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ABSTRACT

Universities are eager to foster global citizenship within their students, including through study abroad opportunities. However, studying abroad does not necessarily guarantee gains in intercultural competence (Paige & Vande Berg, 2012), especially for the shorter programs that have gained in popularity among university students. This chapter examines the recent literature and argues the need to nurture identity negotiation for students who choose to do part of their higher education abroad; the understanding of one’s self is a key component to intercultural competence (Deardorff, 2006). More and more study abroad providers (universities and businesses) have begun to use guided intervention during abroad programs to enhance students’ intercultural competence. With careful and intentional pedagogical design, study abroad programs can help students better understand their intercultural identity and become better global citizens.

INTRODUCTION

With the increase of globalization at governmental, economic, and social levels, universities seek to increase globalization at academic levels to better prepare students to be contributing members of an interdependent, intercultural world. Part of this preparation is increasing students’ cultural awareness and global competence, and one of the main avenues for university students to increase these areas is through studying abroad. More than 150 universities have committed to the Institute of International Education’s Generation Study Abroad initiative to drastically increase student participation in study abroad by 2020. In 2010 and 2011, respectively, President Obama launched the 100,000 Strong in China
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and 100,000 Strong in the Americas initiatives to get as many U.S. students studying abroad in China and Latin American countries by 2020. The push to immerse our students in different cultures through study abroad has become a focus for increasing this cultural competence.

Paige and Vande Berg (2012), Salisbury, An, and Pascarella (2013), and Dockrill, Rahatzad, and Phillion (2016) note that intercultural learning and development are not necessarily taking place when students go abroad. Students may return to the United States with a handful of anecdotes and some stamps in their passports but no real appreciation for cultural perspectives beyond their own. These students may have spent time living in another country, but not engaging in it. Universities have begun to realize that merely sending their students across borders does not instill the cultural awareness and global competence they seek to develop in those same students.

One of the benchmarks of positive intercultural development is a keen awareness of one’s self in the wider global context (Kim, 2000; Deardorff, 2006). This chapter argues that one of the most effective approaches for abroad students to increase their cultural awareness and global competence is with supported identity negotiation from pre-departure through re-entry. Through deliberate and effective pedagogical devices that foster identity negotiation in education abroad students, the resultant self-understanding will better aid students in meaningful global competency development and cultural adaptation. By examining the framework of study abroad’s benefits (including intercultural awareness and growth), the chapter demonstrates how the current research, when effectively drawn together, indicates that understanding one’s own identity is key to understanding other cultures and that guided intervention in abroad experiences facilitates better gains in cultural competency. With these key points outlined, the assertion for structured intervention in student identity negotiation is discussed and further supported, including the use of Personal Leadership, reflective journaling, experiential learning, and technology. The chapter concludes by outlining the implications and actions that study abroad providers and practitioners should execute as best practices for enhancing their students’ intercultural growth.

BACKGROUND

This chapter defines study abroad as the academic study of “university students who do part of their degree program requirements outside of their home university and their home country for a temporary period” (Sol, 2013, p. 25). The concept of study abroad can theoretically be traced back to ancient times when scholars would travel to neighboring countries to learn from other cultures, though the more current model of study abroad in the United States emerged in the late nineteenth century (Hoffa, 2007). According to the Institute of International Education, more than 300,000 students studied abroad in the 2013–2014 academic year, increasing from just over 190,000 ten years prior (IIE, 2015). They also report that 87% of study abroad students in that academic year were undergraduates; the research presented here focuses almost exclusively on this group of students, as does this chapter in its analysis.

Scholars have long touted the personal benefits of study abroad (Pfnister, 1972; Nash, 1976; Kauffmann & Kuh, 1984; Yachimowicz, 1987; Carlson, Burn, Useem, & Yachimowicz, 1990; Kauffmann, Kuh, Weaver, & Weaver, 1992; Miller, 1993; Sharma & Mulka, 1993; Laubscher, 1994; Drews et al., 1996; Bates, 1997; Gmelch, 1997; Thot, 1998; Dwyer, 2004a; van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005; Guerrero, 2006; Che, Spearman, & Manizade, 2009; Fry, Paige, Jon, Dillow, & Nam, 2009; Gillespie, Braskamp, & Dwyer, 2009; Cho & Morris, 2015; Ye & Edwards, 2015). From the Grand Tour of Europe to today’s multiple options for learning in different countries and cultures, study abroad has become a fixture within
higher education. With the steady annual increase in U.S. students taking advantage of educational abroad opportunities (IIE, 2015), understanding their experiences has gained more focus in academic research.

