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“Informed and intelligent action”, philosopher John Dewey once wrote, is “the aim of all educational development.” (1935, p. 605)

ABSTRACT

Globalization is reaching impacts never thought of before and intercultural competence, once the prerogative of restricted circles, has become a necessary attribute for all of those who intend to be successful in the world of enterprise including the travel and tourism sector. Yet, travel and tourism academic institutions face systemic shortcomings in offering intercultural education and training for their students. This research examined how an educational approach called a Formative Experiment (Reinking & Bradley, 2008) helped undergraduate college students develop intercultural competence. The purpose of the Formative Experiment was to design and evaluate an instructional intervention aimed at facilitating the development of students’ intercultural competence in the context of a regular travel and tourism undergraduate university course. This Formative Experiment employed a scaffolding case study as the instructional intervention. The instructional intervention created metacognitive stimuli to promote the students’ intercultural competence development. The results show that when using the scaffolding case study both the number of students and their levels of intercultural competence increase during the Formative Experiment; these outcomes suggest the achievement of the research’s goal. This study also showed that even when students attend a class which focuses on intercultural competence instruction, they still need effort and time to develop their intercultural competence. The lesson learned is that intercultural competence is not innate, and that for this reason people must prepare to acquire it. In particular, this research indicated that the students develop higher CQ when they are able to make their own case choices, when they select small incidents, and when the material used in the travel and tourism class concentrates on CQ aspects. The final conclusion of this
research, then, is that travel and tourism departments in higher education institutions must incorporate systemic and comprehensive intercultural competence education in their programs to prepare their students for the challenges of the 21st century.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my committee members for assisting me in this research dissertation. I am deeply grateful to each of them because without their help and guidance this project would have not taken place.

My thanks go to Dr. Kenneth Backman, chair of the committee, for having trusted my initial idea about the integration of an intercultural education module in a travel and tourism class. Dr. Backman let me develop the module in one of his classes and during the entire semester, while supporting me all the way. His guidance was brilliantly disguised by an unobtrusive and yet caring approach which balanced his presence in the class and with the students and his letting go of them at the same time.

My thanks go to Dr. Sheila Backman, who also supported this project in every opportunity she had. She let me conduct the Preliminary Formative Experiment in one of her classes the previous semester and provided me with invaluable help especially during the last weeks of the dissertation preparation. She took great care and patience in teaching me the arts and tricks of academic writing and dissertation presentation.

My thanks go to Dr. Betty Baldwin, who has given me very important advice, in particular during the greatest moments of frustration and uncertainty, when the qualitative methodology was confusing me with its nuances and subtleties. Dr. Baldwin’s organization and wisdom allowed me to see the picture, whether big or small, that I had to see. Dr. Baldwin also let me interfere in her class for the Preliminary Formative Experiment, and she did it most graciously.

My thanks go to Dr. David Reinking, whose teachings about Formative Experiments in his graduate seminar motivated me to reflect on the direction to take for my dissertation methodology. Dr. Reinking inspired the first conception of this research dissertation; he gave me the match to
ignite the fuselage of this project and kept providing an attentive ear and total support throughout the study. I feel as if Formative Experiments have become a part of my daily experiences.

Also, my thanks go to Xu “Tony” Chen who has been instrumental in helping me with several tasks, from assisting me with the statistical component of the research to helping me with the computer dilemmas I often encountered such as formatting, tables and other tricks I needed to use with the computer to complete the dissertation. Tony is not only an invaluable colleague, but also a great friend.

Finally, my thanks go to Cindy Hartman for completing the cross-checking analysis of the scaffolding case studies; she made this analysis with expertise despite the short amount of time available. Thank you also to Geoff Lacher for helping me with his healthy critiquing and thought-provoking mentoring during the dissertation presentation rehearsals.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE PAGE</th>
<th>ii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>xi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CHAPTERS

1. INTRODUCTION ............................................................................................................. 1
   - Purpose of the Study ................................................................................................. 5
   - Overarching Questions for This Research ............................................................... 6
   - Approach to the Study ............................................................................................. 6
   - Implications .............................................................................................................. 7
   - Conceptual Definitions ............................................................................................ 7
   - Summary .................................................................................................................. 9

2. LITERATURE REVIEW .................................................................................................. 10
   - CQ Education and Training in the Context of Travel and Tourism ......................... 10
   - CQ: Emergence in Higher Education Institutions ..................................................... 11
   - CQ: Approaches in Higher Education Institutions ................................................... 13
   - CQ: Approaches in Travel and Tourism Academic Programs ................................... 16
   - Theoretical Approaches to Explain CQ Dynamics ..................................................... 22
   - Review of the Theories ............................................................................................. 23
     - Uncertainty and Anxiety ......................................................................................... 24
     - Cultural Variability .............................................................................................. 25
     - Motivation ............................................................................................................. 26
     - Knowledge ............................................................................................................ 28
     - Skills .................................................................................................................... 29
Table of Content (Continued) ........................................................................................................... Page

Summary .................................................................................................................................................. 30

3. METHOD ........................................................................................................................................... 32

   The Methodology ................................................................................................................................. 32
   The Formative Experiment (FE) Design .............................................................................................. 32
   The Instructional Intervention Design ................................................................................................. 39

The Methods .......................................................................................................................................... 46

Setting and Students ............................................................................................................................. 48

Data Sources ......................................................................................................................................... 48

   The Scaffolding Case Study .................................................................................................................. 50
   Class Time (Instruction + 6 Guest Speakers) ...................................................................................... 59
   Class Work (2 Exams + 10 Quizzes) .................................................................................................... 61
   Field Notes (Daily Journal + 2 Focus Groups) ..................................................................................... 62
   The ‘Detailed’ Analysis of the Scaffolding Case Study (n = 11) ......................................................... 63
   The Cross-Checking ‘Summative’ Analysis (n = 11) ......................................................................... 64
   The Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI) .................................................................................... 64

Preliminary Formative Experiment ........................................................................................................ 66

Summary ................................................................................................................................................ 73

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION ........................................................................................................... 74

Results and Discussion .......................................................................................................................... 74

Overarching Questions for This Research ............................................................................................ 78

Convergent Evidence Processes ........................................................................................................... 79

   Field Notes .......................................................................................................................................... 79
   Class Work .......................................................................................................................................... 83
   Class Time .......................................................................................................................................... 84
   The Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI) ................................................................................... 85
   ICSI Alternative Analysis (n = 15) ......................................................................................................... 91

The Scaffolding Case Study with ‘Detailed’ Analysis (n = 11) ............................................................... 93
# Table of Content (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Cross-Checking ‘Summative’ Analysis (n = 11)</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity and Rigor of the Formative Experiment</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Questions Guiding a Formative Experiment</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1: What is the Pedagogical Goal of the Experiment, and What Theory Establishes Its Value?</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2: What is an Instructional Intervention that Has the Potential to Achieve the Pedagogical Goal?</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3: What Factors in the Environment Enhance or Inhibit the Intervention’s Effectiveness in Achieving the Goal?</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4: How Can the Intervention and its Implementation be Modified during the Experiment to Achieve the Goal More Effectively?</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5: Has the Educational Environment Changed as a Result of the Intervention?</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6: What Unanticipated Positive or Negative Effects Does the Intervention Produce?</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Remarks: So What?</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX C</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX D</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX F</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX G</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Intercultural Competence Groups and Sub-Groups .......................................................... 24
Table 2: Diagram of the Iteration of the Formative Experiment................................................. 50
Table 3: ICSI t-test Results for the Japanese Section of the Preliminary Formative Experiment ............................................................................................................................ 69
Table 4: Demographic Information of the Students Enrolled in the International Travel and Tourism Class ................................................................................................................................. 74
Table 5: Demographic Information of the Experimental Group for the ICSI Administration ........................................................................................................................................ 85
Table 6: Demographic Information of the Control Group for the ICSI Administration ................................................. 86
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: The Formative Experiment Design .......................................................... 34
Figure 2: Metacognitive Dynamics of the Formative Experiment .......................... 36
Figure 3: Intercultural Competence Dynamics of the Formative Experiment ............. 37
Figure 4: Metacognitive and Intercultural Competence Identification and Tracking .... 38
Figure 5: The Scaffolding Case Study ...................................................................... 40
Figure 6: The Steps of the Scaffolding Case Study .................................................. 43
Figure 7: The Formative Experiment Data Sources .................................................. 49
Figure 8: Intercultural Competence Classification .................................................. 54
Figure 9: Students’ Intercultural Competence Placement ....................................... 57
Figure 10: Final Results on Students Intercultural Competence Identification and Tracking .......................................................... 75
Figure 11: Validity and Rigor of the Formative Experiment ................................... 96
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The travel and tourism sector enters the 21st century as “one of the three industries that will drive the world economy.” (Naisbitt, as cited in Theobald, 2004, p. 6). Travel and tourism, though, is much more than a pure commodity as it embraces also social, cultural, recreational, religious, political, environmental aspects of daily and long term activities of both travelers and the communities they visit. According to the World Tourism Organization 1.6 billion people will travel internationally by 2020, spending more than US$2 trillion per year (Frangialli, 2004). These projections are supported by the general view that globalization and the competitiveness it generates stimulate both standardization and differentiation between places, products, experiences and people. In the age of increased competition between destinations for visitors, tourism employees’ strong or weak intercultural competence can make or break the future of the tourism enterprise. Intercultural competence, then, is an important ingredient for tourism practices to be successful.

CQ, an acronym for intercultural intelligence, refers to a wide variety of competencies and skills that share the goal of bridging differences between people for the benefit of all parties involved (Berry & Ward, 2006; Earley & Ang, 2003; Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 2006; Triandis, 2006). Earley and Ang pointed out that “CQ paradoxically reflects a universal quality that is unique to each individual.” (2003, p. 67) Further, Bennett and Bennett defined CQ as “the ability to communicate effectively in cross-cultural situations and to relate appropriately in a variety of cultural contexts.” (2004, p. 149) In sum, CQ qualifies intercultural practices and strategies that people carry out in their international encounters to achieve successful and satisfactory exchanges. When interacting with people of different cultural, religious and social
background, CQ suggests the appropriate attitudes and behaviors one should have in regards to the people who belong to that environment. For example, entering a Catholic church or a mosque without the proper attire would trigger negative reactions in the local population. The consequence would be the denial of access to the visitor with corresponding disappointment on both sides of the exchange, and possible long lasting negative impressions of one another.

Once the prerogative of restricted circles, such as diplomatic entourages, courts and top ranking positions in government and business—CQ in recent decades has become a necessary attribute for those who intend to be successful in the world of enterprise at any level (Pusch, 2004). Technological advances together with the shifting of geopolitical and economic scenarios have shaped the world’s societies at a pace never experienced before. These impacts have been expressed in both mixed and contradictory ways. On the one hand, they allow the elimination of physical and cultural distance with tools such as the internet and the fall of political or economic frontiers (for example, the fall of the Berlin Wall or the opening of communist China to market forces). On the other hand, they multiply the formation, consolidation or dissolutions of interactions among myriads of diverse peoples and organizations, where the human touch is still important. Globalization is praised both as a border reducer, communication enhancer, and condemned as a culture diluent, or as a new form of Western hegemony (Bresler & Ardichvili, 2002; Haigh, 2002; Hall & Tucker, Eds., 1999; Hobson & Josiam, 1996; Robinson, 1999).

The trends exist that intercultural exchanges have become more complex, and thus demand that individuals need to increase their cross-cultural awareness, so that they are better able to work successfully in global business (Pusch, 2004). Earley and Ang (2003) pointed out that “some organizations have added ‘intercultural competence’ to the existing list of dimensions to be assessed in their assessment centers” (p. 204). Further, in the business world, “there is
pressure on multinationals to select the best employees to manage these foreign operations and, therefore, an increasing demand for managerial talent with the requisite international experiences.” (p. 210) Including CQ as a key component of increasing knowledge of other cultures may provide business firms with a competitive advantage over those which do not include this training.

Data on professional success in intercultural contexts show that the failure rate in terms of early returns for American international employees ranges between 10 and 80 percent, the average being about 20 to 30 percent (Earley & Ang, 2003, p. 210). This rate is much higher than the average for European and Japanese international employees, which is around 10 percent only (Early & Ang, 2003, p. 210). Thus, despite the importance for individuals and firms that are interested in doing business globally to understand CQ, and compared to other nationalities, American international professionals in general do not show to have this understanding and do not experience the same level of success that other international professionals experience when working with collaborators from other nations.

Currently anthropology, psychology and social psychology have examined CQ as a constructed quality that people acquire and forge in different ways and times. The literature on CQ acquisition is in general agreement that, “This kind of sophisticated cultural competence does not come naturally and requires a high level of professionalism and knowledge” (Earley & Ang, 2003, p. 263). In other words, CQ— especially high levels of CQ— must be learned (Earley & Ang, 2003, p. 192). In consideration of the “pedagogical” nature of CQ acquisition, then, it is reasonable to consider that a connection may exist between the early return rates of American international employees and their lacking of adequate CQ education and training. That is, even though the importance of CQ for global professionals success is unquestioned, many
academic institution display systemic shortcomings in offering CQ education and training for their students.

These observations are particularly concerning in the field of the travel and tourism industry, because the predictions for future international travel and tourism growth are impressive, as the The World Tourism Organization (WTO) projected. It is, therefore, important that travel and tourism suppliers provide this education to their employees. Furthermore, these suppliers must be cognizant of the CQ levels of candidates for employment in their business. Thus, current travel and tourism students must be exposed to CQ education as part of their undergraduate preparation, so as to prepare to be involved in global business. For this reason, travel and tourism educational institutions must provide CQ education if they wish to remain competitive in the educational sector.

The published literature agrees that currently there is a lack of CQ instruction in higher education. For example, Knight (1999) suggested that, “The preparation of graduates who have strong knowledge and skill base in intercultural relations and communications is considered by many academics as one of the strongest rationales for internationalizing the teaching/learning experience of students in undergraduate and graduate programmes.” (p. 20) Earley & Ang (2003) indicated that:

There is a growing need to measure the CQ of international managers and staff. For example, careers in international or culturally diverse organizations, especially those using team approaches, require a positive attitude toward cross-cultural differences; any person who does not have some level of CQ to handle such diverse situations is closing the door to many career opportunities. (p. 186)
However, there is also agreement by CQ researchers that there is a paucity of studies published on CQ education and training programs as well as their implementation in higher education institutions (Haight, 2002; Knight, 1999, 2007; Rivera Jr., 2010; Sangpikul, 2009). At the present time the focus of higher education is oriented towards the internationalization of existing curricula. Haigh (2002), for instance, stated that “Internationalization of the curriculum is the process of designing a curriculum that meets the needs of an international student body (cf. Callan, 2000). Ultimately, the process is about ‘fair play’.” (p. 51)

Researchers (Haigh, 2002; Knight, 1999, 2007; Sangpikul, 2009) express also their concern that educational institutions address CQ education in very general terms. For example, Knight (1999) suggested that internationalization of higher education “is better associated with the primary and universal functions of an institution of higher education, namely teaching, research and service to society.” (p. 17)

Furthermore, despite the importance of CQ to travel and tourism the published literature agrees on the paucity of CQ connections in the travel and tourism field between theory and practice, between academia and industry, and between teaching and learning (e.g. Collins, 2002; Gladstone, 1998; Jayawardena, 2001; Rivera Jr., 2010; Saee, 2006; Zehrer & Mössenlechner, 2009) for the successful shaping of future ranks of global professionals. In recognition of the current state of CQ in the travel and tourism sector, this research proposes to gain an understanding of CQ education and training in the context of travel and tourism.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to design and evaluate a formative experiment with the goal to help undergraduate travel and tourism students develop CQ. The formative experiment proposed an instructional intervention which combined selected educational principles and
techniques to provide an optimal learning environment for CQ acquisition; the instructional intervention design consisted of a scaffolding case study. Insights gained from this study provided guidelines for future refinement of the formative experiment and the instructional intervention.

This research does not contradict the traditional views on important requisites for CQ acquisition which call for extensive training and living abroad experiences (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992; Haigh, 2002). Yet, this research acknowledges that in many instances those criteria cannot realistically be met, or can be met only in part, due to time, scope, or resources or other constraints (Gladstone, 1998; Obst, Bhandari, & Witherell, 2007).

Overarching Questions for This Research

The following overarching questions were developed to guide this study:

A) Is this formative experiment’s instructional intervention capable of helping college students develop CQ in a semester-long, pre-existing travel and tourism undergraduate class?

and;

B) Is the travel and tourism students CQ development identifiable and trackable?

Approach to the Study

The approach to this study is adopted from Reinking and Bradley (2008), and it is called a formative experiment (FE). The rationale for this choice rests above all on the pragmatic nature of FEs, a quality of utmost importance when pursuing pedagogical goals. In particular, a FE allows the assessment of an educational issue which needs improvement. To make this improvement the FE uses a series of techniques and tools, called the instructional intervention, which have the goal to help improve or eliminate the issue. The pragmatic nature of a FE must not be mistaken for lack of theoretical support, since every FE strives to align theory with
practice, in fine tuning processes which advance both the area of knowledge and of practical solutions.

For this dissertation the educational issue is the development of CQ in travel and tourism students, the FE is the collection of theories, methods, data sources and processes used to address the need to develop the students CQ, and the instructional intervention consists of a particular assignment the students carried out, called the Scaffolding Case Study.

Implications

The goal of this study is to provide both a theoretical foundation and a practical application of effective pedagogical strategies to help travel and tourism students develop CQ while enrolled in a traditional travel and tourism curriculum. Therefore, this dissertation has the scope to call attention and stimulate action of travel and tourism educators towards the consolidation of explicit, precise and systematic CQ education and training in travel and tourism programs. The positions of these institutions in regards to internationalization are complex and sometimes confusing and they need to be addressed for the benefit of the students.

Conceptual Definitions

Education and Training: “Education is directed toward expanding one’s awareness of the human environment; Training is directed toward developing one’s skills on coping with this environment.” (Gunn, 1998, p. 75)

Deep Approach to Learning: “Use of higher order of cognitive processes; knowledge creation; internal motivation.” (Hornby, Jennings, & Nulty, 2009, p.126)

Intercultural Competence (CQ): “The ability to communicate effectively in cross-cultural situations and to relate appropriately in a variety of cultural contexts.” (Bennett & Bennett, 2004, p. 149) Based on the conceptual definition on CQ and metacognition this dissertation defines CQ
development as a person CQ change, recorded through conceptual justifications; in this
dissertation the researcher identified three different CQ levels according to the following criteria:

Lower CQ: Scarcely addresses CQ topics; Little to no examples; Little to no
interpretation (induction-deduction); Over-simplification; Egocentrism.

Middle CQ: Addresses CQ topics, but with superficial and/or unidirectional approaches;
Few and/or shallow examples; Attempted interpretation with some success and some failure;
Complexity emerges; Ethno-relativism emerges.

Higher CQ: CQ topics are central; Many and/or appropriate examples; Meaningful
interpretations; Complexities are addressed and resolutions attempted; Ethno-relativism
characterizes the research.

Formative Experiment (FE): “A methodological approach which calls for various
evaluation systems, an iterative methodology, and fine-tuning processes in pursuing educational
goals.” (Reinking & Bradley, 2008, pp. 17-22)

Instructional Intervention: “A coherent collection of instructional activities aimed at
accomplishing a specific instructional goal.” (Reinking & Bradley, 2008, p. 100)

Visibility: “The goal of cognitive apprenticeship, to make processes that are normally

Convergent Evidence: “Data collection and analysis that produce convergent evidence
from multiple sources through multiple methods produce findings, interpretations, and
recommendations that are more trustworthy and convincing, and thus more rigorous.” (Reinking
and Bradley, 2008, p. 56).
Summary

Chapter I provided an introduction to the importance of CQ education and training. This chapter included the purpose and the goals of the study, and also the most important terminology used in the text. Chapter II will review the literature on CQ. Chapter III, Method, discusses the theoretical approaches used to guide the methodology and the details on how the study was conducted. Chapter IV presents and discusses the results of the study, including the elements of convergent evidence, that is, of validity and rigor. Finally, Chapter V concludes the dissertation by discussing the findings and the implications of this investigation.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review in this chapter has two primary foci. The first component of this chapter is the review of the published literature on CQ education and training, with particular attention to the travel and tourism education sector. The second focus of this review is the discussion of the nature of CQ. In particular, this chapter firstly introduces an overview of the state of CQ education and training in higher education institutions in general and then focuses on the state of CQ education and training in travel and tourism higher education institutions across the globe, with special emphasis on the United States. Secondly, this chapter presents foundational literature on the mechanisms which form and regulate CQ.

CQ Education and Training in the Context of Travel and Tourism

As Chapter I pointed out, the travel and tourism sector enters the 21st century as “one of the three industries that will drive the world economy.” (Naisbitt, as cited in Theobald, 2004, p. 6). Thus, issues of sustainability for the travel and tourism sector emerge under the pressure of such projection. The Preface in the White Paper by the Tourism Education Futures Initiative (TEFI) stated:

The world faces many challenges, of which one of the most important is creating the leaders of tomorrow. With an explicit charge of universities to take a leading role in educating society, many have suggested that we need to take a new approach in teaching our students values that will lead to a sustainable future.

(TEFI, 2009, p. 2)

One fundamental goal of sustainable practices is the preservation of resources for the enjoyment of future generations; a future interpretable in terms of the preservation and
flourishing of these generations’ identities, cultures and resources as part of travel and tourism destinations, and in terms of the security and advancement of their operators’ jobs and careers. It is not unreasonable, then, to suggest that the success of sustainability in travel and tourism practices may depend heavily on the education future generations will receive, including CQ education.

As Dwyer (2004) suggested, “There will be great demand for people with language skills and ability to work in different cultures. The tourism industry may be expected to play an important role in maintaining this demand.” (p. 532). In the food and hospitality sector of the travel and tourism industry, for instance, as MacDonald’s serves potatoes all over the world, social and cultural factors affect how they are processed. In India, the potatoes are fried in non-cow fat, but in the United States whether the fat is from cow or not is not influential for the preparation and consumption of MacDonald’s French fries. Thus, factors that are trivial in one society may be crucial in another for the success or failure of a business. These differences must be known and taken into account. Therefore, CQ is important for the success of most economic enterprises, becoming often an essential contributor to sustainable practices. For the MacDonald’s example, if MacDonald’s managers did not have high CQ in regards to the Hindu customs and beliefs, they would find resistance to visitation and consumption at the local level and a decline in sales in India.

CQ: Emergence in Higher Education Institutions

In addition to being an emerging area of study, CQ education and training also refers to a variety of human endeavors. Bennett, Bennett and Landis (2004) pointed out that “Intercultural training is one application within the domain of intercultural relations…This relatively new field represents an interdisciplinary focus of cultural anthropology, cross-cultural psychology,
sociolinguistics, multicultural education, intercultural communication, and international business management.” (p. 1) The development of CQ education and training, then, has been characterized by multi-disciplinary perspectives and pragmatic approaches (Pusch, 2004).

From a chronological perspective, the contemporary identification of CQ, and the development of intercultural education and training, became important for American domestic and international stability at the end of World War II. When compared to the other nations involved in the conflict, the United States emerged as the most economically intact, globally prominent, and committed country in the international arena (Pusch, 2004). However, the United States were ill prepared to face the intercultural challenge their new world leading role required. The country’s shortcomings became visible in international relations especially through its diplomats who often did not possess the intercultural qualities necessary to be effective in their assignments (Pusch, 2004). In 1958 The Ugly American (Lederer & Burdick) was published divulging this aspect of American society (Pusch, 2004). It is no surprise, then, that CQ education and training and the related literature emerged during those years, and that Edward T. Hall, the ‘founding father’ of intercultural education and training in the United States, wrote for the first time about intercultural communication in 1959, inaugurating a wave of research in the field (Pusch, 2004).

Until the mid 1980s’ the literature on CQ published the experimentation and consolidation of the works of different schools, agencies, and programs. For example, work originated from the activity of the Diplomatic Corps, the Peace Corps, and the Navy to help their professionals in their international assignments (Pusch, 2004). The academic institutions also began organizing similar projects such as the George Washington University project on Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO), the Regional Council for International Education (RCIE) at the
University of Pittsburgh, the National Association of Foreign Students Affairs (NAFSA), the Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research (SIETAR), and the Washington International Center (Pusch, 2004). These organizations were working for the emergent needs of a complex, technologically fast reaching post-war, and then two-block global society. Corporate America was just side by side the public sector in this intercultural development effort with initiatives such as the Standard Vacuum Oil Company and its training program in Indonesia, the creation of the Business Council for International Understanding which had the goal to improve relations between public and private sector, the Clark Consulting Group (CCG) for the training of international deployment of employees, just to name a few (Pusch, 2004).

In the last twenty years of the 20th century, the redefinition of borders, the increase in the number and in the complexity of movements of people, and the changes of the economies—which rely on quasi-instant information technology—have accelerated the intercultural needs of businesses, including tourism suppliers (see Chapter I). National educational organizations, whether for financial, academic, or cultural pressure, began pursuing the internationalization of their curricula (Haigh, 2002; Knight, 1999, 2003, 2007; Rivera Jr., 2010; Sangpikul, 2009).

**CQ: Approaches in Higher Education Institutions**

Higher education institutions traditionally address the students’ intercultural needs in one of two ways: assistance for the domestic students in study abroad programs, and assistance for the international students enrolled in programs on their campuses. These practices are exemplified in the case of the United States, where in the last decades higher education institutions have witnessed, on the one hand, a raised volume of domestic students engaging in study abroad programs (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2006; Cushner & Karim, 2004; Hoffa, 2007; Newswire Association, 2007; Obst, Bhandari, & Witherell, 2007; State News Service,
2006; The Wisconsin State Journal, 2006), and—on the other hand—a greater presence of international students on US campuses.

Such dynamics have encouraged American universities to address, “the need for Americans to understand other cultures.” (Pedersen, 1994, p. 158) Cushner and Nieman (1994) indicate that generally organizations adopt one of two approaches when dealing with international and/or intercultural activities. They either have a narrow and self-centered approach, in which attention is not paid towards their ‘hosts’ but to the institutions’ needs, or they can be sensitive to the other parties involvement in satisfying both the institutions and the ‘hosts’ needs. It is the academic institutions vision which allows departments, faculty, students, and staff to become aware of and to address their intercultural needs and challenges.

Despite the growing emphasis towards the internationalization of students’ experiences on either end of the international spectrum, and despite the good will and broad vision many higher education administrators have, inadequacies still exist for suitable intercultural academic education on many campuses. For example, Brislin (1994) pointed out that some professors who teach cross-cultural topics in a variety of different colleges and departments often find this difficult because the students lack personal inter-cultural experiences. Further, Brislin (1994) pointed out that the students “have a difficult time conceptualizing the fact that many people have been socialized into a very different culture” (p. 94) and subsequently understanding why people behave differently.

Conversely, Cushner suggested that faculty members who come from a rather homogeneous milieu must adapt their teachings to the changing needs of a growing heterogeneous student body. “Perhaps the greatest challenge yet to face the educational system
of most nations is how best to address issues of equity and excellence within a context of
diversity.” (Cushner, 1994, p. 113)

The sensitization in academia to the need for CQ education and training of faculty and
students has become more evident in the literature since the 2000s’. For example, researchers
criticize the lack of intercultural sensitivity in academic forums in developing curricula (Haigh,
2002). This deficiency perpetuates a damaging inertia for international students’ strengths and
preferred learning styles (Barron & Arcodia, 2002).

Researchers have also addressed the need to better prepare the teaching faculty with a
robust international background, and to have students with, “a determinedly international outlook”
(Black, 2004, p. 10), a curriculum that uses cross-cultural material (Knight, 1999), and finally
international collaborations for higher education institutions internationalization (Black, 2004).
For example, European higher education institutions are working in what is called ‘the Bologna
process’, a European initiative that, “encourages the convergence of education and
administrative systems in the 45 countries” of the European Union (Munar, 2007, p. 75). This
process is prompting researchers to reflect on possible initiatives in CQ development. Butts
proposed, for example, a university project in intercultural communication where a sort of
‘snowball effect’ in CQ education and training for few trained faculty would generate more
education and training for more faculty and students alike (2007).

As higher education administrators recognize the general need to address intercultural
education and training in their institutions, so have a number of travel and tourism university
CQ: Approaches in Travel and Tourism Academic Programs

In the context of travel and tourism CQ has been explored from a variety of perspectives. The topics range from an approach to our global economy (Saee, 2006; Shenkar, 2010; Ting-Toomey, 1999), to an anthropological point of view (Rogers & Steinfatt, 1999), to the specifics of the field of tourism, (Cohen, 2004; Turner, Reisinger, & McQuilken, 2001; Urry 2002; Weber, Finley, Crawford, & Rivera Jr., 2009), particularly to tourist/guest relationships (Chambers, Ed., 1997), language and intercultural training (Kumaravadivelu, 2007), and even safety and risk in travel (Reisinger & Mavondo, 2006).

In the late 1980s’, when higher education in general became sensitized to globalizing forces, and with the emergence or the sophistication of departments in hospitality, recreation, parks, travel, and tourism studies across the globe (Airey & Tribe, 2005; Black, 2004; Butts, 2007; Haigh, 2002; Hobston & Josiam, 1996; Jayawardena, 2001; Martin, 1986; Rivera Jr., 2010; Sangpikul, 2009; Zehr & Mössenlechner, 2009; Zeller, Siller & Altmann, 2006) the literature relevant for the internationalization of tourism education became available.

The field studies which address CQ education and training for travel and tourism students, though, highlight confusing and contradictory results. For example, Saee’s study on Australian hospitality tourism managers (2006) indicated the preponderance of assimilationist views when addressing both multicultural staffing and tourism education and training. In particular, “… the managers showed, on the whole, only a limited and narrow understanding of intercultural communication competence … A majority of the managers reported uncertainty in their daily intercultural encounters in the workplace.” (p. 215) Furthermore, “only one senior manager identified education as a key indicator of intercultural communication competence … Thus, it
was a minority view (one or 8 per cent) that education was necessary to achieve intercultural communication competence.” (p. 137)

Baum (2005) denounced the limited impact that intercultural education and training has had on hospitality and tourism education in the United Kingdom and Ireland even though, “there has been long-standing recognition for the need to place the teaching of tourism in an international and, increasingly, a global context.” (p. 35) Baum asserted that, “notwithstanding the global nature of the tourism industry, educational provision in this area remains remarkably parochial.” (p. 29)

In a similar view, Seymour and Constanti (2002) expressed concern that it is necessary to provide travel, tourism, and hospitality students in the United Kingdom with increased intercultural awareness. They drew their conclusion from the results of their study at Oxford Brookes University which showed that the students had low intercultural sensitivity. In Cushner & Nieman’s footsteps (1994), Seymour and Constanti acknowledged how universities struggle with the growing internationalization of their campuses, and how, “Many British universities, faced with the implications of their increasing recruitment of international students have had to decide whether to adopt an ethnocentric or a polycentric model for their curricula and methods of study and assessment.” (p. 4) Their study focused on reciprocal involvement between domestic and international students in the hospitality management degree programs. On the one hand, the international students felt that, “the home students were unfriendly”, and, on the other hand, that “the home students did not seem to share (these) cultural values regarding the role of ‘hosts’ or making international students feel welcome.” (p. 8)

Other international trends are mixed and contradictory. For example, while a Fulbright appointee in Thailand, Chambers (1997) pointed out the need for higher education tourism institutions to address intercultural education and training in tourism studies, particularly for
those countries where a commitment to democratization would be sensible. He observed that curricula in hospitality schools in these countries paid little if no attention at all to social and cultural components for the education and training of their hospitality workforce, and considered this industry just an…‘industry’. In 2009, Sangpikul reiterated the same perspective for Thai travel, tourism and hospitality education.

