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Abstract

This thesis investigated the 11-year-old children’s intercultural learning experience in an international summer camp (CISV Village programme) and the short-term and long-term effects of this experience on the participants’ intercultural development. It consists of three separate but related studies: (1) a participant observation study of a CISV Village held in the UK; (2) a longitudinal questionnaire study of a group of British children who participated in CISV Villages held in various nations in 2006; and (3) an interview study of nine former participants who participated in a CISV Village programme when they were eleven.

Through detailed analysis of interactions in group activities in a CISV Village, it is found that the children employ a range of linguistic and interactional resources, in particular language alternation, clarification and repair, and shadowing, to negotiate and manage their participation, despite disparities in their English language abilities. The analysis also shows how the participants deal with the tensions in group dynamics and cooperate with each other in the activity. The interactional study sheds light on these children’s intercultural learning in an international camp to some extent. The results of the longitudinal study and the interview study demonstrate that most young and former participants are positive about the experience. The participants perceived that the intercultural learning experience in that camp not only facilitated their intercultural communicative competence (ICC) development but also brought about personal changes to them, which they characterized as significant, positive and enduring. The findings have theoretical and practical implications for understanding and facilitating youth intercultural learning.

The thesis proposes that the development of intercultural friendship constitutes the primary aim and outcome of the participants’ intercultural learning. The thesis also evaluates several models of ICC and adds to the current methodological debates on how to measure the development of ICC and intercultural learning.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CISV</td>
<td>Children’s International Summer Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>Intercultural communicative competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYE</td>
<td>International youth exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Intercultural education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC</td>
<td>Junior counsellor in a CISV camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Attitudes towards different cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Attitudes towards different languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>Flexibility/empathy in intercultural encounters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART I  INTRODUCTION
Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Research background

Intercultural learning and education have become an increasingly important issue in today’s globalised world. As we all know, the world today is characterised by an ever growing number of intercultural contacts resulting in communication between people with different ethnic, cultural and linguistic backgrounds. This communication takes place in the political, economic, educational, cultural and other contexts at global, national and individual levels. Therefore, how to construct effective intercultural communication between people from different cultures has become important. From the perspective of individuals, intercultural learning is the first step for them to become competent in intercultural encounters. At national level, intercultural education is believed to be the most appropriate educational policy and approach to prepare their citizens to meet the challenges of intercultural communication (Portera, 2008).

Nowadays, there are various intercultural training and intercultural education programmes in both professional and educational contexts. International youth exchange is one special kind of intercultural education programme which aims to provide opportunities for young people to broaden their horizons and international perspective. They are usually organized by independent, non-profit making and charitable international exchange organizations. International youth exchange programmes always adopt an experiential learning approach and emphasize encounters with people from different cultures. In these programmes, participants always have the chance to study abroad or live with people from different cultures for a period of time. Tens of thousands of young people from at least 60 nations around the world participate in one of these various youth exchange programmes each year. International youth exchanges have played an important role in promoting intercultural learning among young people around the world (Bennett, 2009).

In order to measure the educational effects of these international youth exchange programmes, various short-term and long-term impact studies have been conducted by the exchange organizations in the past thirty years. The existing research results show that the educational effects of intercultural learning through international youth
exchanges lie in two dimensions: (1) the impact on participants’ intercultural communicative competence development; (2) the impact on participants’ personal growth and development. The implied goal of intercultural learning is the development of intercultural communicative competence or intercultural competence, which includes awareness, attitudes, knowledge and skills development to enable positive and effective interaction with members of other cultures (Bennett, 1993; Dignes & Baldwin, 1996). These studies also demonstrate that the positive educational effects of the intercultural experiences in the youth exchange programmes is not only short-term but also long-term. They argue that the time spent in youth exchange is a ‘life-changing’ experience. However, the participants of the youth exchange programmes in these studies are very often high school students aged 15-18. Few studies have targeted the youth exchange participants who are younger at the beginning of their teenage. Moreover, little is known about the process of participants’ intercultural learning in the youth exchange programmes and how they interact with people from different cultures in the settings. Detailed information about the youth exchange programmes or the intercultural learning setting is seldom provided in these impact studies. However, they are essential for our comprehensive understanding of these youth exchange participants’ intercultural learning experiences. In addition, most of the short-term impact research adopted a pre-post research design to measure the immediate impact of youth exchanges on participants. Longitudinal research is needed to understand how the participants sustain and transfer the intercultural learning outcomes from the youth exchange programmes into new intercultural encounters months after their exchange experiences.

The present project focuses on 11-year-old children’s intercultural learning experience in an international summer camp, called CISV Village. The purpose of the project is to investigate what and how these children learn in the international summer camp and how they develop their intercultural communicative competence in the short-term and long-term perspectives following their intercultural experiences in the camp. This interdisciplinary and mixed methods project not only examines both the short-term and long-term impact of the intercultural learning experience in a CISV Village on the intercultural development of the participants, but also examines the
participants’ intercultural learning experience in the village through the fieldwork and interactional analysis of their interactions in the activities.

