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Through an experimental intervention of a four-week cultural project based on the intergroup contact theory, this study sought to (a) explore the possible pedagogical effects on participants’ levels of Intercultural Sensitivity; and (b) investigate the complex interactions between learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity, Foreign Language Motivation, and their Language and Cultural Backgrounds.

Sixty-eight Chinese learning students from a southcentral American university initially participated in the study, whereas only 43 participants completed the required activities and were pretested and posttested on Intercultural Sensitivity and Foreign Language Motivation. The 21 experimental group participants were instructed to complete four cultural assignments during February 2014, namely, interview, skit, news analysis, and sponsor of a cultural event. In contrast, the 22 control group participants continued with their “business-as-usual” language and cultural instructions throughout the study.

Three findings were noted based on the pretest and posttest survey data analyses: (a) statistically significant correlations exist between Intercultural Sensitivity and Foreign Language Motivation, after controlling for the two most influential Language and Cultural Background factors (i.e., Parental Encouragement and Exposure to the Target Language Culture); (b) the four-week innovative culture learning program failed to produce any statistically significant impact on participants’ levels of
Intercultural Sensitivity, in addition to no statistically significant concurrent effects yielded on participants’ levels of Foreign Language Motivation; and (c) three Language and Cultural Background factors (i.e., Parental Encouragement, Exposure to the Target Language Culture, and Chinese Learning History) were significantly related to participants’ responsiveness towards innovative pedagogical approaches in culture learning.

Implications of the current study include (a) strategic integration of language and culture learning in foreign language education to boost and sustain learners’ language motivation; (b) alignment of specific pedagogical approaches with individual learners’ previous language and cultural backgrounds; and (c) implementation of preventive measures to cope with the learning curve phenomenon (e.g., culture shock and learner fatigue) in foreign language and culture learning.

*Keywords*: intercultural sensitivity, foreign language learning motivation, experiential learning
CHAPTER I: STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

As a complex phenomenon, foreign language acquisition involves three basic dimensions: learning, teaching, and using. The understanding and explanation of the emerging issues in foreign language acquisition requires both “breadth” (the inclusion of trans-disciplinary perspectives such as linguistics, psychology, cultural studies, pragmatics, philosophy, etc.) and “depth” (rigorous empirical studies guided by and also aiming at validating certain theoretical frames). Since the beginning of the 20th century, the research in foreign language acquisition (hereafter referred to as FLA) has centered around one fundamental theme: How can the individual learn a foreign language more successfully?

In order to answer this question, three major shifts are noted in the research literature. First, interests have turned from teacher-oriented to learner-oriented (Jang & Jiménez, 2011; Nguyen & Kellogg, 2010; Parla, 1994; Shi, 2006). Realizing how infertile efforts were made to teach a foreign language without considering the learner’s perspective, scholars such as Clément (1980) and Dörnyei (1994) have focused on examining the learner’s unique FLA motivation, attitudes, and cultural identity, as well as their individual use of specific learning strategies under specific circumstances, in an attempt to inform foreign language (FL) educators how to facilitate individual learners’ optimal experience.
Second, much emphasis has been placed on FLA process rather than products in empirical studies (Jang & Jiménez, 2011). Traditionally the FLA products/outcomes refer to the learner’s performance on the four core language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing while studies on the FLA process (Byram & Kramsch, 2008) cover a variety of interactive effects between the learner and different contexts (instructional methods, pedagogical approaches, classroom structures, peer interaction and relationships, contacts with the L2 native-speakers or community, influences of both L1 and L2 cultures, etc.)

Third, researchers (Byram & Feng, 2004; Byram & Kramsch, 2008; Jang & Jiménez, 2011) now tend to adopt a holistic/comprehensive approach towards FLA instead of attempting to draw simplistic causal relationships between several isolated factors. The increasing awareness of the fluidity and complexity of the FLA learning process has led many scholars to believe that no one-size-fits-all solutions exist for the issues in FLA and any pedagogical recommendations need to be made cautiously based on consideration of all three above-mentioned dimensions: teaching, learning, and using (Akinyemi, 2005; Byram & Feng, 2004; Byram & Kramsch, 2008; Durocher, 2007).

Without exception, these three important changes in the FLA research literature also are reflected in the two frontier areas related to teaching culture and the learner’s language motivation. Specifically, the following sections address the status quo in teaching culture, experiential learning and teaching culture, research advances in understanding language motivation, as well as theoretical developments and empirical studies associating teaching culture and foreign language motivation.

**Disagreement in Teaching Culture**

Research in the cultural dimension of FL education has included four phases of
development characterized by “whether to teach culture,” “what to teach about culture,” “how to teach culture,” and “what to achieve through teaching culture” in sequential order. Consensus among scholars and educators has been reached only on “whether to teach culture,” as clearly demonstrated in the five C’s of the National Standards for Foreign Language Learning (1999): communication, culture, connections, comparisons, and communities. As a result, the understanding and knowledge about teaching culture as an integral part of FL education still lacks clarity. The most debated issues include how to standardize objectives for teaching culture, whether to teach static cultural facts/content vs. teaching intercultural awareness/sensitivity as a dynamic learning process, and how to balance between the individuality of the learners and the uniformity of the instructional activities involving all learners.

In sum, considering that most of the studies on teaching culture are descriptive in nature (Byram & Feng, 2004; Byram & Kramsch, 2008; Jang & Jiménez, 2011; Knutson, 2006; Martinsen, 2011; Parla, 1994), there is an urgent need for two kinds of research efforts in the future: overarching theoretical frameworks that capture the essential commonalities of teaching culture as part of FL education, and solid empirical studies that put these theoretical frameworks to the test of educational practice. In addition, as suggested by the overall turn to the holistic approach in FLA research, connecting the teaching of culture to other aspects of FL education is a concern.

**Experiential Learning and Teaching Culture**

Rooted in John Dewey’s (1938) theory that education should be a life-long learning process integrated with and tested in real-world experiences, the model of experiential learning has been developed primarily based on Kolb’s (1984) seminal work
on deciphering the process of learning though doing. Experiential learning forms a looping cycle covering four stages: concrete personal experience, reflective observing, abstract conceptualizing, and active experimenting. In other words, effective experiential learners start from “doing” by themselves, followed by their making sense of “what they have done.” The observation and reflection lead to the formation of their own beliefs, attitudes, conceptualization, and knowledge generalization, which are then put to test in further “doing” and real-world experiences.

Chau (1992) followed the line of preference for experiential learning over traditional didactic methods such as lectures or readings in the literature of teaching cultural awareness and competence by emphasizing skill development based on the affective side of learning through real cross-cultural encounters and practice. Lewis and Hayes (1991) also highlighted the unique value of experiential contacts with people from different cultures and the necessity to improve students’ self-awareness in effective cultural training programs.

Cited among other effective and widely-used pedagogical techniques to teach cultural sensitivity and competence, cultural genograms and racial storytelling have been used to inspire and guide students to examine their own cultural beliefs, attitudes, stereotypes, and presumptions (Hardy & Laszloffy, 1992); ethnographic interviews and inviting guest speakers from different cultures are recommended for increasing students’ exposure to different cultures (Weaver, 1998). In helping students build up various cultural competence skills, case studies, simulations, and role plays have been found successful in many teaching contexts (Chau, 1990, 1992; LaFromboise & Foster, 1992; Leong & Kim, 1991; Lewis & Hayes, 1991).
Weaver (1998), in examining the related literature concerning cultural experiential learning, drew attention to the application of two particular experiential learning techniques (a cross-cultural buddy system and interactions in cultural communities) based on the belief that these exercises underline increasing both students’ self-awareness and their cultural exposures—two necessary preconditions to build adequate intercultural sensitivity and competence. The buddy system refers to partnering a student up with a “buddy” from a different cultural background who meets and interacts with the assigned student regularly throughout the semester. The student is expected to keep a journal to track all the cross-cultural activities with his/her buddy, and the journal is used for evaluation purposes. This exercise is designed to facilitate in-depth cross-cultural communication on a neutral basis. In contrast, the exercise of interactions in cultural communities focuses more heavily on reaching out into “the other’s turf” in order to “force” students to adjust to the ways of thinking and life other than their own (Weaver, 1998, pp. 75-76).

In more recent empirical research related to cultural experiential learning, new training models have been developed and tested using both quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods. One of such models is the Excellence in Cultural Experiential Learning and Leadership (EXCELL) program, a structured training paradigm for individuals to master a wide range of intercultural competencies, particularly in assessing and negotiating in complex cross-cultural interactions (Westwood, Mak, Barker, & Ishiyama, 2000). Knott, Mak, and Neill (2013) have conducted a mixed method evaluation of the application of the EXCELL model with 94 first year psychology students who engaged in two EXCELL tasks throughout a semester, namely, alliance...
A post-task survey collected information on students’ self-reported educational and intercultural experiences specific to the two tasks. Both quantitative and qualitative results suggested an improvement in various aspects of students’ cultural learning, such as increased intercultural confidence, decreased intercultural prejudice and stereotypes, and bettered intercultural encounter readiness.

Other cultural experiential learning models frequently used in various educational settings include short-term study abroad programs and service learning. Related empirical research is abundant in adopting more generally based instruments (such as the Global Competency and Intercultural Sensitivity Index and the Cultural Competence Assessment) to measure the changes (if any) in students’ intercultural sensitivity and competence. Williams (2005) carried out an experimental study to explore the impact of study abroad programs on students’ intercultural adaptability and sensitivity by comparing the pre-post differences of study-abroad students and that of stay-on-campus students in taking the two surveys: the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory and the Intercultural Sensitivity Index. Results showed that study-abroad students reported a greater increase in intercultural communication skills compared to stay-on-campus students, with the level of exposure to various cultures being the strongest predictor. In terms of the application service learning in health education, Houseman, Meaney, Wilcox, and Cavazos (2012) also implemented a quasi-experimental study with students enrolled in community health courses. Seventeen students volunteered to participate in a three-week service learning project. The Cultural Competence Assessment (CCA) was administered to measure all students’ cultural competence levels at the beginning and the end of the course. Results indicated that service-learning students achieved significantly
higher scores on cultural competence behavior than non-service-learning students.

In summary, most of the empirical studies on cultural experiential learning have been focused on various forms of classroom action research (based on one or several specific culture teaching techniques) and teaching effects measured in largely qualitative data such as student journal and course-specific feedback. Recent studies, however, revealed a trend in designing and implementing more structured cultural training models rather than separate unsystematic techniques, and the priority in evaluating teaching and learning culture starts to shift from qualitative to quantitative methods (i.e., generally based psychometric instruments have been developed and used to measure student cultural learning outcomes. Quasi-experimental or experimental designs rather than classroom action research have also been adopted in exploring the effects of certain cultural training models.) The proposed study embodies these two features in its research design.

**Advances in Understanding Language Motivation**

In comparison, the research in the FL learner’s motivation has never lacked the guidance of general theoretical frameworks. Starting from the late 1950s, the research in FL learner’s motivation has experienced a strong momentum based on the proposal of the social-psychological approach by Gardner and Lambert (1972), particularly “the distinction between integrative and instrumental motivation” (Cai & Zhu, 2012, p. 308). Although this theory laid a solid foundation for empirical studies on learner motivation, the two-level framework failed to address the variability and multiple facets of the learner motivation subject to various contextual influences. To complement this weakness, Dörnyei (2005, 2009) put forward a new theory called L2 motivational self system, a
comprehensive examination of the three major aspects of the FL learner motivation: (a) ideal L2 self (the type of L2 speaker the learner aspires to become), (b) ought-to L2 self (the type of L2 speaker the learner is required/expected to become), and (c) L2 learning experience (the aspect of the learner motivation related to the immediate learning environment/experience) (as cited in Cai & Zhu, 2012, p. 311). The contribution of this new theory is especially prominent with the inclusion of the learning experience component to complete the entire picture of the learner motivation in specific contexts.

**Associating Culture Teaching with Language Motivation**

In that foreign language learning motivation is a rather complex and multi-faceted construct, Dornyei (1994) extended Gardner and Lambert’s (1972, p. 279) theoretical framework primarily from the social psychological perspective to a comprehensive language motivation construct consisting of three levels: the language level, the learner level, and the learning situation level. As Dornyei (1994, p. 275) eloquently explained, his new framework focused on the social and pragmatic dimension of language motivation which is “always dependent on who learns what language where.” Especially on the language level, Dornyei (1994) deciphered the complex nature and role of language to argue that language serves as a communication tool; reflects the individual’s identity; and at the same time helps form and maintain social organizations (p. 274). Therefore, learning a foreign language should never be limited to the memorization and use of linguistic coding systems, but concerns real people, as well as different ways of life and thinking. In this regard, the sociocultural components of language learning emerge as key determinants for language learners’ motivation. Dornyei (1994) proposed a list of specific strategies on how to motivate language learners in classroom settings.
through culture studies and cross-cultural contact (shown as below):

- Include a sociocultural component in the language syllabus by sharing positive experiences related to the target-language culture
- Develop learners’ cross-cultural awareness systematically by focusing on cross-cultural similarities and not just differences
- Promote student contact with native speakers of the target language. (p. 281)

Another line of language motivation studies focused on student needs assessment in foreign language learning (Dornyei, 1994; Ho, 1998; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Seedhouse, 1995). Combining the findings of the relevant studies, language learners’ needs specifically associated with the target-language culture and/or people are selected and identified as follows:

- Broadening one’s horizon
- Interests in or curiosity about foreign language culture and people
- Friendship with native speakers of the target-language
- Seeking new intellectual stimulation
- Developing greater cultural tolerance through language study
- Aiding world peace (Dornyei, 1994, pp. 60-66)

One thing to note is that these needs assessments have been conducted in the context where students (adults or teenagers) choose to learn a certain foreign language as a school subject to fulfill their school requirements. The results of the need assessments have shown that encouraging and facilitating students’ cultural studies and contacts in foreign language education can be crucial to improving student language motivation, since they directly assist in satisfying language learners’ needs to know more about the
“foreignness” not only in language but also in the general sociocultural reality.

In exploring the ways in which cultural teaching and studies can be effectively used to motivate language learners, this study relies heavily on the frameworks of Kolb’s (1984) four-step experiential learning process as well as Allport’s (1954, pp. 479-500) intergroup contact theory from the social psychological perspective. In his study of prevalent prejudice across racial groups, Allport (1954) contended that positive effects from intergroup contact could only occur when four conditions of the contact situation are present: (a) equal status of the groups in contact, (b) common goals shared by the groups, (c) intergroup cooperation, and (d) the support of authorities, law, or custom.

Abundant theoretical and empirical research has been conducted in applying Allport’s (1954) Contact Hypothesis in second language acquisition (Giles & Byrne, 1982). Specifically concerning foreign/second language motivation, Clement (1980) found that the quality and quantity of intercultural contact had the most important influence on FL learners’ “self-confidence,” a key determinant of their language motivation. However, it is also noted that further empirical research is needed to clarify the interrelations between the program design, duration, frequency, location, sponsors, and participants of the intercultural contacts and their combined effects on participants’ language and culture learning properly measured by established, relevant psychometric instruments (Clement, 1980; Dörnyei & Clément, 2001; Dörnyei & Csizér, 2005).

The Problem Defined

Unfortunately, a brief review of the research literature in both the fields of teaching culture and learner motivation indicates that few scholars have looked at the possible relationships between the learner’s intercultural sensitivity and language
motivation. Limited research has been conducted regarding the learner’s improvement of intercultural sensitivity as part of the learning outcomes of FLE or the suggestion that high learner motivation could be one of the possible causes for such improvements. Rubenfeld, Clement, Lussier, Lebrun, and Auger (2006) noted in their research on L2 learning process and individuals’ cultural representations that positive attitudes towards the target culture tended to motivate individuals to learn that target language. This discovery was followed by a study exclusively devoted to exploring the relationship between language motivation and intercultural competence, which concluded that higher language motivation led to better cultural adaptation (Rubenfeld, Sinclair, & Clement, 2007). Hernandez (2010) examined the role of integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, and interaction with a second language (L2) culture in shaping students’ speaking performance before and after participation in a one-semester study-abroad program in Spain, and concluded that language motivation predicted the intensity of interactions with the target culture in which participants of the study-abroad programs engaged.

However, to the author’s knowledge, no one has examined the empirical possibility of improved intercultural sensitivity causing higher language motivation in regular foreign language classroom settings. If, as defined by Gardner and Lambert (as cited in Hernandez, 2010), integrative motivation represents an interest in learning the L2 in order to identify with the L2 group as well as positive attitudes towards the L2 native speakers, the natural inference would be that improved understanding of the L2 culture increases the likelihood of developing positive cultural attitudes, and thus should correlate positively with the learner’s integrative motivation in FLA.
Based on the previous discussions, a two-fold problem can be identified in the literature. As has been noted and is clarified in the review of literature section, one problem area is the lack of theoretical guidance and empirical support for designing pedagogical instruction/interventions aimed at the improvement of the FL learner’s intercultural sensitivity. To tackle this problem, systematic efforts have to be made to clarify the learning objectives for proposed cultural instruction/intervention, the theoretical rationale, the detailed design and arrangement of student activities, as well as monitoring closely both the process and the effects/impact of such instruction/intervention. The second problem area involves providing empirical evidence for the possible causal relationship between intercultural sensitivity and language motivation.

**Purpose of the Study**

This study brings together the results discussed in *The Problem Defined* above. In essence, the level of sensitivity towards the target culture varies largely among foreign language learners, as does learners’ individual motivation to learn the target language. It is these variances that give rise to the problem areas proposed for this study in the first place. If a causal link can be established between intercultural sensitivity and language motivation, then it might be possible for pedagogical recommendations to be made from a completely new perspective to inform practices in both the cultural and the linguistic dimension of foreign language acquisition.

Thus, the purpose of this study is to explore ways in which FL learners’ degree of sensitivity towards the target foreign culture compares with their motivation level to learn the target foreign language. Specifically, the study focuses on three primary objectives:
first, to explore the actual effects of the designed quasi-experimental intervention based on experiential learning in manipulating the level of intercultural sensitivity; second, to ascertain the possible causal relationship between intercultural sensitivity and language motivation if the intervention is found effective; and finally, to determine the extent to which the degree of intercultural sensitivity combined with selected demographic variables can predict a person’s level of language motivation as demonstrated in six specific components (general FLL interest, desire to learn the Chinese language, attitudes towards the Chinese Language, integrative motivation orientation, instrumental motivation orientation, and motivational intensity). This leads to the two central research questions (CRQs) for this study: (a) To what extent can Chinese-learners’ levels of intercultural sensitivity be manipulated by the designed four-week cultural experiential learning project based on the intergroup contact theory compared to the control group; and (b) To what extent are Chinese-learners’ levels of intercultural sensitivity associated with their language motivation after controlling for the effects of their language and cultural background factors?

**Research Questions**

There are a total of eight empirical research questions (ERQs) under the above two central research questions. This section elucidates on the relationships between the central research questions and their related empirical questions. Three figures are used to demonstrate the multiple independent and dependent variables involved in the research and their interactions. Figure 1 corresponds to CRQ (a) and ERQs 1-4; Figure 2 corresponds to CRQ (b) and ERQ 5; Figure 3 also relates to CRQ (b) but with ERQs 6 and 7. Finally Figure 4 addresses both CRQ (a) and CRQ (b) with a post-hoc ERQ 8.
Research Questions 1-4

For the first central research question, namely, to what extent Chinese-learners’ levels of intercultural sensitivity can be manipulated by a designed four-week cultural experiential learning project based on intergroup contact theory compared to the control group, a quasi-experimental study is conducted and four empirical research questions are employed to explore the intervention effects.

1. Is there a significant interaction effect between condition (experimental vs. control) and Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI) test scores (pre vs. post)?

2. Is there a significant difference in the Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI) post test scores between the experimental and control group, controlling for the ICSI pretest scores?

3. Is there a significant interaction effect between condition (experimental vs. control) and Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) test scores (pre vs. post)?

4. Is there a significant difference in the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) post test scores between the experimental and control group, controlling for the AMTB pretest scores?
Figure 1. Logic Model depicting the quasi-experimental design to ascertain the intervention effects, where A1, C1 = Pre-Intervention data collection on Intercultural Sensitivity; B1, D1 = Pre-Intervention data collection on Language Learning Motivation; A2, C2 = Post-Intervention data collection on Intercultural Sensitivity; B2, D2 = Post-Intervention data collection on Language Learning Motivation.

Research Question 5

Regarding the second central research question (to what extent are the Chinese-learners’ levels of Intercultural Sensitivity associated with their Language Learning Motivation after controlling for the effects of their Language and Cultural Background factors?), Figure 2 explains the influence that all six student language and cultural background variables have on the main variables of interest (Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation), with the hope of extracting the most relevant demographic controls. For this purpose, correlational studies are implemented to answer ERQ 5.

5. To what extent are American adult Chinese-learners’ language and cultural background factors (Ethnicity, Gender, Parental Encouragement, Chinese
Learning History, Chinese Courses Currently Taken, and Exposure to the Target Language Culture) associated with their levels of Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation, respectively?

![Figure 2. Logic Model depicting associations between Foreign Language Learners’ Language and Cultural Background and their levels of Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation.](image)

**Research Questions 6 and 7**

In contrast, Figure 3 (also associated with the second central research question) hypothesizes the impact of Intercultural Sensitivity on Language Learning Motivation after controlling for the significant demographic factors. ERQs 6 and 7 are answered based on partial correlational studies.

6. To what extent is American adult Chinese-learners’ level of intercultural sensitivity associated with their level of Language Learning Motivation after controlling for the effects of the significant Language and Cultural Background factors?

7. When controlling for any significant Language and Cultural Background factors, to what extent does the change in American adult Chinese-learners’
Intercultural Sensitivity predict the change in their Language Learning Motivation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderator Variables</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language &amp; Cultural Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chinese learning history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chinese courses currently taken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parental encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exposure to the Target Language Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Learning Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3.* Logic Model depicting associations between Foreign Language Learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation after controlling for the significant Language and Cultural Background factors.

**Research Question 8**

For post hoc study purposes, Figure 4 (based on the findings on both CRQs and the preceding 7 ERQs) illustrates specifically what types of American adult Chinese-learners (defined by the six language and cultural background variables listed below) are more likely to be impacted by the experimental intervention and show greater gains in their levels of Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation. Correlational studies are performed to answer ERQ 8.

8. To what extent do American adult Chinese-learners’ Language and Cultural Background factors predict the changes in their levels of Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Motivation respectively?
Figure 4. Logic Model depicting associations between Foreign Language Learners’ Language and Cultural Background factors and their pre-post intervention gains in Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation.

**Significance of the Study**

As noted by Byram and Feng (2004), teaching culture in the field of foreign language education had not received adequate attention until the late 1980s. The confusion and disagreements in the theories and applications of teaching culture were also accompanied by the lack of empirical research on the relationships, especially the possible causal relationships between the foreign language learners’ intercultural and linguistic competence (Byram & Feng, 2004, p. 149).

Specifically pertaining to curriculum development and implementation in teaching culture, language educators and researchers have adopted various ethnographic approaches to systemize the pedagogical models of foreign language education aimed at improving student proficiency, both in the target language and simultaneously in handling cross-cultural circumstances (Byram, 1989; Coleman, 1995; Roberts, Byram, Barro, Jordan, & Street, 2001). Among these pedagogical models, study abroad programs and short-term intensive language and cultural training programs (predominantly targeting international business personnel for preparing their future work and life in
foreign countries) are relatively mature, widely used, and adequately researched. In contrast, the research on and application of teaching intercultural sensitivity and competence in naturalistic settings has not reached the same depth. Although a number of innovative pedagogical techniques and experiments in teaching culture (often with positive results) have been implemented in foreign language classrooms, a structured model focused on experiential learning and ethnographic approaches remains to be developed and tested in educational practice and research. Addressing the two above-mentioned problems in research on teaching culture as part of foreign language education, the present study is expected to make at least four contributions.

First, the study adds to the existing knowledge base of the cultural dimension of foreign language education. As more is known about the relationship (possibly causal) of teaching intercultural sensitivity to such areas as the foreign language learner’s language learning motivation, it will be possible to deepen the understanding of the meaning of teaching culture to foreign language learners. The study uses two generally based psychometric instruments to gather data on student intercultural sensitivity (Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory [ICSI]) and language motivation (the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery [AMTB]), and the data are processed for quantitative analysis on (a) the interaction between intercultural sensitivity, language motivation, and language and cultural background factors, and (b) the intervention effects (if any) of a structured experiential culture learning program based on comparison with the control group. It is in this sense that the study can provide further empirical evidence in linking foreign language students’ cultural competence to their linguistic competence.

Second, this study makes an innovative pedagogical attempt to focus exclusively
on structured, high-quality intercultural contacts in an attempt to raise foreign language learners’ intercultural sensitivity in a structured classroom context. This attempt results in the modification and implementation of a four-task experiential culture learning project as the experimental intervention in this quasi-experimental study. The in-depth investigation of the process in which such culture learning projects work to change participants’ level of intercultural sensitivity will provide valuable reference for curriculum development and class planning practice in teaching culture in foreign language classrooms. Even if no significant intervention effects are found, the study can also produce certain empirical evidence in understanding and locating various contextual and intrinsic factors of the intervention program that fail to facilitate positive student culture learning outcomes.

Third, this study utilizes a self-developed demographic questionnaire to gather student information on their language and culture background factors, such as ethnicity, gender, Chinese learning history, Chinese courses currently taken, parental encouragement, and personal exposure to the target-language culture. Drawn from the literature related to foreign language acquisition from the learner’s perspective (Moran, 2001; Perdue, 2000; Roberts et al., 2001), the questionnaire is developed to capture individual characteristics of foreign language learners that might influence their culture and language learning motivation and outcomes. The data are then coded for quantitative analysis to explore the correlations between these individual learner background factors and their levels of intercultural sensitivity and language motivation. The most relevant background factors are located and can further serve as control variables to single out the intervention effects on student culture learning and language motivation. The findings
could help shed light on personalized learning oriented to curriculum development in the area of teaching culture based on student unique needs and individual language and culture backgrounds.

Finally, the ultimate issue underlying the study is how globalization changes the nature of higher education. It is anticipated that the study may identify ways through which higher education not only imparts knowledge and provides skill training, but more importantly, contributes to preparing students for life-long learning and global citizenship. While this is an enormous undertaking, the study could prove to be a small step in this direction.

**Limitations of the Study**

All research has limitations and the current study is no exception. There are seven major limitations to the current investigation.

First, the study is limited in terms of its generalizability to the total population of adult foreign language learners. Like any other student population, adult foreign language learners are a very heterogeneous population. This particular study was done with one of the Chinese programs in a large mid-southern university in the United States. The information comes from the undergraduate Chinese learners enrolled in this program only. There are many other kinds of Chinese training programs in this university. Some of them exclusively target honor students with higher GPAs while others are short-term Chinese culture and language programs designed for interested learners of all ages and various backgrounds. It is quite possible that teachers from different programs might have different perspectives on how best to teach students about culture and to improve their motivation effectively. This research also represented one very small area of the
Unites States. Different states have different foreign language education policies and requirements for both students and teachers. While this sample should be quite diverse in terms of student backgrounds, the fact remains that certain segments of the adult foreign language learner population will not be included.

A second potential limitation of the study is that the independent (intercultural sensitivity) and dependent variables (language motivation) are measured as subjects’ self-perceptions, not objective ratings of actual behavioral changes. In essence, the study does not address the learner’s actual intercultural competence nor does it address the changes in the learner’s foreign language proficiency level as a result of improvement in self-perceived language learning motivation; rather it describes the changes in subjects’ awareness levels in these areas. This limitation may lead to inaccuracy in measured changes (if any) in students’ levels of intercultural sensitivity and language motivation before and after the intervention due to different positive or negative tendencies in student self-evaluation, or in student attitudes towards taking the pre and post surveys, and thus may affect the ensuing conclusion about the effects of the experiential learning program.

Third, this study is dependent on the highly experimental nature of the experiential culture-learning project used as the intervention program. Developed from experiential learning theory, the four tasks assigned to participants were adapted from an existing training program for international business students to develop their cross-cultural skills (Sizoo & Serrie, 2004). The original training program includes five cross-cultural exercises: (a) ethnographic interview to build cross-cultural management skills at the personal level, (b) analysis of cross-cultural critical incidents to address intercultural
competence at the *interpersonal* level, (c) cross-cultural skit to facilitate emotional commitment at the *institutional* level, (d) international news critique to develop analytical skills at the *institutional* level, and (e) cross-cultural exchange event to consolidate intercultural sensitivity and skills at all three levels (Sizoo & Serrie, 2004, pp. 161-163).

In comparison, due to considerations of participants’ availability and their limited linguistic and cultural competence in the target language (most of the participants are beginner Chinese learners), only four out of the five tasks were selected for the intervention program (the task, analysis of cross-cultural critical incident, was dropped for its high requirement of knowledge of and sensitivity toward the target language culture). Furthermore, the duration of the program was reduced to six weeks in contrast to the original one semester. These above-mentioned program adaptations may negatively influence the intervention effects.

Fourth, the fidelity of implementation for the intervention may be a concern. During the course of the program, participants’ days of presence in their chosen Chinese classes may be subject to changes due to weather, school breaks, and personal reasons, which will inevitably affect their participation and completion of the assigned tasks. In addition, participants’ dropout rates from the intervention program may be higher than expected since completing all four assigned tasks requires a large amount of time and efforts input from the participants yet only accounts for 20% of their final grade. Moreover, although the Chinese instructors are trained to monitor directly participants’ activities, administer the pre and posttests, they may have different levels of understanding/interpretation of the nature of the experiential culture learning. Further, regarding pedagogy that is intended to be used in the intervention, the implementation of
such an intervention program over a span of two months represents an extra burden to their normal workload.

Fifth, participants were randomly selected as an entire class to constitute the pre-post matched groups (experimental vs. control) from a total of four classes enrolled in the 100-level and 200-level Chinese courses at the point of the study (two classes for each level). However, the two classes at each level do not entail students’ exactly equal in Chinese language and cultural proficiencies. For example, Chinese 102 students have supposedly taken Chinese for one more semester than Chinese 101 students, and the same structural difference also applies to the Chinese 201 and 202 students. Due to the overall limited student enrollment in the Chinese language program, the investigator was compelled not to account for such class differences at the same level (Chinese 100 and 200) when matching the participants for the experimental and control groups.

Sixth, there were three different instructors for the above mentioned four Chinese classes at the point of study: Instructor A taught Chinese 102, Instructor B taught Chinese 101, and Instructor C taught both Chinese 201 and 202. Therefore, it is very possible that individual instructor differences (in teaching experiences, teaching styles and preferences, and instructional quality, etc.) may have unavoidable confounding effects on the participants’ pre-post intervention changes in their levels of Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation, which are very difficult to separate from the intended intervention effects in the current study due to the small sample size.

Finally, anytime an instrument is employed in data collection, the results are subject to the known reliability and validity of that instrument. Although some information about the instruments with respect to reliability and validity is known, the
instruments may have limitations in representing what they purport to measure. Only subsequent research with other audiences and other instruments will help further understanding of the concepts being measured in the study.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this investigation, the following terms are defined. These concepts are generally consistent with the vocabulary used in the field of foreign language acquisition and education.

*Intercultural sensitivity:* The ability to discriminate and experience relevant differences between the home and target culture. Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) argued that intercultural sensitivity is an individual’s reaction to people from other cultures, which can predetermine that individual’s ability to work successfully with those people. They further conceptualized intercultural sensitivity into three measurable dimensions: (a) understanding of behavioral differences in individualistic vs. collectivist cultures (the U.S. context versus the Chinese context, constituting two subscales), (b) open-mindedness about cultural differences, (c) willingness and flexibility in adjusting one’s behavioral patterns according to cultural differences (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992, p. 413).

Similarly defined according to Chen and Starosta (1996), “intercultural sensitivity is the affective dimension of intercultural communication competence that refers to the emotional desire of a person to acknowledge, appreciate, and accept cultural differences” (as cited in Fritz, Möllenberg, & Chen, 2002, p. 166). This dimension includes six components: self-esteem, self-monitoring, empathy, open-mindedness, being nonjudgmental, and social relaxation. Intercultural sensitivity entails a person’s cognitive and affective frame-shifting in their worldview after receiving successful training.
**Intercultural competence:** As suggested by Hammer, Bennett, and Wiseman (2003, p. 430), intercultural sensitivity should be distinguished from the term “intercultural competence” which refers to “the ability to think and act in inter-culturally appropriate ways”; further, “greater intercultural sensitivity is associated with greater potential for exercising intercultural competence.”

**Adult foreign language learners:** In this study, adult foreign language learners is defined as any person of at least 18 years of age who is learning a foreign language in a college-level language program.

**Foreign language motivation:** The foreign language learner’s “combination of effort and desire to achieve the goal of learning the language, plus favorable attitudes towards learning the language” (Gardner, 1985a, p. 10). Operationally this includes (a) general interest in learning foreign languages and desire to learn the particular foreign language, (b) attitudes towards learning the target language, the target language group, and language learning experience, and (c) motivational intensity (the amount of effort invested in learning the target language) (Gardner, 1985a, p. 15-28). It is measured by the slightly modified international version of the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB), developed by Gardner (Gardner, Masgoret, Tennant, & Mihic, 2004).

**Summary**

With the accelerating pace of international cooperation and exchanges, the ultimate purpose of foreign language education is to be better integrated into and support the general educational system in order to prepare students for global citizenship. Thus linguistic knowledge and competence are no longer treated as the one and only learning objective for foreign language learners; instead, student acquisition of a comprehensive
set of cross-cultural awareness and skills at the cognitive, affective, and practical levels have become the new ideal for foreign language educators. As educators gain more insights into innovative pedagogies in teaching culture, the connections between cultural competence and linguistic competence take on an increasing interest among scholars. Researchers have realized that teaching language and culture should exist as separate modules in foreign language education that are independent of each other; rather, as Byram and Kramsch (2008) eloquently put it, foreign language teachers in the United States need to be “challenged to teach not language and culture, but language as culture” (p. 21).

One way to approach the relationship between language and culture learning is to explore the impact of intercultural sensitivity on foreign language motivation. To that purpose, such an exploratory investigation needs to include three steps: (a) an effective pedagogy in teaching culture must be located as the intervention program with the hope of successfully manipulating learners’ level of intercultural sensitivity in a quasi-experimental study; (b) a control group is identified as the necessary comparison to single out the intervention effects (if any); and (c) suitable psychometric instruments are pinpointed to measure the changes in participants’ intercultural sensitivity and language motivation respectively. A brief review of the existing literature shows very limited research has been conducted pursuant to exploring the possible causal links between intercultural sensitivity and language motivation generally; to the author’s knowledge, no one has utilized a quasi-experimental design in this regard.

Overall, this quasi-experimental study adapts and implements an experiential culture-learning project as the intervention program to compare participants’ pre-post
scores on intercultural sensitivity and language motivation across the experimental and control groups. The dual purpose of this study lies in (a) determining the effects of the experimental intervention in manipulating participants’ intercultural sensitivity, and (b) exploring the impact of the changes in intercultural sensitivity on participants’ language motivation, as a beginning in the establishment of causal links between intercultural sensitivity and language learning motivation. The study is designed to answer two central research questions: (a) To what extent can Chinese-learners’ levels of intercultural sensitivity be manipulated by the designed four-week cultural experiential learning project based on the intergroup contact theory compared to the control group; and (b) To what extent are Chinese-learners’ levels of intercultural sensitivity associated with their language motivation after controlling for the effects of their language and cultural background factors? This study is primarily subject to limitations in program implementation fidelity, participant’s dropout, and generalizability.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Chapter I described the recent major trends in the research literature related to foreign language acquisition, and identified the existing gap in the understanding of the possible causal relationships between learners’ intercultural sensitivity level and their foreign language learning motivation. Thus, this quasi-experimental study aimed to explore the effects of changes in learners’ intercultural sensitivity (manipulated through an experiential learning intervention) on their motivation in learning a foreign language. Under this research purpose, nine empirical research questions were specified to determine (a) the significance of the intervention on participants’ level of intercultural sensitivity, and (b) the significance of the concurrent changes in participants’ level of language motivation. The study was expected to add to the knowledge base of the cultural dimension of foreign language education, and provide valuable empirical evidence in furthering the understanding of the interrelated patterns between intercultural sensitivity and language motivation. However, five major limitations were also acknowledged as the issue of generalizability, subjectivity in self-report measures, experimental nature of the intervention design and development, implementation fidelity of the intervention program, and choice of the psychometric instruments.