The definition of intercultural competence has been debated for decades (Deardorff, 2006; Lustig & Koester, 2000b). Deardorff (2006) sought to find a conclusive definition for theorists and practitioners. However, she observed that because intercultural interactions are so contextually dependent, the definition often takes on a very general tone. She identified attitudes (respect, openness, and curiosity) as the bedrock of intercultural competence on which an individual builds knowledge and comprehension (including self-awareness), skills, desired internal outcomes (adaptability, flexibility, ethnorelative view, and empathy), and desired external outcomes. Ting-Toomey (1999) stated that for someone to be interculturally competent, the communication must be appropriate, effective, and satisfying. Therefore, in general terms, intercultural competence can be seen as “behaving and communicating effectively to achieve one’s goal to some degree” (Deardorff, 2006, p. 244), taking into account the individual’s internal characteristics.

Like intercultural competence, scholars have deliberated the definition of identity for decades, when Erikson (1968) began the academic discussion on how people understand themselves. Sol (2013) defined identity as “the self-concept that a person possesses in understanding himself or herself in relation to other people and within the context of his or her history, culture, and unique biography” (p. 43). Lustig and Koester (2000a) discuss identity in terms of three aspects: cultural, social, and personal. Each of these aspects informs an individual’s sense of self, and is uniquely interconnected so that, like fingerprints, each individual’s identity is wholly and exclusively his or her own (Grotevant, Bosma, de Levita, & Graafsma, 1994; Ting-Toomey, 1999; Bauman, 2004; Valadez, 2007; Benwell & Stokoe, 2010).

Intercultural Identity

As these definitions suggest, intercultural competence and identity are intimately connected. Sol (2013) explains that identity is a complex entity that is “1) linked to personal contexts; 2) fluid; 3) enhanced by dissidence; 4) defined by in-groups and out-groups, 5) within present circumstance; 6) multifaceted; and 7) individually paced” (p. 46, emphasis in original). Identity can be deeply affected when a person crosses cultures and must learn to navigate in new environments, altering how a person sees herself within the wider global context. Social interactions between and among different cultural groups cause shifts, including in terms of self-concept and identity (Lee, 2011; Udrea, 2014).

Kim (2000) describes this process as a stress-adaptation-growth dynamic, which often occurs with people crossing cultures. This dynamic allows the individual to experience the dissidence within a present circumstance and personal context because of defined in-groups and out-groups inherent in crossing cultures. Adler (1982) asserts that through this dynamic an individual develops an intercultural identity. This intercultural identity does not [focus] on belongingness, which implies owning or being owned by culture, but on a style of self-consciousness that is capable of negotiating ever new formations of reality. [The person] is neither totally a part of nor totally apart from his [or her] culture; [that person] lives, instead, on the boundary (p. 391).

Kim (2000) sees this intercultural identity as one that “conjoins rather than divides” (p. 60). This idea of intercultural identity has also been referred to as “identity in-betweenness” (Yoshikawa, 1988),
“third culture perspective” (Gudykunst, Wiseman, & Hammer, 1977), and “polyculturalism” (Morris, Chiu, & Liu, 2015).

Given the goals of universities to develop interculturally competent graduates that can better work in a more globally interdependent world, a strong intercultural identity should be a key objective for students studying abroad. Ideally studying abroad will nurture this identity, allowing students to see beyond their own culture perspectives and understand themselves and others within a wider context. When properly implemented, study abroad can be a powerful medium in which to foster this.

**Intercultural Competence**

The benefits of study abroad have included qualitative and quantitative findings of the perceived and actual increases in students’ cross-cultural understanding and competence (Cho & Morris, 2015; Costello, 2015; Naka, 2016). Costello (2015) notes that study abroad affords a powerful impact, “particularly in relation to its ability to foster intercultural competence” (p. 57). Returning to Kim’s (2000) stress-adaptation-growth dynamic, the dissonance of having to effectively communicate with a foreign culture causes people to have to adapt their skills to get a positive outcome. The dynamic increases “chances of success in meeting the demands of intercultural contacts” (p. 61), as each person must negotiate through both her own perspective and the other culture’s perspective. Kim (2000) explains that as an individual’s identity develops, she experiences the individualization of identity (better understanding herself) as well as the universalization of identity (relativity of herself within the larger human context). This increased self-knowledge allows people to better appreciate others and make deliberate choices when interacting with others, no matter their culture.

Two possible factors emerge as to why this growth happens. Naka (2016) discovers that study tour participants in her targeted study were more willing to interact with diverse and global cultures and displayed increased cultural competence in customs, perspectives, and appropriate communication. The key here is the social interaction that takes place between the abroad students with their host culture. “Making connections to locals seems to be of interest and benefit to participants as it affords social interaction, leading to cultural awareness” (Costello, 2015, p. 55). The students find methods to integrate with their host communities, which continually builds on their intercultural knowledge. Understanding how these different interactions affect global and cultural development builds on the idea of cultural competence gains through education abroad; it also builds on the next factor affecting growth.

As mentioned earlier, Deardorff (2006) points out that the disagreement over what it means to be interculturally competent has led to a disagreement on how to measure it, which leads to indecisiveness on the best way to facilitate its growth; thus many people and institutions wind up doing nothing. Deardorff (2006) comments that universities’ lack of focus on developing intercultural competence within its abroad students “is due presumably to the difficulty of identifying the specific components of this complex concept” (p. 232).