1.2 Research questions

The project attempts to answer the following main research questions and their respective sub-questions:

1. What is the young participants’ intercultural learning experience in a CISV Village?
   (i) How do the young participants from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds in the village negotiate and manage their participation in the group activities?
   (ii) What factors influence the young participants’ active participation in the multi-party interactions and the group activities in the CISV Village?

2. What is the immediate and short-term impact of CISV Village participation on the young participants?
   (i) What are the immediate effects of the CISV Village experience on the young participants’ ICC development?
   (ii) How do the young participants develop their ICC nine months after their participation in the CISV villages?
   (iii) What is the impact of the CISV experience on the young participants’ personal growth during the period of this longitudinal investigation?

3. What is the long-term impact of CISV Village participation on former participants?
   (i) What is the long-term impact of CISV Village experience on the former participants’ ICC development and personal development?
   (ii) How do the former participants themselves perceive the impact from the long-term perspective?

1.3 Project design

To answer these research questions, a mixed methods research project was conducted with the participants taking part in a CISV Village programme. This international youth camp programme is provided by an international children’s charity,
CISV. The aim of this CISV Village programme is to help participants to learn to understand and appreciate people of different cultures by living together with people from 10 or 12 countries and participating in various activities and practical work in a four-week summer camp (CISV, 2008b). The first study focuses on the intercultural learning experience of young participants (11-year-old) in a CISV village, especially on how those children from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, using English as the lingua franca, negotiate and manage their participation in group activities. Children’s interactions in the group activities in the CISV village were collected and analysed in detail. The second study focuses on the young participants’ immediate and short-term learning outcomes of their intercultural learning through a CISV Village programme. Questionnaires were filled in by CISV village participants before, immediately after and nine months after participation in the CISV camps. The third study focuses on the long-term impact of the intercultural learning experiences through a CISV Village programme on the former participants. Nine former CISV participants were interviewed to examine how they perceive the impact of that experience on their intercultural development and their lives. The three studies together can draw a picture of the process of participants’ intercultural development as a result of their intercultural experience in a CISV Village at a young age.

1.4 Thesis outline

This thesis consists of ten chapters in four main parts. Part I (Chapter 1) introduces the research purpose and research questions of the project and offers an overview of the project and the outline of the thesis.

Part II includes three separate literature review chapters: Chapters 2, 3 and 4. These chapters define the key theoretical frameworks and concepts to this thesis and review the relevant empirical literature. Chapter 2 discusses a number of issues on the concept of intercultural communicative competence (ICC): the conceptual frameworks of ICC, the instruments and the methodological issues of ICC assessment and the main occasions of developing ICC. Chapter 3 focuses on the concepts of intercultural education, intercultural learning and international youth exchange; it in turn explains the conceptual development of ‘intercultural education’ and its relationships with other similar disciplines of education, outlines the educational objectives, approaches to and
process of intercultural learning, and comprehensively introduces the international youth exchange as a special intercultural education programme for the young people. Chapter 4 discusses the importance of evaluating the effectiveness of the intercultural learning in IYE programmes and reviews the previous empirical studies which examined the impact of IYE programmes on participants.

Part III focuses upon the project and includes Chapters 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9. Chapter 5 offers an introduction of the research organization this research project works with – CISV, and especially describes the characteristics of the CISV Village programme based on the fieldwork of a camp. Chapter 6 explains the research design of this project, generically discusses the methods adopted for the three related studies of this project, and discusses a series of ethical issues involved in the process of conducting the project. The following Chapters 7, 8, 9 present detailed analysis of data for the three studies and discuss the findings respectively. Chapter 7 presents the analysis of two episodes of children’s interactions in group activities in a CISV camp and discusses how children from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds communicate in English as the lingua franca and manage their participation in the group activities. Chapter 8 presents the results of the longitudinal investigation of the impact of the intercultural learning experience in a CISV Village programme on young participants’ ICC development and personal growth. Chapter 9 presents the results of the interview study on the long-term impact of the intercultural learning in a CISV Village programme at a young age on the former participants’ ICC development and personal development.

The thesis ends with Chapter 10 (i.e. Part IV). It summarises the main findings, establishes the theoretical and practical implications, reflects on the limitations of the three studies in this project, and provides some suggestions for future research.
PART II  LITERATURE REVIEW
Chapter 2 Intercultural Communicative Competence

2.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to explore some key issues on intercultural communicative competence: what ICC is, how to assess ICC and how to develop ICC. This chapter is organized as follows: the concept of ICC is explored by comparing two pairs of notions: ‘intercultural’ versus ‘cross-cultural’ and ‘communicative competence’ versus ‘communication competence’ in 2.2; then the important models of ICC from the communication and education backgrounds are reviewed in 2.3; the predominant instruments for assessing ICC are reviewed and the methodological issues in assessing ICC are discussed in 2.4; how to develop intercultural communicative competence is discussed in 2.5 and finally a summary of the chapter is given in 2.6.