In this chapter, a review of the literature was conducted using EBSCOhost, ProQuest, and Web of Science accessed through the library at Western Kentucky
University (WKU). Literature was reviewed and reported below on intercultural sensitivity, teaching culture as part of foreign language education, language motivation, and the relationships or links between intercultural sensitivity and language motivation in the foreign language education settings. The key words *Intercultural Sensitivity* and *Language Learning Motivation* were input for the literature search when using the above-mentioned databases. The resources listed in the search findings were then further filtered according to their degree of relevance to the current study.

The first part of Chapter II, *Intercultural Sensitivity*, addresses conceptual studies (explications of intercultural sensitivity in the settings of foreign language education and evaluation of various related instruments of measurement) and empirical research (factors causing changes in the FL learner’s intercultural sensitivity). The second section in the chapter, *Teaching Culture*, includes theoretical frameworks (general models based on which different pedagogical approaches and curricular designs are developed for effective teaching culture as part of FLE) and empirical studies (educational action research on implementing different pedagogical approaches in terms of teaching and assessing intercultural sensitivity). The next section, *Language Learning Motivation*, covers relevant definitions, theories, and instruments of measurement, as well as empirical studies on the factors affecting language learning motivation. Finally, the last part of Chapter II represents the intersection of the main topics in this chapter, theoretical frameworks, and empirical studies and discusses the existing gap in the current research literature. The chapter ends with a *Summary*.

**Intercultural Sensitivity**

The very conceptualization and definition of intercultural sensitivity is highly
contextualized and thus often seems confusing to researchers. As noted by Martinsen (2011), the actual connotations of the term *intercultural sensitivity* vary greatly across disciplines: culturally sensitive practitioners in the medical settings may be trained in the skill sets that can help them “successfully navigate the racial and ethnic differences between them and their patients”; while intercultural sensitivity in the corporate settings may require professionals to function comfortably in cross-cultural environments (p. 122).

When it comes to education, the increasing influence of globalization on post-secondary education has made intercultural sensitivity the center of attention at multiple levels: the modern higher education institutions call for culturally sensitive administrators, researchers, teachers, and more importantly, students who are prepared for the future global citizenship. Since it has been long agreed that language and culture are inseparable, naturally foreign language education becomes the forefront for innovative educational practices aiming at cultivating and improving the learner’s intercultural sensitivity. However, the definition of *intercultural sensitivity* has remained elusively controversial resulting in continuing debates within the foreign profession, first on the identification of intercultural insensitivity, and then on the proposal of different solutions for the specific problem under discussion. In another words, concerning what constitutes intercultural sensitivity and how to teach it to foreign language learners, researchers and educators have reached unanimity for neither the ends nor the means.

**Policy Standards in Foreign Language Education**

In an unprecedented effort to standardize foreign language education at the national level, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL,
1996) led a three-year collaborative project together with eight other professional organizations to produce a final document entitled *Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century*. The National Standards represent a consensus among educators, researchers, business leaders and community on the definition and role of foreign language education, which can be distilled into the five Cs: communication, cultures, connections, comparisons, and communities. The cultural component of FLE is clearly acknowledged in three of the five Cs: cultures, connections, and comparisons.

As stated in the National Standards, the educational objective of the cultural dimension of foreign language education is for students to “demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between the practices/products and perspectives of the culture studied” (Cultures), “recognize the distinctive viewpoints that are only available through the foreign language and its cultures” (Connections), and “demonstrate understanding of the concept of culture through comparisons of the cultures studied and their own” (Comparisons) (ACTFL, 1999). It seems that according to the Standards, the “intercultural sensitivity” that students are expected to achieve refers to a two-faceted concept: knowledge and skills.

While cultural knowledge is mainly related to both tangible and intangible cultural products (the former may suggest paintings, architecture, literature, or artifacts, and the latter may include a dance, a ritual, a folk song, or legal institution), cultural skills require students to identify, understand, navigate, and make sense of the differences between the Self and the Others. These skills are also essential for students’ development of critical thinking and life-long learning. Although the description in the Standards is very generic, it implicitly suggests the importance of a person’s willingness and readiness
to shift between different worldviews in cross-cultural environments when teaching and learning intercultural sensitivity.

This position is made even more salient in the 2007 report by the Modern Language Association of America. According to the report, in order for students to develop “transcultural competence”:

They are also trained to reflect on the world and themselves through the lens of another language and culture. They learn to comprehend speakers of the target language as members of foreign societies and to grasp themselves as Americans—that is, as members of a society that is foreign to others. They also learn to relate to fellow members of their own society who speak languages other than English. (MLA, 2007, p. 5)

The metaphor of “cultural lens” here accurately grasps the nature of intercultural sensitivity: the awareness of the availability of various coexisting perspectives of thinking and viewing the world which leads to improved understanding of the Self and the Others based on comparisons and contrasts.

As shown in both the National Standards and the MLA report, the profession of foreign language education seems to have reached an agreement on the learning objective of intercultural sensitivity (what intercultural sensitivity is about), which in Byram and Kramsch’s (2008) words, is to acquire “the ability to understand another culture on its own terms” (p. 20, emphasis in original).

**Research Based Conceptualization**

Bronfenbrener, Harding, and Gallwey (1958) were among the first researchers who systematically dealt with the concept, sensitivity. They perceive sensitivity as one
aspect of social perception specifically related to two types of abilities: (a) sensitivity to the generalized other, which refers to knowledge and awareness of the unique social norms in one’s own group, and (b) interpersonal sensitivity, the ability to distinguish how other people differ in their behavioral and emotional patterns from one’s own (Bronfenbrener et al., 1958). According to Bronfenbrener et al., intercultural sensitivity is very similar to the interpersonal sensitivity mentioned above, only with the former enabling one to identify the differences more systematically within the framework of a specific culture.

In their attempts to decipher what a rhetorically sensitive person should look like, Hart and Burks (1972) and Hart, Carlson, and Eadie (1980) conducted a series of studies on the strongest predictors of rhetorical sensitivity and attitudes towards communication. The results of these studies led to their proposal that rhetorical sensitivity is a mind-set that is applied by some people in their daily lives. They further resolve this personal “mind-set” or attitude into five constituent parts including: (a) acceptance of personal complexity, (b) avoidance of communicative rigidity, (c) interaction consciousness (which stands distinctive from either “feckless Machiavellianism” or “unconscionable egoism”), (d) appreciation of the communicability, and (e) tolerance for intentional searching (Hart et al., 1980, p. 2). All these elements are also considered very critical in successful intercultural communication and interaction at the cognitive, affective, and behavioral levels.

Hoopes’s (1980) intercultural learning model identifies seven developmental stages for a person to go from the lowest level of ethnocentrism to the highest level of certain ethno relative form of adaption or integration. The seven developmental stages
range from ethnocentrism all the way through awareness, understanding, acceptance/respect, appreciation/valuing, and selective adoption to assimilation/adaptation (Hoopes, 1980, pp. 18-19). While the ideal outcome of any intercultural learning is considered to be biculturalism/multiculturalism, intercultural sensitivity falls somewhere between the third stage of “understanding” and the fourth stage of “acceptance/respect.”

To develop the kind of intercultural sensitivity that mainly contains cultural self-awareness, awareness of other cultures, and necessary skills in intercultural perception and communication, Gudykunst and Hammer's (1983) three-stage intercultural training model consists of (a) perspective training (in which learners are trained to be able to shift worldviews as necessary according to a certain cultural context in order to understand “the cultural other”), (b) interaction training (which involves knowledge and skills in listening, self-expressing, exchange of ideas, and affective recognition and empathy in effective intercultural interactions), and (c) context-specific training (which enables learners to tackle specific intercultural events and possible conflicts) (pp. 102-106).

Based on both Hoopes’ (1980) and Gudykunst and Hammer's (1983) work, Bennett proposes his developmental model of intercultural sensitivity (DMIS) which constitutes a progression of worldview “orientations towards cultural differences” (as cited in Hammer et al., 2003, p. 421). Six developmental stages are identified to include three ethnocentric orientations (Denial, Defense, and Minimization) and three ethno relative orientations (Acceptance, Adaptation, and Integration). Also the term of intercultural sensitivity in the settings of foreign language education is clearly defined for the first time as “the ability to discriminate and experience relative cultural differences”
In developing an innovative measurement of intercultural sensitivity, Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) approach the often vague concept of intercultural sensitivity by pinpointing exactly what areas people should be sensitive to in effective cross-cultural encounters. They argue that the key to acquiring intercultural sensitivity lies in the willingness and readiness to modify one’s behavior whenever appropriate in other cultures. From this perspective, the concept of individualism vs. collectivism is introduced as one of the important criteria in determining the systematic cultural differences to which a person should be sensitive and based on which individuals should be willing to make due to behavioral modifications, depending on whether they live and work in an individualistic or collectivist context. In addition to the constituent of individualism vs. collectivism which mainly addresses the understanding of culturally different behavioral patterns, open-mindedness to different worldviews and flexibility in adjusting one’s behavior in a new culture are also treated as two important indicators of intercultural sensitivity.

Chen and Starosta (1996) developed a model of intercultural communication competence consisting of three distinct dimensions: intercultural awareness, intercultural sensitivity, and intercultural adroitness. As one of the three dimensions, intercultural sensitivity is emphasized at the affective level as “the emotional desire of a person to acknowledge, appreciate, and accept cultural differences” (p. 360), and later is conceptualized as “an individual’s ability to develop a positive emotion towards understanding and appreciating cultural differences that promotes an appropriate and effective behavior in intercultural communication” (Chen, 1997, p. 5). In order to develop
such a positive emotion, an interculturally sensitive person is supposed to demonstrate the following five qualities: self-esteem (a sense of self-value or self-worth), self-monitoring (a person’s ability to regulate behaviors in line with situational requirements), open-mindedness (the willingness to openly and appropriately explain oneself and accept others’ explanations), empathy (the process of projecting oneself into another person’s world cognitively and emotionally), interaction involvement (the ability to perceive the topic or situation that involves their conception of self and self-reward), and non-judgment (an attitude that allows one to listen sincerely before jumping into conclusions) (Chen, 1997, pp. 6-8).

To sum up, two common themes emerge from the research-based conceptualization of intercultural sensitivity. For one, an interculturally sensitive person needs to be open-minded in accepting and understanding the different worldviews and behavioral patterns generated from a specific cultural context; and for the other, an interculturally sensitive person must be willing to act upon that awareness of cultural differences and make appropriate behavioral adjustments.

**Intercultural Sensitivity vs. Intercultural Competence**

It is critical to make a clear distinction between the two related yet completely different terms, *intercultural sensitivity* and *intercultural competence*, because any confusion concerning what each actually connotes would cause problems and difficulties in effective cultural learning and training program implementation as well as in empirical research attempts to apply and measure relevant concepts.

The concept, intercultural competence, appears in the cultural learning literature much earlier than that for intercultural sensitivity. According to Fantini and Tirmizi
(2006), intercultural competence can be broadly defined as “a complex of abilities needed to perform effectively and appropriately when interacting with others who are linguistically and culturally different from oneself” (p. 12, emphasis in original). More importantly, they also notice that in the related literature, researchers have alternatively used various highly similar terms related to intercultural competence, such as intercultural communicative competence, transcultural communication, cross-cultural adaptation, and intercultural sensitivity (Fantini & Tirmizi, 2006, pp. 11-15). This has caused considerable confusion and murkiness in properly conceptualizing and measuring both intercultural sensitivity and intercultural competence.

According to Bennett (1999), intercultural sensitivity (“the ability to discriminate and experience relative cultural differences”) clearly differs from intercultural competence (a more advanced stage of cultural studies) which refers to “the ability to think and act in interculturally appropriate ways” (as cited in Hammer et al., 2003, p. 423). As Bennett articulately states, the concept of intercultural sensitivity is more heavily based on the constructivist idea of cognitive complexity so that a more cognitively complex or interculturally “sensitive” individual has “a more developed set of categories for making discriminations among cultures” and “can observe subtle differences in nonverbal behavior or communication style” (Bennett, 2004, p. 73). In comparison, intercultural competence is closely associated with an individual’s effective or successful behavior in interacting and communicating with people from other cultures. In Bennett’s view, an interculturally competent person is able to “see a culturally different person as equally complex to one’s self (person-centered) and being able to take a culturally different perspective” in cross-cultural communication (Bennett, 2004, p. 74).
In sum, intercultural sensitivity and intercultural competence are interrelated and interdependent with the former creating the potential for the improvement of the latter.

To specify further the interrelationship between intercultural sensitivity and intercultural competence, Chen and Starosta (1996) deconstruct the encompassing concept of intercultural competence as a combination of three dimensions: affective, cognitive, and behavioral. They argue that each of the three dimensions should become an independent concept as intercultural sensitivity (affective dimension), intercultural awareness (cognitive dimension), and intercultural adroitness (behavioral dimension) respectively in order to develop valid and reliable measurements for them. Specifically pertaining to intercultural sensitivity, the conceptualization includes “a person’s ability to receive and send positive emotional signals before, during and after intercultural interaction”; and it is said that acquisition of such intercultural sensitivity (positive emotional responses) can eventually induce an individual’s recognition, acceptance, and respect for cultural differences which fall into the domain of intercultural awareness (Fritz, Graf, Hentze, Möllenberg, & Chen, 2005, p. 54).

Based on the literature, researchers and theoreticians need to bear in mind the distinctive features of intercultural sensitivity as compared to intercultural competence. As sensitivity focuses on **knowing and/or feeling**, competence stresses **doing** driven by the knowledge or emotions, the ability to take actions in order to function in a culturally and linguistically different environment.

**Measurement of Intercultural Sensitivity**

Before reviewing the literature in this area, it is necessary to stress once again the distinction between cultural sensitivity and intercultural competence, for there exist a
variety of measurement instruments for the latter, but only a few research based instruments are available to test cultural sensitivity specifically in the field of foreign language education.

Based on the theoretical framework of Bennett’s developmental model of intercultural sensitivity (DMIS), a final 50-item, paper-and-pencil instrument named the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) was developed to measure cultural sensitivity in foreign language education (as cited in Hammer et al., 2003, p. 421). This instrument has three versions, all of which have been subjected to rigorous psychometric testing. It is claimed that IDI is “a cross-culturally generalizable, valid and reliable assessment of an individual’s and group’s core orientations toward cultural differences” (Hammer, 2010). In practice, IDI can be used to identify a person’s relative position on the continuum of the intercultural sensitivity development as conceptualized in the DMIS model, and thus the test results can provide a valuable perspective in comparing the recipients’ levels of cultural sensitivity. Although IDI is one of the most strongly supported instruments both in theory and practice, the results produced by IDI tests are far more explanatory than summative, which makes the IDI instrument less ideal for the proposed quantitative study in nature.

Also inspired and guided by Bennett’s (1993) theoretical framework of the Development Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS), Olson and Kroeger (2001) developed their own instrument to measure global competency, the Intercultural Sensitivity Index (ISI). They identify three approaches in the development of this instrument: naming of experiences, measurement of competencies, and identification of the DMIS stages (Olson & Kroeger, 2001, p. 119). Consequently, a variety of items are
included in their instrument that pertain to both the six stages of the DMIS (denial, defense, minimization, acceptance, adaptation, and integration) and the three dimensions of global competency (substantive knowledge, perceptual understanding, and intercultural communication) (Olson & Kroeger, 2001, pp. 117-118). Each item is answered on a five-point scale. The 58-item instrument was piloted with faculty members of the New Jersey City University and the result indicates that the majority (69%) of the faculty members self-rated themselves at the fourth developmental stage of “acceptance” in terms of intercultural sensitivity. However, the study fails to report the essential psychometric statistics (including validity and reliability) of the instrument.

Besides IDI and ISI, another instrument appearing in the literature is the Inventory of Cross-cultural Sensitivity (ICCS) developed by Cushner (as cited in Martinsen, 2011). This instrument contains Likert scale items to elicit self-report data, examining five areas considered related to cross-cultural interaction: empathy, attitude toward others, intellectual interaction, behavior, and cultural integration. However, compared to IDI, the ICCS instrument has two apparent disadvantages. First, it lacks the strong theoretical guidance of a general framework logically connected to the foreign language educational practice and individualized learning process. Therefore the five-dimension conceptualization of Cushner’s cross-cultural sensitivity is weak in empirical support. Second, as demonstrated in some of the evaluation studies, the psychometric and structural properties of the ICCS need further improvement as evident in the results of confirmatory and exploratory analysis (Robert, 1999).

Developed by Chen and Starosta (2000) based on their three-dimension theoretical model of intercultural communication competence, the final version of the
Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS) contains twenty four Likert scale items testing five main factors: Interaction Engagement, Respect for Cultural Differences, Interaction Confidence, Interaction Enjoyment, and Interaction Attentiveness. The original 73-item intercultural sensitivity questionnaire went through three stages of empirical validation: a pre-study conducted among one hundred and sixty eight American college students which reduced the number of items to forty four, a principal axis analysis followed by oblique rotation performed on the responses of four hundred and fourteen college students towards the 44-item questionnaire, and finally the concurrent validity of the five-factor, 24-item Scale “evaluated against seven other valid and related instruments” with satisfactory results (Fritz, Möllenberg, & Chen, 2002). Other empirical studies were conducted to validate the reliability and validity of the ISS instrument across cultures. In 2002, Fritz et al. tested the instrument in a German sample by using confirmatory factor analysis. Although the results indicate “the operationalization of the concepts in the instrument can be further improved, the instrument as a whole is a valid one through which a culture-free scale for measuring intercultural sensitivity can be developed” (Fritz et al., 2002, p. 170).

There are two primary advantages that can be identified for the ISS in comparison with the IDI, ISI, and ICCS scales for use in this study. First, compared to ICCS which lacks theoretical justification, ISS is developed based on solid theoretical model with clear operational definitions of the key terms. In addition, ISS is empirically validated with generally satisfactory results, while empirical studies suggest both the ICCS and ISI scales apparently need further improvement both in psychometric and structural properties. Second, ISS is a simple 24-item scale which can be administered within a
single session and participants’ responses can immediately produce straight-forward quantitative data. This feature is regarded advantageous over the more lengthy IDI and ISI due to the quantitative nature and time constraint of the current study, since both IDI and ISI require participants to make several separate time-consuming attempts to complete the test and the results verbally and graphically explain the relative positions/levels of participants on the continuum of intercultural sensitivity development.

In order to measure an individual’s willingness and knowledge to modify behavior in culturally appropriate ways when living and working in different cultural contexts, the Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI) was developed by Bhawuk and Brislin (1992). In particular, the inventory includes three measureable constructs: individualism vs. collectivism, open-mindedness, and flexibility. The first construct, individualism vs. collectivism, is used in comparing behavior in an individualistic culture (i.e., United States) versus a collectivistic culture (i.e., Japan); the second construct, open-mindedness, tests the degree of an individual’s acceptance and tolerance of different worldviews, customs, and norms at the cognitive level; finally, the third construct, flexibility, examines to what extent an individual is willing to “go with the flow,” to adjust their behavior as necessary based on their knowledge of cultural differences.

The 46-item ICSI instrument can be easily completed within a single session either in paper and pencil form or online and can generate straight-forward quantitative data. The authors report reliability coefficient of .84 and find strong external validity (significant correlations existing between participants’ ICSI scores and their evaluation results by experts at the $p < .05$ level) for the ICSI instrument; follow-up empirical studies also reveal ICSI’s adequate construct validity through factor analysis (Comadena,
Kapoor, Konsky, & Blue, 1998) and highly distinctive internal and predictive validity (Graf & Mertesacker, 2009).

In conclusion, two major considerations favored the ICSI over the ISS for this study. First, the innovative way intercultural sensitivity is conceptualized and measured in ICSI is especially embodied in the inclusion of “individualism vs. collectivism.” This is more specifically aligned with the interests and context of the current study where the level of participants’ intercultural sensitivity is measured and manipulated through intervention based on the systematic comparison and contrast of the American society (typically an individualistic culture) and the Chinese society (typically a collectivist culture). Secondly, most of the items in ICSI address concrete cross-cultural experiences and situations which may solicit relatively more honest and objective responses; in contrast, several items in ISS focus on an individual’s general attitudes towards cultural differences and cross-cultural interactions which may subtly encourage survey takers to give uniform, positive responses due to the considerations of “political correctness.”

**Teaching Intercultural Sensitivity**

The purpose of investigating this part of the literature is to gather action research for constructing a theoretical framework for a feasible classroom intervention program aiming at improving students’ intercultural sensitivity. Thus the following review includes definitions of culture, various pedagogical approaches in the cultural dimension of language teaching, and especially experiential learning theory and its applications in teaching intercultural sensitivity.

**What to Teach**

Regarding the actual connotations of culture in foreign language teaching, it is
important to distinguish between two types of culture: objective (the big C) and subjective (the small c). According to Durocher (2007), objective culture includes “art, literature, painting, and music, but also political, economic, social and linguistic systems, and institutions such as the family, marriage, and religion” (also referred to as “cultural products” in the National Standards), while subjective culture “consists of an invisible component (assumptions, values, and beliefs) and a visible component (behaviors)” (p. 145).

Notably compared to subjective culture, the teaching of objective culture has been practiced much more frequently in foreign language education almost as an independent part parallel to language teaching. This pedagogical preference may stem from two main realistic considerations. First, to view culture as an objective, static body of facts and contents seems more “teachable” for instructors and more feasible for curricular designers and evaluators who assess learning outcomes at the end of the course. Second, because the actual process of developing intercultural sensitivity varies greatly for individual learners, the choice of teaching objective cultural knowledge helps avoid dealing with the malleability and uncertainty in terms of learners’ motivation, attitudes, preferred learning strategies, as well as their unique personal backgrounds. In other words, in contrast to the learner-oriented approach of teaching subjective intercultural sensitivity, teaching objective culture is still typically teacher-oriented in attempting to implement uniformed classroom instructions.

Furthermore, Durocher identifies three challenges to integrate organically both culture and language teaching in foreign language education from the angle of teacher training: lack of time, lack of confidence in teachers’ own cultural knowledge, as well as
fear in dealing with learner individuality (p. 145).

**How to Teach**

This part of the review covers two sections: culture pedagogy for on-campus foreign language programs as part of students’ academic requirements and culture-training methods for preparing people to live and work effectively and successfully in foreign countries. The differences between these two types of programs are clear and straightforward. In terms of program structure, on-campus foreign language programs are scheduled within the framework of the academic calendar of the school (often lasting for a semester), while the duration of expatriate cultural training programs varies greatly in accordance with the practical needs and travel plans of the learners involved. As far as the priority in learning and teaching objectives, on-campus foreign language programs focus on the improvement of linguistic competence, and cultural teaching is often regarded as supplementary to language teaching; even when not accessory, it centers on didactic teaching of general cultural facts for the most part. By contrast, expatriate cultural training programs emphasize solely the direct learning outcomes so that learners can reach a certain level of intercultural sensitivity and competence after graduation which enables them to function immediately in various foreign environments. In order to reach that goal, a large variety of pedagogical innovations have been employed to accommodate individuals’ unique learning needs and learning styles.

**On-campus foreign language programs.** In order to restore the balance between teaching objective and subjective culture in today’s foreign language classrooms, quite a few pedagogical approaches or curricular modalities have been proposed in the past decade. Generally speaking, as identified in Byram and Feng’s (2004, pp. 150-158)
general review of the developments, three notable turns have emerged recently in teaching culture in foreign language classroom: (a) culture teaching is moving toward an ethnographic perspective (study abroad and structured language classroom); (b) culture teaching is moving toward a critical perspective (identity, critical pedagogy, and English as lingua franca); and (c) culture teaching is moving toward a practical perspective that focuses on preparation for residence in another country, often without attention to language learning.

Reflecting the second turn towards a critical perspective, Knutson (2006) draws from the relational approach to culture that emphasizes “understanding of the target and home culture(s) as they relate to one another, with explicit reference to the learner’s culturally subjective position” (p. 591) and creates a new curricular modality featuring reduced coverage of cultural content and increased inclusion of culture-general awareness topics such as “defining the self as cultural subject; subcultures within the home culture; insider views of the second/foreign culture; outsider views of the home culture; culture-specific language behavior; and cross-cultural misunderstandings” (p. 591). This approach gives a prominent position of the learner’s subjective cultural identity in teaching culture and advocates individualizing the culture learning process through adoption of specific instructional strategies based on different learner motivation and demands.

Inspired and guided by the socio-contextual model of second language (L2) learning, Rubenfeld et al. (2006) conducted research among a sample of 50 Francophone and 50 Anglophone students taking Introductory Psychology at the University of Ottawa in order to confirm the positive links between second language acquisition and a variety
of contextual aspects of contact with the L2 community, L2 confidence, and identification to both the first language and L2 community. Their questionnaire result suggests high L2 confidence leads to increasing L2 contacts while more L2 contacts improve low L2 confidence, supporting consideration of the learning context/environment in order to teach culture and language effectively. This model embodies the first turn towards the ethnographic perspective mentioned above in that it calls for increasing students’ engagement with the target language culture and communities through activities such as study-abroad programs, structured language classrooms, service learning, or informal personal interactions.

In the attempt to integrate language and culture teaching organically in foreign language education, Byram and Kramsch (2008) proposed the notion of teaching language as culture instead of teaching language and culture. They realize that today’s FL teachers are challenged to teach language “as it represents, expresses and embodies mindsets and worldviews that might be different from those of our American students,” and therefore they offer a way of teaching language “that approaches language as both a personal and cultural/historical event and that places individual experience into a larger social and historical framework” (p. 21). This notion demonstrates both ethnographic and critical perspectives by stressing a holistic view of language and culture learning on the vertical (historical) and horizontal (social) axis.

With respect to the third turn, culture teaching towards a practical perspective, some educational action research has been conducted based on Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) in language classrooms (Durocher, 2007). Bennett, Bennett, and Allen (1999) suggest the sequential matching between respective
levels of language classes and developmental stages identified in DMIS: beginning-level language classes focus on *denial* and *defense* issues in acquiring cultural sensitivity, second-year classes explore the phenomenon of *minimization*, and the advanced-level classes emphasize students’ *acceptance* of and *adaptation* to the differences between the target and home culture(s).

As for the specific methods of cultural teaching in typical on-campus foreign language programs, there exist two major types of pedagogical approaches: didactic culture-specific training methods vs. experiential culture-specific training methods. It appears in the past the former prevails over the latter in the foreign language education practice (Fowler & Mumford, 1995; Landis & Bhagat, 1996).

In particular, didactic pedagogy mainly includes (a) area orientation briefings (lectures about the general facts of a certain country), (b) language training (teaching basic, simple conversational language to inspire learners’ interests in the culture of the target language), (c) culture-specific assimilators (directing learners to read about a series of specific critical cultural events and trying to make the right interpretation of certain cultural behavior), and (d) culture-specific reading (directing learners to read authentic materials to gather information about a specific culture) (Beneke, 2001; Landis & Brislin, 1983). In comparison, experiential cultural learning methods range from culture-specific role plays to bicultural communication workshops. The details in this regard are discussed in a subsequent section, *Experiential Learning and Teaching Culture*.

**Expatriate cultural training programs.** For training expatriates to work and live in various foreign contexts, programs are designed to facilitate a shift in learners’ mindset for understanding foreign norms, values, behaviors, and attitudes as well as developing
their knowledge and skills in handling cross-cultural interaction and communication effectively. The pedagogy used in these training programs is typically more innovative, diversified, and outcome-oriented compared to traditional on-campus foreign language programs. For instance, apart from the previously mentioned division of didactic vs. experiential teaching, additional categories are used to label different culture training activities: didactic, attribution, culture awareness, experiential, cognitive-behavior modification, interaction, and language training (Brislin & Bhawuk, 1999; Kealey & Protheroe, 1996; Littrell & Salas, 2005). These new pedagogical techniques are briefly introduced as follows.

Attribution training aims to develop learners’ skills in perspective taking and worldview shifting so as to increase the likelihood of making correct interpretations of people’s cultural behavior in foreign countries. Typical training techniques include assignments for learners to explain certain host national behavior from the host-culture point of view so that they can experience necessary changes at both the cognitive and affective levels (Befus, 1988).

The one assumption behind cultural awareness training is that an individual who is better aware of his own culture will be more adaptable in foreign environments (Bennett, 1986). Therefore cultural awareness training is used to improve learner’s self-awareness in terms of their home culture so that they will be better able to identify and recognize the uniqueness of the values and behavioral patterns imbedded in their home culture as compared to other cultures. Theoretically, learners trained in this way will be more effective in intercultural interactions.

Black and Mendenhall (1990) propose cognitive-behavior modification as a kind
of intercultural competence training to enable learners to develop the habitual behaviors desired in the host culture (Brislin & Bhawuk, 1999). This training is highly behavior-specific and focuses on helping learners to identify and avoid a list of “inappropriate” behaviors as well as teaching them various “positive” behaviors that are typically rewarded in the host culture (Befus, 1988; Littrell & Salas, 2005).

Interaction training seeks to facilitate “educational” interaction and exchanges between new learners and experienced international travelers or expatriates. The purpose is to encourage learners to draw on the personal experience and/or lessons of those who have successfully lived or worked in foreign countries. In this kind of training, opportunities are made available for learners to get one-on-one mentoring from their experienced predecessors and consult with them on all kinds of questions concerning personal interest. Such training is more commonly employed in business settings and often takes place in foreign contexts within the time frame shortly before the experienced expatriates relocate to other places.

Language training designed for expatriate cultural training programs is distinctively different from traditional on-campus foreign language programs. First, its goal is to supplement expatriates’ cultural training in that some basic linguistic knowledge and skills in the target language can help motivate learners to know more about the culture. Second, the primary purpose of such training is to prepare learners in exchanging common courtesies with the host country nationals to alleviate anxiety and stress in cross-cultural interactions, because people normally tend to appreciate any efforts made by foreigners to learn their native language and feel emotionally close to any foreigners interested enough to learn their language (Gudykunst, Guzley, & Hammer,
1996). Accordingly, a higher level of linguistic proficiency in the target language is not one of the intended learning outcomes, because businesses typically offer language support (including translators) for communicating in the language itself.

To sum up, in terms of cultural teaching and training, there appears a clear divide between programs in academic and cooperate settings mainly demonstrated in the following three aspects. First, the overall design of cultural training programs in business settings is primarily based on the needs of practical working and living experiences in foreign countries; thus the learning goals specifically center on mindset shift and behavioral modification while the adoption of pedagogical approaches are very flexible according to various unique training needs of expatriates. Unlike the practical and flexible expatriate training programs, the cultural dimension of foreign language programs in academic settings are subject to different kinds of constraints including scheduling, duration, general academic requirements, pedagogical preferences, and diversified student background and learning needs. Oftentimes student are “forced” to select a foreign language course only to fulfill their foreign language learning requirements put forward by the college. As a result, they are typically low in learning motivation and resist taking any “intensified” classes or programs. In addition, most of them come to the foreign language classes without any clearly defined learning needs or goals. All these restrictive factors combined create considerable difficulties in designing and implementing high-quality culture learning programs that target specific students with specific learning needs.

Second, in the cultural training programs for expatriates teachers/instructors are more inclined to use experiential cultural learning methods to create opportunities for
learners to learn by doing, and learners get to experience specific critical cultural events and cultural behaviors in simulation. By contrast, the cultural learning programs for college students or school children tend to place emphasis on didactic methods, in large part due to the lack of resources and time. Consequently, students may or may not be interested at all in some factual information about foreign cultures which is in reality only remotely related to their everyday life.

Finally, the cultural training programs in business settings depend much less on the development of learners’ linguistic competence compared to the majority of proficiency-based foreign language programs in academic settings. One of the reasons might be that in the business world where technical support and assistance in terms of translation and interpretation are almost always available, to behave in culturally appropriately ways is considered strategically and practically more important than to speak a foreign language fluently. However, in the academic world where learning is private and personal for the most part, linguistic proficiency is regarded as a more tangible learning goal than intercultural awareness, sensitivity, or competence, and seems more useful for an individual in terms of skill development and knowledge acquisition.

Experiential Learning and Teaching Culture

The essence of any form of experiential learning is “learning by doing,” which lends itself well to the learning and teaching activities in an intercultural context. According to Cheney (2001), experiential methods are deemed perfect for intercultural learning for the following three reasons. First and foremost, culture is ultimately “the collective experience of a group of people that includes their thoughts, feelings, values, behaviors, communication, and their interpretation of sensory stimuli” (Cheney, 2001, p.
which makes learning through actually living in/experiencing the culture yield the best possible results in terms of improved personal understanding and appreciation of the subtlety and complexity of a given culture.

Second, all intercultural learners are under considerable influence from their own culture, language, and past intercultural experiences. Put differently, the unique language and culture backgrounds of individual learners act as a powerful filter in the process of their knowledge acquisition and skill development in the intercultural context. This filter determines to a large degree how they make connections, test assumptions, find answers to their long held questions, and analyze and synthesize the incoming information in their intercultural learning. Experiential learning methods can create hands-on practice opportunities for intercultural learners to draw upon their prior experiences and link the abstract knowledge acquired from their books or instructors with their actual intercultural experiences (Cheney, 2001; Cross, 2000; Hess, 1994).

Finally, experiential learning delivers direct, positive effects on all three dimensions of the intercultural learning: cognitive, affective, and behavioral. Various forms of interpersonal interactions typically involved in culture experiential learning first make changes possible in the intercultural learners’ attitudes, values, and emotions (the affective dimension) concerning the people from other cultures with whom they are communicating. At the cognitive level, direct intercultural communication practice in experiential learning also enable learners to test and apply the related knowledge/theories they have acquired otherwise, which in turn enhances and deepens their intercultural awareness and sensitivity to be more in tune with their real life experiences. Built upon these attitudinal changes and increased awareness, learners are then more likely to
experiment with new things and be capable of modifying their behavior in culturally appropriate ways (the behavioral dimension) (Cheney, 2001; Hess, 1994; Varner, 2001).

It seems inarguable that experiential learning has substantial advantages over the traditional didactic approach in maximizing intercultural learning outcomes. Therefore, the remaining literature review in this section is divided into three parts respectively addressing the history and main features of the experiential learning theory, a list of pedagogical approaches employed in teaching culture based on the experiential learning theory, and representative empirical studies evaluating the effects of such teaching methods.

**Experiential learning theory.** The three intellectual origins that have influenced the development of the experiential learning theory lie in Dewey’s philosophical pragmatism, Lewin’s social psychology, and Piaget’s cognitive-developmental genetic epistemology (Kolb, Boyatzis, & Mainemelis, 2000). As one of the leading modern American philosophers, John Dewey (1938) proposed the philosophical view of pragmatism in terms of knowledge acquisition, which emphasized that humans acquire knowledge through active adaptation to their environment, test hypotheses in real-world application, and solve issues in real-life experiences.

Recognized as the founder of social psychology, Kurt Lewin (1942) put forward the field theory of learning, postulating that behavior is generated from the dynamic interaction between persons and their environment (including both internal and external environmental factors, the so-called “force fields”). Particularly pertaining to learning, Lewin maintained that learning and change ensued from what is learned and are critical for balancing all the opposing force fields in the environment. Thus learning should be
viewed holistically in its context involving the psychological environment of the learner and others with whom the individual interacts.

Established by Jean Piaget (Piaget & Duckworth, 1970), genetic epistemology seeks to link the validity of knowledge to the process of its acquisition/construction, that is, knowledge acquisition should be a process of continuous self-construction driven by the learner’s active interactions with his environment. In his constructivist view of learning, Piaget especially rejects the notion that knowledge is a ready existence in the environment external to the learner or within the learner as he grows and changes.