**Identity Negotiation**

Holmes and O’Neill (2012) note the importance of a person’s identity negotiation process, including the recalibration and understanding of one’s self. They argue that intercultural encounters enable people to use the other culture as a mirror through which they can better consider themselves. “Individuals –
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through critical cultural awareness and reflection in action, and through relational communication with the Other – come to recognize their own identity and its boundaries, and thus to appraise their intercultural competence” (p. 716).

Studying abroad allows for this understanding and development of students’ self-concept to take place. Naka (2016) mentions the need for connections on the personal level, which engages students and increases their intercultural understanding. She believes these exchanges compel abroad students to consider their own personal lives: “Some students start to ponder an increasingly complex sense of self, including their own ethnic identity, as the process of globalization advances and the movement of people and goods intensifies” (p. 717). Laubscher (1994), Jackson (2011), Sol (2013), Udrea (2014), Lo-Philip, Carroll, Tan, Ann, Tan, and Seow (2015), Ye and Edwards (2015), and Young, Natrajan-Tyagi, and Platt (2015) concur.

This said, questions about how racial identity development might affect intercultural identity and intercultural competence in terms of study abroad is an important consideration. For non-White students, the individualization and universalization components of intercultural identity for that Kim (2000) discusses can be in different places than their White peers. Given their Otherness to White culture, they have often already faced the stress-adaptation-growth dynamic that affects intercultural identity at some level. How does this component affect how study abroad might affect further intercultural competency growth? Interestingly most of the research conducted into racial identity development and study abroad has been doctoral research (Ng, 2004; Bryan, 2005; Guerrero, 2006; Stallman, 2009; Willis, 2012; Davis-White Eyes, 2013; Sol, 2013), with academics not examining these issues beyond PhD dissertations. And while Asian/Pacific Islanders are the only non-White group to have study abroad participation at a greater proportion than their undergraduate enrollment figures, 7.7% versus 5.8%, respectively (IIE, 2015; Ginder, Kelly-Reid, & Mann, 2014), other non-White groups have steadily been increasing their study abroad participation over the past decade (IIE, 2015). The need for further investigation in this area will be discussed later in this chapter.

No matter the racial and/or ethnic identity of a student, Ye and Edward (2015) attest that, “studying abroad encourages the self-reflexivity essential for stimulating reflection, self-exploration and self-critique, and for eventually facilitating intercultural adaptation” (p. 231). Education abroad can be a transformative experience; students cannot only learn more about other cultures, but also about their own culture and their positionality within it. If higher education institutions (HEIs) want to better prepare their students in terms of intercultural adaptation and global competency, fostering intercultural identity must be a primary focus. Students will better be able to put their abroad experiences into their own personal context, increasing their ability to effectively cross cultures.

So far the chapter has argued that intercultural competence is a complex concept, but that to increase this competence, individuals must undergo Kim’s (2000) stress-adaptation-growth dynamic, which allows “the individual… likely to become more competent in making deliberate choices of constructive actions rather than simply being dictated by the prevailing norms of a particular culture” (p. 56). This shift in competence also means the development of an intercultural identity, which allows for these successful intercultural interactions to take place. Studying abroad offers one medium for the development of an efficacious intercultural identity and, in turn, intercultural competence. As the next part of the chapter will show, guided intervention offers the most effective route for the creation of an intercultural identity and intercultural competence.
GUIDED INTERVENTION

As mentioned earlier, studying abroad does not automatically mean that students will gain intercultural competence (Paige & Vande Berg, 2012; Salisbury et al., 2013). Some students may (and do) travel to another country and never have meaningful intercultural engagement. These students may surround themselves with other U.S. Americans in island programs, only be in another culture for a week or two, or fail to do any perspective taking beyond their own, none of which is conducive for the stress-adaptation-growth dynamic needed for identity negotiation to occur. Although Bruce La Brack (1993) introduced the idea of guided intervention for study abroad at the University of the Pacific in 1975, the past decade in particular has seen an increase in scholars and practitioners investigating how best to cultivate abroad experiences that allow for this growth.

The rhetoric to construct intentional abroad interventions with the focus on increasing intercultural competence has many proponents (Pederson, 2010; La Brack & Bathurst, 2012). Salisbury et al. (2013) claim “institutions must design educational sequences involving curricular and cocurricular educators to ensure that the learning potential of study abroad is ultimately realized long after they return to campus” (p. 16). The argument that La Brack and Bathurst (2012) make is that intercultural training helps students abroad to more effectively interact and function in their host cultures, while also enabling them to “learn about any culture wherever they may find themselves in the future” (original emphasis, p. 207). This is the very intercultural competence that colleges and universities want for their students to become global citizens.

