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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Today, one can hardly ignore the fact that the world is becoming not only inter-connected but also inter-dependent. World trade has grown considerably, and so has the number of multinational companies, the number of diplomatic missions, and world tourism (Bhawuk, 1990). This growth, however, is not limited to the economic and political sectors. Take for example the dramatic increase in international student mobility that has taken place in the last two decades. UNESCO data show that, in 1970, approximately 500,000 post-secondary students were attending universities in countries other than their own; and that by 1991, this number had increased to 1,158,906 students (in Zikopoulos, 1992).

This trend of continuous expansion in international student mobility can also be observed in this country. In 1970, 144,708 international students were enrolled in U.S. institutions of higher education; and according to figures from the Institute of International Education, in 1991/92, this number had almost tripled to another record high with 419,585 students (Zikopoulos, 1992).

When students first come to the United States, one can assume that their main goal is to pursue an education, which will hopefully “provide them with the professional, social, and personal skills required for a meaningful role in their society” (Lee, Abd-Ella, and Burks, 1981, p. x). In order to pursue such a goal, though, international students have to become involved with the daily life in this country, which will require, among other things, a change of their ingrained cultural habits. Changing habits, though, can not only be a difficult process, it may also cause them some discomfort, fear, anger, uncertainty, disorientation, and stress.
(Foust, Fieg, Koester, Sarbaugh, and Wendinger, 1981; Bochner, 1982; Saltzman, 1986; Westwood, Lawrence, and McBlane, 1986). Needless to say, international students may need a lot of support if they are to pursue their goals successfully in this country, and for that, crosscultural preparation programs can play an important role in their lives.

Many authors have attested to the importance of such programs for the newly arrived students. Althen (1990), for example, feels that orientation programs can contribute to the social as well as academic success of international students. He has found that a good program “can reduce the number of difficulties that new students might...face, and can speed their adaptation to the U.S. academic system” (p. 1). He argues that providing orientation programs for international students should be one of the main responsibilities of any institution admitting students from abroad. Westwood, Lawrence, and McBlane (1986) agree with Althen (1990). They believe that “…our first concern should be to increase the attention paid to the quality of life of the visiting student—and the critical point at which we can have a positive impact is indeed at the point of orientation” (p. 271).

The few empirical studies conducted in this area have also attested to the effectiveness of crosscultural preparation programs. Sellitz, Christ, Havel, and Cook (1963), for example, found that attending orientation programs increased social relations formed between Asian students and U.S. nationals. Similar results were also reported by Lozada (1970) who found that orientation programs encouraged personal contacts and friendships. Orientation programs were also found to increase the knowledge of international students. For example, Kimmel (1969) found that there was information gain as a result of a one week
orientation program, while Longest (1969) reported that the international students who attended the orientation program had significantly higher knowledge of the university's regulations than those who did not. Longest (1969) and Chongolnee (1978) both found that orientation programs had an effect on academic performance.

In summary, the general feeling is that crosscultural preparation programs can play an important role in the lives of newly arrived international students. These programs have been found to benefit the students by helping them meet their needs, overcome their problems, and, most importantly, by facilitating their adjustment to the host country (Lee et al., 1981).

**Statement of the Problem**

While there is no question as to the importance and benefits of crosscultural preparation programs to newly arrived international students, one cannot ignore the fact that those charged with the task of providing such programs still face many problems. First, there has not been much formal knowledge gathered about the process of preparing individuals to live in another culture (Albert, 1986). Second, the field of crosscultural preparation has a serious image problem because practitioners lack the guidance of a formal academic curriculum and credentials that other professionals have. Instead, they enter the field through the "side door" (McCaffery, 1986) by acquiring a degree in areas such as anthropology, sociology, or counseling—a fact which has certainly contributed to most individuals still seeing the field of crosscultural preparation as a "semiprofession" (Paige and Martin, 1983) at best. This situation, in turn, has led to a much bigger problem that both researchers and
practitioners have been struggling with—the inattention to the theoretical foundations that should support many aspects of the crosscultural preparation process (Paige, 1986; Steglitz, 1988), especially program design. The literature has shown that, to this date, practitioners are still “far more willing to experiment with new program ideas than they [are] to identify the conceptual and theoretical foundations of their practice” (Paige, 1986. p. 3).

Directly related to the inattention to theory regarding program design is the fact that the program models available, which could serve as guides for those developing new programs, have serious limitations. A review of the literature pertinent to the field has shown that most of the early models of crosscultural preparation were ineffective in preparing individuals to function effectively in another culture (Gudykunst, Hammer, and Wiseman, 1977). This inefficiency, as one will see later on in this study, was due to the fact that they made limited use of theoretical concepts.

In summary, those in charge of designing crosscultural preparation programs for newly arrived international students are doing so without the proper consideration of the theories and research, for that matter, that should support the program design process. Quite possibly this is due to the aforementioned fact that these practitioners lack the guidance of a formal academic curriculum and credentials that other professionals have. In addition, the program models that could serve as a guide for them in developing their own programs have serious limitations and have been found to be ineffective in preparing individuals for their crosscultural experience.
Purpose of the Study

The literature has shown that two of the main problems facing the field of crosscultural preparation are the inattention to theory regarding the program design process and the lack of effective models practitioners in the field could adopt. This study is an attempt to solve these problems by:

(1) proposing a program model which (a) integrates theoretical concepts experts have indicated to be essential in an effective crosscultural preparation program, such as learning domain, approach, and content; and (b) can serve as a guide for practitioners in the field who are in charge of developing programs for newly arrived international students;

(2) matching (a) the theoretical concepts included in the model presented, and (b) the way they ought to be sequenced against what practitioners think ought to be done in an effort to refine the model and make it more adaptable to real situations;

(3) comparing the activities included in the program model proposed here with the activities included in programs currently being offered as far as (a) the frequency with which they are offered, and (b) the way they are sequenced; and

(4) making recommendations for practitioners in the field on how to design more effective programs.
Rationale for the Study

This study was undertaken in an attempt to narrow the gap that still exists between theory and practice regarding the program design process. It is the hope of this investigator that the program model proposed here will guide not only those professionals in the field who are responsible for developing crosscultural preparation programs for the international students who come to this country in pursuit of an education but also those individuals offering or seeking training in the field of international/crosscultural education.

Research Questions

The questions addressed in this study focused primarily on the theoretical concepts the literature has identified as essential in an effective crosscultural program. They were divided in two groups: (1) questions regarding the program model proposed here, and (2) questions regarding the programs being currently offered to newly arrived international students by U.S. institutions of higher education.

Questions Regarding the Proposed Program Model

(1) *If given the opportunity to design a program for newly arrived international students in order to help them adjust to the host culture, do practitioners in the field believe it is equally important to design a program (a) focusing on cognitive, behavioral, and affective learning domains; (b) using didactic and experiential approaches; and (c) stressing both culture-specific and culture-general contents, as the experts in the field have recommended?*
(2) *Will practitioners in the field sequence their new program according to the experts' recommendations—that is, from cognitive, to behavioral, to affective; from didactic to experiential; and from culture-specific to culture-general?*

**Questions Regarding the Programs Currently Being Offered**

(3) *How does the program model being proposed here compare with the kinds of activities included in programs currently being offered? In other words are the same activities being proposed here also being implemented in programs across the country? If so, in what frequency?*

(4) *Are these activities being sequenced the same way as in the proposed model?*

The answers to these questions will help determine (1) whether or not practitioners in the field agree with what experts are recommending, and (2) how far from or how close to the program being proposed here are the programs currently being offered.

**Limitations of the Study**

Although the reading materials presented in this study will, for the most part, focus on crosscultural preparation programs in general, this study is limited to programs preparing international students to adjust to the host culture upon their arrival, which in this study will be referred to as the *initial program*. It reports the responses of 71 institutions of higher education in the United States, which offer crosscultural preparation programs in varying lengths to newly arrived international students.
Definitions

The following terms are used extensively throughout this study and will be defined as follows:

Learning Domains

Learning domains usually refer to the knowledge and skills to be learned during the program. They can focus on three areas--cognitive, behavioral, and affective--and their general purpose will be specified below.

Cognitive

Aspects of the program which focus on increasing the participants' knowledge, usually by providing them with essential information about the host culture.

Behavioral

Aspects of the program which help participants with the acquisition of behavior that is appropriate to the host culture. These programs are skills-oriented and emphasize how-to activities that prepare participants to perform effectively in the host culture.

Affective

Aspects of the program which help participants deal with the types of emotional reactions they might experience in the new environment. This kind of program is designed to help individuals, among other things, cope with the anxiety of moving into a new environment.

Approach

The approach concerns the method of instruction to be employed during the program. Two approaches have been identified here: didactic and experiential.
Didactic

The didactic approach makes use of traditional teaching activities such as lectures and presentations, with the intent of transmitting information about the host culture. It assumes that the provision of necessary information will help participants gain a better insight into the host culture, thereby facilitating their adjustment process.

Experiential

As the name implies, this approach involves learning from experience. It focuses on providing participants with skills so that they can perform effectively in the host culture.

Content

Content refers to the culture targeted during the program. Two kinds of content were addressed in this study: culture-specific and culture-general.

Culture-Specific

Culture-specific programs emphasize "emic" (Triandis, 1986) concepts, that is, concepts which are pertinent to a particular culture, and that may not be known to individuals outside that culture. The goal is to provide information as well as guidelines for interaction with members of the specific culture being targeted during the program.

Culture-General

Culture-general programs do not focus on any culture in particular. Instead, they emphasize "etic" (Triandis, 1986) or universal constructs, and the assumption is that "it is possible to give some tools to people so that they can go to any culture and be able to achieve their goals without excessive stress" (Bhawuk, 1990, p. 338).
Crosscultural Preparation Programs

These are programs designed for the purpose of preparing individuals to adjust to another culture. Two kinds of crosscultural preparation programs were considered in this study: orientation and training.

Orientation

A program designed to prepare individuals to function effectively in an unfamiliar culture by providing them with essential information about that culture. This type of program focuses on the cognitive domain, using didactic approaches, and the content is often culture-specific.

Training

A program designed to develop specific skills in the participants. It uses experiential approaches, focuses on the behavioral and affective domains, and the content, for the most part, is also culture-specific. This type of program often includes hands-on activities that supposedly help participants become more effective in the host culture.

Other Terms

Host Culture or Host Environment

The culture or country targeted in the program. In this study, it refers to the United States since the program model presented here was designed to help newly arrived international students adjust to life in this country.


**Practitioner**

An individual in charge of designing and/or coordinating crosscultural preparation programs for the newly arrived international students.

**Integrated Program Model**

A program which incorporates different theoretical concepts into the design. In the case of the model presented in this study, it incorporated learning domain, approach, and content.

**Organization of the Study**

Chapter 1 states the problem, the purpose, and the rationale for the study. It also presents the research questions, the limitations, and defines the terminology used throughout the study.

In Chapter 2, the relevant literature is reviewed. It presents the theoretical concepts pertinent to the program design process, discusses the importance of proper selection and sequencing of program activities, and reviews the early models of crosscultural preparation. A new program model is then presented.

Chapter 3 outlines the methodology used in this study in detail, while the research findings and the discussion are presented in Chapters 4 and 5, respectively. The last chapter, Chapter 6, presents the conclusions, recommendations, further limitations of the study, and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter is divided into three parts. First, selected theoretical concepts in crosscultural program design are discussed. These provide the foundation for a review of the program models presented later in the chapter. Second, the early models of crosscultural preparation programs are reviewed; and third, a new program model is suggested based on the theoretical concepts reviewed earlier in the chapter.

Theoretical Concepts in Program Design

The literature has shown that (1) adjusting to a new culture can be a difficult and overwhelming process and that (2) crosscultural preparation programs can play an important role in the lives of those trying to adjust to another culture. Providing well planned and well designed crosscultural programs, then, should be one of the main concerns of institutions admitting students from abroad; not only because these programs can reduce the number of difficulties these individuals might face but also because they can facilitate their adjustment to the host culture (Lee et al., 1981).

Designing an effective program, though, can be, to say the least, a daunting experience. Many things need to be considered, from the conceptual framework to more practical matters such as staffing and logistics. For the purposes of this study, three basic theoretical concepts associated with program design will be discussed: (1) learning domain, (2) approach, and (3) content. Consideration will also be given to the importance of proper selection and sequencing of activities throughout the program. These elements were chosen
because there is evidence in the literature that, by incorporating them into the program design, the effectiveness of such programs is likely to increase.

**The Learning Domains: Cognitive, Behavioral, and Affective**

The literature has shown that crosscultural preparation programs can focus on three domains: cognitive, behavioral and affective (Triandis, 1977; Paige and Martin, 1983).

If the goal of a program is to affect the way people think, that is, the cognitive domain, the program might be designed with the intent of increasing the participants' knowledge. This could be achieved by providing participants with essential information about the host culture. For example, in the case of a program for newly arrived international students, one might provide them with information about the appropriate seasonal clothing, on how to find an apartment off campus, how to find a school for their children, how the academic system works, what the local laws and customs are, etc. The assumption is that, if individuals have the necessary information about the host culture, they will be better able to understand that culture (Paige and Martin, 1983).

If, on the other hand, the goal is to emphasize the behavioral domain, one might design a program that focuses on the acquisition of behavior that is appropriate to the host culture (Paige and Martin, 1983). Programs that focus on the behavioral domain are skills oriented, and they emphasize how-to activities that prepare individuals to perform effectively in the host country. Examples of such activities include how to write a check, how to use a vending machine, how to take multiple-choice tests, and so forth.

If the intent is to reach the individuals' affective domain, though, a program might be
designed in a way that will help the participants deal with the types of emotional reactions they might experience in the new environment (Triandis, 1977; Paige and Martin, 1983). The program should, among other things, help them cope with the anxiety of moving into a new environment, accept differences, and develop a positive attitude toward persons and situations in the host culture.

Researchers have suggested that, in designing crosscultural programs, the ideal would be to address all three domains—cognitive, behavioral and affective—(Triandis, 1977; Paige and Martin, 1983). This way, one can fully prepare the participants for life in the new environment as it will involve "...the integrated functioning of the total organism—thinking, feeling, perceiving, and behaving" (Kolb, 1984, p. 31).

**Approaches to Crosscultural Preparation: Didactic Versus Experiential**

There are two basic approaches that can be used in crosscultural preparation programs—didactic and experiential. This is an important element to consider, especially in programs whose participants represent varied cultures, because different approaches are more or less effective depending on the individuals' cultural background. That is, those used to learning through the didactic approach may find it difficult to learn from the experiential approach, and vice versa (Triandis, 1986). The didactic and experiential approaches will be discussed separately below.

**The Didactic Approach**

The didactic approach assumes that a cognitive understanding of a culture is extremely important if one is to live effectively in that culture (Harrison and Hopkins, 1967). Many of
the early programs designed to prepare missionaries, diplomats, military advisors, business managers, and Peace Corps volunteers relied on this approach. Today, it is still the most common basis on U.S. campuses for crosscultural preparation programs for newly arrived international students.

The didactic approach makes use of traditional teaching activities (e.g., lectures, presentations, question and answer sessions, readings) with the intent of transmitting information about the target or host culture. It assumes that those delivering the program have useful knowledge and that the provision of necessary information can facilitate the participants' adjustment to the host culture.

One of the main advantages of the didactic approach is that it addresses the participants' felt need to know more about the host culture (Bennett, 1986). Furthermore, it gives them a chance to learn in familiar ways (Harrison and Hopkins, 1966), since didactic activities such as lectures and readings are common in many cultures.

Despite these advantages, it soon became clear to practitioners that the use of the didactic approach alone was not enough to prepare individuals to function effectively in a new cultural environment; first, because it was very easy to cause information overload (Mestenhauser, 1988); second, because learning took place at the cognitive level only, leaving the behavioral and affective domains unaddressed; and third, because limitations in language proficiency could affect the processing of information delivered this way.
The Experiential Approach

Researchers have found that “learning is meaningless if it is confined to merely the acquisition of facts and figures” (McCaffery, 1986, p. 169). In other words, in addition to acquiring information, one needs to know why that information is important and how that knowledge can be applied in the real world.

The experiential approach, as the name implies, involves learning from experience. It provides “opportunities for a person to engage in an activity, review this activity critically, abstract some useful insight from the analysis, and apply the result in a practical situation” (McCaffery, 1986, p. 170). The main advantages of the experiential approach are that (1) individuals are active participants in the learning process (Bennett, 1986); (2) emphasis is on provision of skills, and not simply transmission of information (Wight, 1970); and (3) it involves not only the individual’s cognitive but also the behavioral and affective domains (Gudykunst and Hammer, 1983).

The experiential approach is not without its pitfalls, though. This learn-by-doing concept is very much Anglo-Saxon, and individuals from other nationalities, such as northern and southern Europeans, Latin Americans, Asians, and Africans, have reacted negatively to it (Gamboa, 1988). For example, in designing a program in Indonesia using the experiential approach, Mestenhauser (1988) found that it “produced many doubts about effectiveness, transfer of learning value, and appropriateness for Indonesian culture, in which the learning experience is normally didactic and knowledge is commonly ‘predigested’ by others” (p. 149).

In summary, it is evident that (1) both approaches have advantages and disadvantages,
and (2) individuals might react differently to each approach depending on their cultural backgrounds—that is, those who are used to learning through lectures might find it difficult to learn through a hands-on type of activity. It is equally obvious, however, that no program designer can choose an approach that will be suitable to every participant, especially in programs where many nationalities might be represented at once. The option is, then, to incorporate both approaches in a program so that designers can attend to every participant's learning preference (Brislin and Pedersen, 1976; Paige and Martin, 1983).

The Content: Culture-Specific Versus Culture-General Programs

In addition to adopting an effective approach, any individual making a decision about the content of a crosscultural preparation program will have to face the issue of whether the program should be culture-specific or culture-general. This widely contested issue has divided practitioners in the field of crosscultural preparation and no agreement has yet been reached. Both contents will be discussed separately below.

Culture-Specific Programs

Culture-specific programs emphasize emic concepts, that is, concepts which are pertinent to a particular culture, and that may not be known to individuals outside that culture (Triandis, 1986). For example, an American going to the Middle East may find it particularly helpful to understand the way Arabs use personal space, since it differs considerably from the way space is used by North Americans.

---

1 Personal space refers to the way individuals unconsciously structure the space immediately surrounding the physical body. This space is usually determined by the individuals' cultural background. For example, in Middle Eastern countries, being close enough to breathe on another person is proper; however, the same cannot be said for North Americans who tend to prefer greater distances between themselves and others (Hall, 1973).
Programs which emphasize culture-specific content, as the name implies, tend to focus on a particular culture, and the goal is to provide information as well as guidelines for interaction with members of that culture (Brislin and Pedersen, 1976). Examples of topics included in culture-specific programs include eating habits, religious customs, etiquette in personal interaction, and decision-making styles.

Researchers like Roth (1969) and Triandis (1968) have long attested to the importance of culture-specific programs. In describing his own personal experience, Triandis (1968) wrote:

I was born and raised in Greece, but I have lived for more than half of my life in North America. Furthermore, I was exposed to heavy doses of several other cultures in the form of German teachers during my first decade, a French high school during my second decade, and a brief exposure to an Italian high school during the second World War occupation of Greece. (pp. 57-58)

Despite this extensive crosscultural experience, he recalled experiencing culture shock while visiting Calcutta, India. His conclusion was that one's experience with one culture may not necessarily be carried over to another, which, in his opinion, only reinforced the necessity for culture-specific programs.