2.2 Defining ICC

Intercultural communicative competence has been a topic of interest in the field of intercultural communication research over several decades. Researchers in the late 1950s and early 1960s became interested in ICC because of its practical relevance to people who started travelling to other countries for business or as Peace Corps volunteers, for example. Since then, ICC has been studied in various contexts such as sojourner adaptation, acculturation, international business and management, training, international education and cross-cultural counselling. However, there is a lack of consensus on a definition of this concept in the literature (Wiseman, 2002; Deardorff, 2008).

Many different terms have been used to describe the same or similar concepts (Bradford, Allen, & Besser, 2000; Koester, Wiseman, & Sanders, 1993). In addition to the term ‘intercultural communicative competence’, other often-used terms include intercultural communication competence, cross-cultural competence, intercultural competence, and intercultural communication effectiveness. It seems that scholars from different research backgrounds have their own particular preferences in using

---

1 Apart from these, other terms which are used relatively less include transcultural competence, global competence, cross-cultural competence, international competence, etc.
these terms in the scholarly discourses. *Intercultural competence* is often used by the researchers in international education and intercultural education fields as a shorter form of *intercultural communication competence* (e.g. Fantini, 2000; Deardorff, 2008), while *intercultural communication competence* and *intercultural communication effectiveness* are preferred by the communication scholars (e.g. Gudykunst & Mody, 2002) and *cross-cultural competence* by the cross-cultural management researchers (e.g. Magala, 2005). More recently, the term of ‘intercultural communicative competence’ coined by Byram (1997), which maintains a link with traditions in foreign language teaching in adapting the concept of ‘communicative competence’, is frequently used in applied linguistics literature.

The lack of consensus on the understanding of ICC and the inconsistency of the terms used is due to: a) the development of the field itself: ‘intercultural’ versus ‘cross-cultural’; b) different fields and different focuses: ‘communicative competence’ versus ‘communication competence’.

2.2.1 ‘Intercultural’ versus ‘cross-cultural’

As mentioned earlier, ‘communicative competence’ can be modified either with ‘intercultural’ or ‘cross-cultural’. Although the terms of ‘intercultural communication’ and ‘cross-cultural communication’ are sometimes used synonymously in some works, they are different from each other. A commonly accepted general distinction between these two terms is that cross-cultural communication emphasizes the comparison between different cultures while intercultural communication emphasizes the interaction between the individuals from different cultures (Koester et al., 1993; Lustig & Koester, 2003). These two terms will be explained as below.

Cross-cultural communication is a field of study that compare how people from different cultural backgrounds communicate, in similar and different ways among themselves and how they endeavour to communicate across cultures. The main theories for cross-cultural communication are based on the work looking at the value differences between different cultures, especially the work of Edward T. Hall (1976), Geert Hofstede (1980; 2001), and Trompenaars (1993). These theories have been influential on the development of international marketing, international business management, and human resource management in multi-national companies (e.g.
Trompennars & Hampden-Turner, 2004). The view from these cross-cultural communication theories that cultural differences are an *a priori* condition for interpreting people’s social interaction and behaviour is also applied to earlier works in cross-cultural pragmatics and interactional sociolinguistics studies (e.g. Gumperz, 1978; Li, 1999; Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 2007). These studies assumed that cultural differences determined speakers’ discourse strategies and were a source of intercultural miscommunication (for critical comments, see Zhu Hua, in press).

In contrast, the field of intercultural communication focuses on how people from different cultural and sub-cultural backgrounds interact. According to Jandt (2007), intercultural communication refers to face-to-face interactions among people of diverse cultures. Many intercultural communication theories had been developed in the 1990s. These theories can be seen to focus on five strands:

- on effective outcomes (e.g. Gudykunst’s anxiety/uncertainty management theory, 1995; Oetzel’s effective group decision making theory, 1995),
- on accommodation or adaption (e.g. Gallois, Giles, Jones, Cargile, and Ota’s communication accommodation theory, 1995),
- on identity negotiation and management (e.g. Ting-Toomey’s identity negotiation theory, 1993; Cupach and Imahori’s identity management theory, 1993),
- on communication networks(e.g. Kim, 1986; Yum, 1988),
- on acculturation and adjustment (e.g. Kim’s cross-cultural adaption theory, 1995)².