When Schartner (2016) observed that intercultural competence actually decreased for her research participants during the course of their abroad experience, she acknowledged that “conscious pedagogical efforts and intentional intervention might therefore be needed [to foster intercultural competence]” (p. 13). Indeed, though longer (semester and year-long) study abroad programs are found to be more beneficial in intercultural development (Akande & Slawson, 2000; Dwyer, 2004b; Behrnd & Porlezt, 2012), “with proper interventions short-term study abroad programmes can also effectively develop the participants’ intercultural communicative competence” (Guo, 2015, p. 61). This last finding is of particular importance, because over the past decade although the percentage of students studying abroad for a semester or academic year has decreased, short-term programs of eight weeks or less have dramatically increased (IIE, 2015). These findings promise that universities can still meet their ambitions of preparing their students as global citizens with a purposeful curriculum.

Intentional Pedagogy

HEIs committed to having a deliberate pedagogy for their abroad students is not enough; the design must be appropriate to the needs of the students and the program. An island program for a small liberal arts college is going to have different needs from an exchange program for a multi-campus university. Someone traveling to a country where English is the first language has different intervention needs from a student doing a home-stay with a family who does not speak English. The development of guided intervention is not simply a matter of delivering one panacea learning object. Each situation, whether the university, the destination(s), program type, or student background, will inform how to best steer students’ intercultural learning (Milby, Rhodes, & Scott, 2016). The universities and third-party providers who do use meaningful intervention have a variety of schemes to promote intercultural competency. Outlined next are some of the pedagogical methods implemented during different abroad trips.
Lo-Philip et al. (2015) used experiential learning and anthropological tools (e.g., reflexive anthropology and auto-ethnography) to encourage intercultural competence during a six-week field school to Laos. The Singaporean students became aware of their own preconceptions and subjectivity, which in turn allowed them to understand others’ perspectives. Day-Vines, Barker, and Exum (1998) came to the same conclusion after guiding identity negotiation for U.S. students in Ghana. With the use of personal journals and small group discussions, students felt they had a better understanding of themselves and their Ghanaian hosts. Passarelli and Kolb (2012) advocate for the implementation of Experiential Learning Theory (ELT) for students abroad “because of its holistic approach to human adaptation through the transformation of experience into knowledge” (p. 138). These faculty-level designs take an inclusive approach for students to consider themselves and then place it within the larger context.

Bathurst and La Brack (2012) discuss one intervention program at the University of the Pacific that begins before students depart on their abroad experience. They must take a course prior to and upon return from their abroad experiences. The intercultural theory introduced pre-departure is implemented while the students are abroad, while the reentry course reflects on those intercultural skills and concepts used abroad and how they can be used in the future. The research has found that this program has lasting impacts on students’ intercultural sensitivity in comparison with students who do not take part in the program.

The Pacific program is but one of several intentional interventions that seek to build the intercultural competence of students. AFS Intercultural (Hansel, 2008), American University Center of Provence (Engle & Engle, 2012), the Council on International Educational Exchange (Vande Berg, Quinn, & Menyhart, 2012; Harvey, 2013), the Georgetown Consortium Project (Vande Berg, Connor-Linton, & Paige, 2009), the University of Minnesota (Paige, Harvey, & McCleary, 2012), The Scholar Ship (Medina-López-Portillo & Salonen, 2012), and Westmont in Mexico (Doctor & Montgomery, 2010) are a few of the institutions to have developed programs to promote their students’ intercultural competence. More importantly, these interventions, as well as others, have shown to increase intercultural skills that students maintain and apply throughout their lives (see also Vande Berg & Paige, 2009; Behrd & Porzelt, 2012; Holmes & O’Neill, 2012).

All of these programs ask students to be mindful of their interactions with the local culture, noting their (the students’) personal reactions, the differences in living, and what that means in the larger global context. As Passarelli and Kolb (2012) discuss, “Students develop perceptual complexity as they learn to notice detail, attend to multiple stimuli, and embrace a multiplicity of viewpoints” (p. 139). By encouraging students’ learning identities, educators can better facilitate students’ understanding of what is occurring in the environment both around and within themselves. In addition, engagement with local persons creates opportunities to have a cultural informant on the new environment, as well as to further develop multiple perspective taking. “Meaningful relationships abroad not only ease the adaptive challenge of living abroad but also facilitate transformative learning and the development of cultural competence” (Passarelli & Kolb, 2012, p. 158).

These results indicate that more universities and programs are taking to heart the need to purposefully foster intercultural competence in their students. Additionally, they show that the delivery of the intervention can take a variety of forms. La Brack (1993) advocates for a continuum on experiential learning that should not only occur while abroad, but also before departure and upon reentry. He emphasizes not only the holistic person but also the holistic experience that will take students forward into global citizenship.