Such programs are not without problems, though; first, because a program that emphasizes culture-specific content "can deceive the learners into thinking that they are much better prepared for the experience than they actually are" (Paige, 1986, p. 138); and second, just having individuals go through the program does not guarantee that they have a full understanding of the host culture—which some authors argue may never be accomplished (Rhuly, 1976; and Downs, 1969). Take for example a very common approach to culture-specific programs—a list of do's and don'ts appropriate for a stranger in the host
culture. Researchers have argued that it would not only be impossible to prepare a list that is comprehensive enough to include all possible situations that individuals could be involved with during their stay in the host country, but that it would be even more impossible for the newly arrived individual to remember the entire list or apply it appropriately.

**Culture-General Programs**

As an alternative, culture-general programs emphasize etic, or universal, constructs (Triandis, 1986). They allow individuals to learn about themselves as cultural beings in preparation for interaction with individuals from any other culture (Brislin and Pedersen, 1976). The belief is that “it is possible to give some tools to people so that they can go to any culture and be able to achieve their goals without excessive stress” (Bhawuk, 1990, p. 338). Concepts common in this type of program include adjustment, culture shock, perception of differences, ethnocentrism, empathy, self-awareness, and the influence of culture on one's own behavior. These concepts are said to be “…equally if not more important than information about cultural specifics” (Paige, 1986, p. 138). Proponents of culture-general content include, among others, Stewart, Danielian, and Foster (1969). They argue that

...it is insight into one's own values and assumptions that permits the growth of a perspective which recognizes that differing sets of values and assumptions exist (i.e., cultural relativism), and development of the potential for greater understanding of another culture. (p. 7)

The main advantage of this kind of program is that the information received can be generalized to other cultures and situations (Triandis, 1986). However, the effectiveness of culture-general programs is also limited. First, these programs tend to be very time consuming since they focus on increasing the participants' awareness of how culture influences
behavior (Roth, 1969; Rhuly, 1976; Gudykunst and Hammer, 1983). Another problem is that individuals are left to feel their way through many of their first contacts with the host culture. "That is, [they] may have no idea of what behaviors to avoid, until [they] have discovered them—often through trial and error" (Rhuly, 1976, p. 33). This is often the case because the content of this kind of program is not directed towards one particular culture, as is the case of culture-specific programs.

In summary, like many other issues in the field of crosscultural preparation, there is a lack of agreement on the type of content to include in crosscultural programs. Many authors have argued, though, that neither type of content alone is effective, and that the ideal program should emphasize both culture-specific and culture-general activities (Brislin and Pedersen, 1976; Gudykunst, Wiseman, and Hammer, 1977; Gudykunst, Hammer, and Wiseman, 1977; Hammer, Gudykunst, and Wiseman, 1978; Gudykunst and Hammer, 1983; Bennett, 1986; and Paige, 1986).

The Importance of Proper Selection and Sequencing of Activities

Whatever their approach in designing a crosscultural program, those in charge have a vast array of activities to choose from, such as lectures, small-group discussions, critical incidents, role plays, simulation games (e.g., Contrast-American, BAFA-BAFA, The Owl, The Albatross), suggested readings, culture assimilators, and activities that promote interaction with members of the host culture. These and others are the subjects of extensive literature which program designers can refer to, such as Brislin and Pedersen, 1976; Batchelder and
Warner, 1977; Weeks, Pedersen and Brislin, 1977; Casse, 1979; Hoopes and Ventura, 1980; Pusch, Patico, Renwick, & Saltzman, 1981; Blake and Heslin, 1983; Triandis, 1986; Bhawuk, 1990; and many others.

There are many factors, though, which a program designer should consider when selecting activities for a crosscultural preparation program. One of the first is the fact that some activities are better for achieving certain goals than others, depending on the learning domain focused on (Gudykunst and Hammer, 1983; Paige and Martin, 1983; Bennett, 1986). For example, lectures are said to be very effective if the goal is to affect the participants’ level of knowledge (cognitive domain). On the other hand, if the goal is to affect the participants’ feelings (affective domain), a role play, where participants have a chance to deal with all the anxiety associated with being in a new environment, might be preferred.

Another factor that needs to be considered is the degree of involvement that activities require from program participants, which will vary from low to high depending on the learning domain focused upon. Lectures and readings, which focus on the cognitive domain, are *low involvement* types of activities. They use the didactic approach and their main function is to increase the participants’ knowledge at the same time that they generate interest and allow participants to become more comfortable with the program staff (Brislin, 1989). Simulations and role plays, on the other hand, are *high involvement* activities. They focus on the behavioral/affective domains while providing participants with a learn-by-doing experience. Researchers have agreed that well planned programs should include both types of activities—low involvement as well as high involvement—since they serve two different but
equally important purposes. That is, the low involvement activities will provide participants with necessary knowledge about the host culture, while the high involvement ones will provide them with opportunities to apply that knowledge.

Directly associated with the degree of involvement required by program activities are the risks of failure and self-disclosure these activities pose for program participants (Paige and Martin, 1983). Researchers have found that certain activities are inherently more risky than others, especially the ones that require a higher degree of involvement from participants, such as role plays and simulation games. That is because these activities not only are more experiential in nature and may sometimes require the performance of unfamiliar behavior (i.e., risk of failure) but also because they may require, among other things, the public expression of emotions (i.e., risk of self-disclosure), which may be very hard to accomplish depending on the participant's cultural background. Program designers, then, need to give this factor special consideration mainly because program participants may react negatively towards these high risk activities, which may not only result in hostility towards the host culture but quite possibly inhibit rather than promote learning.

To this point, one has seen that, depending on the learning domain focused upon, the approach used should change, and so should the degree of involvement required by the activities as well as the kinds of risk they pose for program participants. That is why the sequencing of activities throughout the program should be given careful consideration by those planning crosscultural preparation programs. Some researchers (Paige and Martin, 1983) have noted that certain activities are inherently more risky than others, especially those that require a higher degree of involvement from participants. These high risk activities may not only result in hostility towards the host culture but may also inhibit rather than promote learning. Program designers, then, need to give this factor special consideration.

---

2 According to Dodd (1982), some cultures value emotional expression while others, such as Asians and Scandinavians, do not.
1983, Gudykunst and Hammer, 1983; Kohls, 1987; Bennett, 1986) feel that programs should start with activities that focus on the cognitive domain, move towards the behavioral, and conclude with those that target the affective domain. Possibly they suggest this order because the activities that target the cognitive domain (e.g., lectures, informational meetings) use the didactic approach and tend to be less involving; consequently, they are more likely to pose lower risks of failure and self-disclosure for the participants. On the other hand, the activities that focus on the affective domain are more experiential in nature, requiring a higher degree of involvement from participants, which will inevitably pose higher risks of failure and self-disclosure for them. Their belief is that, by starting with more familiar and less personally threatening activities and planning the high involvement/high risk activities for later stages of the program, designers can "build a solid level of trust among the [participants] and can establish a social climate that is conducive to more intensive learning" (Paige and Martin, 1983. p. 55).

The Early Models of Crosscultural Preparation

The literature has shown that there have been many schools of thought about the ways one could prepare individuals to live in another culture. There were those who believed that this could be done in a classroom setting, while others believed that the best way to prepare individuals for the host culture would be by helping them experience it. Some argued that helping participants become aware of their own culture provided the best lessons; and yet others argued that the best way to do it was by helping them understand culture in general and
the way it influenced their behavior. Depending on the school of thought, different program models were designed.

It is beyond the scope of this study to review all the early models of crosscultural preparation; therefore, only four are reviewed here: (1) the University model, (2) the Area Training model, (3) the Self-Awareness model, and (4) the Cultural Awareness model. The theoretical concepts presented earlier in this chapter, such as learning domain, approach, and content, will be used as a framework to review these models. In addition, consideration will be given to the degree of involvement and kinds of risks posed by the activities included in these models.

**The University Model**

Also known as the Classroom or Intellectual model, the University model has been one of the most traditional models of crosscultural preparation. It was based on the assumption that a cognitive understanding of the host culture was essential if individuals were to perform effectively in the new environment. This type of program targeted culture-specific content, emphasized cognitive goals, and used didactic approaches. Because of that, its activities tended to be less involving, thus posing lower risks of failure and self-disclosure for program participants (Bennett, 1986). This was the model of choice of early Peace Corps programs, and today it is still very much used by the military, U.S. government aid organizations, business, and institutions of higher education admitting students from abroad. In this model, individuals literally sat down in a classroom and received information about the host country and culture through lectures, assigned readings, media presentations, and other
means (Dawns, 1969; Warren and Adler, 1977; Brislin, Landis, & Brandt, 1983).

According to Bennett (1986), the advantages of the University model were:

1. Staffing was relatively easy since area experts were readily available.
2. Participants could easily relate to the way information was presented since it very likely matched their previous educational experiences (e.g., lectures).
3. It addressed the participants' need to learn more about the host country.

However, it soon became clear that the University model did not adequately prepare individuals for the crosscultural experience. That was because the focus was mainly on the provision of information and not really on teaching participants how to interact effectively with host nationals or how to deal with unfamiliar situations. In other words, with this model, learning took place at the cognitive level only, leaving the behavioral and emotional (affective) levels unaddressed (Gudykunst and Hammer, 1983).

**The Area Training Model**

Developed in response to the limitations of the University model (Harrison and Hopkins, 1967), the Area Training model targeted culture-specific content, emphasized affective goals, and used experiential approaches. Its activities were more involving, posing higher risks of failure and self-disclosure for program participants (Bennett, 1986). Also known as the "Area Simulation" model, it actually simulated the physical environment to which participants were assigned. For example, the Peace Corps tended to look for places with climate, topography, and other features similar to the places its volunteers were assigned. For this reason, those who were to be sent to Latin America were trained in Puerto Rico,
while those going to West Africa received their training in the Virgin Islands. The assumption behind this model was that participants would be better able to adjust to the host culture if they had lived in an environment that resembled it in as many ways as possible (Gudykunst et al., 1977).

Advantages of the Area Training model were:

1. Activities were centered around program participants and not, as in the University model, around those delivering the program.
2. It was based on problem solving skills rather than transmission of information.
3. It took place at a site that simulated the host country (e.g., similar weather and environment).
4. Participants learned to cope with stress and to adjust to new situations (Bhawuk, 1990).

Despite these advantages, there were many limitations to the Area Training model. For example, it was difficult, if not impossible, to construct a perfect simulation of the host country (Gudykunst and Hammer, 1983). Furthermore, the model provided merely an illusory experience of living in the host culture because simulations were limited to the scenery and climate only while all the other aspects of the host culture, such as social, political, and interpersonal factors, were virtually ignored. Finally, the model was costly and time consuming. Very few individuals had the time and money to spend weeks in intensive residential training abroad (Bennett, 1986).
The Self-Awareness Model

Also known as the Human Relations model, the Self-Awareness model stressed culture-general content, as opposed to the University and Area Training models, and focused on the affective domain (Bennett, 1986). In addition, its activities were more experiential in nature, requiring a higher degree of involvement from program participants and posing higher risks of failure and self-disclosure for them as well. The underlying assumption here was that individuals who understood themselves better would be better able to understand their culture and, consequently, would be more effective in another culture (Gudykunst et al., 1977).

The main advantage of the Self-Awareness model was that it was capable of achieving affective goals without the use of a simulated physical environment (Foster and Danielian, 1966). However, the model also had its limitations, the main one being the fact that it was built on American values, such as equality, openness, individuality, and directness, which were not necessarily shared by individuals from a different cultural background (Bennett, 1986).

The Cultural Awareness Model

While in the Self-Awareness model the emphasis was on the individual self, in the Cultural Awareness model, "emphasis [was] on cultural insight, with individual awareness an expected byproduct" (Bennett, 1986, p. 127). It too stressed culture-general content, targeted the affective domain, and used experiential approaches, requiring a high degree of involvement from program participants, and consequently, posing higher risks for them as well.

The underlying assumption behind this model was that culture plays an important role in the way individuals think, act, and behave. Once individuals understood their own culture
and how it differed from others, crosscultural interaction would become more effective. Proponents of this model included Harrison and Hopkins, 1966; Stewart, 1966, Downs, 1969; and Pusch et al., 1981.

The advantage of the Cultural Awareness model was that it moved "from educating individuals to recognize their own values, to analyzing contrasts with other cultures and finally to applying the insights gained to improving the effectiveness of interaction" (Bennett, 1986, p. 127). Activities common in this model included the Contrast American (Stewart, 1966); Intercultural Communication Workshop (Hoopes and Ventura, 1979); and Alfred Kraemer’s (1973a, 1973b, 1974) Cultural Self-Awareness technique.

While few authorities in the field of crosscultural preparation would dispute the value of the Cultural Awareness model, they also would not deny the fact that this model had its limitations, which ranged from the complexity of some of the activities used (e.g., Contrast American), to the western cultural bias of others (e.g., Intercultural Communication Workshop).

To sum up, four of the early models of crosscultural preparation were reviewed here (University, Area Training, Self-Awareness, and Cultural Awareness), using the theoretical concepts presented earlier in this chapter as a framework. Analysis shows, among other things, that they each focused on a single learning domain, approach and content (see Table 1), and because of that, researchers felt that none of these early models alone was sufficient to fully prepare individuals to function effectively in another culture (Gudykunst et al., 1977). The solution was then to integrate all these elements, that is, cognitive, behavioral, and
affective learning domains; didactic and experiential approaches; and culture-specific and culture-general contents into the program design. Other researchers who concur with this suggestion include Foster and Danielian (1966); Stewart et al., (1969); Gudykunst et al. (1977); Batchelder (1978); Newmark (1979); and Bennett (1986).

Table 1. Breakdown of the early models of crosscultural preparation by the theoretical concepts adopted and the degree of involvement/risk posed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical Concepts, Involvement and Kinds of Risk Posed</th>
<th>Program Models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Area Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning domain:</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach:</td>
<td>Didactic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content:</td>
<td>Culture-Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement/Risk:</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An Integrated Model of Crosscultural Preparation

To this point, the literature has shown that (1) inattention to theory, coupled with the lack of effective models that practitioners could follow, has been one of the biggest problems facing the field of crosscultural preparation (Paige, 1986; Steglitz, 1988); and (2) that an integrated approach to crosscultural preparation, where different theoretical concepts are built into the program design, seems to be a more satisfactory way to prepare individuals to
function effectively in the host culture (Foster and Danielian 1966; Stewart, Danielian, and Foster 1969; Gudykunst et al. 1977; Batchelder 1978; Newmark 1979; and Bennett, 1986). The program model being proposed in this study—hereafter called the Integrated Model—was designed with these two premises in mind; that is, it is theory-based and integrated in nature.

Theoretical Concepts Adopted

Three theoretical concepts were included in the Integrated Model: (1) learning domain, (2) approach, and (3) content. These concepts were chosen because there is evidence in the literature that incorporating them into a program might increase its effectiveness. This model also expands on the early models of crosscultural preparation reviewed earlier in this chapter as it proposes the integration into the design of cognitive, behavioral, and affective learning domains; didactic and experiential approaches; and culture-specific and culture-general contents (whereas most of the early models incorporated a single learning domain, approach, or content into the program as one can see in Table 1).

The Integrated Model encompasses all three learning domains because, in this way, participants can be fully prepared for life in the new environment since the focus is on not only their thinking but also their behaving, feeling, and perceiving (Triandis, 1977; Paige and Martin, 1983; Kolb, 1984). It uses both didactic and experiential approaches because, in this way, program designers can attend to every participant's learning preference (Brislin and Pedersen, 1976; Paige and Martin, 1983; Triandis, 1986). As far as the inclusion of both types of content, it calls for the use of culture-specific content because, in this way, participants can receive not only important information about the host culture but valuable
insights into that culture as well. At the same time, it proposes the inclusion of culture-general content because this focuses on, among other things, promoting self-awareness and understanding of the way culture influences one's own behavior, which can be valuable tools in helping individuals understand different cultures (including the host culture).

**Selection and Sequencing of the Activities**

In addition to integrating different learning domains, approaches, and contents, in the Integrated Model special consideration was given to the way activities are selected and sequenced throughout a program. Selecting and sequencing activities properly is important because:

1. some activities are better for achieving certain goals than others, depending on the learning domain focused on; and
2. depending on the learning domain focused on, the approach used will change, and so will the degree of involvement these activities require from program participants, as well as the kinds of risks they pose for them.

That is why experts have suggested that the activities to be included in a program should be sequenced from those that focus on the cognitive domain to those that focus on the behavioral to those that focus on the affective domain (Paige and Martin, 1983; Gudykubst and Hammer, 1983; Bennett, 1986; Kohls, 1987).

As for the sequencing of the activities on the basis of their content, researchers suggested that, ideally, culture-specific activities should be offered before culture-general
ones. That is because the former are supposed to help individuals become more effective in the host culture, while the latter are designed to help individuals adjust to any culture. The assumption here is that functioning effectively in the host culture is a priority of any newcomer.

Ten different activities were suggested to be included in the Integrated Model. They were chosen not only because they represented the theoretical concepts investigated in this study but also because they would give participants a chance to learn through different learning formats (Gudykunst and Hammer, 1983), which, in addition to being stimulating for program participants, could also be an effective way for them to deal with the "mid-point fatigue" (Brislin, 1989, p. 454) they might experience during a program. The activities selected, followed by a brief description of the reasons why they were selected, are as follows:

**Reading Materials**

They can deal with a wide variety of topics, either in-depth or in a nuts-and-bolts format. They are ideal to provide program participants with much needed knowledge about the host country.

**Lectures/Informational Meetings**

They tend to be very convenient because the message is transmitted by a live source, who can not only repeat points for clarification purposes but also skip information deemed too elementary for the audience.
Videos/Film/Slides

They can inform at the same time that they provide program participants with vivid images of life in the host country.

Group Discussions

The audience can play a more active role as members discuss ideas or problems being considered.

Panel Presentations

Ideal for a more in-depth discussion of certain topics or problems since they tend to be delivered by individuals who have expertise in a certain area or issue.

Field Trips/Tours

Ideal to familiarize program participants with their new surroundings.

Outings to Cultural Events

They can be an enjoyable and entertaining way for participants to learn about the host culture.

How-To Activities

They can provide participants with the skills necessary to function effectively in the host culture.

Role Plays/Simulation Games

They can be instrumental in sensitizing participants to important issues, as they usually evolve around a difficult situation participants might face in the new environment.
Social Events that Promote Interaction

They give program participants a chance to interact with host nationals (e.g., practitioners, faculty and other staff from the hosting institution, or volunteers) in a friendly setting. It is an ideal way to make the newly arrived participants feel welcome but also to show them that they matter to the institution.

Figure 1 demonstrates how these activities are sequenced throughout the Integrated Model, in conjunction with the theoretical concepts they represent. The program starts (bottom of the page) with activities that focus on the cognitive domain and use the didactic approach, such as readings, lectures, and informational meetings. That is because these activities require a low degree of involvement from program participants, thus posing lower risks of failure and self-disclosure for them. As one moves further into the program, and the focus changes towards the behavioral and then the affective domains, the activities progressively assume a more experiential nature, thereby increasing the degree of involvement they require and, as a consequence, the risks they pose for program participants. That is why activities such as role plays, simulations, and social events that promote interaction are offered only in later stages of the program. They tend to be more experiential in nature, increasing the degree of involvement and the risks they pose for participants (see Table 2 for a list of the activities included and their characteristics).