Based on the above mentioned three intellectual origins, the term *experiential* appears in the literature of learning theories to be differentiated “both from cognitive learning theories, which tend to emphasize cognition over affect, and behavioral learning theories that deny any role for subjective experience in the learning process” (Kolb et al., 2001, p. 193). Kolb (1984) maintains that experiential learning theory presents a holistic model of the learning process encompassing the learner, the teacher, the learning materials, the learning environment, and their interactions at multiple levels. Specifically, experiential learning is defined as "the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience. Knowledge results from the combination of grasping and transforming experience" (Kolb, 1984, p. 41).

Experiential learning provides a four-stage learning cycle including concrete personal experience, reflective observing, abstract conceptualizing, and active experimenting. The interrelationships among the four stages are detailed as follows (Kolb et al., 2000, p. 195): learners reflect upon the observations drawn on their concrete personal experience, which lays the foundation for them to analyze, synthesize, and
categorize all the incoming information for abstract conceptualization; learners then test their theories/hypotheses in real-world practice, which creates new experiences launching another experiential learning cycle.

Although all learners go through the same four stages mentioned above in a typical experiential learning cycle, Kolb (1984) also calls attention to the role of the personal learning styles unique to each individual learner. He notes that different learners possess and favor different sets of learning abilities as some learn about the world through active doing and engaging in concrete experiences while others interpret their experiences and perceive life through reflective observation and abstract thinking (Kolb et al., 2001, p. 197). Therefore, individual learners make a personal choice every time when presented with a specific learning situation, and the experiential learning only facilitates their learning in ways corresponding to their unique learning styles.

Kolb (1984, pp. 20-37) further classifies the learner’s various learning abilities into four modes based on his experiential learning model: (a) at the level of grasping experience, concrete experience (CE) and abstract conceptualization (AC) are portrayed as two dialectically related modes; and (b) in order to transform experience, reflective observation (RO) and active experimentation (AE) are identified as two opposing yet related modes. These four learning modes actually describe four major distinctive types of learning styles, each of which facilitates the development of relevant learning skills. For instance, the CE mode is most closely linked with interpersonal skills, such as relationship-building, leadership, helping, and understanding people; the RO mode generates perceptual skills, such as information gathering and analysis; the AC mode includes information synthesis and technology skills; and the AE mode involves
behavioral skills such as goal setting, action, and initiative taking (Kolb, 1984; Kolb & Wolfe, 1981; Rainey, Hekelman, Galazka, & Kolb, 1993; Yamazaki & Kayes, 2004; Yamazaki, Murphy, & Puerta, 2002).

**Pedagogical approaches.** The application of experiential learning theory in teaching culture needs to be viewed in two different types of cross-cultural learning contexts: expatriate adaptation training and formal foreign language education. As discussed earlier in the literature review concerning culture teaching methods, expatriate adaptation training programs are generally more outcome-oriented and focused more on the development of concrete intercultural skills compared with formal foreign language programs mostly implemented in classroom settings.

Having noticed the failure in integrating diverse findings related to various cross-cultural adaptation skills and the absence of an overarching theoretical framework in the expatriate training literature, Yamazaki and Kayes (2004) conducted an extensive, in-depth study in order to (a) organize and sort the seventy three cross-cultural adaptation skills that have disparately appeared in the existing literature into nine clusters of essential competencies through thematic analysis (the Q-sort methodology), (b) match the nine clusters of essential competencies with Kolb’s (1984) four learning modes (concrete experience, abstract conceptualization, reflective observation, and active experimentation) and twelve learning skills, and (c) develop a comprehensive pedagogical model for training expatriates’ skills in cross-cultural adaptation based on the experiential learning theory.

The final results yield an exhaustive typology of competencies for successful cross-cultural adaptation for expatriates that falls into nine categories: building
relationships, valuing people of different cultures, listing and observation, coping with ambiguity, translating complex information, taking action and initiative, managing others, adaptability and flexibility, and managing stress. Pursuant to the different dimensions of learning skills based on the experiential learning model, building relationships and valuing people of different cultures fall within the range of interpersonal skill development; the skills to access and process information help to achieve the competencies of listing and observation and coping with ambiguity; the analytic side of the experiential learning facilitates the ability of translating complex information; the skills to learn from concrete action and experience promote competency development in taking action and initiative and managing others; and finally, the adaptive element in the experiential learning cycle fosters the expatriate trainee’s adaptability and flexibility, plus the ability to manage stress (Yamazaki & Kayes, 2004; Yamazaki et al., 2002).

In classroom settings, formal foreign language programs normally lack the resources to create a rich variety of opportunities for students to engage in real-life intercultural communication and interaction (the experiential learning activities outside classroom, such as study-abroad programs and service learning programs, are neither available nor suitable for every foreign language learner). In order to rectify the situation and improve students’ culture learning outcomes, instructors often have to be innovative in moving beyond the traditional didactic approach and designing exercise, simulations, collaboration projects, intercultural workshops, look-see visits, and role plays in either the face-to-face or the online format (Crossman, 2011; Kalfadellis, 2005; Littrell & Salas, 2005; Merryfield, 2003). Generally speaking, in adopting the experiential approach in the
classroom settings, the emphasis should be placed on *learning by doing* and the instructors’ mindset needs to shift from teacher-centered didactic lectures to student-centered experiential learning activities.

Regarding face-to-face classroom experiential learning instructions that target students’ improvement in intercultural awareness, Kalfadellis (2005) puts together a simulated negotiation exercise for his international business students within the theoretical framework of Kolb’s (1984) experimental learning model, wherein a proportional number of both American and Chinese students are involved in a series of Sino-U.S. business negotiations with the hope of reaching a mutual agreement. This exercise is said to allow students to react to specific intercultural situations intellectually, emotionally, and behaviorally (Gudykunst & Hammer, 1983). In addition, Kalfadellis especially highlights the significance of after-exercise reflective discussion and debriefing directed by the instructors which provides necessary guidance for learners to benefit from the experience of their own and others’ working together in the same project.

Other recommended face-to-face pedagogical techniques cited in the literature include (a) cultural genograms and racial storytelling used to improve students’ self-awareness concerning the influence of their own culture and lived experiences (Hardy & Laszloffy, 1992), (b) ethnographic interviews and international guest speakers to facilitate students’ exposure to other cultures through interpersonal interaction (Weaver, 1998), (c) case studies, simulations, and role plays to aid student intercultural skill development (Chau, 1992; LaFromboise & Foster, 1992; Leong & Kim, 1991; Lewis & Hayes, 1991), and (d) cross-cultural buddy system and interactions in foreign cultural
communities to increase both students’ self-awareness and exposure to other cultures (Weaver, 1998).

Recently educators and researchers have turned their attention to the development and implementation of new cultural experimental training models which encompass the previously used disparate pedagogical techniques and thus are more structured to suit various needs in learning culture and intercultural competencies. For instance, the Excellence in Cultural Experiential Learning and Leadership (EXCELL) model is a comprehensive intercultural training program, designed for learners to build a wide range of intercultural skills necessary for successful functioning in foreign contexts (Westwood et al., 2000).

Unlike face-to-face experiential learning activities, technology-driven experiential learning has emerged rather recently in classroom practice; however, it is expected to play an increasingly important role in intercultural learning and teaching mainly due to its easy access, implementation flexibility, and a wider variety of instructional techniques, such as threaded discussions, chats, and online assignments/collaborative projects (Crossman, 2011; Merryfield, 2003).

Merryfield (2003) conducted a comprehensive literature review on online intercultural course design and curriculum development in both theory and practice, based on what he describes and evaluates as a list of cross-cultural online strategies used in his own online education experiences. Some of these strategies include having a proportional number of qualified cultural consultants to “diverse knowledge bases, experiences, and perspectives” (p. 162) throughout the online course delivery; beginning with self-reflective exercise on students’ own cultures and past experiences to increase
their cultural self-awareness before any cross-cultural interaction; employing interpersonal skills to build online relationships and virtual communities in which all discussants can be sufficiently involved and contribute to the completion of collaborative projects; and facilitating discussion of difficult, emotional, and controversial issues in ways that all participants feel safe and comfortable to listen to others and share one’s own ideas (Merryfield, 2003, pp. 148-160). The effects of these online cross-cultural learning strategies are said to be mostly positive and multidimensional: (a) the facelessness of online intercultural interaction alleviates participants’ discomfort and anxiety typical of face-to-face communication with people from other cultures; (b) online technologies allow students to think deeply about and respond meaningfully to the academic contents covered in the online intercultural course; (c) the online platform can extend discussion of ideas and exploration of resources; and (d) online technologies facilitate the building of virtual learning communities of diverse learners (Merryfield, 2003, pp. 161-166).

**Evaluative empirical research.** This part of the review focuses on a series of empirical studies evaluating the effects of various experiential learning strategies/techniques on student culture learning outcomes. Although the value of the experiential learning approach has long been recognized among educators and researchers in intercultural learning/training and it is found that students often favor experiential learning activities over didactic lectures, the research on the effects of the experiential learning strategies/techniques remains largely anecdotal; further, a limited number of related empirical studies have produced mixed results in evaluating the efficacy of the experiential learning model in teaching culture (Kalfadellis, 2005; Knutson, 2003; Littrell & Salas, 2005; McKenzie, 2013; Takkula, Kangaslahti, & Banks,
Due to the rich variety of the experiential learning activities addressed in the literature, the following review discusses the related evaluative empirical research for three types of cultural experiential learning situations as in classroom instruction, service learning projects, and study-abroad programs.

Earley (1987) compares the teaching effects of two types of instructional methods (documentary and interpersonal training) on preparing managers for their work assignments overseas. The documentary method falls into the didactic category while the interpersonal training involves simulated cross-cultural interaction and field experience, typical of the experiential learning approach. The results show that both instructional methods produce similar desirable cultural learning outcomes, although participants prefer the experiential learning activities.

In a similar study, Pruegger and Rogers (1994) also compared two methods of training cross-cultural sensitivity: an experiential approach (simulation game) and a lecture-based, cognitive presentation. The teaching effects of the two methods are examined in two ways: quantitative (using a self-developed program indicator test to measure intercultural sensitivity) and qualitative (analyzing data gathered from student personal documents). The quantitative analysis demonstrates no significant differences in terms of students’ cross-cultural sensitivity improvement between the two approaches either immediately or at a 2-month follow-up. However, qualitative data based on student feedback indicate significantly greater effects of the experiential instruction, which needs cautious interpretation because the positive student feedback only ascertains their personal preference in learning styles rather than the actual efficacy of the experiential approach.
To further this line of evaluative research, Gannon and Poon (1997) conducted a comparative study with more than one hundred MBA students taking cross-cultural courses, failing to find empirical evidence in support of the superiority of the experiential instruction over the didactic approach with respect to student culture learning outcomes. In order to understand the reasons behind such null findings, Poon, Stevens, and Gannon (2000) extended the explorative research with one hundred and twenty three MBA students by adding the individual learner’s learning style as a new dimension affecting the learning outcome besides the influence of different training methods (didactic vs. experiential). The findings suggest that when the training method matches the learner’s personal learning style, more positive cross-cultural attitudes and learner reaction will be generated as a result.

With the appearance of new intercultural training models in the classroom settings such as the previously mentioned EXCELL program (Westwood et al., 2000), researchers began to evaluate their impacts on student learning outcomes using both qualitative and quantitative methods. Knott et al. (2013) conducted an evaluative study with ninety-four first year psychology students to explore their learning outcomes after engaging in two EXCELL tasks (alliance building and cultural mapping) throughout a semester. The analyses of both the qualitative and quantitative data yield positive results indicating improvements in students’ intercultural confidence, willingness and readiness for intercultural encounters, and their cultural self-awareness to deal with personal prejudice, stereotypes, and presumptions in cross-cultural communication.

On the subject of the experiential learning activities implemented outside the classroom, short-term study abroad programs and service learning have always been
under the researchers’ microscope for appraising their efficacy in raising learners’ intercultural sensitivity and competence. Williams (2005) orchestrates a quasi-experimental study comparing the pre-post survey (the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory and the Intercultural Sensitivity Index) on the difference between study-abroad and stay-on-campus students. The results suggest that study-abroad students experience a greater increase in intercultural competencies than those who remain on campus, and the extent of an individual’s intercultural exposure is found to predict strongly learners’ positive intercultural learning outcomes.

In order to evaluate the application of service learning in health education, Houseman et al. (2012) conducted a quasi-experimental study on the impact of a 3-week service learning project with students taking the community health courses. Students’ levels of intermural competence are measured before and after the service learning project using the Cultural Competence Assessment (CCA). The results imply that the short-term service learning project significantly affects students’ development of intermural competencies.

In summary, the inconsistency demonstrated in the findings of empirical studies evaluating the efficacy of the experiential approach in teaching culture can be interpreted from three different aspects. First, the specific experiential learning techniques under evaluation probably need further improvements and adjustments in their design, implementation quality, and alignment with given learning contexts. Second, it is very questionable to isolate and examine the effects of the instructional methods alone, not taking into account a wide range of other influential situational factors in the learning process, such as the learner’s preferred learning style and personality traits, the length
and intensity of cultural exposure, and access to related resources in intercultural communication. Finally, the validity and reliability of some of these quantitative studies might be debased due to their choice of psychometric instruments in measuring students’ intercultural learning outcomes.

**Language Learning Motivation**

This part of the literature review starts from the discussion on the definition and major theories of language learning motivation, followed by an examination of empirical research on factors that affect improvement of language learning motivation. Finally several measurement instruments for language motivation are compared and evaluated in terms of their respective strengths and weaknesses.

**Theoretical Models**

The complexity and difficulty in defining motivation in the foreign language education setting are explained in great detail in Keblawi’s (2009) comprehensive review paper on language learning motivation theories. The challenge in conceptualizing language learning motivation (LLM) is attributed to the necessity of cross-discipline understanding of the multiple facets of this concept. As acknowledged by Keblawi (2009),

General, educational, social, and cognitive psychology, as well as general educational and social theories and sociolinguistic theories have something to contribute for understanding LLM (language learning motivation) within a formal school context. The concept of motivation involves, in addition, neurobiological and physiological explanations. (p. 1)

Because of such depth and width of what is involved in language learning motivation,
Belmechri and Hummel believe that there exists little agreement among researchers on its components and the different roles that these components play—individual differences, situational differences, social and cultural factors, and cognition (as cited in Keblawi, 2009).

One of the earliest theoretical attempts to address the language motivation issue is evident in the Affective Filter Hypothesis, one of the five core hypotheses in Krashen’s (1981, pp. 60-70) Monitor Model (the other four hypotheses include the Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis, the Monitor Hypothesis, the Natural Order Hypothesis, and the Input Hypothesis). This hypothesis maintains that various affective factors such as attitudes to language, motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety are related to the degree of success in second language or foreign language acquisition. Favorable attitudes and higher self-confidence may lead to better language learning outcomes while unfavorable attitudes and high anxiety may impede making progress in learning. Although the Monitor Model is the most widely cited theoretical paradigm in second language acquisition among researchers and has been adopted and implemented in many classroom practices, it fails to offer a clear definition of language learning motivation and logical rationale to explain exactly how language learning motivation positively affects language learning outcomes.

In Schumann’s (2001) Acculturation Model, acculturation is proposed as the primary causative factor of the variation in the individual second language acquisition achievement, while successful acculturation depends on two sets of factors that determine the learner’s level of social distance and psychological distance. Factors affecting social distance mainly include group characteristics such as social dominance, integration
pattern, cohesiveness, cultural congruence, and mutual attitudes of the L1 and L2 groups. By contrast, factors related to psychological distance focus on learner individuality specifically from the psychological perspective, and language learning motivation becomes one of the four major variables alongside with language shock, culture shock, and ego permeability. Again the process of how changes occur in the learner’s language motivation is overlooked in this model; furthermore, borrowed from Gardner’s (1985a) socioeducational model, the term language motivation here refers to integrative and/or instrumental motivation to learn a second or foreign language. Such conceptualization of language motivation adds nothing new to the existing body of knowledge, and does not clarify the possible link between language motivation and acculturation.

From the early 1960s through the 1980s, Gardner developed and refined the socioeducational model, “the most influential model of language learning motivation” in the literature (Keblawi, 2009, p. 12). In this model, Gardner (1985a, p. 8) clearly defines language motivation as a “combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favorable attitudes towards learning the language” which may take one or both of the two forms: integrative and instrumental motivation. According to Gardner, integrative motivation refers to learners’ desire to at least communicate or at most integrate (or even assimilate) with the members of the target language. Instrumental motivation refers to more functional reasons for learning the language such as getting a better job, a higher salary, or passing an examination (as cited in Keblawi, 2009). In follow-up studies conducted by Gardner and his associates, a series of attitudinal and motivational scales called Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) were developed especially to measure the above mentioned integrative and instrumental motivation.
Noticeably, however, in Gardner’s model, integrative motivation is given much more emphasis than instrumental motivation based on a considerable amount of empirical research in support of the significant contribution of integrative motivation to the learner’s successful foreign language acquisition. Yet it is exactly the notion of integrative motivation that receives the most criticism, mainly because integrative motivation is defined in an overgeneralized way, such that it can be “understood in different and sometimes contradictory ways by different researchers” (Keblawi, 2009, p. 20). Adding to the confusion is the co-existence of three similar concepts in the integrative aspect of this model: integrativeness, integrative orientation, and integrative motivation. Although Gardner (1985a) insists on differentiating the three concepts, clear-cut distinction is not realistic in attempts to adopt these definitions in educational research or classroom instructions.

In an effort to expand the socio-educational model in language learning motivation research and drawing from the self-determination theory in psychology (the backbone of this theory is the conceptual dichotomy between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation), Dörnyei (2005) proposed a new foreign language acquisition motivation theory named the L2 motivational Self system where motivation is viewed as a three-faceted construct including ideal L2 self, ought-to L2 self, and L2 learning experience. The ideal L2 self refers to the ideal L2 speaker one aspires to become, ought-to L2 self refers to the L2 speaker one needs to become in order to meet external expectations and to avoid possible negative consequences (i.e., failure to pass a language test), and L2 learning experience refers to situational or contextual “motives related to immediate learning environment and experience” (Dörnyei, 2009, pp. 60-80).
According to Dörnyei (2009), compared to Gardner’s socioeducational model, the L2 self-system enjoys three notable advantages. First, the proposed concepts of ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self help to clarify the all-encompassing contents of integrative motivation. The ideal L2 self tackles the learner’s intrinsic/internal desire in terms of forming a new culture and language identity during language learning that varies greatly from person to person, while the ought-to L2 self involves the influence of external motivators on that new identity, such as language course requirements or acculturation demands. Second, in Dörnyei’s framework, a distinction between promotion (ideal L2 self) and prevention (ought-to L2 self) is drawn to breakdown further instrumental motivation. Finally, the addition of L2 learning experience into the L2 motivational self system expands the understanding of language learning motivation as a primarily personal construct to a more comprehensive concept that also considers various contextual aspects. However, one weakness of this new model is the lack of validated special measurement instrument to enable more rigorous follow-up empirical studies. This issue will be discussed in detail in a later section.

**Empirical Research**

In this section, two empirical studies are examined with respect to possible factors predicting changes in the learner’s language learning motivation. One focuses on the perspective of the learner and the other deals with the impact of different teaching strategies on the learner’s language learning motivation.

Giang (2011) carried out qualitative research on first-year students studying English as non-majors in the Strategic Mission Project of University of Vietnam National University in order to examine the types of motivation that students possess, the changes
in their motivation during the course of study, and most importantly possible factors that result in such motivational changes. Questionnaires and semi-structured interviews were employed to collect data from one hundred and forty four participants.

The results reveal that two major factors fuel the students’ language learning motivation at the beginning of the language learning process: future career aspiration and the pressure of examinations. Later in the semester, however, it was found that two other factors significantly contribute to the students’ motivational changes (more than half of the students have their language learning motivation decreased after seven months of English study): dissatisfaction with the syllabi and a lack of self-regulatory strategies.

While this study is one of the first few in-depth examinations of foreign language learners’ language learning motivation types and process, its scientific rigor is weakened by three factors: insufficient theoretical rationale to guide the research design due to the failure to select one particular theoretical model or framework from many available, failure to validate the self-developed instruments (questionnaires and interview protocol), and limited generalizability due to the nature of case study.

In order to collect classroom data on motivational strategies, Dörnyei and Csizér (1998) implemented empirical research among two hundred Hungarian teachers of English from various language teaching institutes, asking them to rate the relative effectiveness of fifty-one selected motivational strategies and the frequency of using these strategies in classroom practice. Based on the teachers’ responses, motivational strategies in language classroom are classified into ten major types, namely, the so-called “ten commandments for motivating language learners.” The following is the ranking order of the “ten commandment” in terms of their perceived importance from the

1. Set a personal example with your own behavior.

2. Create a pleasant, relaxed atmosphere in the classroom.

3. Present the tasks properly.

4. Develop a good relationship with the learners.

5. Increase the learners’ linguistic self-confidence.

6. Make the language classes interesting.

7. Promote learner autonomy.

8. Personalize the learning process.

9. Increase the learners’ goal-orientedness.

10. Familiarize learners with the target language culture.

The results of this empirical study provide Dörnyei with first-hand data in developing his initial tripartite language learning motivation model, which later leads to his proposal of the L2 self system. Also interestingly enough, the 10th motivational strategy in the above-mentioned list suggests that language teachers have long noticed the positive link existing between the learner’s understanding of the target language culture and his/her language learning motivation in classroom practice.

Measurement of Language Motivation

With regard to the measures of language learning motivation, one of the most widely used instruments is the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) developed by
Gardner and his associates (Gardner, 2004). AMTB is designed to measure different components of Gardner’s socioeducational model of second language acquisition, including eleven subsets (nine with ten items and two with four items). Five main variables assessed in the AMTB are attitudes towards the learning situation, integrativeness, motivation, instrumentality, and language anxiety.

In order to clarify the validity issues related to exporting the AMTB across countries and cultures, Gardner conducted a number of empirical studies in the foreign language education settings of different countries (Croatia, Poland, Romania, and Spain); the results support the appropriateness of the AMTB instruments internationally (as cited in Giang, 2011). In addition, this instrument has gone through several refinements in order to include the multiple facets of language learning motivation respectively at the learner, learning, and contextual/situational levels.

As Dörnyei’s L2 motivational self system emerges as the new theoretical framework for language learning motivation, many researchers have tried to implement empirical studies to validate this theory or to further their understanding of language learning motivation. However, no standardized and psychometrically tested instruments (similar to Gardner’s AMTB) are ready made to serve such purposes. Researchers have to rely on themselves to apply the general theoretical model to specific research settings and develop their own instruments (mainly self-report questionnaires). Fortunately, Dörnyei (2009) provides interested researchers with valuable suggestions and instructions in terms of constructing, administering, and processing questionnaires in empirical studies related to language learning motivation.

**Linking Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Motivation**
In second or foreign language research literature, intercultural sensitivity is treated as an outcome variable of language acquisition (Akenyemi, 2005; Durocher, 2007; Martinsen, 2011; Rubenfeld et al., 2006) about half of the time, and researchers explore from different perspectives the antecedents that may result in changes in the learner’s level of intercultural sensitivity. At other times, relationships with the linguistic outcome of second/foreign language acquisition are examined to provide empirical support for integration of language and culture in foreign language education (Byram & Kramsch, 2008; Kang, 2006; Jang & Jiménez, 2011; Lybeck, 2002; Martinsen, 2007).

By contrast, the related research on language learning motivation mainly focuses on the role of language motivation as a causative variable that predicts gains in both the cultural and linguistic outcomes of foreign language acquisition, with the latter receiving more attention than the former. Abundant theoretical and empirical studies have been conducted to clarify how language learning motivation affects the learner’s progress in linguistic proficiency and performance (Bernaus & Gardner, 2008; Csizer & Dörnyei, 2005; Wharton, 2000).

However, very few studies are exclusively devoted to examining the possible relationships between language learning motivation and the learner’s intercultural sensitivity (Hernandez, 2010; Rubenfeld et al., 2007), and almost all such research looks at the one-way link between language motivation and intercultural sensitivity, namely, higher language motivation might lead to higher intercultural communication/contact willingness which predicts improvement in the learner’s intercultural sensitivity.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that in addition to the above-described relational approach in language learning motivation research literature, numerous meaningful
research efforts have been made to probe into the “black box” of the language learning motivation process itself, as in exactly how the relevant motivators work to sustain learner’s learning interest and maintain a positive attitude toward foreign language learning (Allen, 2010; Cai & Zhu, 2012; Giang, 2011; Kouritzin, Piquemal, & Renaud, 2009; Kozaki & Ross, 2011; Xiao, 2012).

**Theoretical Framework**

The literature reviewed in this section discusses three theoretical models supporting the positive associations between student intercultural sensitivity and language learning motivation, implying further the causal link for intercultural sensitivity to language motivation. These models include Dörnyei’s (2009) comprehensive model of language motivation, student needs assessment model, Kolb’s (1981) experiential learning model, and Allport’s (1954) intergroup contact theory.

**Dörnyei’s comprehensive language motivation model.** Considering that Gardner and Lambert’s (1972, p. 279) theoretical model of language learning motivation only focuses on the social psychological aspect of language learning, Dörnyei (1994) extends the conceptualization of the complex construct of language motivation to encompass all three aspects from the language, the learner’s rate of progress, and the learning situation. Comparatively speaking, Dörnyei’s model furthers understanding of language motivation by adding the social and pragmatic dimensions to the whole picture. Thus language motivation should be viewed comprehensively which is “always dependent on who learns what language where” (Dörnyei, 1994, p. 275, emphasis in original).

With respect to the level of language learning, Dörnyei (1994, p. 274) argues that
apart from its primary function as a communication tool, language also helps to define
the individual’s identity and sustain his relationships to others in social and cultural
organizations. This multi-faceted role of language itself determines the complexity of the
language learning process, and thus its success not only lies in the mastery use of
linguistic coding systems, but concerns real people in real life with their different ways of
life and thinking. Put differently, language is best learned in its application to socialize
and communicate effectively with the native speakers in their own cultures. From this
perspective, access to and appreciation of the authentic sociocultural contexts in which
any given language is spoken become the key motivators for language learners.

On the learner level, motivational psychologists believe that the motivation
behind certain human behavior can always be traced back to the individuals themselves,
including their instinct, need, ability, and personal traits like anxiety and self-esteem; in
contrast, sociologists focus more on the role of social contexts (interpersonal or
intergroup patterns) in determining individual attitudes and behavior (Dörnyei, 1994;
Gardner, 1985a). In the view of social psychologists, an individual is a social being and
his/her social existence provides the overall framework within which choices are made
and actions are taken. In this sense, learners’ choices in starting/continuing to learn a
foreign language are influenced by their immediate sociocultural contexts to a large
extent. If an individual has never been exposed to any foreign culture, it might never
occur to take the challenge of learning a foreign language during that lifetime; however
on the other end of the spectrum, if an individual lives and works among a community of
foreign language speakers, the pressing need to speak their language and function in daily
social life undoubtedly becomes one of that person’s life necessities.
Finally on the learning situation level, Dörnyei (1994, pp. 277-279) combines and classifies the relevant findings in the literature into three types of motivational factors specific to the language learning situation: (a) course-specific components (i.e., syllabus, course content, teaching materials, assignments, and tasks), (b) teacher-specific components (i.e., instructional quality, teaching style, teacher-student interaction, teacher feedback, grades and rewards), and (c) group-specific components (i.e., peer interaction, classroom climate, group cohesion). In all three aspects of the language learning situation, various extents of cultural exposure for students plays a valuable role in mediating their motivation. Concerning the course-specific components of the language learning situation, well-designed course syllabuses that adequately integrate linguistic study and cultural study are more likely to boost students’ learning interests and demonstrate the relevance of the course to students’ application of their linguistic and intercultural skills in real life (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991). Likewise, if language instructors make an effort in helping students develop intercultural sensitivity and competence in addition to linguistic training, students would be more able to put the linguistic study into their context, which may result in a higher level of satisfaction and confidence in learning a language (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991). Similarly, culture learning based on within-group and intergroup interaction can also facilitate students’ activities in taking initiatives, exerting creativity, sharing learning resources, and participating in productive peer interaction, because generally speaking, learning culture is perceived as less stressful, less mechanical, and more closely related to students’ everyday life than pure linguistic training. The improved student engagement and group cohesion contribute to creating positive classroom climates and group dynamics, which in turn drives up and
sustains student language learning motivation (Clement, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1994; Dörnyei, 1994).

Based on all the above mentioned associations between culture learning and language learning motivation, Dörnyei (1994, p. 281) postulates the following list of specific strategies on motivating language learners in the classroom settings through cultural studies and intercultural contact:

1. include a sociocultural component in the language syllabus by sharing positive experiences related to the target-language culture;

2. develop learners’ cross-cultural awareness systematically by focusing on cross-cultural similarities and not just differences; and

3. promote student contact with native speakers of the target language.

**Student needs assessment.** The theoretical underpinning for promoting the use of student needs assessment in foreign language education is rooted in the learner-centered communicative language teaching approach (Van Ek & Alexander, 1975). The communicative approach stresses language learners’ communicative competence which includes not only grammatical and vocabulary competence, but more importantly, pragmatic competence in real-world cross-cultural communication (Cook, 1999; Savignon, 1991). Thus in order to encourage learner autonomy and increase learner motivation, a foreign language program employing the communicative teaching methods typically starts with leaner needs assessments and strives to cater to those identified language learning needs throughout its design and implementation (Savignon, 1991, p. 263). The communicative language teaching approach has been frequently adopted in
foreign language programs for specific purposes.

In developing learners’ communicative competence in language learning, Hymes (1971) and Halliday (1978) both support the notion of integrating language, communication, and culture in foreign language education. They posit that instead of learning language itself, learners should focus on the authentic use of language as “a social behavior”; therefore, learning about the native speakers’ cultural norms become a necessary precondition to effective use of the target language, although how to teach and learn culture in language classroom to support foreign language learning is not specified in their theories (as cited in Savignon, 1991, p. 264).

Derived from the work of the communicative methodologists (Candlin, 1978; Halliday, 1978; Hymes, 1971; Paulston, 1974), a whole line of language motivation empirical studies focuses on learner needs assessment in foreign language education (Dörnyei, 1994; Ho, 1998; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Seedhouse, 1995). The combination of the findings of these studies identifies a list of language learners’ needs specifically related to culture learning and/or cross-cultural contact and communication as follows:

1. broadening one’s horizon;

2. interests in or curiosity about foreign culture and people;

3. friendship with native speakers of the target language;

4. seeking new intellectual stimulation;

5. developing greater cultural tolerance through language study; and

6. aiding world peace. (Seedhouse, 1995, p. 60)
These findings on and analyses of the learner needs suggest that culture learning and cross-cultural contact play a unique role in inspiring and sustaining language learning motivation, because they directly satisfy language learners’ needs to appreciate “foreignness” not only in the linguistic format but also in the broader sociocultural contexts.

**Project/task-based experiential learning and language motivation.** The experiential learning model advocates learning by doing, and its application in foreign language classrooms shows a tendency towards the prevailing use of project/task-based group/individual learning activities that encourage student autonomy and engagement (Knutson, 2003). Educators and researchers observe that when students are given the opportunities to be involved in an independent project outside of the class and after formal language training, they tend to invest more time, resources, and efforts in order to complete it in a satisfying manner (Padgett, 1994; Parks, 2000; Spruck-Wrigley, 1998). This type of project/task-based experiential learning can assist motivating students in language learning due to the following three theoretical considerations (Knutson, 2003; Oxford & Shearin, 1996).

First, based on the needs assessment, the majority of language learners are not motivated by their pure interest in studying linguistic mechanics and formal language training which typically features teacher-centered didactic lectures and presentations. On the contrary, they often actively seek the opportunities to experiment and apply their acquired linguistic knowledge and skills in real-life situations outside the classroom in their attempts to reach their individual “social, career-related, or scholastic goals” (Knutson, 2003, p. 59). Project-based experiential learning activities meet their language
learning needs specifically in this regard, and thus contribute to maintaining their long-
term language motivation.

Second, project-based experiential learning empowers language learners in that it promotes learners’ positive self-perception and increased self-confidence with the target language in experiencing actual intercultural interaction and communication (Knutson, 2003; Parks, 2000; Spruck-Wrigley, 1998). A well-designed experiential learning task/project can create positive experiences for learners in using the target language, and thus is beneficial for their positive self-perception as successful language learners; moreover, the completion of an experiential learning task/project normally means a formal presentation of the finished products in public (i.e., PowerPoint slide show; posters; or group report), which often stimulates a sense of satisfaction and achievement in the students participating in the project (Knutson, 2003; Parks, 2000).

Finally, project-based experiential learning activities enable learners to build a wide range of competence which include not only linguistic, communicative, intercultural, and interpersonal skills but also practical skills (such as videotaping, making a poster, and conducting an interview) and cognitive skills (such as critical reflection, self-evaluation, teamwork, and leadership) (Knutson, 2003, p. 63). The increased competence at multiple levels motivates learners to work harder and achieve more in language learning.

Allport’s intergroup contact theory. In both language learning and intercultural learning, mere exposure to different cultures may not automatically lead to improvement in linguistic and intercultural competence. More importantly, questions should be asked about what factors in the process of intercultural exposure impact students’ learning
outcomes, and what tools can assist students in maximizing the benefits of intercultural exposure, namely, increased linguistic and intercultural competencies. In other words, the format and quality of cultural exposure and what students choose to do with that exposure are what really makes a difference in language and intercultural learning (Mendelson, 2004).

One type of the cultural exposure encourages language learners’ social contacts with ethnolinguistic out-groups derived from Allport’s (1954) intergroup contact theory. The contention is that in order to reduce the prejudice against a particular group other than one’s own (i.e., race, ethnicity, nationality), effective intergroup contacts are to be promoted; what defines effective intergroup contacts depends on the presence of four conditions: (a) equal status of the groups in contact, (b) common goals shared by the groups, (c) intergroup cooperation, and (d) the support of authorities, law, or custom (pp. 73-89).

In a meta-analysis, Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) review 515 relevant empirical studies in the past decades of research concerning the application of intergroup contact theory in different groups, contexts, and societies, and conclude that “contact theory, devised originally for racial and ethnic encounters, can be extended to other groups” in significantly reducing intergroup prejudice (p. 751). Furthermore, they also point out that in different contact settings, it is vital to treat the four conditions described previously as an interrelated bundle instead of independent factors in order to bring about the best contact effects.

When such high-quality intergroup contacts occur in an intercultural context, the intercultural attitudes are expected to differ between high-contact and low-contact
language learners in that frequent social interaction with the native speakers at both the interpersonal and group level can lead to positive changes in language learners’ intercultural awareness, sensitivity, and understanding (Giles & Robinson, 1990; Spencer-Rodgersa & McGovern, 2002; Wiseman & Koester, 1993; Yook & Albert, 1999). To confirm this relationship between intercultural contacts and intercultural attitudes, Spencer-Rodgersa and McGovern (2002) conduct a large-scale empirical study on the role of intercultural communication barriers, affective responses, consensual stereotypes, and perceived threat in affecting American students’ attitudes towards international students. Their findings indicate that “domestic (American) students who had experienced less contact with the international student population were more likely to rely on stereotypic knowledge as a basis for intergroup judgments” (pp. 625-626).

Based on empirical data gathered in a repeated cross-sectional survey of 8,593 Hungarian pupils in a national sample, Dörnyei and Csizér (2005) also confirm the findings about a positive contact-attitude relationship, and further the inquiry in the concurring contact effects on language attitudes and language motivation. However, they call attention to the existence of “a threshold” in terms of “the optimal intercultural contact level,” which means the intercultural contacts can only produce positive effects up to a certain level. Put differently, “the more, the merrier” pattern cannot describe the curvilinear contact-attitude relationship found in their studies (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2006, pp. 127-130).

**Empirical Research**

When it comes to empirical research regarding the relationship between intercultural sensitivity and language learning motivation, the number of relevant studies
(Beneke, 2001; Corbett, 2003, 2010; Dörnyei, 1994; Kramsch, 1993; Roberts et al., 2001) that are exclusively devoted to the exploration of possible causality in the interaction of the two variables is very limited regarding the process of how one may impact the other. Despite the scarcity of the related empirical research in this respect, three notable lines of research appear in the literature: (a) authenticity in language learning and language motivation; (b) the impact of language motivation on cultural adaptation/acculturation; and (c) intercultural interaction in the study abroad contexts and language motivation.

