open doors 2004: International students in the U.S.* New York, NY.

International Association of University Presidents. (n.d.). *What is IAUP?* Retrieved December 7, 2004, from http://www.ia-up.org

Johnston, J. S., & Edelstein, R. J. (1993). *Beyond borders: Profiles in international education.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.

Johnson, M. M. (2006, July 18). Toward a new foreign-student strategy. *The Chronicle*

of Higher Education, 52(47). Retrieved October 13, 2006, from http://0-find.galegroup.com.unistar.uni.edu:80/itx/infomark.do?&contentSet=IAC-Documents&type=retrieve&tabID=T002&prodId=EAIM&docId=A148663569&source=gale&userGroupName=uni_rodit&version=1.0

Kameoka, Y. (1996). The internationalization of higher education. *OECD Observer, 202*, 34-37.

Kendrick, J. R. (2005). *Social statistics: An introduction using SPSS for Windows* (2nd ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Kim, Y. Y. (2005). Association and dissociation: A contextual theory of interethnic communication. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 323-349). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Knight, J. (1995). A national study on internationalization at Canadian universities. In H. de Wit (Ed.), *Strategies for internationalization of higher education: A comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe and the United States of America* (pp. 99-119). Amsterdam: European Association for International Education (EAIE).

Knight, J. (2004, Winter). New rationales driving internationalization. *International Higher Education, 34*. Retrieved April 15, 2004, from http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/News34/text002.htm

Knight, J., & de Wit, H. (1995). Strategies for internationalization of higher education: Historical and conceptual perspectives. In H. de Wit (Ed.), *Strategies for internationalization of higher education: A comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe, and the United States of America* (pp. 5-32). Amsterdam: European Association for International Education (EAIE).

Kubiszyn, T., & Borich, G. (2000). *Educational testing and measurement: Classroom application and practice* (6th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Larsen, D. (2002). Campus case studies: Arcadia University. In D. Engberg & M. Green (Eds.), *Promising practices: Spotlighting excellence in comprehensive internationalization* (pp. 31-40). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Levin, J. S. (2001). *Globalizing the community college: Strategies for change in the twenty-first century.* New York: Palgrave.

Lustig, M. W., & Koester, J. (2003). *Intercultural competence: Interpersonal communication across cultures* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Marden, P. G., & Engerman, D. C. (1992, Spring). In the international interest: Liberal arts colleges take the high road. *Educational Record, 73*, 42-46.

McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction* (5th ed.). New York: Longman.

Michie, A. A. (1969). *Higher education and world affairs*. New York: Education and World Affairs.

Mikhailova, L. K., (2003). *The history of CIEE: Council of International Educational Exchange and its role in international education development: 1947-2002.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minnesota.

Miller, N., & Brewer, M. (1984). *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation.* New York: Academic Press.

Miville, M. L. (1992). *Measuring and defining universal orientation.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland at College Park.

Miville, M. L., Gelso, C. J., Pannu, R., Liu, W., Touradji, P., Holloway, P., & Fuertes, J. N. (1999). Appreciating similarities and valuing differences: The Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46*, 291-307.

NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (2003, January 14). *In America's interest: Welcoming international students. Report of NAFSA's strategic task force on international student access.* Retrieved October 12, 2006, from http://www.nafsa.org/_/Document/_/in_america_s_interest.pdf

NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (n.d.). *International student and scholar access to U.S. higher education.* Retrieved September 30, 2006, from http://www.nafsa.org/public_policy.sec/international_student_1

Otten, M. (2000). Impacts of cultural diversity at home. In P. Crowther, M. Joris, M. Otten, B. Nilsson, H. Teekens, & B. Waechter (Eds.), *Internationalization at home: A position paper* (pp. 15-20). Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.

Paige, R. M. (1993). On the nature of intercultural experiences and intercultural education. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 1-19). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Paige, R. M., Jacobs-Cassuto, M., Yershova, Y. A., & DeJaeghere, J. (2003). Assessing

intercultural sensitivity: An empirical analysis of the Hammer and Bennett Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27*, 467-486.

Peterson, P. M. (2002, April 19). *Addressing the challenge to internationalize our academic institutions: How are we doing?* Speech delivered to the American Council on International Intercultural Education Conference, Seattle, WA. Retrieved September 19, 2006, from http://www.cies.org/articles/patt_internation.htm

Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*(2), 173-185.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Recent meta-analytic findings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 93-114). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pickert, S. M. (1992). *Preparing for a global community : Achieving an international perspective in higher education.* Washington, DC : The George Washington University.