Summary of the Integrated Model

The Integrated Model is based on the following principles:

1. It integrates into the design theoretical concepts the literature has shown to be
Learning Domain

Sample of Activities
10. Social Events
9. Role Plays/Simulations
8. How-to Activities
7. Outings to Cultural Events
6. Field Trips/Tours
5. Group Discussions
4. Panel Presentations.
3. Videos/Films/Slides
2. Lectures/Informational Meetings
1. Reading Materials

Figure 1. Multidimensional Model of crosscultural preparation
Table 2. Breakdown of the activities according to their conceptual characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Learning Domain</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Degree of Involvement</th>
<th>Degree of Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Reading materials</td>
<td>cognitive</td>
<td>didactic</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lectures/Informational meetings</td>
<td>cognitive</td>
<td>didactic</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Videos/Films/Slides</td>
<td>cognitive</td>
<td>didactic</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Group discussions</td>
<td>cognitive-behavioral</td>
<td>didactic-experiential</td>
<td>low-moderate</td>
<td>low-moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Panel presentations</td>
<td>cognitive-behavioral</td>
<td>didactic-experiential</td>
<td>low-moderate</td>
<td>low-moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Field trips/Tours</td>
<td>cognitive-behavioral</td>
<td>didactic-experiential</td>
<td>low-moderate</td>
<td>low-moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Outings to cultural events</td>
<td>cognitive-behavioral</td>
<td>didactic-experiential</td>
<td>low-moderate</td>
<td>low-moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 How-to activities</td>
<td>behavioral</td>
<td>experiential</td>
<td>moderate-high</td>
<td>moderate-high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Role plays/Simulations</td>
<td>behavioral-affective</td>
<td>experiential</td>
<td>moderate-high</td>
<td>moderate-high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Social events that promote</td>
<td>affective</td>
<td>experiential</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The content of these activities can be both culture-specific and culture-general.*
essential for an effective program.

2. It expands on the early models of crosscultural preparation as it suggests the integration into the design of cognitive, behavioral, and affective learning domains; didactic and experiential approaches; and culture-specific and culture-general contents.

3. Special consideration is given to the way activities are selected and sequenced throughout the program. The program starts with those activities that focus on the cognitive domain, and use the didactic approach. That is because these activities require a lower degree of involvement from program participants, and consequently, pose lower risks of failure and self-disclosure for them. It then moves progressively towards the behavioral and the affective domains which stress more experiential types of activities, requiring, in this way, a higher degree of involvement for program participants, and, consequently, posing for them higher risks of failure and self-disclosure. It is important to notice here that the cognitive activities are more prevalent that the behavioral and affective activities. As for the sequencing of the activities on the basis of their content, the model suggests that culture-specific activities come before culture-general ones. That is because the former are supposed to help individuals become more effective in the host culture, while the latter are designed to help individuals adjust to any culture. The assumption made here is that functioning effectively in the host culture is a priority of any newcomer.

4. It encompasses characteristics of both crosscultural orientation and training programs and the rationale for that follows.
Crosscultural Orientation and Training

When one looks at the terms employed to denote the general purpose of programs preparing individuals to live in another culture, some variation is evident, such as "orientation", "training", "education", and "briefing". For the purposes of this study, only orientation and training will be considered as possibly relevant descriptors.

Orientation generally implies "acquainting [others] with the existing situation or environment" (Batchelder, 1978, p.4). This type of program is designed to prepare individuals to function effectively in an unfamiliar but fully developed culture by providing them with essential information about that environment (Bennett, 1986). It focuses on the cognitive domain, using didactic approaches, and the content is usually culture-specific since it tends to examine primarily the host culture. Examples of activities included in orientation programs include lectures, suggested readings, lists of "do's and don'ts", and informational meetings. These are generally activities that require a low degree of involvement from program participants at the same time that they pose low risks of failure and self-disclosure for them. Bennett (1986) characterizes orientation as "the 'who, what, when and where' of the preparation period" (p. 118), which she considers essential but certainly not sufficient to ensure effectiveness in the host country.

---

Some researchers consider "education" and "briefing" as methods of crosscultural preparation (Gudykunst and Hammer, 1983; Bennett, 1986; Kohls, 1987). However, with regards to "education," Bennett (1986) has found that, when asked, most individuals in charge of delivering programs believe that, one way or another, they are always involved in educating participants, by helping them apply what they have learned in the new environment. In fact, the belief is that this should be an essential part of any program preparing individuals to adjust to the host country. As far as "briefing" is concerned, it is designed to provide essential information about an organization, topic, place or situation, in a limited time frame (Kohls, 1987). Since this, in a sense, overlaps with the overall purpose of orientation, the assumption here is that briefings can be one of the many techniques used in any program designed to acquaint participants with the host environment.
Training, on the other hand, goes one step beyond orientation by focusing on developing specific skills in the participants (Kohls, 1987). It uses experiential approaches, focuses on the behavioral and affective domains (Gudykunst and Hammer, 1983), and the content, for the most part, is also culture-specific (though not exclusively). Training programs include, among others, hands-on activities that supposedly will help participants become more effective in the host country. Such activities tend to require a higher degree of involvement from participants, thereby increasing their risks of failure and self-disclosure.

Both orientation and training have been shown to be effective ways of crosscultural preparation, but neither is better than the other. Researchers have found that both types of programs have strengths, weaknesses, and applicability, with each one being of value when the conditions are appropriate. So those in charge of developing programs preparing individuals for their crosscultural experience should understand the differences between both types of programs and then combine them creatively and effectively (Kohls, 1987), as in the case of the Integrated Model being proposed here.

Summary

The literature review conducted in this study showed that:

1. Adjusting to a new culture can be a difficult and complex process.

2. Crosscultural preparation programs can play an important role in the lives of those trying to adjust to another culture (e.g., newly arrived international students). These programs can, among other things, reduce the number of difficulties these individuals
might face and facilitate their adjustment to the new environment as well.

3. Among the main problems those in charge of developing crosscultural preparation programs have to face are (a) the lack of guidance of a formal academic curriculum and credentials that other professionals have, which, in turn, has led to the inattention to theory regarding the program design process; and (b) the lack of effective models practitioners in the field can adopt when developing their own programs.

4. An integrated approach to crosscultural preparation, where different learning domains, approaches, and contents are designed into the program seems to be a more effective way to prepare individuals for their crosscultural experience.
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

Population and Sample

Description of the Population

The target population in this study consisted of 621 U.S. institutions of higher education enrolling at least 100 international students during the 1989/90 academic year. This was the only criterion used to select these institutions, and the assumption made here was that, if these institutions were admitting students from abroad, some kind of crosscultural preparation was being provided to them in order to facilitate their adjustment to the host culture.

Sampling Frame and Geographical Area

All participating institutions were selected from the annual census of international students in the United States, published in the book *Open doors 1989/90: Report on international educational exchange* (Zikopoulos, 1990). The book provided, among other information, the international student enrollment by institution during 1989/90 in each state in the continental United States, as well as Hawaii, Alaska, and the various protectorates. Institutions from all 50 states, then, as well as the District of Columbia\(^1\), were selected to take part in this study provided they met the criterion of having at least 100 international students enrolled during the 1989/90 academic year.

---

1 Although Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were listed in the census, institutions from these places were not selected to take part in this study.
Sampling Procedure

Sample Size

Due to prohibitive costs and to time constraints, a decision was made to gather information on 20% of the population, that is, 124 institutions. The belief was that this sample, which was assumed to be representative of the population, would be sufficient to attain the objectives of this investigation.

Sampling Technique

In order to select the sample used in this investigation, first, for identification purposes, each member of the target population was assigned a code number. Next, these institutions were separated into nine groups according to the size of the international student population. Group A contained all the institutions which had between 100 and 500 students, while group I represented the institutions with over 4000 students (see Table 3 for the frequency of institutions in each category).

Once these institutions were separated into groups, different sampling techniques were used in order to ensure participation from all the groups. Institutions from the largest group, which contained between 100 and 500 students, were selected through simple random sampling. On the other hand, institutions enrolling between 501 and 2,500 students were selected through proportional allocation according to the size of the international student population. All the institutions enrolling more than 2,500 international students were included in this study due to their limited numbers (11 out of 621). (See Table 3 for the number of institutions selected from each group and the corresponding response rate).
Table 3. Use of institutions in the population and sample when categorized by the number of international students enrolled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Institutions in Each Group</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Sampled from Each Group</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Dropped from the Study</th>
<th>Completion Rate from Each Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 100-500</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 501-1000</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 1001-1500</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 1501-2000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 2001-2500</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 2501-3000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 3001-3500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 3501-4000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I over 4000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Results from the questionnaire indicated that 14 institutions had a different international student enrollment than expected. As a result, these institutions were reassigned to a different group, depending on the actual number of international students they indicated having. One of these institutions had fewer than 100 international students enrolled by the time the questionnaires were received. Despite the fact that 100 was the cut-off number, this institution was not dropped out of the study as it provided an initial orientation program that met the criterion established for this study.

Completion Rate

Out of the 124 institutions originally chosen to take part in this study, seven were dropped out of the study either because the program they offered involved both international and American students, or because they did not offer a crosscultural preparation program at all. The sample size was then dropped to 117 institutions. Of these, 71 responded to the questionnaire, which corresponded to a final response rate of 61%.
Research Procedures

The Instrument

Data from this study were obtained from a questionnaire (see Appendix A) containing three parts. Part I was designed to test whether those in charge of developing crosscultural programs would agree with the experts' recommendations by integrating different theoretical concepts into a program designed to help newly arrived international students adjust to life in the United States. It contained six possible goals (representing the theoretical concepts investigated in this study), and respondents were asked to indicate (1) how important it would be for them to implement each of these goals in a new program, and (2) in what chronological order they would implement them.

Part II of the questionnaire was designed to compare the program model proposed here (the Integrated Model) with what is actually being offered to international students when they first come to this country. It listed the same activities which were suggested in the Integrated Model, for which respondents were asked to indicate (1) whether these activities were currently part of the program their institutions were offering, and (2) if they were part of the program, in what part of the program—beginning, middle, or end—they were being implemented. This way, in addition to finding out which activities are commonly used in programs across the country, one could also find out whether these activities were being implemented in the sequence recommended by experts in the area of crosscultural preparation.

Part III of the questionnaire was designed to provide descriptive information about the institutions as well as some demographic information on the respondents.
Preliminary Revisions and the Pilot Study

The questionnaire used in this study was revised twice before it was mailed to the selected sample. The first draft was revised by the members of the researcher's graduate committee, who suggested certain refinements.

After these preliminary revisions were made, the second draft of the instrument was pretested with a small sample of the population, and for that, 21 institutions, representing groups A (16), B (2), C (1), D (1), and F (1), were selected through simple random sampling. No institutions from groups E, G and H were used in the pilot study; in addition, none of the piloted institutions were included in the full study. The purposes for conducting this pilot study were: (1) to test for clarity or ambiguity of instructions and the questionnaire items; (2) to determine completion time; and (3) to seek the respondents' suggestions on ways to improve the instrument.

As a result of the pilot study, the following changes were made to the questionnaire:

Part II – Activities

(a) The option "on-going program" was added in order to make sure that practitioners distinguished between activities offered during an initial program and those offered during an on-going program.

(b) The term "assigned", which was being used to categorize the reading materials distributed during the initial programs, was replaced by the term "suggested". So, Activity 9 became "Suggested Readings" instead of "Assigned Readings".

(c) Films/Videos were added to the list of activities included in this study.
Part III - Descriptive information about the institutions

(a) In question five, dealing with who was involved in delivering the initial program, the category "from outside your office" was included so that a clear distinction could be made between those individuals from within the international student office who helped in delivering the initial programs, and all the other university staff and administrators who were also involved in this process.

After these changes were made, approval from the Human Subjects Review Committee at Iowa State University was obtained (see Appendix B).

Validity and Reliability Measures

A system of judges, comprising the researcher's Ph. D. committee and the respondents of the pilot study, was used in order to determine the content validity of the instrument used in this study. In order to measure the internal consistency of the items used in this instrument, the questionnaire's internal reliability was calculated, with the reliability coefficients varying from .8943 to .9955 (see Table 4 for a complete list).

The Mailing Packet

The final version of the questionnaire was mailed to the international student office in each of the participating institutions. The questionnaires were addressed to the director of the office, who was asked through a letter to forward the questionnaire to the staff person in his/her office in charge of crosscultural preparation programs. Each one of the mailing packets contained:
Table 4. Reliability coefficients of the questionnaire items used in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficient (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Importance of goals</td>
<td>.9290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1</td>
<td>.9460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2</td>
<td>.9888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3</td>
<td>.9831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4</td>
<td>.9837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 5</td>
<td>.8943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 6</td>
<td>.9916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 7</td>
<td>.9854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 8</td>
<td>.9493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 9</td>
<td>.9955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 10</td>
<td>.9789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) A letter to the director of the office (see Appendix C) explaining the purposes of the research and asking him/her to forward the instrument to the appropriate staff in the office (in case he/she was not the one in charge of programs);

(b) A cover letter addressed to the respondent (see Appendix D) explaining the purposes of the study and assuring confidentiality of the data;

(c) A questionnaire (see Appendix A), which was coded to identify individual respondents and to facilitate follow-up procedures; and

(d) A self-addressed, stamped envelope.

**Follow-Up Techniques**

Respondents were given approximately ten days to return the questionnaire. In order to increase the response rate, five follow-up techniques were used:

1. A week after the established deadline, a postcard/reminder was sent to all the
institutions which had not returned the initial mailing. This postcard was addressed to
the attention of the staff person in charge of orientation for international students in
the hopes that it would get to him/her faster, without having to pass through the hands
of the director of the office first.

2. Two weeks after the first postcard/reminder was sent, a second postcard was mailed
to those who had not yet sent their responses.

3. A week after the second postcard was sent, a phone call was made to all those
individuals in charge of orientation in each of the institutions which had not yet
responded to the questionnaire. In case that individual could not be reached during
the first try, a message was left, or a second phone call was made later on. This phone
call helped establish (1) whether the questionnaire had been received or if a second
mailing was necessary, and (2) whether the respondent was still willing to participate
in the study.

4. Those individuals who indicated having lost or misplaced the questionnaire but were
still willing to participate received a second copy of the questionnaire immediately
after the phone call was made. A total of 13 second copies were sent; of those, 10
were completed and sent back to the investigator.

5. Finally, three weeks after the phone call was made and a second copy of the
questionnaire was mailed to those individuals who had requested one, a final
postcard/reminder was sent to all the institutions which had not yet responded to the
questionnaire. By this time, these individuals had already received at least two
postcards/reminders and a phone call.

Figure 2 summarizes the increase in response rate after each follow-up. Results show that the highest increase occurred after the first follow-up, which increased the response rate from 28% to 40%. On the other hand, the final reminder seemed to have been the least effective follow-up, as it increased the response rate by only 3%.

Figure 2. Frequency of total response and percentages for initial mailing and follow-ups
Data Collection and Analysis

The data collected from the returned questionnaires were coded and used to construct a data file with which to run statistical analyses by means of the SPSS statistical package (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). WYLBUR, a text editing and job entry program available at the Iowa State University Computation Center, was used as a communication facility for the Computation Center. In the data analyses, descriptive statistics were used, as the objective here was merely to summarize the information gathered from the questionnaires.
CHAPTER 4. RESEARCH FINDINGS

This chapter is divided into seven parts. In the first two, the questions posed in this study, which focus not only on the model being proposed here but also on the programs currently being offered, will be answered. In Part III, an analysis of the activities being offered in the initial programs will be presented. The theoretical concepts they focus on, the frequency with which they are offered, and when they are offered in the course of the programs will serve as basis for this analysis. In Part IV, these same activities will be compared for the kind of content—culture-specific or culture-general—they target, while Part V will provide general information about the institutions, the kinds of programs they offer, and the respondents. Part VI will compare the Integrated Model with programs being offered across the country in terms of the total number of activities included; Part VII, on the other hand, will provide a more in-depth analysis of the topics covered through all the activities these programs are offering.

Part I - Questions Regarding the Proposed Program Model

Question 1

*If given the opportunity to design a program for newly arrived international students in order to help them adjust to the host culture, do practitioners in the field believe it is equally important to design a program (a) focusing on cognitive, behavioral, and affective learning domains; (b) using didactic and experiential approaches; and (c) stressing both culture-specific and culture-general contents, as the experts in the field*
Part I of the questionnaire was designed to investigate whether those in charge of developing crosscultural programs for newly arrived international students would follow recommendations from the experts in the field of crosscultural preparation, by designing cognitive, behavioral, and affective learning domains; didactic and experiential approaches; and culture-specific and culture-general contents into a program. It contained six possible goals, representing different learning domains, approaches, and contents, for which respondents were asked to use a five-point Likert-type scale to indicate how important it would be for them to implement each goal in a new program they were being asked to develop. Table 5 lists the goals, the labels they were assigned (for clarity purposes), and the theoretical concepts they represented.

Results from the questionnaire indicated that most respondents felt most goals to be very important (see Table 6), with two exceptions: goal six, which proposed helping students develop an insight into the host culture, was found only somewhat important by 43.3% of the respondents; and goal two, which focused on helping the students adjust not only to life in this country but also to life in any other country or culture to which they might choose to go, was rated neither important nor unimportant by most of the respondents (34.3%).

**Question 2**

*Will practitioners in the field sequence their new program according to the experts' recommendations—that is, from cognitive, to behavioral, to affective; from didactic to experiential; and from culture-specific to culture-general?*
Table 5. List of goals and the corresponding theoretical concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Assigned Label</th>
<th>Learning Domain Focused On</th>
<th>Approach Used</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To prepare the newly arrived international students to deal with the emotional changes they may undergo in adjusting to the host culture</td>
<td>Emotional Changes</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Culture-Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To prepare the newly arrived international students to adjust not only to life in this country but also to life in any other country or culture to which they may choose to go</td>
<td>Adjustment to different countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To provide the newly arrived international students with essential information about the host culture</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Didactic</td>
<td>Culture-Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To help the newly arrived international students develop a positive attitude towards the host culture and host nationals as well</td>
<td>Positive Attitude</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Culture-Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To provide the newly arrived international students with opportunities to acquire skills that will be appropriate to the host culture</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Culture-Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To help the newly arrived international students develop an insight into the host culture.</td>
<td>Insight</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Didactic</td>
<td>Culture-Specific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Importance ratings of individual goals with frequencies and percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Number and Label</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Neither Important Nor Unimportant</th>
<th>Somewhat Unimportant</th>
<th>Totally Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Emotional changes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(54.4)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(29.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adjustment to different countries</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(10.4)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(26.9)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Information</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(73.5)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(8.8)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Positive attitude</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(37.7)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(31.3)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Skills</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(43.3)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(32.8)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Insight</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(38.8)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(43.3)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After indicating how important it would be for them to implement each goal in their program, respondents were asked to rank all six goals indicating the order in which they would implement them over time, with number one being used for the goal to be implemented first, and number six for the goal to be implemented last. The purpose here was to find out whether practitioners would sequence their program from cognitive, to behavioral, to affective; from didactic to experiential; and from culture-specific to culture-general. Results will be reported, first, by comparing all six goals together; and second, by grouping these goals according to the theoretical concepts they represented.