After a comprehensive review of the theoretical and empirical research literature pertaining to the motivating potentials of the use of authentic materials in language learning, Gilmore (2007) concludes that regardless of the common belief among foreign language educators that language learners are more motivated to respond to learning authentic or “real” materials, there exists very little empirical support for such claims (pp. 106-108). However, since there has not been agreement among researchers and theorists on delimiting the term of “authenticity” in language learning to authentic materials, its definition and application can be extended to broader contexts that are closely related to intercultural exposure and intercultural experiential learning. Several empirical studies reflect the new layers added to “authentic language learning” and produce some interesting findings on authentic learning situations and language motivation (Kienbaum, Russell, & Welty, 1986; Gonzalez-Edfelt, 1990; Peacock, 1997).

Kienbaum et al. (1986) executed a quasi-experimental study with twenty-nine American college students learning German, French, and Spanish as a foreign language to investigate the possible impact of a communicative pedagogy together with the use of authentic materials on students’ language learning motivation during a 30-week period.
Both quantitate and qualitative data are collected for analyses. The “authenticity” intervention leads to interesting findings in two aspects: analysis of the quantitative data shows no significant difference between groups regarding students’ language performance; while the qualitative data collected based on student self-report indicate that most students are more motivated about and more responsive towards the use of authentic materials. One key weakness in this study is the difficulty to single out the actual impact variable(s), since the intervention involves two interrelated but separate components (the communicative pedagogy and the use of authentic materials) from the very beginning. Another issue concerns the validity of the psychometric instrument employed in the study to measure students’ language motivation, because very few items in the attitude survey directly address authentic language learning.

In comparison, Peacock’s study (1997) effectively tackles the two above mentioned weaknesses in Kienbaum et al.’s (1986) study. First, he adopts a more specified model of language motivation in conceptualizing and measuring participants’ language motivation. The model is derived from Crookes and Schmidt’s (1991) theoretical work, including a number of constructs of interest in and enthusiasm for the materials used in class, persistence with the learning task, and levels of concentration or enjoyment on task. Furthermore, instead of involving multiple components, the experimental intervention only focuses on the use of authentic materials with ESL students in South Korea over twenty days. Results suggest significant ($p < 0.001$) increases in both on-task behavior and overall class motivation when authentic materials are used in language learning.

A second line in the empirical research literature emphasizes the possible causal
Rubenfeld et al. (2007) examines students in English as a Second Language (ESL) programs with two different reward structures (extrinsic reward vs. intrinsic reward) using two psychometric scales and a demographic background questionnaire. The participants’ levels of language learning motivation and cultural adaptation/acculturation are measured for the hypothesis that the congruence between language learning goals and motives would predict the learner’s degree of acculturation.

The result confirms the hypothesis, which means that the more congruently the internal components of a learner’s language learning motivation are aligned, the more likely the learner will adapt to the target language culture. This study (Rubenfeld et al., 2007) opens a new perspective in researching second language acquisition and acculturation. However, weakness in its research design cannot be ignored: in an attempt to examine the hypothetical relationship between the congruence in language learning motivation and acculturation success, the researchers fail to consider and remove a variety of possible extraneous factors that might affect a person’s acculturation process. Therefore, the validity of the findings in this study is questionable to a certain degree.

Fully aware of the difficulty in establishing indisputable causality of language motivation on intercultural sensitivity, other empirical researchers choose to focus on the correlations between various dimensions of language learning attitudes and cross-cultural attitudes along this line of research. Sakuragi (2006) surveyed 151 U.S. college students on both language learning attitudes (including a general attitude toward language study; attitudes toward specific languages, such as Chinese, French, Japanese, and Spanish; and instrumental and integrative attitudes) and cross-cultural attitudes (world-mindedness and
social distance). The results reveal three correlational patterns: (a) a general attitude toward foreign language learning is significantly associated with world-mindedness and social distance; (b) attitudes toward some specific foreign languages (Chinese, Japanese, and Spanish) are significantly related to both world-mindedness and social distance; however, attitudes toward some other foreign languages, such as French, are significantly related to neither world-mindedness or social distance; and (c) an integrative attitude is significantly correlated with only social distance, while an instrumental attitude is significantly linked to neither world-mindedness or social distance.

A third line of the empirical research addresses the correlations between intercultural interaction in the study-abroad contexts and language learning motivation. To explore the relationships among motivation, interaction, and the development of foreign language proficiency in a study abroad context, Hernandez (2010) collected data from twenty study-abroad participants by means of a questionnaire (Student Background Information and Motivation Index), a language contact profile, as well as a pretest and posttest oral proficiency interview.

This study (Hernandez, 2010) produced three major findings. First, the one-semester study-abroad program can indeed improve participants’ L2 speaking proficiency; second, participants’ interaction with the L2 culture is found to be positively related to their integrative motivation; finally, participants’ contact with the L2 language significantly impacts their speaking proficiency.

The Current Study

Especially relevant to the present study here is the second finding from Hernandez (2010), claiming a positive relationship between students’ language motivation and their
interaction with the L2 culture. This suggests that language motivation could be one of the determinants of the leaner’s positive cultural attitudes and willingness to interact with the L2 culture. Both are essential to improve the learner’s intercultural sensitivity.

Adding to the knowledge along this line of research, Allen’s (2010) empirical study about short-term study-abroad programs examined the patterns of changes in students’ language learning motivation from the perspective of activity theory. Three kinds of data sources (questionnaires, interviews, and learning blogs) were collected from the six intermediate-level college students of French before, during, and after they participated in a six-week study-abroad program in France. The data sources were separately analyzed first and later triangulated to document the evolution in language learning motivation of two types of students: those with linguistic motives and those with career-oriented motives. The findings suggest a notable improvement in language learning motivation for students who viewed study-abroad programs as a language and cultural learning experience; in contrast, the language learning motivation remained largely unchanged for those who believed foreign language study was only valuable for pragmatic purposes in the first place.

Empirical research initially builds on and extends previous studies that are closely related in purpose, context, and method, designed explicitly to address specific deficits, questions, or problems in the field. For the current study, the empirical precedence includes the following: (a) an authentic foreign language learning environment and the ensuing authentic tasks (which often involves real-world interactions with native speakers) may impact individuals’ motivation to learn or continue to learn the foreign language; (b) individuals’ positive language attitudes may contribute to their improved
intercultural sensitivity and awareness; and (c) in various study-abroad contexts, the specific pattern of individuals’ interaction with native speakers may associate with their level of foreign language motivation. Collecting these studies indicates the nature of the problem that needs to be addressed: to what extent is learners’ foreign language learning motivation (comprehensively measured including but not limited to the previously studied dimensions in language attitudes and motivation) associated with their intercultural sensitivity, controlling for the confounding effects of personal language and cultural background factors. The current study seeks to answer such a question using a quasi-experimental design to study a sample of stay-on-campus foreign language learners, eliminating the influence of various covariate factors on the two variables of interests: intercultural sensitivity and language learning motivation.

**Summary**

Both intercultural sensitivity and language learning motivation have been important areas of study in the research field of second/foreign language acquisition in recent decades. Because of the complex and dynamic nature of both constructs, researchers have adopted a variety of perspectives across disciplines in an attempt to further their understanding and establish possible meaningful links.

One of these perspectives focuses on examining the possible relationship between intercultural sensitivity and language motivation. However, the preceding brief literature review reveals that most researchers favor one particular sequential order of such relationship between the two variables, that is, language motivation predicts changes in intercultural sensitivity.

Thus this research is expected to add to the literature base by building a rationale
for recognizing the impact of improved intercultural sensitivity on the learner’s language learning motivation in second/foreign language acquisition. The results of this research should help in documenting a spiral pattern of the interaction between intercultural sensitivity and language learning motivation.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Acquiring satisfying intercultural competence alongside linguistic competence for foreign language students presents a number of challenges for both teachers and learners, mainly because of the lack of opportunities for learners to observe and reflect upon their personal experiences related to the target language culture. Although short-term study abroad programs and service-learning programs may help create direct hands-on experiences for their participants, not all foreign language students are so lucky to enjoy these opportunities during their education due to various reasons, and such programs are often called to question in generating long-lasting, in-depth changes, both cognitively and affectively, in the participants’ foreign language learning (Martinsen, 2011; Hernández, 2010). Therefore, teaching culture as part of foreign language education is in the need of a more cost-effective and student-oriented model to suit the general educational system.

The purpose of this study is to seek a better understanding of an adapted experiential culture learning program in foreign language education, focusing on its effects first on changing students’ level of intercultural sensitivity and then on changing students’ language motivation as a result (if any), after controlling for individual students’ language and culture background factors (gender, ethnicity, Chinese learning history, Chinese courses currently taken, parental encouragement, personal exposure to the Chinese culture).
The remainder of this chapter is divided into eight sections. First, the **Research Questions** are identified, followed by the explanation about the **Research Design**. The **Population and Sample** are then defined. Next, the **Instrumentation** and data collection **Procedures** are covered. The **Data Analysis** addresses description of the variables and the logic of the data analysis. Then **Validity Considerations** are discussed, followed by a section on **Ethical Standards** reviewing fundamental treatment of respondents with respect to human subjects’ protection. The chapter ends with a brief **Summary**.

**Research Questions**

This study sought to answer eight questions regarding the interactive relationships among foreign language learners’ levels of intercultural sensitivity, foreign language motivation, and their language and culture background factors. Specifically the possible causative impact of intercultural sensitivity on language motivation was explored through a quasi-experimental study, controlling for various background factors. The specific research questions are repeated here from Chapter I, for the convenience of the readers. The related hypotheses are inferred in Chapter I as depicted by Figures 1-4.

1. Is there a significant interaction effect between condition (experimental vs. control) and Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI) test scores (pre vs. post)?

2. Is there a significant difference in the Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI) post test scores between the experimental and control group, controlling for the ICSI pretest scores?

3. Is there a significant interaction effect between condition (experimental vs. control) and Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) test scores (pre vs.
post)?

4. Is there a significant difference in the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) post test scores between the experimental and control group, controlling for the AMTB pretest scores?

5. To what extent are American adult Chinese-learners’ Language and Cultural Background factors (Ethnicity, Gender, Parental Encouragement, Chinese Learning History, Chinese Courses Currently Taken, and Exposure to the Target Language Culture) associated with their levels of Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation, respectively?

6. To what extent is American adult Chinese-learners’ level of Intercultural Sensitivity associated with their level of Language Learning Motivation after controlling for the effects of the significant Language and Cultural Background factors?

7. When controlling for any significant Language and Cultural Background factors, to what extent does the change in American adult Chinese-learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity predict the change in their Language Learning Motivation?

8. To what extent do American adult Chinese-learners’ Language and Cultural Background factors predict the changes in their levels of Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Motivation respectively?

**Research Design**

The study is divided into two stages. Stage 1 employs a pretest-posttest comparison group quasi-experimental research design as described by Stuart and Rubin.
There are two key ways in which the matching methods we discuss replicate a randomized experiment. First, matching aims to select subsamples of the treated and control groups that are, at worst, only randomly different from one another on all observed covariates. In other words, matching seeks to identify subsamples of treated and control units that are “balanced” with respect to observed covariates: the observed covariate distributions are essentially the same in the treatment and control groups. (p. 155)

Therefore, this stage of the study is limited due to the infeasibility of random assignment of research participants to a particular study group. Because the experimental intervention program was made a part of the research participants’ Chinese course requirements, only participants in a natural class taking the same level Chinese courses (Elementary Chinese at 100 level or Intermediate Chinese at the 200 level) were selected as a whole and randomly assigned to the experimental or the control group. As a result, the experimental group was comprised of thirty two participants from the two randomly selected classes (Chinese 102 and Chinese 201), while the control group consisted of thirty six participants from two comparison classes (Chinese 101 and Chinese 202). In the Chinese program of the Modern Languages Department, students taking the same level Chinese course received very similar language and culture instructions and exercises, although some instructional differences may have existed due to individual instructors’ teaching styles and preferences.

After different study groups were identified, an adapted four-task experiential culture learning project (Sizoo & Serrie, 2004) over four weeks was introduced.
(including four assignments of cross-cultural interview, skit, news analysis, and sponsoring a cultural event) to the experimental group in addition to their normal class activities, while the control group participants were taking the business-as-usual language and culture instructions in their Chinese classes. This may cause another limitation inherited in this type of research design: compared with the control group participants who only follow the normal class instructions and complete the routine class work, any change in the levels of intercultural sensitivity and language motivation of the experimental group participants may be attributed to the extra time and efforts invested in learning the Chinese culture throughout the intervention program rather than to the actual intervention effects alone. However, considering the number of undergraduate students enrolled in the sample Chinese program was rather limited (less than ninety), it was not feasible to add another control group which would be given an alternative culture learning project in order to provide further evidence about the intended intervention effects.

Participants’ levels of intercultural sensitivity (using ICSI) and language motivation (using AMTB) were measured before and after the cultural project in both the experimental and control groups. Demographic background questionnaires were also administered through online surveys at the beginning of the study to collect data on participants’ culture and language backgrounds, such as ethnicity, gender, and profile of contacts with the Chinese culture, the history of learning Chinese, Chinese courses currently taken, parental encouragement, and exposure to the target language culture. All the surveys were uploaded and distributed online via Qualtrics online survey software (https://wku.co1.qualtrics.com/ControlPanel/) so that participants could complete them.
on their own time within a one-week window before and after the completion of the intervention program. Having participants take online surveys may cause problems in data collection due to some students’ less than desirable computer savviness and/or lack of motivation to follow through on their own without supervision.

Stage 2 adopts a correlational research method to explore the nature of the interactive relationships “among a collection of variables” that include the two main variables of interests (Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation) and six learners’ Language and Cultural Background factors so that “unrelated variables can be eliminated from further consideration, thereby allowing the researcher to give more serious consideration to related variables” (Lomax & Li, 2013, Role of Correlational Research section, para. 1).

**Population and Sample**

In its broadest sense, this study is intended to address the population of adult second/foreign language learners enrolled in various language teaching programs around the world. However, the vast diversity of this population in terms of learners’ own cultural and linguistic backgrounds, learning environments, as well as other related variables would make for a monumental undertaking. Therefore, it was necessary to delimit the setting from which a sample for this study would be drawn. Thus the specific population for this study is adult Chinese learners at the beginning level enrolled in post-secondary formal foreign language programs provided by American public universities.  

---

1.There can be a variety of post-secondary formal language programs offered by most American public universities. Among which, a notable distinction exists between the programs situated within the Modern Language Departments and those affiliated with the U.S. Defense Department sponsored Flagship Programs for Learning Critical Languages: the former target the general student population and emphasize both language and cultural learning, while the latter only enroll students with outstanding GPAs and focus on intensive language training and linguistic proficiency improvement. Thus “the specific
The sample drawn from this population for this study consisted of sixty eight adult American students learning the Chinese language at the beginner and intermediate levels in the Modern Languages Department of a central-south American public university from the academic year, 2013-2014. Although there were incentives for participating, students must opt into the project voluntarily. Thus the actual sample represents the set of volunteers from the population who did participate. These students opted for receiving lower division Chinese instruction to fulfill the university foreign language requirements. Choosing these students from varied language and cultural backgrounds provided for a sample of adult foreign language learners within a confined geographic area, thereby facilitating the collection of data, while at the same time meeting the requirements of having diversity in learners’ language learning backgrounds and overall learning environments.

These students came from various departments across the campus majoring in different fields, and they opted for receiving lower division Chinese instruction to fulfill the university foreign language requirements. In this sample of students \((N = 68)\), thirty six were male compared to thirty two female. A majority of fifty-six students took the beginner Chinese courses at the 100 level, while the remaining students \((n = 12)\) were enrolled in the intermediate Chinese courses at the 200 level. With an average age of twenty two years old, ninety percent of the students \((n = 61)\) were under twenty five; the seven nontraditional students ranged from twenty nine to sixty nine. Regarding student ethnicity, seventy one percent of the students \((n = 48)\) were white compared to very few Asian \((n = 7)\), African American \((n = 8)\), Pacific Islander \((n = 1)\), and Two Races or More
In terms of cultural origin, seventy four percent of the students ($n = 50$) were children of natural American citizens born and raised here in the United States just like their parents, eighteen percent ($n = 12$) were born outside the United States or at least one of their parents were born and raised overseas (areas other than Asia), and the rest, nine percent ($n = 6$), were either themselves born and raised in certain Asian countries or at least one of their parents came from Asia. Eighty two percent of the students ($n = 56$) had been learning Chinese less than one year with only a few exceptions ($n = 4$) having spent more than two years in Chinese learning. As far as students’ personal international experience, fifty nine percent ($n = 40$) had never traveled outside the United States, and only ten percent ($n = 7$) were considered frequent international travelers.

The remaining descriptive statistics related to the sample characteristics are presented in Chapter IV (Table 2). Choosing these students from varied language and cultural backgrounds provided for a sample of adult foreign language learners within a confined geographic area, thereby facilitating the collection of data, while at the same time meeting the requirements of having diversity in learners’ language learning backgrounds and overall learning environments.

The experiment was conducted with participants among American students enrolled in different levels and types of Chinese courses. To that purpose the experiment was integrated into the participants’ Chinese course syllabi for the spring semester of 2014 with the permission and support of their Chinese instructors. As a result, successful completion of the cultural project was made to account for twenty percent of the participants’ final grades, an incentive to secure recruits totaling at least sixty volunteers. The final sample ($N = 68$) were those who did volunteer for the project, representing 85%
of the students enrolled in beginning and intermediate Chinese courses for the spring semester, 2014. For these students participating, one Chinese 101 class and one Chinese 201 class were randomly selected to form the experimental group, while the remaining students taking Chinese 101 or 202 classes were assigned to the control group. Obtaining a minimum of sixty people as described above would result in a representative cross section of subjects with respect to individual cultural and language backgrounds, profile of contacts with the Chinese culture, and study/travel abroad experiences.

Instrumentation

In this study, three instruments (the Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory [ICSI], the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery [AMTB], and the participants’ language and culture background survey developed by the researcher) were employed to measure respectively one independent variable (foreign language learners’ intercultural sensitivity), one dependent variable (foreign language learners’ language motivation), and six moderator (demographic) variables (gender, ethnicity, Chinese learning history, Chinese courses currently taken, parental encouragement, and exposure to the target language culture). The contents, reliability, and validity of these three instruments are detailed below.

The Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory

Intercultural Sensitivity, as the independent variable in this study, was measured by the Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI). Developed by Bhawuk and Brinslin (1992), the 46-item instrument can be easily completed within a single session either in paper and pencil form or online and can generate straight-forward quantitative data.

In the ICSI scale, Bhawuk and Brinslin (1992, p. 413) identify three measurable components to capture the concept of intercultural sensitivity as in exactly “what people
should be sensitive to when they find themselves in other cultures”: (a) awareness of specific differences in behavioral patterns expected in a typical individualistic or collectivist culture (Individualism vs. Collectivism); (b) open-mindedness towards cultural difference in general (Open-Mindedness); and (c) flexibility in modifying and adjusting one’s behavior according as required by different cultural norms (Flexibility).

The actual ICSI scale contains forty six self-report items in three sections: the U.S. section, the China section, and the Flex/Open section (Bhawuk & Brinslin, 1992, p. 420). While the combination of the first two sections address the construct of Individualism vs. Collectivism from alternative perspectives, the Flex/Open section deals with both the construct of Open-mindedness and the Flexibility construct. Participants responded to each item on a 7-point Likert-type scale, with 1 = very strongly disagree, 2 = strongly disagree, 3 = disagree, 4 = not decided, 5 = agree, 6 = strongly agree, and 7 = very strongly agree.

The first U.S. section of the ICSI (Bhawuk & Brinslin, 1992, p. 420) consists of sixteen items which require respondents to imagine they are living and working in the United States (a typical individualistic society) and react to specific situations in line with the American cultural norms. The second China section presents the same set of sixteen items but responses must be made by visualizing the life and work experiences in China (a typical collectivist society). Of the sixteen items used in the first two sections, seven items are developed related to behavioral patterns representative of an individualistic mentality, such as item 3 (“I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people”), item 9 (“I say “No” directly when I have to”), and item 14 (“I enjoy feeling that I am looked upon as equal in worth to my superiors”). The remaining nine items specify
behavioral patterns reflecting the influence of collectivist cultures, including item 2 (“I would offer my seat in a bus to my supervisor”), item 5 (“I am very modest when talking about my own accomplishments”), and item 10 (“I define the other person’s status by paying attention to name, gender, age, and other demographic attributes”).

The third Flex/Open section (Bhawuk & Brinslin, 1992, p. 420) is comprised of seven items addressing the construct of “Open-Mindedness” and seven items regarding the construct of “Flexibility.” “Open-Mindedness” items include item 38 (“We all have a right to hold different beliefs about God and religion”) and item 43 (“A woman’s place, truly, is at home”); “Flexibility” items tackle such situations as depicted in item 36 (“I do not like to receive unannounced visitors at home”) and item 46 (“While living abroad, I spend most of my personal time with people from my own country”). Detailed information on the instrument can be found in Appendix B.

The authors (Bhawuk & Brinslin, 1992) report the overall reliability coefficient of .84 and find strong external validity (significant correlations existing between participants’ ICSI scores and their evaluation results by experts at the $p < .05$ level) for the ICSI instrument; follow-up empirical studies also reveal ICSI’s adequate construct validity through factor analysis (Comadena et al., 1998) and highly distinctive internal and predictive validity (Graf & Mertesacker, 2009). Based on these psychometric testing results, the ICSI appears to be an appropriate approach to measuring the variable, Intercultural Sensitivity. A limitation is that the authors did not report reliability or validity information for the subscales.

**Attitude/Motivation Test Battery**

The dependent variable in this study is Language Learning Motivation, measured
via the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB). Developed by Gardner (1985a), the AMTB is designed to measure a variety of major components in his socio-educational model of second language acquisition. The instrument assesses five main aspects that constitute language learning motivation: attitudes towards the learning situation, integrativeness, motivation, instrumentality, and language anxiety.

The original AMTB scale is comprised of three sections addressing twelve sub-constructs altogether. The first section concerns attitudinal integrativeness involving (a) attitudes towards the people speaking the target language as their native tongue (in the case of this study, attitudes towards the Chinese people), (b) interest in learning foreign languages in general, (c) attitudes towards learning the particular target language (in this study, attitudes towards learning Chinese), (d) integrative orientation (i.e., “Studying Chinese can be important for me because it will enable me to better understand and appreciate Chinese art and literature”), (e) instrumental orientation (i.e., “Studying Chinese can be important for me only because I’ll need it for my future career”), (f) Chinese class anxiety (i.e., “I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my Chinese class”), and (g) parental encouragement (i.e., “My parents show considerable interest in anything to do with my Chinese courses”) (Gardner, 1985a, pp. 168-175).

This first section of the AMTB adopts a Likert seven-point alternative response format, with assigned value 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = moderately disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neutral, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = moderately agree, and 7 = strongly agree (Gardner, 1985a). One significant modification was made to the first section of the AMTB scale when used in this study: the last two constructs (Chinese Class Anxiety and Parental Encouragement) were excluded. This modification was justified in two ways: (a)
the experimental intervention program was only intended to affect direct changes in the
general affective dimension of participants’ culture and language learning rather than to
influence indirectly the understanding and behavior of participants’ parents outside the
classroom; and (b) the intervention program was completed in one month’s time and it
was expected that such short time would not be sufficient in causing major changes in
participants’ Chinese class anxiety which was also directly determined by a variety of
other factors (such as acceptability of the Chinese instructor’s teaching style, peer
interaction in class, participants’ individual personality and learning styles, etc.).

Three sub-tests constitute the second section of the original AMTB scale
(Gardner, 1985a, pp. 168-175) related to the constructs of Motivational Intensity, Desire
to Learn Chinese, and Orientation Index. The items in the second section are presented in
multiple choice format in which participants circle the alternative they feel best describes
them. For instance, item 7 under Motivational Intensity is “After I get my Chinese
assignment back, I: (a) always rewrite them, correcting my mistakes; (b) just throw them
in my desk and forget them; (c) look them over, but don’t bother correcting mistakes.”
Item 3 under Desire to Learn Chinese is presented as “Compared to my other courses, I
like Chinese: (a) the most; (b) the same as all the others; (c) least of all”). Different
weights are given to each alternative response according to its respective motivational
intensity level, but the multiple choices are presented in a randomized order based on
their assigned weights. In this study, the last construct, Orientation Index, was removed
when using the AMTB scale due to redundancy, because it essentially addresses the same
issue covered earlier under Integrative Orientation and Instrumental Orientation in the
first section.
The third section of the original AMTB scale regards participants’ ideas and impressions about their Chinese course and Chinese teachers using a 7-point semantic differential assessments format (i.e., “My Chinese teacher is insensitive ___:___:___:___:___:___:____ sensitive,” and “My Chinese course is awful ___:___:___:___:___:___:____ nice”). Again, considering that the intended purpose of the intervention program in this study has little to do with students’ specific evaluation of their Chinese course and Chinese teacher, the researcher deleted the entire third section when using the AMTB scale for the current research. The details of the adapted AMTB scale are presented in Appendix C.

The Cronbach coefficient (α) assesses the degree of homogeneity of the items within each subscale and demonstrates the extent to which each subscale is internally consistent. Gardner (1985b, pp. 6-7) reports overall values for internal consistency (α = .85) and test-retest reliability (r = .79) for the AMTB scale. With respect to the Cronbach coefficients of each subscale, the internal consistency reliability of the majority of scales is substantial. Specifically, although the subscale coefficients range from .13 to .97, 89% of them exceed a value of .70. Among all the subscales, the measure of Instrumental Orientation is found the least reliable, with 48% of the coefficients associated with this subscale calculated at less than .70. However, Gardner (1985b, p. 6) chooses to retain this subscale of Instrumental Orientation for the AMTB “because of its potential value and the fact that, though the reliability coefficients are lower than for the other scales, they are nonetheless acceptable (the median reliability for Instrumental Orientation is .62).”

In addition, both internal and construct validity of the instrument have been demonstrated to have strong properties (Gardner, 1985b, pp. 8-15). Thus it appears that
the AMTB is appropriate for use with adult foreign language learners as a means of identifying variance across the population, despite its relatively “low” internal consistency on one of the subscales, Instrumental Orientation.

**Student Language and Culture Background Survey**

Developed by the researcher, the Student Language and Culture Background Survey (see Appendix A) was composed of three parts. The first part requested information related to participants’ personal and family characteristics. The variables of interest included gender, age, ethnicity, the birth places of both the participants and their parents (to determine the amount of intercultural influence the participants may be exposed to in the home settings), year in school (freshmen, sophomore, junior, or senior), and participants’ undergraduate majors. It should be noted that not all of the data collected from this survey were utilized for the Research Questions.

The second part contained four items to assess participants’ language background. Participants were asked to specify “what Chinese courses you are currently taking”; “how long you have been learning the Chinese language” (i.e., less than a year, two years, three to four years, or over four years); “my parents encourage me to learn Chinese” (i.e., strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, or strongly agree); and “all the scenarios where you feel comfortable communicating in Chinese” (i.e., make an appointment over the phone; talk about your favorite books, movies or music; elaborate on a point with reasoning and supporting evidence/examples; or recount a story or a personal experience).

The third part consisted of eight items to collect information related to participants’ personal exposure to the Chinese culture. The variables of interest included
the number of native Chinese speakers “you know personally other than your teachers and tutors” (i.e., none, one or two, more than three, or a lot), affiliation with organizations related to the Chinese language and culture (i.e., none, one or two, more than three, or a lot), frequency of reading and/or watching authentic Chinese materials (i.e., rarely, occasionally, on a monthly basis, every other week, weekly, or daily), international travel/study experiences (i.e., never, once or twice, more than three times, or oftentimes), and personal experiences in China (i.e., “What is the longest time you have spent in China?” and “How many Chinese cities have you been to?”).

**Data Collection Procedures**

With approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the central-south public university where the study was conducted, over one hundred hard copies of informed consent forms were presented to all the students enrolled in the Chinese courses at both the 100 and 200 levels at the Modern Languages Department. In addition, twenty copies of informed consent forms were also provided for fifteen volunteer native Chinese speakers who served as the Chinese culture experts during the intervention program. The IRB-approved informed consent form explained in detail the purpose of the study, the procedures to be used, and the potential benefits and possible risks of participation. It was explicitly specified in the form that refusal to participate or withdrawal from the study at any point would *not* result in any form of penalty. The researcher’s contact information was also listed on the form for interested students. As a result, sixty eight students and fifteen volunteer native Chinese speakers agreed to participate in the study and signed the informed consent forms. The participants were given one signed copy for personal keeping and the researcher filed another signed copy for documentation purposes.
After consulting and discussing with the three involved Chinese instructors (Instructor A for Chinese 101, Instructor B for Chinese 102, and Instructor C for Chinese 201 and 202), the one-month, four-task intervention program was incorporated into the syllabi for the two classes assigned to the experimental group at the beginning of the spring semester of 2014. Prior to the survey administration, copies of an introductory letter from the researcher and the respective administrators, plus the informed consent forms, were given to the three Chinese instructors for the introductory and intermediate classes. Then during class time, the instructors were asked to make a brief introduction about the proposed research and distribute the introductory letters and consent forms to the students in the hope of attracting the largest number of volunteer participants as possible. The letters described the research and its importance, and also noted that signing a letter of informed consent related to the research and completing the cultural project would account for twenty percent of the final grade for students taking the Chinese courses. Next the two instruments (ICSI and AMTB) and the student background questionnaire were administered to all signed-up participants through Qualtrics online survey software. Participants were allowed a one-week window before and after the intervention program to complete the related pre- and post-test surveys on their own time.

One week after the pretest, the two classes (Chinese 102 and 201) assigned to the experimental group started the four-week-long experiential culture learning project; the two classes (Chinese 101 and 202) assigned to the control group were subject to the regular language and culture instructions offered in their respective courses. The experiential culture learning project contained four weekly assignments (including a one-on-one interview with a native Chinese speaker, a cultural skit co-planned and co-
performed with native Chinese speakers, a news critique on Sino-American intercultural exchanges and communication, and sponsoring a cultural exchange event for American and Chinese students to meet each other) completed by the participants either individually or as group work. The participants were asked to submit audio-video recordings, written essays, feedback flowcharts, or photos as products and evidence of their completed assignments. Immediately upon completion of the experiential culture learning project, participants’ assignments were graded and post-test surveys were administered to both the experimental and control groups.

The above described data collection procedures are based on the modifications informed by a pilot study conducted by the researcher before the main study. Three months prior to the main study, similar procedures had been pilot-tested with a total of eight volunteer American students learning Japanese from the same university to refine the data collection plans (see Appendix D). Based on the pilot study, several changes were made in the research design and data collection plans before initiating the actual data collection process. The first modification concerned survey administration. In the pilot study, participants took hard copy surveys at home, which led to some loss of the hard copies and confusion in retrieving the completed surveys. Thus in the main study, online surveys were made available to each participant to complete at their own convenience within the one-week window. The second change occurred in the area of intervention program implementation. In the pilot study, the researcher initiated and implemented the intervention program in a workshop format, completely independent of the participants’ regular language and culture instructions and exercises, which resulted in low motivation to participate and high dropout rates due to the difficulties in
coordinating meeting schedules for everyone. Therefore, in the main study, the intervention program was embedded as part of the participants’ Chinese class requirements, and the Chinese instructors took the role as direct initiators and monitors of student activities during the intervention program in order to increase and sustain participants’ motivation.

**Data Analysis**

After deactivation of the online survey instruments, the data were downloaded from the Qualtrics online survey platform and imported into the statistical data analysis program Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The data were then coded, processed, and reviewed against the criteria to be included or not in the final data analysis. Data were included for the cases of those participants who had successfully completed and submitted both the pre and post surveys (ICSI and AMTB) as well as the student language and culture background survey during the required time periods. This screening procedure reduced the number of cases from the original sixty eight ($N = 68$) to the final forty three ($N = 43$) for the data analysis. The plan for data analysis is summarized in Table 1. For all analyses, 95% confidence intervals were utilized.
Table 1

*Plan for Data Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>Moderators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is there a significant interaction effect between condition (experimental vs. control) and Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI) test scores (pre vs. post)?</td>
<td>Mixed model ANOVA</td>
<td>Groups--Pre and post-test time points</td>
<td>Intercultural Sensitivity (five sub-scales)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is there a significant difference in the Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI) post test scores between the experimental and control group, controlling for the ICSI pretest scores?</td>
<td>Independent samples <em>t</em> tests; MANCOVA</td>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>Intercultural Sensitivity (five sub-scales)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is there a significant interaction effect between condition (experimental vs. control) and Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) test scores (pre vs. post)?</td>
<td>Mixed model ANOVA</td>
<td>Groups--Pre and post-test time points</td>
<td>Language Learning Motivation (eight sub-scales)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is there a significant difference in the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) post test scores between the experimental and control group, controlling for the AMTB pretest scores?</td>
<td>Independent samples <em>t</em> tests; MANCOVA</td>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>Language Learning Motivation (eight sub-scales)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>Moderators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent are American adult Chinese-learners’ Language and Cultural Background factors (Ethnicity, Gender, Exposure to the Target Language Culture, Chinese Learning History, Chinese Courses Currently Taken, and Parental Encouragement) associated with their levels of Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Motivation respectively?</td>
<td>Pearson product-moment correlation</td>
<td>Ethnicity; Gender; Exposure to the Target Language Culture; Chinese learning history; Chinese courses currently taken; Parental encouragement</td>
<td>Intercultural Sensitivity; Language Learning Motivation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To what extent is American adult Chinese-learners’ level of Intercultural Sensitivity associated with their level of Language Motivation after controlling for the effects of any significant Language and Cultural Background factors?</td>
<td>Semi partial correlation</td>
<td>Intercultural Sensitivity</td>
<td>Language Learning Motivation</td>
<td>Ethnicity; Gender; Exposure to the Target Language Culture; Chinese learning history; Chinese courses currently taken; Parental encouragement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>Moderators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. When controlling for any significant Language and Cultural Background factors, to what extent does the change in American adult Chinese-learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity predict the change in their Language Learning Motivation?</td>
<td>Semi partial correlation</td>
<td>Pre-post change in Intercultural Sensitivity</td>
<td>Pre-post change in Language Learning Motivation</td>
<td>Ethnicity; Gender; Exposure to the Target Language Culture; Chinese learning history; Chinese courses currently taken; Parental encouragement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To what extent do American adult Chinese-learners’ Language and Cultural Background factors predict the changes in their levels of Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Motivation respectively?</td>
<td>Pearson product-moment correlation</td>
<td>Ethnicity; Gender; Exposure to the Target Language Culture; Chinese learning history; Chinese courses currently taken; Parental encouragement</td>
<td>Pre-post gain in Intercultural Sensitivity; Pre-post gain in Language Learning Motivation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Both independent samples *t* tests and MANCOVA were performed for RQ2 and RQ4 as supplemental triangulation in determining the intervention effects.

**Description of the Variables**

In this section, variables of interest are described conceptually (including variable label codes) and operationally with references made to the literature when appropriate.

Hard copies of the three survey instruments used in this study are attached at Appendix A, Appendix B, and Appendix C. Specific operational definitions of all variables are attached at Appendix D.
**Moderator variables.** The Student Language and Culture Background Survey was developed by the researcher under the guidance of Drs. Stephen Miller, Jie Zhang, and Laura McGee--co-chairs and content expert, respectively, from the dissertation committee. The complete questionnaire, totaling twenty four items, is designed to gather information from research participants on three types of data, namely, the personal, language, and culture background variables of interest.

**Cultural background variables.** Specifically regarding the cultural background variables, Gender was categorical and provided nominal data, with $1 = \text{male}$ and $2 = \text{female}$. Age was expressed in whole numbers, was numeric, and provided ratio level data. Ethnicity was also categorical, providing nominal level data, where $1 = \text{white}$, $2 = \text{African American}$, $3 = \text{Asian}$, $4 = \text{Pacific Islander}$, and $5 = \text{two races or more}$.

