

Intercultural Partnerships that Foster Cultural Competence among Undergraduate Students

Elizabeth J. Sandell, PhD -- Minnesota State University, Mankato, MN (USA)

Background/Introduction

Literature Review

Methodology

Cultural Partnerships

Nine hours of contact time required, along with a series of assignments that included establishing the partnership, interviews, common recreational activities, and reflection.

Students in the course earned points for their assignments; international students earned points to qualify for academic scholarships. * Previous analysis suggested students began the course with an ethno-centric minimization orientation toward cultural differences.

* Formative assessments showed that students in general had very few relationships with persons from other cultures.

* So, a major course revision was made to require experience and reflection in a Cultural Partnership. *When the course went online, the assignment was revised into the Giving Voice Project. * Intergroup Contact Theory, Allport (1954), suggests that positive effects of intergroup contact occur in contact situations characterized by four key conditions:

- \circ equal status,
- \circ cooperation,
- \circ common goals, and
- support by social and institutional leaders.

* Others have applied ICT to intercultural and cross-cultural contacts (Berryman-Fink, 2006; Campbell, 2012; Sakurai et al, 2010). * Convenience Sample –
Undergraduates in 3 semesters
of Human Relations in a
Multicultural Society at a midsize Midwest university.
* Four groups:
(1)on-campus Cultural
Partnership with international students;
(2)virtual Cultural Partnership
with international students;
(3)virtual group Cultural
Partnership;
(4)Giving Voice Project.

* Survey Methodology -

Between 2012 and 2019, facilitated by the course instructor and the university's International Center to match class members with international students who were studying on campus.

Spring 2020, some students matched with international students and completed activities online, through Facebook, mobile phone, or other device platform.

Fall 2020 & Spring 2021. One section was matched as a class cohort with a class cohort of Alaska

at Course Conclusion Group	Ν	Μ	SD	SE	Diff.	F	df	р
<u> </u>					3.68	0.73	1	0.4
Cultural Partnership / not GVP	77	92.24	16.24	1.85				
US ethnic difference on-campus	9	92.77	14.89	4.96				
International student on-campus	52	91.49	16.53	2.29				
International student on-line	3	97.28	25.11	14.5				
Alaska Native on-line	13	93.68	15.68	4.35				
Giving Voice Project / not CP	25	90.12	13.66	2.73				

Intercultural Development Inventory TM online during class time.

* Score of interest: IDI Developmental Orientation at conclusion of the course.

Participants & Setting

* All participants were undergraduate students in enrolled in Human Relations in a Multicultural Society (n=102).

* Participants were 26% male and 74% female, with an average age of 21 years (range, 18 - 24years old).

* At a mid-sized public university in the Midwest of the United States. Data/Results

* SPSS v.5 was used to compare the IDI scores for students with Cultural Partnerships or with the Giving Voice Project.

* A complex contrast between the mean Developmental Orientation score of the cultural partnership group (comprised of US ethnic difference, international student oncampus, international student online, and Alaska Native on-line) (M = 92.24, SD = 16.24) compared the Giving Voice Project group (M = 90.13, SD = 13.66).

Future Research

* Examine if similar results occur with undergraduate students from underrepresented groups.

* Examine if similar results occur with different disciplines.

* Examine if similar results occur if the Cultural Partnership is more directed and individually matched.

Native students. Two other sections fulfilled a Giving Voice Project.

Giving Voice Project was individually designed to 'give voice' to an issue on behalf of a culture or marginalized group. * Outcome data for three Spring semesters: 2019, 2020, and 2021.

* The mean difference was 3.68, 95% CI [-12.23, 4.87], was not a statistically significant difference,

p = .40.

* Examine if similar results occur with the Giving Voice Project.