Laubscher (1994) recommended a cross-cultural learning model that, like La Brack (1993), spans pre-departure orientation, abroad activities, and reentry reflection focused on 1) building in experiential
activities, 2) controlling the quality of the experience, 3) developing the appropriate skills in advance, 4) preparing for reflective observation, and 5) forcing critical thinking and reflection. Instructors should consider how the five pedagogical tactics can be incorporated not just in the classroom, but also in three other activities that Laubscher (1994) stated abroad students spend most of their time: participant observation, personal interaction, and travel. “[These] can serve as a guide in developing specific activities that are appropriate to a particular program” (p. 110).

Medina-López-Portillo and Salonen (2012) describe several theoretical frameworks used by The Scholar Ship during its two voyages, including integrative learning theory and Personal Leadership (PL). Integrative learning encourages students to take new ideas (like intercultural theory) and apply it “to new, complex situations within and beyond the campus” (p. 364). PL takes this idea a step further by inspiring mindfulness and creativity with the application of new ideas to “discern creatively the best right action at any given moment” (p. 365; see also Schaetti, Ramsey, & Watanabe, 2008). Therefore, by attending to the self, a person can act more interculturally competent.

Robinson (2012) promotes the application of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL) to guide interventions for abroad students. SOTL emphasizes teachers’ flexibility in modifying pedagogy dependent on the needs of the students; they do this by building on their and others’ knowledge of best practices to design (and redesign) more effective teaching (p. 240). One of the most effective indicators is the use of formative assessment, which allows frequent feedback on both students’ learning and the intervention’s effectiveness. With the instructor taking an active and deliberate role in students’ growth, intercultural development is not left to chance but is a conscious factor in delivery of study abroad material.

Lou and Bosley (2012) developed the Intentional, Targeted Intervention (ITI) Model from student learning and intercultural development theories and study abroad learning outcomes research. They reverse-engineered the ITI model “to allow the learning outcomes of intercultural development to drive the model’s design” (p. 335). This model showed student gains in intercultural sensitivity compared to students who did not participate in the intervention. In it, Lou and Bosley (2012) outline the steps the university, program coordinator, or faculty member should take for a successful ITI. These steps include establishing learning outcomes, identifying resources and challenges, evaluating the program and determining the most appropriate intervention, engaging abroad partners, and identifying a quantitative instrument as a teaching tool.

Lou, Vande Berg, and Paige (2012) elaborated on these steps to incorporate: identifying learning outcomes, designing the program, familiarizing one’s self with recent research on student learning abroad, deciding on the intervention, training mentors and/or instructors, and assessing. A particular program must determine what learning outcomes it wants for its students. For smaller faculty-led courses, these outcomes might be easier to determine given the limited scope of the program, such as language immersion, learning the history of a region, or examining the economic structures of a community. Faculty can then establish how intercultural competency fits within these specific contexts. Spenader and Retka (2015) discussed the application of the ITI Model to a faculty-led cohort model designed to engage students with their intercultural development by using institutionally developed learning outcomes and experiential learning. Their findings indicate that the type of experiential learning (in this study, a service model versus an excursion model) has more effect on positive intercultural development. Larger or longer programs (e.g., exchanges, semester-long island programs) have to consider how best to target intercultural competency skills for its students. As mentioned earlier, the University of the Pacific has done this with its required courses for abroad students (La Brack, 1993).
Part of designing the program itself and its accompanying intervention is the need to be familiar with recent research on student learning abroad. The way students experience study abroad now is vastly different from a decade ago. Changes are constantly occurring in higher education because of shifts in technological, economic, political, and social climates (Lou et al., 2012). These changes affect how students learn, and ensuring more effective intervention means that facilitators need to understand how best to reach their students where they are at. Working with students to understand their perceptions allows for a better systematic pedagogy to enhance the experience (Laubscher, 1994; Pedersen, 2010). This exchange can only be accomplished when the educational climate of the students is understood so that they can be made partners in their intercultural learning.

Of course, understanding the research also means that instructors need to be trained in how best to deliver it. Paige and Goode (2009) stress the importance of training international education professionals so that they themselves can foster intercultural understanding and competence in the students with whom they work. If a faculty member with 20 years’ experience teaching law decides to take a small cohort of students to another culture to learn about artistic traditions there, that faculty member needs to understand more than just art. He needs to comprehend the complexity of what it means to cross cultures for his students, the processes they are likely to experience, and how he as the facilitator can best support those students through these processes. Sanderson (2008) remarks “academic development workshops that educate staff about teaching [internationally]… are more likely to be ‘hints and tips’ sessions focused on knowledge and skills rather than about attitudinal change on the teacher’s behalf with respect to fostering a spirit of cosmopolitanism” (p. 297). Instead, Sanderson (2008) emphasizes the need to foster intercultural awareness within instructors so that they cannot only cope with these situations as they arise, but also so that they can make these situations teachable moments to develop intercultural competency.