Other countries, such as Taiwan, show how being relatively new on the global market may have its advantages: “Since Taiwan began its tourism and hospitality education relatively late it has the benefit of the experiences of other advanced countries to learn from.” (Horng & Lee, 2005, p. 191) Taiwan is learning that, “Under the globalization trend in the 21st century, the biggest challenge facing domestic hospitality education is to balance between the need for the cultivation of truly international professionals of hospitality and the demand for promoting the characteristics of the local hospitality culture.” (Horng, & Lee, 2005, p. 192)

After consolidating its own tourism educational system, mainland China is currently focusing on international co-operation and integration with international practices. “Now there is still a big gap between China’s tourism education and the world level. In order to get integrated with the world practice, China needs to import advanced teaching methods and textbooks from abroad and to create more opportunities to send more people to study abroad.” (Zhang & Fan, 2005, p. 158)

In the Caribbean, hospitality and tourism are the life of the economy with tourist visitation being one of the top sources of income for the Caribbean nations and continuing to rise (The State of Caribbean Tourism, 2011). Nevertheless, the Caribbean tourism education sector has been criticized for incoherence of curricula, obsolete teaching materials and inadequacy of funding (Lewis, 2005). To strengthen their efficacy and competitiveness these countries have
taken initiatives such as the Caribbean Tourism Learning System (CTLS) which addresses issues of curricular and credit systems standardization for their travel and tourism students. Furthermore, the travel and tourism students’ exchanges are encouraged by critiques aimed at improving, “the governance and operations of the institutions as well as the quality of programmes.” (Lewis, 2005, p. 145)

Latin America is still struggling through its infancy in hospitality and tourism, but holds great potential, especially with Brazil at the forefront of the educational and research efforts. Tourism volume is rising in this world region for its natural beauty, history and diversity and also because disrupting events in other destinations around the world (whether diseases, natural or human induced disasters, wars, unrest) have detoured tourists from visiting. Initiatives are taking place to consolidate, expand and deepen the tourism education sector, with more programs both at the undergraduate and graduate level, more research and outlet for research, such as journals, conferences and organizations (Leal & Padilha, 2005).

East Africa needs strong co-operation and exchange components at all levels in the tourism education sector. These components will be able to function and prosper only if the internal institutional networks become stronger and if the intra-regional effort between Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda create stronger collaborations. The compromise between maintaining each country’s individual development as a primary focus by attracting tourism to their unique destinations and the need for cooperation, harmonization and consolidation of these countries tourism services, including education for future operators of the tourism sectors, requires effort and ability on behalf of the governments, organizations, and universities in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda (Mayaka, 2005).
Germany has a long tradition in tourism education, but only at a vocational level. The presence of hospitality and tourism studies in academic settings is a relatively new phenomenon. However, it is reasonable to predict that the academic consolidation of the hospitality and tourism sector will experience a significant thrust in the future under the pressure of the ‘Bologna Declaration’, especially towards CQ education and training (Freyer, Hammer, & Piermeier, 2005).

On a wider scale, Australasia is becoming more and more prominent in international tourism education and research, while North America is experiencing a decline in international graduate students presence, due mostly to visas and stay issues (Hudson, 2005). Barron stated that Australia, for example, attracts great numbers of international students, especially Asian hospitality management students; he stressed that Australian academic institutions must continue their effort towards the implementation of attractive programs for these students (2002).

With specific reference to the United States, CQ education and training are approached unsystematically. A survey of 25 U.S. universities with large travel, tourism and hospitality departments (that is, with both undergraduate and graduate programs) attempted to assess the current position of such institutions in regards to CQ education and training (Cross, 2008). In particular, the survey tried to determine whether these departments offered CQ education and training in their travel, tourism and hospitality programs. Similarly to Saee’s research in Australia, Cross’ (2008) survey received only an 8 per cent response. Furthermore, the responses were fragmentary and contradictory. One survey response indicated that the department did not offer intercultural education and training courses and the other survey response indicated that travel, tourism and hospitality students could take intercultural communication courses in the general education curriculum (Cross, 2008). A recent web-based search of the same 25 travel,
tourism and hospitality programs in U.S. universities (aimed at cross checking the 2008 survey) still did not find specific CQ courses offered in the travel, tourism, and hospitality programs curricula; some sideline courses were found such as “domestic” diversity courses, language requirements in foreign languages departments and/or study abroad experiences (Cross, 2010).

This part of the literature review addressed the state of CQ education and training in the field of high education. In particular, it reviewed the state of CQ education and training in travel and tourism programs outside and within the United States. The bottom line is that travel and tourism departments have been traditionally wrestling with an identity carved out in part from a plurality of academic disciplines, and in part being the result of parochial and vocational training. These may be some of the reasons why CQ education and training programs are underdeveloped in travel and tourism departments.

On the other hand, and based on the literature review, CQ education and training has emerged as a most needed component of travel and tourism curricula. CQ is considered a necessary requisite travel and tourism professionals must have in view of the rising challenges international travel and tourism operations present. A positive economic impact of travel and tourism operations, whether at the local level or at the global level, will rely more and more heavily on international visitation satisfaction; the travel and tourism industry, with its service orientation, depends on it.

The literature review in the next section focuses on the research conducted on CQ. Selected fundamental CQ studies are presented to help understand its nature, components and mechanisms. Also, the next section helps the understanding of CQ complexities and nuances, and therefore helps to understand why it is important, but also difficult to acquire CQ. A general grasp of the major characteristics and the mechanisms which assist the development of CQ is
essential to appreciate the rationale for this dissertation. In this light, chosen theories and their implications as to the attributes and the dynamics of CQ are presented.

Theoretical Approaches to Explain CQ Dynamics

CQ encompasses a complex system of cognitive, emotional and behavioral dimensions (Earley & Ang, 2003) that allow individuals to live satisfactory and successful experiences when they get in contact with environments and people that do not belong to their milieu. Bennett and Bennett defined CQ as, “the ability to communicate effectively in cross-cultural situations and to relate appropriately in a variety of cultural contexts.” (2004, p. 149) A multifaceted and ever fluid quality, CQ is extremely difficult to fit into a “one-size-fits-all” frame.

There are numerous intercultural theories on effective intercultural communication (Reisinger, 2009). As CQ can be approached from a great many angles, a complete review of the theories that explain the conceptual nature of what is CQ and why it matters is practically impossible and not even desirable. The amount of material generated in a wide range of disciplines such as psychology, sociology, anthropology and business— just to name the most prominent— suggest to consider selected, representative constructs on CQ.

This research is based on the theories of Gudykunst (1988, 1993) and Hofstede (1979, 2001) as the fundamental theoretical approaches to describe CQ characteristics and their mechanisms. In particular, Gudykunst’s theory was deemed most appropriate to guide this study because it offered a holistic approach for the study of the students CQ development in a travel and tourism class. Although most intercultural communication theories address cognitive, emotional and behavioral components of CQ development, Gudykunst integrated these components within a construct called “cultural variability” which represents a synthesis of the five cultural dimensions elaborated by Hofstede in his studies. As this dissertation aims at
identifying and tracking CQ development in students by analyzing their international travel and
tourism scaffolding case studies, the cultural variability components suggested by Hofstede were
considered a basic and explicit construct of reference for data analysis. The chosen intercultural
communication theories described next assist this dissertation by providing the necessary
knowledge to understand how the students CQ development was observed, recorded and
analyzed.

Review of the Theories

In the Anxiety and Uncertainty Management (AUM) theory Gudykunst suggested that
the uncertainty and anxiety construct and the cultural variability construct are fundamental for
CQ management. These constructs are responsible, along with three other functional
constructs—motivation, knowledge and skills—for CQ acquisition and development. For this
reason, Gudykunst did not attribute sub-groups to the uncertainty and anxiety and cultural
variability constructs, because they are the conceptual constructs which are ‘regulated’ by and—
they themselves—‘regulate’ the motivation, knowledge and skills constructs in ongoing
processes. For the three functional constructs, instead, Gudykunst identified: for the Motivation
construct the sub-groups of Needs, Self-Conceptions, Social Bonds, Attraction, and Openness to
New Information; for the construct of Knowledge, the sub-groups of More than One Perspective,
Alternative Interpretations, Expectations, Similarities and Differences, and Shared Networks; for
the Skills construct, the sub-groups of Ability to Create New Categories, Tolerate Ambiguity,
Emphatize, Adapt Our Communication, Gather and Use Appropriate Information, and
Accommodate Our Behavior. Table 1 shows the grouping of Gudykunst’s constructs that
contribute to his Anxiety and Uncertainty Management (AUM) theory:
The motivation construct is comprised of needs, self-conceptions, social bonds, attraction, and openness to new information. For the knowledge construct Gudykunst selected: knowledge of more than one perspective, knowledge of alternative interpretations, expectations, knowledge of similarities and differences, and shared networks. For the skills construct he identified: ability to create new categories, ability to tolerate ambiguity, ability to empathize, ability to adapt our communication, ability to gather and use appropriate information, and ability to accommodate our behavior. The following paragraphs briefly describe the CQ constructs and their sub-groups.

**Uncertainty and Anxiety**

In Gudykunst’s words, “effective communication involves minimizing misunderstandings” (1993, p. 64) which are often provoked by uncertainty and anxiety. Knapp and Vangelisti (1992), though, reminded us also that perception is relative and similarly, in relation to communication effectiveness, Stephan and Stephan (1985) reported that positive interactions will produce positive emotions and negative interactions, negative emotions. Keeping these nuances in mind, it is still useful to adopt Gudykunst’s approach which suggests that the basic tenets for effective
communication rely fundamentally on two factors: uncertainty and anxiety. When these factors are kept under control, reduced or even eliminated, intercultural communication benefits both at the cognitive and emotional levels, misunderstandings are reduced, behavior improves, and effective communication becomes a realistic outcome.

**Cultural Variability**

Gudykunst referred to cultural variability as his second conceptual construct and defined it as, “the cultural level of analysis…a way of talking about how cultures differ” (1993, p. 65). Cultural variables are given various labels. In labeling these variables Gudykunst adopted Hofstede’s five dimensions of low-high individualism-collectivism, low-high power distance, low-high uncertainty avoidance, low-high masculinity-femininity, and long-short term orientation (Hofstede, 1979, 2001). So, Gudykunst’s cultural variability represents nothing else than Hofstede’s five cultural dimensions.

For example, there exist high individualistic versus high collectivistic cultures, where the former emphasize the “I” dimension and the latter the “we” dimension in societal values (Hofstede & Bond, 1984). Low or high power distance cultures are characterized by the intensity of power’s acceptance. The low power distance cultures, for example, believe that power should be used only when necessary and should emanate from legitimacy or expertise only. The high power distance cultures see power as an intrinsic element of society and expect it to be much more widely present (Hofstede & Bond, 1984). The low uncertainty avoidance cultures have high tolerance for other cultures and towards ambiguity, whereas high uncertainty avoidance cultures have low tolerance for other cultures, and do not cope well with ambiguity and difference (Hofstede, 1979). Low and high masculinity cultures value different degrees of roles fluidity. High masculinity cultures, for example, identify with highly differentiated roles between
genders, and low masculinity cultures (alternatively called high femininity cultures) tolerate
greater gender flexibility in society’s positions and activities (Hofstede, 2001). Finally, long term
orientation cultures are characterized by far reaching expectations, patience and thrift while short
term orientation cultures are driven by instant gratification and quick results; this dimension is
also called the ‘time horizon dimension’ (Hofstede, 2001).

The five cultural variability dimensions proposed by Hofstede and recuperated by
Gudykunst are fluid: they merge, blend, separate and combine in many ways. Cultures present,
for example, high individualism and short term orientation characteristics, or maybe combine
some forms of low uncertainty avoidance and low masculinity; that is, they may have different
assortments and different proportions among the five constructs (sub-cultures and individual
nuances are not taken into consideration for the scope of this review).

The complexity presented so far becomes even greater when the constructs of uncertainty
and anxiety, and culture variability are analyzed through the motivation, knowledge, and skills
constructs. Different levels of intercultural communication and competence are attained
depending on the quality and the types of dynamics triggered among the conceptual constructs,
and between them and the functional constructs.

Motivation

Motivation consists of factors that play complex and dynamic roles in effective
intercultural communication. Turner J.H. (1987) identified needs as basic mechanisms that
trigger behaviors interpretable as motivators in intercultural communication. Stephen and
Stephen (1985) maintained that if our needs are not satisfied, anxiety emerges and as anxiety
grows, negative attitudes and behaviors do too. For example, we may avoid inter-group relations
and may create negative conceptions about the ‘others’.
Turner J.C. (1987) identified self-conception as a motivator in that we tend to place ourselves in groups and consequently we ‘categorize’ ourselves and others. Also social bonds are identified as vital motivators in intercultural contacts. Social bonds derive from close connections made with others. In this perspective, Scheff (1990) held that attunement (meaning mutual understanding) is necessary to bond with others. Attunement leads to two major emotions that are related to social bonds and that influence motivation in intercultural contacts. One of them is pride, the sign of a healthy social bond, while the other, shame, is the sign for an insecure social bond.

Attraction has been extensively examined as a motivator for intercultural exchanges and it has shown to be important for anxiety and predictive uncertainty reduction (predictive uncertainty meaning the ability to predict how strangers feel and act) (Berger & Calabrese, 1975; Gudykunst, 1988; Gudykunst, Chua, & Gray, 1987; Stephan & Stephan, 1985).

Sorrentino and Short (1986) suggested that the openness to new information is a motivator for intercultural communication and identified two groups of people: those who are certainty-oriented and those who are uncertainty-oriented. The certainty-oriented individuals are basically those people who “don’t give a hoot for resolving discrepancies or inconsistencies about the self.” (pp. 379-380) Not quite close-minded, and regardless of the context in which they find themselves, they are nevertheless well established in their positions. Earley and Ang (2003) interpreted this dimension similarly: “Indeed, people acknowledge that there will be those who show little or no concern for others’ impressions of them.” (p. 156) The uncertainty-oriented people, instead, are open-minded individuals who always look forward to incorporate new ways and new perspectives in their cultural and experiential baggage.
Knowledge

Knowledge of more than one perspective in intercultural communication means to be cognizant of the fact that people behave and interpret others’ behaviors in different ways (Gudykunst, 1993). The category width we possess (that is, the ability to stretch our mindset), helps us to be more or less open-minded (Pettigrew, 1982); narrow category width is a characteristic of narrow-minded people, and broad category width is a quality of those people who are better suited for CQ.

Closely related to the category width construct is the knowledge of alternative interpretations construct, for which Gudykunst indicated three related processes: description, interpretation, and evaluation. These three processes should be respected in this given order when engaging in intercultural interactions or their misuse may risk jeopardizing the intercultural exchange. During our intercultural interactions, in fact, we may skip the first and even the second process (description and interpretation) and land straight into the evaluation process with a ‘jump to conclusions’ that may be inaccurate and eventually harmful to our intercultural effectiveness. To counter this process, Gudykunst suggested the adoption of mindfulness (a conscious effort to maintain our sensitivity expanded). With mindfulness we can control and manage our anxiety, separating and sequencing correctly these three processes. To reinforce the concept of mindfulness, Gudykunst adopted Werner’s idea of cognitive complexity (1957), that is, the abundance of differentiations, and a rich pool of conceptual resources which constitute frames of reference for CQ.

Expectations derive from our cultural background, and therefore play an important role in CQ as well. Gudykunst (1993) stated, “…there is a ‘should’ component to most of our expectations.” (p. 54) In this respect, the more foreign to us our counterpart is, the more our
expectations may be confused and challenged. Not far from expectations, knowledge of similarities and differences relate to our acquired knowledge about other cultures and peoples. This knowledge allows us to “make accurate predictions and explanations.” (Gudykunst, 1993, p. 56) Finally, shared networks refer to the level of communication we may establish with strangers. Research shows that well developed shared networks reduce both uncertainty and anxiety (Gudykunst, Chua, & Gray, 1987; Parks & Adelman, 1983).

**Skills**

Gudykunst (1993) defined skills as “our abilities to engage in the behaviors necessary to communicate appropriately and effectively.” (p. 59) For the ability to create new categories, he adopted Langer’s (1989) perspective that to have high CQ we need more distinctions rather than fewer differentiators. Ownership of many references helps us renounce our own frameworks in trying to understand those of others. Gudykunst (1993) indicates that when we develop the ability to tolerate ambiguity, even if we have incomplete information about the ‘other’, we are still able to achieve successful communication while interacting with that ‘other’ (p. 59). Following this pattern, Gudykunst borrowed the concept of ability to empathize from Bennett (1979) who believes empathy to be more relevant than sympathy for successful intercultural exchanges. While sympathy implies an ethnocentric perspective of the ‘other’, empathy implies an ethno-relative stand, in which we do not attempt to place ourselves in others’ positions, but we respect and feel externally for that position, realizing that it is not our own.

In externalizing our intercultural sensitivity, the ability to adapt our communication requires both cognitive and behavioral skills (Duran, 1983). Duran maintained that competent communication requires the perception and adaptation to other forms of communication at the same time. A step further in this process requires the ability to gather and use appropriate
information for an accurate interpretation of the contact with the ‘other’. Different elements may hinder this ability, as Wilder and Shapiro (1989) pointed out. For example, anxiety may prevent us from gathering appropriate information. The ability to accommodate our behavior goes hand-in-hand with the concept of communication convergence illustrated by Giles, Mulac, Bradac, and Johnson (1987). They argued that to accommodate our behavior we need to seek communication commonalities with the ‘other’; when these commonalities are found, uncertainty and anxiety are reduced and CQ is enhanced.

To conclude, the research on CQ has shown that in general when people find themselves in foreign situations their avoidance and interaction levels in those situations tend to vary depending on their CQ levels. When people’s CQ is low, their stress level rises because they do not know how to think or act in the interactions. Because people with low CQ are uncomfortable towards the foreign encounter, they usually avoid it as much as possible. When people’s CQ is high, instead, their stress level tends to be low in foreign encounters. These people are more relaxed when facing an unknown situation, and they usually interact more willingly and more successfully with the foreign counterparts. Furthermore, the cultural and personal backgrounds of these people play important roles in the management of their uncertainty and anxiety.

Summary

This chapter in the first part presented the literature review on CQ education and training development, using chronological, geographical, and thematic approaches to describe the state of CQ education and training in the major areas of the world. Particular emphasis was placed on the evolution of CQ education and training in the United States, how its modern shaping developed and why. The focus was placed on CQ education and training in higher educational institutions, and most of all, on travel and tourism university programs.
In the second part of the literature review the intercultural communication theories adopted in this study were reviewed to provide an understanding of what CQ is, what are the mechanisms that develop it or inhibit it and how to manage them. This review of CQ was performed by presenting selected fundamental studies on CQ development proposed by two major scholars in the intercultural communication field.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Chapter III organizes the theoretical elements of this research in a methodological design used to help develop, identify and track CQ development in the travel and tourism students. Thus, Chapter III has the goal to provide the reader with a clearer approach to the Results and Discussion chapter by describing the methodology and the methods adopted. In particular, this chapter is divided into two major sections. The first section, the Methodology, explains the linkage of the theoretical approaches that explain CQ to the research purpose and to the chosen methods. The second section, the Methods, describes how the research design was carried out. A Preliminary FE conducted to fine-tune the procedures and instruments of this study concludes the chapter.

The Methodology

The Formative Experiment (FE) Design

The complexity and the range of CQ dynamics are individual and collective realities which are difficult to frame into static, rigidly defined scenarios. To capture the complex nature of CQ in the way that this research has set forth in its goal, that is, for the development, identification and tracking of CQ in undergraduate students engaged in travel and tourism studies, this research is founded on the assumption widely shared in the social sciences that CQ, especially high levels of CQ, must be learned. The methodology for this dissertation, then, was based on two premises equally important: the premise regarding higher levels of learning, that is, focusing on the teaching and learning criteria that encourage metacognitive development; and the premise regarding the most effective strategies for the attainment of CQ, based on the nature of CQ, the mechanisms that guide it, and the requisites for its teaching and learning. To satisfy
these requisites, a formative experiment (FE) (Reinking & Bradley, 2008) was adopted as the overarching approach to this dissertation methodology.

A FE appropriately guides this study because “it is a methodological approach which pursues educational goals by using various evaluation systems, an iterative methodology, and fine-tuning processes” (Reinking & Bradley, 2008, pp. 17-22). In particular, FEs are: “goal oriented, intervention-centered in authentic instructional contexts, theoretical, adaptive and iterative, transformative, methodologically inclusive and flexible, and pragmatic” (Reinking & Bradley, 2008, pp. 17-22). Because FEs take place in classrooms settings, their major tenet holds that it is not possible to control the variables at play in such environments. Based on this assumption, this research is guided by the Pragmatic Paradigm (Dewey, 1935), and adopts a mixed methodology. In a similar view, Reinking and Bradley (2004) stated, “pragmatism…allows for more epistemological flexibility in method and analysis, focuses on useful ends, and encourages a democratic involvement of multiple stakeholders…” (p.158)

The iteration process for FEs includes: 1) Collection of information on theory to give a rationale; 2) Design; 3) Retrospective analysis (Reinking & Bradley, 2008); and 4) Broader impact (Bannan-Ritland, 2003). Reinking and Watkins (2000) suggest the following six basic questions as guidelines to conduct a FE:

1. What is the pedagogical goal of the experiment, and what theory establishes its value?
2. What is an instructional intervention that has the potential to achieve the pedagogical goal?
3. What factors in the environment enhance or inhibit the intervention’s effectiveness in achieving the goal?
4. How can the intervention and its implementation be modified during the experiment to achieve the goal more effectively?

5. Has the educational environment changed as a result of the intervention?

6. What unanticipated positive or negative effects does the intervention produce?

Based on the six questions, it becomes apparent that a FE unfolds through its instructional intervention on two connected levels (Gravemeijer & Cobb, 2006): at a ‘micro-level’ the daily observations of the intervention effects are recorded and used to inform subsequent actions; at a ‘macro-level’ the FE develops and transforms to adjust to the ‘micro-level’ changes. Using an engineering metaphor or a musical metaphor, it is possible to understand a FE by comparing it to the fine tuning of an engine or of an instrument. Figure 1 represents the FE design for this research:
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**Figure 1: The Formative Experiment Design**
The FE design includes tools that help the students develop high CQ and high metacognition in the following ways: high CQ is facilitated with the instruction and the application of the intercultural theories used in class instruction. For example, the content of the course, International Perspectives on Travel and Tourism, lent itself to a wide array of intercultural topics to which the students related and to which they applied Gudykunst and Hofstede’s intercultural theories. The testing material and the assignments, especially the scaffolding case study, also were designed with the primary goal of helping the students develop CQ. High metacognition is facilitated with deep learning and person-centered learning teaching techniques; in particular, the one-on-one mentorship created between each student and the researcher/instructor during the scaffolding case study via the prompts intended to create trust and encouragement in the students, a forum for meaning negotiation, and the Socratic Method pedagogical technique of question and answer. Furthermore, the scaffolding case study created opportunities for authentic learning, inductive learning, and problem-based learning; in particular, the flexibility the students had in choosing the formats and the topics for their scaffolding case studies facilitated the ‘hands-off’ and consequent transfer of authority teaching strategies. Also, the scaffolding of the case study allowed the students to come back to their cases and deepen their insights by addressing their case study in three iterations. These educational tools facilitated a person-centered learning approach, in which the students were encouraged to develop their own locus of evaluation and to create their own knowledge. The FE’s instructional intervention which facilitated these dynamics, the scaffolding case study, is shown in the following three figures and explained next:
Figure 2: Metacognitive Dynamics of the Formative Experiment

Figure 2 shows the metacognitive components of the FE. The bubble marked “High Metacognition = Deep Learning and Person Centered Learning” reflects the fundamental pedagogical assumption of this study and that was described for the FE design: metacognition induces better learning. As previously mentioned, deep learning and person centered learning strategies encourage metacognition by educating the students to dig deeper in the subject they study, work for their own sake, become owners of their own knowledge creation, and overcome inert knowledge. In this FE, metacognition was stimulated with the Socratic Method (Paraskevas & Wickens, 2003). Socrates involved his students in the question-answer exercise to help them reach the elenchus-aporia stage, that is, a stage of confusion and doubt about the students’ own knowledge in which they would finally admit their need to know better the topic at hand. The elenchus-aporia stage induces the students into a cognitive ethno-relativistic condition, important
for metacognitive development. The students’ path towards cognitive ethno-relativism, that is, towards metacognition, is well coupled with their path towards intercultural ethno-relativism, that is, towards CQ development. Figure 3 shows what elements help CQ development:

![Diagram](image-url)

Figure 3: Intercultural Competence Dynamics of the Formative Experiment

Figure 3 shows the CQ components of the FE. The bubble marked “High CQ = Minimizing Misunderstanding”, reflects the fundamental CQ assumption of this study, which states that when people are able to minimize misunderstanding they achieve higher CQ. The subgroups that contribute to high CQ examined in this study (Gudykunst, 1988, 1993; Hofstede, 1979, 2001; Hofstede, 1979, 2001), and shown in the bottom part of Figure 3, were analyzed in the previous chapter, and will be addressed again in detail later, in relation to the data analysis.
Figure 4: Metacognitive and Intercultural Competence Identification and Tracking

Figure 4 shows the identification and tracking of metacognitive and CQ processes of the FE. The bubble, “Visibility = Cognitive Apprenticeship”, indicates how the instructor/researcher identified and tracked the students’ metacognitive and CQ processes; visibility is possible through cognitive apprenticeship which is well described by Granbiger and Dunlap (2008) as the way teaching and learning occurred before the advent of mass instruction (and production). That is, before modern times, pupils were taught a trade, skill or art by a master in a workshop and they would learn by being shown and then by doing and showing on their turn. The third bubble, then, incorporates both a data analysis technique (for the visibility) and a pedagogical technique (the cognitive apprenticeship). The students’ development is facilitated by cognitive apprenticeship, and this development becomes visible and recordable through cognitive apprenticeship. The following paragraph describes the instructional intervention.
The Instructional Intervention Design

In FE design, “An instructional intervention is a coherent collection of instructional activities aimed at accomplishing a specific instructional goal.” (Reinking & Bradley, 2008, p. 100) The instructional intervention of this FE is called a ‘scaffolding case study’ because it relates to the educational case study as a pedagogical tool, and it was designed to develop in layers, hence the ‘scaffolding’.

The educational case study was a good choice for this FE because it is a well-established approach to teaching and learning (Leonard Jr. & Cook, 2010). The educational case study draws from theoretical frames such as deep learning (Hornby, Jennings & Nulty, 2009), authentic learning (Meyers & Nulty, 2009), anchored instruction, cognitive flexibility, problem based learning (Grabinger & Dunlap, 2008), anchors in students’ intuitions (Clement, Brown & Zietsman, 1989), situated cognition (CTGV, 1990), and constructivist pedagogy (Simon, 2006). Other elements which informed the case study as an educational tool in this FE draw from person-centered principles to teaching (Barkham & Elender, 1995; Sparrow, Sparrow & Swan, 2000); andragogy and the Socratic method (Paraskevas & Wickens, 2003); and Vygotsky’s principle of Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) (1978).

The pedagogical principles described above were developed in the instructional intervention under the guidance of the following FE principles: 1) learning is social; 2) metacognition is fundamental to learning; and 3) individual differences are paramount to learning (Brown & Campione, 1996). The instructional intervention abided by the principle that learning is social as it encouraged interactions between the students and the instructor through Cognitive Apprenticeship. Also, the instructional intervention was guided by the principle that metacognition is fundamental to learning because it guided the students towards metacognition
with the re-occurrence and expansion of the case studies in phases. Finally, the instructional intervention abided by the principle that individual differences are paramount to learning with a design targeted to each student CQ processes. Figure 5 shows the instructional intervention design:

![Instructional Intervention](image)

**Figure 5: The Scaffolding Case Study**

The scaffolding case study, the instructional intervention of the FE, consisted of the students’ major assignment in the travel and tourism course. The students elaborated their scaffolding case studies in three phases. The three-layered iteration was used to encourage the students’ metacognitive processes. In university courses the students are usually asked to write one or more distinct research papers throughout the semester. However, with this instructional intervention, the students were asked to write only one research paper throughout the semester,
but in three phases, their scaffolding case study. The case study was approached and developed from different angles, with different purposes, and at three levels of analysis.

The extension of metacognitive development to CQ development was possible with the nature of the topics studied in this class. In Phase 1, for example, the students chose and described a case area that interested them, and provided an outline of the cultural components of their case area. For example, the case area could have been the Aborigines in Australia. The outline should have expressed the students’ judgment on what were the most effective intercultural instruments to prepare their case area for the achievement of successful tourism practices (see Appendix B on the Guidelines for the Case Studies). For the Aborigines in Australia example, the students would have had to identify whether they displayed high or low levels of anxiety in their social encounters, and which of the Motivation, Knowledge and Skills sub-groups best served them when interacting with other people such as tourists. Also, the students had to analyze which cultural dimensions the Aborigines displayed: high or low power distance, high or low masculinity, long or short term orientation, high or low uncertainty avoidance, and high or low collectivism.

In Phase 2, the students began to build their case incident from the analysis of the outline in the last section of Phase 1. In Phase 2, the students had to identify and develop an international case incident that related to a travel and tourism issue and to the case area of their choice. In particular, the students had to explain the terms and dynamics of their case incident according to Gudykunst’s constructs and Hofstede’s dimensions, which had been described in their Phase 1 of the scaffolding case study. With the Aborigines in Australia, the students could have chosen, for example, the Aborigines’ “lost generation” and the impact on Aborigine’s tourism as their case incident. The particular feature of Phase 2 was that the students developed their cases study
incidents entirely, rather than choosing a solution for a given incident. Typically, case incidents are provided to the students by their instructors and consist of already pre-arranged scenarios which propose a dilemma and a list of possible solutions to the dilemma. In traditional case incidents, then, the scenario is already provided to the students, and the possible solutions usually appear in a multiple choice format at the end of the description paragraph for the case incident. The students choose the solution they perceive as being the most appropriate to the case. However, with the scaffolding case study, the students had to identify and develop their case incidents in every element which contributed to it, and then, they had to elaborate the solution for the case incident.

In Phase 3, the students edited and completed their case studies, including their conclusions, that is, the lesson learned from their case incident. Phase 3, then, gave the students the opportunity to polish, deepen and elaborate on all the areas that needed improvement for higher metacognitive and CQ performance, wrapping up the insights gained from their metacognitive and CQ development.

CQ development became visible by combining the evaluation of the students work from one case to the next with the analysis of the Cognitive Apprenticeship occurred within each of the three phases of the students scaffolding case study. The steps employed in Cognitive Apprenticeship were: 1) at the completion of each phase the instructor provided extensive feedback to each student and asked him/her to address areas which needed further work; 2) the instructor wrote the feedback on the margins of the students’ papers (in the analysis these comments are called ‘prompts’); 3) once the students got their corrected phase back (with the prompts), they revised it and incorporated it in the subsequent phase with the new material. That is, the instructor corrected/prompted Phase 1, gave it back to each student who had the chance to
revise it and to incorporate it in Phase 2. The instructor corrected/prompted Phase 2, gave it back to each student who had the chance to revise it and to incorporate it in Phase 3 (the final phase). The instructor tracked the students’ research paths and recorded both metacognitive and CQ processes. These processes were recorded based on the quality of the students’ work in carrying out their assignments, and on the quality of the students’ revised work, which was assessed by comparing and evaluating the student’s three phases through the amount and nature of revisions the students made. Figure 6 shows the steps of the scaffolding case studies:

Figure 6: The Steps of the Scaffolding Case Study

For each step the students engaged in specific metacognitive and CQ challenges, going from simpler to more complex (see Appendix B). Phase 1 was mostly descriptive, allowing the students to familiarize themselves with their case area; only at the end of this phase they were asked to begin evaluative processes. At the end of Phase 1, the students were required to prepare an outline on the cultural dimensions of their case areas that according to them (and based on the course instruction) best suited tourism practices. The instructor/researcher returned the corrected
Phase 1 papers to the students with prompts (feedback) on the margins. The prompts were marked in red to help the students identify easily the areas that needed improvement.

In Phase 2, the students were asked to identify and develop a case incident for their case area. With the help of the prompts from Phase 1 and the ongoing instruction in class, the students worked on their Phase 2 in tight collaboration with the instructor. Phase 2 presented the students with many requirements in dealing with their case incident. In addition to having to identify a real incident, they had to analyze it and address it from an intercultural perspective.

The instructor compared the students’ papers for Phase 2 with their Phase 1 papers, which had been photocopied before returning them to the students. The instructor took note of the changes, additions and deletions the students made from Phase 1 to Phase 2 of the scaffolding case study. The prompts that were addressed by the students were circled in red, while the prompts that were ignored were marked by an asterisk. Then, the instructor added the prompts for Phase 2 accordingly, made photocopies of all the Phase 2 case studies and gave the originals back to the students. The students received their Phase 2 papers back with red markings (circles and asterisks) and the new prompts in red on the margins to prepare for Phase 3.