**Order of Implementation of All Goals Together**

When considering all six goals together, the following order of implementation was expected:

- Goal 3 (Information) and/or 6 (Insight), followed by
- Goal 5 (Skills), followed by
- Goal 1 (Emotional changes) and/or 4 (Positive attitude), followed by
- Goal 2 (Adjustment to different countries)

In other words, the cognitive goals (numbers 3 and 6) were expected to be implemented before the behavioral goal (number 5), which should then be followed by the affective goals (numbers 1 and 4). Results found here, though, showed that the sequence cognitive-behavioral-affective was not followed in practice (see Table 7 for the order of implementation of all goals together), indicating the possibility that practitioners might not be basing their sequencing decisions on theory, as they should.
Table 7. Ranking of the goals according to their mean order of implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Goal Number</th>
<th>Assigned label</th>
<th>Learning Domain</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Mean Implementation Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Didactic</td>
<td>Culture-Specific</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Emotional Changes</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Culture-Specific</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Culture-Specific</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Insight</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Didactic</td>
<td>Culture-Specific</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Positive Attitude</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Culture-Specific</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adjustment to many countries</td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture-General</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Order of Implementation According to the Learning Domains Represented

When looking at the mean order of implementation of the goals after grouping them according to the learning domain they focused on, results showed the following: if the goals which focused on the cognitive domain were implemented first, as recommended by the experts as well as by the respondents, there would be no difference in the preferred order of implementation between the goals that focused on the behavioral and affective domains (see Table 8). Here again, the order of implementation practitioners would apply does not totally coincide with that of the experts in the field.
Table 8. Ranking of the goals according to the learning domains they represented and their mean order of implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Goals Represented</th>
<th>Learning Domain</th>
<th>Mean Implementation Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3, 6</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>2.71&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1, 4</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>3.43&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Mean represents the average of both cognitive goals
<sup>b</sup> Mean represents the average of both affective goals

**Order of Implementation According to the Approaches Represented**

The assumption made in this study was that the activities that focused on the cognitive domain used a didactic approach, while those that focused on the behavioral and affective domains used a more experiential approach. When looking at the mean order of implementation of the goals according to the approaches they used, results showed that, as expected, the goals which stressed the use of the didactic approach would indeed be implemented before the ones which stressed the experiential approach (see Table 9).

Table 9. Ranking of the goals according to the approaches they represented and their mean order of implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Goals Represented</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Mean Implementation Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3, 6</td>
<td>Didactic</td>
<td>2.71&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1, 5, 4</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>3.43&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Mean represents the average of goals using the didactic approach
<sup>b</sup> Mean represents the average of goals using the experiential approach
**Order of Implementation According to the Contents Represented**

In addition to representing different learning domains and approaches, it was assumed that goals one, three, four, five, and six represented culture-specific content, as they focused on the host culture. When looking at the mean order of implementation of the goals based on the kind of content they represented, results showed that preference was for the culture-specific goals to be implemented before the culture-general one (i.e., goal two), thus confirming the experts' recommendations (see Table 10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Goals Represented</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Mean Implementation Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, 3, 4, 5, 6</td>
<td>Culture-Specific</td>
<td>3.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Culture-General</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean number represents the average of all culture-specific goals

**Part II - Questions Regarding the Programs Being Currently Offered**

This study was conducted not only to test the model proposed here but also to compare it with programs being currently offered cross the country as far as (1) the kinds of activities they offer, and (2) the way these activities are sequenced throughout these programs.

**Question 3**

*How does the program model being proposed here compare with the kinds of activities included in programs currently being offered? In other words, are the same*
activities being proposed here also being implemented in programs across the country? If so, in what frequency?

Ten activities were included in the Integrated Model proposed here: (1) distribution of reading materials, (2) lectures/informational meetings, (3) videos/film/slides, (4) panel presentations, (5) group discussions, (6) field trips/tours, (7) outings to cultural events, (8) how-to activities, (9) role plays/simulation games, and (10) social events that promote interaction. They were chosen not only because they represented the theoretical concepts investigated in this study but also because they would give participants a chance to learn through different learning formats (Gudykunst and Hammer, 1983), which, in addition to being stimulating for program participants, could also be an effective way for them to deal with the "mid-point fatigue" (Brislin, 1989, p. 454) they might experience during a program.

Part II of the questionnaire listed the ten activities described above for which respondents were asked to indicate, among other things, whether they were currently part of the programs their institutions were offering to the newly arrived international students. When comparing these activities with the activities being currently offered in programs across the country, results showed that some of them were more frequent than others. For example, lectures/informational meetings, which focus on the cognitive domain, were one of the most frequent activities; role plays and simulations, on the other hand, which focus on the behavioral-affective domain, were among the least offered (see Table 11). This, in a sense, agreed with the Integrated Model, which predicted that the cognitive activities would be more prevalent than the behavioral and affective ones.
Table 11. Frequencies, valid responses, and percentages of total responses on the activities offered during the initial programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Offering Each Activity During the Initial Program (n=71)</th>
<th>( f )</th>
<th>valid responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lectures/Informational meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>(86.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How-to Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>(73.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>(61.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field trips/Tours</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(60.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social events that promote interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(59.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>(55.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>(41.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videos/Films</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>(39.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outings to cultural events</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(22.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role plays/Simulation games</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(17.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 4**

*Are these activities being sequenced the same way experts in the area of crosscultural preparation have recommended?*

In the Integrated Model special consideration is given to the way activities are sequenced throughout the program. Proper sequencing of the activities is important because, depending on the learning domain focused upon, the approach used will change and so will the degree of involvement that the activities require from program participants, as well as the kinds of risks they pose for them. So, in addition to indicating whether the activities proposed here were currently part of the program their institutions were offering, respondents were also asked to indicate in what part of the program—beginning, middle, or end—each one of them was being offered. The purpose here was not only to find out which of the suggested
activities were being offered in the different programs but also if they were being sequenced in the way experts in the area have recommended, that is, from those that focus on the cognitive domain, to those that focus on the behavioral, to those that focus on the affective domain. Results for each of the activities will be presented separately below in descending order of implementation. The learning domain they focus on, the approach they use, the degree of involvement they require, and the types of risks they pose for participants will be used as a framework to present these results. An analysis of all the activities according to the content they represent will then follow.

Part III - Activities

Lectures/Informational Meetings

By far, lectures/informational meetings were the most frequent activity included in initial programs for newly arrived international students (86.8%). The topics they covered ranged from health related issues, the most frequent type of lecture, to survival and social/relationship issues, the least frequent (see Table 12 for a complete list).

Lectures and informational meetings focus on the cognitive domain and use the didactic approach, requiring a low degree of involvement from participants, and posing low risks of failure and self-disclosure for them as well. For these reasons, experts in the field of crosscultural preparation have recommended that they be offered at the beginning of the program, and results found here showed institutions to be following this recommendation, for the most part.
Table 12. Frequencies, valid responses, and percentage of topics covered by different activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics Covered</th>
<th>Lectures/ Informational Meetings</th>
<th>How-to Activities</th>
<th>Group Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>vr</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic/Student-life issues</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(60.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Health related issues</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(69.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Immigration and other legal issues</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(60.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Campus resources/Opportunities/Services</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(39.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Miscellaneous issues</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(14.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Banking/Financial issues</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(12.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Housing issues</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(20.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Adjustment/Culture shock</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(10.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. American culture/Values</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Transportation issues</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(10.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Safety/Security issues</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(25.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Social/Relationship issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Other crosscultural issues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Area resources/Opportunities/Services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(11.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Shopping</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(6.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Survival</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Orientation related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Telephone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Food issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* See Table 2 for a list of the theoretical concepts represented by each activity

*b* For examples of materials on each of the topics covered, see Appendix E

*c* Valid responses

*d* See Appendix E for examples
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Materials</th>
<th>Panel Presentations</th>
<th>Audiovisual Materials</th>
<th>Role Plays/Simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>vr</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>(46.2)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(22.7)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>(3.1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(12.1)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(19.7)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(10.6)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>(6.2)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(4.5)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(10.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>(4.7)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(12.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(7.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(4.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>(3.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 lists the topics covered during the lectures/informational meetings offered, and the timing during the program they were mostly offered. Results showed that out of the 16 topics covered during this activity, seven were offered at the beginning of the program (health issues, immigration and other legal issues, safety/security issues, housing, banking/financial issues, adjustment/culture shock, survival), while four were offered at the beginning as well as at some other time during the initial program (academic/student life issues, area resources/opportunities/services, transportation, shopping).

How-To Activities

Over 70.0% of the institutions investigated offered how-to activities during their initial orientation for newly arrived international students. Examples of topics these activities covered included banking, housing, survival, immigration matters and others (see Table 12 for a complete list of the topics covered and their frequencies). Most of the how-to activities offered focused on academic/student life issues (46.0%), followed by those focusing on banking/financial issues (40.3%). The least frequent topic covered dealt with adjustment/culture shock, being offered by only 3.0% of the institutions.

How-to activities focus on the behavioral domain, use the experiential approach, and require a moderate-to-high degree of involvement from participants, thus posing moderate-to-high risks of failure and self-disclosure for them. The recommendation, then, is that they be implemented after activities that focus on the cognitive domain, and results found here confirmed this recommendation. Most of the how-to activities offered during the initial programs were indeed implemented in the middle of the programs (10 out of 13), with 2 out
Table 13. Timing during the programs when the topics were offered more frequently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics Covered</th>
<th>When Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lectures/ Informational Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B  M  E  O*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.  Academic/Student-life issues</td>
<td>X         X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.  Health related issues</td>
<td>X         X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.  Immigration and other legal issues</td>
<td>X       X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.  Campus resources/Opportunities/Services</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.  Miscellaneous issues a</td>
<td>X         X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.  Banking/Financial issues</td>
<td>X         X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.  Housing issues</td>
<td>X         X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.  Adjustment/Culture shock</td>
<td>X         X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.  American culture/Values</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Transportation issues</td>
<td>X         X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Safety/Security issues</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Social/Relationship issues</td>
<td>X         X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Other crosscultural issues</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Area resources/Opportunities/Services</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Shopping</td>
<td>X         X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Identification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Survival</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Orientation related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Telephone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Food issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  B: Beginning of the program
   M: Middle of the program
   E: End of the program
   O: More than once during the program

b  See Appendix E for examples
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>When Offered</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong></td>
<td><strong>Panel</strong></td>
<td><strong>Audiovisual</strong></td>
<td><strong>Role Plays/ Simulations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B M E O</td>
<td>B M E O</td>
<td>B M E O</td>
<td>B M E O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Field Trips/Tours

Sixty percent of the institutions investigated in this study offered field trips/tours to newly arrived international students. Six kinds of tours/trips were identified in this study (see Table 14), with the most frequent being campus tours (42.9%), and the least frequent being tours of museums and institutes (12.9%).

Field trips/tours focus primarily on the cognitive domain, use a didactic-experiential approach, require a low-to-moderate degree of involvement from participants, and pose low-to-moderate risks of failure and self-disclosure for them. The expectation is, then, for these activities to take place at the beginning of the program, but results found here showed that tours took place not only at the beginning but also at the end, as well as more than once throughout the programs (see Table 14).

Group Discussions

The fourth most common type of activity, group discussions, were offered in 61.8% of the institutions investigated. Thirteen topics were identified in this study (see Table 12) and results showed that group discussions on academic/student life issues were among the most frequent (32.3%), while those on transportation issues were among the least frequent (1.5%).

Group discussions focus primarily on the cognitive domain, use a didactic-experiential approach, requiring a low-to-moderate degree of involvement from participants, and posing low-to-moderate risks of failure and self-disclosure for them. For these reasons, experts have
Table 14. Frequency, valid responses, percentage, and timing of places visited during field trips/tours offered during the initial programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Places Visited</th>
<th>Institutions Offering Each Trip/Tour</th>
<th>When Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>vr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Campus</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. City/Surrounding communities</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other points of interest</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stores/Shopping areas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Useful places</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Museums/Institutes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 For more details on the places visited, see Appendix E
2 Valid responses
3 B: Beginning of the program
   M: Middle of the program
   E: End of the program
   O: Offered more than once during the program

recommended that they be offered at the beginning of the program; however, results found here showed that most of the group discussions were offered in the middle of the program, contrary to the experts' recommendations. The only group discussions that were offered at the beginning of the programs were the ones focusing on academic/student life issues, on other crosscultural issues, and on health-related issues, the latter being also offered in the middle of the programs (see Table 13).

Social Events

Over 59.0% of the institutions investigated included social events, such as picnics, receptions, and dinners, as part of their initial program for newly arrived international students. Table 15 shows that, out of all the social events included, picnics were the most
Table 15. Frequency, valid responses, percentage, and timing of social events offered during the initial programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Events</th>
<th>Institutions Offering Each Event</th>
<th>When Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>vr²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Picnics</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Receptions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dinners</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dances and parties</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other social events</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Luncheons</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 For further examples, see Appendix E
2 Valid responses
3 B: Beginning of the program
   M: Middle of the program
   E: End of the program
   O: Offered more than once during the program

Social events that promote interaction with host nationals tend to focus on the affective domain and are experiential in nature. Furthermore, they require a high degree of involvement from participants, posing high risks of failure and self-disclosure for them. For these reasons, experts have recommended that they take place at the end of the programs, and results found in this study supported such a recommendation. Most of the social events were indeed offered at the end of the programs, with the exception of luncheons, which took place at the beginning; and receptions, which took place both in the middle and at the end of the programs (see Table 15).
**Reading Materials**

Thirty-eight institutions, that is, 55.1%, distributed reading materials during their initial programs. These covered 14 different topics (see Table 12), with materials focusing on academic/student life issues being one of the most frequent.

Reading materials focus on the cognitive domain, use the didactic approach, require a low degree of involvement from program participants, and pose low risks of failure and self-disclosure for them. The appropriate timing then for these materials to be distributed is at the beginning of the program, and results from this study confirmed this expectation. Materials on most of the topics covered were indeed distributed at the beginning of the programs; the only exception being materials on the American culture and values, which were mostly distributed at the end of the programs (see Table 13).

**Panel Presentations**

About 41.0% of the institutions investigated included panel presentations in their initial programs for newly arrived international students. Examples of topics covered included immigration and legal matters, banking issues, and health related issues (see Table 12 for a complete list). Results showed that panel presentations on academic/student life issues were by far the most frequent, being offered by 25.0% of the institutions; on the other hand, panel presentations on safety/security issues were offered by only 1.5%.

Like group discussions, panel presentations focus on the cognitive-behavioral domain and use a didactic-experiential approach, requiring a low-to-moderate degree of involvement from program participants, and posing low-to-moderate risks of failure and self-disclosure for
them. The recommendation is, therefore, for them to be offered at the beginning of the programs, but results found here showed that they were not only offered in the beginning but also in the middle and at the end (see Table 13).

**Videos, Films and Other Audiovisual Materials**

About 40.0% of the institutions investigated showed audiovisual materials during their initial program for international students. These materials focused on, among others, academic issues, such as phone registration, as well as on health, safety, and housing issues. Here again, materials focusing on academic/student life issues were among the most frequently offered, followed closely by those focusing on adjustment (see Table 12).

Audiovisual materials focus on the cognitive domain, use a didactic approach, require a low degree of involvement from participants, and pose low risks of failure and self-disclosure for them. The recommendation by the experts is that these materials be presented to participants at the beginning of the program, and results found here partially confirmed this expectation. Audiovisual materials on academic/student life issues, health, and housing issues were mostly shown at the beginning of the programs. In addition, materials on immigration were shown equally at the beginning and in the middle of the programs, much like videos on adjustment, which were shown both at the beginning as well as at the end of the programs (see Table 13).

**Outings to Cultural Events**

Only 22.7% of the institutions investigated included outings to cultural events as part of their initial program. Three types of events were attended: art events (the most frequent), sports events, and other cultural events, such as a Martin Luther King Day celebration.
This type of activity focuses on the cognitive-behavioral domain and uses a didactic-experiential approach, requiring a low-to-moderate degree of involvement from those attending the events, as well as posing low-to-moderate risks of failure and self-disclosure for them. The recommendation is, then, that they take place in the beginning of the programs; however, results found here did not confirm such expectation as none of the institutions investigated scheduled them for the beginning of their programs. As Table 16 shows, cultural events were scheduled either for the middle or for the end of the programs, with a few institutions scheduling them more than once.

Table 16. Frequency and timing of cultural events during the initial programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Event</th>
<th>Institutions Including Each Event</th>
<th>When Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>vr²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Art events</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other cultural events</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sports events</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ For examples of events attended from each category, see Appendix E
² Valid responses
³ B: Beginning of the program
M: Middle of the program
E: End of the program
O: Offered more than once during the program

Role Plays or Simulation Games

Out of all the institutions investigated, only 17.1% offered role plays or simulations during their initial programs. Table 12 summarizes the topics covered by these activities, and results showed that, of the topics covered, role plays and simulations on social/relationship
issues and on other cultural issues were among the most frequently offered.

Role plays and simulations tend to target the behavioral-affective domain. Furthermore, they make use of the experiential approach, require a moderate-to-high degree of involvement from program participants, and pose moderate-to-high risks of failure and self-disclosure for them. Therefore, the recommendation is that they be included in the later stages of the programs, and results found here indicated that most of the institutions offered them in the middle or at the end of their programs. Role plays and simulations on two of the topics (relationship issues and on academic/student life issues), though, were offered at the beginning of the programs, contrary to what had been expected. (See Table 13 for the timing of all the role plays and simulations offered.)

Part IV - Analysis of the Activities According to the Content They Represent

The literature has shown that program activities can be either culture-specific or culture-general in content. Culture-specific activities focus on a particular culture, in this case, the host culture, with the intent of providing information as well as guidelines for interaction with members of that culture (Brislin and Pedersen, 1976). Culture-general activities, though, are just the opposite. They are “tools” (Bhawuk, 1990) which not only help individuals understand culture in general but also facilitate performance and interaction, regardless of where these individuals go or the cultural background of those they have to deal with. Researchers have agreed that an effective crosscultural program should include both culture-specific and culture-general activities. In the case of a program for newly arrived
international students, for example, participants will not only be able to understand the host
culture and interact effectively with host nationals, but they will also be able to deal effectively
with individuals from other cultural backgrounds they might come in contact with.

Part II of the questionnaire contained ten activities which, in addition to focusing on
different learning domains and using different approaches, could also stress different contents.
A content analysis of these activities revealed that six out of the ten did include topics
focusing on both kinds of content, though the culture-specific topics were far more prevalent
than the culture-general ones. These activities were (1) panel presentations, (2) videos and
films, (3) how-to activities, (4) lectures/informational meetings, (5) role plays and simulations,
and (6) group discussions. Much to the surprise of this investigator, no culture-general
reading materials were distributed during the initial programs. Of all the topics these activities
covered, only three were culture-general in content, and they dealt with health issues (e.g.,
stress control), cultural adjustment, or other crosscultural issues, such as stereotypes.

In Table 17 a display of the culture-general topics covered within each activity is
shown. Results showed that while 28.6% of all the role plays and simulations offered dealt
with culture-general topics, only 0.7% of the how-to activities included were culture-general
in nature.

As for the timing during the initial program when the culture-general topics were
covered, the expectation was that programs would deal with culture-specific issues first, and
then offer the culture-general ones. Since only a small percentage of the activities were
culture-general in nature, there was not much basis for a comparison here. However,
Table 17. Frequency, valid responses, and percentage of culture-general topics covered within each activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Role plays/Simulations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Group discussions</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Panel presentations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lectures/Informational meetings</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Audiovisual materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How-to activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A frequency count of all the culture-general activities indicated that most of these activities (22 out of 54) were offered in the middle of the initial program, while 15 were offered in the beginning and 14 were offered at the end.