Paige and Vande Berg (2012) concur, stating that “the presence or absence of a well-trained cultural mentor who meets frequently with students may be the single most important intervention to improve student intercultural learning abroad” (2009, p. 25). These skills require a flexibility from educators to consider their own mindset and pre-conceptions, handle ambiguity, and be open and creative to adaptation. If these traits sound familiar, they are the key skills of Personal Leadership (Schaetti, et al., 2008) mentioned as a tool used by The Scholar Ship during its voyage (Medina-López-Portillo & Salonen, 2012). The pedagogical practices used for students can be applied to their educators, preparing educators to better manage intercultural conflicts that arise and make them into developmental opportunities.

The cycle of the intentional pedagogy completes itself when the program and the intercultural intervention have been properly assessed. Understanding what is working well for students’ intercultural development and what needs to be modified ensures that the program is effectively meeting its objectives of developing intercultural competency. Although Lou et al. (2012) recommend quantitative approaches to gauge the effectiveness of these interventions, qualitative methods can also be beneficial in understanding the particular components of a model and how it is working for students. Bathurst and La Brack (2012) note that the Pacific intervention program not only facilitates intercultural competence for its students, but also acts as a feedback mechanism for the program’s effectiveness. As tweaks are made, the cycle begins anew so that as situations change, students are getting the most out of their abroad experiences, particularly by way of intercultural development.
SOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The guided interventions mentioned earlier offer exciting opportunities to facilitate students’ negotiation of an intercultural identity. Instead of simply sending students abroad to dissect their intercultural development, which really only happens for students who go abroad for eight months or more (Guo, 2015), programs can offer varying approaches to help navigate the questions that arise about one’s own identity in the context of other cultures. The options for these interventions’ designs can be crafted to meet students’ needs, as well as the program’s learning outcomes. Laubscher’s (1994) cross-cultural learning model of experiential activities, skill development, and critical reflection offers insight into some of the possibilities that universities and study abroad providers can utilize in structuring their guided intervention.

From the outset of a student learning that he will go abroad, opportunities emerge to begin the process of developing intercultural competence. Not only does a student usually begin individual research into his host country, but that student’s educator can start constructing a mindset for intercultural learning in terms of identity and competency. LaBrack (1993) described Pacific’s process (a term he very much emphasizes) for students, where the pre-departure orientation should ideally be part of a much larger undertaking which involves inculcating values and transmitting knowledge. More importantly, it should be constructed so as to encourage students to think laterally, synthesize, and make educated, intuitive leaps of imagination which serve to draw together and integrate diverse types of experience (p. 243).

The key, LaBrack (1993) stated, is to ensure that the pre-departure orientation be integrated seamlessly with the re-entry reflection where the abstract theory of the former transforms into the direct experience of the latter (p. 246). Looking at the current iteration of the Pacific course, one notes the focus not only on information about the students’ host countries, but also looks at U.S. values and assumptions, cross-cultural communication, and cross-cultural adjustment and problems (University of the Pacific Education Abroad Office, 2016). Therefore, students begin to consider their own identity (such as U.S. beliefs and customs) to prepare them for reflection during their time abroad and upon their return.

One key aspect to fostering intercultural identity is a person’s ability to self-reflect (Ting-Toomey, 1999). Becoming aware of one’s thinking processes creates a new perspective from which to understand new stimuli. This notion echoes Passarelli and Kolb’s (2012) interest in kindling students’ learner identities mentioned earlier. Houghton (2014) asserts that stimulating curiosity through pedagogical means can enhance intercultural competence by augmenting students’ mega-cognition, and their self-awareness (p. 377). Students discover how to learn, reflect, and start asking (and answering) questions about how and why they view the world the way they do.

Day-Vines et al. (1998) and Jackson (2011) found reflective journaling to be an effective method to encourage self-reflection during study abroad. Bassot (2013) discusses how journaling offers a form of experiential learning by encouraging individuals to engage in both their learning experiences and their responses (emotional and otherwise) to better understand themselves. Emotional vulnerability in study abroad settings helps students reflect on their self-understanding (Ting-Toomey, 1999). Oftentimes they will adjust their identities to deal with the discomfort in a strange setting, experiencing the stress-adaptation-growth dynamic (Kim, 2000). Journaling creates a forum for them to understand that process. Journal entries can take many forms, such as free writing, examining a critical intercultural moment,
or analyzing observations in day-to-day activities. Reflective journaling can extend students’ thinking beyond the superficial so that they can begin to examine and understand the cultural differences to which they are exposed and their reactions to those differences. More importantly reflective journaling, and reflection in general, helps individuals to not only examine their abroad situations, but also sets them up to be mindful individuals in the future (Johns, 2009).