Apart from these theories from the perspective of social psychology, there are other approaches to intercultural communication. For instance, Scollon and Scollon (1995) offer a discourse approach to intercultural communication and they regard intercultural communication as the communication across the boundaries of groups, or discourse systems which can be from the most inclusive of those groups, cultural groups to gender groups. Holliday, Hyde and Kullman (2004) explore the social strategies for achieving successful intercultural communication and emphasize the importance of the understanding of social and psychological forces that underpin intercultural communication. These theories examine different constituent elements of

---

² Gudykunst (2002) offered a review and a synthesis of various intercultural communication theories.
intercultural communication.

According to Jandt (2007), intercultural and cross-cultural are different contexts for the study of communication and culture. Despite their different emphases, both of these two fields seek to understand how people from different countries and cultures act, communicate, and perceive the world around them.

2.2.2 ‘Communicative competence’ versus ‘communication competence’

According to Spitzberg and Cupach (1984), both the terms communicative competence and communication competence initially refer to “the ability to demonstrate appropriate communication behaviour in a given context” (p.35). However, these two concepts have been developed differently by researchers in different fields. Although these two terms are often used interchangeable with each other in the contexts of intercultural-related research, individually they are concepts from different fields. The term of ‘communicative competence’ is one of the most common and important terminologies used in the field of language teaching and learning, while the term ‘communication competence’ is often used in communication studies.

Communicative competence is a concept introduced by the sociolinguist Dell Hymes and discussed and refined by many scholars. This term ‘communicative competence’ was coined by Hymes (1972) in a critique of Chomsky’s distinction between competence and performance. Hymes’s original idea was that a speaker of a language has to have more than grammatical competence (linguistic competence) in order to be able to communicate effectively in that language; they also need to know how language is used appropriately by members of a speech community to accomplish their purpose. Hymes was concerned originally to analyse social interaction and communication within a social group using one language (ethnography of communication); he was not writing for the foreign language teaching (FLT) profession and did not pay specific attention to intercultural communication either (Byram, 1997).

The concept of communicative competence was interpreted in the context of FLT by others. Canale and Swain (1980) defined communicative competence in terms of four components: 1) grammatical competence (words and rules), 2) sociolinguistic
competence (appropriateness), 3) discourse competence (cohesion and coherence), and 4) strategic competence (appropriate use of communication strategies). Based on Canale and Swain’s model of communicative competence, Van Ek (1986) developed what he called a framework for comprehensive foreign language learning objectives. Van Ek’s ‘communication ability’ model comprises six components as below:

1) Linguistic competence: the ability to produce and interpret meaningful utterances, which are formed in accordance with the rules of the language.

2) Sociolinguistic competence: the awareness of ways in which the choice of language forms is determined by factors such as setting, relationships, etc.

3) Discourse competence: the ability to use appropriate strategy in the construction and interpretation of texts.

4) Strategic competence: the ability to use communication strategies to express oneself and understand others’ messages.

5) Socio-cultural competence: the familiarity with the social-cultural context of communication.

6) Social competence: both the will and the skill to interact with others.

This model is explicitly developed in the context of his view of how FLT must be justified through its contribution to learners’ general education. He emphasizes that FLT is not just concerned with training in communication skills but also with the personal and social development of the learner as an individual. The notion of communicative competence had fundamental impact on foreign language teaching (especially English language teaching), which signalled the shift from grammar-based pedagogy to communicative language teaching (Leung, 2005; Byram, 1997).

Communication competence is referred to as ‘competence in communicating’ by Spitzberg and Cupach (1984). The complex nature of communication competence as a construct is best illustrated in the following quote from Spitzberg (1991):

In general, to be viewed as competent, an individual must desire to interact competently with a particular individual in a specific context. Even wanting to interact competently does not guarantee understanding of the requirements and the rules for communicating competency. And possessing both motivation and knowledge to interact competently still may not produce effective communication if the individual lacks the skills to interact competently. (Spitzberg, 1991, p.22)
Spitzberg and Cupach (1984) proposed a component model of relational competence in an attempt to provide a comprehensive approach to competence in communicating. In this component model of relational competence, “the elements of motivation, knowledge, and skill are seen as interacting with communicative situations to constitute the process of competence which leads to functional outcomes” (p.100). It is suggested that “to be a competent communicator, one is likely to need to be motivated to communicate, knowledgeable about how to communicate, skilled in communicating, and sensitive to the expectations of the context in which the communication occurs” (p.152). This is developed as a conceptual model of competence in communicating which embodies six critical assumptions in the conceptualisation of competence:

1) Competence is perceived appropriateness and effectiveness;
2) Competence is contextual;
3) Competence is a matter of degree;
4) Competence is both molar (specific) and molecular (general);
5) Competence is an interdependent process; and
6) Competence is an interpersonal impression (of self or other).

The component model of competence is not a theory about communication, but rather a model that has sets the framework for what makes someone a competent communicator.