Part V - General Information About the Institutions Investigated, the Programs Being Offered, and the Respondents

Part III of the questionnaire was designed to gather information about the institutions in general and the respondents as well as other supplemental information about the programs being offered, such as how long they lasted and who was involved in delivering them.

When looking at the size of the student population, for example, the number of students attending these institutions (excluding international students) ranged between 1,500 and 57,232 students; while the size of the international student population ranged between 120\(^1\) and 4,000. Great variance was also noted when comparing their yearly budget for the initial program. While one institution indicated having a $7,000 budget for such a purpose,

---

\(^1\) One institution indicated having fewer than 100 students.
eight of them indicated having to work with a zero budget. In addition, five institutions indicated they had $100 to work with, four had $500, while four others had a $1,500 budget.

For the most part, these programs were attended by undergraduate (98.6%), graduate (84.5%), and special students (53.5%). Other individuals who attended these programs included students of English language courses (31.4%), visiting scholars (31.0%), spouses (30.0%), parents (18.6%), and immigrants (15.7%).

A variety of individuals was involved in delivering these programs, both from inside and outside the respondents' offices. When looking at the number of full-time foreign student advisers (FSA) involved, for example, 59.7% of the programs (40 out of 67) were delivered by one full-time FSA, while 3.0% of them (2 out of 67) were delivered by five full-time FSA. Five institutions, though, indicated having no full-time FSA delivering their programs (their programs were delivered by part-time FSA only). The number of part-time FSA involved ranged from zero to three. More than 73.0% of the institutions investigated (51 out of 69) had no part-time FSA on their staff, one institution indicated having three, while 13 institutions had only one.

In addition to FSA, results found here indicated that most institutions had other individuals involved in delivering their programs. From inside the respondent's office, for example, the number of additional staff involved ranged from no additional staff at all (which meant the programs were delivered by FSA only) to 25 additional staff, such as directors, assistant directors, receptionists, graduate assistants, insurance clerks, immigration specialists,

---

2 One of these institutions had three part-time FSA while the other four had only one. Their international student population ranged from 172 to 1,600 students and the programs they offered lasted between half a day to three days.
orientation group leaders, secretaries, and program coordinators, among others. Table 18 lists the number of additional staff in the different institutions who were involved in delivering their initial programs. Despite the wide range, results showed that, in most cases, only one additional staff member from the office was involved in such a task, eight institutions had three, while one institution had 25.

Table 18. Frequency and percentage of individuals other than Foreign Student Advisers involved with the initial programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Additional Staff Involved</th>
<th>Number of Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, respondents indicated that a number of individuals outside their offices, including school administrators, were involved in delivering their initial program. These individuals ranged in number from zero (9 out of 57 institutions) to 75\(^3\) (1 out of 57);

\(^3\) Most of these individuals were volunteers.
however, results found here indicated that 47.4% of the institutions investigated had between one and five individuals from outside the international student office involved with their initial programs. Among these were academic advisors, deans, nurses, police officers, Immigration and Naturalization officials, as well as staff from offices such as Financial Aid, Health Center, Admissions, Women's Center, Tutorial Center, Registrars, Legal Services, etc.

Participating institutions were divided in their use of volunteers. While about 50.0% of the institutions (32 out of 63) did not use volunteers in their programs, about 49.0% of them (31 out of 63) did. Of these, about 35.0% (11 out of 31) used between one and two volunteers, 32.0% (10 out of 31) used between three and five, 16.0% (5 out of 31) used between seven and 10, while another 16.0% (5 out of 31) used between 15 and 50 volunteers.

International students who had been in this country for a while were also among the individuals helping deliver the programs for the newly arrived students. Although 40.0% of the institutions investigated (26 out of 65) did not include these students among the individuals delivering their programs, 60.0% (39 out of 65) did. The number of volunteer international students used varied from two (3 institutions) to 50 (2 institutions), with seven institutions (highest frequency) indicating they used five of these students during their initial programs.

Faculty members were also among the individuals helping deliver the initial program to the newly arrived international students, although their numbers were considerably smaller (between 1 and 15) compared to the number of volunteers used. Results indicated that about 44.0% of the institutions (28 out of 64) included faculty members during their initial
programs; of these, 28.6% (8 out of 28) used one faculty member, and 21.4% (6 out of 28) used five. Only one institution reported having used 15 faculty members in their initial program.

Table 19 shows the number of institutions which offer an initial program during each term. Results showed that all the institutions which responded to this questionnaire item offered a program in the Fall, about 67.0% of them offered it in the Spring, and roughly 25.0% of them offered it in the Winter and Summer terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Institutions Offering the Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Valid cases: 62
\(^b\) Valid cases: 68
\(^c\) Valid cases: 64
\(^d\) Valid cases: 69

In addition to indicating when their institutions offered a program, respondents were asked to indicate the length of these programs. Results found here indicated that, despite the wide range in duration (between less than a day to more than 20 days), a higher number of programs seem to have lasted between less than a day to between one and two days in all four terms (see Table 20). No attempt was made to differentiate school calendars that were
Table 20. Frequency of institutions offering different-length programs across all terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of the Programs</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Not offered at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Less than a day</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Between 1 and 2 days</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Between 3 and 4 days</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Between 5 and 6 days</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Between 7 and 8 days</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Between 9 and 10 days</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Between 11 and 12 days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Between 13 and 14 days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Between 15 and 16 days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Between 17 and 18 days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Between 19 and 20 days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. More than 20 days</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 62  68  64  69

based on semester or quarter systems.

When asked whether or not there was a fee for individuals to attend the initial program their institutions were offering, 81.2% (56 out of 69) of the respondents said no, while 18.8% (13 out of 69) said yes. A more in-depth investigation into the fees charged indicated that they differed as to what they were expected to cover. For example, in 6 of the institutions, the fee charged, which ranged in price between $10 and $132, covered the programs only. The fee in three of the institutions, which ranged between $30 and $85, covered the program plus meals, transportation from the airport or train station, or housing. Two of the institutions indicated they had separate fees for graduate and undergraduate students, or for students
living on or off campus. Finally, two institutions indicated that their fees applied to the Fall
term only.

Lastly, the individuals who participated in this study were, for the most part, females,
ranging in age between 30 and 50 years. Most of them had at least a Master's degree and had
been in their current position between one and three years. Their positions in the office varied
from directors to assistant FSA, and the great majority of them belonged to a professional
organization (see Table 21 for a complete profile of the respondents).

Part VI - Number of Activities Included in the Programs

Part II of the questionnaire listed the ten activities included in this study
(distribution of reading materials, lectures/informational meetings, panel presentations,
videos/film/slides, group discussions, field trips/tours, outings to cultural events, how-to
activities, role plays/simulation games, and social events that promote interaction) for which
respondents were asked to indicate, among other things, whether they were currently part of
the programs their institutions were offering. When comparing the number of activities being
included in programs across the country with the number of activities suggested in the
Integrated Model, results found here showed that:

(1) None of the programs being currently offered included all ten activities which had
    been suggested for this model.

(2) Four out of 71 institutions indicated that none of the activities included in the
    Integrated Model were included in their initial program (although three of them
### Table 21. Profile of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest degree held</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1 and 3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 4 and 6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 7 and 9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten years or longer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title of position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adviser/Counselor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple titles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Foreign Student Adviser</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership in professional organizations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
them indicated that, despite the fact that most of these activities were not part of their initial orientation, they were indeed part of the on-going orientation their institutions were offering).

(3) Five institutions offered only one of the suggested activities. They were: lectures/informational meetings (2), group discussions (1), how-to activities (1), and social events that promote interaction (1).

(4) Six institutions offered nine out of ten activities. Some of the activities not included in the programs they were offering: outings to local cultural events (3); panel presentations (1); role plays/simulation games (1); and videos/films (1).

(5) Seven was the most frequent number of activities included in the programs investigated. (See Table 22 for a summary of the number of activities offered.)

Part VII - Topics Covered During the Programs
In addition to indicating which activities were currently part of the programs their institutions were offering to newly arrived international students, respondents were also asked to list the topics covered under each activity as well as the time during the programs when these topics were covered. For example, if group discussions were scheduled during their program, respondents had not only to list the topics of these discussions but also to indicate whether they took place at the beginning, in the middle, or at the end of the programs.

A comparison among the activities included in this study revealed that twenty topics were fairly common to all of them:
Table 22. Frequency of activities offered during the initial programs by the institutions investigated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Institutions</th>
<th>Total Number of Activities Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Academic/Student-life issues
2. Health related issues
3. Immigration and other legal matters
4. Campus resources/opportunities/services
5. Miscellaneous issues
6. Banking/Financial issues
7. Housing issues
8. Adjustment/Culture shock
9. American culture/values
10. Transportation
11. Safety/Security issues
12. Social/Relationship issues
13. Other crosscultural issues
14. Area resources/opportunities/services
15. Shopping
16. Identification
17. Survival
18. Orientation related materials
19. Telephone
20. Food issues
Table 23 lists these topics and the frequency with which they were covered under each activity. Results found here showed that topics such as health, academics, housing, and other miscellaneous issues were covered under all seven activities. On the other hand, orientation-related materials, telephone, food issues, and identification were covered under only one. Results also showed that 16 out of the 20 topics (80.0%) were covered under lectures/informational meetings, while role plays/simulation games covered only eight out of the 20 topics (40.0%).

Health, academic/student life, and immigration issues were by far the most frequent topics covered. As for the activities through which they were covered, results showed that health and immigration issues were mostly presented through lectures/informational meetings. Academic/student-life issues, on the other hand, were covered more often through lectures/informational meetings, how-to activities, and reading materials.

Results also showed that some topics were more frequent under certain activities. For example, health, immigration, academic/student life, safety/security, housing, and campus resources/opportunities/services were mostly covered through lectures/informational meetings; while banking, transportation, shopping, survival, and identification issues, were explored through how-to activities. The topic of area resources/opportunities/services, on the other hand, was equally covered through either lectures/informational meetings, panel presentations, films and role plays/simulations were included in this analysis. Field trips/tours, outings to cultural events, and social events that promoted interaction were excluded because, instead of listing topics, respondents listed places visited, and events attended/sponsored.
Table 23. Rank order and frequency of topics covered under each activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Lectures/Informational Meetings</th>
<th>How-To Activities</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Group Discussions</th>
<th>Panel Presentations</th>
<th>Audiovisual Materials</th>
<th>Role Plays/Simulations</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Academic/Student-life issues</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Health related issues</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Immigration and other legal issues</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Campus resources/Opportunities/Services</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Miscellaneous issues</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Banking/Financial issues</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Housing issues</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Adjustment/Culture shock</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>American culture/Values</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Field trips/tours, outings to cultural events, and social events that promote interaction were excluded from this analysis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Lectures/Informational Meetings</th>
<th>How-To Activities</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Group Discussions</th>
<th>Panel Presentations</th>
<th>Audiovisual Materials</th>
<th>Role Plays/Simulations</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Safety/Security issues</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Social/Relationship issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Other crosscultural issues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Area resources/Opportunities/Services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Survival</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Orientation related</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Food issues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**: 240, 135, 107, 93, 49, 44, 14, 682
meetings or reading materials; while adjustment/culture shock was dealt with more frequently through films. Topics such as American culture/values, social/relationship issues, and other crosscultural issues were more common under group discussions; while miscellaneous issues were handled through reading materials. There were also topics that were covered under one activity only; for example, orientation-related materials and telephone issues were covered through reading materials only; similarly, food issues were only covered through panel presentations.

An analysis of the timing during the programs when these topics were presented revealed that most of them were more frequent at the beginning of the programs, with the exception of "other" crosscultural issues, American culture/values, social/relationship issues, and identification, which were covered more often in the middle of the programs; and adjustment/culture shock issues, which were more common at the end of the programs. Food issues were equally covered in the middle and at the end of the programs.
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION

The literature has shown that, to this date, practitioners are still "far more willing to experiment with new program ideas than they [are] to identify the conceptual and theoretical foundations of their practice" (Paige, 1986. p. 3). In other words, those in charge of designing crosscultural preparation programs are doing so without the proper consideration of the theories, and research, for that matter, that should support the program design process—a problem which can seriously compromise the effectiveness of such programs. The goals of this study were: (1) to develop and refine a model by surveying practitioners in the field of crosscultural preparation; and (2) to make recommendations for designing more effective programs based on the findings of the study. For that, a descriptive questionnaire was distributed to elicit the necessary information.

In the first part of the questionnaire, respondents were asked how important it would be for them to integrate cognitive, behavioral, and affective learning domains; didactic and experiential approaches; and culture-specific and culture-general contents into a program they were being asked to design. Results indicated that most respondents felt it either very important or somewhat important to include these elements in their programs\(^1\), with the exception of culture-general content, which was found to be neither important nor unimportant by most of the respondents. It is quite possible that this happened because this general kind of program is not directed to one particular country or culture, and that respondents felt that their primary responsibility would be to help the newly arrived students

\(^1\) It is important to mention here that, despite the fact that 73.5% of the respondents felt that providing information to newly arrived students (cognitive goal) would be very important, about 13.0% of them felt that this would be totally unimportant (see Table 6). Further investigation in this area is necessary.
adjust to the host country—which could be accomplished with a culture-specific program. However, by not designing a culture-general component into their programs, practitioners might be depriving program participants of an opportunity to learn about themselves as cultural beings and of recognizing the existence of different sets of values and assumptions. The literature has shown that these elements can be potentially useful to the international students pursuing an education in this country as it might give them the tools necessary to interact effectively not only with their hosts but also with individuals from other nationalities who will be here pursuing similar goals.

Respondents were also asked about the way they would sequence their program. The purpose here was to find out whether or not they would do it according to the experts' recommendations; that is, from cognitive, to behavioral, to affective; from didactic to experiential; and from culture-specific to culture-general. They were presented with six goals, representing the theoretical concepts mentioned above, and they were asked to indicate the order in which they would implement them over time.

When comparing the order of implementation of all six goals together, the following sequence was expected: goal 3 (Information) and/or 6 (Insight) should be followed by goal 5 (Skills), which should be followed by goal 1 (Emotional Changes) and/or 4 (Positive Attitude), then followed by goal 2 (Adjustment to Many Countries). In other words, the cognitive goals should be implemented before the behavioral goal, which, in turn, would be followed by the affective goals. However, results found here showed that this sequence is not followed in practice. To illustrate, assuming that priority determined what practitioners did
first, it appears that respondents felt that helping students deal with the emotional changes they would have to undergo (affective goal) as well as providing them with the skills necessary to perform effectively in the host culture (behavioral goal) was more important than providing them with insight about the host culture (cognitive goal). This preference contradicts the order of implementation recommended by the experts in the field, which suggested that the cognitive goals be implemented before the behavioral and affective goals (e.g., Paige and Martin, 1983; Gudykunst and Hammer, 1983; Bennett, 1986; Kohls, 1987). However, providing participants with information about the host culture (cognitive goal) seems to have been given the utmost priority by most respondents, who therefore agree with the experts' recommendations. One other issue that needs to be brought up here is the fact that there was a difference in the order of implementation even between goals that represented the same theoretical concepts. One has to wonder, though, whether this happened because of the nature of these goals (e.g., providing information seems to be a more tangible goal than providing insight), or because practitioners were trying to avoid including materials focusing on the same concepts (if, indeed, they were aware of these concepts).

When looking at the mean order of implementation of the goals by singling out each of the theoretical concepts they represented, one notes that the results confirmed the experts' recommendations only for the approaches and contents represented. The goals which stressed the use of the didactic approach tended to be implemented before the ones which stressed the experiential approach; likewise, all culture-specific goals tended to be implemented before the culture-general one. However, the mean order of implementation of the goals, considering
only the learning domains they focused on, showed that respondents would indeed implement the cognitive goals first, as recommended by the experts; however, there would be no difference in the order of implementation between the goals that focused on the behavioral and affective domains. In other words, the order of implementation that practitioners in the field would apply does not totally coincide with that of the experts (see Figure 3).

One possible explanation for this result is the fact that practitioners are probably not aware of the theoretical concepts included in the Integrated Model presented here. This, in a sense, only confirms the problem with inattention to theory that researchers have pointed out as still prevailing in the program design process.

On the other hand, it is also possible that this happened because both the behavioral and affective domains call for the use of the experiential approach—a fact which might have obscured any other differences respondents would have seen between them. Nevertheless, despite the fact that both the behavioral and the affective domains make use of the experiential approach, they do differ in other ways, such as the degree of involvement they require as well as the kinds of risks they pose for the participants. For this reason, there should be a difference in the order of implementation between the activities that focus on these two domains. For example, experts have suggested that the activities focusing on the affective domain, which tend to be high involvement/high risk activities, should be planned for the end of a program after some level of trust in the program and in those delivering it has been established. The fact that practitioners would not follow this recommendation raises some concerns as to the consequences this might bring to the participants, and as to whether or not
Figure 3. Comparison between the order of implementation recommended by experts in the field of crosscultural preparation and that preferred by practitioners.
these programs would indeed help participants adjust to the host culture in the most effective and satisfactory way.

Ten activities were suggested for the Integrated Model proposed here: (1) distribution of reading materials, (2) lectures/informational meetings, (3) videos/film/slides, (4) panel presentations, (5) group discussions, (6) field trips/tours, (7) outings to cultural events, (8) how-to activities, (9) role plays/simulation games, and (10) social events that promote interaction. When comparing these activities with those currently being offered in programs across the country, results showed that some of them were more frequent than others. This should come as no surprise, especially considering the time, personnel, and budget limitations of the programs investigated.

As to the kinds of activities being offered, results showed that lectures/informational meetings were among the most common; possibly because this is still one of the easiest ways to provide necessary information about the host culture, especially considering that the resource persons are readily available on campus. In addition, this kind of activity allows practitioners to fulfill the students' felt need to learn about the host culture (Bennett, 1986) and in a way that, very likely, would be familiar to them (Harrison and Hopkins, 1966). However, the fact that lectures/informational meetings constituted the most common mode of presentation in the programs investigated also means that institutions are relying very heavily on the assumption that, if the newly arrived international students merely receive enough information, they will then know how to behave in the new environment. While lectures/informational meetings may be an easy and convenient way to fill the students' areas
of "cognitive blindness" (Mestenhauser, 1988, p. 151), experience has also shown that simply providing information is unreliable because "information is forgotten, misplaced in memory, used as evidence in unintended or inaccurate ways, or cognitively isolated and thus irrelevant to understanding a culture because it does not fit into a needed conceptual frame of reference" (Mestenhauser, 1988, p. 151).

Of all the activities included, role plays and simulations were one of the least offered, which could very well be due to the nature of these activities. Role plays, for example, may require the use of props (e.g., dresses, artifacts), instructions for the actors, not to mention the extra time for discussion. In addition, they tend to be a high involvement/high risk type of activity, which, in itself, might be enough to make some people—participants and leaders as well—very uncomfortable. Like role plays, simulations tend to be time-consuming and involve participants very intensely. In addition, they require highly-skilled trainers since there is always so much happening during their implementation that "it is easier for the inexperienced leader to stumble" (Hoopes and Pusch, 1981, p. 174). So, the fact that few institutions included these activities in their programs should come as no surprise. However, despite the difficult nature of these activities, it is undeniable that they can provide a powerful learning experience to all those involved. For example, they can provide individuals with a firsthand experience about the issues and principles "which up to this moment they may have only read [about] or discussed in fairly abstract terms" (Weeks, Pedersen, and Brislin, 1977, p. 54). So, what seems to be happening is that practitioners are relying quite heavily on the provision of information (which, according to some researchers, is an important component of any
program, but by no means sufficient to ensure effective behavior) yet conspicuously neglecting to provide participants with meaningful learning experiences. One has to conclude, then, that for the most part international students are being only partially prepared for their experience in this country.