Visual anthropology is another method through which to build intercultural competence and develop one’s self-awareness (Lo-Philip et al., 2015). By having abroad students engage purposefully with their cultural hosts to create visual relics, instructors can facilitate both the teaching of learning outcomes and the development of intercultural understanding. Experiential learning and anthropological research methods allow students to become “[more culturally sensitive and knowledgeable of the local culture and more critically aware of their own biases” (Lo-Philip et al., 2015, p. 231). They go on to encourage instructors to have a continuing dialogue to help in their reflection of self-awareness. Indeed, the Spenader and Retka’s (2015) study mentioned earlier also encourages faculty to consider the type of experiential learning to best foster intercultural growth. discussed a similar application of the ITI Model to a faculty-led cohort model designed to engage students with their intercultural development by using institutionally developed learning outcomes and experiential learning. Their findings indicate that the type of experiential learning (in this study, a service model versus an excursion model) has more effect on positive intercultural development.

Technology is another area to exploit to aid students in better comprehending their intercultural identity. La Brack and Bathurst (2012) note that with the advances in online technology over the past two decades, the opportunities for guided intervention are more plausible than ever before. Students can access online resources at convenient times for them and can take advantage of more self-paced reflection. Wooley (2013) argues that constant connection to social media may hinder some aspects for intercultural development for study abroad students. However, the digital connectedness of this generation of students means that institutions must consider how to utilize the medium to their advantage, including for students’ identity growth. Many universities are putting pre-departure orientations online to discuss not only facts about a given destination, but also to present intercultural theory to better inform students about the experiences they are about to have (Vande Berg & Paige, 2009; La Brack & Bathurst, 2012; Wojenski, 2014).

Through computer-mediated resources, options open up from which students can consider their abroad experiences, oftentimes in a medium with which they are more comfortable. Technological instruments such as social media, blogs, and virtual classrooms allow students to visually, orally, and with the written word express their struggles and adjustments in their host cultures. Lee (2011) also found that computer-mediated communication can support intercultural development, but she noted that for critical reflection to occur, students need guidance and feedback from teachers (see also Sanderson, 2008; Paige & Goode, 2009; Paige & Vande Berg, 2012; Spenader & Retka, 2015). This directed process better enables a student to self-regulate by cultivating reflective thinking. So although technology does offer a cutting-edge method to allow students to begin to order their thoughts and develop their intercultural competence, proper intervention from the instructor helps students to make sense of their thought processes and subsequent attitudinal and behavioral changes.

Upon repatriation to their home country, students continue to need support in their intercultural development (La Brack, 1993; Bathurst & LaBrack, 2009; De Moura Lohner Arouca, 2013). The idea of reverse cultural shock (or reentry shock) suggests that returning sojourners experience dissonance in readjusting to their home culture (Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963; Ward, 2001). Abroad educators have
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been aware of this phenomenon for decades and some have worked to support their returning students with meaningful interventions. This guidance can ensure that the intercultural competency gains from going abroad become firmly rooted in students’ skill set that they can utilize in their future intercultural interactions (Bathurst & LaBrack, 2009).

The University of the Pacific’s reentry course mentioned earlier has students use the intercultural theory they learned prior to departure, take their experiences from their time abroad, and reflect on how these connect; this positions students to not only make meaning of their time abroad, but also to understand how intercultural competence can be structured. Other universities also seek to engage their returning students by getting them involved with further abroad activities (recruiting students, helping with orientation for departing students, or working with incoming exchange students). The idea behind these activities is that students benefit from putting the experiences and skills they developed into action, continuing the intercultural learning beyond being abroad.

Feedback and feedforward are important components in guiding students through their identity negotiation and, in turn, their intercultural competency development. Whether using a computer, a pencil, or dialogue, study abroad practitioners, be they faculty, staff, or third-party providers, need to understand how to best implement these strategies in their particular context. As Young et al. (2015) explain, “Without better understanding of the process of identity negotiation, educators … risk being ill prepared for shifts in self-identity that accompany study abroad” (p. 178). Medina-López-Portillo and Salonen (2012) suggest that “[f]aculty with monocultural worldviews can become a hindrance for student development” (p. 379); therefore, investing in the intercultural training of these stakeholders can enhance the intercultural experience of the students.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

The research thus far has indicated the transformative power of intentional pedagogy in both enhancing students’ intercultural competence in study abroad and making that gained competence last beyond the abroad experience. Importantly, these interventions particularly aid students who partake in short-term programs, where intercultural competence does usually not occur (Guo, 2015). As seen, the options available for what these guided interventions might look like can vary greatly. These programs and new ones must rigorously be tested to ensure their suitability for use.

In particular, the support of identity negotiation, an important factor in intercultural competency development, must be understood and supported. How best can study abroad providers (be they a faculty member, university program, or third-party provider) best foster a student’s intercultural identity? Many of the intercultural competence theories and identity negotiation theories presented by Ting-Toomey (1999) can be used as a blueprint from which to start developing potential new pedagogies, much as The Scholar Ship did in developing its learning outcomes (Medina-López-Portillo & Salonen, 2012). As discussed earlier, considering the needs of various student sub-groups offers a rich area for further investigation. Research into the intercultural development needs of graduate students, as well as international students and underrepresented groups (e.g. Black and Latino students) who travel abroad, would offer more perspectives on which to build more effectively intentional pedagogy.