A total of ten items in the Student Language and Culture Background Survey addressed the issue of participants’ exposure to different cultures, especially the Chinese culture. Conceptually, the variable for cultural exposure covered five aspects based on the related literature (Alon & Higgins, 2005; Crowne, 2013; Embong, 2000; Sklair, 2002; Tarique & Takeuchi, 2008; Yamazaki & Kayes, 2004): (a) general international travel experiences (measured by the number of times for international travel), (b) exposure to multicultural influences in the home settings (measured by the birthplaces of both the participants themselves and their parents), (c) travel/study/work experiences in China (measured by the number of times participants visited China, the number of Chinese cities visited, and the longest time of stay in China), (d) direct personal interaction experiences with native Chinese speakers (measured by the number of native Chinese speakers whom participants know personally other than their Chinese teachers and
tutors), and (e) indirect exposure to the Chinese culture through authentic Chinese
cultural products and activities (measured by the frequency for participants to access
authentic Chinese materials such as books, magazines, movies, music, etc.).

Responses to the ten items were made in a multiple choice format. Various
weights were assigned to each of the four alternatives based on the depth and breadth of
cultural exposure it reflected (Crowne, 2013). For example, responses to the item “How
many Chinese cities have you been to?” were coded as 1 = none, 2 = two or three, 3 =
more than three, and 4 = a lot. A composite score was then calculated by summing up the
weights assigned to each participant’ responses to all the ten items, and thus the cultural
exposure variable was numeric and provided interval level data.

Language background variables. In the Student Language and Culture
Background Survey, there were three types of variables of interest related to participants’
language background: Chinese learning history, Chinese courses currently taken, and
Parental encouragement in learning Chinese. The variable, Chinese Learning History,
was ordinal, where 1 = less than a year, 2 = two years, 3 = three to four years, and 4 =
over four years. The variable, Chinese Courses Currently Taken, provided nominal data
(i.e., Elementary Chinese 101, Elementary Chinese 102, Intermediate Chinese 201, or
Intermediate Chinese 202), and was later coded to identify the experimental/control
group to which participants were assigned. The grouping identifiers were coded as 0 =
The control group for Elementary Chinese 102 and for Intermediate Chinese 201; and 5 =
Finally, the Parental encouragement variable generated numeric responses and provided
interval level data on a Likert scale, where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 =
neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly disagree.

**Independent variable.** As noted in Chapter I, the primary independent variable of interest in this research was foreign language learners’ intercultural sensitivity measured by the Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI) developed by Bhawuk and Brislin (1992). This variable was conceptually defined as the ability to discriminate and experience relevant differences between the home and target culture. Operationally, Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) defined intercultural sensitivity as an individual’s reaction to people from other cultures, which can predetermine that individual’s ability to work successfully with those people. Based on the ICSI scale, three subscales were further measured under the variable of intercultural sensitivity: (a) understanding of distinct behavioral patterns in a typical individualistic culture (in this study, the individualistic culture referred to the American society and thus this sub-variable was named “Individualism vs. Collectivism [U.S. Case]), (b) understanding of distinct behavioral patterns in a typical collectivist culture (in this study, the Chinese society was chosen to represent the collectivist culture and thus this sub-variable was referred to as “Individualism vs. Collectivism [China Case]), and (c) general open-mindedness about cultural and ideological differences and willingness/flexibility in adjusting one’s behavioral patterns according to cultural differences (the sub-variable Open-mindedness and Flexibility) (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992, p. 413). The measurements of the three above-mentioned subscales resulted in five sub-variables of interest under intercultural sensitivity: Intercultural Sensitivity Total, Individualism vs. Collectivism Total, Individualism vs. Collectivism (U.S. Case), Individualism vs. Collectivism (China Case), and Open-mindedness and Flexibility Total.
Responses to a total of forty six items in the ICSI scale were made on a 7-point Likert scale, with 1 = very strongly disagree, 2 = strongly disagree, 3 = disagree, 4 = not decided, 5 = agree, 6 = strongly agree, and 7 = very strongly agree. These responses were numeric and provided interval level data, based on which of the five above mentioned sub-variables were then computed. Specifically, Intercultural Sensitivity Total was calculated by summing the responses to all the forty six items in the ICSI scale, Individualism vs. Collectivism Total by adding up the responses to the thirty two items in the first two sections, Individualism vs. Collectivism (U.S. Case) by totaling the responses to the sixteen items in the first section, Individualism vs. Collectivism (China Case) by combining the responses to the sixteen items in the second section, and the responses to the remaining fourteen items in the third section were added up for the sub-variable Open-mindedness and Flexibility Total.

**Dependent variable.** The dependent variable in the current study was foreign language learners’ Language Learning Motivation measured by the adapted Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) scale originally designed in 1975 by Gardner and Smythe. According to Gardner (1985a), language motivation was conceptually defined as the foreign language learner’s “combination of effort and desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favorable attitudes towards learning the language” (p. 10). Operationally based on the AMTB scale, there were three types of sub-variables to be measured, including (a) general interest in learning foreign languages and desire to learn the particular foreign language, (b) attitudes towards learning the target language, the target language group, and the language learning experience, and (c) motivational intensity (the amount of efforts invested in learning the target language) (Gardner, 1985a,
Interest and desire in foreign language learning. Two major sub-variables of interest, Interest in Foreign Languages and Desire to Learn Chinese, were measured in this category. Ten items in the AMTB scale addressed the sub-variable, Interest in Foreign Languages, to which partisans responded in a Likert seven-alternative response format, where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = moderately disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neutral, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = moderately agree, and 7 = strongly agree. These responses were numeric and provided interval level data.

For the sub-variable, Desire to Learn Chinese, there were ten items in multiple choice format. Different weights were assigned to each alternative response according to the respective strength of Chinese learning desire it reflected. For example, three alternatives were provided for the item “During Chinese class, I would like:” as 1 = c (to have only Chinese spoken), 2 = a (to have a combination of Chinese and English spoken), and 3 = b (to have as much English as possible spoken). The responses to these items were thus numeric and provided interval level data.

Attitudes towards learning the target language and culture. In this category, a total of four sub-variables included Attitudes toward the Chinese People, Attitudes toward Learning Chinese, Integrative Orientation, and Instrumental Orientation. The responses to the sixteen items related to the sub-variable, Attitudes toward the Chinese People, were made on 7-point Likert scale, with 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = moderately disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neutral, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = moderately agree, and 7 = strongly agree. These responses were numeric and provided interval level data.

Among the ten items focused on Attitudes toward Learning Chinese, five items
were positively worded and five negatively worded. Since these items required responses in a Likert seven-alternative response format, the responses to the five negatively worded items needed reverse coding. For these items, a response of 1 = *strongly disagree* became 7 = *strongly agree* and vice versa, a response of 2 = *moderately disagree* became 6 = *moderately agree* and vice versa; and a response of 3 = *slightly disagree* became 5 = *slightly agree* and vice versa. A response of 4 = *neutral* remained the same. All analyses were conducted with the recoded item scores.

The third and fourth sub-variables, Integrative Orientation and Instrumental Orientation, were based on four items each in a Likert seven-alternative response format. The responses to these items were numeric and provided interval level data.

**Motivational intensity.** Regarding the sub-variable, Motivational Intensity, there were ten items in the multiple choice format. Different weights were assigned to each alternative response according to its respective level of motivational intensity, but the multiple choices were presented in a randomized order based on their assigned weights. For example, the three alternatives were presented for the item “When it comes to Chinese homework, I:” as 1 = *c (just skim over it)*, 2 = *a (put some effort into it, but not as much as I could)*, and 3 = *b (work very carefully, making sure I understand everything)*. The responses to these items were thus numeric, producing interval level data.

**Descriptive Statistics**

Descriptive statistics summarize information about the sample respondents who completed the survey (Gay & Airasian, 2000). Measures of central tendency and variability provide a picture of the demographics section. The scores from the three
survey instruments comprising the moderator, independent, and dependent variables (mean and standard deviation for each item) are also reported.

**Correlation and ANOVA**

Research Question 5 (To what extent are American adult Chinese-learners’ language and cultural background factors associated with their levels of intercultural sensitivity and language motivation respectively?) and Research Question 8 (To what extent do American adult Chinese-learners’ Language and Cultural Background factors predict the changes in their levels of Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Motivation respectively?) investigated the relationship between participants’ personal, language, and culture background factors and the two foreign language learning outcomes: Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation. Because participants’ background factors involved six different types of variables (Gender, Ethnicity, Chinese Learning History, Chinese Courses Currently Taken, Parental Encouragement, and Exposure to the Chinese Culture), two forms of data analysis (ANOVA and Pearson product-moment correlation) were selected for categorical and continuous variables, respectively.

Three moderator variables--Parental Encouragement, Chinese Learning History, and Exposure to the Chinese Culture--provided interval level data, and thus Pearson product-moment correlation analysis was performed to explore their associations with Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation, which are also interval scales. This analysis is appropriate for research designs examining the relationship between two quantitative, continuous variables in order to measure the strength of the association between the two variables (Malgady & Krebs, 1986, p. 111), the situation in RQ 5.
The Pearson product-moment correlation analysis requires the following data assumptions to hold: interval or ratio level, linearly related, and bivariate normally distributed (Malgady & Krebs, 1986, p. 113). The first two assumptions were met as described above; to determine whether the normality assumption was also met, the frequency distributions of all four variables of interest were inspected.

As for the remaining three categorical variables (Gender, Ethnicity, and Chinese Courses Currently Taken) that comprise the participant background factors, data were analyzed using one-way ANOVA on each of the four variables. ANOVA is suitable for research designs with one independent variable having two or more groups and one dependent variable measured as continuous data (Larson, 2008). In this case, the independent variables included Gender with two levels (i.e., male or female), Ethnicity with five levels (i.e., white, African American, Asian, Pacific Islander, or two races or more), and Chinese Courses Currently Taken (i.e., Elementary Chinese 101, Elementary Chinese 102, Intermediate Chinese 201, or Intermediate Chinese 202). The dependent variables to be investigated referred to Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation, respectively.

The assumptions of ANOVA include independence, normality, and homogeneity of variance (Larson, 2008). The first independence assumption was assumed logically, because it was not possible for each participant to make multiple responses to the items related to student personal, language, and culture background factors (responses were supposed to be mutually exclusive, i.e., either male or female, or either white or non-white). To see if the normality assumption was met, the frequency distributions of the commitment component scores were computed and examined. For the assumption of
homogeneity of variance, Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was evaluated for non-significance.

**Semi Partial Correlational Analysis**

The sixth and seventh research questions estimated the predictive relationship between participants’ Intercultural Sensitivity and their Language Learning Motivation after controlling for the effects of other predictors such as the most relevant student language and culture background factors. These questions were

6. To what extent is American adult Chinese-learners’ level of Intercultural Sensitivity associated with their level of Language Learning Motivation after controlling for the effects of the significant Language and Cultural Background factors?

7. When controlling for any significant Language and Cultural Background factors, to what extent does the change in American adult Chinese-learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity predict the change in their Language Learning Motivation?

For each of these questions, data were analyzed using semi-partial correlational analysis. The statistical procedure was selected because partialing can be used to determine the degree of association between two variables (a predictor variable and a criterion or outcome variable) that would exist if all influences of one or more other variables could be removed (Velicer, 1976). A special advantage in computing semi-partial coefficients is that the criterion remains unchanged after removing variance that the predictor of interest has in common with other predictors, which makes the results more interpretable when the purpose of the research is predictive since the procedure
produces the correlation between the residualized predictor and the unaltered criterion (Velicer, 1976). Particularly in this study, the predictor variable of interest was participants’ level of Intercultural Sensitivity (or the pre-post change in the level of Intercultural Sensitivity), the dependent variable was participants’ Language Learning Motivation (or the pre-post change in their language motivation), and the other predictors causing covariance included any significant Language and Cultural Background factors.

Semi-partial analysis requires the same assumptions about the data as do Pearson correlations, since it is a modified form of Pearson correlation. The data used for this statistical procedure must be interval or ratio level, linearly related, and bivariate normally distributed (Malgady & Krebs, 1986, p. 113). The first two assumptions were met in this study because both the predictor and outcome variables of interest as well as the two other predictors were numerical and they are related to one another linearly; to determine whether the normality assumption was also met, the frequency distributions of all four variables of interest were inspected.

**Two-way ANOVA with Repeated Measures in One Factor**

Two research questions in this study examined whether there was a significant interaction between the intervention condition (experimental vs. control) and the changes in participants’ pretest and posttest scores on Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation. The two questions were

1. Is there a significant interaction effect between condition (experimental vs. control) and Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI) test scores (pre vs. post)?

2. Is there a significant interaction effect between condition (experimental vs.
control) and Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) test scores (pre vs. post)?

For each of the two questions, data were analyzed using two-way ANOVA with repeated measures in one factor (IS or LM pretest and posttest scores). This analysis was selected to test for differences between two or more independent groups (experimental vs. control) while subjecting participants to repeated measures (pretest vs. posttest). In this particular mixed design ANOVA model for RQs 1 and 3, the between-subjects variable (fixed effect factor) was condition/group (experimental vs. control) while the within-subjects variable (random effects factor) was test points (pre vs. post) on either Intercultural Sensitivity (measured by ICSI) or Language Learning Motivation (measured by AMTB) (Field, 2009, p. 482).

In order to run the mixed model ANOVA, three assumptions must be met for both the between-subject and within-subject effects in the data: homogeneity of variance, normal distribution, and sphericity of the covariance matrix (Field, 2009, p. 503). To determine if the normality assumption was met, the frequency distributions of both variables of interest were inspected. Sphericity (requiring equal variance for each level in a group) is regarded as the repeated measures equivalent of homogeneity of variances for independent ANOVA, and can be tested using Mauchly's Test for sphericity as part of the General Linear Model Repeated Measures procedure in SPSS. If the sphericity assumption is violated (the F ratios do not match the F distribution), a Greenhouse-Geisser or Huynh & Feldt adjustment would be performed to correct the specific F ratio(s) concerned (Field, 2009, p. 504).

**MANCOVA and Independent Sample t Test**
The second and fourth research questions in this study were designed to ascertain the intervention effects by investigating if there was a significant difference in the posttest scores for Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation between the experimental and control group after controlling for their respective pretest scores. These research questions were

2. Is there a significant difference in the Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI) post test scores between the experimental and control group, controlling for the ICSI pretest scores?

4. Is there a significant difference in the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) post test scores between the experimental and control group, controlling for the AMTB pretest scores?

For these two questions, data were analyzed first using two-way MANCOVA, and then independent sample \( t \) tests for triangulation purposes. This analysis allows the characterization of differences in group means in regards to a linear combination of multiple dependent variables, while simultaneously controlling for covariates (Woodworth, 1979). Thus MANCOVA was appropriate for the two above-mentioned questions because the independent variable was group, which had two levels (experimental or control); in terms of the dependent variables, multiple sub-variables under Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation were compared across the groups in order to provide further insight into the intervention effects (if any).

The assumptions of MANCOVA include independence of observation, normality, homogeneity of variance, and homogeneity of covariance (Woodworth, 1979). The first assumption of independence of observation means that each observation must be
independent of all other observations. This assumption was logically assumed since the four classes in the study sample were randomly assigned to either the experimental or the control group. When the assumption of normality is met, each dependent variable must be normally distributed. To determine if this assumption was met, the frequency distributions of the multiple sub-variables under each of the two dependent variables (Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation) were computed and inspected. To determine whether the assumption of homogeneity of variance was satisfied, Levene’s test of homogeneity of variance was evaluated against the non-significance standard. Finally, the Box’s M test was conducted to see if the data met the assumption of homogeneity of covariance (the test results should be insignificant in order to meet the assumption).

Furthermore, independent sample \( t \) tests were also performed for RQs 2 and 4 because this analysis is fitting for the research purpose of determining if there is a significant difference between the means of two independent groups (in this case, experimental vs control group) (McCluskey & Lalkhen, 2007). Such purpose is reflected in the two research questions mentioned above. In each question, the posttest score means of either Intercultural Sensitivity (measured by ICSI) or Language Learning Motivation (measured by AMTB) for the two independent groups (experimental vs. control) were compared for any statistical differences, if and only if the mean differences in the pretest scores between the two groups were found statistically insignificant using also the independent sample \( t \) tests.

The three major assumptions of independent sample \( t \) tests require the data for analysis to be interval level, normally distributed, and collected from independent
samples. As previously discussed, both variables, Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation, were numerical and generated interval level data. To determine if the normality assumption was met, the frequency distributions of both variables of interest were inspected. In addition, there was no relationship between the subjects in each of the two groups, since subjects in the experimental group could not also be in the control group and the independence of observations was guaranteed.

**Ethical Standards**

Because this study involved human subjects, the Western Kentucky University (WKU) Institutional Review Board (IRB) clearance was required. Once the approval process was finalized (from both the Chinese Language Program administrator and instructors and student human subjects involved in the study), data collection proceeded as described above (see Procedures). Adherence to the rules of privacy safeguarding participant information was followed as required by law.

Before beginning the experiment and surveys, the participants were given directions as to how to complete and submit the questionnaires. Since the surveys had minimal impact on the individuals completing it, a preamble was utilized in lieu of a consent form, with implied permission granted if the participants complete the surveys.

The introduction and surveys were both written in language that is easy for college students to understand. Efforts were made to ensure that the questions are non-threatening to participants and that they can read and answer the survey efficiently within their limited planning times or other times at their convenience during the day.

Protocol for research on human subjects, per the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the Western Kentucky University research department, was followed. The researcher
has complied with all requirements related thereto. Once permission was gained, the IRB approval letter was filed (see Appendix D).

Summary

The study involved two stages. Stage 1 employed a pretest-posttest comparison group quasi-experimental research design. As the experimental intervention, a four-week-long cultural project (Sizoo & Serrie, 2004) was introduced (including four assignments of interview, skit, news analysis, and sponsoring a cultural event) aimed at improving participants’ levels of Intercultural Sensitivity (using ISI) and Language Learning Motivation (using AMTB), which were measured before and after the cultural project in both the experimental and control groups. Demographic questionnaires were also administered through online surveys at the beginning of the study to collect data on participants’ culture and language backgrounds information, such as age, gender, ethnicity, year in school, types of Chinese courses currently taken, parental encouragement concerning learning Chinese, profile of contacts with the Chinese culture, and previous study/travel aboard experiences.

Stage 2 implemented a series of correlational studies to ascertain the relationship between the two main variables of interest—Intercultural Sensitivity (IS) and Language Learning Motivation (LM), and to identify the most relevant learners’ Language and Cultural Background factors to IS and LM.

Based on the review of literature, two major hypotheses areas guided the analysis of data. First, it was hypothesized that perceptions of intercultural sensitivity were related to perceptions of language motivation among a sample of adult American Chinese-learners. Those learners who report a high degree of intercultural sensitivity tended to
have perceptions of higher language motivation while low intercultural sensitivity was related to low language motivation. Secondly, it was hypothesized that subjects from different groups (experimental vs. control) are expected to demonstrate different level of intercultural sensitivity and language motivation accordingly based on the intervention effects.

There were eight research questions in this study. Research Question 1 and 3 investigated the possible interaction effects between condition/group (experimental vs. control) and participants’ test scores (pre vs. post) in intercultural sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation. Research Question 2 and 4 compared the posttest mean differences between groups in terms of intercultural sensitivity and language motivation after controlling for the pretest scores. Research Question 5 focused on how the demographic controls influence the two variables of interest: Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation. Research Question 6 focused on the unique predictive power of intercultural sensitivity on language motivation after controlling for the significant demographic variable(s). Research Question 7 explored how uniquely the pre-post change in participants’ level of intercultural sensitivity predicts the change in their language motivation. SPSS (version 19) was utilized for the quantitative data analysis. Finally, Research Question 8 clarified what types of language learners (as defined by the six selected Language and Cultural Background factors) were more likely to show intended changes in the IS and LM levels as a result of the experimental intervention.

Regarding data collection procedures, the two survey instruments (ICSI and AMTB) and the Students’ Culture and Language Background Questionnaire were administered to all participants online through Qualtrics. Prior to the survey
administration, copies of an introductory letter from the researcher and the respective administrators and informed consent form were given to the three Chinese instructors. The letters described the research and its importance, and also noted that signing a letter of informed consent related to the research and completing the cultural project would account for 20% of students’ final grade taking the Chinese courses. This procedure was pilot-tested with at least 6 volunteer American students learning Japanese from the same university to refine the actual data collection plans.

To conclude, two central research questions framed this study: (a) To what extent can Chinese-learners’ levels of intercultural sensitivity be manipulated by the designed four-week cultural experiential learning project based on the intergroup contact theory compared to the control group; and (b) To what extent are Chinese-learners’ levels of intercultural sensitivity associated with their language motivation after controlling for the effects of their language and cultural background factors?
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to: (a) investigate the interrelations between intercultural sensitivity and foreign language learning motivation, and (b) explore the effects of an experiential culture learning intervention program on foreign language learners’ levels of intercultural sensitivity and language learning motivation. A limited number of previous empirical studies (Dörnyei, 1994; Dörnyei & Csizér, 2005; Hernandez, 2010; Rubenfeld et al., 2006; Rubenfeld et al., 2007) explored the interrelated patterns between intercultural sensitivity and language motivation, but the related research was mostly based on correlational studies and focused on only one-way relationships concerning how more motivated language learners tend to be more positive and sensitive in intercultural communication. The current study adds to the body of knowledge on the relationship between intercultural sensitivity and language motivation by adopting a quasi-experimental research design to separate the effects of possible confounding demographic and other background factors.

The previous three chapters introduced the key concepts of intercultural sensitivity and foreign language motivation, reviewed the literature related to the cultural dimension of foreign language education, experiential learning, intercultural sensitivity, and language motivation, and outlined the methodology utilized in the current study. This
chapter presents the results of the data analysis from a statistical perspective that pertain to three parts: (a) based on the pretest results, preliminary correlations are explored and reported between the selected six demographic factors and participants’ pretest scores on Intercultural Sensitivity (measured by ICSI) and Language Learning Motivation (measured by AMTB); (b) after comparing the participants’ pretest and posttest scores, the significance of the experimental effects is described and reported on Intercultural Sensitivity (measured by ICSI) and Language Learning Motivation (measured by AMTB), respectively; (c) contingent on the participants’ pre-post gains on ICSI and AMTB, the results of the correlational study are reported on all the variables involved (including demographics, Intercultural Sensitivity, and Language Learning Motivation). Descriptive statistics are discussed first, followed by the analysis results of each of the eight empirical research questions.

**Research Questions**

This study investigated the following eight questions:

1. Is there a significant interaction effect between condition (experimental vs. control) and Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI) test scores (pre vs. post)?

2. Is there a significant difference in the Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI) post test scores between the experimental and control group, controlling for the ICSI pretest scores?

3. Is there a significant interaction effect between condition (experimental vs. control) and Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) test scores (pre vs. post)?
4. Is there a significant difference in the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) post test scores between the experimental and control group, controlling for the AMTB pretest scores?

5. To what extent are American adult Chinese-learners’ Language and Cultural Background factors (Ethnicity, Gender, Parental Encouragement, Chinese Learning History, Chinese Courses Currently Taken, and Exposure to the Target Language Culture) associated with their levels of Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation, respectively?

6. To what extent is American adult Chinese-learners’ level of Intercultural Sensitivity associated with their level of Language Learning Motivation after controlling for the effects of the significant Language and Cultural Background factors?

7. When controlling for any significant Language and Cultural Background factors, to what extent does the change in American adult Chinese-learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity predict the change in their Language Learning Motivation?

8. To what extent do American adult Chinese-learners’ Language and Cultural Background factors predict the changes in their levels of Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Motivation respectively?

The results of the statistical analyses related to each of these questions are presented in the order of the research questions. The implications are discussed in the next chapter.

Descriptive Statistics

The population for this study is formed by American adult Chinese language
learners enrolled in various kinds of formal foreign language programs at the post-secondary level provided by American public universities (see Note 1). The specific study sample drawn from this population is composed of sixty eight American adult Chinese learners at the beginner and intermediate levels in the Modern Language Department of a central-south American public university. All sixty eight participants took the pretests, but only a total of forty three (a completion rate of 63.24%) completed the four-week-long intervention program and took the posttests. Missing data accounted for less than 3% of participant responses.

Because the data collected from the pretest sample of sixty eight participants were used for analyses of the first two correlational research questions, and the posttest sample of forty three participants provided the data for analyzing the remaining six research questions as listed above, the descriptive statistics for the demographic variables of both the pretest and posttest samples (including gender, age, ethnicity, cultural origins, Chinese learning history, Chinese language courses currently taken, and international travel/study experiences) are presented in Table 2 and Table 3 respectively. The tables for descriptive statistics here contain raw data for variables not utilized for the analyses of the eight research questions as listed above in this study.

As shown in Table 2 and Table 3, the demographic features of the research participants as described by the seven demographic variables remained largely unchanged in the pretest \((n = 68)\) and posttest \((n = 43)\) samples, in spite of the notable participant attrition/incompletion rate (36.8%) over the course of the current study.

Table 2

*Descriptive Statistics for Demographic Variables in the Pretest Sample \((N = 68)\)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two Races or More</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Origins</td>
<td>Born as Children of Natural American Citizens</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Born Outside the US and Asia (or with at least 1 parent born outside the US and Asia)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Born in Asia (or with at least 1 parent born in Asia)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Learning History</td>
<td>0-1 year (s)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-2 year (s)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 2 year (s)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Courses Currently Taken</td>
<td>100 Level Chinese</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200 Level Chinese</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Travel/Study Experiences</td>
<td>0    time (s)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 time (s)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 3 time (s)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a, b, & c</sup>For presentation purposes, age, Chinese Learning History, and International Travel/Study Experiences were categorized.

From comparing the demographic features of the pretest and posttest samples, despite the drop in the number of participants who continued with the experiment, the demographic composition of the study samples had not experienced any significant changes: the majority of the participants were white young adults who just began to learn the Chinese language and had very limited personal knowledge and experiences in
intercultural communication and exchanges.

Table 3

*Descriptive Statistics for Demographic Variables in the Posttest Sample (N = 43)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)*</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two Races or More</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Origins</td>
<td>Born as Children of Natural American Citizens</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Born Outside the US and Asia (or with at least 1 parent born outside the US and Asia)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Born in Asia (or with at least 1 parent born in Asia)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Learning History</td>
<td>0-1 year (s)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-2 year (s)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Courses Currently Taken</td>
<td>100 Level Chinese</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200 Level Chinese</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Travel/Study Experiences</td>
<td>0 time (s)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 time (s)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 3 time (s)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a, b, & c* For presentation purposes, age, Chinese Learning History, and International Travel/Study Experiences were categorized.

The subscale responses on ICSI (including five subscales) and AMTB (including eight subscales) were examined for all research participants as a whole and for
participants in each of the demographic categories defined by the above listed six
Language and Cultural Background factors, respectively. The full range of responses,
from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*, were used for all the items in the above
mentioned subscales. Tables 4 and 5 provide the means and standard deviations for the
total and for each of the sub-scales.

Table 4

*Descriptive Statistics for Participants’ Subscale Responses on ICSI in the Pretest Sample*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>IS_total(^a)</th>
<th>Open-mindedness(^b)</th>
<th>CvsI_total(^c)</th>
<th>CvsI_China(^d)</th>
<th>CvsI_US(^e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.33)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.15)</td>
<td>(.31)</td>
<td>(.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.16)</td>
<td>(.40)</td>
<td>(.11)</td>
<td>(.29)</td>
<td>(.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.39)</td>
<td>(.34)</td>
<td>(.18)</td>
<td>(.33)</td>
<td>(.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.19)</td>
<td>(.39)</td>
<td>(.15)</td>
<td>(.28)</td>
<td>(.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.17)</td>
<td>(.40)</td>
<td>(.11)</td>
<td>(.32)</td>
<td>(.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.33)</td>
<td>(.19)</td>
<td>(.20)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Races or More</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.10)</td>
<td>(.09)</td>
<td>(.12)</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td>(.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year Chinese-learning history</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.35)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.14)</td>
<td>(.31)</td>
<td>(.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more years Chinese-learning</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>history</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.19)</td>
<td>(.47)</td>
<td>(.13)</td>
<td>(.22)</td>
<td>(.31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)

Table 4 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>IS_total(^a)</th>
<th>Open-mindedness(^b)</th>
<th>CvsI_total(^c)</th>
<th>CvsI_China(^d)</th>
<th>CvsI_US(^e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.33)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.15)</td>
<td>(.31)</td>
<td>(.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.16)</td>
<td>(.40)</td>
<td>(.11)</td>
<td>(.29)</td>
<td>(.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.39)</td>
<td>(.34)</td>
<td>(.18)</td>
<td>(.33)</td>
<td>(.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.19)</td>
<td>(.39)</td>
<td>(.15)</td>
<td>(.28)</td>
<td>(.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.17)</td>
<td>(.40)</td>
<td>(.11)</td>
<td>(.32)</td>
<td>(.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.33)</td>
<td>(.19)</td>
<td>(.20)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Races or More</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.10)</td>
<td>(.09)</td>
<td>(.12)</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td>(.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year Chinese-learning history</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.35)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.14)</td>
<td>(.31)</td>
<td>(.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more years Chinese-learning</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>history</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.19)</td>
<td>(.47)</td>
<td>(.13)</td>
<td>(.22)</td>
<td>(.31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 4, in terms of participants’ pretest scores on Intercultural Sensitivity (measured by ICSI) before the experimental intervention, three tendencies were discerned as a factor of the pretest sample’s Language and Cultural Background: (a) female Chinese learners were slightly more culturally sensitive than their male partners; (b) African American Chinese learners were noted as the least sensitive towards foreign cultures while learners identified as Two Races or More seemed the most sensitive in intercultural communication; and (c) the lengths of time that learners spend learning Chinese varied positively according to their levels of intercultural sensitivity, in others words, the longer learners have been learning Chinese, the more sensitive they will become in their interaction with the native speakers from the Chinese culture. However, these differences were not determined statistically significant at this point.
### Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Participants’ Subscale Responses on AMTB in the Pretest Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>LM_Total</th>
<th>Atti_ChinPeople</th>
<th>Interest_FL</th>
<th>Atti_LearnChin</th>
<th>Integrative Orientation</th>
<th>Instrumental Orientation</th>
<th>Motivational Intensity</th>
<th>Desire LearnChin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.43)</td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>(.59)</td>
<td>(.72)</td>
<td>(.59)</td>
<td>(.62)</td>
<td>(.39)</td>
<td>(.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.47)</td>
<td>(.48)</td>
<td>(.66)</td>
<td>(.73)</td>
<td>(.62)</td>
<td>(.65)</td>
<td>(.41)</td>
<td>(.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.38)</td>
<td>(.44)</td>
<td>(.50)</td>
<td>(.71)</td>
<td>(.52)</td>
<td>(.58)</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td>(.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.42)</td>
<td>(.44)</td>
<td>(.59)</td>
<td>(.71)</td>
<td>(.54)</td>
<td>(.58)</td>
<td>(.39)</td>
<td>(.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.48)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.78)</td>
<td>(.63)</td>
<td>(.98)</td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.32)</td>
<td>(.26)</td>
<td>(.49)</td>
<td>(.68)</td>
<td>(.64)</td>
<td>(.75)</td>
<td>(.33)</td>
<td>(.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Races or More</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year Chinese-learning history</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.41)</td>
<td>(.41)</td>
<td>(.59)</td>
<td>(.75)</td>
<td>(.51)</td>
<td>(.64)</td>
<td>(.39)</td>
<td>(.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more years Chinese-learning history</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.58)</td>
<td>(.74)</td>
<td>(.70)</td>
<td>(.64)</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td>(.68)</td>
<td>(.40)</td>
<td>(.44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
### Table 5 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>LM_Total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Atti_ChinPeople&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Interest_FL&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Atti_LearnChin&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Integrative Orientation</th>
<th>Instrumental Orientation</th>
<th>Motivational-Intensity</th>
<th>Desire LearnChin&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.41)</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td>(.66)</td>
<td>(.74)</td>
<td>(.60)</td>
<td>(.65)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.44)</td>
<td>(.53)</td>
<td>(.55)</td>
<td>(.71)</td>
<td>(.51)</td>
<td>(.63)</td>
<td>(.40)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.60)</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.40)</td>
<td>(.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.35)</td>
<td>(.54)</td>
<td>(.44)</td>
<td>(.47)</td>
<td>(.50)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.40)</td>
<td>(.22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* <sup>a</sup>the total score of the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) scale; <sup>b</sup>the total score in the AMTB sub-scale measuring participants’ attitudes (favorable/unfavorable) towards the Chinese people; <sup>c</sup>the total score in the AMTB sub-scale measuring participants’ general interests towards learning foreign languages; <sup>d</sup>the total score in the AMTB sub-scale measuring participants’ attitudes (favorable/unfavorable) towards learning the Chinese language; <sup>e</sup>the total score in the AMTB sub-scale measuring participants’ desire to learn the Chinese language.
Table 5 demonstrated that participants’ pretest scores on Language Learning Motivation (measured by AMTB) differed in the pattern of their scores on Intercultural Sensitivity across gender, ethnicity, and time spent in Chinese learning compared to the ICSI. Specially for the AMTB, female Chinese learners were generally more motivated than males towards foreign language learning, approximately the same for ICSI; learners of mixed races tended to have the highest language learning motivation while African American learners showed relatively the lowest language motivation, similar to ICSI; and the time spent in Chinese learning seemed to push up the learners’ learning motivation, whereas for ICSI, there was a decline from first semester to second semester, then increase for second year. Again, these trends were not tested for statistical significance to questions in general.

**Analyses for Research Questions 1-4**

Research questions 1-4 were generated from the quasi-experimental study (Part 2 of the overall study; see p. 122) aiming to ascertain the intervention effects of the four-week-long experiential cultural learning program on participants’ levels of Intercultural Sensitivity (direct intervention effects) and Language Learning Motivation (concurrent intervention effects). Among these, Research Questions 1 and 3 focused on the possible interaction effects between the group conditions (experimental vs. control) and participants’ ICSI and AMTB test scores (pre vs. post); in other words, RQs 1 and 3 investigated whether the pre-post gains in participants’ ICSI and AMTB test scores were significantly influenced by their participation (or lack thereof) in the experimental intervention program. In contrast, Research Questions 2 and 4 sought to compare the means of participants’ ICSI and AMTB posttest scores between the experimental and
control group (to explore if there existed a significant difference in the group posttest score means), controlling for the two groups’ ICSI and AMTB pretest scores.

**Research Questions 1 and 3**

Research Questions 1 and 3 investigated if there was a significant interaction effect between the condition (experimental vs. control) and the participants’ pre-post test score changes as measured by ICSI and AMTB, respectively. In other words, to what extent were participants’ pre-post test score changes on ICSI and AMTB were affected by their participation (or not) in the experimental intervention. The independent variables for Research Questions 1 and 3 were the conditions (experimental vs. control) and test times (pre- vs. post-test), and the dependent variables were the participants’ pre-post test score changes on ICSI (for RQ 1) and AMTB (for RQ 3), respectively.

Mixed model ANOVA (two-way ANOVA with repeated measure in one factor) analyses were performed for Research Questions 1 and 3 to explore the main effects of the test times (pre vs. post) and condition in addition to the interaction effects between the conditions (experimental vs. control) and the test score changes based on the test times (pre vs. post). First, Mauchly’s tests were used to check if the assumption of sphericity was met for implementing the mixed model ANOVA analyses. For sphericity to be an issue at all, at least three conditions are needed (Field, 2009, p. 212). However, for Research Questions 1 and 3 in this study, the repeated-measure variables—the ICSI and AMTB test scores—has only two levels (pre vs. post), which means sphericity was already automatically met.

As shown in Table 7, there were no significant interaction effects between participation in the four-week-long experiential cultural learning program (the condition
factor) and the participants’ pre-post test score changes on ICSI and AMTB (the pre-post time factor). These results suggested that the participants assigned to the experimental group experienced pre-post gains similar to those who were assigned to the control group and had not participated in the intervention program in their levels of Intercultural Sensitivity (measured by the ICSI scale) and Language Learning Motivation (measured by the AMTB scale).