It will be recalled that in the Integrated Model, activities were sequenced according to the theoretical concepts they represented, starting with the activities that focused on the cognitive domain, moving towards the behavioral, and concluding with those that targeted the affective domain. That is because the activities that focus on the cognitive domain tend to employ the didactic approach, which requires from participants a lower degree of involvement and, consequently, poses for them lower risks of failure and self-disclosure. In comparing the sequencing proposed in the Integrated Model with the sequencing of programs currently being offered in other institutions, results showed that, despite the fact that some of the cognitive activities were indeed implemented at the beginning of the programs, and that most of the behavioral and affective activities were implemented in the middle and at the end, respectively, the truth was that, contrary to what had been expected, all three types of activities occurred throughout the programs. Further investigation into the reasons why some activities were sequenced according to the experts' recommendations and others were not, then became necessary.

The crosscultural literature attests to "the frustration of theoreticians and researchers who often do not know how to translate ideas into programs, and of practitioners who have difficulty knowing how theory is supposed to underpin their activities" (Mestenhauser, Marty,
and Steglitz, 1988, p. ix). So, it is quite possible that the sequencing discrepancies found here were due to the lack of knowledge on the part of the practitioners of the theoretical concepts that should underpin the program design process. This problem, in fact, was evident in Steglitz's (1988) study where she asked practitioners about their awareness and knowledge of selected concepts and learned that, not only do those in charge of delivering programs not utilize many of these concepts, but that many were not even familiar with them. One of her respondents wrote: "It is very hard to determine the influence these theories/concepts have on practice. I believe the incorporation of such concepts is more subtle and unconscious" (in Steglitz, 1988, p. 15).

However, if practitioners are not basing their sequencing decisions on theory, what are they basing them on? Results found in this study indicate that it is quite possible that activities are being sequenced more in relation to the topics they cover than because of the theoretical concepts they represent. In other words, convenience or custom seems to play a larger role than theory in designing these programs.

A comparison across the activities included in this study showed that twenty topics were fairly common to most of them. Table 24 summarizes, among other things, these topics and their timing during the programs. Assuming that priority determined what practitioners did first, it looks like the programs currently being offered are primarily concerned with academics, government and institutional regulations (e.g., immigration and health requirements), and functional/survival needs such as housing, banking, and shopping.

The fact that programs put a lot of emphasis on academic/student life issues should
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing During the Program When Each Topic Was Mostly Offered</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Activity Under Which Each Topic Was Mostly Covered</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>1. Academic/Student life issues</td>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>Academic responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Health related issues</td>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>Health care and health insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Immigration and other legal issues</td>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>Immigration regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Campus resources/Opportunities/Services</td>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>Host family program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Housing</td>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>Finding a place to live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Safety/Security issues</td>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>Personal safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Banking/Financial issues</td>
<td>How-to activities</td>
<td>How to write a check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Shopping</td>
<td>How-to activities</td>
<td>How to buy food and personal items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Transportation</td>
<td>How-to activities</td>
<td>How to obtain a driver's license</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Survival</td>
<td>How-to activities</td>
<td>How to dress for the Winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Area resources/Opportunities/Services</td>
<td>Lectures/Readings*</td>
<td>Community resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Orientation related materials</td>
<td>Reading materials</td>
<td>FSA roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Telephone</td>
<td>Reading materials</td>
<td>Long-distance dialing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Other issues and matters</td>
<td>Reading materials</td>
<td>Acquaintance rape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Topic was equally covered by lectures and reading materials.

b Topic was covered both in the middle and at the end of the programs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing During the Program When Each Topic Was Mostly Offered</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Activity Under Which Each Topic Was Mostly Covered</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>1. American culture and values</td>
<td>Group Discussion</td>
<td>Understanding the American culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Social/Relationship issues</td>
<td>Group Discussion</td>
<td>U.S. dating customs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Other crosscultural issues</td>
<td>Group Discussion</td>
<td>Crosscultural communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Identification</td>
<td>How-to activity</td>
<td>How to apply for a social security card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Food issues b</td>
<td>Panel Presentation</td>
<td>Food problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End</td>
<td>1. Adjustment/Culture shock</td>
<td>Audiovisual Materials</td>
<td>&quot;Cold Water&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Food issues</td>
<td>Panel Presentation</td>
<td>Food problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
come as no surprise. When students first come to this country, their main goal, one assumes, is to pursue an education. Because the U.S. system of education differs in many ways from many other educational systems, "the sooner [international] students understand these differences and learn to operate according to the system's 'rules', the better off they will be" (Althen, 1990, pp. 3-4). That is probably why sessions on registration procedures, academic responsibilities, financial aid, academic requirements, university rules and regulations, academic advising, grading system, code of student conduct, and academic integrity were common in many of the programs investigated. These and other related topics can be instrumental in helping the newly arrived students understand the U.S. educational system and, more importantly, help them realize their educational objectives with the least possible difficulty.

As for the emphasis placed on government regulations, the NAFSA: AIE (National Association for Foreign Student Affairs: Association of International Educators) Adviser's Manual of Federal Regulations Affecting Foreign Students and Scholars states:

It is clearly the responsibility of the foreign student adviser to ensure that the [international] students with whom he/[she] works are fully and properly informed and instructed regarding their privileges and responsibilities and regarding the limitations placed on their activities by U.S. laws and regulations. (in Althen, 1984, p. 67)

The problem is that immigration laws, as well as the ways they can be implemented, tend to be extremely complicated. Furthermore, these laws are constantly changing, and keeping abreast of such changes has proven to be a very challenging task. It is not surprising, then, that programs put a lot of emphasis on giving guidance and information regarding immigration
regulations. This helps students not only understand their privileges and responsibilities but also maintain their legal status in this country.

In addition to complying with government regulations, international students have to comply with a series of institutional regulations—one of them being the acquisition of health insurance. Helping students understand the health care system in this country is extremely important, not only because this system differs considerably from other such systems but also because of the high cost of medical care in this country. So, it is to the students' advantage that they fully understand the health care system and be made aware of the importance of buying health insurance for themselves and their dependents (Althen, 1984).

Everyday life issues (also known as survival material), such as opening a bank account, finding a place to live, learning about bus schedules, or dressing appropriately for the season, were also very common among the programs investigated. In fact, together with academic issues and government and institutional regulations, they also tended to be addressed first, possibly because, psychologically, it would make more sense to provide the students with the kind of information they "most want to hear at a time when they themselves see a need for the information" (Gudykunst and Hammer, 1983, p. 146). This, in a sense, goes along with what some researchers have found—that, unless the students' immediate needs are taken care of, they "...will be unable to turn their attention to more abstract considerations of cultural adjustment..." (Foust et al., 1981, p. 13).

To sum up, decisions on the sequence of activities in a crosscultural program appear to be made more on the basis of the topics of the activities than according to the theoretical
concepts they represent. Assuming that priority determined what practitioners did first, results found here showed that certain topics, such as academic issues, government and institutional regulations, and everyday life issues have proven to be of such extreme importance to the students that they must be addressed first before other matters. So, in addition to considering the theoretical concepts to be included in a program, it has become apparent that practitioners also need to give special consideration to the topics to be covered in a program. With that in mind, modifications to the Integrated Model have become necessary.

The new version of the Integrated Model suggests that crosscultural preparation programs be divided into two equally important phases (see Figure 4). In the first, practitioners would take care of essential, culture-specific issues, such as academics, government and institutional policies, and everyday life issues. These issues are related to the students' immediate needs and must be addressed first so that their minds can be put at ease. This first stage of the program, then, can be considered crucial; however, as some researchers would be quick to point out, it is by no means sufficient to ensure adjustment to the host culture. Thus the necessity of phase two of the program. In this second phase, which is intended to be complementary to the first, practitioners would be able to address some of the more abstract, culture-general issues, such as the adjustment process, culture shock, perception of differences, ethnocentrism, empathy, self-awareness, and the influence of culture on behavior. These issues, despite not being directly related to the students' immediate needs, can also be instrumental in their adjustment to the host culture, and therefore, should be
Figure 4. Revised version of the Integrated Model
addressed during the program. If time is a factor (and it usually is), these issues could be
explored in a more general way during the initial program, and then later on, if an on-going
program is offered, students would have a chance to explore them in more depth.
Another option would be for practitioners to select some of the topics that could be of more
use to the students at first, such as the adjustment process and culture shock, and leave the
other ones to be explored later in the semester.
CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Conclusions

This study was conducted in order to narrow the gap between theory and practice in the program design process, by proposing a model for a crosscultural preparation program for newly arrived international students which included in its design theoretical concepts, such as learning domain, approach, and content, believed to be essential for an effective program. This model, called the Integrated Model, was then surveyed with practitioners in the field and compared with programs currently being offered by institutions in this country admitting students from abroad. It is the hope that results from this study will be potentially useful to those individuals involved in designing crosscultural preparation programs for the thousands of students who come to the United States to further their education.

Results found here showed that there is a difference between what researchers have suggested, what practitioners would like to do, and what they are actually doing in terms of which elements to include in a program and the basis on which to sequence them. Researchers have suggested that programs should focus on cognitive, behavioral, and affective learning domains; use didactic and experiential approaches; and include both culture-specific and culture-general contents. They have also suggested that program activities should be sequenced from those that focus on the cognitive domain to those that focus on the behavioral to those that focus on the affective domain. Practitioners, on the other hand, agree only in part with what researchers have suggested. In their view, programs should indeed focus on different learning domains and use different approaches; however, they
disagree with the experts about the inclusion of culture-general activities. While they agree that a program should start with cognitive activities, they attach no importance to the order of implementation between activities that focus on the behavioral and the affective domains.

Despite the fact that the programs investigated included cognitive, behavioral, and affective activities and that some activities were indeed being implemented according to the experts' recommendations, the fact remains that, contrary to what had been recommended, activities from all three learning domains were being offered throughout the programs. In other words, there is no apparent progression in the skills demanded of the participants. Thus, one could expect a certain attrition after the first phase with its crucial content.

Many things could have contributed to such discrepancies; among them is the possibility that practitioners are not aware of the theoretical concepts that should support the program design process, possibly because they lack the guidance of a formal academic curriculum and credentials that other professionals have. So, instead of basing their programming decisions on theory, they seem to be relying on their intuition, instinct, or experience (Paige, 1986). The fact that they tended to cover essential topics first, such as academics, government regulations, and survival issues, and then address other more general topics seems to suggest that the topics themselves, rather than any pedagogical theory, were the primary factor considered in program designs.

The ultimate goal of this research was to narrow the gap between theory and practice regarding the program design process. Perhaps the best way this can be effectively accomplished is by acknowledging the contribution of both to the development of an effective
educational program. The fact that practitioners are taking care of the students' immediate needs first makes perfect sense. But that does not mean that they should dismiss theory completely. This study has provided evidence that by integrating certain theoretical concepts into the program design, and by sequencing them rationally, the program can be more beneficial to the students. The modifications made to the proposed Integrated Model were a consequence of this marriage of theory and practice; that is, it now incorporates the practitioners' point of view with the experts' recommendations in the hope that it now illustrates how a better and more efficient program can be designed. (Although "better" and "more efficient" are evaluative labels that require a follow-up study comparing programs.)

Recommendations

Three basic recommendations were generated from this study. They focused on what practitioners should consider in order to design better and more effective programs, the need for more research and evaluation, and the need for dissemination of research findings and other related information pertinent to the field of crosscultural preparation. Each one of these recommendations will be discussed separately below.

Designing Better and More Effective Programs

In designing crosscultural preparation programs for newly arrived international students, practitioners should consider the following:

1. There are a number of activities to choose from. Those listed in the Integrated Model are just examples. Ideally a program should include a variety of activities, which would not
only give participants a chance to learn through different learning formats (Gudykunst and Hammer, 1983) but could also be stimulating for them.

2. Some activities are better for achieving certain goals than others, depending on the learning domain they focus on. For example, lectures are said to be very effective if the goal is to provide the participants with knowledge (cognitive domain). On the other hand, if the goal is to affect the participants' feelings (affective domain), a role play, where they have a chance to deal with all the anxiety associated with being in a new environment, might be preferred.

3. In addition to focusing on different learning domains, activities vary as far as the approach they use, the degree of involvement they require from participants, and the kinds of risk they pose for them. Lectures and readings, for example, which focus on the cognitive domain, are low involvement types of activities. They use the didactic approach and their main function is to increase the participants' knowledge at the same time that they generate interest and allow participants to become more comfortable with the program staff (Brislin, 1989). Simulations and role plays, on the other hand, are high involvement activities. They focus on the behavioral/affective domains while providing participants with a learn-by-doing experience. A well planned program should include both types of activities--low involvement as well as high involvement--since they serve two different but equally important purposes. That is, the low involvement activities will provide participants with necessary knowledge about the host culture, while the high involvement ones will provide them with opportunities to apply that knowledge. However, certain activities are inherently more risky than others, especially the ones that require a higher degree of involvement from participants, such as role
plays and simulation games. That is because these activities may sometimes require the performance of unfamiliar behavior (i.e., risk of failure) but also because they may require, among other things, the public expression of emotions (i.e., risk of self-disclosure), which may be very hard to accomplish depending on the participant's cultural background. Some program participants may react negatively towards these high risk activities, which may not only result in hostility towards the host culture but quite possibly inhibit rather than promote learning. Nevertheless, planners should select with care some activities that are more challenging for inclusion in later stages of their programs.

4. Not only should the degrees of involvement and risk increase as the programs progress, but the approach should change, depending on the learning domain focused upon. Therefore, the sequencing of activities throughout the program should be given careful consideration by those planning crosscultural preparation. The recommendation is to start with activities that focus on the cognitive domain, move towards the behavioral, and conclude with those that target the affective domain. This order is suggested because the activities that target the cognitive domain (e.g., lectures, informational meetings) use the didactic approach and tend to be less involving; consequently, they are more likely to pose lower risks of failure and self-disclosure for the participants. On the other hand, the activities that focus on the affective domain are more experiential in nature, requiring a higher degree of involvement from participants, which will inevitably pose higher risks of failure and self-disclosure for them. The belief is that, by starting with more familiar and less personally threatening activities and planning the high involvement/high risk activities for later stages of the program,
practitioners can "build a solid level of trust among the [participants] and can establish a social climate that is conducive to more intensive learning" (Paige and Martin, 1983, p. 55).

5. Certain topics, such as academic concerns, government and institutional regulations, and everyday-life issues tend to be more important for program participants; for this reason, these topics must be addressed first so that the students' minds can be put at ease.

**Research and Evaluation**

The field of crosscultural preparation has a serious image problem. For some, it is a semiprofession (Paige and Martin, 1983), conducted by quasi-professionals (Paige, 1986). For others it has a definite anti-intellectual image (Brislin et al., 1983), quite possibly because of all the problems mentioned earlier in this study: (1) practitioners lack the guidance of a formal academic curriculum and credentials that other professionals have and, therefore, enter the field through the side door (McCaffery, 1986); and (2) there has not been much knowledge gathered about the process of preparing individuals to live in another culture (Albert, 1986). To this point, "there is much more that we do not know than there is what we do know" (Triandis, 1986, p. 213) about the field of crosscultural preparation. For example, the order of implementation suggested by practitioners in the field (cognitive-behavioral/affective) does not agree with that proposed by researchers (cognitive-behavioral-affective). It would be premature, though, to discard the practitioners' opinion unless research in the area is conducted. It is possible that the order of implementation preferred by practitioners would work as well as, or even better, as a matter of fact, than the one proposed by researchers. This will not be known unless one compares the benefits to the students from
both kinds of programs.

It is important to note here that the kind of evaluation advocated in this study is different from the kind that asks merely, "Is this a good program?" There is great need today for more long-term evaluations where practitioners can focus on assessing whether and how the program benefited the students, and not so much whether participants enjoyed the program. This can only be accomplished through long-term evaluations which follow the students for some period after completing the program. An ideal way to measure the effects of a program would be by randomly assigning newly arrived international students to two groups. Group A would then go through a program based on the Integrated Model, while group B would go through the usual program the institution has been offering. Some time after these programs have been administered (let us say, at the end of the students' first semester) practitioners should be able to compare, among other things, (1) the number of difficulties/problems these students encountered (through a questionnaire, or an interview), (2) the solutions they found to these problems, and (3) whether or not the fact that they went through the Integrated Model helped them in solving the problems/difficulties they encountered.

In summary, it is the belief here that as more research and evaluation is conducted, practitioners will be able to determine what works and what does not and, more importantly, reach some understanding of why some program designs are more effective than others. Consequently, they will be able to base their programming decisions on facts rather than
intuitions. Another consequence would be that the field of crosscultural preparation would then start losing its anti-intellectual image and, thus get closer to being a profession.

**Dissemination of Information**

The literature has shown that little has been gathered about the process of preparing individuals for their crosscultural experience. So, it is very important that any research findings related to the area (in this case, the model proposed here and related findings) be made available to those in charge of developing crosscultural preparation programs. One way this could be done is through publication, and for that, there are organizations that specialize in publishing material related to the field, such as NAFSA:AIE (National Association for Foreign Student Affairs: Association of International Educators) and SIETAR (Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research).

One other way to disseminate these and other related findings is through training. In the case of this study, for example, a training program could help practitioners understand the importance of (1) using a model, (2) integrating theoretical concepts into their programs, and (3) selecting and sequencing activities properly. But more importantly, the training of program designers could lead to the "systematization" of the field and the "professionalization" of those practicing it (Brislin, Landis, and Brandt, in Paige, 1986, p. 3).

Systematizing the field would be especially important because, despite all the elements contributing to the variance in programs (e.g., number of staff available, academic calendar, location, time, funding), program designers would be able to include the same standard concepts into their programs. In other words, programs would still (and they should) vary
from one institution to another, but practitioners would have a standard way to develop them, much as standard curricula guide varied courses in departments.

Those attending training programs should be certified, a process which would also lead to the professionalization of those in charge of developing crosscultural preparation programs. The result would be that, instead of being professionals who entered the field through the "side door" (McCaffery, 1986) and who relied primarily on their intuition, instinct or experience to develop their programs, they would now be able to rely on acquired skills and knowledge to accomplish such a task. Furthermore, institutions could look for certification among the criteria for hiring or upgrading their staff members.

It would be illusory, though, to believe that training alone would solve all the problems of the field. Results from this and other research, and observations from working closely with professionals in the area, have shown that the field of crosscultural preparation has many other problems that still need to be addressed. For example, most programs are being developed by overburdened semi-professionals. This became evident during the many phone calls that had to be made in order to increase the response rate for this study. The majority of those professionals who did not respond to the questionnaire used in this research did so because of lack of time. One person indicated that she would try to respond to the questionnaire but that, at the time, it was sitting on one of the many piles of things to do she had on her desk. It was no surprise, then, when her responses never came.