The idea of guided intervention in intercultural identity development is not without its limitations. Although the research results have revealed positive outcomes, several hurdles must be overcome to see the implementation of such programs universally. One of the main considerations is budget. Develop-
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ing a curriculum that fosters intercultural identity and competence means a financial commitment that might not be as feasible in today’s economic climate. Though ideally these programs would be unique to the needs of each cohort of students, most universities or third-party providers may instead want a one-size-fits-all approach that they can use. That does not mean this model cannot work, as the University of the Pacific does have such a program, which it has been adjusting since 1975. Researchers and practitioners should continue to investigate what curricular designs work best for students studying abroad in different capacities so that educators have a variety of tools from which to choose in implementing their guided interventions.

Requiring these interventions as part of the curriculum is another possible limitation. Universities in particular would have to determine if this requirement was instituted on the course level (i.e., part of a class’s learning outcomes), major, department, or university level. A course-level requirement might be more appropriate for shorter-term faculty-led programs, whereas universities could make a powerful statement about their commitment to producing global citizens by having compulsory guided interventions for all of their abroad programming. Logistically such large-scale institutional shifts do not always occur in the easiest or timeliest fashion. Committed leadership would be required to ensure such curricular changes happen.

Additionally, even with top-level leadership pushing such an agenda, resistance from certain stakeholders is almost inevitable. Students may be put off from studying abroad if they do not feel they need a particular mandated curriculum (and usually these are the students who would need such a curriculum the most). Instructors may be unwilling to undergo training to become intercultural facilitators for their abroad courses. They may not see the importance of such interventions or be in such a place in their own intercultural development that they are unable to be effective mediators in their students’ personal and intercultural journeys.

Although these possible barriers to guided intervention with regard to intercultural identity development exist, they are not insurmountable. The research shows that these interventions can greatly enhance students’ intercultural competency, and with proper guidance, abroad students can become more self-aware of their own cultural perspectives and identities, how these factors influence the ways they relate with others, and how they can adjust their behaviors to have productive and appropriate interactions with people from other cultures. In short, these interventions offer a roadmap to creating the global citizens for which higher education is so keen.

CONCLUSION

Extensive research has shown that studying abroad as part of one’s higher education experience can be transformative, particularly for those who go abroad for longer-term programs. By experiencing new cultural perspectives, students are better able to understand others as they can see their own perspectives more clearly in contrast with cultural others. This insight into a student’s self can develop into an intercultural identity, which enhances the student’s ability to navigate successfully through a milieu of cultural contexts. It is this development of an intercultural identity that has been the focus of this chapter.

More study abroad providers have been developing intentional and meaningful guided interventions in their students’ abroad experiences. These interventions have taken a variety of forms, which take students from pre-departure into the study abroad experience and through reentry. Trained facilitators (either the instructors or others) guide them through critical intercultural moments so that the students can process
their experiences to gain meaningful understanding of their own reactions and how they might adjust those reactions in the future. Whether with experiential learning activities like reflective journaling and visual anthropology or technological tools like social media or blogs, the pedagogical options can be tailored to the needs of a program’s learning outcomes or a university’s globalization goals.

If HEIs are serious about developing graduates who are interculturally aware and competent, they must consider how they can best foster these attributes in all areas of their institutions. Study abroad is itself an appropriate sphere to target to meet this goal. HEIs cannot simply rely on students going abroad and transforming into culturally competent beings, but must cultivate intentional pedagogies to assist students in understanding their cross-cultural experiences, thus developing a healthy intercultural identity and becoming effective global citizens to meet the challenges of an increasingly interconnected world.
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KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

**Guided Intervention:** A supportive encounter between the teacher and student(s) to better help them understand intercultural experiences inside and outside the classroom.

**Identity Negotiation:** The process of understanding one’s self in relation to both one’s personal context and the context of others.

**Integrative Learning:** The process of understanding information across both curricula and practical experiences.

**Intentional Pedagogy:** A deliberate teaching structure that seeks to apply experiences to learning outcomes and vice versa.

**Intercultural Competence:** The ability to better appreciate others and to accurately and appropriately make deliberate choices when interacting with others.
**Intercultural Identity**: The understanding of one’s self as a cultural being and how that self-understanding fits within different cultural contexts.

**Personal Leadership**: The ability to be aware of one’s self in mindful and creative ways to make decisions best for the individual.

**Reflective Journaling**: The writing down of one’s experiences in order to think on them and their implications and proactively improve one’s thoughts and behaviors, as well as learn how one processes information.

**Third-Party Provider**: Independent organizations that offer study abroad programs of various structures and levels of support.

**Visual Anthropology**: A subfield of social anthropology that focuses on the collection, analysis, and/or production of pictorial research data regarding a cultural group.