In Phase 3, the students had the opportunity to deepen their metacognitive and CQ development by synthesizing and re-organizing their entire research according to the CQ theories they learned during the semester. Also, several topics from the textbook (Reisinger, 2009, part IV) engaged the students in higher order of thinking by elaborating on delicate issues such as ethics and human behavior. With Phase 3, it became apparent that those students who had put more effort in the first two phases had a relatively easy task ahead. This outcome is mentioned here, and not in the Results and Discussion chapter, because it is relevant as a methodological observation, for the efficacy of the design.
The elements and stages of the scaffolding case study mentioned above were the essential component of this instructional intervention. That is, without these elements and stages, the instructional intervention would have not been able to create and support the specific environment sought for the students’ CQ development in this FE design. Therefore, the case study as the pedagogical tool, the scaffolding in three phases of the case studies, and the Socratic Method of question-answer (prompts) between the instructor and each student were non-negotiable features of this instructional intervention.

In addition to the principal conceptual frameworks which guided this FE and that were described in detailed in this chapter, the instructional intervention was also based on other theoretical frameworks regarding self-awareness (Duval and Wicklund, 1972). This extension towards self-awareness theories applied to the analysis of the students themselves while they were developing their scaffolding case studies. For example, theoretical frameworks such as one’s social history (one’s own background) (Earley & Ang, 2003; Erez & Earley, 1993), for which, “Numerous studies have demonstrated that self-referent information is more highly recalled than other-referent information, or semantic information (Markus, Kitayama & Heiman, 1977); one’s self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977; Earley & Ang, 2003) and one’s self-determination (Ryan & Deci, 2000) which characterize the sequel and the nature of decisions taken based on criteria of self-adequacy; the theory of cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957), which gives meaning to decisions one may opt (or not) to make, and other metacognitive, motivational and behavioral theories relevant in CQ teaching and learning, such as problem solving (Brislin, 1986), inductive reasoning and analogical logic (Earley & Ang, 2003) were also used to evaluate the students’ CQ processes. The students’ scaffolding case studies material was examined in reference also to these theories to help understand the students’ work and place it in the most
appropriate CQ level of development. For example, some students chose cases which related to their own experiences abroad, and this characteristic was taken into consideration as a distinct feature of their cases and in reference to self-referent information theories (Markus, Kitayama & Heiman, 1977).

Finally, the methodology in this FE was based on the criterion that quality assessment of the instructional intervention is an inseparable element of the instructional intervention itself (Casado, 2009; Rankin, 1992; Wiggins, 1993). “Kealey (1996) lamented that in spite of the fact that much is known about the criteria associated with cultural success, little knowledge and few skills have been developed to reliably and validly assess people on these criteria.” (Earley & Ang, 2003, p. 188) Quality assessment must account not only for the quality of the end product— in this case CQ development in college students— but also for the quality of the assessment itself, in a sort of ‘double quality’ check, which involves both the assessment of CQ development and the assessment of the instructional intervention design (Rankin, 1992).

Furthermore, in regards to both the design and the assessment of the instructional intervention, the concern that, “cross-cultural training programs thus far have not emphasized the role of metacognition, motivational training, and the importance of behavioral changes.” (Earley & Ang, 2003, p. 266, p. 268, p. 271, p. 275) is addressed in this study by analyzing these roles through Gudykunst’s Knowledge, Motivation, and Skills (the sub-constructs of the Uncertainty and Anxiety and Cultural Variability constructs) as key elements for CQ development in the students, and for the assessment of the effects of the instructional intervention.

The Methods

From the methods perspective, this FE is best described as a case study (Stake, 1995). Case study is intended here as a social science tool of research (Ragin, 1992) and it is completely
distinguished from the scaffolding case study, the instructional intervention for this FE, described in the previous section. In this dissertation, the dichotomy between empirical or theoretical categories (Ragin, 1992) involved in the research of a case is not decisive for the data analysis and collection because FE s, with their pragmatic approach, are not concerned with this discussion. Therefore, for this case study the observations were based on both empirical discoveries and theoretical conventions (Ragin, 1992). The unit of analysis of this case study was an undergraduate course in international travel and tourism perspectives. The case was both intrinsic and instrumental (Stake, 1995, 2010), because it presented understandings about itself, and also understandings for similar cases. This case study adopted Kennedy’s rationale (1979) on generalization from a single case:

Whether or not statistics are used, inferences of generalization are always tentative. Data might offer confirming or disconfirming evidence, but never conclusive evidence… Furthermore, the strength of the evidence is a matter of judgment… A currently popular term for the generalizability of a finding is external validity (Campbell and Stanley, 1963), but a more appropriate term would be “strength of external validity,” or “strength of generalizability,” because these terms suggest that generalization is a judgment of degree, rather than a binary decision (pp. 664, 665)….That the range cannot be known, does not mean that a range does not exist (p.671).

Chapter III is organized in the following way: first the setting is discussed along with the characteristics of the unit of analysis, and the data sources for the FE. Then, the instructional intervention and its modalities of administration are presented. Data classification and data analysis follow that discussion. Next, the other data sources which contributed to the FE
convergent evidence processes are described. Finally, a Preliminary FE conducted to fine tune the FE is reviewed as the closing component of the FE design.

Setting and Students

Because a FE calls for various evaluation systems, an iterative methodology, and fine-tuning processes in pursuing educational goals (Reinking & Bradley, 2008), this FE was developed during a semester long class in which international travel and tourism perspectives were taught. Also, in relation to the two fundamental criteria for CQ development, that is, CQ must be learned and metacognitive techniques are the best learning tools, a scaffolding case study was adopted as the FE instructional intervention.

The FE took place during the spring semester of 2010 (January-May) in an American Southeastern university which has a well established program in travel and tourism studies. A fourth year elective international travel and tourism undergraduate class was chosen for the data collection. The class was held Monday, Wednesday, and Friday for a 50 minute period during the 2010 spring semester (see the Syllabus in Appendix A). The classroom was equipped with internet access and projection capability.

Data Sources

The scaffolding case study [not to be confused with case study research methodology, as described by Stake (1995), but intended here as a pedagogical tool] was the principal source of data in this study, that is the instructional intervention. The other components of the FE, that is, the scaffolding case study ‘detailed’ analysis, the scaffolding case study cross-checking ‘summative’ analysis, the Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI), class time, class work, and field notes, provided elements of convergent evidence which emerged from these other data sources. Reinking and Bradley (2008) pointed out: “That is, data collection and analysis that
produce convergent evidence from multiple sources through multiple methods produce findings, interpretations, and recommendations that are more trustworthy and convincing, and thus more rigorous.” (p. 56) The FE is shown in Figure 7:

![Figure 7: The Formative Experiment Data Sources](image)

Based on the FE rationale, the data collection and analysis included an iterative methodology that followed the class’s progression. The FE did not change for the macro-cycles (to be consistent with the course’s syllabus), that is, it remained committed to the tools chosen, but it underwent fine tuning changes within the micro-cycles (for example, in modifying the case study’s guidelines from one phase to the next, or in changing the format of the quizzes, or in extending the length of the 2nd focus group). The researcher was at the same time also the instructor for the course and the qualities and limitations of such position will be discussed later. Table 2 illustrates the Formative Experiment in a schematic representation of its iteration:
### Table 2: Diagram of the Iteration of the Formative Experiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Function</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Beginning of Semester</th>
<th>Middle of Semester</th>
<th>End of Semester</th>
<th>After End of Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Intervention</td>
<td>Scaffolding Case Study</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent Evidence</td>
<td>Class Instruction</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent Evidence</td>
<td>6 Guest Speakers</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent Evidence</td>
<td>Disney</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent Evidence</td>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent Evidence</td>
<td>Quizzes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2nd Focus Group</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent Evidence</td>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>1st Focus Group</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent Evidence</td>
<td>Daily Journal</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent Evidence</td>
<td>ICSI</td>
<td>Pre test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent Evidence</td>
<td>Alternative ICSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent Evidence</td>
<td>Case Study ‘Detailed’ Analysis (n = 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent Evidence</td>
<td>Case Study Cross-Checking ‘Summative’ Analysis (n = 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent Evidence</td>
<td>Case Study ‘Summative’ Analysis (n = 37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The details of the instructional intervention, its data classification, collection, and analysis criteria are described in the next paragraphs.

**The Scaffolding Case Study**

The scaffolding case studies were the main components of the FE, that is, the instructional intervention. The scaffolding case studies were the research papers the students prepared throughout the course. The students completed their scaffolding case studies in three phases during the semester. The syllabus emphasized that the three phases were cumulative, that is, they were to be built on each other, hence the ‘scaffolding’ of the case studies. Separate
guidelines were given for each phase and provided the detailed requirements for their development (see Appendix B). The scaffolding case study had to relate to an international travel and/or tourism topic and to an incident involving CQ that the students identified and developed.

The first handout of the guidelines suggested to the students possible topics together with general instructions for all the phases. The students were free to decide whether to choose from the list in the guidelines or propose a topic of their own. Then, the first handout provided specific guidelines and a series of brainstorming questions to help the students build their Phase 1, their case study’s area, including material from the textbook (Reisinger, 2009, Chapters 1-4). Finally, the students were instructed to choose the CQ theories that they believed best suited the culture of their case area (material they learned from the textbook content, the lecture content, and their research) and to prepare an outline of the cultural dimensions of their case area. The first phase was called Case Study 1.

The guidelines for the second phase instructed on how to improve the first phase (and its grade). Then, Phase 2 (called Case Study 2) provided strategies for the identification of a travel and/or tourism incident involving CQ. A final section of the guidelines dwelled on the elaboration of CQ theories and their applications to the case incident, including a thorough selection of topics from the course material [the textbook (Reisinger, 2009, Chapters 5-11)], and more details on CQ theories from the lectures’ notes; (see Appendix C on the Power Point material for the class).

Phase 3 (called Case Study 3) also gave instructions on how to improve the second phase (and its grade). Then, the guidelines for Phase 3 suggested the re-shaping of the whole case in a coherent and organic research paper, and insisted on the deepening and application of Gudykunst and Hofstede’s theories in the re-shaping of the case. Generally, Phase 1 was to become the
introduction of the final case (since it provided the majority of the descriptive part of the case); Phase 2 was to become the body of the case [the incident involving CQ, and related topics in the textbook (Reisinger, 2009, Chapters 12-14)]; and the final part of Phase 3 was to provide the conclusions, that is, the lesson learned for the whole case study [using in particular Chapter 16 in the textbook (Reisinger, 2009), and any useful information acquired thus far in the course]. The last section of these guidelines outlined the detailed elaboration of Phase 3 for the introduction, the body and the conclusions of the research paper with specific reference to CQ constructs.

For metacognition development, the guidelines of the scaffolding case study instructed the students to elaborate not only on the ‘what’, but also on the ‘why’ and ‘how’ of their research for each of the three phases. Furthermore, the guidelines asked the students to write a reflection paragraph at the end of each phase entitled, “Research Process Development: Stages and Insights for My Case Study”. This paragraph provided further information on the students’ metacognitive processes. The three phases of the scaffolding case study were due respectively on February 5th, March 12th and April 23rd, 2010.

The Scaffolding Case Study: Data Collection

The students’ scaffolding case studies, including the instructor’s prompts, that is, the corrections and comments the instructor made on the margins of the students’ papers, were photocopied and put together for each student in a folder with all the other material generated during the semester. Each student was assigned a number and the letter ‘F’ for a female student and ‘M’ for a male student. The scaffolding case studies generated 108 texts (36 x 3 = 108); one student did not turn in any phase of the case study, although she turned in the other materials for the class. For the total results [the ‘summative analysis’ (n = 37) discussed later], this student
was counted all the same (n = 37), because her performance (in this case, lack of performance) still
proved to be part of the unit of analysis.

The Scaffolding Case Study: Data Classification

The instructor/researcher based the analysis of the students CQ development on CQ and metacognitive criteria justified in previous sections of this study; that is, for each phase of the scaffolding case studies, the instructor/researcher integrated the CQ findings with metacognitive findings and vice versa.

In Chapter I, CQ development was defined as a recorded person CQ change, expressed through conceptual justifications. The theoretical criteria found in the literature which support metacognition and CQ development (see Chapter II) helped determine the CQ levels for this research. Specifically, the following criteria were identified, with no hierarchical order: a) CQ centrality in the case study; b) The use of examples; c) Interpretation; d) Complexity; e) Ethno-relativism. a) CQ centrality in the case study was essential to determine the level of CQ development because CQ was the FE field of investigation; had the FE investigated another area, then, that area would have been the core of attention. b) Examples are ideal ways to show understanding of an issue. When the students gave examples in the scaffolding case studies, they provided inductive-deductive cognitive patterns which mapped whether a topic had been understood or not and to what degree. Giving examples is a way to help others understand, and show that who is giving the examples knows what they are talking about. c) Interpretation implies thorough explanation of phenomena. In particular, interpretation focuses on meaning for the explanation itself. In the scaffolding case studies, \as the students interpreted the issues they presented, they provided further metacognitive patterns for their CQ development, because they did not only write about what happened in their cases, but also why and how. d) Complexity
refers to depth of inquiry which the students engaged in or not in their scaffolding case studies. Complexity stands in this analysis as the amount of involvement, and the breadth of ramifications the students developed in the scaffolding case studies. e) Ethno-relativism shows the attained level of cognitive open-mindedness necessary to create knowledge. In the cognitive domain, ethno-relativism in this FE refers to the elenchus-aporia stage induced through the Socratic Method, which helped the students re-build their knowledge. In the CQ domain, ethno-relativism refers to an ideal state of high CQ. These criteria are synthesized in Figure 8:

![Definition of CQ Levels](Figure 8)

Figure 8: Intercultural Competence Classification

The animals’ pictures in Figure 8 represent a simplified metaphor of CQ levels. These animals’ characteristics help understand the characteristics that in general people possess at each CQ level. Wikipedia provided the information on the animals’ characteristics:
For lower CQ, the Komodo dragon stands for a person who is well established in his/her own environment. Like the Komodo dragon, a low CQ person does not find change easy or necessary, especially when change is called for to adapt to unknown situations. The Komodo dragon is not found in diverse environments and has not evolved from its original appearance on Earth. This lack of flexibility makes the Komodo dragon an endangered and fragile species, despite its formidable strength and determination (the Komodo dragon lives solely in a restricted number of islands in the Pacific Ocean).

For middle CQ, the gecko stands for a person who has adapted to different environments and who has particular skills which developed during the adaptation process. There exist many varieties of geckos; they live in several regions of the world; some can reproduce without a male; they are remarkable climbers thanks to their exceptional padded toe pads. Yet, a gecko needs a warm climate (with a temperature not falling under 72 degrees Fahrenheit), and in case of attack, geckos most likely defend themselves by either dropping their tail or by throwing feces and expelling foul smells onto the aggressors; so, like the gecko, a middle CQ person, even though more flexible than the low CQ person, has still several environmental and personal limitations. For example, when facing intercultural uncertainty and anxiety in foreign situations he/she may not react with ‘positive’ strategies, just like the gecko.

For higher CQ, the chameleon is the most renowned symbol of adaptation. Despite its proverbial changeable nature, the chameleon is unmistakable and unique in the animal kingdom. So, like a chameleon, a high CQ person is someone who successfully interacts in a variety of environments without losing his/her identity. Chameleons live in most continents and in many habitats; they vary in size and colors; they don’t have ears, and communicate via vibrations; they are acute observers and infallible hunters; their best defense strategy consists in their blending
with the landscape. Similarly, a high CQ person is an acute observer and subtle communicator and, above all, can adapt and live successfully in the environment he/she is in.

Based on the FE environment and on the chosen instructional intervention, the instructor/researcher placed the students’ case studies in lower, middle or higher CQ levels in the following way:

Case Study - Phase 1: Whether the students addressed the required Outline on CQ theories and other CQ elements when appropriate. The following grouping applied:

Lower CQ: The Outline was not done and/or other CQ elements identified in the paper fulfilled in general the criteria for lower CQ development as exemplified in Figure 8;

Middle CQ: The Outline was partially done and/or other CQ elements identified in the paper fulfilled in general the criteria for middle CQ development as exemplified in Figure 8;

Higher CQ: The Outline was done and/or other CQ elements identified in the paper fulfilled in general the criteria for higher CQ development as exemplified in Figure 8.

Case Study – Phase 2: Whether the students addressed Cognitive Apprenticeship (prompts) and whether the Case Incident displayed CQ qualities. The following grouping applied:

Lower CQ: Prompts were not addressed and/or CQ qualities in the Case Incident fulfilled in general the criteria for lower CQ development as exemplified in Figure 8;

Middle CQ: Prompts were partially addressed and/or CQ qualities for the Case Incident fulfilled in general the criteria for middle CQ development as exemplified in Figure 8;

Higher CQ: Prompts were addressed and/or CQ qualities for the Case Incident fulfilled in general the criteria for higher CQ development as exemplified in Figure 8.
Case Study – Phase 3: Whether the students addressed Cognitive Apprenticeship (prompts) and whether the re-shaping of the paper displayed CQ qualities through the command of Gudykunst and Hofstede’s theories. The following grouping applied:

Lower CQ: Prompts were not addressed and/or CQ qualities for the re-shaped paper fulfilled in general the criteria for lower CQ development as exemplified in Figure 8;

Middle CQ: Prompts were partially addressed and/or CQ qualities for the re-shaped paper fulfilled in general the criteria for middle CQ development as exemplified in Figure 8;

Higher CQ: Prompts were addressed and/or CQ qualities for the re-shaped paper fulfilled in general the criteria for higher CQ development as exemplified in Figure 8.

Figure 9 schematizes the analysis and placement of the students CQ levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination of CQ Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHER CQ: Outline done and/or CQ elements fulfilled the criteria for higher CQ development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE CQ: Outline partially done and/or CQ elements fulfilled the criteria for middle CQ development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWER CQ: Outline not done and/or CQ elements fulfilled the criteria for lower CQ development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompts addressed and/or Case Incident fulfilled criteria for higher CQ development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompts partially addressed and/or Case Incident fulfilled criteria for middle CQ development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompts not addressed and/or Case Incident fulfilled criteria for lower CQ development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompts addressed and/or CQ qualities for re-shaped paper fulfilled criteria for higher CQ development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompts partially addressed and/or CQ qualities for re-shaped paper fulfilled criteria for middle CQ development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompts not addressed and/or CQ qualities for re-shaped paper fulfilled criteria for lower CQ development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: Students’ Intercultural Competence Placement

*The Scaffolding Case Study: Data Analysis*
The instructor/researcher studied the data with two approaches that are called the ‘detailed’ analysis approach and the ‘summative’ analysis approach. The following paragraph describes them.

The ‘detailed’ analysis occurred first. The instructor/researcher selected eleven case studies and performed a thorough analysis of these texts, paragraph by paragraph, according to the metacognitive and CQ criteria presented in this research. There was no particular criterion in choosing the eleven students’ scaffolding case studies, and the ‘detailed’ analysis stopped at eleven scaffolding case studies because this number provided ample satisfaction of the requisites for the ‘detailed’ analysis thoroughness. The ‘detailed’ analysis indicated to which of the three CQ levels each of the eleven students’ work belonged. For this analysis the instructor/researcher examined every passage in the students’ case studies which presented relevance and pertinence for CQ processes. The instructor/researcher selections of passages derived from her experience in both pedagogy and CQ.

The ‘summative’ analysis occurred after the ‘detailed’ analysis. In the ‘summative’ analysis, the instructor/researcher interpreted the comments (prompts) made on the students’ case studies for each individual phase, according to the metacognitive and CQ criteria presented in this research; the final comments to each phase were the departing point of the ‘summative’ analysis. The ‘summative’ analysis, then, relied on the instructor/researcher’s writings and on knowledge of the students work. This analysis indicated to which of the three CQ levels each student’s work belonged. The instructor/researcher began the ‘summative’ analysis with the case studies that had been already examined with the ‘detailed’ analysis. This approach was adopted to provide a stronger base for the ‘summative’ analysis with cases already well studied. After the ‘summative’ analysis of the eleven case studies was completed, the instructor/researcher
compared the results of the two analyses, before proceeding further with the other 25 ‘summative’ analyses of the case studies. The overall correspondence between the results obtained with the ‘detailed’ and ‘summative’ analyses (see Chapter IV) for the eleven case studies examined twice, suggested that the analytical tools worked at both levels of analysis. The ‘detailed’ analysis, then, was not made on the remainder 25 case studies, but only the ‘summative’ analysis. Based on the ‘summative’ analysis, the 36 case studies were placed in lower, middle or higher CQ for each phase and these placements were used as final results (the final results included also the student who did not work on the scaffolding case study, n = 37).

The two levels of data analysis, ‘detailed’ and ‘summative’, were based on quality assessment not only for the end product of the instructional intervention, but also for quality assessment of the instructional intervention itself (see the closing considerations of Chapter II). For the quality assessment of the instructional intervention, the ‘detailed analysis’ was used in the first place to establish whether or not the results generated at this level of analysis would align and corroborate those obtained with the ‘summative analysis’. The limitations and strengths of this design are discussed later. Appendix J provides coding examples of the ‘detailed’ and ‘summative’ analyses.

*Class Time (Instruction + 6 Guest Speakers)*

Class Time defines any contribution to CQ acquisition that took place in the classroom. The major components were the daily activities during the contact hours of instruction and the six guest speakers’ interventions (see Appendix D for the guest speakers’ detailed information). On the one hand, class instruction aimed at being an average type of class, with a typical lecture supported by Power Point presentations, class discussion, routine activities, and assignments checks. The rationale for the typical course organization was to mimic an average course in an
American university. On the other hand, the class was also set up with specific pedagogical, CQ and visibility criteria for the research’s goals. For instance, the six guest speakers were invited to provide the students with a diversified and authentic source of information in regards to their countries’ travel, tourism and cultures, but they were also observational tools for possible research development. For the guest speakers in particular, the instructor/researcher wanted to see whether the students would adopt some forms of Cognitive Apprenticeship with them. The researcher videotaped the guest speakers’ presentations with the guest speakers and the students’ permission, and acquired long lasting access to these data.

In class time, the students were always encouraged to participate, whether during the regular classes or after the guest speakers’ presentations. The students also carried out group activities and individual activities. In general, the instructor/researcher used teaching and learning metacognitive techniques from the first day of class; for example, mini-cases and numerous examples were used in the concepts taught, often drawn from personal experience (inductive, case-based learning strategies). Also, oral prompts, especially question-answer dynamics were habitually used (Socratic Method). Furthermore, the instructor/researcher showed interest and concern for each student individually (cognitive apprenticeship), as the end of semester students’ evaluations expressed. The daily journal in Appendix E gives more information on the unfolding of the course.

The guest speakers’ component of the FE had the goal to create a positive environment for CQ development by providing the students with authentic sources of information regarding intercultural topics. Of the six guest speakers (see Appendix D), five were foreign scholars and their interventions in the class gave the students information about their cultures not only through knowledge dissemination, but also with their presence, accents, expressions, demeanors and
sometimes artifacts (for example, food from their countries). The American guest speaker presented Disney in a global context and his contribution was a suitable complement for the nature of the course.

*Class Work (2 Exams + 10 Quizzes)*

Even though Class Work took place in the classroom, it is treated as separate data from the Class Time data because of its specificity. Like the other data sources, also the exams and the quizzes were designed to fulfill typical classes’ requirements, and also with the pedagogical, CQ and visibility goals of this research. The exams were the Midterm Exam, taken on February 17, 2010 and the Final Exam (non cumulative) on April 27, 2010 (see Appendix F). Both exams were essay types of exams and gave the students choices among topics. The exams’ questions were short, but required articulate answers for adequate responses. The ten quizzes did not follow a standard format (see Appendix G), and always provided the students with topics’ choices. Few quizzes had a multiple choice format, some had brief commentary format, others used grids or figures to guide the students in their development, other quizzes suggested case scenarios or text interpretations. The quizzes, then, were unpredictable in terms of their presentation, but were also always pre-announced. The variety of formats was meant to address different cognitive styles, to encourage different angles in the students’ approaches to the topics examined.

The two exams and ten quizzes contributing to the Class Work data were constructed on the principles of deep learning, CQ development and visibility. They had the goal to help the students create and recognize their knowledge (and the goal of allowing the instructor/researcher to observe their development) and become owners of their own learning. For example, the examinations stressed not only the ‘what’, but also the ‘why’ and ‘how’ of issues; they insisted
on giving examples at all occasions; they allowed the students to make choices; the two multiple-
choice quizzes were carefully prepared to see how the students grasped the concepts, and how
the students made their selections. For example, the choices in Quiz 2 drew from all true cultural
dimensions studied through Hofstede, but only one per statement was the correct dimension. In
Quiz 9, item 3 asked: In which culture is it customary for men to kiss each other on the
cheeks? The choices were: a) North American; b) French; c) Arab; d) Indian. Many
students answered b), relating kissing to a French cultural stereotype. Quiz 5 consisted of an
assessment of social interactions topics while observing the presentation of a guest speaker.
Other quizzes presented mini-cases that needed interpretation, figures that needed elaborations
and, finally, quiz 10 presented the students with the task to perform a personal evaluation on
their own CQ development (see Appendix G for all quizzes).

Field Notes (Daily Journal + 2 Focus Groups)

The Field Notes are the collection of all relevant dynamics which emerged through the
course and that are suitable data. They were the daily journal and two focus groups, and provided
useful information on the FE environment. The daily journal entries were written immediately
after each class and kept the instructor/researcher reflecting on the facts and impressions of the
day (see Appendix E). The daily journal was the major source of the Field Notes, but many other
occasions for reflection were provided by data such as email exchanges, in person
communications, out of class situations and conversations such as feedback on coursework,
personal anecdotes and interactions with the students and with the guest speakers. The entries in
the daily journal provided observations which reinforced both the teaching style of the
instructor/researcher and the research direction of the FE.
The first focus group took place on February 5th, 2010 with the students present in the class. It consisted of an informal session between the instructor/researcher and the students about their Case Study, Phase 1. The focus group took place on the eve of the due date for Phase 1, and the purpose was to clarify any possible “last minute” inquiry that the students might have had before handing in the paper. The second focus group took place in two sessions because of time constraints, respectively on March 31st and on April 9, 2010 with the students present in the class as well. The second focus group took place three week before Phase 3 was due. Its goal was to brainstorm Phase 2 and prepare for Phase 3. The educational purpose for the focus groups was to guide the students and give them feedback for the case studies’ phases; the research purpose for the focus groups was to provide another angle to the convergent evidence process. The focus groups were audio taped with the students consent.

The ‘Detailed’ Analysis of the Scaffolding Case Study (n = 11)

As mentioned before, the instructor/researcher examined eleven scaffolding case studies in a first reading with the ‘detailed’ analysis (n = 11) (see Appendix J for a coding example). In this reading, the case studies were examined paragraph by paragraph to provide the placement into lower, middle or higher CQ levels for the eleven students’ work. The ‘detailed’ analysis also helped the instructor/researcher refine the coding processes of the scaffolding case studies towards more effective use of the material in the analysis. In a second reading, the eleven case studies were examined with the ‘summative’ analysis. The goal of this double analysis was to assess the convergence of the case studies CQ placement between the two readings, and therefore establish whether there were solid criteria of analysis and interpretation which worked at both levels, ‘detailed’ and ‘summative’. The convergent evidence section of Chapter IV will show the results of this double analysis.
The Cross-Checking ‘Summative’ Analysis (n = 11)

A different graduate student, experienced in travel and tourism and in CQ education and training, performed the ‘summative’ analysis on the eleven scaffolding case studies which had been already examined by the instructor/researcher with both the ‘detailed’ and the ‘summative’ analyses, hence the ‘cross-checking’. The graduate student’s analysis was independent from the instructor/researcher’s analysis. The instructor/researcher provided the eleven scaffolding case studies and the ‘summative’ analysis criteria to the graduate student; then, she showed the graduate student one example of ‘summative’ analysis on one of the eleven cases, and did not reveal the outcomes obtained about the other ten scaffolding case studies. The results took in consideration also the student’s case study used as a coding example for two reasons; the first one was that even though this case study was used as a coding example, it was not examined in its entirety (that is, the graduate student was exposed only to the ‘summative’ analysis criteria); the second reason was that there was little difference between the results obtained for n = 11 or n = 10.

The Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI)

The Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI) (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992) is a well established instrument that measures intercultural sensitivity, open-mindedness and flexibility according to criteria which define CQ effectiveness and overseas success (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992). The ICSI not only measures cognitive and emotional responses (which other instruments measure as well), but also behavioral responses; these three aspects of CQ align consistently with this study’s approach to CQ, as Chapter II points out. Furthermore, the ICSI is based on the Individualism-Collectivism dimension, also described in Chapter II, because the authors of the ICSI found that the Individualism-Collectivism dimension is the least controversial among the
five cultural dimensions that Hofstede proposed in his studies (1979, 2001), and it is also the most studied in the literature (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992). Finally, the ICSI proved to have external and construct validity, after comparing its scores with the evaluations of experts [they consisted of nine permanent staff members from the East-West Center at the University of Hawaii. In particular, “there were five program officers, one health officer, one visa officer, one officer responsible for participants [sic] social activities, and one recently retired executive who headed all student programs at the center.” (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992, p. 422)]; its reliability test had a Cronbach’s alpha of .82; and factor analysis confirmed its internal consistency and reliability especially in relation to the Individualism-Collectivism dimension (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992; Bhawuk & Sakuda, & Munusamy, 2008).

Appendix C shows the ICSI: the inventory has three parts which ask the respondents to mark the items on a seven-point Likert scale (from 1—completely disagree to 7—completely agree, 4 being neutral). The first two parts are identical, with 16 items each; the only difference stands in the introduction for each part. In Part One, the respondents answer by imagining they must act successfully in an American working environment. In Part Two, the respondents imagine that they have to perform successfully in a Japanese working environment. The United States and Japan are chosen as extreme cases of Individualism and Collectivism as shown by Hofstede’s studies (1979, 2001). The scores rank in the following way: #1, #3, #6, #9, #11, #13, and #14 are individualism items; #2, #4, #5, #7, #8, #10, #12, #15, and #16 are collectivism items. Each country would require reversed scoring for high CQ qualification; for example item # 14 requires a high score for high CQ in the American environment and it requires a low score for high CQ in the Japanese environment. Part Three of the ICSI does not provide instructions to the respondents except to mark their response; this section addresses living abroad situations and
measures open-mindedness and flexibility dimensions through 14 items in the following way: #3, #6, #7, #8, #9, #10, and #11 for open-mindedness and items #1, #2, #4, #5, #12, #13, and #14 for flexibility. Higher scores reflect low open-mindedness and flexibility except for #3, #6, and #9 which are reverse coded (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992). The ICSI was administered on the first day of class and on the last day of class to see whether there were statistically significant differences in the students’ responses between pre and post CQ instruction. A control group of travel and tourism undergraduate students also completed the ICSI once during the same semester, in the same university program. None of the students in the control group had been exposed to CQ education and training before taking the ICSI. The control group set a benchmark for the pre and post ICSI results of the experimental group.

In line with a quantitative experimental methodology the ICSI administrations were tracked by using the students’ birth dates as tracking number. This procedure allowed the pairing up of the pre and post questionnaires for the experimental group, but not the identification of their authors. The ICSI results for the experimental group underwent a paired sample t-test and then an ANOVA test to find whether there were significant differences in the students’ mean scores between pre and post CQ instruction.

Preliminary Formative Experiment

A preliminary FE took place during the fall semester 2009 at the same university and in the same program of study where the actual FE took place the following semester. The goal of the preliminary FE was to fine tune the components of the FE design in preparation for the actual study the following semester. The following excerpt from the notes taken by the instructor/researcher at the end of the preliminary FE synthesizes it:

Fall 2009 – Preliminary FE:
The Intercultural Education and Training Preliminary FE took place in the PRTM Department at Clemson University in the fall semester 2009 in the following way: 4 modules were conducted in 4 different PRTM classes for a 3 week period each. One class, PRTM 201, was the only Tuesday/Thursday class, so we did the module only for 2 weeks at 1.15 hours per session.

The classes were: PRTM 343, PRTM 342-2, PRTM 201 and PRTM 342-1. The Preliminary FE prepared for the spring 2010 semester research project. The Preliminary FE aimed at:

- **GOAL:** To improve the students’ intercultural competence in PRTM classes.

The Preliminary FE used the following tool to achieve the formative experiment’s goal:

- **INTERVENTION:** Case Studies.