Further, Table 7 also indicated significant main effects of the test times (pre vs. post) on four of the AMTB subscales: Attitudes towards the Chinese People with $F(1, 43) = 4.11, p = .05$, and $\eta^2_p = .09$; Integrative Orientation with $F(1, 43) = 22.46, p = .00$, and $\eta^2_p = .35$; Instrumental Orientation $F(1, 43) = 10.83, p = .00$, and $\eta^2_p = .21$; and Total Score on AMTB with $F(1, 43) = 4.19, p = .05$, and $\eta^2_p = .09$. While for the main effects of conditions (experimental vs. control), no significant effects were found on any of the total thirteen ICSI and AMTB subscales.

Finally, the general absence of significant participants’ pre-post changes on the ICSI scale for the experimental group might imply that the four-week-long experiential cultural learning program was not effective in directly influencing participants’ level of Intercultural Sensitivity.
Table 6

*Mixed Model ANOVA Descriptive Results for the Pre-post Differences in ICSI and AMTB Subscales across the Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Pretest M (SD)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Posttest M (SD)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exp. (n = 21)</td>
<td>Con. (n = 22)</td>
<td>Exp. (n = 21)</td>
<td>Con. (n = 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICSI Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS_total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.04 (.49)</td>
<td>3.21 (.21)</td>
<td>3.20 (.13)</td>
<td>3.21 (.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.39 (.31)</td>
<td>3.52 (.41)</td>
<td>3.50 (.28)</td>
<td>3.51 (.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_total&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.02 (.11)</td>
<td>3.07 (.17)</td>
<td>3.07 (.13)</td>
<td>3.08 (.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_US&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.90 (.22)</td>
<td>3.00 (.28)</td>
<td>3.00 (.19)</td>
<td>2.98 (.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_China&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.14 (.24)</td>
<td>3.15 (.36)</td>
<td>3.13 (.30)</td>
<td>3.19 (.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMTB Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_ChinesePeople&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.89 (.39)</td>
<td>3.71 (.47)</td>
<td>4.01 (.28)</td>
<td>3.88 (.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest_FL&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.24 (.53)</td>
<td>4.24 (.66)</td>
<td>4.32 (.55)</td>
<td>4.13 (.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_LearningChinese&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.11 (.69)</td>
<td>3.98 (.77)</td>
<td>4.06 (.73)</td>
<td>4.06 (.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Orientation</td>
<td>4.18 (.48)</td>
<td>4.13 (.51)</td>
<td>4.48 (.61)</td>
<td>4.48 (.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Orientation</td>
<td>4.05 (.57)</td>
<td>4.04 (.70)</td>
<td>4.47 (.58)</td>
<td>4.22 (.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational intensity</td>
<td>2.42 (.36)</td>
<td>2.34 (.40)</td>
<td>2.44 (.35)</td>
<td>2.42 (.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire_LearningChinese&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.35 (.44)</td>
<td>2.36 (.35)</td>
<td>2.38 (.44)</td>
<td>2.42 (.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM_total&lt;sup&gt;j&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.54 (.38)</td>
<td>3.45 (.44)</td>
<td>3.62 (.39)</td>
<td>3.55 (.41)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.*<sup>a</sup> the total score of ICSI;<sup>b</sup> the total score in the ICSI sub-scale measuring open-
mindedness; the total score in the ICSI sub-scales measuring participants’ sensitivity of collectivist and individualistic tendencies in responding towards given situations in a specific culture; the total score in the ICSI sub-scale measuring participants’ sensitivity of collectivist and individualistic tendencies in responding towards given situations in the American culture; the total score in the ICSI sub-scale measuring participants’ sensitivity of collectivist and individualistic tendencies in responding towards given situations in the Chinese culture.

The total score in the AMTB sub-scale measuring participants’ attitudes (favorable/unfavorable) towards the Chinese people; the total score in the AMTB sub-scale measuring participants’ general interests towards learning foreign languages; the total score in the AMTB sub-scale measuring participants’ attitudes (favorable/unfavorable) towards learning the Chinese language; the total score in the AMTB sub-scale measuring participants’ desire to learn the Chinese language; the total score of AMTB.
Table 7

*Mixed Model ANOVA Results for the Pre-post Differences in ICSI and AMTB Subscales between the Experimental and Control Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Interaction Effects</th>
<th>Main Effects</th>
<th>Main Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre_post*Condition</td>
<td>Pre_post</td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$\eta^2_p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICSI Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS_total$^a$</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness$^b$</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_total$^c$</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_US$^d$</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_China$^e$</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMTB Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_ChinesePeople$^f$</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest_FL$^g$</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_LearningChinese$^h$</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Orientation</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Orientation</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational intensity</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire_LearningChinese$^i$</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM_total$^j$</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* $^a$the total score of ICSI; $^b$the total score in the ICSI sub-scale measuring open-mindedness; $^c$the total score in the ICSI sub-scales measuring participants’ sensitivity of collectivist and individualistic tendencies in responding towards given situations in a specific culture; $^d$the total score in the ICSI sub-scale measuring participants’ sensitivity of collectivist and
individualistic tendencies in responding towards given situations in the American culture; the total score in the ICSI sub-scale measuring participants’ sensitivity of collectivist and individualistic tendencies in responding towards given situations in the Chinese culture.

the total score in the AMTB sub-scale measuring participants’ attitudes (favorable/unfavorable) towards the Chinese people; the total score in the AMTB sub-scale measuring participants’ general interests towards learning foreign languages; the total score in the AMTB sub-scale measuring participants’ attitudes (favorable/unfavorable) towards learning the Chinese language; the total score in the AMTB sub-scale measuring participants’ desire to learn the Chinese language; the total score of AMTB.

the interaction effect between condition (experimental vs. control) and the time points of observations (pre vs. post); the main effect of the time points of observations (pretest vs. posttest)

the main effect of the conditions (experimental vs. control)

*p ≤ .05. **p < .01
Research Questions 2 and 4

For the second and fourth research questions, the posttest ratings of the experimental group and the control group on the ICSI and AMTB scales were compared to ascertain whether there were significant differences between the two groups, adjusted for the differences in their pretest ICSI and AMTB scores. As proposed in Chapter III, both ANCOVA and independent samples t test would be utilized to triangulate the findings. The independent variables for both of the RQs in these analyses were group conditions including two levels: the experimental group and the control group. The dependent variable for RQ2 was the participants’ posttest ratings of the ICSI scale which included five measures: (a) the total score of the ICSI scale; (b) the total score in the Open-mindedness sub-scale; (c) the total score in the Collectivism vs. Individualism sub-scales; (d) the total score in the ICSI sub-scale of Collectivism vs. Individualism in the U.S. Context; and (e) the total score in the ICSI sub-scale of Collectivism vs. Individualism in the Chinese Context. The covariant for RQ2 was the participants’ pretest ratings of the ICSI scale.

The dependent variable for RQ4 was the participants’ posttest ratings of the AMTB scale which included eight measures: (a) Attitudes towards the Chinese People; (b) Interests in Learning Foreign Languages; (c) Attitudes towards Learning the Chinese Language; (d) Integrative Orientation; (e) Instrumental Orientation; (f) Motivational Intensity in Foreign Language Learning; (g) Desire to Learn the Chinese Language; and (h) the total score on the AMTB scale. The covariant for RQ4 was the participants’ pretest ratings of the AMTB scale.

Before conducting an ANCOVA, the assumption of the homogeneity of
regression (slopes) should be tested first. The test evaluates the interaction between the covariate and the factor (independent variable) in the prediction of the dependent variable. A significant interaction between the covariate and the independent variable suggests that the differences on the dependent variable among groups vary as a function of the covariate, and thus ANCOVA should not be conducted because the assumption of homogeneous regression slopes is violated.

A preliminary analysis for RQ2 evaluating the homogeneity-of-regression (slopes) assumption indicated no significant interactions between the pretest scores (covariate) and the group conditions (independent variable) for three sub-variables under Intercultural Sensitivity (dependent variable): (a) the total score in the Open-mindedness sub-scale, $F(1, 43) = .48, p = .49$; (b) the total score in the ICSI sub-scale of Collectivism vs. Individualism in the Chinese Context, $F(1, 43) = .57, p = .45$; and (c) the total score in the U.S. sub-scale of Collectivism vs. Individualism in the Chinese Context, $F(1, 43) = 1.09, p = .30$. However, results showed that the relationships between the covariate and the remaining two dependent sub-variables differ significantly as a function of the independent variable (condition): (a) the total score of the ICSI scale, $F(1, 43) = 19.76, p < .001$; and (b) the total score in the Collectivism vs. Individualism sub-scales, $F(1, 43) = 4.54, p = .040$.

A preliminary analysis for RQ4 evaluating the homogeneity-of-regression (slopes) assumption also indicated no significant interactions between the pretest scores (covariate) and the group conditions (independent variable) for six sub-variables under Language Learning Motivation (dependent variable): (a) the Attitudes toward the Chinese People sub-scale, $F(1, 43) = .03, p = .87$; (b) the Interests in Learning Foreign Languages,
\( F(1, 43) = .96, p = .33; \) (c) the Instrumental Orientation subscale, \( F(1, 43) = .06, p = .81; \) (d) the Motivational Intensity subscale, \( F(1, 43) = .32, p = .58; \) (e) the Desire to Learn the Chinese Language subscale, \( F(1, 43) = .02, p = .89; \) and (f) the total score on the AMTB scale, \( F(1, 43) = 1.34, p = .25. \) Nevertheless, results demonstrated that the relationships between the covariate and the remaining two dependent sub-variables differed significantly as a function of the independent variable: (a) the Attitudes toward Learning the Chinese Language subscale, \( F(1, 43) = 7.12, p = .011; \) and (b) the Integrative Orientation subscale, \( F(1, 43) = 4.78, p = .035. \)

Due to the inconsistency in the homogeneity-of-regression assumption test results for RQs 2 and 4, it was decided that independent samples \( t \) tests instead of ANCOVA would be utilized alone for the data analysis of the second and fourth research questions. In order to control for the effects of the ICSI and AMTB pretest scores (co-variants), independent samples \( t \) tests were first performed to determine if there were significant differences in the pretest ICSI and AMTB ratings between the experimental and control group. If the results indicated significant pre-existing group differences, independent samples \( t \) tests would not be appropriate for the direct comparisons of the two group (experimental vs. control) means in terms of their posttest ICSI and AMTB ratings.

As shown in Table 8, an independent samples \( t \) test was conducted to compare the pretest ICSI ratings of the experimental group and that of the control group. The results suggested that there was no significant difference in the pretest ratings on any of the ICSI five sub-measures between the experimental group and the control group. Furthermore, a general pattern was noted that the experimental group tended to rate lower (though not significantly lower) than the control group across all the five ICSI five sub-measures.
during the pretest before they participated in the four-week-long experimental intervention.

Table 8 also indicated that there was no significant difference in the pretest ratings on any of the AMTB eight sub-measures between the experimental group and the control group. In addition, different from the trend reflected in the ICSI pretest ratings, the experimental group tended to rate higher (though not significantly higher) than the control group across all the eight AMTB sub-measures during the pretest before they participated in the four-week-long experimental intervention.

Table 8

Independent Sample t tests for ICSI and AMTB Pretest Mean Ratings for the Experimental Group and the Control Group (N = 43)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th></th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICSI Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS_totala</td>
<td>3.04 ( .49)</td>
<td>3.21 ( .21)</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindednessb</td>
<td>3.39 ( .31)</td>
<td>3.52 ( .41)</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_totalc</td>
<td>3.02 ( .11)</td>
<td>3.07 ( .17)</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_USd</td>
<td>2.90 ( .22)</td>
<td>3.00 ( .28)</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_Chinae</td>
<td>3.14 ( .24)</td>
<td>3.15 ( .36)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>AMTB Subscales</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_ChinesePeople&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.89 (.39)</td>
<td>3.71 (.47)</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.45 -.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest_FL&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.24 (.53)</td>
<td>4.24 (.66)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-.37 .37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_LearningChinese&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.11 (.69)</td>
<td>3.98 (.77)</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.58 .32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.18 (.48)</td>
<td>4.13 (.51)</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.36 .25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.05 (.57)</td>
<td>4.04 (.70)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>-.41 .38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational intensity</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.42 (.36)</td>
<td>2.34 (.40)</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.31 .16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire_LearningChinese&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.35 (.44)</td>
<td>2.36 (.35)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>-.24 .25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM_total&lt;sup&gt;j&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.54 (.38)</td>
<td>3.45 (.44)</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.34 .17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. *the total score of ICSI; †the total score in the ICSI sub-scale measuring open-mindedness;  ‡the total score in the ICSI sub-scales measuring participants’ sensitivity of collectivist and individualistic tendencies in responding towards given situations in a specific culture; ‡the total score in the ICSI sub-scale measuring participants’ sensitivity of collectivist and individualistic tendencies in responding towards given situations in the American culture; ‡the total score in the ICSI sub-scale measuring participants’ sensitivity of collectivist and individualistic tendencies in responding towards given situations in the Chinese culture. †the total score in the AMTB sub-scale measuring participants’ attitudes (favorable/unfavorable) towards the Chinese people; ‡the total score in the AMTB sub-scale measuring participants’ general interests towards learning foreign languages; ‡the total score in the AMTB sub-scale measuring participants’ attitudes (favorable/unfavorable) towards learning the Chinese language; ‡the total score in the AMTB sub-scale measuring participants’ desire to learn the Chinese language; ‡the total score of AMTB.

*p < .05. **p < .01
Based on the test results of the null pre-existing group differences as specified above, an independent samples $t$ test was utilized to compare the ICSI and AMTB posttest ratings between the experimental group and the control group. As displayed in Table 9, the results indicated that there was no significant difference in the posttest ratings on any of the ICSI five sub-measures between the experimental group and the control group.

Likewise, Table 9 also suggested that there was no significant difference in the posttest ratings on any of the AMTB eight sub-measures between the experimental group and the control group. However, the comparison of the means showed greater increase (though not statistically significant) in the posttest ratings over the pretest scores for the control group than for the experimental group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICSI Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS_total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.20 (.13)</td>
<td>3.21 (.18)</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.50 (.28)</td>
<td>3.51 (.47)</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_total&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.07 (.13)</td>
<td>3.08 (.15)</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_US&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.00 (.19)</td>
<td>2.98 (.21)</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_China&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.13 (.30)</td>
<td>3.19 (.29)</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMTB Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_Chinese People&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.01 (.28)</td>
<td>3.88 (.46)</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest_FL&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.32 (.55)</td>
<td>4.13 (.67)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_Learning Chinese&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.06 (.73)</td>
<td>4.06 (.66)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Orientation</td>
<td>4.48 (.61)</td>
<td>4.48 (.52)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Orientation</td>
<td>4.47 (.58)</td>
<td>4.22 (.69)</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational intensity</td>
<td>2.44 (.35)</td>
<td>2.42 (.41)</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire_Learning Chinese&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.38 (.44)</td>
<td>2.42 (.39)</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM_total&lt;sup&gt;j&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.62 (.39)</td>
<td>3.55 (.41)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. The same as Table 8 Notes (See p. 150).
To sum up, for the second and fourth research questions, independent samples $t$ tests were selected over ANCOVA to perform the data analysis in comparing the posttest ICSI and AMTB scores between the experimental and control group. The reasons for this selection of statistical procedures were: (a) the data set drawn from the study sample failed to pass the homogeneity-of-regression (slopes) assumption tests, a prerequisite for conducting meaningful ANCOVA analysis; and (b) independent samples $t$ tests showed no significant pre-existing differences between the two groups (experimental vs. control) based on their pretest ICSI and AMTB ratings. To compare the posttest ratings of the ICSI and AMTB scales between the experimental and control group, independent samples $t$ tests were conducted for RQs 2 and 4, and the results indicated that (a) for RQ2, there was not a significant difference in the ICSI posttest ratings in experiment condition and in no experiment condition, although the posttest ratings given by the experimental group showed a greater (though not statistically significant) increase over their pretest ratings compared to the control group; and (b) for RQ4, there was not a significant difference in the AMTB posttest ratings in experiment condition and in no experiment condition, although the posttest ratings given by the experimental group showed a smaller (though not statistically significant) increase over their pretest ratings compared to the control group.

**Analysis for Research Question 5**

For the fifth research question, the effects of the six Language and Cultural Background factors (Gender, Ethnicity, Parental Encouragement, Chinese Learning History, Chinese Courses Currently Taken, and Exposure to the Target Language Culture) were investigated on Chinese-learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning
Motivation. In the analyses, the independent variables were three categorical variables including Gender (Male and Female), Ethnicity (categorized as White, Asian, African American, Pacific Islander, and Two Races or More), and Chinese Courses Currently Taken (categorized as CHN 101, 102, 201, and 202); and three continuous variables (based on the scores of the participants’ responses on the related Likert-scale items) including Parental Encouragement, Chinese Learning History, and Exposure to the Target Language Culture. The dependent variables were Intercultural Sensitivity (the ICSI total score, the score on the Open-mindedness subscale, the total score on the subscale of Collectivism vs. Individualism, and the scores on its two subsets of Collectivism vs. Individualism in the U.S. Context and in the Chinese context, respectively) and Language Learning Motivation (the AMTB total score, and the scores on the seven subscales of Attitude towards the Chinese People, Interest in General Foreign Language Study, Attitude towards Learning the Chinese Language, Integrative Orientation, Instrumental Orientation, Motivational Intensity, and Desire to Learn the Chinese Language).

An independent $t$ test was first used to compare the male and female group differences in terms of Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation. As shown in Table 10 below, among all 13 dependent sub-variables, a significant gender difference was found only on the sub-variable of Integrative Orientation, $t(61) = -2.09, p = .04$, with females scoring slightly higher than males in their intrinsic motives in foreign language learning ($M_{\text{difference}} = -1.22$).
### Table 10

**Independent Samples t test Results Comparing Males and Females on Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation (N = 63)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Male M</th>
<th>Female M</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval Lower</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICSI Subscales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS_total^a</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness^b</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_total^c</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_US^d</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_China^e</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMTB Subscales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_ChinesePeople^f</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest_FL^g</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_LearningChinese^h</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Orientation</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>2.09*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Orientation</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational intensity</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire_LearningChinese^i</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM_total^l</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes.** The same as Table 8 Notes (See p. 150).

For the remaining two categorical independent variables, Ethnicity and Chinese Courses Currently Taken, one-way MANOVA was first performed to examine the cross-group differences regarding the multiple dependent sub-variables. Results suggested: (a)
the mean differences across five ethnicity groups were significant for the sub-variable of Attitudes Towards the Chinese People under Language Learning Motivation, \( F(4, 60) = 3.66, p = .010 \), and for the sub-variable of Collectivism vs. Individualism in the U.S. Context, \( F(4, 60) = 3.02, p = .025 \); and (b) students currently taking different Chinese courses varied significantly in their pretest ratings on the ISCI Total Score, \( F(3, 60) = 3.14, p = .032 \), and Collectivism vs. Individualism Total Score, \( F(3, 60) = 2.94, p = .041 \).

Next based on the MANOVA results, one-way ANOVA tests were used to confirm further and specify these potentially significant cross-group differences. Results showed certain inconsistency in two aspects: (a) participants’ pretest ratings on the subscale of Collectivism vs. Individualism in the U.S. Context was found not significantly different across Ethnicity groups, \( F(4, 65) = 2.02, p = .102 \); and (b) participants currently taking different Chinese Courses did not significantly differ in their pretest ratings on the ISCI Total Score, \( F(3, 62) = 1.96, p = .130 \), and Collectivism vs. Individualism Total Score, \( F(3, 62) = 2.62, p = .059 \).

However, significant differences were confirmed across Ethnicity groups in participants’ pretest ratings on the sub-variable of Attitudes towards the Chinese People under Language Learning Motivation. As displayed in Table 11, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was calculated on participants’ pretest ratings of Attitudes towards the Chinese People based on their ethnicity. The results indicated a statistically significant difference in Attitudes towards the Chinese People across five ethnic groups, \( F(4, 62) = 3.68, p = .010 \). Ethnicity explained 20% \( (\eta^2 = .20) \) of the variance in participants’ Attitudes towards the Chinese People.
Table 11

ANOVA Results for the Dependent Sub-variable of Attitudes towards the Chinese People Based on Ethnicity (N = 62)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>681.59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>170.40</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2689.49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3371.08</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Levene test of variance was utilized for the Table 11 results to determine if the assumption of homogeneity of variance for independent t tests was met. For this analysis with Attitudes towards the Chinese People, the Levene test was not significant (p < .05), indicating that the homogeneity assumption was not violated. Thus, post hoc comparisons were conducted with the LSD test (selected based on the Levene test result) to determine where exactly the differences in Attitudes towards the Chinese People lay across the ethnic groups. In addition, because there was only one participant identified as Pacific Islander (calculation of mean and standard deviation not possible), the data from this case was excluded from the post hoc testing.

The post hoc test results (as shown in Table 12) revealed a significant difference between the White (M = 62.21, SD = 7.06) and African American groups (M = 54.14, SD = 4.14) with p = .006, between Asian (M = 56.17, SD = 5.85) and Two Races or More (M = 67.25, SD = 9.85) group with p = .014, and between the African American (M = 54.14, SD = 4.14) and Two Races or More (M = 67.25, SD = 9.85) with p = .003. Ordering from the most favorable to the least favorable attitudes held by the various ethnic groups towards the Chinese people, the Two Races or More group took the lead in giving the highest ratings, followed by the White, Asian, and African American groups. The one
response identified as Pacific Islander gave a rating of 64.00 on the subscale, which would place this group second behind the Two Races or More group in Attitudes towards the Chinese People.

Table 12

*LSD Post Hoc Comparisons for the Dependent Sub-variable of Attitudes towards the Chinese People Based on Ethnicity (N = 61)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Two Races or More</td>
<td>-11.08</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Two Races or More</td>
<td>-12.75</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the three continuous demographic variables (including Parental Encouragement, Chinese Learning History, and Exposure to the Target Language Culture), Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated to determine their statistical relationships with the thirteen dependent sub-variables under Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation. As exhibited in Table 13 below, the results of the correlational analyses indicated that participants’ cultural exposure and parental encouragement were significantly related to most of the five sub-variables under Intercultural Sensitivity and all the eight sub-variables under Language Learning Motivation. More cultural exposure and stronger parental encouragement in foreign language study were associated with higher levels of Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation.

Specifically in terms of Intercultural Sensitivity, cultural exposure correlated significantly with the ICSI total score ($r = .36$, $r^2 = .13$), the open-mindedness subscale ($r = .36$, $r^2 = .13$), and the subscale of Collectivism vs. Individualism in the Chinese
Context ($r = .29, r^2 = .08$); whereas parental encouragement significantly correlated with the ICSI total score ($r = .37, r^2 = .14$) and the open-mindedness subscale ($r = .33, r^2 = .11$). However, no significant relationship was found between parental encouragement and the subscale of Collectivism vs. Individualism in the Chinese Context.

As for Language Learning Motivation, Exposure to the Target Culture and Parental Encouragement were both significantly correlated with all eight sub-variables, and the highest among them were with the AMTB total score ($r_1 = .54, r_1^2 = .29; r_2 = .50, r_2^2 = .25$), Attitude towards Learning the Chinese Language ($r_1 = .49, r_1^2 = .24; r_2 = .50, r_2^2 = .25$), Motivational Intensity ($r_1 = .54, r_1^2 = .29; r_2 = .44, r_2^2 = .19$), and Desire to Learn the Chinese Language ($r_1 = .58, r_1^2 = .33; r_2 = .38, r_2^2 = .14$). Generally speaking, the cultural exposure subscale was more strongly associated with Language Learning Motivation than the parental encouragement subscale, especially in terms of participants’ Integrative Orientation and Instrumental Orientation in their motivation to study a foreign language.
Table 13

Correlations between the Three Continuous Demographic Variables and Intercultural Sensitivity Measures and Language Motivation Measures (N = 63)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Cultural exposure</th>
<th>Chinese learning history</th>
<th>Parental encouragement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICSI Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS_total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_total&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_US&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_China&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMTB Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_ChinesePeople&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest_FL&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_LearningChinese&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Orientation</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Orientation</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational intensity</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.44**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire_LearningChinese&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM_total&lt;sup&gt;j&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.50**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. The same as Table 8 Notes (See p. 150).

In sum, among the six Language and Cultural Background factors (Gender, Ethnicity, Parental Encouragement, Chinese Learning History, Chinese Courses Currently Taken, and Exposure to the Target Language Culture), only Parental Encouragement and Exposure to the Target Language Culture were found significantly related to most of the subscales related to the two target variables, Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation. Consequently, the contributions of these two factors would be considered as the major control variables in the subsequent
correlational analyses between Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation.

In addition, the data analyses for RQ 5 also suggested that Ethnicity had significant confounding effects on one of the eight AMTB subscales (Attitudes towards the Chinese People); and theoretically, any significant relationships between any of the demographic factors and the two scales of ICSI and AMTB should be accounted for in the ensuing data analyses regarding the interactions between the two target variables. However, the researcher decided not to include the Ethnicity factor as one of the confounding variables on the relationships between Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation based on two considerations: (a) the limited sample size ($n = 68$ in the pretest sample and $n = 43$ in the posttest sample) in the current study made it statistically infeasible to include too many control variables; and (b) Ethnicity was found significantly related to only one of the total thirteen ICSI and AMTB subscales, and thus was deemed as a much less influential confounding factor on the two target variables compared to Parental Encouragement and Exposure to the Target Language Culture.

**Analysis for Research Question 6**

The sixth research question investigated whether the two target variables (Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation) were significantly associated with each other, after controlling for the covariates of any significant demographic variables on Language Learning Motivation (the potential Outcome/Dependable Variable) in addition to the main effects of Intercultural Sensitivity (the potential Predictor/Independent Variable). Based on the data analysis results for
Research Question 5, Parental Encouragement and Exposure to the Target Language Culture were found as the most relevant demographic factors significantly related to both Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation. Owing to the limited sample size, multiple regression model was deemed not suitable for this analysis; therefore, semi partial correlational coefficients were calculated to determine the correlations between Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation, net of the effects of Parental Encouragement and Exposure to the Target Language Culture.

As demonstrated below in Table 14, five significant correlations were noted about the interrelations between Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation, controlling for any known confounding effects based on Analysis for Research Question 5: the scores on the Open-mindedness subscale under Intercultural Sensitivity were found associated significantly with the scores on five out of the eight subscales under Language Learning Motivation, except for the Instrumental Orientation subscale, the Motivational Intensity Subscale, and the Desire to Learn the Chinese Language subscale. Specifically, the Open-mindedness subscale was significantly related to the Attitudes towards the Chinese People subscale ($r = .40, r^2 = .16$), the Interest in Learning Foreign Languages subscale ($r = .48, r^2 = .23$), the Attitudes towards Learning the Chinese Language subscale ($r = .44, r^2 = .19$), the Integrative Orientation subscale ($r = .36, r^2 = .13$), and to the AMTB scale Total Score ($r = .51, r^2 = .26$).

To sum up, partial correlational analysis for Research Question 6 separated the confounding effects of the two most relevant Language and Cultural Background factors (Parental Encouragement and Exposure to the Target Language Culture) from the interrelations between the two target variables, Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation.
Learning Motivation. The results showed that several significant correlations (as described above) existed between Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation, after controlling for the effects of relevant demographic variables on the potential Outcome/Dependable variable: Language Learning Motivation.

Table 14

Semi Partial Correlations between Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation Measures After Controlling for Parental Encouragement and Cultural Exposure (N = 63)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>IS_totala</th>
<th>Open-mindedness b</th>
<th>C vs I_totalc</th>
<th>C vs I_USd</th>
<th>C vs I_Chineae</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atti_ChinesePeoplef</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest_FLg</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_LearningChineseb</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Orientation</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Orientation</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational intensity</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire_LearningChinesei</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM_totali</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. The same as Table 8 Notes (See p. 150).

Analysis for Research Question 7

For the seventh research question, the relationships between the changes in American adult Chinese-learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity and the changes in their Language Learning Motivation, controlling for any significant Language and Cultural Background factors (based on the data analysis results for the fifth research question, the two most relevant Language and Cultural Background factors were identified as Parental Encouragement and Exposure to the Target Language Culture.). Because the data
analysis results for the first and second research questions indicated that the experimental intervention, the four-week-long experiential learning program, did not produce expected significant effects on manipulating the level of Intercultural Sensitivity for the experimental group as compared to the control group, the data analysis procedures aiming to examine the possible causal relationship between Intercultural Sensitivity (IV) and Language Learning Motivation (DV) were deemed inapplicable in answering this particular research question. In other words, the lack of statistically significant effects resulting from the experimental intervention in this study was unable to provide sufficient ground for conducting the data analysis to test any causality hypothesis at this point (i.e., that changes in Intercultural Sensitivity predict the changes in Language Learning Motivation).

Thus, an alternative statistical procedure, semi partial correlation analysis, was selected and utilized to investigate the associations between the pre-post gains in Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation, net of the confounding effects of the two most relevant Language and Cultural Background factors (Parental Encouragement and Exposure to the Target Language Culture). The independent variable in the semi partial correlation analysis was the pre-post gains in participants’ Intercultural Sensitivity. The dependent variable was the pre-post gains in participants’ Language Learning Motivation.

As specified in Table 15, the results suggested that four significant interrelation patterns were identified between the pre-post gains in their levels of Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation, controlling for the above listed two confounding effects: (a) the total scores on the ICSI scale were significantly related to the
scores on the Motivational Intensity subscale ($r = -.32, r^2 = .10$); (b) the scores on the Open-mindedness subscale were significantly associated with the scores on the subscale of Interests in Learning Foreign Languages ($r = .32, r^2 = .10$); (c) the total scores on the Collectivism vs. Individualism subscales under Intercultural Sensitivity correlated significantly with the scores on two out of the eight subscales under Language Learning Motivation, including the Motivational Intensity subscale ($r = -.36, r^2 = .13$), and the AMTB total score ($r = -.35, r^2 = .12$); and (d) the scores on the subscale of Collectivism vs. Individualism in the Chinese Context was significantly associated with the scores on the Motivational Intensity subscale ($r = -.33, r^2 = .11$) and with the AMTB total score ($r = -.33, r^2 = .11$). Particularly interesting was the dominantly negative $t$ values in these semi partial correlation analyses, findings suggesting cautious interpretation in Chapter V.

Table 15

Semi Partial Correlations between the Pre-post Gains in the ICSI and AMTB Ratings after Controlling for Parental Encouragement and Cultural Exposure ($N = 43$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-post Gains</th>
<th>IS_total$^a$</th>
<th>Open-mindedness$^b$</th>
<th>C vs I_total$^c$</th>
<th>C vs I_US$^d$</th>
<th>C vs I_China$^e$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atti_ChinesePeople$^f$</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest_FL$^g$</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_LearningChinese$^h$</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Orientation</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Orientation</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational intensity</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.36*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire_LearningChinese$^i$</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM_total$^l$</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.35*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. The same as Table 8 Notes (See p. 150).
To summarize the data analysis for the seventh research question, semi partial correlation analysis was utilized to explore the relationships between the pre-post gains in participants’ Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation, because statistical procedures to test any causality hypothesis were inappropriate based on the data analysis results for the first and second research questions. The semi partial correlation analysis results implied that the gains in the ratings on several ICSI and AMTB subscales were negatively correlated, in addition to a few positive correlations. For example, higher gains in the total score on the ICSI scale were related to lower gains in the total score on the AMTB scale.

**Analysis for Research Question 8**

For the eighth research question, the effects of the six Language and Cultural Background factors (Gender, Ethnicity, Parental Encouragement, Chinese Learning History, Chinese Courses Currently Taken, and Exposure to the Target Language Culture) were investigated on experimental group participants’ pre-post changes in Chinese-learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation. In the analyses, the independent variables included three categorical variables including Gender (Male and Female), Ethnicity (categorized as White, Asian, African American, Pacific Islander, and Two Races or More), and Chinese Courses Currently Taken (categorized as CHN 102 and 201, since only one participant in the experimental group was taking CHN 202, this particular case was excluded from relevant data analyses); and three continuous variables (based on the scores of the participants’ responses on the related Likert-scale items or the interval data collected on natural number of years the participants reported for learning Chinese) including Parental Encouragement, Chinese Learning History, and Exposure to
the Target Language Culture. The dependent variables were experimental group participants’ pre-post changes in their levels of Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation.

Independent $t$ tests were first used to compare the male and female group differences in terms of Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation. As shown in Table 16 below, no significant gender difference was found only on any of the 13 dependent sub-variables under Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation.
Table 16

*Independent t tests Results Comparing Males and Females on Experimental Group Participants’ Pre-post Gains in Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation (N = 21)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-post Gains</th>
<th>Male (n = 9)</th>
<th>Female (n = 12)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICSI Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS_total</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_total</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_US</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_China</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMTB Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_ChinesePeople</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest_FL</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_LearningChinese</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Orientation</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Orientation</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational intensity</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire_LearningChinese</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM_total</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. The same as Table 8 Notes (See p. 150).

For the remaining two categorical independent variables, Ethnicity and Chinese Courses Currently Taken, because less than two cases of observation were identified under Ethnicity as African Americans, Asians, and Pacific Islanders, and under Chinese Courses Currently Taken as student taking Chinese 202, independent t tests were selected and performed to compare the experimental group participants’ pre-post gain means on the 13 dependent sub-variables across the two ethnic (White vs. Two Races or More) and
Chinese-course (Chinese 102 vs. Chinese 201) groups.

The independent $t$ tests results (as shown in Tables 17 and 18) revealed that (a) no significant differences across the ethnic groups in the experimental group participants’ pre-post gains on any of the 13 sub-variables; (b) for the pre-post changes in the subscale of Collectivism vs. Individualism in the U.S. Context, a significant difference was found between the experimental group participants who took Chinese 102 ($M = 1.29, SD = 2.59$) and those who took Chinese 201($M = 5.33, SD = .58$), $t(18) = -2.63, p = .017$, suggesting that after their participation in the four-week-long experimental intervention, those participants enrolled in the Chinese 201 class showed significantly greater growth than the Chinese 102 students in their level of sensitivity regarding collectivist and individualistic tendencies when responding towards given situations in the American culture.
Table 17

*Independent t tests Results Comparing White and Two Races or More on Experimental Group Participants’ Pre-post Gains in Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation (N = 18)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-post Gains</th>
<th>White (n = 16)</th>
<th>Two Races or More (n = 2)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICSI Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS_total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_total&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_US&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_China&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMTB Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_ChinesePeople&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest_FL&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_LearningChinese&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Orientation</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Orientation</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational intensity</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire_LearningChinese&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM_total&lt;sup&gt;j&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes. The same as Table 8 Notes (See p. 150).*
Table 18

Independent t tests Results Comparing Chinese 102 and 201 on Experimental Group Participants’ Pre-post Gains in Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation (N = 21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-post Gains</th>
<th>Chinese 102 (n = 17)</th>
<th>Chinese 201 (n = 3)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval Lower</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICSI Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS_total(^a)</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness(^b)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_total(^c)</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_US(^d)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-2.63*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_China(^e)</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMTB Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_ChinesePeople(^f)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest_FL(^g)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_LearningChinese(^h)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Orientation</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Orientation</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational intensity</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire_LearningChinese(^i)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM_total(^j)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. The same as Table 8 Notes (See p. 150).

Regarding the three continuous demographic variables (including Parental Encouragement, Chinese Learning History, and Exposure to the Target Language Culture), Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated to determine their statistical relationships with the pre-post changes on the thirteen dependent sub-variables under Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation. As exhibited in Table 19 below, the results of the correlational analyses indicated that (a) participants’
Exposure to the Target Culture and Parental Encouragement were significantly related to the experimental group participants’ pre-post gains on altogether three of the five sub-variables under Intercultural Sensitivity (Exposure to the Target Culture and Parental Encouragement with two subscales: the ICSI Total Score and the Collectivism vs. Individualism Total Score; and Parental Encouragement with two subscales: the Collectivism vs. Individualism Total Score and the Collectivism vs. Individualism in the Chinese Context); and (b) participants’ Chinese Learning History correlated significantly with one of the eight sub-variables under Language Learning Motivation (Instrumental Orientation). It was also noted that Exposure to the Target Culture, Parental Encouragement in foreign language study, and participants’ Chinese learning history were negatively associated with the experimental group participants’ pre-post gains in their Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation.