In addition, many programs are being developed on a limited budget (some institutions do not even have a set budget for this!) as well as being squeezed into a very short time. One
has to wonder, then, what kind of message institutions are conveying to the international students who come to this country to pursue their educational goals. One of them, surely, is that such programs are not important; if they were, there would be more resources, more staff; and more time dedicated to them.

To sum up, in addition to providing more training to the professionals in the area, the system itself needs to change. Educational institutions need to acknowledge the fact that international students are an important constituent of the total student body, and that properly preparing these students would ensure that they achieve their educational goals with the least possible difficulties. More resources need to be allocated to the international student offices so that more professionals can be hired, and that better, more comprehensive programs can be offered.

**Limitations of the Study and of the Proposed Model**

In addition to the limitation mentioned earlier in this study (i.e., the fact that the reading materials presented focused on crosscultural preparation programs in general, while the model developed here focused on preparing newly arrived international students to adjust to the host culture), there were others that were felt to have influenced the results found here.

First, all the theoretical concepts included in the Integrated Model were surveyed with practitioners in the field in an indirect manner. Instead of being asked whether or not they would include the concepts investigated in this study into their programs, practitioners were presented with goals, which represented the theoretical concepts investigated, and then asked
whether they would include these goals in their programs. As a consequence, there was no certain way of knowing if the results found here (especially the discrepancies between what researchers have recommended and what practitioners would do) were indeed due to lack of knowledge of those concepts, a problem which the literature has pointed out as being prevalent among practitioners in the field. At best, one can say that results found here suggested the possibility that such a problem existed among the subjects of this research.

The main limitation concerning the Integrated Model is the fact that the learning domains included were separated into three distinct categories, thus giving the impression that the activities to be included in a program fall precisely into these categories, when in reality they may not. It is very important that the model proposed here be seen as representing a continuum, mainly because, while some activities will fall perfectly into a domain (e.g., lectures are truly cognitive activities), others will assume characteristics of more than one domain (e.g., role-plays are said to focus on the behavioral and affective domains).

One other limitation of the Integrated Model is the fact that it contained a preponderance of cognitive activities compared to the number of behavioral and affective activities. While this may have resembled reality (only activities commonly listed in the literature were included in the model proposed here), it may also have contributed to the fact that the programs investigated seem to be relying quite heavily on the provision of information—which is essentially what the cognitive activities try to accomplish.
Suggestions for Further Research

The original model proposed in this study was surveyed with practitioners in the field of crosscultural preparation and then modified in light of the results found. One will never know, though, whether this new version will actually work unless the outcomes for program participants can be determined. The best way to accomplish such a task is by comparing and evaluating the outcomes between programs following other models and the Integrated Model proposed here. This way, practitioners will be able to determine whether the Integrated Model indeed works, if it needs to be further modified, or even discarded.

One of the findings of this study was that the topic to be covered seemed to have played a significant role in determining what would be presented first. It would be interesting to find out some of the other elements that practitioners take into consideration when making their programming decisions. The literature has already shown that theory may not be among such elements. But if practitioners are not basing their decisions on theory, what are they basing them on? An answer to this question could be particularly useful in determining what other elements need to be incorporated in the design process so that programs can become more effective for the participants.

Although the size of the institutions was not an issue in this study, it would be worth investigating whether or not size affects (1) the way programs differ from each other, and (2) how far from or how close to the program being proposed here are the programs currently being offered.
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE
**PART I: GOALS**

Part I of this questionnaire includes six possible goals for an initial orientation program designed to prepare newly arrived international students for life in the U.S. (host culture). Assuming you were asked to design a NEW PROGRAM for these students, read each goal carefully and answer COLUMN A for all goals, and then complete COLUMN B as indicated.

**DIRECTIONS**

**COLUMN A:**

**CIRCLE ONE NUMBER** to indicate how important it would be for you to implement each goal in your new program, using the following scale:

1. Very important
2. Somewhat important
3. Neither important nor unimportant (neutral)
4. Somewhat unimportant
5. Totally unimportant

**COLUMN B:**

Assume you were asked to implement ALL SIX goals in your new program. **RANK ALL SIX GOALS** indicating the order you would implement them IN TIME. Use number one for the goal you would implement first, up to number six for the goal you would implement last. Please make sure to include ALL SIX GOALS in your ranking, giving each goal a unique rank from one to six.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOALS</th>
<th>COLUMN A</th>
<th>COLUMN B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To prepare the newly arrived international students to deal with the emotional changes they may undergo in adjusting to the host culture.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To prepare the newly arrived international students to adjust not only to life in this country, but also to life in any other country or culture to which they may choose to go.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To provide the newly arrived international students with essential information about the host culture.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To help the newly arrived international students develop a positive attitude towards the host culture and host nationals as well.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To provide the newly arrived international students with opportunities to acquire skills that will be appropriate to the host culture.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To help the newly arrived international students develop an insight into the host culture.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART II: TYPES OF ACTIVITIES

In this section, you will find TEN TYPES OF ACTIVITIES that can be included in an initial orientation program aiming at preparing newly arrived international students for life in this country.

DIRECTIONS

For each activity listed, please indicate whether or not that activity is CURRENTLY part of the initial orientation program your institution is offering to newly arrived international students. Please keep in mind that "PROGRAM" here means the entire initial orientation schedule (including check-in procedures), and not just the program of the day.

If the activity IS NOT currently part of the program your institution is offering — proceed to the next activity.

If the activity IS currently part of the program your institution is offering -- answer COLUMNS A and B as follows:

COLUMN A: List ALL the topics, materials, or events that are covered during the initial orientation program under this type of activity.

COLUMN B: Indicate WHEN each topic, material, or event is included in the program your institution is offering, using the following scale:

- B Beginning of the program
- M Middle of the program
- E End of the program

Example: Museum of Natural History

CHECK ONE:

Included in the initial orientation program (answer columns A and B)

NOT included in the initial orientation program, but included later on in the term as part of "ongoing" orientation, or part of a class (i.e., American Studies) international students are required/encouraged to take (go on to activity number 3)

Not offered at all (go on to activity number 3)

COLUMN A

List THE PLACES international students are scheduled to visit during their initial orientation

COLUMN B

INDICATE WHEN during the initial orientation each place is visited

B M E
### 2. GROUP DISCUSSIONS

**CHECK ONE:**
- Included in the initial orientation program
  (check columns A and B)
- **NOT** included in the initial orientation program, but
  included later on in the term as part of "ongoing"
  orientation, or part of a class (i.e., American Studies)
  international students are required/encouraged to take
  (go on to activity number 3)
- Not offered at all (go on to activity number 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLUMN A</th>
<th>COLUMN B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIST THE TOPICS international students have group discussions on during the initial orientation</td>
<td>INDICATE WHEN during the initial orientation each group discussion takes place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: *American values*  

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | |
4. LECTURES/INFORMATIONAL MEETINGS

CHECK ONE:

- Included in the initial orientation program

- NOT included in the initial orientation program, but included later on in the term as part of “ongoing” orientation, or part of a class (i.e., American Studies) international students are required/encouraged to take

- Not offered at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLUMN A</th>
<th>COLUMN B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIST THE TOPICS OF THE LECTURES/INFORMATIONAL MEETINGS scheduled during the initial orientation program</td>
<td>INDICATE WHEN during the initial orientation each lecture or informational meeting takes place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B M E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: Health insurance

5. OUTINGS TO LOCAL CULTURAL EVENTS

CHECK ONE:

- Included in the initial orientation program

- NOT included in the initial orientation program, but included later on in the term as part of “ongoing” orientation, or part of a class (i.e., American Studies) international students are required/encouraged to take

- Not offered at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLUMN A</th>
<th>COLUMN B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIST THE CULTURAL EVENTS international students are encouraged to attend as part of the initial orientation program</td>
<td>INDICATE WHEN during the initial orientation each outing is scheduled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B M E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: Demonstration of folk dance
6. PANEL PRESENTATIONS

**CHECK ONE:**

- Included in the initial orientation program
(Answer columns A and B)

- **NOT** included in the initial orientation program, but included later on in the term as part of “on going” orientation, or part of a class (i.e., American Studies) international students are required/encouraged to take
(go on to activity number 7)

- Not included at all (go on to activity number 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLUMN A</th>
<th>COLUMN B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIST THE TOPICS OF THE PANEL PRESENTATIONS scheduled during the initial orientation program</td>
<td>INDICATE WHEN during the initial orientation each panel presentation takes place (B M E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: **Stereotypes**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7. ROLE PLAYS/SIMULATION GAMES

**CHECK ONE:**

- Included in the initial orientation program
(Answer columns A and B)

- **NOT** included in the initial orientation program, but included later on in the term as part of “on going” orientation, or part of a class (i.e., American Studies) international students are required/encouraged to take
(go on to activity number 8)

- Not offered at all (go on to activity number 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLUMN A</th>
<th>COLUMN B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIST THE TOPICS OF THE ROLE PLAYS as well as THE SIMULATION GAMES scheduled during the initial orientation program</td>
<td>INDICATE WHEN during the initial orientation each role play, and each simulation game is scheduled (B M E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples: **Roommate conflicts** (role play)  
**The Albatroz** (simulation game)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
### 8. SOCIAL EVENTS THAT PROMOTE INTERACTION WITH HOST NATIONALS

**CHECK ONE:**

- Included in the initial orientation program (answer: columns A and B)
- NOT included in the initial orientation program, but included later on in the term as part of "on going" orientation, or part of a class (i.e., American Studies) international students are required/encouraged to take (go on to activity number 9)
- Not offered at all (go on to activity number 9)

**COLUMN A**

**LIST THE SOCIAL EVENTS** scheduled during the initial orientation program that give international students a chance to interact with Americans.

- Example: **A picnic for international students and Americans who volunteer to be English conversational partners**

**COLUMN B**

**INDICATE WHEN** during the initial orientation program each social event takes place (B M E)

### 9. SUGGESTED READINGS

**CHECK ONE:**

- Included in the initial orientation program (answer: columns A and B)
- NOT included in the initial orientation program, but included later on in the term as part of "on going" orientation, or part of a class (i.e., American Studies) international students are required/encouraged to take (go on to activity number 2)
- Not offered at all (go on to activity number 2)

**COLUMN A**

**COLUMNS** indicate WHEN during the initial orientation each material is handed to the international students.

- Example: **Class schedules**

**COLUMN B**

- Indicate WHEN during the initial orientation each material is handed to the international students (B M E)
### 10. VIDEOS/FILMS

**CHECK ONE:**

- Included in the initial orientation program
  (answer columns A and B)
- NOT included in the initial orientation program, but included later on in the term as part of "on going" orientation, or part of a class (i.e., American Studies) international students are required/encouraged to take
- Not offered at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLUMN A</th>
<th>COLUMN B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIST THE VIDEOS/FILMS</strong> scheduled during the initial orientation program</td>
<td><strong>INDICATE WHEN</strong> during the initial orientation each video/film is scheduled (B M E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: Cold Water</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PART III: INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR INSTITUTION, YOUR INITIAL ORIENTATION PROGRAM, AND YOURSELF

#### A. Information about your institution and your initial orientation program

1. Total number of students in your institution: _____
   - NOT including international students
2. Number of international students in your institution: _____
3. Yearly budget for the initial orientation program: _____
4. Who and how many individuals attend the initial orientation program your institution provides? (Answer columns A and B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Who attends</th>
<th>B. Approximate number who attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Graduate students</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Undergraduate students</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Visiting scholars</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. International students admitted on a special basis</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Immigrants</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ESL students</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Spouses</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other (please specify)</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Who and how many individuals are involved in delivering the initial orientation program in your institution? Please give further specifications in COLUMNS A and B below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. WHO IS INVOLVED</th>
<th>B. NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS INVOLVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)</td>
<td>(PLACE THE NUMBER IN THE SPACES PROVIDED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Foreign student Advisers</td>
<td>(______)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(full time employee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(part time employee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(in your office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. University/College administrators</td>
<td>(______)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Please specify positions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Volunteers</td>
<td>(______)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(community members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(&quot;old&quot; international students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Faculty members</td>
<td>(______)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other university/college staff</td>
<td>(______)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Please specify positions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How often and for how long is the initial orientation program for newly arrived students offered in your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. HOW OFTEN IT IS OFFERED</th>
<th>B. HOW LONG IT LASTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Check all that apply)</td>
<td>(Indicate length)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Every spring term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Every fall term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Every winter term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Every summer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Is there a FEE for individuals (students, etc.) to participate in the initial orientation program your institution offers?

CHECK ONE:  
 a. YES ____ How much? _____
 b. NO ____

B. Information about yourself

For items 1-4, CHECK ONE about yourself:

1. Gender: _____ Male
   _____ Female

2. Age range: _____ a. 20 - 30
   _____ b. 31 - 40
   _____ c. 41 - 50
   _____ d. 51 - 60
   _____ e. over 61
3. Highest degree held
   ___ a. Bachelor's degree
   ___ b. Master's degree
   ___ c. Doctorate
   ___ d. Other (specify) ________________________________

   In what field? ______________________________________

4. How long have you been in your current position?
   ___ a. Less than a year
   ___ b. 1-3 years
   ___ c. 4-6 years
   ___ d. 7-9 years
   ___ e. 10 years or longer

5. Title of your position: ________________________________
6. Professional organizations to which you belong:
   __________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________

7. Professional meeting(s) you have attended in the last year:
   (Please indicate the sponsoring organization of each meeting)
   __________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________

THANK YOU !!!

PLEASE RETURN BY NOVEMBER 15 TO:
LUIZA DREASHER
INTERNATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER
118 OLD BOTANY
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
AMES, IOWA 50011

If you are interested in a summary of the results of this survey, indicate your name and address below. (This information will not be related to your responses in any way.)
APPENDIX B

HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW COMMITTEE FORM
Information for Review of Research Involving Human Subjects
Iowa State University
(Please type and use the attached instructions for completing this form)

1. Title of Project: Linking theory to practice in orientation/training programs for newly arrived international students

2. I agree to provide the proper surveillance of this project to insure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are protected. I will report any adverse reactions to the committee. Additions to or changes in research procedures after the project has been approved will be submitted to the committee for review. I agree to request renewal of approval for any project continuing more than one year.

Maria Luiza de Melo Dreasher 10/22/91
Typed Name of Principal Investigator Date

Professional Studies International Resource Center 4-0371
Department Campus Address Campus Telephone

3. Signatures of other investigators Date Relationship to Principal Investigator

4. Principal Investigator(s) (check all that apply)
   □ Faculty □ Staff □ Graduate Student □ Undergraduate Student

5. Project (check all that apply)
   □ Research □ Thesis or dissertation □ Class project □ Independent Study (490, 590, Honors project)

6. Number of subjects (complete all that apply)
   125. # Adults, non-students # ISU student # minors under 14  # minors 14 - 17

7. Brief description of proposed research involving human subjects: (See instructions, Item 7. Use an additional page if needed.)
   (attached)

(Please do not send research, thesis, or dissertation proposals.)

8. Informed Consent:
   □ Signed informed consent will be obtained. (Attach a copy of your form.)
   □ Modified informed consent will be obtained. (See instructions, item 8.)
   □ Not applicable to this project.
9. Confidentiality of Data: Describe below the methods to be used to ensure the confidentiality of data obtained. (See instructions, item 9.)

Each questionnaire will have a CODE NUMBER for the sole purpose of identifying which institutions have responded the questionnaire. As soon as the questionnaires are returned, the code number will be removed, and the data will be summarized and reported in group terms only.

Institutions that have not responded by the suggested due date will be sent a follow-up letter. Please note that no names will be used in the questionnaire, and that only the principal investigator and the major professor (Dr. W. Wolansky) will have access to the code numbers.

10. What risks or discomfort will be part of the study? Will subjects in the research be placed at risk or incur discomfort? Describe any risks to the subjects and precautions that will be taken to minimize them. (The concept of risk goes beyond physical risk and includes risks to subjects' dignity and self-respect as well as psychological or emotional risk. See instructions, item 10.)

No risk or discomfort to the subjects is anticipated.

11. CHECK ALL of the following that apply to your research:

- A. Medical clearance necessary before subjects can participate
- B. Samples (Blood, tissue, etc.) from subjects
- C. Administration of substances (foods, drugs, etc.) to subjects
- D. Physical exercise or conditioning for subjects
- E. Deception of subjects
- F. Subjects under 14 years of age and/or Subjects 14-17 years of age
- G. Subjects in institutions (nursing homes, prisons, etc.)
- H. Research must be approved by another institution or agency (Attach letters of approval)

If you checked any of the items in 11, please complete the following in the space below (include any attachments):

Items A - D Describe the procedures and note the safety precautions being taken.

Item E Describe how subjects will be deceived; justify the deception; indicate the debriefing procedure, including the timing and information to be presented to subjects.

Item F For subjects under the age of 14, indicate how informed consent from parents or legally authorized representatives as well as from subjects will be obtained.

Items G & H Specify the agency or institution that must approve the project. If subjects in any outside agency or institution are involved, approval must be obtained prior to beginning the research, and the letter of approval should be filed.
Checklist for Attachments and Time Schedule

The following are attached (please check):

12. [ ] Letter or written statement to subjects indicating clearly:
   a) purpose of the research
   b) the use of any identifier codes (names, #’s), how they will be used, and when they will be removed (see item 17)
   c) an estimate of time needed for participation in the research and the place
   d) if applicable, location of the research activity
   e) how you will ensure confidentiality
   f) in a longitudinal study, note when and how you will contact subjects later
   g) participation is voluntary; nonparticipation will not affect evaluations of the subject

13. [ ] Consent form (if applicable)  NA

14. [ ] Letter of approval for research from cooperating organizations or institutions (if applicable)  NA

15. [x] Data-gathering instruments  (questionnaire)

16. Anticipated dates for contact with subjects:

   First Contact
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month / Day / Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 4, 1991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Last Contact
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month / Day / Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 18, 1991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. If applicable: anticipated date that identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments and/or audio or visual tapes will be erased:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month / Day / Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 18, 1991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Signature of Departmental Executive Officer
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**ITEM NUMBER 7**

**A. PROBLEM:**

Researchers have agreed that providing orientation programs for newly arrived international students should be one of the main responsibilities of any U.S. institution admitting students from abroad.

However, while there is no question as to the importance of orientation programs to international students, there is still very little agreement as to what orientation means, how its activities should be timed and sequenced, what outcomes should be presented, and what content would be more appropriate.

This study will look at orientation programs U.S. institutions of higher education are providing to their newly arrived international students. The following theoretical concepts, which researchers have identified as "essential" to an orientation program to international students, will be investigated:

a. Focus (Cognitive, Behavioral, Affective)
b. Content (Culture-specific, Culture-general)
c. Sequencing and timing of activities.

**B. SUBJECTS:**

Subjects for this study will be individuals in U.S. institutions of higher education who are in charge of developing and/or coordinating orientation programs for newly arrived international students. The institutions for this study will be randomly selected from the total population, which constitutes all U.S. institutions of higher education that have at least 100 international students among their total student population.

**C. METHODS:**

A questionnaire (see attachment) will be sent to the individual who is in charge of orientation programs for international students at the U.S. institutions of higher education selected for this study. Each institution will be sent one questionnaire containing three parts:

Part I -- possible goals for an orientation program for international students;

Part II -- a list of activities which subjects will indicate whether or not such activities are currently part of the program their institution is offering;

Part III -- personal and institutional demographics.