The Preliminary FE used the following resources to monitor the intervention:

- **DATA AND PROCESSES OF THE FE:**
  
  - Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory pre and post tests (ICSI)
  - Audio and Visual recordings of classes activities and interactions
  - Power Point Presentations/Class material
  - Readings,
  - Google Earth
  - Youtube
  - Guest Speakers
  - Tests/Quizzes
  - Focus Groups
  - Instructor’s Logs
See folder (I will bring it to the meeting):

What comes next:

In the spring of 2010 I will teach “PRTM 447: International Tourism” under Dr. Ken Backman’s supervision. This class will integrate the Intercultural Education and Training Module material in the core of the course and during the entire semester. Formative design being the umbrella methodology, Case Studies being the tool, and quantitative and qualitative data being the resources for the data collection, the spring project will propose, monitor, refine the instruction on intercultural education and training. The data collection shall end in May of 2010 and the analysis shall begin in the summer and fall of 2010.

The results of the Preliminary FE belong in the Methods chapter because they show how the FE was modified after analyzing them. Each item of the FE listed before is commented next.

- Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory pre and post tests (ICSI):

The ICSI inventory was pilot tested for its validity and reliability in four different classes for three weeks during the fall semester 2009. In total, 126 students participated in the pilot tests. There were 88 female (69.8%) students and 38 male students (30.2%). White students counted for 87.3% of the sample. African American students counted for 9.5% and students with other ethnic background counted for 3.2%. The major of study almost evenly distributed in the student sample. 38.1% of them studied in the Travel and Tourism major, 30.2% studied in the General PRTM major, and 31.7% studied in other majors. The average age of the students in the pilot test was 20.37, with a standard deviation of 1.51.

Using Paired Sample t-tests, the pilot study found significant changes in the “US” questions. They were items US8 (t (91) = -1.97, p = .052, M =-.283 SD =1.37); US12 (t (91) = - 4.19 p = .000 M = -.543, M = 1.24), and US 14 (t (91) = 2.85, p = .005, M = .272 SD = .912).
These items’ results suggested that the students’ perceptions may have changed through the module instruction.

Similar t-tests were run on the “Japanese” and “live abroad” questions. The tests showed that the students’ perceptions of items JP3, JP4, JP5, JP7, JP10, JP13 and JP14 changed after the module (see Table 3 for the t-test results). There were seven items out of 16 questions showing significant changes, suggesting that the module influenced the students understanding of the Japanese culture. Table 3 shows the results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JP3</td>
<td>2.249</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>1.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP4</td>
<td>3.833</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>1.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP5</td>
<td>2.405</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>1.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP7</td>
<td>-2.290</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.554</td>
<td>2.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP10</td>
<td>-3.132</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.619</td>
<td>1.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP13</td>
<td>2.199</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>1.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP14</td>
<td>4.078</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>2.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: ICSI t-test Results for the Japanese Section of the Preliminary FE

Among the “live abroad” questions, the paired sample t-tests only found significant changes on questions LIVERABROAD1 (t(91) = 2.267, p =.026 M =.380, SD=1.609), and LIVERABROAD10 (t(91) = -2.304, p=.024, M= -.283, SD = 1.725).

The ICSI results showed significant differences in more items with the Preliminary FE sample (n = 126) than in the ICSI results obtained with the actual FE sample (n = 31) of the following semester. Since the major difference between the Preliminary FE and the actual FE in terms of the ICSI administration was the number of students in the sample, the lesson learned for this part of the Preliminary FE and of the actual FE was that the ICSI is a valid statistical tool to measure intercultural sensitivity; the modest results obtained in the actual FE with n = 31 should be considered in light of the small sample which generated them. The ICSI was used also in the
actual FE to verify the above conclusion and to provide another angle to the FE convergent evidence process.

- Audio and Visual recordings of the modules activities and interactions:

These tools proved useful in recollecting data, especially when considering that the instructor was also the researcher. Having only one person conducting the project, audio and visual aids proved to be the ‘second person’ badly needed throughout the research. Audio and visual recordings were adopted also in the actual FE.

- Power Point Presentations:

The power point presentations created for the modules proved useful, especially in assisting with instruction. The use of the power point presentations indicated what slides to keep, eliminate, or modify. The progression of the changes made from one module to the next and then to the FE evolved this material into a more effective delivery tool. The students paid great attention to the presentations, being the only “text” they had available at all times to work with (uploaded on their university Blackboard system). The power point presentations were adopted for the actual FE in their refined versions.

- Readings, Google Earth, Youtube (CASE STUDIES):

These materials were used to present the students with case studies and they were successful in grasping the students’ attention and in providing information. The readings consisted of handouts, information, articles about regions, scenarios or topics. The students used these paper materials in their group and individual activities to reflect, jot down ideas, store, and retrieve information. Google Earth and Youtube were extremely successful in catching and retaining the students’ attention while providing unique and sometimes remarkable visuals of cases the students discussed.
At this stage of the design, the case studies were not scaffolded, but the need to make them so emerged as a better way to stimulate deep learning in the students. The design of the scaffolding case study in three phases and the prompts technique (the Socratic Method) emerged during the Preliminary FE and was encouraged by the fact that the actual FE would take place during a whole semester and not just for few weeks. The case studies were transformed into scaffolding case studies for the actual FE.

- **Guest Speakers:**

  The guest speakers who came to the Preliminary FE modules generated great enthusiasm and interest in the students as conversations with the students and observations of class dynamics made clear. For the actual FE, several guest speakers from very different areas of the world were invited to present.

- **Tests/Quizzes:**

  Tests and quizzes were used marginally in the Preliminary FE and not uniformly because of the different needs each instructor had in their classes. They proved useful to the instructor/research to begin preparing her testing material for the course of the following semester. Tests and quizzes provision was already a decision made before the Preliminary FE, to integrate the actual FE in the regular travel and tourism course. One decision taken during the Preliminary FE was to organize the quizzes and tests for the following semester in different formats, because of the different learning and testing styles students possess and prefer.

- **Focus Groups:**

  The students in two of the four Preliminary FE classes participated in a focus group at the end of their module. The focus groups provided several important suggestions for the overall design. The students gave ample feedback on each item of the modules. Also, insights into their
CQ processes became accessible. The focus groups proved to be useful and effective feedback tools about the modules design and the students’ perceptions. They were included in the actual FE.

❖ Lesson Plans:

Lesson Plans proved essential for the instructor/researcher for organization, effectiveness and thoroughness. Not necessarily a tool that all instructors may need, it definitely was necessary for this instructor. Also, the lesson plans proved useful material for data collection and re-collection. The director of the Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation (OTEI) observed one class and the evaluations provided after the observation supported this finding (see Appendix I). Lesson Plans were refined for the actual FE.

❖ Instructor’s Logs:

The instructor/researcher kept daily logs of the modules sessions. They proved useful in the recollection of data. At times the logs were not written right after class, or not at all, and that proved to be a limitation at the time of data retrieval. The lesson learned in the Preliminary FE, and for the actual FE was to keep a daily journal and to be rigorous and disciplined about writing the daily journal at the end of each class.

Finally, at the end of the Preliminary FE the students in each class were asked to fill an evaluation form to assess the module (see Appendix H). On a five-point Likert scale, the students evaluated the various components of the module itself. The students rated high on most of the items (above 4), except item 7 (which is: ‘I am more interested in the subject now than I was before I took the Module’) which rated a little bit above average (M=3.822), suggesting that the students appreciated the module despite their overall lack of interest in the subject.
Summary

This chapter addressed the Method used for this study and was divided into two sections. The first one, the Methodology, focused primarily on the design of the FE, its theoretical underpinning and organization. The FE and the instructional intervention were described in detail, including the iteration of the scaffolding case study and the coding categories. The second part of the chapter was dedicated to the Methods which included the description of the setting, of the unit of analysis, of the data selection, collection, and criteria of analysis. Specific information was given about each data source and its use, with extensive review of the organization of the convergent evidence processes. Finally, a review of the Preliminary FE conducted in 2009 completed the Method chapter, and presented the refinement and changes which brought about the actual FE design.

The following chapter displays and discusses the data analysis results of the FE. The discussion on the results will focus on the students CQ development, balancing the individual findings with the findings concerning the class as a whole.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Chapter IV presents the results and the discussion of the students’ data analysis, including the processes of convergent evidence. This chapter is organized in the following way; first, it presents and discusses the final results of the study, that is the ‘summative’ analysis results of the students’ case studies (n = 37); second, it covers the convergent evidence data. Chapter IV, then, intends to provide information on the attainment of the research’s goal, including issues of validity.

Results and Discussion

The students who were enrolled in the international travel and tourism class had the general demographic information described in Table 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>T. &amp; T.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Afr. Amer.</td>
<td>PRTM</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As. Pacif.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 : Demographic Information of the Students Enrolled in the International Travel and Tourism Class

The FE final results were obtained after examining the three phases of the scaffolding case studies the students prepared during the travel and tourism course and after placing the
students’ work in either “lower”, “middle”, or “higher” CQ. These results were obtained through
the ‘summative’ analysis (n = 37) of the students’ scaffolding case studies, and are presented in
Figure 10. Their detailed explanation follows:

Figure 10: Final Results on Students Intercultural Competence Identification and Tracking

In Phase 1 of the FE, 35 percent of the students displayed lower CQ, 57 percent showed
middle CQ, and 8 percent higher CQ. The reason for the lower CQ results for over a third of the
class is that in Phase 1 many students neglected to produce the CQ Outline which was the most
relevant area for the observation of CQ processes; many students did not ‘gear in’ with the
class’s rhythms right away (subsequent phases’ outcomes indicate their growing understanding
of what they needed to know and do). A solid majority, though, produced part of the Outline or
addressed CQ topics to some extent, deserving a middle CQ placement. Finally, the 8 percent
higher CQ demonstrates how very few students (only three) displayed full grasp of both the
class’s requirements and the topic at hand. These students prepared articulate outlines and also meaningful insights for their case areas intercultural profiles.

In Phase 2 of the scaffolding case study, the students displayed 32 percent lower CQ, 43 percent showed middle CQ, and 25 percent higher CQ. From Phase 1 to Phase 2, then, there was very little change in the lower CQ percentage, while middle CQ and higher CQ showed sensible changes to the advantage of higher CQ placement. The reasons for these changes from Phase 1 to Phase 2 reside in the following observations: for lower CQ, the little change between Phase 1 and Phase 2 occurred because in Phase 2 many students did not address Cognitive Apprenticeship and so, their work did not deepen and progress as it should have from Phase 1 to Phase 2. Also, few students did not produce a case incident; other students’ case incidents were poorly elaborated from a CQ perspective. For middle CQ, the decrease from 57 to 43 percent from Phase 1 to Phase 2, is attributable to the increase in higher CQ (from 8 percent in Phase 1 to 25 percent in Phase 2). Even though middle CQ decreased from Phase 1 to Phase 2, it still represented the students’ majority in Phase 2; this result, together with the little change in lower CQ from Phase 1 to Phase 2, indicates that CQ development takes time.

From another angle, the majority of the students in Phase 2 were at middle CQ, and a fourth of the students was at higher CQ showing that many of them addressed the Cognitive Apprenticeship technique. Furthermore, Phase 2 was centered on the case incidents; therefore, it was much harder for the students to ignore CQ elements of their scaffolding case studies. Also, the students became more accustomed to the course’s rhythms and requirements, so the initial confusion displayed in Phase 1 was reduced (the focus groups showed these dynamics most than other data). Finally, in Phase 2, many students produced their “Research Process Development: Stages and Insights for My Case Study 2” paragraph, in which they recognized and critiqued
their metacognitive processes of Phase 1. The students acknowledged their shortcomings and explained how they tried (and often succeeded) to improve their processes in Phase 2. These are the reasons why middle CQ remained solidly the majority and higher CQ saw a sensible increase during Phase 2.

In Phase 3 of the scaffolding case study, lower CQ diminished sensibly to 14 percent of the class, while middle CQ slightly rose to 48 percent, and finally, higher CQ improved to 38 percent. These results show that by the third phase many students consolidated their performance at a middle CQ level, more than a third of the class pushed further to higher CQ levels, and a small group lagged behind. The students’ reflection paragraphs, at the end of the phases, explained in part these results. Some students expressed their fatigue in working on their scaffolding case study, indicating that the three-layered research proved to be taxing. These comments explain how some students preferred to remain on comfortable middle grounds in CQ (and metacognition) acquisition. A considerable group, though, produced CQ analyses that were sometimes astonishing both to the students themselves and to the instructor/researcher. The 14 percent of lower CQ reflects types of students who, while being in unique situations, they also are an emblematic presence in universities’ classrooms (these are the students who, for one reason or another, adopt marginal positions in their courses. For example, they are either confronted with unexpected personal events during the semester, which distract them from their academic focus, or they remain unmotivated throughout the course).

The results of the ‘summative’ analysis of the scaffolding case studies provided useful information regarding the FE design, specifically regarding the effects of the instructional intervention on the students CQ development.
Overarching Questions for This Research

The results shown in the previous paragraph indicate that the overarching questions for this research were answered in the following ways:

The first overarching question was:

A) Is this formative experiment’s instructional intervention capable of helping college students develop CQ in a semester-long, pre-existing travel and tourism undergraduate class?

Based on the criteria established in this research, the first overarching question was answered because the students progressively increased their numbers and levels of CQ development during the semester of instruction. In particular, lower CQ continued to fall from one phase to the next; middle CQ diminished to the advantage of higher CQ between Phase 1 and Phase 2, and solidified in Phase 3 (it did not diminish); and finally, higher CQ continued to grow throughout the three phases.

The second overarching question was:

B) Is the travel and tourism students CQ development identifiable and trackable?

Based on the criteria established in this research, this overarching question was answered, because the students’ development was determined both for each single phase of the case studies and also for the three phases of the case studies as a continuum. The scaffolding of the case study and the cognitive apprenticeship, among other theoretical instruments, proved to be the two most important and non-negotiable tools for the identification and tracking of the students CQ processes. Were the students’ case studies not scaffolded, CQ could have been identified, but not tracked. Were the students’ researches not approached with cognitive apprenticeship, the tracking would have been much more difficult, slow and ineffective.
The following section of this chapter presents the convergent evidence processes. Convergent evidence provides further insights on the discussion on the ‘summative’ analysis results.

Convergent Evidence Processes

Within a FE approach and design, triangulation refers to the construct of ‘convergent evidence’ that Reinking and Bradley (2008) adopted to describe the various processes and activities which aim at reinforcing the findings of a FE (see Chapter III). The following data contributed to the processes of convergent evidence brought about to corroborate the results of this FE.

Field Notes

The daily journal and the two focus groups provided useful information on the FE environment. The entries in the daily journal indicated that the class climate was built towards metacognitive and CQ development. The instructor/researcher observed that metacognitive and CQ development occurred especially thanks to the pedagogical tools used in the FE; for example, mini-cases and numerous examples in the concepts taught, often drawn from personal experience (inductive, case-based learning strategies). Also, habitually asking the students questions helped reduce the lecturing and increase the dialogue between instructor/researcher and students (Socratic Method). Furthermore, the instructor/researcher showed interest and concern for each student individually, both during the semester in and out of class and in mentoring the students in their scaffolding case studies assignments (cognitive apprenticeship). Excerpts from the daily journal follow (see full journal in Appendix E):

CLASS 4 – Wednesday, January 13, 2010
“...we begin with two “mini case studies”, that is, short cases that I use to exemplify concepts we are learning.”

“In the evening I reviewed their assignments and for each student I marked some questions that I will ask them to reply to on the same sheet of paper...”

CLASS 7 – Monday, January 25, 2010

“The students, instead, thought that they would be provided with an already prepared case study that they would have to solve. After a few repetitions, I decide to give them an example...”

CLASS 10 – Monday, February 1, 2010

“...they were given the uncertainty avoidance dimension and the 2 countries representing the extremes of high and low uncertainty avoidance—Greece and Singapore. When I asked them to let us know what would they do with the Singapore group, the students replied that they would rather begin with the Greeks, since they were high uncertainty avoidance...I... praised emphatically this correction they made to my priorities...”

“It is surprising how many students still don’t have a clue of what area they want to study and the project is due in 4 days.”

CLASS 16 – Monday, February 15, 2010

“At times I ask the students for some inputs and they comply, but it seems to me that they would just rather stay anonymous and listen rather than talk. This feeling opens a new chapter of reflections for me, in that I realize how long and deep the process of “opening up” takes, if it occurs at all in a classroom environment. I must think of some strategy to get the students more prone to share their thoughts with each other and me.”
Ken teaches.

**REFLECTIONS ON CASE STUDY 2**

“…in this stage I am providing much looser guidelines than I did for cs1…. now they have to “pick and choose” what topics within each chapter best suits their case incident and so, they need to be more critical and selective + responsible for their choices.”

**CLASS 21 – Friday, February 26, 2010**

(On this day the instructor/researcher explained the guidelines for Case Study 2)

“…the impression I have is that most students seem adamant to grasp well what the second step of their case. I feel this sensation of “ownership” on the students' behalf also in the way they ask questions, especially at the end of class.”

**CLASS 22 – Monday, March 1, 2010**

“…I encouraged her to look at a relatively simple and verifiable incident in which all parties involved are real people and few people…”

**CLASS 31 – Wednesday, March 31, 2010**

“…we focused on the case study 2 results through our 2nd focus group. I prepared a sheet with questions I meant to ask and I did use it. However, I felt that I was “lecturing” because it was more like asking rhetorical questions to have the students reflect rather than answer… I felt I was “preaching” and “nagging” for the critiques I included in their papers and so I did not feel the students could be open to a constructive critique (and nor was I, honestly: I had to let them know how I felt and so, I too was not ready for constructive thinking in that sense: both the students and I needed to “let it cool”).”

**CLASS 32 – Friday, April 2, 2010**
“There are few students (fewer and fewer, it seems to me)... I feel I have lost some on the way, at different levels. [names of several students] and— to a lesser extent—[other students’ names] and, of course, [student’s name] who comes always, but does not do anything. It’s a strange feeling of loss...”

CLASS 37 – Wednesday, April 14, 2010

“...they [the students] were given the choice to either begin the one-on-one assistance for case 3, or to continue with my example. The students decided to continue with my Burkina Faso case incident as an example to clarify the case study 3 guidelines.”

CLASS 39 – Monday, April 19, 2010

“When I asked her several questions in regards to the case... she had not formulated any solution for the main problem I raised with her case 2: that was, the narrowing down to a specific, smaller incident her case incident.”

“...I asked if the class wanted to reiterate the guidelines for case 3. There was silence and then [student’s name] shook her head like saying “not another time, please”. So, we went to the one-on-one meetings.”

The focus groups provided the following insights: the first focus group indicated that the scaffolding case studies require much preparation and effort both from the students and the instructor. Many students had not even started their case studies on the day of the focus group, which was the day before the due date. Among the several reasons given, the students blamed in particular the novelty of the scaffolding case study, implying that they were confused and unsure on how to proceed for the scaffolding part of it, despite the thorough instructions provided in the guidelines. This situation prompted the instructor/researcher to observe and record how the students reacted in the focus group, displaying either high or low uncertainty avoidance and long
or short term orientation in their approach to the assignment. Also, other elements were recorded which assisted the instructor/researcher in defining the students’ traits. Another lesson learned was to have the second focus group much earlier than the due date for the case studies’ third phase.

The second focus group took place three week before Phase 3 was due. Its goal was to brainstorm Phase 2 and prepare for Phase 3. Also, it took place in two sittings, one class day after the other, so that all the items that were felt as important could be addressed. This focus group developed much more efficiently than the first focus group in terms of pedagogical guidance for the case study, therefore providing useful information also on the metacognitive and CQ processes of the students. The students began talking right away, asking questions, expressing concerns or frustration, indicating areas of expertise in an exchange with the instructor which was more balanced than the first one, especially in the focus group second session. The discussion focused less on the formalities of the papers (for example on APA style, like the first focus group did), and more on the substance of the students’ cases. With this focus group the instructor/researcher recorded important changes in the students both in terms of metacognitive and CQ development. In general, the two focus groups proved useful both from a pedagogical and research perspective; also their taping allowed the instructor/researcher to recollect many memories about the class which helped in assessing the students’ work for the analysis.

*Class Work*

The class work consisting of two exams and ten quizzes helped in the assessment of the students metacognitive and CQ development when there were some doubts in regards to their CQ placement. Therefore, they were consulted to deepen the understanding of the students
metacognitive and CQ processes. Their primary goal was to set the learning environment, rather than provide specific results. In general, when the class work was consulted for data analysis, it matched the overall performance of the students in their other assignments, thus indicating consistency of learning processes in the students.

*Class Time*

Class time provided a learning environment by building trust, respect and dialogue among the students and the instructor, and allowing for a relaxed climate and cooperative attitude. The end of semester evaluations showed these aspects of class time. The students also expressed their appreciation for each guest speaker’s presentation. Several students chose their scaffolding case studies motivated by the guest speakers’ presentations; these decisions were both a good and bad occurrence, as some students ‘rushed’ their choices for their case areas—for example student 12M with the Venice case study—and did not produce CQ development comparable to the amount of enthusiasm they had for their case area. Overall, the guest speakers provided an attractive and exciting (possibly ‘exotic’?) bend to class time; all the students benefitted from the guest speakers’ interventions, both those with travel experience and those without it, as foreshadowed in the Preliminary FE.

To show the impact the guest speakers had on the students, here are some excerpts found in the end of semester students’ evaluations:

Item G18: Please comment on the strengths of the instructor and the course.

#13: “She (the instructor) *also brought in awesome guest speakers that added to the topics of the course*”.

#22: *guest speakers and lectures.*
Item G20: Please comment on any teaching methods you found particularly helpful, and suggest alternative methods that you feel would improve the course.

#8: “Guest speakers were very informative”.

#11: “The guest speakers to help us learn about cultural differences and varieties.”

Similar comments were made in items #20, 26, 28, 32.

The Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI)

The Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI) (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992) (see appendix C) was described in detail in Chapter III. Here it suffices to say that the ICSI is a well established instrument that measures intercultural sensitivity, open-mindedness and flexibility according to criteria which define CQ effectiveness and overseas success. The ICSI was used to record the students CQ development by measuring possible statistical effects of the FE design on the students’ sample. This approach is consistent with the FE inclusive and pragmatic methodological nature.

Of the 37 students enrolled in the course, 31 provided pre and post completed ICSI.

These students formed the experimental group. Table 5 shows the characteristics of the experimental group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>T. &amp; T.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Afr. Amer.</td>
<td>PRTM</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7 (22.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian Pacif.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14 (45.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6 (19.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31 (100%)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31 (100%)</td>
<td>Total 31 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Demographic Information of the Experimental Group for the ICSI Administration
The control group yielded 33 complete ICSI. Table 6 shows their demographic information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male 17 (51.5%)</td>
<td>White 30 (90.9%)</td>
<td>T. &amp; T. 16 (48.5%)</td>
<td>19 (15.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 15 (45.5%)</td>
<td>Other 1 (3%)</td>
<td>PRTM 13 (39.4%)</td>
<td>20 (42.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 2 (6.1%)</td>
<td>21 (18.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22 (9.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 (6.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing 1 (3%)</td>
<td>Missing 2 (6.1%)</td>
<td>Missing 2 (6.1%)</td>
<td>Missing 1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 33 (100%)</td>
<td>Total 33 (100%)</td>
<td>Total 33 (100%)</td>
<td>Total 33 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Demographic Information of the Control Group for the ICSI Administration

The ICSI results for the experimental group underwent a paired sample t-test and then an ANOVA test to find whether there were significant differences in the students’ mean scores between pre and post CQ instruction. The results for both groups follow.

For the experimental group the paired sample t-test for n = 31 at α = .05 yielded statistically significant results for the following ICSI items:

For the American section (US), item 15:

**I have respect for the authority figures with whom I interact** \([t(29) = 2.757, p = .010]\).

The pre test mean score for item 15 was 6.43 on the Likert type scale, indicating a strong agreement towards the statement. In the post test, the mean score for item 15 was 5.83, indicating a movement of the sample towards a more neutral position (4 being neutral). This change may indicate that the students became more aware of the differences between high and low power distance cultures, and, to some extent, between individualistic and collectivistic cultures. That is, the sample’s overall shift between pre and post CQ instruction towards a more neutral approach to item 15 in the US section of the ICSI can be explained with the students’ higher awareness of the constructs of high/low power distance and high/low collectivism, and that the characteristics
of high power distance and high collectivism, displayed in item 15, are not ideal for an American environment. This interpretation is reinforced by the reading of item 15 in the Japanese section. For this section of the ICSI, in fact, in the pre test the students were at 6.22 on the Likert type scale, and at 6.00 in the post test, indicating consistent approval of item 15’s traits in a Japanese working environment. So, one observation from item 15’s reading is that CQ acquisition works first on one’s own cultural awareness (which is also a foreign language instruction effect; students become more proficient in their own mother tongue when they learn a foreign language).

US section, item 16:

**If I want a person to perform a certain task I try to show how the task will benefit others in the person’s group** \( t(29) = 2.408, p = .023 \).

The students’ mean for item 16 in the pre test was 5.80 on the Likert type scale, while in the post test it was 5.30. The comments made for item 15’s changes in the US section of the ICSI apply here too. However, the same cannot be said for the Japanese section of the ICSI, which also showed significant difference towards a more neutral position, as indicated later in this paragraph.

US section, Item 3:

**I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people with whom I work** \( t(29) = 1.833, p = .077 \).

Item 3 showed a near significant result and may be worth a comment. In the pre test the sample’s mean was 5.86 on the Likert type scale, and in the post test the mean was 5.26. Since the students should have rationally responded in the opposite direction after CQ instruction for the US section, it is arguable that CQ acquisition is not linear, nor systematic (Shenkar, 2001). It appears that people apply constructs and dynamics in a variety of ways, and also to the ‘wrong’ environments when they begin their CQ education and training. Even though these effects appear
counterproductive for CQ development, they are supported and accepted as part of the process of CQ development by the literature; especially high levels of CQ development require long and sophisticated instruction and exposure. Similar patterns appeared also in the alternative ICSI analysis (n = 15), as the research will show later. Also item 3 in the Japanese section showed statistical significance, and it is addressed next.

Among the Japanese questions, only items 3, 8, and 16 showed significant differences between the pre and post CQ instructional intervention. The results were:

JPN section, Item 3:

**I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people with whom I work** \[t(29) = 2.295, p = .029\].

The pre test mean at 5.06 on the Likert type scale, and the post test mean at 4.25 indicate the appropriate change in the choice’s direction for a Japanese working environment. Yet, the students did not show a clear opposite stance, but only a mitigation of their original position toward neutrality. This outcome shows that the students almost suspended their judgment for the environment they did not know well (a good example of Gudykunst’s construct of knowledge of alternative interpretations’, for which Gudykunst indicated three related processes: description, interpretation, and evaluation, see Chapter II).

JPN section, Item 8:

**I prefer to give opinions that will help people save face rather than give a statement of truth** \[t(29) = -1.984, p = .056\].

The sample’s pre test mean was 4.19, and the post test mean was 5.09. This result indicates the appropriate CQ changes for a Japanese environment. Item 8 in the US section yielded a pre test
mean of 2.70 and a post test mean of 2.90, that is, it remained in the negative portion of the Likert type scale, supporting the ICSI’s logical findings for item 8 for a US environment.

JPN section, Item 16:

If I want a person to perform a certain task I try to show how the task will benefit others in the person’s group \([t(29) = 2.108, p = .043]\).

In the pre test, the sample’s mean was 5.70 and in the post test, it was 5.32. This item’s change is counterintuitive and it is not easy to interpret. The students indicated agreement with the statement in both takes, even though in the post test it was not as strong as in the pre test. Yet, the sample should have scored higher in the post test and not lower. In the US section, item 16 received a score of 5.80 in the pre test and of 5.30 in the post test (as seen before in this paper), indicating the logical direction of CQ development in a US environment. The reading for item 16 for the Japanese section remains unclear.

Among the living abroad (LVABR) questions, no items showed significant differences between the pre and post CQ instructional intervention. Only item 11, A woman’s place, truly, is at home showed near significant difference \([t(29) = -1.909, p = .066]\). For this item, the pre test mean was 2.38 and the post test mean was 2.87, indicating a move from a negative position towards a less negative position regarding the concept expressed in item 11. The result for item 11 reflected a less polarized (negative) position in regards to the traditional view of women’s place in society from pre to post testing. This item’s result, then, indicates higher CQ awareness towards other cultural realities (regarding gender roles in this instance), especially in consideration that the sample was two thirds female and from a US environment.

For the control group, ANOVA tests were conducted to reveal any significant change between the three groups’ conditions of “control”, “pre” and “post”.
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Among the US questions, nearly all items showed no significant changes between the groups of “control” and “post test”. Only item 12: **I enjoy being emotionally close to the people with whom I work** \[F(2, 90) = 4.438, p = .015\] showed a significant difference between the control group (m=4.9, sd=1.53) and the post test group (m=3.9, sd=1.18), and did not show any difference between the control group and the pre-test group. In the pre test, the experimental group showed a more favorable attitude towards emotionally close relationships in the working environment, while they were less favorable (practically neutral) towards this aspect in the post test. This result is explained if the suspension of judgment as one expression of CQ development, and mentioned also before in this paper, is taken into consideration. Further support for this position comes from the observation that the control group and the pre test experimental group were not significantly different.

Among the Japanese questions, item 3: **I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people with whom I work** \[F(2, 91) = 5.376, p = .006\] showed significant changes in the correct direction between the control group (m=5.46, sd=1.16) and the post test group (m=4.25, sd=1.63). Also item 8: **I prefer to give opinions that will help people save face rather than give a statement of truth** \[F(2, 91) = 4.225, p = .018\] showed significant changes in the correct direction between the control group (m=3.9, sd=1.42) and the post test group (m=5.09, sd=1.77), and no significant differences between the control group and the pre test experimental group. All the other items showed no significant changes between the control group and the post test experimental group.

Among the living abroad questions, no items showed significant changes in either control-pre comparisons, or control-post comparisons. Finally, because of the small sample, the confidence interval was changed to \(\alpha = .1\) to see whether more statistically significant items would emerge.
Yet, only 3 items emerged: the already discussed US 3 \([t(29)=1.833, p=0.077]\) and LVABR 11 \([t(29)=-1.909, p = .066]\), and JPN 1 \([t(30)=1.709, p=0.098]\). JPN 1 stated: **When I disagree with a group, I would allow a conflict in the group to remain, rather than change my own stance on important issues.** JPN 1 had a pre test mean of 4.03, and a post test mean of 3.32. This change occurred in the correct direction for a Japanese environment.

The bottom line of the ICSI results was that for the most part the inventory did not provide statistically important information about the class progression between pre and post CQ instruction even though the few statistically significant items showed encouraging signals. However, the results obtained in the Preliminary FE, which were more significant at \(n = 126\), indicate that the small sample size for the actual FE \((n = 31)\) was likely the cause for its few significant results. Based on these premises, and after carrying out few individual readings of the ICSI, it became apparent that the ICSI for the actual FE was still useful as the outcomes of the individual readings provided valuable information in terms of individual results. These individual readings, then, were used to add more information to the convergent evidence processes. That is, even though only very few ICSI items said something about the students CQ processes through statistical analysis, on an individual basis, the students’ choices were far from being ‘insignificant’. For this reason, and in accordance with the methodological flexibility of FEs, the IRB protocol was modified to allow an alternative data analysis of the ICSI results.

**ICSI Alternative Analysis \((n = 15)\)**

In June of 2010 the IRB approved the protocol modification and the alternative iteration of the ICSI. This procedure allowed the identification of about half of the students. According to the modified IRB protocol the original students were contacted via email and were asked for permission to specifically identify them through their birth dates on the ICSI. Sixteen students
replied and consented to the modified procedure for the ICSI analysis, which identified them; one student was discarded, because her ICSI was incomplete.

Then, a thorough scrutiny, item by item of the ICSI of the 15 students was compiled. To unequivocally identify CQ changes, the students’ individual ICSI scores were analyzed for changes that went, for example, from a score of 2 (quite strongly disagree) in the pre ICSI to a score of 6 (quite strongly agree) in the post ICSI; in other words, the results had to indicated the students unambiguous change in either direction of the survey (that is toward ‘higher CQ’ or ‘lower CQ’, or towards ‘neutral CQ’ if the previous score was not neutral). Furthermore, the alternative ICSI results were compared with the results of the 15 students’ scaffolding case studies, based on the criteria established for the ICSI interpretation (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992) and for the scaffolding case studies interpretation.