We can see that the interpretation of communicative competence discussed above is from the field of second language learning and teaching while the conceptualisation of communication competence is based on the contexts of communication studies. However, Spitzberg and Cupach’s understanding of communication competence and their component model has had more influence on the research of intercultural communicative competence. Although their model of communication competence was not developed for the purpose of explaining the communication action in intercultural contexts, it has become the prototype of many ICC models because of its breadth. This model can be easily applied to a criterion of appropriateness and effectiveness that make up a competent communicator. The impact of Spitzberg and Cupach’s model of competence on the research of ICC can also be demonstrated from the existing definitions of ICC as discussed in the next section.
2.2.3 Definition of ICC

The concept of ICC has been defined differently by intercultural experts based on their individual research assumptions concerning ICC. For example, Imahori and Lanigan (1989) defined it as “the appropriate level of motivation, knowledge, and skills of both the sojourner and the host-national in regards to their relationship, leading to an effective relational outcome” (pp. 276-277). This definition emphasizes the relational goal of intercultural communication. Chen and Starosta (1996) define ICC as “the ability to negotiate cultural meanings and to execute appropriately effective communication behaviour that recognizes the interactants’ multiple identities in a specific environment” (pp. 358-359). This definition emphasizes that competent persons must know not only how to interact effectively and appropriately with people and the environment, but also how to fulfill their own communication goals by respecting and affirming the multilevel cultural identities of those with whom they interact. According to the result of Deardorff’s (2004) Delphi study, the first one that documents consensus among leading intercultural experts on key elements of ICC, the top-rated definition is that “ICC is the ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations based on one’s intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes”. It could be said to be the most appropriate because it not only focuses on the interlocutor’s competence but also issues of communication and behaviour in intercultural situations.

The efforts on ICC research gradually shifted from defining what ICC is to the identification of the abilities needed to be effective in intercultural communication since the end of 1980s (Martin & Hammer, 1989; Wiseman & Koester, 1993). In other words, what dimensions, factors or elements could predict an individual’s competence in intercultural communication? What competences are essential for an individual to be a competent communicator in finishing an overseas assignment or living in an international environment etc? In the past two decades, many models of ICC have been developed attempting to identify the traits needed to be an effective intercultural communicator. A number of ICC models will be reviewed in the next section.

2.3 Models of ICC

As Brislin and Yoshida (1994) note, models are “simplified representations of
complex human behaviour” (p.70). Various models of ICC have been developed by scholars from different research backgrounds, such as communication (e.g. Gudykunst, 1994; Chen & Starosta, 1996), foreign language education (e.g. Byram, 1997) and cross-cultural psychology (e.g. Bennett, 1993), as well as in different contexts of intercultural communication, including international business (e.g. Rhinesmith, 1993), international education (e.g. Deardorff, 2004), and health care settings (e.g. Gibson & Zhong, 2005). For the purposes of this thesis, only four ICC models which have been developed from the backgrounds of communication and education and related to the project reported in this thesis will be reviewed.

2.3.1 Chen and Starosta’s model

Chen and Starosta (1996) synthesize the different approaches to the study of intercultural communication competence into a model of “interactive-multicultural building” (p.362). They describe ICC as an umbrella concept which is comprised of cognitive, affective and behavioural ability of interactants in the process of intercultural communication. The concepts of intercultural sensitivity, intercultural awareness and intercultural adroitness are used to represent the affective, cognitive and behavioural aspects of ICC. Chen and Starosta (1996) claim that these three aspects of ICC are equally important and all are interdependent. These aspects are described as below:

- **Intercultural sensitivity** refers to “the subjects’ active desire to motivate themselves to understand, appreciate, and accept differences among cultures”; it includes four personal attributes: self-concept, open-mindedness, non-judgemental attitudes and social relaxation.

- **Intercultural awareness** refers to “the understanding of culture conventions that affect how we think and behave”; it comprises two components: self-awareness and cultural awareness.

- **Intercultural adroitness** refers to “the ability to get the job done and attain communication goals in intercultural interactions” (ibid, p.367), in other words, the communication skills/behaviours which enable an individual to act effectively in intercultural interaction; it includes message skills, appropriate self-disclosure, behavioural flexibility, interaction management and social
2.3.2 Byram’s model

In his book *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*, Byram (1997) proposed a “prescriptive, ideal model” (p.48) of intercultural communicative competence. Byram’s model of ICC is one of the most accepted, especially in Europe where it has had a profound impact on the integration of culture into language education. His model consists of five components or *saviors* as he defines them, which can be summarised as follows:

- **Intercultural attitudes** (*savoir être*) refer to attitudes towards people who are perceived as different in respect of the cultural meanings, beliefs and behaviours they exhibit, which are implicit in their interaction with interlocutors from their own social group or others; the attitudes for successful intercultural interaction need to be attitudes of curiosity and openness, of readiness to suspend disbelief and judgement which respect to others’ cultures and belief about one’s own.