After the data are collected and analyzed (using the SPSSx statistical software package), recommendations will be made in order to help educational institutions improve the orientation programs they offer to their newly admitted international students.
ITEM NUMBER 8/12

INFORMATION SHEET
(to be typed in a letterhead containing address and phone number of principal investigator)

Dear Respondent:

The attached survey instrument is part of a nationwide study designed to look at orientation programs that U.S. institutions of higher education are providing to their international students. The purpose of this study is to look at the focus, content, timing, and sequencing of the activities these programs offer. We are particularly interested in obtaining your responses because your experience in this area will contribute significantly towards this important area of cross-cultural education.

The enclosed instrument has been tested with a sampling of program coordinators, and we have revised it in order to make it possible for us to obtain all the necessary data while requiring a minimum of your time. The average time for program coordinators trying out the survey instrument was 20 minutes.

It will be greatly appreciated if you could complete the enclosed form prior to November 15 and return it in the stamped envelope that is enclosed. Other phases of this study cannot be carried out until we complete the analysis of the survey data.

We would welcome any comments that you have concerning any aspects of the development and/or coordination of orientation programs for international students not covered in this instrument. We would also welcome any questions you might have with regards to this questionnaire.

Please be assured that your responses will be held in strictest confidence. The code number used in each questionnaire will be removed as soon as it is returned and the data are collected. Data will be summarized and reported only in group terms, and not individually. We also want you to understand that your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw from participating in this study at any time.

We will be pleased to send you a summary of the survey results if you indicate so in the questionnaire. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Dr. William Wolansky
Professor and Coordinator
International Education Programs

Luiza Dreasher
Graduate student
Professional Studies in Education
APPENDIX C

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL TO THE DIRECTOR
November 4, 1991

Dear Director:

The attached instrument is part of a nationwide survey designed to look at orientation programs U.S. institutions of higher education are providing to international students attending their institutions.

This study is concerned specifically with the focus, content, timing and sequencing of the activities of such programs. It is our hope that results from this study will help educational institutions improve the programs they offer to the growing population of international students in the U.S.

We would appreciate it if you could direct this survey instrument to the staff member in your office who is in charge of developing/coordinating orientation programs for newly arrived international students. Your staff’s input will be a great contribution to this important area of cross-cultural education.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. William Wolansky
Professor and Coordinator
International Education Programs

Luiza Dreasher
Graduate student
Professional Studies in Education
APPENDIX D

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL TO THE RESPONDENTS
Dear Respondent:

This survey instrument is part of a study designed to look at orientation programs that institutions of higher education across the U.S. are providing to their international students. The purpose of this study is to look at the focus, content, timing, and sequencing of the activities these programs offer. We are particularly interested in obtaining your responses because your experience in this area will contribute significantly towards this important area of cross-cultural education.

The enclosed instrument has been tested with a sampling of program coordinators, and we have revised it in order to make it possible for us to obtain all the necessary data while requiring a minimum of your time. The average time taken for program coordinators to complete the survey instrument was 20 minutes.

It will be greatly appreciated if you could complete the enclosed form prior to November 15 and return it in the stamped envelope that is enclosed. Other phases of this study cannot be carried out until we complete the analysis of the survey data. We would welcome any questions or comments you might have with regards to this questionnaire.

Please be assured that your responses will be held in strictest confidence. The code number used in this questionnaire will be removed as soon as it is returned and the data are collected. Data will be summarized and reported in group terms only. We also want you to understand that your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw from participating in this study at any time.

We will be pleased to send you a summary of the survey results if you indicate so in the questionnaire. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Dr. William Wolansky
Professor and Coordinator
International Education Programs

Luiza Dreasher
Graduate student
Professional Studies in Education
APPENDIX E

EXAMPLE OF TOPICS COVERED UNDER EACH ACTIVITY
# EXAMPLES OF FIELD TRIPS/TOURS

## 1. CAMPUS
- Library
- Physical Education bldg.
- Registration area
- Health Center
- Recreational facilities
- Classroom areas
- Various departments
- Computer Center

## 2. CITY/SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES (including both bus and walking tours)
- Campus town
- Downtown
- Local neighborhood
- Surrounding communities

## 3. STORES/SHOPPING AREAS
- Local shopping areas
- Discount stores
- Grocery stores
- Shopping malls
- Farmer's market
- Ethnic markets

## 4. USEFUL PLACES
- Furniture rental place
- Social Security office
- Driver's license facility
- Local banks
- International loan closet
- Apartments available
- ID center
- Post Office
- Transportation
- Terminals
- Public schools
- Public schools

## 5. MUSEUMS/INSTITUTES
- Getty Museum
- State Museum
- Art Museum
- University Museum
- Art & Science Museum
- Art Institute
- Art Gallery
- Historical Museum
6. OTHER TOURS/POINTS OF INTEREST

Zoo
Local restaurants
Historical sites
International Cultural Center
University experimental farm
Whale watching
Nearby mountains
Local churches
Cannoning
Sea World
Nearby lake/park
Amusement parks
State Capitol
World Trade Center
Harbor cruise
Disneyland
Campus night life
Women's Center
Space Center
Tourist sites
State Fairs
Botanical Gardens
Aquarium
Court house
Indian Center
Day hike

EXAMPLES OF TOPICS COVERED DURING GROUP DISCUSSIONS

1. ACADEMIC/STUDENT LIFE ISSUES

Student views/perspectives
Field of study
Academic life/issues
Educational system
American educational values
Undergrad student life
Adjustment to academics
What being a student is like
Registration procedures
Classroom etiquette
Student life in the US
Being a TA
Educational differences
Tips on college survival
Problems experienced by intl. students
American college life
Educational goals
Academic ethics
Faculty expectations
Grad student life
Classroom culture
University rules

2. HEALTH ISSUES

Wellness
Stress control
Substance abuse
Health care issues
Health insurance

3. BANKING/FINANCIAL ISSUES

Banking issues
Managing money
Personal finances

4. HOUSING

Housing issues
Apartment leases
5. TRANSPORTATION

Transportation issues

6. ADJUSTMENT/CULTURE SHOCK

Culture shock  Crosscultural adjustment  Adjusting to the U.S.
Phases of adjustment

7. AMERICAN CULTURE/VALUES

Understanding American Culture  American assumptions/values  Living in America
American values and situations

8. SAFETY/SECURITY ISSUES

Personal safety  Security

9. OTHER CROSSCULTURAL ISSUES

Cultural and social differences  Crosscultural communication  Cultural values
Comparative cultural responses  Cultural assumptions  Stereotypes
Celebrating diversity  Crosscultural comparison of sex roles

10. IMMIGRATION AND OTHER LEGAL ISSUES

Employment regulations  Keeping legal status  U.S. laws
Immigration regulations

11. SOCIAL/RELATIONSHIP ISSUES

Getting to know each other  U.S. dating customs  Icebreakers
Date rape  Relationship w/ opposite sex  Sexual ethics
Making friends  Good communication  Sexual harassment
Meeting Americans
Sexual assault  How to meet people  Social customs
Roommate conflict  Social relations
12. OPPORTUNITIES & SERVICES AVAILABLE

Community involvement activities  OISS services  Student organizations

13. MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES

Practical matters  Why you came to the U.S.  Racism
Challenges  Religion  Prejudice
Discussion w/ int'l student council  American politics  American business
Your homecountry & family

EXAMPLES OF HOW-TO ACTIVITIES

1. BANKING/FINANCIAL ISSUES

Manage finances  Write a check  Balance a checkbook
Select a bank  Budget your money  Credit cards
Open a bank account (checking & savings)

2. HOUSING

Rent an apartment  Register for dorm room  Review a lease
Select residence how  Read apartment contracts  Find housing

3. SHOPPING

Find food & personal need items  Buy groceries & other items
4. ACADEMIC AND STUDENT LIFE ISSUES

Register (i.e., add and drop classes)  Choose classes  Use the library
Study in English  Manage undergraduate studies  Take tests
Improve study skills (i.e., note-taking)  Register by phone  Read a catalogue
Negotiate graduate school  Prepare for TOEFL  Select an adviser
Prepare for SPEAK test  Interact with faculty  Get around campus
Achieve academic success  Use on-line cataloguing

5. SURVIVAL

Dress for winter  Survive the winter  Deal with
emergencies

6. IMMIGRATION AND OTHER LEGAL ISSUES

Stay in legal status with the INS  Complete a W-4 form  Deal with the INS
Obtain work permission  Fill out immigration forms

7. HEALTH RELATED ISSUES

Apply for/Buy medical insurance  Use the Health Center  File medical insurance

8. SOCIAL

Get involved w/ university clubs  Respond to an invitation  Meet Americans
Greet and introduce oneselfs  Etiquette when visiting Americans
& others

9. TRANSPORTATION

Obtain driver's license  Read bus schedule/route  Drive appropriately
Use campus transportation  Use public transportation (ride a bus, etc.)
10. IDENTIFICATION

Apply for social security number
Obtain rec. center user card
Apply for ID card

11. ADJUSTMENT/CULTURE SHOCK

Manage culture shock

12. SERVICES AND FACILITIES ON CAMPUS

Use computers on campus
Use the cafeteria/dinning hall
Use the educational support services
Do on campus job search
Find jobs off campus
Utilize campus services & facilities

13. MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES

Hook up a telephone
Read maps
Address an envelope
Use cleaning supplies
Obtain P.O. boxes
Use feet, inches and miles
Read time schedules
Use the telephone

EXAMPLES OF TOPICS COVERED DURING LECTURES/INFORMATIONAL MEETINGS

1. IMMIGRATION AND OTHER LEGAL ISSUES

Immigration rules and regulations
Status & work regulations
Visa and I-20 information
Work regulations
Employment authorization
INS and other regulations
Law enforcement
Tax information
Immigration matters
F-1/J-1 requirements/visas
Legal issues
Visa regulations
Legal advice
Work permits

2. BANKING/FINANCIAL ISSUES

U.S. banking system
Bank accounts
Financial concerns
Banking matters
Paying bills
3. HOUSING

Housing concerns  Residence hall life and rules  Finding housing
Dorm life  Apartments -- legal issues  University housing
Rental contracts/leases

4. ACADEMIC/STUDENT LIFE ISSUES

Registration procedures  University policies  Transfer credit
University/College history  Academic expectations  Career planning
Students' rights and responsibilities  Assistantships/Fellowships  University honor code
Academics at the university  School ID and policies  Academic success
Scholarship & other financial aid  College history  Choosing classes
English/Math requirements  Grading system  Using the library
Current issues in higher education  Issues in international educ.  Academic advising
Foreign students in the U.S.  Academic requirements  Academic integrity
Evaluation of foreign academic credit  Developing your English  U.S. academic system
Intro to U.S. grad school  Higher ed. in USA and CA
Fee payment/billing system  Student academic resources
Code of student conduct

5. SAFETY/SECURITY ISSUES

Public safety  Safety and security  Personal safety
Campus police  Campus safety  Personal security
Safety department  Crime and safety at the university  Campus security

6. TRANSPORTATION

Automobiles and insurance  Campus parking  Public transportation
Cars and bikes issues  Transportation issues  Cars -- legal issues

7. HEALTH RELATED ISSUES

Health insurance  Health care  Health and counseling
Health service  Immunization  Wellness Center
Health check  Medical services  Counseling services
Health issues  Wellness
8. ADJUSTMENT AND CULTURE SHOCK

Culture shock  Issues int'l student adjustment  Adjustment concerns
Cultural adjustment

9. CAMPUS RESOURCES/OPPORTUNITIES/SERVICES

Host family program  Int'l student associations  Recreational Center
Student programming council  Orientation activities  Campus activities
Clubs/Associations  Student activities  Study skills
Opportunities to educate Americans  Conversation partners program  Campus resources
International Office procedures  University facilities  Learning center
Clubs of interest to int'l students  Computing services on campus  Hospitality program
Programs & services for women  Important areas of the college  ESL classes
Counseling & Testing assessment  Tutoring services
Contributing to the university community
Orientation for families
Int'l Student Office programs & services

10. AREA RESOURCES/OPPORTUNITIES/SERVICES/INFORMATION

Orientation to Capitol District  Community resources  Cultural events
Community awareness  Traveling  Life in the city
Recreation opportunities  Fun places to visit

11. AMERICAN CULTURE

Basic values of U.S. culture  American customs  American culture
Introduction to American football

12. CROSSCULTURAL ISSUES

Cultural awareness  Experiences in crossing cultures

13. SOCIAL/RELATIONSHIP ISSUES

Relationships  Cultural interaction  AIDS/Safe sex
14. SHOPPING

Shopping in town  Shopping for food  Consumer education

15. SURVIVAL

Survival issues

16. MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES

- Discrimination (sexual, racial)
- Religious opportunities
- Extracurricular activities
- Social security
- Telephone use
- Departure and sailing permits
- Leisure needs
- Children of the world
- Personal hygiene

EXAMPLES OF CULTURAL EVENTS ATTENDED

1. ARTS

Concerts  Theater productions  Movies
Folk dancing  Music festival  Musical
Ballets  Plays

2. SPORTS

Baseball games

3. OTHER

Martin Luther King celebration  Danish day celebration  City events
Asian festival  River fest  October fest
Reenactment of Indian treaty
EXAMPLES OF TOPICS COVERED DURING PANEL PRESENTATIONS

1. ACADEMIC/STUDENT LIFE ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic responsibilities</th>
<th>Academics</th>
<th>Academic success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic expectations</td>
<td>The university library</td>
<td>Student perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American universities</td>
<td>Success in grad school</td>
<td>Graduate life/studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student life in the U.S.</td>
<td>Campus life</td>
<td>Campus slangs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational differences</td>
<td>U.S. educational system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old students-first impressions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. IMMIGRATION AND OTHER LEGAL/ETHICAL ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights and regulations</th>
<th>F &amp; J visas</th>
<th>Immigration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. HEALTH RELATED ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health care</th>
<th>Counseling services</th>
<th>Health services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. ADJUSTMENT/CULTURE SHOCK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment &amp; expectations</th>
<th>Crosscultural adjustment</th>
<th>Adjusting to the U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. SOCIAL/RELATIONSHIP ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building relationships w/ Americans</th>
<th>Social life</th>
<th>Talking to Americans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meet inscrutable Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. OTHER CROSSCULTURAL ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural differences</th>
<th>Intercultural issues</th>
<th>Stereotypes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. OPPORTUNITIES/SERVICES AVAILABLE

- Undergraduate opportunities
- Club activities
- Tutoring services
- Int'l Students Office
- Activities beyond academics
- Support services
- Study skills
- Hospitality program

8. HOUSING

- Housing conflicts
- Residence hall living

9. FOOD

- Food problems
- Food issues

10. BANKING/FINANCIAL ISSUES

- Budgeting
- Stretching your money

11. SAFETY/SECURITY ISSUES

- Campus security

12. AMERICAN CULTURE

- Understanding American culture
- Do's and don'ts

13. MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES

- All you wanted to know about...
- Southern language and idioms
- Racism
EXAMPLES OF ROLE PLAYS/SIMULATION GAMES AND THE TOPICS THEY COVERED

1. HEALTH RELATED
   Anxiety               Stress on campus

2. HOUSING
   Roommate conflicts   Dormitory stay

3. AMERICAN CULTURE
   American communication styles   American manners

4. CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR
   Classroom activities

5. RELATIONSHIP ISSUES
   Sexual assault   Sexual harassment   Date rape

6. OTHER CULTURAL ISSUES
   Value conflicts   Crosscultural communication   Different cultural assumptions

7. ADJUSTMENT
   Cultural adjustment
8. MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES

Get acquainted game  Icebreaker  Scavenger hunt
Significant names

EXAMPLES OF SOCIAL EVENTS AND THE AUDIENCES INVOLVED

SOCIAL EVENTS

Picnics  Receptions  Dinners
Dinners/Parties  Luncheon  Ice-cream socials
Evening social events  BBQ  Rotary weekend
Group socials  Potlucks  Cookouts
Pizza and movie party  Welcome dance  Comedy night
Beach party  TGIF (for grads)  Tea
Friendship groups (American & int'l stds)  Coffee hour

AUDIENCES INVOLVED (besides newly arrived international students and international office staff)

Host families  Community members  American students
"Old" international students  Advisors  Faculty members
Staff members  Members campus organizations  University president
Orientation volunteers  University administrators

EXAMPLES OF READING MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED (OR SUGGESTED) DURING INITIAL ORIENTATION

1. SAFETY/SECURITY MATERIALS

Security/Safety brochure

2. SHOPPING

Consumer pamphlet
3. **HEALTH RELATED MATERIALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health insurance</th>
<th>Student health center</th>
<th>Counseling center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's information</td>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health pamphlet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **AMERICAN CULTURE/LIFE MATERIALS**

| The American Way | Readings on American culture & life |

5. **IMMIGRATION AND OTHER LEGAL ISSUES**

| Employment | Immigration handouts |

6. **HOUSING**

| Housing brochure | Apartment information | Adjusting to dorm life |
| Dorm rules | Rental guide | |

7. **FINANCIAL ISSUES**

| Finances | Bank brochures |

8. **TRANSPORTATION**

| Bus/train schedule | Bus information | Driver's manual |

9. **ORIENTATION RELATED MATERIALS**

| Orientation survival guide | Orientation handouts/information FSA roles |
| Orientation handbook | |
10. ACADEMIC/STUDENT LIFE MATERIALS

- University policy booklet
- International student handbook
- Working w/ U.S. professors
- University responsibilities
- TOEFL handbook
- Code of student conduct
- Study skills information
- On becoming an international student
- Registration checklist/information

- School catalogue
- Student arrival guide
- Cafeteria plans
- University calendar
- Graduation requirements
- Transfer information
- University requirements

- Class schedules
- Welcome handbook
- Library information
- University handbook
- Library handbook
- Semester schedule
- Academic calendar

11. CAMPUS RESOURCES/OPPORTUNITIES/SERVICES MATERIALS

- Computer Center classes
- Organization & support groups
- Host family applications

- ESL flier
- Clubs on campus

- Campus resources
- University services

- Foreign student service council

12. AREA RESOURCES/OPPORTUNITIES/SERVICES MATERIALS

- City attractions
- Community groups
- Tourism information

- Area information/opportunities
- Daycare

- Community programs
- Community services

13. TELEPHONE MATERIALS

- Information sheet w/ phone numbers
- Long distance dialing
- Phone directories

- AT&T information

14. MISCELLANEOUS MATERIALS

- Campus/city/state maps
- Welcome letter
- Religious groups--brochure
- Acquaintance rape handout

- Int'l student newsletter
- Social Security application
- U.S. government responsibilities

- "How Guide"
- Checklists
- Metro area maps
EXAMPLES OF FILMS/VIDEOS/SLIDES PRESENTED

1. ACADEMICS/STUDENT LIFE

School video
Introduction to the university
How to use phone registration
Introduction to grad school
What's on the midterm, Dr. Brown?

Slides registration procedures
University policies
Int'l student office--slide show
Admissions tape
What is expected of foreign grad students

Campus overview
Library welcome
Being a student

2. AMERICAN CULTURE/VALUES

Commercial reflections of American values

3. ADJUSTMENT

Cold Water

Culture Shock

4. HEALTH RELATED

Health care in the U.S.

Health Center--slide presentation My Health Care

5. IMMIGRATION

Immigration video

INS requirements

6. HOUSING

Where shall I live?

7. SAFETY

Safety issues
8. MISCELLANEOUS

Cultural programs--slides  Anti discrimination video  Popular videos
Football video  Interview w/ int'l students  NAFSA videos
Video produced by minority & int'l stds
Community services for int'l visitors