Of the 15 Alternative ICSI readings, 11 (or 73%) were consistent with the same students’ scaffolding case studies results; that is, there was consistent CQ improvement shown in the ICSI results and in the scaffolding case studies results (indicated with the CQ levels placement). For example, student 18F had the case study’s three phases placed at the following levels: Phase 1 = Middle; Phase 2 = Middle; Phase 3 = Higher. Student 18F showed CQ development by the third phase of the scaffolding case study. In the alternative ICSI, student 18F showed an improvement of 6.5% between the pre and post administration. This percentage was established by recording the number of different (and improved) responses from the ICSI pre test to the post test.

Of the 15 alternative readings of the ICSI only four readings (or 27%) did not follow a logical trend. Of the four readings, two may be explained with the personal history of the students; in fact, both students were well traveled people and one was also an adult learner, with more worldly background than the average college student. These two students, then, may have
been better equipped for the second take of the ICSI, even though their scaffolding case studies did not show a correspondent improvement. The other two case studies readings were not clear: one showed improvement in the case studies, but not on the ICSI, and the other showed great improvement on the ICSI but a decline in the case studies (another pattern that emerged in the alternative ICSI reading was that many students scored several items in the opposite direction); more research should address these specific findings.

Furthermore, the Alternative ICSI results were also examined in relation to the graduate assistant data analysis. Of the 15 alternative ICSI, nine were also part of the graduate student pool of the scaffolding case studies ‘cross-checking’ analysis (n = 11). So, the nine case studies results obtained by the graduate assistant and the corresponding nine Alternative ICSI results were compared; seven of the nine examined case studies (78%) showed consistent results in that both the Alternative ICSI results and the ‘cross-checking’ analysis (n = 11) results showed CQ improvement. Only two out of the nine comparisons (or 22%) were inconsistent between the two analyses; that is, for one student the graduate student evaluated a decline in CQ development through the scaffolding case study, while the ICSI showed an improvement, and for the other student, the graduate student’s evaluation kept the student at a lower CQ throughout the three phases of the scaffolding case study, while this student showed a great improvement on the ICSI results. These outcomes need further research.

**The Scaffolding Case Study with ‘Detailed’ Analysis (n = 11)**

The first analysis conducted on the scaffolding case studies, the ‘detailed’ analysis (n = 11), produced CQ placements that perfectly matched the ‘summative’ analysis’ CQ placements for four of the eleven case studies (36%). Six CQ placements(55%) matched by two thirds, and only one case study (9%) had a mismatch of CQ placement that encompassed two of the three
phases of the scaffolding case study, although the final phase had the same result for both the ‘summative’ and the ‘detailed’ analyses. Since 91% of the scaffolding case studies analyzed with both foci displayed an accuracy of at least two thirds, it is arguable that the criteria used for the ‘detailed’ analysis were applicable and appropriate for the ‘summative’ analysis as well. Hence, the ‘summative’ analysis technique was adopted for the 37 scaffolding case studies, and its results were used as the final results of this research.

*The Cross-Checking ‘Summative’ Analysis (n = 11)*

The cross-checking ‘summative’ analysis which another graduate student performed on eleven scaffolding case studies provided results which were compared with those the instructor/researcher obtained. These results are shown in Table 7 (L = lower CQ; M = middle CQ; H = higher CQ). Their discussion follows:

Reading the table in percentages and ratios, 36 percent of the scaffolding case studies placement made by the instructor/researcher and the other graduate student was identical; 9 percent of the scaffolding case studies placement was two thirds the same; 36 percent of the scaffolding case studies placement was one third the same; and 18 percent of the scaffolding case studies placement did not match. These results indicate that almost half (45%) of the scaffolding case studies received two thirds of identical interpretation and placement from the graduate student and the instructor/researcher, and that of the 45 percent 36 was 100 percent identical. Despite its “bulkiness”, this outcome is interpretable as an encouraging signal for the convergent evidence process of the scaffolding case studies analysis, given the complexity of the cases and the complexity of the interpretation criteria.
Table 7: Parallel Analysis of the Case Studies Placement Made by Two Researchers

Validity and Rigor of the Formative Experiment

Issues of validity and rigor for this FE and for its instructional intervention conclude this chapter, to provide further support to the rigor of the data results. Validity and rigor in FE design are based on the criteria of preferability and of alignment between theory, research and practice (Reinking & Bradley, 2008). Figure 11 shows their underpinnings:
Validity and Rigor

Formative Experiments
• Preferability (Reinking & Bradley, 2008);
  – Utility (Reinking & Bradley, 2008);
  – Effectiveness, efficiency, appeal (Reinking & Bradley, 2008);
  – Broader impact (Bannan-Ritland, 2003).

Instructional Intervention
• Alignment between theory, research and practice (Reinking & Bradley, 2008);
  – Intense scrutiny of particulars (Hostetler, 2005);
  – Triangulation (Creswell, 2002);
  – Adequate time, interdisciplinary perspectives, careful selection of site, skepticism (Reinking & Bradley, 2008);

Figure 11: Validity and Rigor of the FE

For the FE, and under the concept of “Preferability”, the categories of Utility, Effectiveness, and Efficiency indicate why a FE design has been chosen over another. Utility refers to the reasons why the whole FE is designed and implemented in the first place. In this study, utility was perceived in the lack of CQ education and training in travel and tourism university programs, while the need for CQ education and training in travel and tourism programs is rising (see Chapter I and II). Effectiveness remains a matter of judgment, as Kennedy (1979) stated in regards of single cases validity (see Chapter III). This research focused its effort on effectiveness all along, from the theoretical assumptions to the practical applications of the FE. Efficiency may be the least satisfied category in the list. The amount of work required was considerable, yet it may be considered “efficient” mostly in economical terms. The Broader Impact sub-category pertains to the domain of “Preferability”, but on a less intrinsic way. The
Broader Impact of this FE could be assessable, for example, in a longitudinal study on the students’ future careers, and whether or not the FE may have contributed to their choices. Some indications were already perceptible during this research and could become assessable through future studies. An almost immediate broader impact of this FE, though, was the adoption of the scaffolding case study as one of the assignments in future travel and tourism classes at the university where it took place. Also, a visiting scholar from China who observed the class for most of the semester expressed his appreciation for the scaffolding case study pedagogy, and thought of it as a superior way of teaching and learning than the case studies techniques used, for example, in his country (see the daily journal, in Appendix E, entry for Class 21). Even though the scholar’s comments were not of immediate consequence, yet it is not excluded that his experience of the scaffolding case study will impact his students in China in the future.

For the instructional intervention, and under the concept of “Alignment between theory, research and practice”, the Intense Scrutiny of Particulars sub-category characterized the scaffolding case study, especially with the re-iterations of the materials analysis, the formal ones being the ‘detailed’ analysis (n = 11) and the Alternative ICSI (n = 15). The convergent evidence processes contributed to the validity and rigor of the instructional intervention through the multiple examinations explained in previous sections. Theory, research and practice were in constant attunement during the scrutiny of particulars as the previous chapters showed. Adequate time was respected with the unfolding of the instructional intervention during the natural course of the international travel and tourism class (one semester); less time would have been inadequate, and more time would have been exceeding the scope of this research (according to the purpose of this study, see Chapter I). Interdisciplinary perspective refers to the paradigmatic adoption the researcher made. Since this research adopted a Pragmatic approach (Dewey, 1935),
the embracing of many theoretical frameworks, together with the background of the researcher (formed in political science, foreign languages, travel and tourism, and with a long experience in teaching and in international travel and sojourn), contributed to the instructional intervention rigor. In this research, the instructor/researcher used many paths to reach the goals of the study, in conducting and assessing the instructional intervention. The site was carefully selected with the international travel and tourism class at the American university and with the fourth year level course; the instructional intervention demands would have been even more challenging had the travel and tourism students been introduced to the scaffolding case study assignment earlier in their academic career. Skepticism was the most difficult category to satisfy during the instructional intervention, because the instructor was a ‘solo’ researcher most of the time, and also, the instructor was and remains an enthusiastic supporter of CQ education and training.

Summary

This chapter presented and discussed the final results of the FE which consisted of the ‘summative’ analysis of the students’ scaffolding case studies. The results showed that both the number of students and their levels of CQ increased during the FE; these outcomes encourage an optimistic view of the research’s goal attainment. After the final results were discussed, the convergent evidence processes section provided ample explanations on how these processes contributed to and supported the final results. Lastly, a clarification and synthesis of FE's validity and rigor conceptual constructs were presented, with particular reference to this FE design.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This research examined how an educational approach called a Formative Experiment (FE) (Reinking & Bradley, 2008) helped undergraduate college students develop intercultural competence (CQ). The purpose of the FE was to design and evaluate an instructional intervention aimed at facilitating the development of the students CQ in the context of a regular travel and tourism undergraduate university course. The details of the dissertation conclusions are organized around the six questions (Reinking and Watkins, 2000) that guide FEs (see Chapter II). Each question is addressed in hindsight, providing further reflections on the results of the FE. The implications are then summarized and provide the grounds for future research.

The Questions Guiding a Formative Experiment

Question 1: What is the Pedagogical Goal of the Experiment, and What Theory Establishes Its Value?

The pedagogical goal of this FE was to facilitate students CQ development during a regular travel and tourism undergraduate university course. The theories which provided the theoretical framework for this FE were those regarding metacognition development and CQ development; that is, CQ development was sought through metacognitive development. The theoretical basis for metacognitive development was provided by the theories on deep learning (Hornby, Jennings & Nulty, 2009), the Socratic Method (Paraskevas & Wickens, 2003) and cognitive apprenticeship (Grabinger & Dunlap, 2008). In particular, evidence of deep learning was sought by identifying elements contrary to those which indicate surface learning and that have been identified in the literature in the following way (Grabinger & Dunlap, 2008; Hornby, Jennings & Nulty, 2009):
The surface approach to learning is typically associated with the student attempting to meet course requirements through minimal effort (Biggs, 2003). Typically, in surface learning students focus on “the signs”, treat “parts” as separate, focus on “essentials”, use memorization, do not connect facts and concepts, fail to distinguish principles from examples, do not separate knowledge from everyday activity, and consider tasks as external impositions (Entwhistle & Marton, 2003). (Hornby, Jennings & Nulty, 2009, p. 126)

Deep learning was observed in the academic work of the undergraduate travel and tourism students, specifically through their major assignment: the scaffolding case studies. The scaffolding case studies were examined for the students CQ identification both as a class and as individuals. The scaffolding case studies showed that the students achieved various levels of metacognitive development. The students’ metacognitive development was analyzed in conjunction with the criteria for CQ development. In particular, the Uncertainty and Anxiety Management Theory (Gudykunst, 1988, 1993) was the theoretical framework of reference for the placement of the students’ work into higher, middle or lower CQ. The FE worked because CQ development was developed, identified and tracked through the students’ work during the travel and tourism undergraduate course, in particular, through the FE instructional intervention.

**Question 2: What is an Instructional Intervention that Has the Potential to Achieve the Pedagogical Goal?**

The instructional intervention used to facilitate the students’ metacognitive and CQ processes was a scaffolding case study. Case studies are an ideal medium for deep learning as they present all the qualities deep learning calls for, which are: “1) authentic, real-world and relevant; 2) constructive, sequential and interlinked; 3) require students to use and engage with
progressively higher order cognitive processes; 4) are all aligned with each other and the desired learning outcomes; and 5) provide challenge, interest and motivation to learn.” (Meyers & Nulty, 2009, p. 567).

The students in the travel and tourism class were assisted towards metacognition in two ways. First, through the gradual development of their case studies in three phases (hence the scaffolding of the case studies). Each phase presented the students with new and more challenging metacognitive steps. These steps were the following: Phase 1, the introduction of the case area and its intercultural characteristics; Phase 2, the identification and development of an intercultural travel and tourism incident; Phase 3, the re-organization and synthesis of the case studies, including the lessons learned. Second, the travel and tourism students worked on their cases in intense consultation with the instructor/researcher via the “prompts”, that is, using the cognitive apprenticeship technique of question and answer (Socratic Method). After each phase, the researcher/instructor returned the students’ cases with detailed suggestions regarding the areas which needed further development. In this way, the instructor/researcher and the students were able to check the status of these developments in subsequent phases. These dynamics facilitated the students and the instructor/researcher ‘thinking aloud’ processes, making their thinking visible (Grabinger & Dunlap, 2008, p. 12).

For the analysis and placement of the students CQ, the instructor/researcher followed the ‘tracks’ of these processes throughout the three phases of the scaffolding case studies and their edits and in conjunction with CQ development criteria. The students CQ levels were identified according to Gudykunst’s and Hofstede’s constructs and dimensions. The CQ aspects involved CQ both in reference to the case areas, their incidents, and the students themselves; for example, the students in this FE came from a high individualistic and low power distance environment.
Finally, the metacognitive and CQ processes were grouped for a final attribution of CQ level to the travel and tourism students’ work (lower, middle and higher CQ). To track and retrieve this process, the students were assigned a file marked by a number and a letter to protect their confidentiality in which the coding and memoing were stored. CQ levels did not automatically reflect the students’ grades. Although in many respects this happened—as the dynamics and logic of the design assume—it is nevertheless important to keep somewhat separate the two concepts. Using family as a metaphor, for example, husband and wife are intimately connected, but not genetically related.

*Question 3: What Factors in the Environment Enhance or Inhibit the Intervention’s Effectiveness in Achieving the Goal?*

This question raises issues of efficacy, and its answer identifies the lesson learned with this instructional intervention. The positive and negative factors that influenced the instructional intervention of this FE are often the two sides of the same medal and for this reason they will be discussed together.

The first factor, both positive and negative, was that the researcher and the instructor were the same person; on the positive side, the instructor/researcher was in a privileged position both for personal and professional background and for the rapport developed with the students. The negative side of this factor, though, was that bias had to be kept in check at all times by using skepticism and numerous convergent evidence processes during the data collection and analysis. The lesson learned in this regard is that in the future this FE should be carried out by a team of experts coming from different pedagogical and CQ areas. This team effort would contribute to a much richer and balanced assessment of the design and its results, without taking
away anything from the special rapport established between the instructor and the class, as the instructor would still be the same one throughout the FE.

The second positive and negative factor of the instructional intervention was its holism. The comprehensiveness of the instructional intervention made it approximate and deep at the same time. It was approximate, for example, because the scaffolding case study design was rather “messy” and “serendipitous”. It was approximate also because the convergent evidence processes produced approximate results. Yet, the instructional intervention was also deep for the same reasons, as the ‘messiness’ of the scaffolding case studies allowed insights otherwise difficult to achieve (for example, in the way the travel and tourism students re-organized their cases from one phase to the next). The lesson learned with this aspect of the instructional intervention is the acceptance of future results as welcomed regardless of whether they corroborate or not this FE. The positive feature of this stand point is that universals may be further identified, while particulars will become more understandable and resolvable, all for the benefit of future designs.

The third positive and negative factor of the instructional intervention was its complexity and simplicity. The instructional intervention had to compromise between very articulate dynamics such as those that trigger metacognitive and CQ development and the need to categorize their outcomes, such as channeling CQ development into “lower”, “middle”, and “higher” CQ levels. The lesson learned with this feature of the instructional intervention is that if the classification used in this FE is not found satisfactory for future designs, it may be refined and improved, or perhaps even changed altogether.

Lastly, the instructional intervention was both reasonable and impractical. It was reasonable because it made sense. The rationale that guided this FE was supported by well-
established theories and by practical needs, as the literature suggested (see Chapter II). On the other hand, the instructional intervention, and the FE as a whole, were also impractical because of the extensive and yet approximate data collection and analysis processes. The lesson learned for this feature relates to the lesson learned regarding the instructor and researcher being the same person, and reinforces the suggestion made to increase the FE resources with the involvement of more researchers.

*Question 4: How Can the Intervention and its Implementation be Modified during the Experiment to Achieve the Goal More Effectively?*

This question was addressed during the unfolding of the FE, and the modifications which took place reflect the lessons learned throughout the semester-long design. In particular, the mini-cycles of the FE were adjusted, while the macro-cycles were left untouched to maintain the syllabus consistent. For example, the guidelines for the three phases of the case study were designed, distributed and instructed in different ways, and at different times, after different events took place for each phase. The guidelines for Phase 2, for instance, were discussed in a focus group much earlier than the guidelines for Phase 1 were, because the post-first phase discussion revealed the need to address the guidelines weeks in advance.

Modifications to the instructional intervention (and the FE) raise also issues of possible broader impacts in that, if and when this FE will be repeated, many aspects will need fine-tuning to make it more effective. One change, for example, would consist of the shedding of excessive course material that appeared too cumbersome in the case studies guidelines. This aspect detracted from the FE effectiveness. Other modifications should include: a different researcher or team of researchers contribution to the FE, not only for a limited section, as it happened in this dissertation research, but during the entire FE. With another researcher’s complete contribution,
bias would be reduced further. Also, the narrowing and strengthening of the case incidents would help the students metacognitive and CQ development by eliminating overwhelming and often distracting challenges. In the scaffolding case study, the identification from scratch of the travel and tourism case incidents was a useful, but hard lesson for the students. Making their case incidents more stringent would help reduce frustration, confusion, and ineffectiveness on their part. For example, the case incident could have the requirement of being a “petit” incident, that is, a small event such as a difficult intercultural encounter between two individuals in a travel and tourism context. A “grand” incident often placed the students in front of a daunting task, as the scaffolding case studies analysis revealed.

Question 5: Has the Educational Environment Changed as a Result of the Intervention?

For what was observable during the FE, the educational environment changed mostly through the rapport that developed between the students and the instructor/researcher. Here are some excerpts from the instructor/researcher’s journal; they show the perceived changes throughout the semester:

CLASS 7 – Monday, January 25, 2010

I also invite whoever needs more clarifications or needs to discuss what case they would want to address after class or to email me. However, nobody stays after class nor emails me.

CLASS 16 – Monday, February 15, 2010

At times I ask the students for some inputs and they comply, but it seems to me that they would just rather stay anonymous and listen rather than talk.

CLASS 40 – Wednesday, April 21, 2010
Today it was our last formal day in class. We had quiz 10 on chapter 16 with open books. Almost the entire class was there to take the quiz. The atmosphere was very upbeat and the students willing to chat a lot. I had a hard time keeping them quiet once finished to let those who didn’t finish in peace. Many stayed after to talk about their case studies 3.

In particular, (student A) asked about Gudykunst. (Student B) a bit of everything; she seemed like she just wanted to chat. (Student C) asked how to use chapter 13 in her case study. (Student D) asked about the guidelines and I stressed to read them carefully. (Student E) reiterated the guidelines with me, almost embarrassed to ask again, but I encouraged her. (Student F) wanted clarifications about the difference between case 2 and 3, especially in reference to Hofstede and Gudykunst and wanted to be assured that they were not suitable for the part called “Introduction”. (Student H) asked briefly about Hofstede and Gudykunst for his case incident. And, finally, (Student I) lost his corrected case 2 so I made an extra copy for him.

Also, the students expressed a positive rapport development through their course evaluations. An example follows:

“(The instructor) had us think of examples in our lives or in the news to compare what we learned in class from our books. It made learning the material much more relevant and useful.”

The educational environment of this FE changed for the better because of the instructional intervention design with the scaffolding case study, and in particular because of the rapport developed between the students and the instructor with the application of the cognitive apprenticeship technique. Such elements of the instructional intervention should not change,
unless important and unforeseen reasons would emerge requiring their changing, and only after careful consideration.

*Question 6: What Unanticipated Positive or Negative Effects Does the Intervention Produce?*

The effects of the intervention have been addressed in the Results and Discussion chapter and in the previous paragraphs of this chapter. What is relevant in answering this question is the adjective “unanticipated”, because it captures the nature of the FE and of the instructional intervention. Despite the detailed and painstaking design, still a FE and its intervention are unpredictable. To use a horse race metaphor, it is like raising, nurturing, and training a race horse, but then—at the time of the race—anything can happen. Even though conducting a FE is not a matter of winning or losing a competition, like a horse race is, there are still elements that may contribute to victory or loss, to accomplishment or failure. In this FE, the horse maintained its middle grounds, and finished the race; that is, this FE produced cautiously encouraging results.

The scaffolding case study showed the ability to help students develop CQ during a regular travel and tourism class. Also, the convergent evidence processes showed cautiously corroborating results. The ICSI analysis was satisfactory, given the small sample and the nature of the items which emerged as statistically significant; the Preliminary FE reinforced this observation by showing that a larger sample produced more significant results. The Alternative ICSI results reinforced the quality of the statistical readings of the ICSI, and supported the students CQ development in more detail, and also in connection to their scaffolding case studies. The instructor/researcher’s ‘detailed’ analysis in conjunction with the ‘summative’ analysis is more suspect, because the instructor/research was the same person making both analyses. In terms of correspondence with the instructor/researcher analysis, the graduate student’s cross-
checking ‘summative’ analysis yielded an overall accuracy of over a third; greater resources are needed to clarify these last aspects of the convergent evidence processes.

Implications

From the conclusions described above, the following implications are conceivable:

- The identification of an instructional intervention that facilitates the travel and tourism students CQ development in regular travel and tourism classes. This process does not conflict with and is not privileged over the accepted practice of longer and more specific periods of education and training and living abroad experiences; the scope of this study was to find an alternative way, not a better way to acquire CQ.

- The travel and tourism students CQ development can be not only identified, but also tracked. Instead of capturing CQ solely through ‘single shots’ as most assessment tools do, for example through pre and post survey testing (see Paige, 2004 for an extensive review), with this FE, the travel and tourism students CQ development is observed and recorded on a continuum, from the beginning until the end of the intervention. This implication facilitates a deeper and more holistic understanding of CQ acquisition dynamics within an educational setting.

- The instructional intervention becomes available in travel and tourism programs (and perhaps in other programs), while opening the possibility for further refinement and also for the consolidation of CQ education and training in travel and tourism programs.

- Future research should focus on improving the pedagogy introduced with this dissertation, in particular on refining educational practices in travel and tourism and in other academic programs for the educational goals they intend to achieve.
• The travel and tourism industry will hire better prepared employees, improving the overall quality of service, and that travel and tourism graduates will market themselves better when looking for employment.

• The travel and tourism industry as a whole will achieve higher standards of performance for globalization is intensifying and international travel is on the rise.

Final Remarks: So What?

Based on this FE outcomes, and based on the literature on intercultural education and training in travel and tourism university programs, this research suggests that travel and tourism departments and schools should incorporate systemic and comprehensive CQ education and training in their programs to prepare their students for the challenges of the 21st century. “That intercultural training is valuable for tourism studies seems like a no-brainer” was the opening statement that the National Science Foundation used to justify its rejection of the fellowship proposal made in support of this dissertation project (NSF, 2008). Because CQ education and training should be both an obvious and important component of travel and tourism educational programs, CQ is misunderstood and downplayed as being learnable almost unconsciously along the travel and tourism curriculum while attending to other courses. This paradox makes CQ education and training even harder to implement as a distinct discipline in travel and tourism university programs.

Trends show that globalization, increased interdependence and increased conflicts are irreversible (Reisinger, 2009). Few disciplines taught in universities both in the United States and abroad are more justified to increase the internationalization of their programs than the travel and tourism discipline, with CQ education and training at the forefront of instruction:
In 2011 the better educated will control 60.1% of all new jobs; by 2015, the projection rises to 66.4%, and that’s even after construction bounces back. It’s most evidence that America is facing a bifurcated employment future. At the top end is a highly educated, technically competent workforce attuned to the demands of the global marketplace…” (Emphasis added) (Saporito, 2011, p. 32).

The White Paper of the Tourism Education Futures Initiative (TEFI) (2009) indicated that travel and tourism educators must take the responsibility to teach cutting edge curricula to their students, to prepare them for travel and tourism careers that are available in the industry today and in the future. Curricular enhancement in CQ education and training for travel and tourism students, as suggested in this dissertation, fits appropriately in this new movement of travel and tourism educators. The travel and tourism academic institutions must prepare their students for these challenges.
APPENDIX A

Course Syllabus

PRTM 447
Perspectives on International Travel
Spring 2010
Credit Hours: 3
11:15-12:05
Room 246 Lehotsky Hall

Dr. Kenneth Backman
288 Lehotsky Hall
Email: frank@clemson.edu
Office Phone: 656-2204
Electronic Office Hours:

TA: Cinzia Cross
137 Lehostky Hall
Email: cinziac@clemson.edu
Office Hours: Fri. 1:00-2:00
or by appointment

In PRTM 447 perspectives on international travel and tourism, particularly cultural differences among international tourist markets, will be explored and discussed. Special emphasis will be placed on the identification of similarities and differences among international tourists, as well as locals and decision-makers in different countries. As Dr. Reisinger, author of our textbook puts it, “This book should be a loud wake-up call for those who underestimate the significance of cultural differences in tourism…This book is also a hard hit at those who operate with preconceived cultural assumptions, or form their own cultural perspective.” (p. xxvii)

COURSE OBJECTIVES

This course will help students…

* understand the impact of globalization on international travel and culture;
* understand intercultural theories;
* make connections between theory and practice in the field of international travel and tourism;
* realize that cross-cultural awareness, sensitivity and competency are essential for successful international travel and tourism practices.
COURSE CONTENT

This course examines international travel and tourism from both theoretical and practical perspectives. The study of international travel and tourism has utility for students who plan to have a career in the travel and tourism sector. It is important that different stakeholders within the industry (state institutions, business owners, tourism marketers, service employees and even travelers and tourists) understand international travel and tourism perspectives and their ramifications. Research that explores international travel and tourism perspectives can be used to develop sound travel and tourism policy and better travel and tourism products.

The course will explore a wide array of themes and issues related to international travel and tourism. To start we will explore what Globalization means in travel and tourism and what its challenges and benefits are. Then, cultural diversity and cultural influences and their importance in the world of travel and tourism will be addressed. The theories and practices that help bridge cultural divides will be studied and tourist behaviors better understood from a cross-cultural perspective. Finally, we should appreciate cross-cultural scenarios in international travel and tourism with improved intercultural competence.

Plus additional readings at the discretion of the instructor.

GRADING

A tentative list of class assignments and their grading weights is attached. There are no absolutely right or wrong answers for most of the assignments. Grading will be based on the following criteria:

1. The rationale and logic used to justify the decision;
2. The use of supporting evidence;
3. Originality;
4. Depth:
5. Quality of presentation – spelling, typographical correctness, neatness, format, grammar, etc.

Greater reward will be given to initiative and creativity rather than to pedantic thinking. Deep learning versus surface learning—being much more valuable for your academic advancement—encourages you to approach this class as an opportunity for growth and not for the simple fulfillment of requirements. It is expected that all work submitted will represent the highest standard of which you are capable. It is essential that you carefully proofread your work. Spelling, typographical, and grammatical errors detract from your credibility. Similarly, the standard of presentation is important, for others also use this as a means of forming an impression of your abilities.

Final grades for the course will be based on the following scale and points:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>177 or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVALUATION and TENTATIVE DATES**

1. **2 TESTS: 100 points**
   
   Both tests are essay based. The essay questions will be drawn from the “Discussion Points and Questions” sections at the end of the book chapters. Make up tests are an option only for exceptional and documented circumstances.

   a) **Midterm** (50 points); On Wednesday, **February 17**.
   
   b) **Final non-cumulative** (50 points). On the day of scheduled semester final exams: Tuesday, **April 27 @ 8:00-10:30 a.m.** in Room 246, Lehotsky Hall.

2. **3 CASE STUDIES: 100 points**
The case studies are cumulative, that is, given a list of several cases, you will choose the one you want and then build 3 different levels of analysis in its regards. Guidelines will be provided separately.

a) 1\textsuperscript{st} case study: stage 1 (33 points); due on Friday, February 5.
b) 2\textsuperscript{nd} case study: stage 2 (33 points); due on Friday, March 5.
c) 3\textsuperscript{rd} case study: stage 3 (34 points); due on Friday, April 16.

3. **10 QUIZZES: 100 points**

Each quiz is 10 points and it takes place on Wednesdays, beginning on Wednesday, January 20\textsuperscript{th}. If you miss a Wednesday (and a quiz), you can make it up the following class day at 8:00 a.m., provided that you document the reason for your absence (for ex. if you could not come to class on a Wednesday, then you show your documented absence and take the quiz the coming Friday at 8:00 a.m. in the TA’s office). If you have a class conflict, please make different arrangements with the instructor. Finally, if for flexibility reasons the total number of quizzes will be different than 10, the grade will still be based on 100 points total. Quizzes will have no fixed form; they may consist of multiple choice questions, essay questions, definitions questions and so on.

**COURSE POLICIES**

All assignments are due at the dates indicated in the course outline. Assignments will be devalued as follows:

20\% if handed prior to 4:30 p.m. on the due date. Please leave your assignment in the TA’s mail box.

35\% if handed the following day by 9:30 a.m. Please leave your assignment in the TA’s mail box. After the devaluation of 35\% of the day following the due date, the assignments are no longer accepted.

**DISABILITY STATEMENT**

115
It is the policy of Clemson University to provide appropriate accommodations to any student with a documented disability. If you have need for accommodation in this course, please make an appointment to see the instructor at your earliest convenience.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

“As members of the Clemson University community we have inherited Thomas Green Clemson’s vision of this institution as a ‘high seminary of learning’. Fundamental to this vision is a mutual commitment to truthfulness, honor, and responsibility, without which we cannot earn the trust and respect of others. Furthermore, we recognize that academic dishonesty detracts from the value of a Clemson degree. Therefore, we shall not tolerate lying, cheating, or stealing in any form”.

Avoid:

(A) Acquiring information in the following ways:

1. Acquiring answers for any assigned work or examination from any unauthorized source.

2. Working with another person or persons on any assignment or examination when not specifically permitted by the instructor. It is expected that the case studies in this class will be done independently by each student. The assignments should be entirely your own work.

3. Observing the work of other students during any examination or quiz.

(B) Providing information in the following ways:

1. Providing answers to any assigned work or examination or quiz when not specifically authorized to do so.

2. Informing any person or persons of the contents of any examination or quiz prior to the time the examination is given.

Plagiarism:

This class defines plagiarism as the copying of ideas, organization, wording or anything else from another source without appropriate reference or acknowledgement so that it appears to be one’s own work. This includes published and unpublished work, the Internet and the work of other students and staff.
*Any problems of academic integrity on an individual assignment will result in a student being given and “F” grade for the whole course.

COURSE OVERVIEW

Week 1-4: PART 1 and 2; International Tourism: The Global Environment, and Cultural Theories and Practices
CHAPTER 1: Globalization, tourism and culture
CHAPTER 2: Cultural diversity
CHAPTER 3: Intercultural theories
CHAPTER 4: Cultural practices and tourism impacts on culture

Week 5-11: PART 3; Culture and Cultural Differences,
CHAPTER 5: Culture
CHAPTER 6: Cultural variability
CHAPTER 7: Cultural influences on intercultural communication
CHAPTER 8: Cultural influences on social interaction
CHAPTER 9: Cultural influences on rules of social interaction
CHAPTER 10: Cultural influences on service
CHAPTER 11: Cultural influences on ethics

Week 12-14: PART 4, 5 and 6; Tourist Behavior, Cross-Cultural Comparison, and Multicultural Competence
CHAPTER 12: Human behavior: its nature and determinants
CHAPTER 13: Consumer buying behavior
CHAPTER 14: Cultural influences on tourist buying behavior
CHAPTER 15: Cultural differences among international societies
CHAPTER 16: Multicultural competence in a global world
**Important dates:**

Wednesdays = weekly quizzes

Fridays at 8 a.m. = make up quizzes only for accepted Wednesdays’ absences

Feb. 5 = 1\textsuperscript{st} case study due

Feb. 17 = Midterm exam

March 5 = 2\textsuperscript{nd} case study due

\textit{March 15-19 = Spring Break}

Apr. 16 = 3\textsuperscript{rd} case study due

Apr. 27 = Final exam
APPENDIX B

Scaffolding Case Study Guidelines

Case Studies

General guidelines for all three case studies:

1. Choose from the following list a case study topic that you will pursue during the semester in three stages of inquiry. At the end of the semester you will be an “expert” in your case, while you will have developed also the intercultural skills necessary to address different scenarios from the one you currently chose.