- **Knowledge** (*savoirs*) refers to the knowledge individuals bring to an interaction with someone from another country; it can be described in two broad categories: knowledge about social groups and their cultures in one’s own and the interlocutor’s country on one hand and knowledge of the processes of interaction at individual and societal levels, on the other hand.

- **Skills of discovery and interaction** (*savoir apprendre/faire*) - ability to acquire new knowledge of a culture and cultural practices and the ability to operate knowledge, attitudes and skills under the constraints of real-time communication and interaction.

- **Skills of interpreting and relating** (*savoir comprendre*) - ability to interpret a document or event from another culture, to explain it and relate it to documents from one’s own.

- **Critical cultural awareness** (*savoir’s engager*) refers to an ability to evaluate practices and products of one’s own and others’ cultures.

In this model, Byram emphasises that the knowledge and attitude factors are
preconditions and attitude factors are viewed as fundamental for ICC development. Byram’s model of ICC has been followed by many researchers in the field of applied linguistics and used as a model for designing curriculum and standards for the requirement of ICC in language teaching.

2.3.3 Fantini’s model

Fantini (2000) proposes a model of ICC from the study abroad background. There are five dimensions in his ICC model: awareness, attitudes, skills, knowledge (A+ASK), and proficiency in the host tongue. Except for the three components of many ICC models – attitudes, knowledge and skills - there are two new components in Fantini’s model: awareness and proficiency in the host language. According to him, there are two facets of awareness - self-awareness and awareness of others. He argues that awareness has become increasingly recognised as another essential component of ICC development along with attitude, knowledge and skills. Moreover, he claims that awareness is the most powerful dimension of ICC and it is central to ICC development because awareness leads to deeper cognition, skills and attitudes just as it is also enhanced by their development. For this reason, awareness is shown at the centre of the graph as demonstrated in Figure 2.1. Fantini also emphasizes the importance to ICC development of learning other languages. ICC is enhanced by developing proficiency in a second language. Learning another language is learning to perceive, conceptualize, and express ourselves in alternative ways. Therefore, language learning will enhance one’s ICC development. This ICC model is especially related to the intercultural learning in the context of study abroad in a foreign culture.

![Figure 2.1 The Construct of Intercultural Communicative Competence](image-url)
2.3.4 Deardorff’s model

Deardorff (2004) develops a model of ICC, called ‘Process Model of Intercultural Competence’. This model has been developed from a Delphi study which is the first study that documented consensus from leading intercultural experts on this concept. As shown in Figure 2.2, this model depicts the movement between attitudes, skills, and knowledge and comprehension at the individual level and the internal and external outcomes at the interaction level in a cyclical framework.

- The **attitudes** of openness (withholding judgement), respect (valuing all cultures), and curiosity and discovery (tolerating ambiguity) are viewed as fundamental to the acquisition of the knowledge and skills that will lead to both the conceptual shifts and the behavioural changes needed to increase intercultural competence.
- The **knowledge** dimension include awareness of one’s own cultural norms and sensitivity to those of other cultures (cultural self-awareness), a deep understanding of other cultures, and sociolinguistic awareness.
- The **skills** refer to both cognitive and communicative skills which include listening, observing, evaluating, analysing, interpreting, and relating.

![Figure 2.2 Process Model of Intercultural Competence](image)
Source: Deardorff (2004)

Note:
- Begin with attitudes; move from individual level (attitudes) to interaction level (outcomes).
- Degree of intercultural competence depends on the degree of attitudes, knowledge/comprehension, and skills achieved.

Such skills, in combination with the prerequisite attitudes and the resulting knowledge gains ideally lead to an internal ‘frame of reference shift’ in which adaptability and flexibility play a central role together with an ethnorelative view and empathy. The mental internal shift ultimately manifests itself in the observable external outcome of effective and appropriate communication and behaviour in intercultural situations. Deardorff (2008) sees that this cycling process in turn reinforces the ongoing process of acquiring and honing one’s ICC. Deardorff’s process model is intended to offer direction for the preparation of “global-ready graduates” in higher education context.

2.3.5 Summary of ICC models

We can see that Spitzberg and Cupach’s (1984) component model of relational competence (reviewed in section 2.2.2 of this chapter) has been the basic framework of these ICC models, which include the elements of motivation (attitudes), knowledge and skills or affective, cognitive and behavioural aspects. The concept of ICC is heterogeneous and multi-dimensional. It seems that there is no consensus as to which elements are the most crucial or their relation to each other between the components of ICC (Chui & Hong, 2005; Deardorff, 2008). Chen and Starosta (1996) perceived that all aspects of ICC were equally important. Byram (1997) and Deardorff (2004) view attitudes as the fundamental factor in the development of ICC. However, Fantini (2000) thinks that awareness is crucial to the acquisition of the knowledge, attitudes’ positive change and skills in ICC development. It is also worth to mention that these models and others which were not reviewed in this section are Western-biased (Hajek & Giles, 2003; Deardorff, 2008). In other words, most of these intercultural experts who developed ICC models are from Western countries, mainly from the USA. Hajek and Giles (2003) suggest that the conceptions of communication competence may differ in non-Western cultures. For example, Chen (1993) defines communication competence
in Chinese culture in terms of the achievement of relational harmony rather than the achievement of individual communicative goals. Yum (1994) identifies elements of Korean communication competence as empathy, sensitivity, indirectness, being reserved and transcendental. The elements from these non-western cultures do not translate into the models of ICC.