Sall, J., Lehman, A., & Creighton, L. (2001). *JMP start statistics : A guide to statistics and data analysis using JMP IN software* (2nd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Duxbury.

Samovar, L., Porter, R., & Stefani, L. (1998). *Communication between cultures.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Scanlon, D. G. (1990). Lessons from the past in developing international education in community colleges. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 70*, 5-15.

Shannon, D. M., Johnson, T. E., Searcy, S., & Alan, L. (2002). Using electronic surveys: Advice from survey professionals. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation, 81*(1). Retrieved September 23, 2006, from http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=8&n=1

Shoorman, D. (2000). *Internationalization: The challenge of implementing organizational rhetoric.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 444 427)

Siaya, L., & Hayward, F. (2003). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses: Final report (2003).* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Siaya, L., Porcelli, M., & Green, M. (2002). *One year later: Attitudes about international education since September 11.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Siegel, S., & Castellan, N. J. (1988). *Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Singley, D. B., & Sedlacek, W. (2004). Universal-diverse orientation and precollege academic achievement. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(1), 84-89.

Skolnikoff, E. B. (1993). Knowledge without borders: Internationalization of the research universities. *Daedalus, 122*, 225-253.

Stangor, C. (2000). *Stereotypes and prejudice: Essential readings.* Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Stangor, C., & Schaller, M. (2000). Stereotypes as individual and collective representations. In C. Stangor (Ed.), *Stereotypes and prejudice: Essential readings* (pp. 64-82). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Stephan, W. G. (1985). Intergroup relations. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (Vol. III, pp. 599-659). New York: Addison-Wesley.

Stephan, W. G. (1999). *Reducing prejudice and stereotyping in schools.* New York: New York Teachers College Press.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1984). The role of ignorance in intergroup relations. In N. Miller & M. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact* (pp. 229-255). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2001). *Improving intergroup relations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stoddard, E. W., & Cornwell, G. H. (2003). Peripheral visions: Towards a geoethics of citizenship. *Liberal Education, 89*(3), 87-102.

Straight, H. S., & Krebs, K. C. (2002). Campus case studies: Binghamton University, State University of New York. In D. Engberg & M. Green (Eds.), *Promising practices: Spotlighting excellence in comprehensive internationalization* (pp. 41-50). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Tajfel, H., & Forgas, J. P. (2000). Social categorization: Cognitions, values and groups.

In C. Stangor (Ed.), *Stereotypes and prejudice: Essential readings* (pp. 49-63). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Trochim, W. (2000). *The research methods knowledge base* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Atomic Dog Publishing.

Van Ginkel, H. (2002, April). *Internationalization in higher education: Towards a new international partnership.*

Vestal, T. M. (1994). *International education: Its history and promise for today.* Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Vontress, C. E. (1996). A personal retrospective on cross-cultural counseling. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 24*, 156-166.

Ward, C. (2001). *The impact of international students on domestic students and host institutions: A literature review.* Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University of Wellington.

Williamsen, M. (2002). Campus case studies: Appalachian State University. In D. Engberg & M. Green (Eds.), *Promising practices: Spotlighting excellence in comprehensive internationalization* (pp. 21-30). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Zhai, L., & Scheer, S. D. (2004). Global perspectives and attitudes toward cultural diversity among summer agriculture students at the Ohio State University. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 45*(2), 39-51.

Zimitat, C. (2005). Student perceptions of internationalization of the undergraduate curriculum. In A. Brew & C. Asmar (Eds.), Higher education in a changing world. Research and development in higher education. *Proceedings of the 2005 HERDSA Annual Conference, Sydney, Australia, 28*, 651-659

APPENDIX

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Dear Student:

You are invited to participate in a research project conducted though the University of Northern Iowa. This study examines students' orientation toward international diversity on campus. This survey will take about 10-15 minutes to complete. Although there is no direct and immediate compensation for the participation in this study, your responses will contribute to the success of this research and provide much needed information in order to improve educational programs at the university.

Please be informed that there is a minimal risk associated with the participation in this study. In addition, your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw from participation at any time or choose not to participate at all, and by doing so you will not be penalized in any way. The information you provide in this survey will be completely confidential and your responses will be stored separately from any identifying information. The principal investigator will gain access only to the summary of all the responses once the electronic survey is already deactivated.

If you choose to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete a survey by following the link provided below. Once you have answered all the questions, please click the "submit" button.