2. If you have a particular case study topic that you would like to pursue and that is not in the list, talk to your instructor about it. Based on your information, the instructor will decide whether your proposed case is valid for the purpose of this course.

3. The list of brainstorming questions refers to tourism practices even when this is not mentioned explicitly. Remember to stay on track and do not begin talking about other topics which are not directly informing the tourism sector.

4. The abbreviation c.a. stands for “case area” and refers to your specific case study.

5. The last 1-2 pages for each case study shall cover the process you engaged in while developing your case and its research. You will entitle this section “Research Process Development: stages and insights for my case study”.

6. Use APA style for your case studies and use between a minimum of 10 to a maximum of 20 pages (double spaced, references excluded) for each case (for a total of minimum 30 to maximum 60 pages for the three case studies combined, references excluded).

List of Case Studies:

119
Specific guidelines for 1st case study:

These guidelines cover Part 1 and 2 in your textbook (chapter 1, 2, 3 and 4). These two parts instruct you for the first level of analysis your case study will reach. Use the textbook and the additional material your instructor provides to assist you in your research. In particular, use the following brainstorming questions as a way to guide your inquiry through your 1st case study.
You need not follow any particular order, but make sure you address all the topics mentioned in systematic, and clear way. Finally, do not only discuss the WHAT or WHY, but also the HOW things happen when it helps in understanding your case.

Brainstorming questions for 1st case study:

Provide the background information for your c.a. in such detail as necessary for the reader to understand the development of your case study based on answers to the following questions:

- How does your c.a. express its cultural background and cultural diversity? For example, describe its ethnic, linguistic, religious, traditional, geographical, social, economic, political fabric, including anything you find relevant for the case study (for example, food, customs, dress, attractions, etc.).
- How does the cultural background of your c.a. influence its tourism practices and how do tourism practices influence the culture of your c.a.?
- What types of tourists visit your c.a.?
- What types of tourism attractions and structures does your c.a. currently offer?
- Are the 11 fundamental articles of UNESCO’s Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity observed in tourism practices in your c.a.?
- How does globalization affect tourism practices in your c.a.?
- What are the benefits and the criticisms that globalization brings to your c.a.?
- Are there any other indications of a move towards globalized forms of tourism in your c.a.? If yes, describe them.
- What are the general reactions of the local cultures in your c.a. towards globalization?
• In your c.a. are there trends towards one or more of the following: commoditization, homogenization, heterogenization, convergence, disappearance, divergence, glocalization, hybridization of the local cultures in relation to globalizing forces?

• In your c.a. are there trends of cultural diffusion, borrowing, drifting, acculturation, on either side of the tourism paradigm (hosts, guests)?

• Is cultural adaptation, adjustment, assimilation or even enculturation taking place to a significant extent in your c.a.?

• Are the c.a. products becoming more standardized or customized?

• Are the local artifacts artistically stagnating or evolving?

• Are the experiences provided in your c.a. “authentic” or “staged”?

• Are the relations between tourists and locals marked by hostility, arrogance or other types of emotions?

• Is the demonstration effect an issue in your c.a.?

• Are there cultural conflicts taking place with reference to tourism practices in your c.a.?

• What are the future challenges your c.a. will face in terms of globalizing tourism practices?

• Review the intercultural theories of chapter 3 and together with the instruction provided in class on Hofstede’s and Gudykunst’s theories, prepare an outline of the dimensions in these theories that appear to equip your c.a. with the most effective intercultural instruments for the achievement of successful tourism practices in the future years.

PRTM 447: Case Study 2

Students who wrote the “Research Process Development: stages and insights for my case study” for Case Study 1:
Students who **DID NOT WRITE** the “Research Process Development: stages and insights for my case study” for Case Study 1:

- Write the “Research Process Development: stages and insights for my case study” paragraph for Case Study 1. Insert this paragraph in the original Case Study 1 paper and upload it on Blackboard and email your instructor to inform him/her about your upload. This correction will improve your grade for Case Study 1.

---

**GUIDELINES FOR CASE STUDY 2**

1. If you have any questions and/or doubts as far as the feedback given by your instructor on your Case Study 1, don’t hesitate to ask as soon as possible for clarifications;

2. Make the revisions/improvements marked in red in your Case Study 1;

3. Add anything to your Case Study 1 that you believe necessary to enhance your research;

4. Write a new paragraph *entitled*, “Case Study Incident”. In this section you will present a real incident that you have researched and that happened for your case area (c.a.). The incident will have involved a problem in *travel, tourism and intercultural competence*;

5. Incorporate the “Case Study Incident” paragraph in the corrected and revised Case Study 1, which becomes **Case Study 2**; incorporate this paragraph in the text where you consider it to be the most suitable place;

6. Provide citations for your “Case Study Incident” in the text with sources which will be added also in your reference list (the original reference list of Case Study 1);

7. Also for Case Study 2, remember to stay on track and do not begin talking about other topics which are not directly informing the travel and tourism sector;
8. In modification # 7 of the original case studies guidelines, your Case Study 2 will consist of a different page requirement: there is a minimum of 5 pages extra (references excluded) for the Case Study Incident paragraph alone + any other additional text you may need to add to make the improvements suggested in red in Case Study 1;

9. The last paragraph for Case Study 2 (which is independent from the minimum of 5 pages requirement for the Case Study Incident paragraph) shall cover the process you engaged in while developing your Case Study 2 You will entitle this section “Research Process Development: stages and insights for my case study 2”. For this last paragraph you need not include the one you wrote for Case Study 1, because this is a different stage/research;

10. Finally, also for Case Study 2 we still encourage you to not only discuss the WHAT and/or WHY, but also the HOW things happen to help us understand your case.

ELABORATION OF YOUR CASE STUDY INCIDENT

From Dictionary.com, ELABORATE: planned or executed with painstaking attention to numerous parts or details

The intercultural theories based on Hofstede’s and Gudykunst’s research will be the foundation for the elaboration of your Case Study Incident. That is, your Case Study Incident will be explained in reference to the constructs introduced by both Hofstede and Gudykunst. Part 3 in your textbook (chapter 5-11) will serve as the catalyst to structure your new section (From dictionary.com CATALYST means: a person or thing that precipitates an event or change: ex:
His imprisonment by the government served as the catalyst that helped transform social unrest into revolution.

Refer to the appropriate topics discussed in the following chapters to prepare your Case Study Incident. DO NOT SKIP ANY CHAPTER, you will find some topics in each one of them that will apply to your case incident:

Chapter 5: Culture

- Concepts, elements and characteristics of culture
- Types and levels of culture
- Subcultures
- National culture, nationality, country of residence and country of birth
- Cultural identity
- Concept and measurement of cultural distance

Chapter 6: Cultural Variability

- Main sources of cultural differences
- Value system and value orientation
- Types and measurements of values
- Value dimensions
- Major cultural differences in values among international communities

Chapter 7: Cultural Influences on Intercultural Communication

- Concept of communication
- Influence of culture on communication
- Cultural differences in communication
• Ethnocentrism, stereotyping, and their influences on communication
• Intercultural communication strategies
• Ethical dilemmas in intercultural communication

Chapter 8: Cultural Influences on Social Interaction
• Concept, purpose and major features of social interaction
• Social interaction in tourism: types and determining factors
• Intercultural social interaction: dimensions and types
• Models of social interaction in a cross-cultural context
• Contact hypothesis and its outcomes
• Difficulties associated with intercultural interaction
• Culture shock: types, symptoms and phases

Chapter 9: Cultural Influences on Rules of Social Interaction
• Rules of social behavior
• Types of rules of social behavior
• Influence of culture on rules of social behavior
• Consequences of breaking the social rules
• Cultural differences in social rules

Chapter 10: Cultural Influence on Service
• Service, service quality and satisfaction with service
• Role and importance of cultural influences on service
• Cultural differences in service perception among various nations
Chapter 11: Cultural Influences on Ethics

- Ethics and ethical behavior
- Importance of ethics in tourism
- Ethics in a cross-cultural context
- Cultural influences on ethical behavior
- Business ethical issues
- Main conflicting ethical behavior practices and ethical dilemmas
- Ethical theories and frameworks dealing with ethical dilemmas
- Strategies for managing ethical dilemmas
- Global Code of Ethics in Tourism

For your reference and convenience, here are the constructs from Hofstede and Gudykunst:

**Hofstede’s 5 dimensions:**

High-Low masculinity/femininity

High-Low power distance

High-Low individualism/collectivism

High-Low uncertainty avoidance

Long-Short term orientation
Gudykunst’s constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual</th>
<th>Functional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs;</td>
<td>Of more than one perspective;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-conceptions;</td>
<td>Of alternative interpretations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Bonds;</td>
<td>Of similarities and differences;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction;</td>
<td>Expectations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty and Anxiety</td>
<td>Shared Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Variability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRTM 447: Last Chance for Case Study 2

Students who DID NOT WRITE the “Research Process Development: stages and insights for my case study 2” for Case Study 2:

Write the “Research Process Development: stages and insights for my case study 2” paragraph for Case Study 2. Insert this paragraph in your Case Study 2 paper and email the completed Case Study 2 to your instructor. This correction will improve your grade for Case Study 2.

Students who wrote the “Research Process Development: stages and insights for my case study 2” for Case Study 2:

IGNORE THE PREVIOUS PARAGRAPH AND GO STRAIGHT TO THE GUIDELINES FOR CASE STUDY 3.

GUIDELINES FOR CASE STUDY 3
11. If you have any questions and/or doubts as far as the feedback given by your instructor on your Case Study 2, don’t hesitate to ask as soon as possible for clarifications;

12. Make the revisions/improvements marked in red in your Case Study 2, including the missing changes to Case Study 1;

13. Add anything to your Case Study 2 that you believe necessary to enhance your research;

14. Incorporate Gudykunst’s theories and constructs’ applications in the corrected and revised Case Study 2, which becomes Case Study 3.

15. Reshape your Case Study 3 in 3 parts (you can keep subheadings if you wish):
   A) an Introduction (write “Introduction”) (that should mostly include your Case Study 1 information);
   B) a Body of the paper (write the title you want to give to this section) (that should mostly include your Case Study incident + the material from chapters 12, 13 and 14 in your textbook); and
   C) a Conclusion (write “Conclusions”) (that should mostly include material from chapter 16 in your textbook);

16. Update citations for your Case Study 3 (both in text and in the Reference list) in APA style;

17. Also for Case Study 3, remember to stay on track and do not begin talking about other topics which are not directly informing the travel and tourism sector;
18. After the Conclusion paragraph of your Case Study 3 another, **SEPARATE** paragraph shall cover the process you engaged in while developing your Case Study 3. You will entitle this section “Research Process Development: stages and insights for my case study 3”. For this last paragraph you need not include the ones you wrote for Case Study 1 and/or 2, because this is a different stage/research (the last one, HOPEFULLY!!!);

19. Finally, also for Case Study 3 you are strongly encouraged to not only discuss the **WHAT** and/or **WHY**, but also the **HOW** things happen to help us understand your case.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**ELABORATION OF YOUR CASE STUDY 3**

*From Dictionary.com, ELABORATE: planned or executed with painstaking attention to numerous parts or details*

The communication theories based on Gudykunst’s research will be the foundation for the elaboration of your Case Study 3. Gudykunst’s constructs will be interwoven into the fabric of your Case Study 3 together with Hofstede’s 5 intercultural dimensions. That is, your Case Study 3 will develop in reference to the constructs introduced by Gudykunst and applied to Hofstede’s dimensions that pertain to your Case Study.

Part 4 in your textbook (chapter 12-14) and Part 6 (chapter 16) will be added as catalyst to structure your Case Study 3 (From dictionary.com CATALYST means: a person or thing that precipitates an event or change: ex: *His imprisonment by the government served as the catalyst that helped transform social unrest into revolution*).
Refer to the appropriate topics discussed in the following chapters to further improve your Case Study 3. DO NOT SKIP ANY CHAPTER, you will find some topics in each one of them that will apply to your Case Study:

**Chapter 12: Human Behavior**

- Concepts of human behavior
- Environmental factors influencing human behavior
- Theories of human behavior
- Needs of human behavior
- Nature of tourist behavior
- Importance of understanding tourist behavior in a cross-cultural context

**Chapter 13: Consumer (Buying) Behavior (extended to tourist/host behaviors in general as talked about it in class)**

- Environmental factors
- Buyer’s factors

**Chapter 14: Cultural Influences on Tourist (Buying) Behavior (same comment as for chapter 13)**

- Cultural influences on tourist/host (buyer)’s personal characteristics
- Cultural influences on tourist/host (buyer)’s psychological characteristics
- Cultural influences on tourist/host (buyer)’s decision process
Chapter 16: Multicultural Competence in a Global World

- Concept of multicultural competence
- Domains of multicultural competence
- Other factors influencing multicultural competence
- Multicultural competence as a process
- Multicultural competence development levels

FOR YOUR REFERENCE AND CONVENIENCE, HERE ARE GUDYKUNST’S CONSTRUCTS AND HOFSTEDE’S DIMENSIONS:

### Gudykunst’s constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual</th>
<th>Functional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs; Self-conceptions; Social Bonds; Attraction; Openness to new Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hofstede’s 5 dimensions:

- Cultural Variability
- Uncertainty and Anxiety
- Power Distance
- Individualism/Collectivism
- Masculinity/Femininity
High-Low masculinity/femininity
High-Low power distance
High-Low individualism/collectivism
High-Low uncertainty avoidance
Long-Short term orientation
Confidentiality Statement

Risks and discomforts

There are certain risks or discomforts associated with this research. They include a small privacy risk inherent with transmitting and storing survey data on computers. Data will be kept on a secure web server, and survey results will be aggregated to protect privacy before release, removing any personal identifiers such as your name, address, or phone number that you may voluntarily provide. The researchers have every expectation of full effectiveness of security measures. Only individuals directly involved in this study will have access to the survey data.

Potential benefits

This study has the potential to help improve the intercultural learning experience for students in the field of travel, tourism, and hospitality, by helping teachers and administrators improve the intercultural training program at Clemson and other Universities.

Protection of confidentiality

We will do everything we can to protect your privacy. Your answers to survey questions are strictly confidential. No record level data will be released. No data will be shared in any individually identifiable way. Your privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from the survey.
Voluntary participation

Your participation in this research study is voluntary. You may choose not to participate and you may withdraw your consent to participate at any time. You will not be penalized in any way should you decide not to participate or to withdraw from this study.

Contact information

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, or if any problems arise, please send an email to Cinzia Cross at cinziac@clemson.edu or telephone at (864) 656-2739. If you have any questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Clemson University Office of Research Compliance at (864) 656-6460.

Thank you again for your participation.

QUESTIONS PRIOR TO COMPLETING THE SURVEY

Instructions: STUDENT TRACKING N.________________

Please, follow this format:

1) Read and reflect on the following questions;

2) Fill out the intercultural sensitivity survey.

Questions for reflection:

1. Why is it important to be interculturally sensitive?

2. Reflect on your past experience, in particular on 1 or more incidents in which you acted sensitively in intercultural contexts.

3. Reflect on your past experience, in particular on 1 or more incidents in which you did not act sensitively in intercultural contexts.

4. What are the situations in which you find it difficult to be interculturally sensitive? Why is it so? How can you change to be interculturally sensitive in these contexts?
5. Why is becoming interculturally sensitive a challenge?

6. If you had unlimited resources, how would you prepare yourself to become an interculturally sophisticated global professional?

**Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory**

**PART ONE**

There is no right or wrong answer. Please follow the instructions carefully.

Imagine you are living in the U.S. and want to develop your career in the UNITED STATES.

Indicate your response to the following statements on the seven point scale of ‘STRONGLY DISAGREE’ to ‘STRONGLY AGREE’.

1) __ When I disagree with a group, I would allow a conflict in the group to remain, rather than change my own stance on important issues.

2) __ I would offer my seat in a bus to my supervisor.

3) __ I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people with whom I work.

4) __ I enjoy developing long-term relationships among the people with whom I work.

5) __ I am very modest when talking about my own accomplishments.

6) __ When I give gifts to people whose cooperation I need in my work, I feel I am indulging in questionable behavior.

7) __ If I want my subordinates to perform a task, I tell the person that my superiors want me to get that task done.
8) ___ I prefer to give opinions that will help people save face rather than give a statement of truth.

9) ___ I say ‘no’ directly when I have to.

10) ___ I define the other person’s status by paying attention to name, gender, age, and other demographic attributes.

11) ___ To increase sales I would announce that the individual salesperson with the highest sales would be given the “Distinguished Salesperson” award.

12) ___ I enjoy being emotionally close to the people with whom I work.

13) ___ It is important to develop a network of people in my community who can help me out when I have tasks to accomplish.

14) ___ I enjoy feeling that I am looked upon as equal in worth to my superiors.

15) ___ I have respect for the authority figures with whom I interact.

16) ___ If I want a person to perform a certain task I try to show how the task will benefit others in the person’s group.

PART TWO

There is no right or wrong answer. Please follow the instructions carefully.

Imagine you are living in JAPAN and want to develop your career in the

JAPAN. Indicate your response to the following statements on the seven point scale of ‘STRONGLY DISAGREE’ to ‘STRONGLY AGREE’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disagree | Agree
1) __ When I disagree with a group, I would allow a conflict in the group to remain, rather than change my own stance on important issues.

2) __ I would offer my seat in a bus to my supervisor.

3) __ I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people with whom I work.

4) __ I enjoy developing long-term relationships among the people with whom I work.

5) __ I am very modest when talking about my own accomplishments.

6) __ When I give gifts to people whose cooperation I need in my work, I feel I am indulging in questionable behavior.

7) __ If I want my subordinates to perform a task, I tell the person that my superiors want me to get that task done.

8) __ I prefer to give opinions that will help people save face rather than give a statement of truth.

9) __ I say ‘no’ directly when I have to.

10) __ I define the other person’s status by paying attention to name, gender, age, and other demographic attributes.

11) __ To increase sales I would announce that the individual salesperson with the highest sales would be given the “Distinguished Salesperson” award.

12) __ I enjoy being emotionally close to the people with whom I work.

13) __ It is important to develop a network of people in my community who can help me out when I have tasks to accomplish.

14) __ I enjoy feeling that I am looked upon as equal in worth to my superiors.

15) __ I have respect for the authority figures with whom I interact.

16) __ If I want a person to perform a certain task I try to show how the task will benefit
others in the person’s group.

PART THREE

Indicate your response to the following statements on the seven point scale of ‘STRONGLY DISAGREE’ to ‘STRONGLY AGREE’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Neutral Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) ___ When I am living abroad, I assess situations as quickly as I do when I am living in my own country.

2) ___ I get upset when I do not get a letter, email or call from my close friend(s) for more than a month when I am living abroad.

3) ___ Given acceptable hygienic conditions, I would not mind if my children ate local food at school, when I am living in another country.

4) ___ I do not like to receive unannounced visitors at home.

5) ___ I do not like custom officers meddling with my baggage at the airport.

6) ___ We all have a right to hold different beliefs about God and religion.

7) ___ I do not like to meet foreigners.

8) ___ It is unusual for people to eat dogs.

9) ___ I decorate my home or office with artifacts from other countries.

10) ___ Culturally mixed marriages are wrong.

11) ___ A woman’s place, truly, is at home.

12) ___ I would not allow my subordinate to promote his nephew/her niece if there were
someone marginally better than him/her.

13) ___ Chinese influence is threatening to national identity of many Asian countries.

14) ___ While living abroad I spend most of my personal time with people from my own country.

**Please complete the last section:**

Have you already completed this questionnaire before?       Yes       No

Your age                   Your ethnicity
Your gender                Your major

*Thank you for completing this survey!*
APPENDIX D

Guest Speakers

1) January 22nd, 2010: An Italian professor of Economics, native of Venice who spoke about the impacts tourism has on the Venetian environment;

2) February 19, 2010: A Lybian Ph.D. student in travel and tourism who spoke about the cultural challenges the country faces in modernizing through tourism;

3) March 3rd, 2010: An American Disney company representative who talked about Disney’s internationalization’s efforts;

4) March 26th, 2010: A Costa Rican Ph.D. student in travel and tourism who spoke about her country’s cultural practices in tourism;

5) April 2nd, 2010: A visiting Geography professor from China who talked about cultural differences in spatial conceptions between the United States and China;

APPENDIX E

Instructor/Researcher’s Daily Journal

INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING IN PRTM STUDIES IN PRTM 447

Journal

Spring Semester 2010

CLASS 1 - Wednesday, Jan. 6/10

First day of class. Ken and I are both there. Ken leads the class. We distribute the syllabus and Ken explains most of the content. I explain the case studies procedures.

CLASS 2 – Friday, Jan. 8/10

Ken leads the class. I engage the students with a class activity on 4 different countries: Russia, Madagascar, Burundi and Brazil. The students are randomly assigned these countries at each table. They write down individually what they think they know about their country and then share with their table. Finally, we engage in a class sharing activity while I write on the board the major features students thought of. Ken assigns the students to write 3 facts on the country’s culture for next time.

CLASS 3 – Monday, Jan. 11/10

Ken cannot come to class and I teach the first chapter in Power Point. I also introduce the global village 12 power point to give the students a first perspective of the world’s proportions before approaching globalization, culture and tourism. I try to go systematically through the power points so that the students can refer easily for their studies on the text, but I also ask many questions and for examples. I give examples and move around the class a lot. At the end of class I collect the assignments on the 4 countries. About half of the class turns them in. The others will on Wednesday.
Ken has another meeting, so I teach class today again. Tony Chen takes up about 15 minutes to conduct a pilot study with the class. When he leaves we begin with two “mini case studies”, that is, short cases that I use to exemplify concepts we are learning. The first one regards the earthquake that struck Haiti yesterday. The second one is about the Chinese cadmium jewelry sold in the US. I ask the students to identify the global dimensions of these two cases in terms of the dimensions we talked about with the Power Point presentation, that is environmental, social, political, economic, cultural and technological dimensions. The students are rather clueless, at least as far as actively taking a vocal stance. I must prompt their responses and guide them pretty much step by step. But, at least, I seem to win their undivided attention. One girl, for example, was reading a book on Economics at the beginning, then, when I began reading over her shoulder out loud what she was reading and told her that seemed very interesting, she graciously stopped the out-of-task activity and paid attention until the end of class. The class flew so quickly by barely surfacing the two mini cases (using google earth and youtube also), that I did not have time to go over the last third of Chapter 1 in the power point slides. On the way out the students that still had not done so, gave me their assignments on the 4 countries. I feel really good in this class. Maybe I am overexcited, yet I feel like I have found my niche!

In the evening I reviewed their assignments and for each student I marked some questions that I will ask them to reply to on the same sheet of paper (a sort of informal communication back-and-forth game). I will have to address some “cut and paste” activity done especially through Wikipedia. I will also redress (after talking with Ken and
David) the case studies guidelines. I believe I should add a self-reflection component to help understand how the students progressed in their cases research.

CLASS 5 – Friday, January 15, 2010

Not surprisingly many students are absent today. I feel badly about this, because I give back their assignments with my comments and we use them as a way to establish our communication and expectations: it is a good opportunity for dialogue establishment. I do tell the present students that being absent on a Friday is a real shame, because most Fridays are going to be the best classes they will have. For example, I announce that Friday, January 22nd there will be a guest speaker from Venice, Italy.

As a mini case today, and to talk about the specifics of globalization in tourism, I ask the students to close their eyes and imagine a place they would like to badly visit. Then we share our choices. I ask them to close their eyes again and imagine not having internet, cell phones, satellite TV, credit cards, wide transportation choices, etc. They open their eyes rather puzzled and so I explain that this was the way people had to organize their travel up to about 20-30 years ago. In some countries it is still like this and in others not even close. That is globalization in tourism. We discuss the pros and cons of it and I encourage the students to see how they have been born in a globalized world, and—because of this—they need to be even more sensitive to all those that did not, like the baby boomers and those from emerging countries that are barely achieving technological advances now. I remind them that these are the people who will be the biggest segment in travel and tourism of the future.

I feel obligated to finish the Power Point for chapter 1, but I must admit that, even though I had all my notes for each slide, I am ill prepared to match the repetition of the
slides. This makes me realize that in the future Power Points, I will modify them and tailor them to my own class, instead of trying to do the other way around. I can still post on Blackboard the whole power points that go with the text, yet, I will tell the students that they may be slightly different from class presentation; probably this is a good thing, because it will alert the students that the typical print and go over the power point is not going to be so mechanical and unprocessed any more.

CLASS 6 – Friday, January 22, 2010

Monday and Wednesday we did not have class. Monday was Martin Luther King’s holiday and Wednesday it was the PRTM career fair. It has been a whole week that we have not seen each other, and today we have our guest speaker from Italy. All this was announced through email on Blackboard. I urged the students to prepare good questions for our speaker.

Quite a bit of students showed up for class. Some asked about assignments and I told them we would address them next Monday. The presentation went very well. Aside from a group of 3 students in the front who were on and off at times by doodling on a paper, the majority of the class and of the time were well versed into the topic of Venice facing many challenges with the presence of tourism. I videotaped the session with everyone’s consent. The last ten minutes were dedicated to questions and I was grateful to see that the students had several and they were good questions as well. I took note of those who did ask questions. I will process the details of the exchange once I get the video back and in the journal section dedicated to the video segments.
One last thing. One student sent an email afterwards to show appreciation for this presentation and saying he was looking forward to the next ones. I forwarded the email to both the guest speaker and Dr. Backman.

CLASS 7 – Monday, January 25, 2010

Today Ken comes to class and we cover chapter 2. First, we remind the students about quiz 1 on Wednesday, then I give back the 4 countries papers to those who were absent on the 15th and then I go over the case studies’ guidelines, with Ken’s reinforcement. The initial reaction of many students is rather shocked regarding the page requirement (min 10-max 20 pages, references excluded). Some of the students have questions and seem quite uneasy with the task ahead of them. They seem to be confused about the topics they may choose. The major difficulty is to establish first of all that by “case study” we mean that the students will create the case study and then address it. The students, instead, thought that they would be provided with an already prepared case study that they would have to solve. After a few repetitions, I decide to give them an example with the Tunisia case study I used in the fall 2009 for the Pilot Study. This example seems to help clarify a lot what the students may do. I also invite whoever needs more clarifications or needs to discuss what case they would want to address after class or to email me. However, nobody stays after class nor emails me. Ken has the good idea to suggest a sign-up sheet to be passed around on Friday, Jan. 29th so that all the students must know by then what case they wish to cover. I feel good about this; it will give us an idea of what the students want to do, and also gives the students an idea of what the rest of the class is going to do. We allow same case areas, but we also warn the students that these are individual research papers.
Power Points for chapter 2 go quite uneventful. Ken introduces the beginning and I finish with the UNESCO and the introduction to cultural diversity training which will start for us with Chapter 3 (and my Pilot Study from the fall 2009).

CLASS 8 – Wednesday, January 27, 2010

QUIZ 1: (chapter 1 & 2)

All students but one are in class for the quiz. We start right away and I give them 20 minutes to complete it. In reality, I wanted to give them 15 minutes, but being the first quiz I tell them they can have up to 20. The students finish about 10 minutes after beginning, except for 2 or 3, so we wait until the 20 minutes are up. I realize that I gave them way too much time, yet after—when I correct the papers—I see that they could have done much more/better. I will write about the quizzes on a different section of this journal.

Class begins after collecting the quizzes. Chapter 3 will be covered with my material from the Pilot Study. The textbook describes 14 theories, but none in depth, so Ken and I decide to use Hofstede and Gudykunst instead. I suggest to the students on the previous day to print out the slides from BB in a handout format (3 slides per page) to take notes. Half of the class didn’t do this, but luckily I brought copies.

1st Power Point presentation on Hofstede’s 5 dimensions of cultural variability. We barely cover 2. Using the animal metaphors some of the students remember from the Pilot Study in the fall some of the characteristics. Class time flies, again and we must finish at the Individualism/Collectivism dimension.

CLASS 9 – Friday, January 29, 2010
Today half of the class is absent. We concluded the Power Point on Hofstede and dedicated the last 15 minutes to talking about people we know who display the dimensions we learned about. The reaction to this exercise is various. I thought that by sharing my personal anecdotes with them (even embarrassing ones) the students would have been more prone to do the same, but I was probably wrong in this assumption. First of all, none of the students volunteered comments. After addressing particular students, I got some answers. A couple of students went straight to the point with their connections between dimensions and people they know who exemplify those dimensions. Some of the students didn’t seem to be motivated to talk much. It seemed like they didn’t understand what the dimensions entail. Others seemed shy, rather than clueless. Overall, I didn’t feel much dynamism with this exercise. I am not sure why not. Is it my fault? Is the activity too open and unstructured? Is it too soon to get the students to talk about these things with one another and then with the class? Maybe I should have used celebrities to help students identify the 5 dimensions and also to shift the analysis out of their personal realm. In fact, even though I suggested that they did not need to identify the persons they would talk about, they did. For example students referred to their “dad”, “brother”, “mother”, etc. when sharing their ideas.

The bottom line is that I don’t see the students involved and committed. In defense of today’s slow pace, I must say that half of the class (and of this half of some of the most interesting students) is not here today. I guess Fridays are a bit like roller coasters. Last Friday, with Dr. Orrefice’s visit, the class went very well. Today, it was much more modest. I would have liked to begin with Gudykunst, but realize that with only 5 minutes left it is wasn’t worthy.
Today we resumed Hofstede’s instruction and I used a MINI CASE to illustrate his 5 dimensions. I ask the students where it would be good to go today to see some issues. Nobody has an idea, so I take them with Google Earth to Peru and then show them a couple of youtube clips on the just-happened evacuation of 2000 tourists coming from all over the world from Machu Picchu. The region has been flooded and the Urubamba River has caused great devastation and 2 tourists’ deaths so far.

One of the hotel down in the lower valley hosted a bunch of rescued tourists and I suggested each table to pretend they were part of the hotel staff and were in charge of welcoming the scared tourists in the facility according to the best practice they could think of, based on the tourists’ background. So, each table was assigned 1 of the 5 dimensions proposed by Hofstede and the 2 extreme countries representing those dimensions as the groups they were taking care of. Each group of students had to come up with a strategy to host their groups of tourists.

After a few minutes of consultation, we started the brainstorming. Each group came up with appropriate behaviors in respect to the group of tourists they were dealing with. A group went further than myself in assessing the situation; they were given the uncertainty avoidance dimension and the 2 countries representing the extremes of high and low uncertainty avoidance—Greece and Singapore. When I asked them to let us know what would they do with the Singapore group, the students replied that they would rather begin with the Greeks, since they were high uncertainty avoidance and so it was more imperative to address their stress first and then the Singaporeans’. I was surprised and pleased with the sensitivity the students displayed and praised emphatically this
correction they made to my priorities, indicating to the class what a good example they set. The activity seemed useful and went beyond my expectations. I thought the students would have been more confused and clueless about what to think and say, but instead, they showed more imagination and dedication than I had thought of.

The rest of the class we go through the Power Point presentation on Gudykunst (up to the first 1/3 of the overall presentation). The parentheses in my slides display my personal anecdotes to illustrate Gudykunst’s constructs (as MINI CASES). I can see that my unusual language attracts the students’ attention and triggers their curiosity. For example, I wrote things like: ‘slow “idiot” driving with water tank’, or: ‘armpit shaving’, or: ‘drunk/stinky person next to you in theater’, etc. etc.

At the end of class a few students ask me about the case studies. We also had a sign up sheet for them to give me, so that I know what their topics are. It is surprising how many students still don’t have a clue of what area they want to study and the project is due in 4 days.

CLASS 11 – Wednesday, February 3, 2010

The students took a 10 minutes quiz on Hofstede’s dimensions. [When I correct them later today, I am surprised to see how many made careless mistakes. What I considered an easy quiz and an easy 10/10, turned out to be not so for many in the class].

After the quiz we resume the power point presentation on Gudykunst and I finish with his constructs. I encourage the students to begin thinking about applications of these theoretical concepts to their cases.
This afternoon I receive more emails of “clueless” students regarding the case studies. Other emails, instead, are more conscious-oriented and ask for details such as whether they should include a cover page and/or an abstract.

CLASS 12 – Friday, February 05, 2010

Only 9 students showed up for class. This is despite the fact that I emailed the class yesterday announcing that today we could brainstorm the case studies in class. I decided to conduct the class informally. No computer, nor screen on. Just all of us sitting pretty closely and talking about the case studies. I asked the students if it is all right to record the session so that I can better prepare in grading the case studies and also in preparing for the 2nd case study. I also say that this tape will help me with my data collection for the dissertation. They agreed.