Specifically in terms of participants’ pre-post gains in Intercultural Sensitivity, cultural exposure correlated significantly with the pre-post gains on the subscale of Collectivism vs. Individualism Total Score ($r = -.43, r^2 = .18$), and on the subscale of Collectivism vs. Individualism in the Chinese Context ($r = -.43, r^2 = .18$); whereas parental encouragement significantly correlated with the pre-post gains on the ICSI total score ($r = -.51, r^2 = .26$) and on the Collectivism vs. Individualism Total Score subscale ($r = -.47, r^2 = .22$).

As for Language Learning Motivation, the experimental group participants’ Chinese Learning History was found significantly correlated with their pre-post gains on the Instrumental Orientation subscale under Language Learning Motivation ($r = -.47, r^2 = .22$).
### Table 19

*Correlations between the Three Continuous Demographic Variables and Intercultural Sensitivity Measures and Language Motivation Measures for the Experimental Group Participants (N = 21)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-post Gains</th>
<th>Cultural exposure</th>
<th>Chinese learning history</th>
<th>Parental encouragement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICSI Subscales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS_total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_total&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.43*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_US&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs I_China&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.43*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMTB Subscales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_ChinesePeople&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest_FL&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atti_LearningChinese&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Orientation</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Orientation</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.47*</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational intensity</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire_LearningChinese&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM_total&lt;sup&gt;j&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* The same as Table 8 *Notes* (See p. 150).

In sum, among the six Language and Cultural Background factors (Gender, Ethnicity, Parental Encouragement, Chinese Learning History, Chinese Courses Currently Taken, and Exposure to the Target Language Culture), Chinese Learning History, Chinese Courses Currently Taken, Parental Encouragement, and Exposure to the Target Language Culture were found significantly related to the experimental group participants’ pre-post gains on some of the thirteen sub-variables under the two target variables, Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation.
Summary

This study investigated (a) the effects of the experimental intervention, a four-week-long experiential cultural learning program, on manipulating participants’ levels of Intercultural Sensitivity, plus its concurrent effects on possibly changing participants’ levels of Language Learning Motivation; (b) the relationship between (the changes in) American adult Chinese-learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation, net of the effects of any significant Language and Cultural Background factors; and (c) what types of participants as defined by the six Language and Cultural Background factors were more sensitive to the experimental intervention. The data analyses (Research Questions 1-4) for the effects of the experimental intervention yielded results indicating no significant results between the groups in the experimental condition and the no-experimental condition.

To explore the patterns of interrelations between Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation (Research Questions 5-7), the related data analyses led to results at two different levels: (a) data analyses based on the pretest sample showed Intercultural Sensitivity were significantly related to Language Learning Motivation after controlling for the confounding effects of the selected two most relevant Language and Cultural Background factors, Parental Encouragement and Exposure to the Target Language Culture (Research Questions 1-2); and (b) data analyses based on the posttest sample identified significant negative correlations between the pre-post gains in the experimental group participants’ ratings of Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation, implying that as they experienced greater increase in Intercultural Sensitivity, the increase in their ratings of Language Learning Motivation tended to be
smaller. However, special caution is called for in interpreting these results in that the negative correlations between the pre-post gains on the ICSI and AMTB scales should not be confused with the negative correlations between Intercultural Sensitivity (IV) and Language Learning Motivation (DV) themselves. These findings are explored in more depth in Chapter V.

To investigate to what extent the six Language and Cultural Background factors affect the participants’ responsiveness towards the experimental intervention (Research Question 8), the pertinent data analyses indicated that Chinese Learning History, Chinese Courses Currently Taken, Parental Encouragement, and Exposure to the Target Language Culture (among the six Language and Culture Background) had significant effects on participants’ pre-post gains on selected sub-variables among the thirteen comprising Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation after the four-week-long experimental intervention. Detailed implications of these results are discussed further in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Study in Brief

This research sought to explore the relationship of Language Learning Motivation (DV) to Intercultural Sensitivity (IV), and investigate whether a four-week-long cultural experiential learning intervention improves Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation after controlling for the effects of relevant personal Language and Cultural Background factors. Instead of utilizing one-dimensional measures for Intercultural Sensitivity (IV) and Language Learning Motivation (DV), this study adopted multi-component measures for both variables based on the ICSI (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992) and AMTB (Gardner, 1985b) scales, respectively.

In specific, five components were extracted for Intercultural Sensitivity from the ICSI measure, including the total score on the ICSI scale, the score on the Open-mindedness subscale, the total score on the two Collectivism vs. Individualism subscales, the score on the subscale of Collectivism vs. Individualism in the U.S. Context, and the score on the subscale of Collectivism vs. Individualism in the Chinese Context; whereas the AMTB measure yielded eight components for Language Learning Motivation, containing the total score on the AMTB scale and the scores correspondingly on the seven subscales of Attitude towards the Chinese People, Interest in General Foreign Language Study, Attitude towards Learning the Chinese Language, Integrative
Orientation, Instrumental Orientation, Motivational Intensity, and Desire to Learn the Chinese Language.

In addition, the participants’ Language and Cultural Background factors were measured by a self-designed demographic questionnaire, which produced data in six main aspects: Gender, Ethnicity, Parental Encouragement, Chinese Learning History, Chinese Courses Currently Taken, and Exposure to the Target Language Culture.

The first chapter introduced three important shifts in the research literature related to teaching language and culture in the field of foreign language education and briefly discussed the concepts of and relationships between Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation, which led to The Problem Defined for the study. It also included a description of the Purpose of the Study and stated the Research Questions. To conclude Chapter I, The Significance of the Study was illustrated in four major aspects while five Limitations of the Study were also specified.

Chapter II first reviewed the literature on Intercultural Sensitivity, from conceptual studies (interpretations of Intercultural Sensitivity in foreign language education and appraisal of various related instruments of measurement) and empirical research (factors impacting the foreign language learner’s Intercultural Sensitivity). The review in this chapter also included research on Teaching Culture, comprised of theoretical frameworks (general pedagogical models for teaching culture effectively as part of foreign language education) and empirical studies (action research on implementing different pedagogical approaches with respect to teaching and assessing Intercultural Sensitivity). Previous studies concerning Language Learning Motivation were reviewed, with a separate section covering relevant definitions, theories, and
instruments of measurement, as well as empirical research on the factors affecting Language Learning Motivation. The final part of the literature review addressed the links between the above mentioned main topics in this chapter (containing related theoretical frameworks and empirical studies) and thus specified the existing gap in the current research literature.

The third chapter provided the research plan for the current study, including a description of Research Questions, Research Design, Population and Sample, Instrumentation of measurement, the data collection Procedures, the plan for Data Analysis, Validity Considerations, and Ethical Standards.

The most recent chapter presented the data analysis results for the nine empirical research questions in terms of statistical testing and significant findings. This final chapter offers an interpretation of the findings and provides suggestions for future research.

Discussion

This section discusses the meanings and connotations of the main findings in application for each of the eight empirical research questions plus descriptive statistics based on the data analysis results described in Chapter IV. Such interpretations are tied back to the research literature reviewed in Chapter II, with reference to the relevant theoretical and empirical studies as deemed necessary.

Sample Characteristics

The results concerning descriptive statistics first defined the population for this study as American adult Chinese language learners enrolled in various kinds of formal foreign language programs at the post-secondary level provided by American public
universities, and specified the study sample drawn from this population as sixty eight American adult Chinese learners at the beginner and intermediate levels in the Modern Language Department of a central-south American public university.

Next, the descriptive statistics analysis highlighted the change in the number of participants in the pretest sample and posttest sample. Originally sixty eight participants took the pretests, but only a total of forty three (a completion rate of 63.24%) completed the four-week-long experimental intervention program and took the posttests. This change led to a systematic comparison of demographic features between the pre and posttest sample participants in six main aspects based on the data collected from the Student Language and Cultural Background Survey: Gender, Age, Ethnicity, Cultural Origins, Chinese Learning History, and Chinese Courses Currently Taken.

Such comparison yielded two major findings: (a) despite the obvious decrease in the number of participates who continued with the experiment, the demographic composition of the pretest and posttest samples had remained relatively stable; and (b) the shared demographic features of the study samples could be described as mostly white young adults (age from 18 to 25) who just began to learn the Chinese language and had very limited prior knowledge and experiences in intercultural communication and exchanges.

When put into the context of the empirical research literature focused on linking intercultural contacts and language learning attitudes/motivation, the uniqueness regarding the demographic characteristics of the current study samples is demonstrated in the following three aspects: (a) the size of the current study samples (pretest and posttest) is significantly smaller compared to other large-scale survey-based research involving
over eight thousand participants (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2005; Spencer-Rodgersa & McGovern, 2002); (b) the current study focuses on stay-on-campus domestic American college students learning a foreign language other than English rather than foreign college students learning English as a second language (Rubenfeld et al., 2007), or American college students participating in study-abroad programs (Hernandez, 2010); and (c) the current study samples were drawn from students enrolled in one single type of foreign language program at the postsecondary level, as in contrast with research conducted with participants from two or more distinctive types of language and/or cultural programs (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2005; Rubenfeld et al., 2007; Sakuragi, 2006; Sizoo & Serrie, 2004). However, this decidedly smaller and more homogeneous sample is related to the purpose of the research, i.e., a quasi-experimental study examining the effects of an intervention on Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation.

**Research Questions 1 and 2**

The first two research questions investigated the intervention effects of a four-week-long cultural experiential learning program on participants’ pre-post changes in their intercultural sensitivity levels as measured by the ICSI scores. From different perspectives, both research questions served to test a central hypothesis that Chinese-learners’ levels of intercultural sensitivity can be manipulated (hypothetically improved) by the designed cultural experiential learning program based on the intergroup contact theory.

Specifically, the first research question (Is there a significant interaction effect between experimental vs. control condition and pre vs. post ICSI test scores?) examined if the participants’ pre-post changes in ICSI test scores (the Observations based on Time)
were significantly influenced by their participation (or the lack thereof) in the experimental intervention program (the Condition).

The second research question (Is there a significant difference in the ICSI post test scores between the experimental and control group, controlling for the ICSI pretest scores?) focused on comparing the post-intervention differences in ICSI test scores between the experimental and control group participants in order to ascertain whether the two groups differed significantly in their levels of Intercultural Sensitivity after the experimental intervention took place.

The results of data analysis failed to provide statistical support for this central hypothesis, as participants’ levels of Intercultural Sensitivity did not show significant treatment vs. control differences due to their participation in the experimental intervention program. However, it was found that the experimental group showed consistently greater gains in their ICSI scores than the control group participants, although such differences did not reach statistical significance. In particular, the interaction effects between the pre-post changes in participants’ ICSI scores and the condition (experimental vs. control) on the subscale of Collectivism and Individualism in the U.S. Context approached significance ($p = .08, \eta^2_p = .07$), with the experimental group reporting higher gains in their levels of Intercultural Sensitivity than the control group after participating in the experimental intervention program.

The meaning of the null findings in the intervention effects can be interpreted from the following four perspectives. First, such lack of quantitatively manifested pedagogical “superiority” of cultural experiential learning programs over traditional cultural learning models has been predominantly evidenced in the previous relevant
empirical studies, despite the mixed results produced in the overall body of research literature evaluating the efficacy of the experiential learning model in teaching culture (Kalfadellis, 2005; Knutson, 2003; Littrell & Salas, 2005; McKenzie, 2013; Takkula et al., 2008; Taras et al., 2013). On one hand, a number of empirical studies comparing the effects of two types of instructional methods (experiential vs. traditional) in teaching culture yielded similar statistical “null findings”: both instructional methods produced similar desirable cultural learning outcomes, although participants reported strong personal preferences of the experiential learning activities over traditional culture teaching styles (Earley, 1987; Pruegger & Rogers, 1994).

It is worth noting, however, that although the current study generally reflected the similar tendency of “null findings”, the control group in this study didn’t engage in a carefully designed, clearly focused traditional cultural training program to compare with the experimental group receiving a four-week cultural experiential learning intervention; instead, they took “business as usual” language classes, incorporating both linguistic and cultural elements. Another difference between the preceding empirical research and the current study lies in the instrumentation. For example, Earley’s (1987) study on comparing two instructional modes for intercultural training of business managers utilized three measures to assess participants’ learning outcomes from multiple perspectives (including supervisory and self-rating of employee’s working performance, Perceived Intensity of Adjustment Index to assess participants’ adjustment to the new culture, and an exploratory measure to evaluate how training influenced participants’ outlook on working abroad); whereas the current study only focused on one instrument, ICSI, to assess the dimensions of participants’ cultural learning related to their general
attitudes and worldviews in cross-cultural encounters (p. 691).

On the other hand, after additional dimensions affecting culture learning outcomes (such as the individual learner’s learning style) were included in the above-mentioned comparative studies, the results indicated that only when these new dimensions were complimentary with a particular type of culture training method (experiential vs. traditional) would learners demonstrate statistically greater progress in culture learning.

What might essentially explain these mixed findings from the empirical research literature and the current study is the highly complex nature of the process of culture teaching and learning itself: the other side of the equation leading up to effective culture learning and intercultural training encompasses not only pedagogical innovations such as the experiential leaning model adopted in the current study, but also the learner characteristics, learning contexts, and duration of language and culture training, etc. Thus, it is very difficult to use quasi-experimental designs to separate all the confounding effects from the main effect of pedagogical innovations in cultural teaching and learning practice, mainly due to the infeasibility of perfectly matching learners at the personal level while still maintaining the structure and characteristics of the natural learning contexts as a whole (i.e., the language learning classes, grades, programs, and instructor placements).

Further, a number of empirical studies have revealed that a variety of structural factors in intercultural training program design, such as program duration, housing, experiential work, and on-site mentoring, significantly impact the assessment results of the program effects on participants’ intercultural sensitivity (Engle & Engle, 2003; Engle
& Engle, 2004; Medina-López-Portillo, 2004; Vande Berg, 2003). Especially concerning the link between program duration and the development of intercultural sensitivity, Medina-López-Portillo (2004) conducted an empirical research project to “measure and describe changes” in participants’ intercultural sensitivity who studied abroad in two language and cultural training programs of differing lengths: one lasted six weeks and the other sixteen weeks (p. 179). Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected and analyzed. The results indicated significantly greater development of intercultural sensitivity in the students who took part in the 16-week program than those in the 6-week summer program. These studies help explain the “null findings” of the current study in the aspect of program duration: due to the researcher’s initial consideration of minimizing the disruptions of the experimental study on the participants’ normal classroom language learning activities, the intervention program duration was significantly shortened from the original length of four months to only four weeks, which means participants were required to complete each of the four intercultural training tasks originally designed for one month within one week. Consequently, it shouldn’t be surprising if the quality of some participants’ work was seriously compromised due to the pressure of such a tight schedule; or the amount of the experiential learning activities that participants received simply didn’t suffice to spur significant growth in their development of intercultural sensitivity due to the time constraints.

Moreover, the mode effects of online surveys may also affect data quality compared to face-to-face surveys (Duffy, Smith, Terhanian, & Bremer, 2005; Heerwegh & Loosveldt, 2008; Heerwegh, 2009; Nojin & Radler, 2002). For instance, Heerwegh and Loosveldt’s study (2008) examined the differences in data quality between a face-to-face
and a web survey based on satisficing theory, and found that compared to face-to-face survey respondents, online survey takers tended to (a) differentiate less on rating scales by selecting the so-called “midpoint” option (i.e., “I don’t know,” “Neutral,” or “Neither agree or disagree”), and (b) to produce more item nonresponse. Such web survey mode effects could also contribute to the “null findings” of the current study, because among the twenty-five participants who were excluded from the final posttest sample, about half of them skipped responding to one to three items in either the pre or posttest self-administered online surveys. Moreover, one particular participant selected the “midpoint” option on the Likert-type rating scale for all the survey items.

Finally, because the current study utilized repeated measures of the same instruments, the quality of the data collected may also be subject to the negative impacts of the fatigue effect and/or practice effect of repeated testing (Ackerman & Kanfer, 2009). According to Ackerman and Kanfer’s (2009) empirical study, participants’ cognitive fatigue significantly increases while their test performance deteriorates with the prolonged time-on-task. The two instruments repeatedly used prior to and after the experimental intervention in this study contained one hundred items in total, including forty-six items for ICSI and sixty-four items for AMTB. Although normally it takes about 30–40 minutes for most people to complete, being required to go through it twice may prove too much a burden for many participants in addition to their other school-related assignments.

Apart from participants’ increased cognitive fatigue, also notable is that possibility of the practice effect of repeated measuring on test-takers’ initial values/opinions related to certain survey items. Coen, Lorch, and Piekarski’s (2005)
study on the effects of survey frequency on survey-takers’ responses suggest that
individuals’ experience level (defined as their participation in a number of surveys)
clearly and significantly predicts the degree of negativity in their responses, that is, more
experienced survey-takers tend to have less positive opinions than inexperienced, first-
timers (pp. 8-9). The current corroborated such findings in that the comparison of
participants’ pre-post test scores showed slightly negative gains on several ICSI
subscales, indicating they reported relatively less favorable attitudes regarding
intercultural sensitivity in the posttest than the pretest.

Additionally, an alternative explanation for the “null findings” on the intervention
effects in this study could lie in the implementation quality of the experimental
intervention program to a certain extent. The four-week-long cultural experiential
learning program was introduced to the two Chinese classes assigned to the experimental
group at the beginning of the 2014 spring semester on top of their regular language and
culture learning activities. Participants were required to complete four weekly
assignments during a one-month period. In order to do that, participants needed to (a)
find one or more native Chinese speakers to work with, (b) complete a considerable
amount of reading and discourse analysis, (c) put together some creative projects such as
a short stage play or a cross-cultural event, and (d) submit large audio and/or video files
online every week to document their learning activities. The overall implementation
fidelity proved less than satisfactory because only about one third \((n = 6)\) of the
experimental group participants completed all four assignments as instructed, due to
possible reasons such as time constraints, difficulties in finding cooperating native
speakers in time, technical issues in uploading large digital data online, and general lack
of cooperation since participation in this experiment was completely voluntary and would only earn them some extra credits (20% of their final grades) and minimal financial compensation after full completion.

In contrast, although the control group did not receive a comparably structured cultural learning program based on the traditional model, their regular class instructions included a variety of cultural learning opportunities too (e.g., observation of a Chinese tea ceremony demonstration, listening to international speakers’ lectures on Chinese history and culture, learning to write Chinese calligraphy, and guided tour in the Confucius Institute). Most importantly, the control group participants were able to choose these cultural learning experiences completely based on their personal interests, and were not required to turn in any homework to document their learning, which differed greatly from the amount of time and efforts that the experimental group participants were required to invest in completing the experimental intervention program.

To sum up the interpretation of the “null findings” for Research Questions 1 and 2, the possible explanations for the four-week experiential cultural learning program to have failed to show any significant effects may include (a) difficulty in implementing experimental designs to isolate the intervention main effects owing to the complexity of intercultural learning and teaching, (b) flaws in program design, such as inadequate program duration, and (c) the negative impact of the online survey mode effects and repeated testing on the data quality. Alternatively, the implementation fidelity of the experimental intervention may also have interfered with collecting high quality data in this study.

**Research Questions 3 and 4**
The third and fourth research questions examined the possible concurrent/indirect effects of the experimental intervention program (a four-week cultural experiential learning project) on participants’ pre-post changes in their language learning motivation levels as measured by the AMTB scores. The related hypothesis was that Chinese-learners’ levels of language learning motivation would change proportionally to the alterations experienced in their levels of intercultural sensitivity as a result of participating in the designed cultural experiential learning program based on the intergroup contact theory.

The third research question (Is there a significant interaction effect between experimental vs. control condition and pre vs. post AMTB test scores?) explored whether the participants’ pre-post changes in AMTB test scores (the Observations based on Time) were significantly influenced by their participation (or the lack thereof) in the experimental intervention program (the Condition).

The fourth research question (Is there a significant difference in the AMTB post test scores between the experimental and control group, controlling for the AMTB pretest scores?) compared the post-intervention differences in AMTB test scores between the experimental and control group participants to discover whether the group differences qualified for any statistical significance.

Data analysis failed to support the above-mentioned hypothesis in general: the experimental and control group participants’ pre-post changes in their Language Learning Motivation were not significantly different after the experimental intervention program was completed, indicating statistically significant concurrent effects of the intervention had not occurred on participants’ levels of Language Learning Motivation. However, in
the data analysis for Research Question 3, significant pre-post differences were found for the whole sample of participants (including both the experimental and control group) on four out of the eight AMTB subscales: Attitudes towards the Chinese People, Integrative Orientation, Instrumental Orientation, and Total Score on AMTB. This finding suggested that all Chinese-learners involved in the study as a whole experienced some significant growth in the above-listed four aspects of their Language Learning Motivation after a four-week period of language and cultural learning regardless of its form (experimental or control). Such similar growth across the groups may be a result of natural maturation of the participants.

The findings on RQ4 indicated that there was no significant cross-group difference in the posttest ratings on any of the AMTB eight sub-measures, which also failed to support the related hypothesis that the participants’ post-intervention ratings on the AMTB scale would be significantly different between the experimental and control group.

The interpretation of the findings regarding Research Questions 3 and 4 may be approached from two different angles. First, the experimental intervention program was expected to have concurrent effects on participants’ Language Learning Motivation given the premise of improved Intercultural Sensitivity after the intervention; however, the four-week experiential cultural learning project did not successfully manipulate participants’ Intercultural Sensitivity directly. Aligned with the relevant literature on various positive connections between foreign language learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation (Akenyemi, 2005; Byram & Kramsch, 2008; Dörnyei & Csizér, 1998; Dörnyei, 2005; Durocher, 2007; Gardner, 1985b; Kang, 2006; Jang &
Jiménez, 2011; Lybeck, 2002; Martinsen, 2011; Rubenfeld et al., 2006; Schumann, 2001), it seemed only natural that there appeared an absence of significantly greater changes in the experimental group participants’ Language Learning Motivation over the control group, corresponding to the lack of expected intervention effects directly on Intercultural Sensitivity based on the data analysis for Research Questions 1 and 2.

Moreover, the related theoretical and empirical literature covers multidisciplinary investigations to further the understanding of the complex nature of Language Learning Motivation, and has identified a variety of contributors of a foreign language learner’s motivation, including individual differences, situational differences, social and cultural factors, and cognition (Byram & Kramsch, 2008; Dörnyei, 2005; Gardner, 1985b; Keblawi, 2009; Schumann, 2001). All these components interact dynamically with each other and as a whole influence the changes in learners’ Language Motivation during different phases of their language and cultural learning. Intercultural exposure and experiences are only one piece of the puzzle despite their close links to Language Learning Motivation, as they cannot predominantly determine the rise or fall of a person’s Language Learning Motivation alone. Thus, it could be understood that the significant pre-post growth found in some aspects of participants’ Language Learning Motivation after four weeks with or without taking part in the experimental intervention was caused by a wide range of personal, situational, social, cultural, and cognitive factors including but definitely not limited to intercultural learning.

In addition, the slightly (statistically insignificant) greater gains in the control group’s scores on some of the AMTB subscales over the experimental group participants can be explained by the learning curve theory in second language acquisition (Yu, 2010;
Yu & Shen, 2012) empirically supported by Giang’s (2011) research: she found that generally two major factors fuel the English language learning students’ motivation at the beginning of the language learning process: future career aspiration and “the pressure of examinations” (pp. 41-43). Later in the semester, however, over half of the students have their language learning motivation decreased after seven months of English language and culture study mainly due to “dissatisfaction with the syllabi” and “a lack of self-regulatory strategies” (Giang, 2011, pp. 45-51). Since compared to the control group participants who were only exposed to regular language and culture training, the experimental group participants were required to complete a much more strenuous academic adaptation with the new, intensive experimental intervention program added to their normal classroom activities within a brief period of four weeks. The negative impact of academic stress and anxiety on Language Learning Motivation was not inconsequential. The fact might well be that the experiment and relevant tests were completed prematurely just before the experimental group participants started to feel comfortable with the new learning demands and experiences.

**Research Questions 5 and 8**

The fifth and eighth research questions sought to explore the effects of the six Language and Cultural Background factors (Gender, Ethnicity, Parental Encouragement, Chinese Learning History, Chinese Courses Currently Taken, and Exposure to the Target Language Culture) on Chinese-learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation. It was hypothesized that Chinese-learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation would differ according to some or all of the above listed six Language and Cultural Background factors.
To differentiate, Research Question 5 (To what extent are American adult Chinese-learners’ Language and Cultural Background factors associated with their levels of Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation, respectively?) focused on the pre-test sample data (including both the experimental and control group participants) to examine the pre-existing relationship between participants’ background factors and their ICSI and AMTB pre-test scores before the experimental intervention.

In contrast, Research Question 8 (To what extent do American adult Chinese-learners’ Language and Cultural Background factors predict the changes in their levels of Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Motivation respectively?) dealt with the post-test sample data only of the experimental group participants to investigate which types of Chinese-learners as defined by the six background factors were more sensitive to the experimental intervention and produced greater gain scores on the ICSI and AMTB scales.

Data analysis for both research questions supported the related hypothesis as mentioned above. Statistical analysis for Research Question 5 demonstrated that even before the implementation of the experimental intervention, participants’ levels for both Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation differed significantly for two out of the six Language and Cultural Background factors: Parental Encouragement and Exposure to the Target Language Culture. Significant positive correlations existed between these two variables and more than half of the total thirteen subscales under the ICSI and AMTB scales.

Likewise, the findings relevant to Research Question 8 indicated again that after the experimental intervention was completed, Parental Encouragement and Exposure to
the Target Language Culture were significantly associated with the experimental group participants’ pre-post score changes on four out of thirteen ICSI and AMTB subscales. In addition, another two aspects of the Research Question 8 results were noted: (a) significant negative instead of positive correlations were found between Parental Encouragement ($r_1 = .51; r_2 = .47$) and Exposure to the Target Language Culture ($r_1 = -.43; r_2 = -.43$) and the experimental group participants’ pre-post ICSI score changes; and (b) a third Language and Cultural Background variable, Chinese Learning History, showed significant negative relations ($r = -.47$) to participants’ gain scores on the AMTB subscale of Instrumental Orientation.

In Wright’s (1997) quasi-experimental study on culture pedagogy in language courses, the transformative, process-oriented experimental culture lessons seemed to have improved student attitudes toward cross-cultural adaptability and language learning [as measured by the Kelley and Meyers’ (1995) Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) and Gardner and Lambert’s (1972) Attitude Measurement Test Battery (AMTB), respectively]. In order to control for the influence of learners’ individual differences in their language learning background, the impact of various background factors (i.e., age, sex, previous language-learning experience, previous time spent abroad, etc.) were examined on students’ language and cultural learning and no significant effects were found on participants’ CCAI and AMTB gain scores. Similar to this research, the data analyses of Research Questions 5 and 8 in the current study also revealed no links between most Language and Cultural Background factors (including Gender, Ethnicity, Chinese Learning History, and Chinese Courses Currently Taken) and learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation (as measured by ICSI and
AMTB respectively).

However regarding the connections between parental encouragement and language learning, as reviewed by Noels (2001), a number of previous theoretical and empirical studies revealed the positive predictive power of parental encourage and support in learners’ second/foreign language acquisition efforts directly and indirectly on their language learning attitudes and motivational intensity. Gardner (1985a) argues that parents can consciously or unconsciously influence their children’s (a) general beliefs about foreign language and culture learning, and (b) attitudes towards learning a specific foreign language. Consequently, parents’ attitudes about language learning helps to enhance or hamper learners’ persistency in foreign language studies. Such a notion has been empirically supported by Vijchulata and Lee’s (1985) and Gardner et al.’s (1999) research: in both studies, a positive relation was found between parental encouragement and foreign language learners’ development of motivational intensity and language and culture learning attitudes. The findings for Research Question 5 in the current study corroborated the above-mentioned studies and extended the results by including and identifying the positive correlations between Parental Encouragement and Intercultural Sensitivity.

On the other hand, data analysis for Research Question 8 produced mixed findings slightly contradictory to the relevant research literature, in that significant, negative associations were found between Parental Encouragement and participants’ ICSI gain scores on the subscales of the ICSI Total Score and on the Collectivism vs. Individualism Total Score. The meaning of such negative correlations can be understood from two possible interpretations: (a) participants who reported higher ratings in Parental
Encouragement also tended to have scored higher in their ICSI and AMTB pretests, which might lead to relatively less *room for growth* for them after receiving the experimental intervention compared to participants who initially rated lower on both Parental Encouragement and their ICSI and AMTB pretest scores; and (b) again in consideration of the “time” factor in program design, the 4-week experimental intervention program might have not lasted long enough to spur significant further progress for those already highly culturally sensitive and motivated language learners.

Furthermore, in terms of the effects of Exposure to the Target Language Culture on language learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation, LaBelle, Dembs, and Eisner’s (2000) research addresses “the connectedness between language and culture” by suggesting that learners’ familiarity of the target language culture not only helps create “meaning contexts” for effective cross-cultural communication, but also promotes their accurate understanding of the “linguistic and social functions behind” the formal vocabulary and grammar knowledge (p. 95). In their following two case studies about Lisa Loeb fellows studying abroad for six weeks, LaBelle et al. found that improved cultural and geographic awareness as a result of international travel and study experiences enhanced the fellows’ study of literature and motivation to learn Spanish (pp. 99-100). In another empirical study conducted by Masgoret (2006), 127 British university students were tested on their sociocultural adjustment and job performance before and after their 4-week EFL teaching assignments in Spain. The data on their demographic characteristics were also collected, including Contact with Spanish Speakers, Perceptions Regarding Differences between the Cultures of Spain and Britain, etc. The results showed that previous experiences with the target
language culture and communicative competence predict the success in sociocultural adaptation in foreign contexts (Masgoret, 2006, pp. 327-330).

Coherent with the above described studies, the results for Research Question 5 confirmed the positive connections between Exposure to the Target Language Culture and learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation (significant correlations were found on all but two of the thirteen ICSI and AMTB subscales: the subscales for Collectivism vs. Individualism Total Score and for Collectivism vs. Individualism in the U.S Context). While the finding relevant to Research Question 8 also implied significant negative associations between Exposure to the Target Language Culture and learner’s pre-post gains on the two ICSI subscales (Collectivism vs. Individualism Total Score and Collectivism vs. Individualism in the Chinese Context). Such findings suggested learners with less previous experience with the target language culture would benefit more from the experiential cultural learning program and achieve greater improvement in their understanding of the critical cultural difference between the Home and foreign culture.

**Research Questions 6 and 7**

The sixth and seventh research questions looked at the interactive relationships between Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation, controlling for any significant Language and Cultural Background factors. (Based on the data analysis results for the fifth research question, the two most relevant Language and Cultural Background factors were identified as Parental Encouragement and Exposure to the Target Language Culture.)

Specifically, Research Question 6 (To what extent is American adult Chinese-
learners’ level of Intercultural Sensitivity associated with their level of Language Learning Motivation after controlling for the effects of the significant Language and Cultural Background factors?) utilized the pre-test sample data (including both the experimental and control group participants) to examine the pre-existing relationship between participants’ ICSI and AMTB pre-test scores before the experimental intervention.

Regarding Research Question 7 (When controlling for any significant Language and Cultural Background factors, to what extent does the change in American adult Chinese-learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity predict the change in their Language Learning Motivation?), the statistical analysis was based on the post-test sample data containing the experimental and control group participants to examine whether participants’ pre-post gains on their ICSI and AMTB test scores were interrelated after the 4-week period with or without completing the experimental intervention program.

The hypothesis guiding the data analysis for both research questions predicted that American Chinese-learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity would be related to their Language Learning Motivation. Data analysis provided partial support for this hypothesis. Semi partial correlation analysis for Research Question 6 demonstrated significant positive correlations between one ICSI subscale (Open-mindedness) and five out of eight AMTB subscales, suggesting more culturally open-minded learners tended to be more motivated in learning foreign languages. However, Research Question 7 analysis yielded mixed results: (a) participants’ pre-post gains on the Open-mindedness subscale was found again positively related to the improvements in their Interests in Learning Foreign Languages; but (b) participants’ pre-post gains on the ICSI Total Score and two
Collectivism vs. Individualism subscales showed negative associations with their growth in the AMTB Total Score and Motivational Intensity.

The findings of Research Question 6 analysis provide further empirical evidence to echo two themes noted in the previous theoretical and empirical research linking culture learning to language motivation. First, the positive relationships existing between cross-cultural experiences and the linguistic side of second/foreign language acquisition highlight the essential value of integrating language and culture in foreign language education (Byram & Kramsch, 2008; Kang, 2006; Jang & Jiménez, 2011; Lybeck, 2002; Martinsen, 2007). Moreover, a systematic research body focuses on identifying various motivators (including personal, psychological, situational, contextual, and sociocultural factors) contributing to language learner’s learning interest and positive attitudes toward foreign language learning (Allen, 2010; Cai & Zhu, 2012; Giang, 2011; Kouritzin et al., 2009; Kozaki & Ross, 2011; Xiao, 2012). Cross-cultural experiences and intercultural sensitivity were considered a critical influencer on language motivation (Beneke, 2001; Clement et al., 1994; Corbett, 2003, 2010; Dörnyei, 1994; Ho, 1998; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Knutson, 2003; Kramsch, 1993; Parks, 2000; Roberts et al., 2001; Seedhouse, 1995).

In addition, the current study based on Research Question 6 analysis also extended the knowledge base concerning the relationships between Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation in two ways: (a) it was found in the current study that cultural open-mindedness rather than all the other aspects of Intercultural Sensitivity had the single most significant impact on language learners’ Language Learning Motivation; and (b) using relevant statistical procedures, the current
study assessed and removed the confounding effects of learners’ Language and Culture Background factors (which were seldom dealt with quantitatively in the previous research) to ascertain the net predictive power of Intercultural Sensitivity on Language Learning Motivation.

The mixed results for Research Question 7 can be interpreted from three perspectives. First, based on the data analysis results for Research Questions 1 and 3 (see Table 5, p. 134), although the differences in the group means were not deemed statistically significant, the experimental group participants showed greater pre-post gains on their ICSI test scores but less gains on their AMTB test scores compared to their control group counterparts. This might be understood that the experimental intervention helped to produce greater improvement in learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity, but somehow slowed down the growth in their Language Learning Motivation.

Secondly, the apparent negative relationships between the pre-post changes in Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation might be partially attributed to the dynamic, affective nature of Language Motivation itself, in that its assessment can only be perceived as a provisional, psychological state of mind subject to a wide range of personal, situational, contextual, and sociocultural factors (Byram & Kramsch, 2008; Dörnyei & Csizér, 1998; Dörnyei, 2005; Durocher, 2007; Gardner, 1985a; Kang, 2006; Keblawi, 2009; Jang & Jiménez, 2011). Thus the less growth in the experimental group participants’ Language Learning Motivation against their notably improved Intercultural Sensitivity might be interpreted as a natural response to the extra academic stress and language anxiety caused by the increased cross-cultural communication opportunities provided by the experimental intervention program. In other words, these beginning-level
Chinese-learners might have experienced a so-called “cultural and/or linguistic reality shock” when they were made to know the differences between what they thought they knew and what things really were; therefore, their previous false confidence in their cultural knowledge and linguistic abilities were subject to serious tests, resulting in temporary, relatively lower language motivation than their “blessed ignorant” counterparts in the control group (Buttarro, 2004; Genc & Bada, 2005; Graham, 1997; Kinginger, 2004; Kramsch, 1991; Whorf, Lee, Levinson, & Carroll, 2012).

**Implications**

There are four implications of the current study for foreign language program designers and teachers. An explication follows as below.

First, similar to the results of previous research, the findings of the current study provided further evidence for integration of language and culture learning in foreign language education. More importantly, due to various flaws in program design (especially concerning the inadequate time duration), the experimental intervention in the current study failed to show statistically significant improvement of learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity. However, the results (the experimental group participants demonstrated greater, albeit not significant, gains on all five ICSI subscales than the control group) hold the promise of the value of applying pedagogic innovations in order to teach culture effectively to language learners, such as shifting the focus from teaching cultural knowledge towards experiential cultural learning.