2.4 Assessing ICC

2.4.1 Predominant assessment instruments

According to Fantini (2006), there are over 85 assessment tools available to assess various aspects of intercultural communicative competence in the literature. Some of the assessment tools are used more often than the others. Due to the limit of space, only five instruments (see Table 2.1) are reviewed in this section.

Table 2.1 A selection of the instruments for assessing ICC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Author (year)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI)</td>
<td>Hammer and Bennett (1998)</td>
<td>44 item self-reporting assessment tool measuring overall intercultural sensitivity referred to the developmental stages: denial, defence, reversal, minimization, acceptance and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI)</td>
<td>Kelly and Meyers (1993)</td>
<td>50 item self-reporting component assessment focused on four main dimensions: emotional resilience, flexibility/openness, perceptual acuity, and personal autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Intercultural Competence (AIC)</td>
<td>Fantini (2000)</td>
<td>90 item self-assessment focused on five dimensions: awareness, attitudes, knowledge, skills and proficiency in foreign language with four developmental levels of intercultural experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Competence Assessment (INCA)</td>
<td>INCA (2005)</td>
<td>Two different types of test (cognitive/affective-oriented written test and behaviour-oriented group test) focused on six components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters</td>
<td>Council of Europe (2009a)</td>
<td>A personal document with a structured sequence of questions which encourages users to think about and from the intercultural encounters that have made a deep impression or had a long-lasting effect on them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two of the most used instruments in the research are the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) developed by Hammer and Bennett (1998) based on Bennett’s (1993) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) and the Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) developed by Kelley and Meyers (1993). The IDI is designed to assess an individual’s stage in the 6-stage developmental process of intercultural sensitivity from ‘denial’ to ‘acceptance’. This psychometric instrument has been widely used in the studies which aim to measure the ICC development of the participants in study abroad and intercultural exchange programmes (e.g. Jackson, 2008; Hammer, 2005). The CCAI is an instrument designed to address one’s ability to adapt to any culture. It has been widely used as a training tool for intercultural training programmes. It measures the psychological factors that are crucial to success in cross-cultural interactions and situations. It raises the participants’ awareness on whether they are suited to work in a culturally-diverse company and whether they are ready to work abroad and to enter another culture. Due to its sound research foundation and user-friendly features, CCAI is very popular among trainers and cross-cultural specialists. Both of these two instruments are not open to public access.³

Fantini (2000) develops an instrument called Assessment of Intercultural Competence in YOGA Form (“Your Objectives, Guidelines and Assessment” Form) based on his model of ICC. This YOGA form not only aims to examine an individual’s five dimensions of ICC: awareness, attitudes, knowledge, skills and proficiency in foreign language, but also to predict the developmental levels of intercultural experiences. While Fantini’s assessment tool seems more holistic than other instrument (e.g. IDI, CCAI etc) in assessing the ICC because it covers all dimensions of ICC, it is less evidenced in validity and reliability.

Unlike the above four assessment tools, the one developed by the Intercultural Competence Assessment (INCA) project is a multi-method assessment tool which uses questionnaires, role plays and scenarios to measure ICC. The specific impetus for the INCA project is the demand from engineering companies with multinational operations.

³ The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) and analysis software are available to educators/administrators who have successfully completed a three-day qualifying seminar organized by IDI, LLC (or, previously, by the Intercultural Development Institute). (Contact www.idiinventory.com). The CCAI instrument and supplementary products can be purchased from its website.
and with multi-ethnic teams to assess or predict the potential of their employees’ ICC in undertaking international assignments (Prechtl & Davidson-Lund, 2007). This portfolio-type assessment instrument has been developed based on its own framework of ICC, which comprises six components: tolerance for ambiguity, behavioural flexibility, communicative awareness, knowledge discovery, respect for otherness, and empathy. Also, the INCA model of ICC sets up a series of developmental levels: basic, intermediate, and full. The INCA suite of assessment tests includes two types of test: cognitive/affective-oriented written exercises for completion by the candidates and behaviour-oriented group exercises assessed by external assessor. The second type of exercises is designed to observe and measure the candidates’ behaviour in a multi-cultural group exercise, which is also the uniqueness of this tool. However, managing a multi-faceted assessment process is very challenging and expensive.