I am writing about the brainstorming on case study 1 in another venue. Overall, it seems to me that opening up to a small and present group has enhanced our relation and the students seem more eager to talk to me. One student (Katie W.) talked to me about surgery coming up. One student (Greg) came to my office after to tell me about his case study. Most expressed their doubts and asked questions regarding the requirements. Finally, the biggest dilemma I have, after this session, is how to feel about these cases due at midnight. Many of the students haven’t even started with their research yet, and they clearly said so.

CLASS 13 – Monday, February 8, 2010

Many of the students are not there. It may be the lasting effects of the Superbowl. I begin chapter 4 with a youtube clip from 1932 on Ceylon and then another one from current times on Sri Lanka. I attract the attention of the students on the different ways of
presenting this culture and land and how the marketing has “evolved” in the past decades. This is an example I use to show the students how cultures evolve and also stay the same, how perceptions change and yet they don’t. Many of the examples I had prepared for class are not shared. We ran out of time and I am not even sure how. Yet, time seemed to go slowly because the students seemed quite passive; attentive, but passive, as if they had no energy (rather than interest). The lack of feedback made me feel somewhat unhappy after the class (that I prepared meticulously), but I guess there are days like this.

On a different note, today a visiting scholar from China, Professor Peing, sat in the class and we exchanged a nice conversation after. He teaches geography at the University of Beijing. He may visit again. He was very complimentary about the lesson (while I was feeling just the opposite!).

CLASS 14 – Wednesday, February 10, 2010

15 minutes for quiz 3 on chapter 4 go fast. The class is more numerous. Jokingly, I ask the students if we should have a quiz for every lesson; they do not seem to share the sense of humor! Several students arrive late and I let a few minutes extra, but then insist that they return the quiz. I start resenting a bit the tardiness that often the students display. I tell them so (nicely), and remind them that I too must find a parking spot where they have to, but we should all not feel entitled to disturb the class by entering late. They seem indifferent either way to the remarks, possibly because I am not holding a grudge.

We begin chapter 5 today in power point. The slides have nice and colorful maps of the world’s regions in regards of the different topics we are going to cover. We talk about
culture through different lenses, beginning with religions. I stay as neutral as possible in presenting the various major religions of the world and their locations. I also share, though, the fact that a common trait of all cultures is the confrontation— sooner or later—of the BIG question of the afterlife, even the atheists. I see that the students are very attentive. It seems that we are touching an important note, especially when I ask them why do they think the text begins talking about the cultures through religion? Several students give answers relating to values, beliefs, etc. without hesitation. One student in particular (Eugene) is adamant to talk about issues such as the jihad and the motives that push Muslims to engage in the holy war. It all stems from a comment I made regarding the BIG question, which is asked by each and every one of us and when I said that even the atheists have a sense of ethic and morality, and that is why they do not rob banks, etc. Eugene intervened at this point, although I did not quite understand the connection he was trying to make. After a bit of back-and-forth, we all moved on (that was a bit weird).

Class ended fast, but it felt good to begin this chapter today.

CLASS 15 – Friday, February 12, 2010

Many students decided not to come today… I guess it’s Friday. Dr. Peng—the Chinese scholar—visits the class today. We roll right into where we left it with chapter 5 and the religions and culture’s several dimensions. We go back and forth with the world map, because some don’t know where this or that country is, or to show the different zones in Africa that mark its geo/historical and cultural variations. I use the clicker to point where Chile is or where Ethiopia is. Some students ask questions or make comments also reflecting about other classes where they discussed areas of culture.
A few have their computers open and are intent on their screens. Yet, they are quiet and I am totally unaware whether they listen to the lesson or not. One girl asked if they could have extra points for being there today. I replied jokingly that I will detract points from the absentees instead and smiled. I try to let the students feel that I treat them as adults, responsible for their choices and that the lack of an attendance policy is not a strategy just to avoid headaches on our part, but also a way to let the students take full charge of their outcomes.

When we talked about individuals and their cultures, I used my own case as an example and then I asked a girl about her background; it turned out she defined herself as a “south-eastern US”. Then a boy gave his background and said that he felt like the Swedish, for he comes from California and feels he is much more liberal than the south east people of the US. I noticed a moment of embarrassment and moved on. I guess many students didn’t feel good about that comment.

CLASS 16 – Monday, February 15, 2010

As most times, about 2/3 of the class shows up. Dr. Peng comes to class too. We do chapter 6 today through Power Point and youtube clips. In this class too I feel I am “lecturing” and the students “follow” and “pay attention”. I talk about delicate issues such as cultural values; for example, what is worth dying for, abortion, capital punishment, faith, etc. At times I ask the students for some inputs and they comply, but it seems to me that they would just rather stay anonymous and listen rather than talk. This feeling opens a new chapter of reflections for me, in that I realize how long and deep the process of “opening up” takes, if it occurs at all in a classroom environment. I must think
of some strategy to get the students more prone to share their thoughts with each other and me.

The class goes well. I feel that a lot is addressed, and the topics that cannot be addressed in class for time constraints are encouraged for readings at home.

CLASS 17 – Wednesday, February 17, 2010

MIDTERM TODAY. Before starting, I announce the visit of Ph.D. student Mohamed Darfoon from Libya on Friday. All the students are there except for one student who emailed being sick and she is going to make it up on Friday. I explain what the midterm asks and encourage the students to ask me questions if they have some.

Most people stay long. One or two give their papers unusually early (it’s an essay type of exam). SEE MIDTERM COPIES AND RELATED DATA SEPARATELY.

CLASS 18 - Friday, February 19, 2010

Mohamed Darfoon presents his country and tourism related issues (Libya). We have a bit of trouble with the computer so the presentation starts a bit late and that will influence the amount of time left at the end for questions and interactions. Nevertheless, even though we end late, the students stay and ask questions and taste the cookies Mohamed brought. Also, they stayed because I was handing back their midterm and case study 1 and they were eager to have feedback.

Unfortunately the videotape did not work. With the trouble trying to fix the computer I accidently turned the video camera off instead of on and so the session was lost. In general, the presentation followed typical lecture styles with Mohamed talking about his topic while showing a power point slide show. The students listened throughout the hour, most of them just looking at the presenter and the slides. A few had their computers on,
notably Coty, Stanley and Nicole, but I don’t think that they were completely astray. One can never tell what they are doing or thinking.

The presentation was good and I could tell most of the students were curious and attentive. One student in particular, Lindsay Green, was well tuned in and nodded at various times, as if she already felt more ownership of that area, since her case study is about Tunisia. That felt good. Also Dr. Backman came to class and that was good, since next Monday and Wednesday he will be teaching. Also Dr. Peng came and had questions for Mohamed. At the end, even though the class time was over a few students asked questions. Coty, Nicole, Lindsay, Eugene and Richie asked a question each. Since I thought I was video taping I didn’t mark down their questions, but I distinctly remember Richie’s question; he asked what was the situation in Libya for tourists and alcohol consumption. Mohamed replied that Libya is an alcohol free country and I could tell that the students were shocked.

Overall a great session, not to mention the fabulous cookies! All students but Kantrell tasted the cookies.

CLASS 19 – Monday, February 22, 2010
Ken teaches.

CLASS 20 – Wednesday, February 24, 2010
Ken teaches.

REFLECTIONS ON CASE STUDY 2

I prepared the guidelines for case study 2 (cs2) based on the outcomes of case study 1 for, according to FD, I am trying to make the adjustments and the fine tuning necessary to advance my intervention.
First of all, cs2 [and the overall framework for the 3 case studies] is revealing its positive outcomes in that the students are rewarded for their effort and penalized for the lack of effort in their own terms. For example, those who did a good job in cs1 will have much less work to do than those who didn’t. This is because a good portion of cs2 consists of the redressing of the issues raised in cs1 through my evaluation. For cs2 there are only 5 extra pages minimum required to introduce a case incident and so those who are on track will have plenty opportunity to delve on their incident, while polishing their overall case, while the others will have to do the incident on top of fixing different degrees of messes from cs1.

Second, in this stage I am providing much looser guidelines than I did for cs1. In fact, I suggest the 2 theoretical frameworks they need to use (Hofstede and Gudykunst) and the objectives for each chapter from 5 to 11, but nothing else. While in cs1 I provided a list of questions that the students used as guidance through their case, now they have to “pick and choose” what topics within each chapter best suits their case incident and so, they need to be more critical and selective + responsible for their choices.

CLASS 21 – Friday, February 26, 2010

I haven’t seen the students since last Friday and I am surprised to see that there are more than the usual numbers on a “regular” Friday. I also have a student (Torrey) who emailed me with a small emergency, expressing his regret for not being able to assist to the Case Study 2 guidelines instruction. I reassured him that we can catch up on Monday.
So, the impression I have is that most students seem adamant to grasp well what the second step of their case. I feel this sensation of “ownership” on the students’ behalf also in the way they ask questions, especially at the end of class.

I was planning on taping this session, but unfortunately one thing led to another and I forgot. When I remembered I was already in the middle of the explanation and didn’t want to disrupt the flow at that point.

Before we “attacked” case study 2 I gave back the quizzes 4 and brainstormed with the class all the suggestions of relevance that were made in it (see quiz 4). I told them I would start implementing some, but not likely others, such as the suggestion of watching movies. I told them that even if it was a good idea, on a practical standpoint that would be possible only outside of class time, if they were willing to watch movies as extra assignments: nobody volunteered. A couple of students nodded their heads when I said that we could not sacrifice so much class time for movies. They seemed to acknowledge regrettaibly.

I had planned several activities for chapter 8, but the entire time was taken to talk about the major corrections on case study 1 (I used the board to illustrate how to proceed from case study 1 to case study 2), then about the guidelines for case study 2 and, finally, in answering particular questions 3 students asked at the end of class. Kelly Krause asked me about certain sources and we clarified that. She also asked about 2 possible incidents she could address and we made an appointment for Monday after class to talk about them. Kathleen Kling asked how to cite “common knowledge”, Katie Mcwhorter asked some questions about how to reference “inferences from all the readings”; finally, Nicole asked some clarifications regarding the Gudykunst’s constructs and how to
extend her comments from the aborigines point of view to the white Australians and the tourists as well. She too wanted to set an appointment for Monday.

The questions asked were indicative of the difficulty of research accuracy and policy guidelines for the APA format. We clarified also how to cite the internet sources even though I had to say that even the APA manual is not clear on many types of citations. I too admitted to the students that often times need guidance from my advisor and/or editors when writing for publications and/or school assignments.

At the end of class (and when we were about to get kicked out by Gena, rightly so), Dr. Peng complimented me for being a “very good teacher” and in our usual walk in the hall told me that at his school also they use case studies, but the confront 2 different cases and he thought that our way of building up the second case on the first one was better. When I told him that we would have even a third step he seemed quite surprised. I told him also that at this point we cannot say yet what the 3rd case will comprise, because we need to see what the 2nd case produces (in the formative experiment fashion). I added that it will probably include some form of comparison and contrast among the cases. He seemed surprised again in learning that I didn’t know what was coming next.

CLASS 22 – Monday, March 1, 2010

About average presence of students today. I asked a few questions relating to Mohamed’s visit and the “little mosque on the prairie” of the previous lessons. For Mohamed’s visit I sense a reluctance to give me feedback (the question was: how distant did you feel Mohamed was from you, in terms of culture? Then—since nobody answered—I rephrased and asked: did you have difficulty in understanding Mohamed? And then I said: because I did, being a foreign myself. One student (Lindsay Green)
admitted that she too had a bit of trouble understanding him, but that overall she just
needed to be a bit more attentive. When I acknowledged her answer it felt like a sense
of relief in the class (and from Lindsay), as if we established that there was nothing
wrong about not understanding other people’s accents. I brought myself as an example
and even used Dr. Peng who was in class today and reinforced through his nodding that
we do have difficulty in understanding foreign accents.
When introducing today’s lesson, I immediately experienced problems with the video
clip I meant to show. So we moved to the following activity and I delayed the video clip
for later (hoping that the web page would get unblocked). I showed the power points of
chapter 8 and basically “lectured” the students on social interaction. I passed around the
activity sheet and they filled out the first bullet point. Then the video clip worked and we
made it just in time to watch it and to dismiss class.
I asked the students to write the remainder of the activity sheet as homework at home
and also to brainstorm the video clip based on the features of slide 3 in the power point.
I have never given homework as such until now and am really curious to see who will do
it all, who will do it at all and anything in between.
At the end of class Dr. Peng asked me to re-explain the difference that the book makes
between “local residents” and “indigenous residents” and I told him. He seemed to
understand it, and added that in China they have similar issues but they rather call the
people in terms of “ethnicity”. I admitted to him that it’s a words game and that people
need to establish at the beginning of a conversation what they mean for one thing or
another in intercultural contexts. I also admitted that the book delves a lot on different
terminologies for very similar concepts.
Kelly Krause was patiently waiting for me in the hall. She wanted to talk about her case incident for her case study (Semester at Sea). She presented a couple of scenarios and I gave her some advice. Basically, I encouraged her to look to a relatively simple and verifiable incident in which all parties involved are real people and few people (rather than mega incidents like the shipwreck of one year or the SARS detours of another). I reminded her that “social interaction”—which we talked about today—is going to play a major role in the incident, so she needs to trace it back to all the players: better be few, approachable and …interacting.

CLASS 23 – Wednesday, March 3, 2010

Today we had a guest speaker: Wayne Hampton from Disney World. I gave out quiz 5 for the students to work with during Wayne’s presentation (SEE QUIZ 5). Many students arrived like a dripping faucet when the lesson already had started. Wayne did a great job in introducing Disney around the world, talking about Japan, Hong Kong, Paris and the future project of a theme park in Shanghai. He addressed many of the issues we have talked about in class (SEE VIDEO) and the students appeared to relate, based on their attentiveness, nodding and questions at the end of class.

I saw the same type of ownership Lindsay Green displayed during Mohamed’s presentation (Lindsay is doing Tunisia for her case study) in Tory Anthony who is working on Disney in Paris and California. I saw this familiarity also when Wayne gave out a hand out to work with different intercultural dimensions with the students. Even if about half of the dimensions were not the ones we worked with, we could fast related to them based on Wayne’s brief explanations and based on the background we were
building throughout the semester. I kept most of the students’ handouts and will use them as data.

At the end of class there was a lot of motion. People were approaching Wayne to ask more questions; several students complained to me that they didn’t understand how to do the quiz 5. Others were waiting to collect old case studies and/or assignments. I told all the students to email me their questions about quiz 5 and helped a couple of students with the corrected case studies.

It’s been an intense morning! P.S. none of the students followed up for quiz 5; I even sent out an email asking for their feedback and nobody replied in terms of asking for directions. Have the student’s conquered their uncertainty and anxiety? Or are they just busy elsewhere?...Or, do they simply not care?

CLASS 24 – Friday, March 5, 2010

Lots to do since 8:30 am with make up quizzes and papers’ returns. Today some of my usually not Friday students showed up (Tori, Torrey, Eugene, for example). I expressed my appreciation for their coming to class. Today we closed chapter 8 and we primarily talked about culture shock.

First, I asked about anyone’s experience with culture shock and since nobody volunteered I began with my own story as a kid spending a week at the countryside, with my friend’s grandparents. I explained that I was totally distressed as an “urban” kid by living with no electricity and drinking “fresh” milk. After my “national” anecdote, Katie Mcwhorter told us about her shock in visiting Istanbul; how seeing police with guns at the airport was troubling and how not being able to speak to people truly shook her. She also recounted how after 5 days, upon leaving, she felt already much better in her skin.
I asked Richie Lambert who spent a semester in Australia, but off the bat he could not remember any particular incident. Then Nicole Barber, who also went for a study abroad in Australia, recounted that her pre-departure preparation helped very much in reducing the symptoms of culture shock. We also described how cultural distance plays a role as for the case of Katie in Turkey and Nicole and Richie in Australia.

Then I asked our visiting scholar from China, Dr. Peng and he interestingly talked about how the way houses are built in the USA is different than in China. He recounted that the typical 2 doors American house (one in the front and one in the back) is considered poor building technique for the Chinese, because the draft that it may cause is not appreciated. For the Chinese good homes are built with only one door, at the front.

I finally showed a 5 minutes clip on the most traumatic shocks in recent history across the world and they included September 11 and the 2006 tsunami and I reminded the students that “culture shock” must be kept in perspective in regards to true human and natural disasters.

At the end of class I explain to a couple of reluctant students what was asked of quiz 5 (still!) and they said, “is that all?” I said, “yes” and they felt much relieved. We will see what these mysterious quizzes 5 will be like.

**CLASS 25 – Monday, March 8, 2010**

Quizzes 5 went quite well and the students kept them to the level I was looking for.

Today we talked about chapter 9. I used the power point (I still do not do well with my notes and the slides. For some reasons they don’t stick in my mind. I find the slides quite “weak” and distracting). I use examples to illustrate most points and then an activity with the students identifying the social interactions they would have when going
on a flight. I asked them why would I choose a flight and they rightly answered, because it would be a rather uniform experience and also one that most would have had. One student raised her hand and said she never flew. She looked a bit embarrassed (she turned red), but I reassured her it was ok to work with someone else. The students worked on their lists using table 9.1, p. 226 to help them. After a few minutes, I asked the students for their results and they gave good feedback on the activity. One student used the frequent flyer rewards system to explain the item “required reward” as mentioned on in the textbook. The last few minutes I showed them the youtube clip on the ritual of cremation at a Laos funeral. I asked the students to think about the differences and similarities among their customs and ours and also I asked them how would they feel if some foreign tourists would videotape and comment on a funeral that they would have for a family member.

CLASS 26 – Wednesday, March 10, 2010

Today we have quiz 6 and 2 chapters to cover, 10 and 11. I go over quiz 6 instructions and nobody asks for clarification. I am eager to read what they wrote, because it is a very loose and yet hard quiz (I myself am not sure what I would answer in it!). Then I present chapter 10 with regular power point, although I try to be more on task and less distracted by them. I relate several anecdotes from my experiences, for example, study abroad in Italy and other visits in Italy with other visitors and many other examples taken from the book. For chapter 11 (tourism and ethics) I tell the students that they will have to go over it on their own and that it is an easy reader. Instead, I present them with a case study about Brazil. I show them 2 youtube clips. The first one is about Rio de Janeiro as a sun, sand and sea luxurious resort and fabulous city to visit. The second
one is about Rio’s favelas. I asked the students to reflect, while they will read chapter 11, about 2 scenarios. In the first one, they would be tourists in Rio who would be approached by a tourist operator who would offer them a tour of a favela as an “attraction”. In the second scenario, the students themselves were tourist professionals who would have the possibility to create a business in touring visitors in favelas or similar types of slums in their destination. What would the ethical issues be in both cases? How would they feel about contributing to, in the first scenario, and making a profit out of, in the second, other human beings’ misery? How would they deal with their commoditization of indecent living and its crystallization by endorsing such tourist activities? Students were nodding and seemed to understand the gravity. But, then, I asked if—on the other hand—maybe such activities would benefit the favelas inhabitants; maybe they would help sensitize the public of the dire conditions a lot of humanity lives in; maybe it would be a success story where public intervention has failed. The students seemed confused at first, but then began nodding again. I concluded the class reminding them that ethical issues are more often than not very difficult to confront. I also told them that chapter 11 is my favorite in the book. Finally, I announced that there will be no class on Friday and so we will resume after spring break.

CLASS 27 – Monday, March 22, 2010

We were back from Spring Break and about half of the class showed up. I too felt somewhat out of sync and committed myself to just teach chapter 12 through the power point. I could not resist, though, the opportunity to show youtube with Cast Away’s trailer to talk about Maslow’s pyramid of needs.
The students seemed quiet and not very interactive. I tried to engage them with their life examples and anecdotes, but they seemed to be afraid of giving me the “wrong” answer. Was it only my impression? I, then, gave several personal stories to illustrate the points of the chapter. I also took the opportunity to illustrate intrinsic and extrinsic motivation using our PRTM 447 attendance policy as an example. The class concluded as quietly as it began. Some students stayed a bit after class to clarify issues about their case study 2, with follow up emails.

CLASS 28 – Wednesday, March 24, 2010

Today we had quiz 7. I am extremely curious to see how this quiz goes. It is easy and difficult at the same time. It requires having read chapter 12, but also creativity and personal judgement/insight. I am confident that 20 minutes should be enough for the students and I am surprised to see that most finish within 10 minutes. A very few write until the last minute and seemed like they would have liked a bit more time. A few others stopped writing almost right away and just waited.

There were about 20 minutes left for the remainder of the class and we talked about case study 2 (setting deadline for late ones on Friday, March 26 at midnight and the Vancouver people by Monday, March 29) and the deadline for case study 3, which I will confirm with them to be the last week of class in the semester.

To introduce chapter 13 I showed 2 YouTube clips on consumer behavior and glocalization. I wanted to show them a third one on globalization, but we ran out of time. When asked about reactions to the 2 clips students responded quite easily. They seemed to “dig” consumer behavior and Eugene, in particular, made an original remark. He said that it was interesting how the anti-consumerism people would use the same
marketing strategies and means to divulge their message. I agreed with him and was quite surprised by his comment.

I encouraged the students to come on Friday for our guest speaker from Costa Rica will present and we joked a bit (especially with Tory, who is not a Friday person) about attendance. In this regard, Anna Louise Dixon gave me a sheet for a field trip that wasn't even required (the sheet). I made sure all the class heard my appreciation for considering informing me about the absence, even though it was not a requirement.

We also brainstormed briefly the concepts of western consumerism, wants, needs and their differences. The students seemed at ease with this subject. Probably more than me.

CLASS 29 – Friday, March 26, 2010

Guest speaker Carla Mora, from Costa Rica. See video.

CLASS 30 – Monday, March 29, 2010

Chapter 13 is very long and I decided to re-format the power point slides in a much more practical way (at least for me!). This is a long lecture, especially since I have decided to postpone the 2 clips I was planning on showing today to introduce chapter 14 next week.

Also, I told the students that this coming Wednesday we will not have our regular quiz. I told them that I wanted to go over the case study 2 results with them and so we will condense quiz 8 for the following Wednesday (April 7), with chapter 13 and 14 together. I actually see chapter 12, 13 and 14 very intertwined. So, I do my best to keep chapter 13 down to earth with an example of Myrtle Beach. The students seem attuned in the “lecture mode”, that sort of transient zone, where liminality prevails.
CLASS 31 – Wednesday, March 31, 2010

Patrick Halloway took the first 15 minutes of class to administer a survey to the students as part of his research. After he left, we focused on the case study 2 results through our 2nd focus group. I prepared a sheet with questions I meant to ask and I did use it. However, I felt that I was “lecturing” because it was more like asking rhetorical questions to have the students reflect rather than answer. Nothing wrong with that. The students probably didn’t know that I goofed and the exercise is beneficial, I was sure. When I realized that the atmosphere was not right to have the focus group I hoped for (that is, brainstorming the cases) I continue recording (with their consent) and decided in my mind to have another focus group (the real one) the following week. The students needed to digest the returned papers with the corrections and comments made. I warned them, before distributing the cases, that some would not be happy with the grades. I felt I was “preaching” and “nagging” for the critiques I included in their papers and so I did not feel the students could be open to a constructive critique (and nor was I, honestly: I had to let them know how I felt and so, I too was not ready for constructive thinking in that sense: both the students and I needed to “let it cool”). So, as time was shrinking I suggested that we worked together on building the guidelines for case study 3, together, on Friday, April 9th during the whole hour. The rationale for this was that by focusing on the next challenge I believed we could confront the critiques in the previous case with a more positive attitude. Sort of, instead of a “pointing fingers” attitude, a “let’s roll our sleeves up and make this better” attitude would be more useful.
After class I emailed Dr. Reinking and asked him to join us on April 9th as part of the “experiment”. He replied he should be able to come and observe this class. The real focus group that will deal with the transition from case 2 to case 3 will then take place on April 9th under the expert eye of Dr. Reinking.

See (or … hear!) audio material.

CLASS 32 – Friday, April 2, 2010

Dr. Peng, the visiting scholar from China, presents today and does a great job in tying what we have done in class with his subject. It does show that he has been in class for the majority of time. He has understood clearly how to present his topic (landscaping and architecture) in an intercultural perspective. There are few students (fewer and fewer, it seems to me). Perhaps it is because of Good Friday, perhaps it is the dwindling attitude towards the end of the semester. We will see in the last weeks what the attendance will be like. I feel I have lost some on the way, at different levels. Virginia, Dean, Kelly Grimes, Catherine Cunnigham, Katie Wercholuk and—to a lesser extent—Torrey, Richie, Josh, Tory, Kathryn Stone, Corey and, of course, Stanley who comes always, but does not do anything. It’s a strange feeling of loss…

CLASS 33 – Monday, April 5, 2010

Monday after Easter and attendance still meager. I begin on time with chapter 14 and go through the power point presentation without incident. I also remind the students of the next steps until Friday, when we will discuss the guidelines for case 3. I also announce to the students that the external member of my committee, Dr. Reinking, will observe the class. At the end of class, I try to catch on some of the students, namely Richie, Chris, Stanley and Alison (who are present). Stanley sneaks out, but I manage
to talk to the others. Richie seems totally oblivious of the guidelines for case 2 and says that he understood that all he had to do was to write the case incident. Chris shows me what he considered his case incident, but I explain again how undeveloped it is. Alison cannot find on her paper where her incident is and so I tell all of them to re-read the guidelines and move on with the corrections. I am rather frustrated, but keep calm. I give them until this Friday to finish their work.

CLASS 34 – Wednesday, April 7, 2010

Quiz 8 on chapter 13 and 14 takes about 30 minutes. We started a bit late, because I reiterated the importance of coming to class on Friday for the brainstorming of case study 3 guidelines and other announcements.

I explained quiz 8 with the example given and encouraged the students to ask me if they had any questions. The class was almost full today: an unusual sight. Several students asked me for clarifications and I provided them. Kelley Grimes has finally shown up and asks a couple of very good questions on the quiz. Especially students who were not here on Monday to listen to chapter 14’s explanation (like Kelly Krause) or students who in general are a bit unsure (like Coty) asked for some guidance.

I figured that the quiz would take the whole period and even if the majority finished within the 30 minutes (not much before, though), a few stayed also a bit later. One student (Kantrell) asked me if he could finish on Friday; he did only half of the quiz and I said ok.

Before leaving the class I stressed with the students that we will work also closely individually with case 3. On our way out, Kathleen Benton asked me to meet for her case 3 and Katie Wercholuk updated me on her case 2. She said she was not
interested in the topic she chose and therefore had a hard time finding an interesting incident. I encouraged her to bring what she had to me on Friday and we would work with it together to some extent. She was mostly concerned with the 5 pages minimum required for the incident in case 2. I feel good that some of the students are concerned with being up to the challenge.

When I met with Ken after class, like we usually do, I told him about the students writing frantically for the quiz and the overall hope that case 3 should yield a better product yet. He reinforced these feeling saying that the repeat case studies are a great idea and that he will continue it for the future classes.

CLASS 35 – Friday, April 9, 2010

Today we brainstormed the guidelines for case study 3. Dr. Reinking, the external member of my committee and the professor in charge of the formative experiment side of the dissertation research is observing the class. Also Dr. Peng came and observed with him. The session is videotaped. Yet, here are a few remarks.

13 students came to class today and they were: Kelly Krause, Christina, Kelley Grimes, Caitlin, Stanley, Josh, Greg, Nicole, Anna Louise, Kantrell, Coty, Kathleen Benton, Michael Monroe. After the session I talked briefly with Christina who had a bad 2nd case study and admitted to nor reading the guidelines as she was supposed to. I feel good she came to talk to me, because the bad grade she got was weighing on my conscience without clarification. Things feel better with her now, and I feel she will do a terrific job on her case 3.

Dr. Reinking spent a bit of time after to tell me that he was happy to have sat in the class. He got a feel for what we are doing. He asked me if today's dynamics were
typical and I answered “no”. Today was very atypical and I explained our routine. He was interested in the ICSI and the textbook and I have written a note to myself to remember lending a copy to him and also some literature on the ICSI.

CLASS 36 – Monday, April 12, 2010

We began with the guidelines for case study 3 and I put them on the screen to review together with the class. Half of those present today were there on Friday, but the other half wasn’t, so, they look a bit clueless. Nevertheless, I engaged in a “line-by-line” explanation. At the end I scrolled again through the document and asked for comments, questions and or changes.

Some students asked questions regarding the formatting of the sections (Ashley Page, Katie Mc.) others asked about the extra points for submitting the revised case 2 (Reeves). Others asked to which extends should Gudykunst be incorporated in the paper. I replied everywhere, but especially in the body section. We make a couple of corrections/additions to the guidelines and then we close them.

Then we proceeded with the review of Gudykunst’s power point together with the case I brought as an example: my study abroad in Burkina Faso and, in particular, the situation created in the village when 2/3 of the graduate students became ill by drinking the local beer during the evening celebration in our honor. I used Google Map to locate the country and gave a brief intro to its major features. I also used a short power point to indicate the differences between West Africa and the USA in Hofstede’s dimensions also to show the students how to tie these dimensions with Gudykunst’s constructs.

But time has already flown with the guidelines sucking up most of the period. Towards the end of the hour I felt rushed. I barely began talking about the concrete example at
11:45 and so little time was left to deepen its various facets. I announced that we would continue in the next lessons to address the case study 3 venture, while keeping up the work with the textbook and quizzes.

**CLASS 37 – Wednesday, April 14, 2010**

Half of the class was there. Many were on a field trip with Dr. Norman and so, I will not see them until next Monday. The students took quiz 9 and the reminder of the class they were given the choice to either begin the one-on-one assistance for case 3, or to continue with my example. The students decided to continue with my Burkina Faso case incident as an example to clarify the case study 3 guidelines. (Dr. Peng took pictures, with the students’ permission, of the class “in action”). I managed to detailed through Gudykunst’s conceptual constructs (anxiety-uncertainty, cultural variability) and 2 of the functional constructs (motivation and knowledge). The skill section was a bit rushed, but it was nevertheless mentioned and briefly illustrated. Ashley Page asked if Gudykunst’s constructs should permeate the whole paper or only the case incident. Good question: I encourage the class to begin working on the incident with him, and then—once they have a bit the gist of it—to see if any of his constructs apply elsewhere in the paper.

I strongly encouraged the students to come on Friday for our guest speaker from Germany. She is the last guest speaker and since half of the class is on a field trip, I hope that this half will show up for the presentation.

In my meeting with Ken, after class, we decided to announce a free day for the last day of class, so that the students can work on their case studies 3. Also, Ken suggested
making quiz 10 relatively easy, sort of a “bonus” quiz. I already had thought of this and will have the students take an inventory from chapter 16.

CLASS 38 – Friday, April 16, 2010

Today we had Mrs. Schmidt as our last guest speaker for Germany and the presentation was the most interactive I witnessed so far. There were few students (being Friday and also with Dr. Norman’s field trip to Louisiana taking away a number of students). Yet, the few there were particularly talkative and also Mrs. Schmidt’s demeanor favored, in my opinion, a closer contact (you can tell she is a foreign language instructor). She moved close to the students, asked them simple questions and waited for their questions. See the video for further analysis.

After class Kathleen Benton asked me for a brief meeting regarding her case study. She is working with Mexico and the drug cartels as a case incident. We identified the areas of weakness such as not really knowing what she wants to know about this issue. Then, once identified the topic, things seemed brighter in her eyes. She could not find a relation between the drug wars and tourism, so I encouraged her to look up American tourists in Mexico and find out the trends of visitation to attractions and why places like Juarez definitively do not stand out as a tourism destination. Then I encouraged her to explore what it would take to change the situation in favor of travel and tourism in the region of the drug cartels. For example, I asked her to reflect on what Mrs. Schmidt had said today about Berlin and how the Wall in the city had been a tourist destination for decades. Could places like Juarez and other areas between the US and Mexico become attractions like the Berlin Wall had been? For example along the frontier line?
She seemed reassured and expressed the desire to do better on her final case study. I wished her well.

CLASS 39 – Monday, April 19, 2010

(Before class, Ashley Porcher came to make up a quiz and then wanted to talk about her case study. When I asked her several questions in regards to the case, I realized that she had not prepared to ask about her case. In particular, she had not formulated any solution for the main problem I raised with her case 2: that was, the narrowing down to a specific, smaller incident her case incident. Also, she wanted to ask me questions about APA and we addressed those)

Today the students that came to class were those who normally don’t come and vice versa. I introduced chapter 16 on power point and had about 20 minutes left to discuss the case studies on an individual basis.