Furthermore, special caution needs to be taken in program design and curriculum development for innovative culture teaching and learning. Factors to account for may include but are not limited to (a) balance between preparing students with essential
cultural knowledge and providing ample opportunities for them to engage in authentic cross-cultural communication and other experiences; (b) careful selection of program duration, clinical sites, and forms of experiential cultural learning tasks in order to cater to different learning needs of various types of language learners; (c) clearly specified and standardized on-site monitoring of students’ completion of experiential cultural learning tasks; (d) a system of accurate and timely feedback on student learning; and (e) integration of formative and summative program evaluation allowing room for appropriate adjustments as needed.

A third implication concerns parental encouragement for language learning and language learners’ personal cultural exposure. Evidently based on the findings of the current study, these are the resources yet to be tapped into by foreign language program designers and teachers to help inspire and sustain Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation. Focused and consistent efforts should be made to understand individual learners’ language and cultural backgrounds in order to make their foreign language studies more relevant to their personal interests and everyday lives.

Finally, program designers and teachers need to pay close attention to the changes in students’ learning interests and motivation in different phases of foreign language acquisition and intercultural sensitivity development, and make conscious efforts accordingly in alleviating academic stress and language anxiety, boosting language confidence, and addressing issues related to cultural shocks. Again because the processes for both language and cultural learning are extremely complicated and interactive in nature, it is essential for foreign language pedagogy to form a dynamic, benign cycle that constantly builds on and guides the reciprocal nature of teaching and learning to produce
the most efficacious result. This implication appeals especially to a typical university language program in face of various challenges in improving the student retention rate after the completion of language requirements in general education for two reasons: (a) the current study revealed a foreign language learning curve in both language motivation and cultural outlook, which calls for further in-depth research to probe into a range of possible causative factors; and (b) further exploratory studies need to be conducted to ascertain what kind of pedagogical adjustments/innovations should be made to maintain students’ language motivation and facilitate continuous learning.

**Limitations**

In addition to the seven potential limitations listed in Chapter I (see pp. 20-23) including issues related to generalizability, measurement subjectivity based on self-reporting data, experimental nature of pedagogic innovations adopted as the intervention program in the current study, fidelity of program implementation, possible participant inequality in the group assignment, instructor differences, and limited power of instrumentation (validity and reliability), three other major limitations were made clear upon the completion of the current study.

The first limitation concerns the flaws in the quasi-experimental research design. Due to feasibility considerations, the participants in the experimental and control groups were not matched on the personal level based on their demographic information collected from the Language and Cultural Background Survey; instead, the natural class units were randomly selected and assigned to either of the two groups (Chinese 101 and 201 constituted the experimental group and the control group consisted of Chinese 102 and 202). Additionally, in an attempt to minimize the interruptions to the participants’
required language and cultural learning activities on the regular basis, the researcher had to implement the experimental intervention program as an add-on assignment for the experimental group participants, while in the meantime the control group participants did not have to “bear the extra burden” at all. The consequent issues of such methods are twofold: (a) the group assignment based on the class-level matching neglected the personal dimension so essential in language and cultural learning, such as the compatibility of individual learner’s learning style and preferences with various pedagogical approaches (innovative vs. traditional) in teaching culture; and (b) any intervention effects (as desired or not) shown at the end of the intervention program might be attributed to the fact that the experimental group participants were made to work more than their control group counterparts.

The second limitation is related to the sampling method. The sample in the current study focused on beginning-level Chinese learners, and most of them were taking Chinese language courses under the college requirements for foreign language learning. Therefore, their responsiveness towards experiential cultural learning programs as well as language attitudes and motivation may differ significantly from those of advanced-level Chinese learners. However, because the Chinese program of the Modern Languages Department was relatively young, the students enrolled in their advanced-level Chinese courses at the point of study were less than ten altogether and it would not have been quantitatively meaningful to include them in the sample.

The last limitation involves testing effects resulting from repeatedly testing participants. Testing effects refer to the threat to internal validity that occurs when participants repeatedly take the same or similar tests and may remember correct answers
or may be influences by their previous responses to the same questions (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1993). The current study utilized the pre-post, quasi-experimental design to test the participants twice on the same sets of instruments; thus the testing effects might be unavoidable. In addition, the negative mode effects of online surveys were also evident in some participants’ nonresponses or tendency to select the “middle” options for certain survey items (Heerwegh & Loosveldt, 2008; Nojin & Radler, 2002).

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Corresponding to the limitations discussed in the previous section, three suggestions are proposed for future research on Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation.

First, future researchers might want to address the research design flaws of the current study by adopting a three-group experimental design where participants are randomly assigned to Treatment 1 Group (Treatment 1 can be the intervention program of interests), Treatment 2 Group (Treatment 2 can be another innovative cultural pedagogy equivalent to the intervention program of interests), and Control Group (receiving no treatment). Such a research design is considered more rigorous and stronger in internal validity than the two-group, treatment vs. no treatment design because the addition of Treatment 2 Group would rule out the plausible explanation that the intervention effects (or the lack thereof) may be caused by the experimental group (or Treatment 1 Group) participants’ “extra work or input” compared to the Control Group, if statistical evidence shows that Treatment 1 Group out-performs not only Control Group but also Treatment 2 Group. If feasible, it is suggested that the two Treatments are best developed into two selective cultural learning courses for language learning students that
last for at least one academic semester, and researchers may randomly assign the students of the same linguistic proficiency level to take either of the two cultural learning courses (Treatment 1 or Treatment 2 Group), or else take no selective cultural course in addition to the required ones (Control Group).

Second, future researchers could examine the intervention effects of various innovative cultural pedagogies on medium- and advanced-level foreign language learners, and based on the relevant findings, further investigate the predictive power of Intercultural Sensitivity on Language Learning Motivation. In such studies, special attention should be paid to possible fluctuations in learners’ language attitudes and motivation during different phases of their participation in experimental cultural learning programs, so that researchers and teachers can work together in taking timely measures to mitigate effectively the language anxiety and cultural shocks that learners might be experiencing. Such studies would also need to address measuring these possibilities by comparing results for students at different levels in the sequence of coursework from beginner to advanced.

Finally, considering the negative impacts of self-administered, online surveys on the data quality, it is recommended for future researchers to conduct face-to-face surveys with participants as a group. At least two advantages can be estimated for the change in surveying mode: (a) researchers would have the opportunity for close monitoring and providing respondents with immediate feedback on any questions or concerns they might have taking the survey(s) to avoid confusion or misunderstandings; and (b) it would be more likely to obtain higher response rates and higher quality data since survey-takers are given a specific period time and clear instructions to focus on completing the tasks.
In addition, future researchers can further improve the structural design of innovative cultural pedagogies derived from multi-disciplinary theories, and explore the effectiveness and feasibility of the related cultural learning activities. It would also be very informative for future productive curriculum development to document exactly what pedagogy/activity works and what doesn’t for which type(s) of language learners, after controlling for instructor differences.

**Summary and Conclusion**

This study sought to investigate the intervention effects of a 4-week experiential cultural learning program on participants’ levels of Intercultural Sensitivity and the concurrent effects of the program on their Language Learning Motivation. Despite notable greater gains in the test scores for the experimental group participants over the control group on all five ICSI subscales and one of the eight AMTB subscales, data analysis utilizing a mixed model ANOVA failed to yield statistically significant results for direct or indirect impact of the intervention program on participants’ Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation, respectively. These “null” findings are partially in line with previous related experimental studies in that it was difficult to obtain quantitative evidence for the superiority of innovative pedagogical approaches in cultural teaching over traditional classroom teaching of cultural knowledge, even though qualitative data repeatedly indicated language learners’ strong preference of experiential cultural learning activities (Earley, 1987; Pruegger & Rogers, 1994). However, specifically concerning the current study, three other explanations for the null findings were also discussed: (a) flaws in the design of the intervention program, particularly in
terms of program duration and on-site monitoring, (b) the fatigue/shock effect on language learners according to the learning curve theory in second language acquisition (Yu, 2010; Yu & Shen, 2012), and (c) the negative mode effects of self-administered online surveys on the data quality.

This study also examined the relationship between a number of selected language learners’ Language and Cultural Background factors (Gender, Ethnicity, Parental Encouragement, Chinese Learning History, Chinese Courses Currently Taken, and Exposure to the Target Language Culture) and the two main variables of interests: Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation. Both independent t tests and Pearson-product correlation analyses were implemented and the results revealed two Language and Cultural Background factors (Parental Encouragement and Exposure to the Target Language Culture) were significantly related to participants’ Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation. These findings corroborated the relevant research literature in two ways: (a) no significant links were found between most Language and Cultural Background factors (including Gender, Ethnicity, Chinese Learning History, and Chinese Courses Currently Taken) and learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation (Wright, 1997); and (b) both home environment (best demonstrated as parental encouragement and support for language learning) and cross-cultural exposure and experiences significantly impact learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation (Gardner, 1985a; Gardner et al., 1999; LaBelle et al., 2000; Masgoret, 2006; Noels, 2001; Vijchulata & Lee, 1985).

Further, this study explored the relationship between language learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation using semi-partial correlation
analysis to remove the confounding effects of any significant Language and Cultural Background factors (Parental Encouragement and Exposure to the Target Language Culture). Data analysis demonstrated that (a) before the implementation of the experimental intervention program, participants’ cultural Open-mindedness (one of the five ICSI subscales) was found positively associated with most aspects of Language Learning Motivation (as measured by the eight AMTB subscales), which is aligned with the relevant research literature (Beneke, 2001; Clement et al., 1994; Corbett, 2003, 2010; Dörnyei, 1994; Ho, 1998; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Knutson, 2003; Kramsch, 1993; Parks, 2000; Roberts et al., 2001; Seedhouse, 1995); and (b) after the experimental intervention program was completed, participants’ pre-post gains in their Intercultural Sensitivity showed negative associations with the gains in Language Learning Motivation, possibly due to the complex, dynamic nature of language motivation itself and the increased language anxiety and cultural shocks experienced by the experimental group participants (Buttaro, 2004; Genc & Bada, 2005; Graham, 1997; Kinginger, 2004; Kramsch, 1991; Whorf et al., 2012).

In conclusion, this study tested the efficacy of an innovative cultural learning pedagogy with a small sample (n = 43) of American adult learners of the Chinese language, and explored its concurrent effects on learners’ Language Learning Motivation. In addition, the relationships between foreign language learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation were also examined. The current study adds to the knowledge base of foreign language acquisition in the following three aspects: (a) in order to provide solid quantitative evidence for the effects of a particular cultural pedagogy on language learners, special caution is called for in designing intervention
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programs and in establishing a set of systematic standards for supervision and monitoring of program implementation; (b) language learners’ Intercultural Sensitivity and Language Learning Motivation are closely interwoven, although acquisition of both is an extremely complex, dynamic process and may not consistently show linear, proportional growth; and (c) learner individuality (i.e., learners’ personal Language and Cultural Backgrounds including Parental Encouragement and Exposure to the Target Language Culture) should always be taken into account when judging the general efficacy of a foreign language pedagogy. Utilizing these insights (for both implementation of classroom pedagogical practice and/or curriculum development and ongoing research efforts) can help language learners to master a foreign language and understand the culture in which that tongue is so inevitably embedded.
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APPENDIX A: DEMOGRAPHIC & BACKGROUND SURVEY

All the information will be kept confidential. Your name will be replaced with a unique code once the data is entered into computer so no one can associate your name to your responses.

Q1 Your Name:
Q2 Your Age:
Q3 Your Gender:
  ○ Male
  ○ Female
Q4 Please specify your race.
  ○ American Indian or Alaska Native
  ○ White
  ○ Asian
  ○ African American
  ○ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
  ○ Hispanic
Q5 Your Year in School
  ○ Freshmen
  ○ Sophomore
  ○ Junior
  ○ Senior
Q6 Your Major (If you haven't determined this yet, please just answer "Uncertain")
Q7 Your Minor (If you haven't determined this yet, please just answer "Uncertain")

Q8 Your place of birth

Q9 Your parent’s place of birth

Q10 Please specify how long you have been learning the Chinese language
   ☐ less than a year
   ☐ two years
   ☐ three to four years
   ☐ over four years

Q11 Please specify what Chinese courses you are currently taking

Q12 My parents encourage me to learn Chinese
   ☐ Strongly Disagree
   ☐ Disagree
   ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree
   ☐ Agree
   ☐ Strongly Agree

Q13 How many native Chinese speakers do you know personally other than your teachers and tutors?
   ☐ none
   ☐ one or two
   ☐ more than three
   ☐ a lot

Q14 How often do you read newspapers, magazines, or books about China?
   ☐ Less than Once a Month
Once a Month
2-3 Times a Month
Once a Week
2-3 Times a Week
Daily

Q15 How often do you surf on-line or watch TV, movie, or documentaries about China?
Never
Less than Once a Month
Once a Month
2-3 Times a Month
Once a Week
2-3 Times a Week
Daily

Q16 Have you joined any club or participated in any special event/activity about China?
none
one or two
more than three
a lot

Q17 Have you ever studied/traveled abroad?
ever
once or twice
more than three times
oftentimes
Q18 Have you ever studied/traveled in China?

- never
- once or twice
- more than three times
- oftentimes

Q19 What is the longest time you have spent in China?

- less than a week
- a few weeks
- less than two months
- more than two months

Q20 How many Chinese cities have you been to?

- none
- one or two
- more than three
- a lot

Thank you for your cooperation!
APPENDIX B: INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY INVENTORY

Your Name:

For items 1-16, imagine living and working in the United States.

Q1 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.

☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly Agree

Q2 I would offer my seat in a bus to my supervisor.

☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly Agree

Q3 I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people.

☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly Agree

Q4 I enjoy developing long-term relationships among the people with whom I work.
Q5 I am very modest when talking about my own accomplishments.

Q6 When I give gifts to people whose cooperation I need in my work, I feel I am indulging in questionable behavior.

Q7 If I want my subordinate to perform a task, I tell the person that my superiors want me to get that task done.
Q8 I prefer to give opinions that will help people save face rather than give a statement of the truth.

Q9 I say “No” directly when I have to.

Q10 I define the other person’s status by paying attention to name, gender, age, and other demographic attributes.

Q11 To increase sales, I would announce that the individual salesperson with the highest
sales would be given the “Distinguished Salesperson” award.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q12 I enjoy being emotionally close to the people with whom I work.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q13 It is important to develop a network of people in my community who can help me out when I have tasks to accomplish.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q14 I enjoy feeling that I am looked upon as equal in worth to my superiors.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
Q15 I have respect for the authority figures with whom I interact.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q16 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.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

**For items 17-32, imagine living and working in China.**

Q17 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.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
Q18 I would offer my seat in a bus to my supervisor.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q19 I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q20 I enjoy developing long-term relationships among the people with whom I work.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q21 I am very modest when talking about my own accomplishments.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
Q22 When I give gifts to people whose cooperation I need in my work, I feel I am indulging in questionable behavior.

Q23 If I want my subordinate to perform a task, I tell the person that my superiors want me to get that task done.

Q24 I prefer to give opinions that will help people save face rather than give a statement of the truth.

Q25 I say “No” directly when I have to.
Q26 I define the other person’s status by paying attention to name, gender, age, and other demographic attributes.

Q27 To increase sales, I would announce that the individual salesperson with the highest sales would be given the “Distinguished Salesperson” award.

Q28 I enjoy being emotionally close to the people with whom I work.
Q29 It is important to develop a network of people in my community who can help me out when I have tasks to accomplish.

Q30 I enjoy feeling that I am looked upon as equal in worth to my superiors.

Q31 I have respect for the authority figures with whom I interact.

Q32 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.
For items 33-46, choose the answer closest to your personal opinion.

Q33 When I am living abroad, I assess situations as quickly as I do when I am living in my own country.

Q34 I get upset if I do not get a letter or call from my close friend(s) for more than a month, when I am living abroad.

Q35 Given acceptable hygienic conditions, I would not mind if my children ate local food at school, when I am living in another country.
Q36 I do not like to receive unannounced visitors at home.
  ○ Strongly Disagree
  ○ Disagree
  ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
  ○ Agree
  ○ Strongly Agree

Q37 I do not like customs officers meddling with my baggage at the airport.
  ○ Strongly Disagree
  ○ Disagree
  ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
  ○ Agree
  ○ Strongly Agree

Q38 We all have a right to hold different beliefs about God and religion.
  ○ Strongly Disagree
  ○ Disagree
  ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
  ○ Agree
  ○ Strongly Agree

Q39 I do not like to meet foreigners.
Q40 It is unusual for people to eat dogs.

Q41 I decorate my home or office with artifacts from other countries.

Q42 Culturally mixed marriages are wrong.
Q43 A woman’s place, truly, is at home.
☑ Strongly Disagree
☑ Disagree
☑ Neither Agree nor Disagree
☑ Agree
☑ Strongly Agree

Q44 I would not allow my subordinate to promote his nephew if there is someone marginally better than him. The person who is better must be promoted at all costs.
☑ Strongly Disagree
☑ Disagree
☑ Neither Agree nor Disagree
☑ Agree
☑ Strongly Agree

Q45 The influence of Communist China is threatening the national identity of many other Asian countries.
☑ Strongly Disagree
☑ Disagree
☑ Neither Agree nor Disagree
☑ Agree
☑ Strongly Agree

Q46 While living abroad, I spend most of my personal time with people from my own country.
☑ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree
APPENDIX C: ATTITUDE/MOTIVATION TEST BATTERY

Your Name:

Q1 Chinese are a very sociable, warm-hearted and creative people.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q2 I would like to know more Chinese people.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q3 Chinese add a distinctive flavor to the American culture.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q4 Americans should make a greater effort to learn the Chinese language.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
Q5 The more I get to know the Chinese people, the more I want to be fluent in their language.

Q6 Some of our best citizens are of Chinese descent.

Q7 Chinese are considerate of the feelings of others.

Q8 I have a favorable attitude towards Chinese people.
Q9 The more I learn about the Chinese people, the more I like them.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q10 Chinese are trustworthy and dependable.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q11 I have always admired the Chinese people.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
Q12 Chinese are very friendly and hospitable.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q13 Chinese are cheerful, agreeable and good humored.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q14 I would like to get to know the Chinese people better.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q15 Chinese are a very kind and generous people.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
Q16 For the most part, Chinese are sincere and honest.

Q17 If I were visiting a foreign country I would like to be able to speak the language of the people.

Q18 Even though America is relatively far from countries speaking other languages, it is important for Americans to learn foreign languages.

Q19 I wish I could speak another language perfectly.
Q20 I want to read the literature of a foreign language in the original language rather than a translation.

Q21 I often wish I could read newspapers and magazines in another language.

Q22 I would really like to learn a lot of foreign languages.
Q23 If I planned to stay in another country, I would make a great effort to learn the language even though I could get along in English.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q24 I would study a foreign language in school even if it were not required.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q25 I enjoy meeting and listening to people who speak other languages.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q26 Studying a foreign language is an enjoyable experience.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
Q27 Learning Chinese is really great.

- Agree
- Strongly Agree
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q28 I really enjoy learning Chinese.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q29 Chinese is an important part of the school program.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q30 I plan to learn as much Chinese as possible.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Disagree
Q31 I love learning Chinese.
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q32 I hate learning Chinese.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q33 I would rather spend my time on subjects other than Chinese.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q34 Learning Chinese is a waste of time.
- Strongly Disagree
Q35 I think that learning Chinese is dull.

Q36 When I leave school, I shall give up the study of Chinese entirely because I am not interested in it.

Q37 Studying Chinese can be important to me because studying Chinese can be important to me because it will allow me to be more at ease with native Chinese speakers.
Q38 Studying Chinese can be important to me because it will allow me to meet and converse with more and varied people.

Q39 Studying Chinese can be important to me because it will enable me to better understand and appreciate Chinese art and literature.

Q40 Studying Chinese can be important to me because I will be able to participate more freely in the activities of other cultural groups.
Q41 Studying Chinese can be important for me because I’ll need it for my future career.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q42 Studying Chinese can be important for me because it will make me a more knowledgeable person.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q43 Studying Chinese can be important for me because I think it will someday be useful in getting a good job.

○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q44 Studying Chinese can be important for me because other people will respect me more if I have some knowledge of a foreign language.

○ Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Agree
Strongly Agree

Q45 I actively think about what I have learned in my Chinese class:
very frequently
hardly ever
once in a while

Q46 If Chinese were not taught in school, I would:
Pick up Chinese in everyday situations (i.e., read Chinese books and newspapers, try to speak it whenever possible, etc.).
Not bother learning Chinese at all.
Try to obtain lessons in Chinese somewhere else.

Q47 When I have a problem understanding something we are learning in Chinese class, I:
Immediately ask the teacher for help.
Only seek help just before the exam.
Just forget about it.

Q48 When it comes to Chinese homework, I:
Put some effort into it, but not as much as I could.
Work very carefully, making sure I understand everything.
Just skim over it.

Q49 Considering how I study Chinese, I can honestly say that I:
Do just enough work to get along.
Will pass on the basis of sheer luck or intelligence because I do very little work.

Really try to learn Chinese.

Q50 If my teacher wanted someone to do an extra Chinese assignment, I would:

Definitely not volunteer.

Definitely volunteer.

Only do it if the teacher asked me directly.

Q51 After I get my Chinese assignment back, I:

Always rewrite them, correcting my mistakes.

Just throw them in my desk and forget them.

Look them over, but don’t bother correcting mistakes.

Q52 When I am in Chinese class, I:

Volunteer answers as much as possible.

Answer only the easier questions.

Never say anything.

Q53 If there were a local Chinese T.V. station, I would:

Never watch it.

Turn it on occasionally.

Try to watch it often.

Q54 When I hear a Chinese song on the radio, I:

Listen to the music, paying attention only to the easy words.

Listen carefully and try to understand all the words.

Change the station.

Q55 During Chinese class, I would like:
To have a combination of Chinese and English spoken.

To have as much English as possible spoken.

To have only Chinese spoken.

Q56 If I had the opportunity to speak Chinese outside of school, I would:

Never speak it.

Speak Chinese most of the time, using English only if really necessary.

Speak it occasionally, using English whenever possible.

Q57 Compared to my other courses, I like Chinese:

The most.

The same as all the others.

Least of all.

Q58 If there were a Chinese Club in my school, I would:

Attend meetings once in a while.

Be most interested in joining.

Definitely not join.

Q59 If it were up to me whether or not to take Chinese, I:

Would definitely take it.

Would drop it.

Don’t know whether I would take it or not.

Q60 I find studying Chinese:

Not interesting at all.

No more interesting than most subjects.

Very interesting.
Q61 If the opportunity arose and I knew enough Chinese, I would watch Chinese T.V. programs:

- Sometimes.
- As often as possible.
- Never

Q62 If I had the opportunity to see a Chinese play, I would:

- Go only if I have nothing else to do.
- Definitely go.
- Not go.

Q63 If there were Chinese-speaking families in my neighborhood, I would:

- Never speak Chinese to them.
- Speak Chinese with them sometimes.
- Speak Chinese with them as much as possible.

Q64 If I had the opportunity and knew enough Chinese, I would read Chinese magazines and newspapers:

- As often as I could.
- Never.
- Not very often.
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APPENDIX E: INFORMED CONSENT

Project Title: The Impact of Intercultural Sensitivity on Language Learning Motivation

Investigator: Chunling Niu, the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences. Tel: 270-303-1946; Email:

chunling.niu516@topper.wku.edu

You are being asked to participate in a project conducted through Western Kentucky University. The University requires that you give your signed agreement to participate in this project.

The investigator will explain to you in detail the purpose of the project, the procedures to be used, and the potential benefits and possible risks of participation. You may ask him/her any questions you have to help you understand the project. A basic explanation of the project is written below. Please read this explanation and discuss with the researcher any questions you may have. You must be 18 years old or older to participate in this study.

If you then decide to participate in the project, please sign on the last page of this form in the presence of the person who explained the project to you. You should be given a copy of this form to keep.

1. Nature and Purpose of the Project:

The proposed study is designed as a pretest-posttest comparison group quasi experiment in order to examine the possible impact of intercultural sensitivity on second/foreign language learning motivation.
2. **Explanation of Procedures:**

   a. A language background survey will be distributed to collect related demographic or language learning information;

   b. Subjects’ levels of intercultural sensitivity and language motivation will be measured by two questionnaire instruments before and after the experiment;

   c. Subjects assigned to the experimental group will complete 4 cultural assignments during February, 2014 as part of their Chinese class requirements;

   d. Subjects assigned to the control group will be subject to regular linguistic and cultural instructions of their Chinese courses;

3. **Discomfort and Risks:**

   This study involves no greater risk than encountered in everyday life and there is no cost to participants.

4. **Benefit:**

   a. Participants will complete their Chinese requirements and may be given credit that constitutes part of their final grades upon completion of the experiment or potentially another minimal incentive.

   b. Participants are likely to improve their intercultural sensitivity as a result of working on the four cultural assignments.

   c. Participants are likely to gain insight concerning the important relationship between cultural knowledge, cultural sensitivity, language learning motivation, and language learning strategies.
5. **Confidentiality:**

   To protect the identity of the students and teacher, pseudonyms will be used to represent the students, teachers, and administrators. The researcher will store all data and documents in a password protected computer or in a locked filing cabinet that only the researcher has access to. After the recommended time frame of three years, all identifying information will be destroyed by erasing files and shredding documents.

6. **Refusal/Withdrawal:**

   Refusal to participate in this study will have no effect on any future services you may be entitled to from the University. Anyone who agrees to participate in this study is free to withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty.

   *You understand also that it is not possible to identify all potential risks in an experimental procedure, and you believe that reasonable safeguards have been taken to minimize both the known and potential but unknown risks.*
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APPENDIX F: CULTURAL ASSIGNMENTS DESCRIPTION AND RUBRICS

THE INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY PROJECT:

UP & FRONT WITH THE CHINESE CULTURE

Project Objectives:

Upon completion of this project, you should be able to:

1) Initiate and engage in meaningful exchanges with native Chinese speakers on various cultural themes;

2) Observe and adapt to differences in worldviews and cultural norms;

3) Experiment and improve your strategies in tackling cultural misunderstandings and other barriers in intercultural communication;

4) Facilitate intercultural exchanges for other American students;

5) Increase your intercultural sensitivity and competence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Product(s)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follow the link posted on the Blackboard, and</td>
<td>Submitted online</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Skit</td>
<td>News Analysis</td>
<td>Cultural Exchange Event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete the two online surveys</td>
<td>surveys</td>
<td>01/31</td>
<td>02/08</td>
<td>02/15</td>
<td>02/22</td>
<td>03/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choose and schedule a 30-minute</td>
<td>Work in a group of 3-5 students,</td>
<td>Locate a newspaper or magazine</td>
<td>Initiate and arrange a social</td>
<td>Follow the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>interview with any one from a list</td>
<td>and invite any 1-2 native Chinese</td>
<td>article on Sino-American exchanges</td>
<td>event for your American friends</td>
<td>link posted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of 15 native Chinese speakers on a</td>
<td>speaker(s) from the listed 15 to</td>
<td>from a credible source, and deliver</td>
<td>to meet the native Chinese</td>
<td>on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>specific cultural theme</td>
<td>put together a 5-10 minute skit on</td>
<td>a critique on the cultural</td>
<td>speakers from the listed 15.</td>
<td>Blackboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>intercultural misunderstandings</td>
<td>differences described in the</td>
<td></td>
<td>, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>between Chinese and Americans</td>
<td>article.</td>
<td></td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-minute video/audio clip recorded</td>
<td>500-word analysis on cultural</td>
<td>Filled-out activity flowcharts</td>
<td>Submitted online surveys</td>
<td>surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and uploaded on BB</td>
<td>differences (source properly cited),</td>
<td>(electronically submitted on BB), &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>written in English and uploaded on</td>
<td>10 pictures taken at the event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>venue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. INTERVIEW

Learning Objectives:

Upon completion of this assignment, students shall be able to:

1) Overcome inertia and fear about getting to know strangers from a different culture;

2) Identify and articulate a cultural theme of your interests;

3) Motivate and engage a foreign stranger in meaningful communication on the cultural theme;

4) Form an informed opinion on the cultural theme based on discussion with the native Chinese speaker.

Assignment:

1) You will be provided with the contact information of 15 native Chinese speakers. Please contact and make arrangements with them to schedule a 30-minute interview on a specific theme that you are interested in about the Chinese culture (i.e. gender equality, religion, environmental issues, Peking Opera, giant panda, music, poetry, festivals, food, etc.)

2) The interview can be conducted mostly in English. You are advised to prepare at least 5 open-ended questions for the interview.

3) You are required to make audio recording of the interview and upload it under the specified folder on Blackboard before the deadline 02/08 (you can use your I-phone, camera, or other audio/video recorders for this task).

Due Date: 02/08

Product: Upload the audio recording of the 30-minute interview on the Blackboard.
Interview Rubric

The Best Practice Criteria
(Unless otherwise noted, each bullet = up to 10 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Total (100 points possible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Initiation
• Introduction (5 points)
• A specific cultural theme as the focus of the interview is clearly articulated and mutually understood (5 points)

Questions
• At least 5 theme-related, open-ended questions are asked and answered
• Questions focus on the cultural comparison and contrast (i.e. what do you think are the similarities and differences in …?)
• The time allocated for each question is properly proportioned, allowing meaningful response while avoiding repetitive comments
• Under each of the 5 big questions, follow-up questions are asked to ensure correct understanding and fruitful exchange of ideas (i.e. Is it correct when I understand your opinion as…? I always thought …, what do you think?)

Facilitation
• Interviewee is respected and encouraged to express freely and openly
• Mutual efforts are made to overcome language and/or cultural barriers when necessary
• Meaningful responses are extracted from the interviewee
• Timely and helpful feedback or clarification are provided

Tactics
• Interview is conducted in a generally agreeable atmosphere in order to improve mutual understanding (5 points)
• Disagreements are tackled with mutual respect and tolerance (5 points)
2. SKIT

*Learning Objectives:*

Upon completion of this assignment, students shall be able to:

1) Recognize cross-cultural errors often made by Americans when dealing with the Chinese people and culture;

2) Identify the reasons behind such cross-cultural errors;

3) Reject the ignorance and arrogance that often cause various kinds of cross-cultural blunders;

4) Master skills and strategies to avoid cross-cultural errors.

*Assignment:*

1) You will be working in a group of 3-5 students. Please contact 1 or 2 Chinese native speaker(s) from the listed 15, and ask them to be head of your group and to serve as the cultural expert in putting together a 5-10 minute skit.

2) With the help of the Chinese native speakers, your group will work together in planning, writing, and performing a skit that illustrate a minimum of two cross-cultural blunders that an American person might make when dealing with the Chinese people and culture.

3) Your group must organize the blunders into a real-life scenario involving social interaction between one or two individuals representing Americans and the rest of the group representing Chinese.

4) The Chinese guest(s) in your group will play the role of “the Ignorant American,” while the American students in your group will take the part of the Chinese nationals (with the help of your Chinese guests, of course).
5) The skit is written and performed in English.

6) You are required to make video recording of the skit and upload it under the specified folder on Blackboard before the deadline 02/15 (you can use your iPhone, camera, or other video recorders for this task).

Due Date: 02/15

Product: Upload the video recording of the skit on the Blackboard.
## Skit Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Best Practice Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Total (100 points possible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Brief introduction of the roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Each member of the group plays a role and has some lines in the skit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plot</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clearly focused on at least 2 well-defined cross-cultural errors often made by an American person in dealing with the Chinese people and/or culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The cross-cultural errors are vividly represented in real-life scenarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The story is told from the Chinese instead of American perspective; that is, the American behaviors perceived in the eyes of the Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The story incorporates coherently the possible causes and consequences of the cross-cultural errors in Sino-American communication and exchanges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actors are able to demonstrate the shift in cultural identities convincingly (Chinese guests play the roles of Americans, while American students play the parts of Chinese nationals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actors show sufficient and adequate interaction with each other throughout the performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creative plotting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Well delivered, lively performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. NEWS ANALYSIS

Learning Objectives:

Upon completion of this assignment, students shall be able to:

1) Identify major cross-cultural differences that may cause problems for American work organizations (mainly businesses) in their attempts to survive and thrive in China;

2) Recognize the negative impacts that such cross-cultural differences may have on Sino-American exchanges and cooperation in various fields;

3) Identify both successful and unsuccessful strategies taken by the American work organizations in resolving the cross-cultural differences;

4) Analyze various factors resulting in the successful/unsuccessful cross-cultural strategies.

Assignment:

1) You are required to locate a newspaper or magazine article (cannot be more than 5 years old) about an American work organization adapting, or having difficulty adapting, to the native culture in China.

Note: The source of the article must be properly cited (please refer to APA style requirements), and any blog posting, online forum posting, or YouTube video sources are not acceptable.

2) Read the article thoroughly and try to find out what cross-cultural differences may have caused problems for the American organization operating in China.

3) Write an analysis on (a) what are the cross-cultural differences encountered by the American organization, (b) what are the consequences of such differences,
and (c) explain why the American organization is successful or unsuccessful in resolving the cross-cultural differences.

4) The analysis is written in English and contains 500 words minimum.

5) You are required to submit the analysis electronically under the specified folder on Blackboard before the deadline 02/22 (you also need to attach the original article if it has digital version; if no digital version is available, you need to take its picture and scan and upload the pdf version).

Due Date: 02/22

Product: Upload the 500-word analysis and the original source article
News Analysis Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Best Practice Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Total (100 points possible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Unless otherwise noted, each bullet = up to 10 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The cross-cultural difference(s) to be analyzed are clearly defined in the introduction paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The specific case settings are briefly introduced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Body</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elaborate on the possible causes of the cross-cultural differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elaborate on the real consequences of the cross-cultural difference for the American work organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies taken by the American work organization in resolving the cross-cultural differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clearly and convincingly explain why the strategies have been successful or unsuccessful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong summary of the main points covered in the previous sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recommendations are made for handling such cross-cultural differences in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarity and coherence in writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. INTERCULTURAL EVENT

*Learning Objectives:*

Upon completion of this assignment, students shall be able to:

1) Identify possible problems in cross-cultural management;

2) Experiment and improve strategies to foster intercultural understanding and friendship among others;

3) Plan, implement, and follow through the cross-cultural exchange activities;

4) Facilitate high-quality intercultural communication.

*Assignment:*

1) You are required to conceive, plan and carry out an event/activity to improve the cross-cultural relations between your American friends and the Chinese guests from the listed 15.

2) Specifically, you must bring together at least 2 Chinese guests and 2 Americans who have never met before, and organize pleasant activities and interesting discussions to foster intercultural understanding and friendship (i.e. BBQ, potluck, poker game, Majiang, watching movies, having tea/coffee together, etc.).

3) You are advised to come up with a specific theme for this event so that the cross-cultural interaction among your guests will stay focused and have desired quality.

4) During the event/activity, you are required to take at least 10 pictures to showcase the event venue, the things you do together, and the general atmosphere of the cross-cultural communication.

5) Upon the completion of the event/activity, you must ask all your participants to
fill out the event flowchart as attached below and acquire their signatures.

6) You are required to scan and upload the pictures and completed pdf version of the flowcharts under the specified folder on Blackboard before the deadline 03/01.

Due Date: 03/01

Product: Upload the flowcharts completed and signed by all participants and 10 photos taken during the activity/event.
## Intercultural Event Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Best Practice Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Unless otherwise noted, each bullet = up to 10 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (100 points possible)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Participation
- At least 2 Chinese and 2 Americans (besides you) attend the events
- Participants actively contribute to the intercultural exchanges

### Interaction Quality
- All participants express their opinions or share information
- All participants understand or seek to understand others’ points
- All participants evaluate others’ viewpoints by agreeing or disagreeing
- All participants are given opportunity to elaborate on their own viewpoints or information

### Improvement Evidence
- Participants report satisfaction with the event itself and quality of the intercultural exchanges
- Participants report interests in furthering the intercultural friendship and communication

### Plus
- The event is enjoyable to most of the participants
- The event has more than 8 participants