The investigator will answer any questions you have about your participation. If you desire information in the future regarding your participation or the study in general, feel free to contact Olga Kostareva in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction via e-mail kostarev@uni.edu or by calling at (507) 474-0055.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Please indicate your level of agreement with the statements below, using the following scale:

SD *(strongly disagree)* ***D*** *(disagree)* ***SWD*** *(somewhat disagree)*
SA *(strongly agree)* ***A*** *(agree)* ***SWA*** *(somewhat agree)*

1. I would like to join an organization that emphasizes getting to know people from different countries.	SD	D	SWD	SWA	A	SA
2. I would like to go to dances that feature music from other countries.	SD	D	SWD	SWA	A	SA
3. I often listen to the music of other countries.	SD	D	SWD	SWA	A	SA
4. I am interested in learning about the many countries that exist in the world.	SD	D	SWD	SWA	A	SA
5. I attend events where I might get to know people from different countries.	SD	D	SWD	SWA	A	SA
6. International students can teach me things I could not learn elsewhere.	SD	D	SWD	SWA	A	SA
7. I can best understand a person from another country after I get to know how he/she is both similar and different from me.	SD	D	SWD	SWA	A	SA
8. Knowing how a person from another country differs from me greatly enhances our friendship.	SD	D	SWD	SWA	A	SA
9. In getting to know a person from another country, I like knowing both how he/she differs from me and is similar to me.	SD	D	SWD	SWA	A	SA
10. Knowing about the different experiences of people from other countries helps me understand my own problems better.	SD	D	SWD	SWA	A	SA
11. Getting to know someone from another country is generally an uncomfortable experience for me.	SD	D	SWD	SWA	A	SA
12. I am only at ease with people of my own nationality.	SD	D	SWD	SWA	A	SA

13. It's really hard for me to feel close to a person from another nationality.	SD	D	SWD	SWA	A	SA
14. It's very important that a friend agrees with me on most issues.	SD	D	SWD	SWA	A	SA
15. I often feel irritated by persons of a different nationality.	SD	D	SWD	SWA	A	SA

16. Approximately, how many conversations with an international student have you had since the beginning of this semester? Please, choose one:

a. none
b. 1-2
c. 3-4
d. 5-6
e. 7-8
f. 9-10
g. 11+

* *If you circle answer* ***(a) none****, please proceed to* ***question 21****, skipping questions 17-20.*

Please recall the most memorable conversation with an international student within the last month.

17. How long did you talk to an international student? Please, choose one:
a. 0-30 minutes
b. 31-60 minutes
c. 61-180 minutes (1-3 hours)
d. 181-360 minutes (3-6 hours)
e. more than 6 hours

18. Where did your conversation with an international student take place?
a. class
b. campus student union
c. residence hall/dining center
d. on-campus workplace
e. other campus location (specify) _____
f. off-campus workplace
g. home
h. neighborhood

i. other off-campus location (specify) _____

19. What is the type of your relationship with the international student you talked to?
    a. stranger
    b. acquaintance
    c. classmate
    d. conversation partner
    e. friend
    f. co-worker
    g. family member/relative
    h. relational partner/spouse

20. How frequently do you usually interact with that international student?
    a. only the time the interaction occurred
    b. less than once a week
    c. 1-3 times a week
    d. 4-7 times a week
    e. more than 7 times a week

21. Are you a citizen or permanent resident of the United States?
    a. Yes
    b. No

22. What is your gender?
    a. Male
    b. Female

23. In what year of school are you?
    a. Unclassified/Undeclared
    b. Freshman
    c. Sophomore
    d. Junior
    e. Senior
    f. 5th year Senior
    g. Graduate
    h. Advanced Graduate

24. What is your college?
    a. College of Business Administration
    b. College of Education
    c. College of Humanities and Fine Arts
    d. College of Natural Sciences
    e. College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
    f. Undeclared

25. What is your age in years?
    a. under 25
    b. over 25

26. How large is your home town community?
    a. rural area or community less than 1,000
    b. 1,000 – 5,000
    c. 5,001 – 25,000
    d. 25,001 – 50,000
    e. 50,001 – 100,000
    f. Over 100,000

27. What is your current living location?
    a. off-campus
    b. university apartments
    c. ROTH Complex
    d. Bartlett Hall
    e. Bender Hall
    f. Campbell Hall
    g. Dancer Hall
    h. Hagemann Hall
    i. Lawther Hall
    j. Noehren Hall
    k. Rider Hall
    l. Shull Hall

28. What is your ethnic background?
    a. African American/Black
    b. Asian/Pacific Islander
    c. Caucasian American/White
    d. Hispanic American/Latin American
    e. Multiracial
    f. Native American
    g. Other (specify) _____