Before doing this, I asked if the class wanted to reiterate the guidelines for case 3.

There was silence and then Ashley Page shook her head like saying “not another time, please”. So, we went to the one-on-one meetings.

Originally I wanted to audio tape each encounter and for that I had brought the digital recorder. Yet, I quickly realize that setting it up and addressing the guidelines in that fashion would have hindered the spontaneity and easiness of the interaction. The students already seemed reluctant to come and talk to me in the classroom, so I decided to just memorize as best as I could our encounters.

The first person to see me was Caitlin Davidson. We didn’t have too much trouble addressing her questions which regarded mostly some references for her interviewee.

Then Tory Anderson came, but she simply handed to me her case 2, after a long time of
electronic chasing around. She said that she wrote 19 pages of profound work and that it was impeccable research! Then Chris Evans came and told me that the next case he did not want to see any red on it. As we talked about his case incident and I was explaining to him how to use Hofstede and Gudykunst, I literally saw him brighten up and he said that now he understood how to go about it. He promised me that the 3rd case study would be perfect. Then Coty Sensabaugh was the last within the time frame available and he wanted to shake hands and we talked “cool”. I showed to him how to go about narrowing down his case incident and he asked me if we could talk also on Wednesday, when he would have his case 1 handy. Kantrell Brown wanted to talk, but didn’t have his case with him, so we postponed for Wednesday. So we did with Michael Monroe, Katie Mcwhorter, Josh Stansell. Torrey Anderson got his case 2 back today with his low grade and when I hinted to him that maybe we should talk, he replied that he didn’t need to because he understood my comments and did not need further clarifications. Finally, Sally Good followed me to the office to talk about her case 2 and we addressed her questions regarding citations (when is it a “common sense” statement and when it is not and a statement need citing).

Many people today made up several quizzes and hopefully by the end of the week I will only have to worry about the final and the case study 3.

CLASS 40 – Wednesday, April 21, 2010

[NOTE BEFORE CLASS]: at about 9 in the morning Dean Rogers came in to make up his quiz 9. I asked him if he studied chapter 15 and when I saw he was wiggling some excuses I told him to go study a bit before the quiz. He replied he did not have his textbook, so I lent him mine and he studied for a good 20 minutes. When he took the
quiz he made only 1 mistake getting a 9 out of 10: the highest score in the class. This observation is strictly to remind myself that those who studied for the quiz could have done equally well. It is a clear indicator of how little students “study” the book.

Today it was our last formal day in class. We had quiz 10 on chapter 16 with open books. Almost the entire class was there to take the quiz. The atmosphere was very upbeat and the students willing to chat a lot. I had a hard time keeping them quiet once finished to let those who didn’t finish in peace. Many stayed after to talk about their case studies 3.

In particular, Katie McWorther asked about Gudykunst. Christina Hawkins a bit of everything; she seemed like she just wanted to chat. Kelly Krause asked how to use chapter 13 in her case study. Alison Richard asked about the guidelines and I stressed to read them carefully. Ashley Porcher reiterated the guidelines with me, almost embarrassed to ask again, but I encouraged her. Kelly Grimes wanted clarifications about the difference between case 2 and 3, especially in reference to Hofstede and Gudykunst and wanted to be assured that they were not suitable for the part called “Introduction”. Michael Monroe asked briefly about Hofstede and Gudykunst for his case incident. And, finally, Reeves Miller lost his corrected case 2 so I made an extra copy for him.

The following days have been hectic with students making up quizzes to the bitter end and coming over for case 3. In particular Reeves Miller seemed to really care about getting a good grade for case 3 and his effort paid off.
APPENDIX F

Exams

PRTM 447 – MIDTERM

NAME: ___________________________________

February 17, 2010

Pretend your reader doesn’t know ANYTHING about the following topics; you must explain the concepts involved in order to answer the following questions in two concise, informative and reflective paragraphs. Said in a different way, your answers must include a clear explanation of any construct that the common person on the street would not understand when listening to your specific answers:

1. Using one or more examples explain why it is important to understand the concept of CULTURAL DISTANCE in international tourism.

2. Create two or more examples that demonstrate how Hofstede’s (1980) five cultural dimensions can cause clashes in a social interaction between tourists and hosts with different cultural backgrounds.

PRTM 447 – FINAL EXAM

NAME: ______________________

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Please, choose 3 of the following questions/items and answer/develop them in an essay format (50 points).

• Use and show all the knowledge and skills you have built during this course to answer the questions (for example, the textbook, Hofstede, Gudykunst, the lectures, the guest speakers and everything else that helped you in PRTM 447);
• Be informative, accurate and concise;
• Provide examples to illustrate your points.

1. Which cultural elements should be used to be able to successfully compare cultures?

2. Is culture shock an evidence of an international experience failure? If not, why not?

3. Identify universal rules of social interaction that should be followed by tourists and hosts in their social interactions.

4. Give some practical examples of how national culture influences satisfaction with services.

5. In your own experience, are tourism professionals in your country sensitive to cultural differences? Identify examples to prove your point.

6. How does culture impact the nature of travel? (destination selection, purpose of travel, travel arrangements, travel timing and schedule, length of stay, spending patterns, companionship, activities, interests, risk taken).
APPENDIX G

Quizzes

PRTM 447 – QUIZ 1

NAME ____________________________

Wednesday, Jan. 27, 2010

(Chapters 1 & 2)

I. Choose one of the following questions from this part to answer and briefly discuss it. You shall be concise, informative and reflective in your answer.

a. What are the benefits and the criticisms of globalization in general?

b. Describe one example of globalization in tourism.

c. How do you explain Glocalization as a blend of heterogenization, convergence, divergence and hybridization of cultures?

II. Choose one of the following questions from this part to answer and briefly discuss it. You shall be concise, informative and reflective in your answer.

d. Describe a culturally diverse experience you had in your life and explain why it provided you with a new insight in the world’s diversity.

e. What are the fundamental principles embraced by the UNESCO Declaration on Cultural Diversity?

f. How do you describe your cultural identity (that is, your ethnicity, language, heritage, social status, traditions, generation, food, values, etc.) and what do you predict it will happen to it in the future years?

PRTM 447 – QUIZ 2

NAME: ____________________________

Wednesday, February 3, 2010

Please, choose the best answer to the following questions:
According to Hofstede’s study on IBM employees,

1. Which of the following statements best describes a collectivistic culture?
   a. Emphasis is places on individuals’ goals over group goals
   b. There is high social mobility
   c. Ability is most important for career
   d. Stresses values that serve the ingroup

2. Which of the following best describes a high power distance culture?
   a. Inequalities among people are expected and desired
   b. Inequalities among people should be minimized
   c. Independence should be emphasized
   d. Use of force reveals the failure of power

3. Which of the following best describes a high uncertainty avoidance culture?
   a. Trusts in people
   b. Tolerates ambiguity
   c. Resists to change
   d. Truth is relative

4. Which of the following statements best describes a long term orientation culture?
   a. Persistence is a virtue
   b. Absolutes determine “good & evil”
   c. Looks at the past or present
   d. Savings are not important

5. Which of the following statements best describes a highly feminine culture?
a. Big gender difference is valued
b. Challenge & recognition in jobs is emphasized
c. Sympathizes for the strong
d. Works to live (and does not live to work)

6. Which country displays the highest masculine dimension?
   a. JAPAN
   b. SWEDEN

7. Which country displays the highest power distance dimension?
   a. USA
   b. MALAYSIA

8. Which country displays the lowest individualism dimension?
   a. USA
   b. GUATEMALA

9. Which country displays the longest term orientation dimension?
   a. PAKISTAN
   b. CHINA

10. Which country displays the lowest uncertainty avoidance dimension?
   a. GREECE
   b. SINGAPORE

   ANSWER KEY:
   1. d.  
   2. a.  
   3. c.  
   6. a.
   7. b.  
   8. b.
4. a. 
5. d. 
9. b. 
10. b.

PRTM 447 – QUIZ 3

NAME: ________________________________

February 10, 2010

(Chapter 4)

Write a short paragraph in response to a), b) and c). You shall be concise, informative and reflective.

a) Describe and explain the concept of AUTHENTICITY of tourism experiences through an example.

b) Describe and explain the differences between ACCULTURATION and ASSIMILATION in cultural processes. You can use an example to help clarify your thoughts.

c) Comment on the following quote found in your textbook on p. 79: “In today’s increasingly multicultural world, global tourism will be characterized by increasing cultural conflicts (Huntington, 1996).

PRTM 447 – QUIZ 4

NAME: ________________________________

February 24, 2010

(Chapters 5-11)

With open books please review the chapters from 5 to 11 that make Part 3 of your text and write for each chapter a brief commentary on how you believe it would most likely be learned by students. What ideas would you suggest for best instruction? What types of activities would you recommend? What do you think would most help you and your peers learn from them? 

183
March 3, 2010

(Chapter 8; you may return the quiz on Friday, March 5th)

During Mr. Hampton’s presentation please:

1) **IDENTIFY** the following elements of social interaction between him and you and/or other students;

2) **EXPLAIN** what is not immediately clear from the listing you provide here on a separate sheet (remember to put your name of the separate sheet as well):

**Mr. Hampton:**

Goals:

Rules:

Roles:

**Me:**

Goals:

Rules:

Roles:
Repertoire of elements:

Sequences of behavior:

Concepts and cognitive structure:

Language and speech:
At an international resort your job is to welcome the arriving guests and brief them about the amenities and services the resort offers. Write what you would tell each type of tourist in relation to Hofstede’s dimensions listed below. How would you interact with the guests? In which way would you try to ensure their satisfaction? Use your imagination and allow the resort to offer anything you may find useful to express the most appropriate social interaction with the guests. Use additional sheets if you need. Make sure you put your name on them. (15 min.)

1. Guests from a collectivistic country:

2. Guests from an individualistic country:

3. Guests from a high power distance country:
4. Guests from a low power distance country:

5. Guests from a high uncertainty avoidance country:

6. Guests from a low uncertainty avoidance country:

7. Guests from a short term orientation country:

8. Guests from a long orientation country:

9. Guests from a high masculinity country:
10. Guests from a low masculinity country:

PRTM 447 – QUIZ 7  

NAME:____________________________ 

Wednesday March 24, 2010

(Chapter 12)

Choose 2 out of the 3 exercises below and complete it (20 minutes).

1. **COGNITIVE DISSONANCE THEORY** (Festinger, 1975): Create an example of Cognitive Dissonance Theory in travel and tourism. Use the constructs in the following figure to exemplify how this theory applies to human behavior in travel and tourism:
2. **REINFORCEMENT THEORY** (Skinner, 1969): Create an example of Reinforcement Theory in travel and tourism. Use the constructs in the following figure to exemplify how this theory applies to human behavior in travel and tourism:
3. McCLELLAND’S LEARNED NEEDS THEORY (McClelland, 1953): Using cultures of your choice (you can use the cultures Hofstede indicated as extremes in his study) create short examples of Learned Needs Theory in travel and tourism for each level of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs shown below:
Read the following case study (from your textbook on p. 344) and explain in detail the behaviors displayed by the Japanese and Australian tourists for each numbered, underlined phrase in relations to Hofstede’s 5 dimensions. The 2 tables below may help you in remembering the steps involved in tourists’ behaviors. (30 minutes)

Cultural background strongly influences Japanese tourist consumer behavior. For instance, the Japanese select a holiday destination differently from a domestic tourist in Australia. 1. In order
to maximize the benefits of their holidays, Japanese carefully pre-plan their travel arrangements. They examine all alternative destinations, their pros and cons, and consider various pricing policies to save additional funds. As a result, in the pre-purchase stage of consumer behavior Japanese spend a lot of time on decision-making. The process of their decision-making is longer when compared to Western consumers. 2. On the other hand, the purchase stage itself is speedier than in Western countries because Japanese try to avoid offending and disturbing the harmony of the group (Ziff-Levine, 1990). In the evaluation stage, Japanese assess the products and services consumed depending on the situation and personal relationships. 3. The Japanese holiday satisfaction level is always weighted against the degree of the Japanese reluctance to express negative emotions.

In contrast, the process of decision making of an average Australian tourist is shorter in the pre-purchased stage. Australians do not spend much time on deciding about their holiday destinations. 4. Their holidays destinations are often unplanned, worry free and relaxed. 5. They are also designed around the individual needs. However, the purchase stage is longer because Australian tourists often shop around to get the best deal in various travel agencies. 6. In the evaluation stage, Australians express their holiday dissatisfaction openly and directly; they often argue and refer to facts.

Hofstede’s intercultural dimensions:

1. Masculinity – Femininity
2. Individualism – Collectivism
3. High – Low Uncertainty Avoidance
4. High – Low Power Distance
5. Long – Short Term Orientation

Example:

1. In order to maximize the benefits of their holidays, Japanese carefully pre-plan their travel arrangements.

In regards to this statement, it is useful to remember that the Japanese, according to Hofstede’s dimensions, are high uncertainty avoidance and long term orientation people. For these reasons when they look for a holiday they try to avoid taking risks that may lead to uncertain and, possibly, unpleasant outcomes. They do not enjoy the unknown and the challenges that “going with the flow” bring. Pre-planning carefully comes natural to them. For these reasons the Japanese most relevant purchase behaviors’ factors from the two figures are, in my opinion:


Purchase: none

Post-Purchase: Satisfaction, Acceptance, Spend, Repeat Purchase, Long Term Commitment, and Loyalty.

PRTM 447 – QUIZ 9

NAME: ________________________________

Wednesday April 14, 2010

(Chapter 15 – 10 minutes)

Please choose the best answer to the following questions:

According to chapter 15 in our textbook,

1. FACE-SAVING as a typical value of which country?
1. a. Australia  
b. China  
c. Spain  
d. Canada  

2. Which country is referred to as SALAD BOWL or MOSAIC in relation to its cultural diversity?  
   a. Russia  
b. United States  
c. Indonesia  
d. United Arab Emirates  

3. In which culture is it customary for men to kiss each other on the cheeks?  
   a. North American  
b. French  
c. Arab  
d. Indian  

4. Which culture is heavily influenced by the Catholic Church?  
   a. Middle Eastern  
b. African  
c. Indian  
d. Latin  

5. Which is the largest Islamic country in the world?  
   a. Saudi Arabia  
b. Indonesia  
c. Japan  
d. India  

6. Which culture sees BARGAINING as a norm?  
   a. Arab  
b. German
c. American
d. Japanese

7. Which country is experiencing LATINIZATION?
   a. Sweden
   b. Poland
   c. India
   d. United States

8. Which country does not have a concept of PRIVACY?
   a. United Kingdom
   b. Canada
   c. China
   d. France

9. Which people are very good at “beating the system”?
   a. Italians
   b. Germans
   c. Canadians
   d. Australians

10. Which people leave sentences unfinished so others can make a conclusion?
    a. Pakistani
    b. Spanish
    c. Japanese
    d. Russians

PRTM 447 - Quiz 9: Answer key

1. b
2. b
3. c
4. d
5. b
PRTM 447 – QUIZ 10

NAME: _____________________________

Wednesday April 21, 2010

(Chapter 16)

1. In the following grid evaluate your **INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE** in your case study area as you believe it was at the **beginning** of your PRTM 447 class, in **January 2010**. The rating goes from a 0 (**no competence**) to 5 (**very high competence**):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traveling for Work</td>
<td>Culture-General Knowledge</td>
<td>Travel and Tourism Professional</td>
<td>Traveling for Pleasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>Cultural Awareness</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td>Culture Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Motivation to Learn about New Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Sensitivity to Cultural Differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Attitude to New Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Personality Traits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Social Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Orientation to Nature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. In the following grid evaluate your **INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE** in your case study area as you believe it is now, at the end of your PRTM 447 class, **in April 2010**.

The rating goes from a 0 (**no competence**) to 5 (**very high competence**):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traveling for Work</th>
<th>Travel and Tourism Professional</th>
<th>Traveling for Pleasure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Culture-General Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Culture-Specific Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cultural Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Foreign Language Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Culture Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>to Learn about New Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Sensitivity to Cultural Differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Attitude to New Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Personality Traits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Social Interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Orientation to Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Orientation to time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

Intercultural Education & Training Module Evaluation

1. The Module was well organized:
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1----------</td>
<td>2----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The pace of the Module was consistent with my ability to learn:
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1----------</td>
<td>2----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The Module’s sessions were thought provoking:
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1----------</td>
<td>2----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The instructor explained the importance of what we were learning:
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1----------</td>
<td>2----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The instructor welcomed student questions in class:
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1----------</td>
<td>2----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The instructor communicated the Module’s material clearly:
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1----------</td>
<td>2----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. I am more interested in the subject now than I was before I took the Module:
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1----------</td>
<td>2----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Given the opportunity, I would further my education and training in this subject:

   Not Very Much
   at all

   1---------------2---------------3---------------4---------------5

9. Taking everything into account, I consider this Module important for PRTM:

   Not Very Much
   at all

   1---------------2---------------3---------------4---------------5

10. Please write below any comments and/or suggestions you may have to improve this Module. Thank you.
APPENDIX I

Classroom Observation
Conducted by Dr. Linda B. Nilson, OTEI Director

Instructor: Cinzia Cross, PRTM
Course: PRTM 342-001: Introduction to Tourism
Date: Monday, November 16, 2009, 11:15am – 12:05pm

You seemed a little confused about the case studies, but your students didn’t seem to mind.

Your use of Google Earth was brilliant! What a great way to reinforce geography! It caught your students’ attention, too.

The cross-cultural dimensions you have your students working with—high and low power distance, high and low individualism, etc.—are very relevant. Consider adding monochromic and polychromic. It’s very important and the Middle East case study draws on it. But I know you can’t throw too much at them at once and you will add more later.

Very good small group exercise having the students explain and analyze the case of their focus to students who studied other cases. Most of the students were highly engaged in the activity. Unfortunately, the football players were not. They weren’t talking very much at all.

You debriefed the cases expertly. You had the students commenting on and adding to one another’s responses. These cases were not clear-cut; they were quite challenging and complex. Then you summed up each case and the student’s analysis of it very succinctly. You asked questions beyond the case as well, such as how to repair the situation. You might consider allowing more wait time and cold-calling on students who were slacking off during the group work.

You have excellent platform skills: an approachable but professional stance and style of dress, excellent eye contact with the class, appropriate gesturing, strong vocal variety (in intonation and pace), and an occasional smile in the right places. You have a good, spontaneous sense of humor as well. You stand in the middle of the classroom, using physical proximity to strengthen your rapport with the class and to encourage their participation.

You use PowerPoint slides very intelligently. You never read the slides and use them more as triggers for your explanations. You give good, student-relevant examples (miscommunication, anxiety, and positive interaction). Your explanations are very clear and concise.

You let the students leave too early. The football players started to exit early. Tell them to stay and sit down for the rest of the class. They’re frustrating and need to be controlled. I know other faculty who have this problem, so don’t take it personally. You might want to time important announcements to come at the end of the class period.

Otherwise, your class went very well.
APPENDIX J

Coding Examples

‘DETAILED’ DATA ANALYSIS EXAMPLE – STUDENT 21F

Case Study: “London’s Cultural Impact on Tourism”

Case Incident: “Lady Diana’s Funeral as an Exceptional International Event”

Excerpt from Case Study, Phase 1 (Case Study 1):

The following is an example of data interpretation on one paragraph student 21F wrote and for which the instructor/researcher identified elements for metacognition and CQ analysis:

“London is an English-speaking country, making it easier for tourists to speak with hotel and restaurant staff, event organizers, tour operators, and any other tourism professionals they may come in contact with….Conversely, if a tourist does not speak English, there is not a problem because London natives usually speak a second language (London is the capital of ethnic diversity as white population falls, 2003), and it would not be hard for tourists of other tongues to communicate.”

Metacognition Elements:

Potential for metacognition increase:

The student showed problem solving attempts in the second part of the paragraph by recognizing that there may be communication problems between visitors and hosts in London. In this effort, there are signals of anchored intuition, knowledge creation and connections between facts and concepts.

Potential for metacognition decrease:

The student lacked cognitive flexibility in the absence of real information processing through either examples, or other metacognitive processes. The student showed surface learning versus
deep learning in focusing on “signs”, and in the oversimplification of the scenario presented. Also, the student did not engage in either “elenchus” (admittance of ignorance) or “aporia” (stage of confusion which should trigger curiosity). Rather than working by induction (from the particular to the general), the student engaged in a deductive process (from general to particular) which led to the oversimplification (ex: London is English-speaking, therefore everybody can understand one another; if people do not speak English, then they speak another language which is understood because London is the capital of ethnic diversity, yet, the paragraph refers to “London’s natives”).

In Phase 1, student 21F showed attempts at recognizing possible depth and complexity to the London “scenario”, but chose to simplify the analysis by deciding the solutions to the possible problems without substantiated evidence on the validity of such easy solutions.

CQ Elements:

Potential for CQ increase:

This student’s potential for increase resides above all in high Motivation and its subgroups. In particular, the constructs of “self-conception” (that is, “us and them”), of “social bonds” (that is, “pride and shame”), of “attraction” and of “openness to new information” allow to speculate on this student’s CQ potential for increase. In particular:

Low uncertainty & anxiety (it is the student’s own perception, though, of how things should be easy on a communicative level in London because it is an English speaking country; the low uncertainty & anxiety is a positive element, but it appears to be based on an Anglo-ethnocentric assumption, which must be kept in check);

Low uncertainty avoidance (the student showed trust in people, hope for success, and simplified encounters among people; life is taken as it comes);
Low power distance (the student showed independence in interactions and a sense of equality, for example when describing the types of interactions that may occur in London with hospitality operators. This trait supports the cultural background of student 21F):

Low negative cognitive dissonance (the student showed no discomfort in having to deal with different environments, by minimizing possible conflicting or stressing situations, and by displaying optimism).

*Potential for CQ decrease:*

The student oversimplified the case through the Knowledge and Skills constructs and their subgroups. For instance, the Knowledge subgroups were superficially addressed in areas such as “expectations” and “similarities and differences”. The student believed that in London there is no problem in communicating, regardless of the origin of the visitors and hosts. Rather than using “cognitive complexity” and “abundance of differences”, this student preferred to simplify reality. Because of the shallow approach in the Knowledge area, the Skills area also suffered from superficiality. For example, “ability to create new categories”, that is, to make more distinctions, was not developed. Also, “tolerance for ambiguity” was characterized by the fact that there was little to no ambiguity in the student’s scenario, which triggered further superficiality in the constructs of “empathy”, “adaptation of our communication”, “gather and use appropriate information”, and “accommodate our behavior”.

In general, the development of mindfulness and the minimization of misunderstanding as key components of high CQ are sought with the student’s genuine wish to be open towards the London experience. Yet, the students’ comments do not reflect a convincing analysis of London’s reality. To synthesize, the student is high in Motivation, but low in Knowledge and Skills.
The traits described for the above excerpt characterized Phase 1 of the case study. For these reasons, and based on the criteria for CQ placement, student 21F’s work was assigned to the following level: CQ for Case Study, Phase 1: LOW.

**Excerpt from Case Study, Phase 2 (Case Study 2)**

As student 21F addressed the organization and management of the funeral of Lady Diana, the instructor/researcher identified elements for metacognition and CQ analysis in close relation to the above illustrated excerpt from Phase 1, in the following paragraph of Phase 2:

“This is not to say there was not a clash of all the cultures in the area, but when people can share a common bond, they are able to open their minds to the other customs around them.”

**Metacognition Elements:**

*Potential for metacognition increase:*

Cognitive flexibility emerged; the student began to recognize the need to address complexity.

The simplification of the event was still sought, but it was rationalized with the acknowledgement of the “common bond” (a CQ element) uniting the crowds gathered for the funeral. Also, the student’s “thinking aloud” process became more conscious and meaningful.

*Potential for metacognition decrease:*

All the elements indicated in the “Potential for metacognition increase” were not pushed to a deeper level of consideration. The student engaged in higher levels of thinking, but did not go very far.

**CQ Elements:**

*Potential for CQ increase:*
Collectivism: the “cultural variability” construct of collectivism emerged indicating that the student recognized and valued collectivistic traits such as tradition and conformity. This elaboration is relevant, especially in relation to the fact that student 21F came from a highly individualistic culture;

Low uncertainty avoidance: student 21F indicated that truth is relative, and showed tolerance toward ambiguity by acknowledging that clashes among cultures may happen when they gather for a special event;

High motivation: this trait developed further from Phase 1 as student 21F believed that “social bonds” (in this case, the common interest in Lady Diana’s fate) are a powerful mean to overcome cultural clashes;

High knowledge: student 21F showed the development of “expectations” in the way people should behave (or not behave) in the event. In particular, if people are able to “open their minds” because of a “common bond”, cultural clashes should diminish. The “shared networks” subgroup rose to a more conscious (cognitive) level as well;

High skills: because of higher knowledge processes the student increased CQ skills as well in displaying a clearer tolerance for ambiguity, empathy, adaptation of communication, and accommodation of behavior.

Potential for decrease:

All the elements indicated in the “Potential for CQ increase” were not pushed to a deeper level of analysis. The student engaged in more elaborate CQ processes, but did not deepen them. Like the metacognitive aspect of the student’s research, the CQ aspect also lacked depth.

The traits described above characterized Phase 2 of the case study. For these reasons, and based on the criteria for CQ placement, student 21F’s work was assigned to the following level:
CQ for Case Study, Phase 2: **MIDDLE**.

In Phase 2, the instructor/researcher wrote the following prompt on the margins of student 21F’s above-mentioned excerpt. This is an example of the Cognitive Apprenticeship technique described in previous sections:

Prompt:

**“Deepen the concept that non-verbal communication was more important here and how, why”**.

The student addressed the instructor’s prompt of Phase 2 with the excerpt below. Excerpts like this one guided the instructor/researcher in the student’s metacognition and CQ processes’ analysis for Phase 3:

**Excerpt from Case Study, Phase 3 (Case Study 3)**

(Response to the instructor’s prompt)

“In this instance Gudykunst’s theory of cultural variability is not as strong as one would think because of the shared meaning of mourning across all cultures at that time: there is not as much uncertainty among the groups. When is grieving in great excess, the motivation behind the emotions blocks out the feelings of uncertainty; people are too sad to worry about uncertainty.”

**Metacognition Elements:**

*Potential for metacognition increase:*

Cognitive apprenticeship: student 21F addressed the instructor’s prompt and tried to deepen the concepts expressed in Phase 2; “thinking aloud” deepened and refined the student’s thought, while making it more visible to the instructor/researcher;
Cognitive flexibility: the student engaged in knowledge creation (attempts); the student recognized the need to stop simplifying the concepts introduced; not only did the student try to justify what lowers uncertainty among groups, but also ventured in further elaborations on Gudykunst’s constructs, even critiqued them;

Inductive reasoning: the student used inductive reasoning to provide the rationale for the lowering of uncertainty among groups (people from all over the world grieved at Lady Diana’s funeral; so, when we grieve in great excess, everything else matters less, including intercultural uncertainty);

*Potential for metacognition decrease:*

Even though the Socratic Method was accepted, it was not fully addressed: for example, the student lacked “elenchus” and subsequent “aporia” in addressing the prompt. Even though “uncertainty and anxiety reduction” was accepted implicitly (CQ element), it was not recognized at a cognitive level.

**CQ Elements:**

*Potential for CQ increase:*

The student moderated uncertainty & anxiety by a more developed elaboration of the motivation, knowledge and skills constructs:

Motivation was expressed in the “needs”, “self-conceptions”, and “social bonds” elements in the paragraph (as the student talked about how deep emotions, such as intense grieving, block feelings of uncertainty);

Knowledge, in that the student elaborated on Gudykunst’s Knowledge’s subgroups, taking a position regarding the reasons which trigger certain behaviors. The construct of “alternative interpretations” became central in the student’s analysis;
Skills had potential for increase because the student showed the ability to “create new categories”, “empathize” and “accommodate our behavior” in the analysis rendered on why people lower uncertainty and anxiety when “grieving in excess”.

Potential for CQ decrease:

The student observed the correct behavior (that is, overcoming differences among cultures, and therefore reducing uncertainty and anxiety due to cultural variability), but for the wrong reason; in fact, it is “shared networks” and “social bonds” that “block” uncertainty and anxiety, not “excess grieving”. This misunderstanding, together with the rather shallow approaches to Phase 2 and Phase 3, indicates that even if the student was working on developing higher levels of CQ, CQ maturity was not achieved.

The traits described above characterized Phase 3 of the case study. For these reasons, and based on the criteria for CQ placement, student 21F’s work for Phase 3 was assigned to the following level: CQ for Case Study, Phase 3: MIDDLE.

CQ Tracking

The following figure shows how student 21F processed metacognitive and CQ elements in the scaffolding case study as a continuum:
Student Intercultural Competence Processes Tracking with ‘Detailed’ Analysis

‘SUMMATIVE’ DATA ANALYSIS EXAMPLE – STUDENT 21F

Case Study: “London’s Cultural Impact on Tourism”

Case Incident: “Lady Diana’s Funeral as an Exceptional International Event”

Phase 1 – Instructor’s final comments:

What happened to your reflection paragraph? Nice work, student 21F, more consistency and depth will improve your investigation in the 2nd step.

For Phase 1 student 21F built a good case area, including some references to CQ dimensions and constructs throughout the paper; however, student 21F did not develop a specific CQ Outline at the end of the paper, and addressed Hofstede and Gudykunst’s theoretical dimensions and constructs superficially. Also, student 21F did not write the “Research Process Development: Stages and Insights for My Case Study”, so metacognitive insights were not explicitly available. (This paragraph was rendered later, but did not add much to a clear
metacognitive development. It appeared to be the result of requirements/grade pressure). For these reasons, and based on the criteria for CQ placement, student 21F’s work was assigned to the following level: CQ for Case Study, Phase 1: **LOW**.

**Phase 2 – Instructor’s final comments:**

You followed many of the revisions suggested for case 1 and chose an interesting incident with Lady Diana’s tragic death and following funeral. Your insights are sometimes very well targeted and unconventional, showing a good grasp of what we are learning in class. My only BIG perplexity is: why didn’t you mold your case 2 on Hofstede and Gudykunst’s dimensions and constructs throughout? The book’s chapters should have assisted you in molding your case primarily on the two scholars’ teachings.

In Phase 2, student 21F addressed many of the instructor/researcher’s prompts, allowing the Cognitive Apprenticeship process to begin. Also, student 21F chose an unconventional case incident with Lady Diana’s death and funeral, showing low Uncertainty and Anxiety in dealing with unusual topics. Also, student 21F displayed high Motivation through “attraction” towards the British culture. Metacognition processes began to become visible with the acceptance of many prompts, and the submission of the “Research Process Development: Stages and Insights for My Case Study” for Phase 2 as due. Yet, student 21F did not go as deep as hoped for in CQ and/or metacognitive processes; the connections between the student’s research and the theories studied were rather shallow; most of the student’s remarks were made based on personal liking, rather than on CQ or metacognitive efforts. For these reasons, student 21F’s work was assigned to the following level: CQ for Case Study, Phase 2: **MIDDLE**.

**Phase 3 – Instructor’s final comments:**

Good work, student 21F: you did a fine job in many of the revisions, yet I felt you could have done much more with the new section (part 4 and the integration of it with Hofstede and Gudykunst). The depth I was looking forward to was not reached and your “security” of staying on the surface has left this wonderful topic and its incident rather neutral.
The final comment for Phase 3 exemplifies the consolidation of student 21F’s processes both in CQ and metacognitive development. Several prompts were addressed, yet without a breakthrough in depth and insight. The student preferred not to engage in a thorough analysis of the case and its incident. For these reasons, student 21F’s work was assigned to the following level: CQ for Case Study, Phase 3: **MIDDLE**.

**CQ Tracking**

The following figure shows how student 21F processed metacognitive and CQ elements in the scaffolding case study as a continuum:

**Student 21F: Intercultural Competence Tracking**

[CQ (Berry & Ward, 2006) = Intercultural Competence]

- **Student 21F – Case Study**
  - 1\(^{st}\) phase:
  - Lower CQ
  - 2\(^{nd}\) phase:
  - Middle CQ
  - 3\(^{rd}\) phase:
  - Middle CQ
  - Final = **Middle CQ**
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