The newly developed Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters (AIE) (Byram, Barrett, Ipgrave, Jackson, & Méndez García, 2009a) is an educational tool which a multidisciplinary team of researchers has recently developed for the Council of Europe. The theoretical model underlying the AIE was derived from the model of ICC by Byram (1997) (Barrett, 2008). The AIE is a document for cross-curricular and general use in formal and non-formal educational contexts. It has been designed to help learners to analyse a specific intercultural encounter which they themselves have experienced, by answering a structured sequence of questions about that encounter. Through the process of answering these questions in this sequence, the learner is encouraged to think much more deeply about the encounter. And through deep thinking, he/she is encouraged to develop new intercultural competences which can then be used in future intercultural encounters. The facilitators or teachers can also measure learners’ current ICC through the analysis of students’ answers to the questions of an intercultural encounter by referring to the aspects of attitudes, knowledge and skills, behaviour and action. There are two versions of the Autography: a version for younger learners, up to around age 11, including those who are not yet able to read and write (Byram et al., 2009b) and another version suitable for other users in schools and beyond (Byram et al., 2009c). It is hoped that “the Autography will make a significant contribution to nurturing, fostering and supporting the development of the intercultural competences which are required for effective intercultural dialogue.” (Byram et al.,
The AIE can be used as both a self-evaluation and developmental tool to promote change.

The majority of the ICC assessment tools are multiple-item self-reporting instruments (except for INCA and AIE), as the description in Table 2.1 indicates. One common limitation of these self-reporting instruments is that participants may select socially desirable answers in terms of attitudes and values that may mask their true feelings. Participants may have inflated answers to the questions when they are filling in the questionnaires. Another problem with the self-assessment tools is their inability to assess the behaviour dimension of ICC (Prechtl & Davidson-Lund, 2007). Moreover, most of these existing assessment tools cannot assess all the components of ICC (Deardorff, 2008). Thus, there might be some danger in putting too much value in one assessment instrument in measuring the ICC. Apart from the strengths and weaknesses of one assessment instrument, other factors such as the age of the participants, the nature and the context of the intercultural contact under study also need to be considered when choosing a proper instrument to measure the participants’ ICC development (Byram, 1997).

2.4.2 Methodological issues

A number of methodological issues need to be considered when assessing and measuring the development of intercultural communicative competence, such as what dimensions of ICC to assess, who should be assessed, when and how to assess ICC (Lustig & Spitzberg, 1993; Chen & Starosta, 1996; Wiseman, 2001).

First, what should be assessed? Should ICC be assessed holistically by one method or separately by various methods? Fantini (2000) points out that knowledge and skills are customarily addressed in traditional educational assessment because they are quantifiable while awareness and attitude are seldom part of traditional assessment because they are less subject to quantification and documentation. Byram (1997; 2008) expresses a similar idea that it is desirable to assess an individual’s knowledge whereas it might appear undesirable to assess his or her attitudes. However, the behavioural dimension (skills) of ICC is always the neglected part in assessment either from the evidence of the existing assessment tools or the empirical research.

Second, who should be the locus of competence evaluation? Self-report by the
participants themselves or reporting by others, such as parents or teachers? Some populations may be in a better position to report on their competence. For example, adults are more suitable for self-report on ICC than young children.

Third, when should ICC be assessed? According to Lustig and Spitzberg (1993), there are two levels in terms of the time in competence assessment: 1) the cross-sectional versus longitudinal research design; 2) the short-term versus long-term perspective. The first level of the time of assessment concerns the design of the assessment: cross-sectional, pre- and post-testing, or longitudinal. The pre- and post-testing design is the most commonly used one by institutions or organizations in conjunction with measuring the effectiveness of study abroad or intercultural exchange programmes (Deardorff, 2008). However, as Kim (2005) points out, a longitudinal research on ICC seems to be the trend for future research in intercultural communication. Deardorff (2004) suggests that it is important to measure intercultural communicative competence over a period of time as opposed to one time. The second-level of the time concept is whether ICC should be assessed in the short-term or long-term perspective. As Fantini (2000) suggests, ICC development is a life-long process. The perspective to assess ICC in the short-term or long-term depends on the context and purpose of the assessment. If the study is just aimed at finding out the changes before-and-after an intercultural experience, it can be taken as a short-term perspective. If a study would like to discover the changes or development of ICC over a long period of time, the assessment can be taken as a long-term perspective.

Finally, how should ICC be assessed? In other words, what data collection methods should be used to assess ICC? Self-report scales or instruments are the most common method in the empirical research (Dinges & Baldwins, 1996). However, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, there are many limitations with the self-report tools. A discussion on how to best assess ICC has become a focus in research recently. Deardorff (2004; 2008) is of the opinion that a mixture of qualitative and quantitative measures is the best way in measuring ICC according to those intercultural experts in her Delphi study, but interview and observation are among the most valued methods of assessing progress towards ICC according to the administrators of institutions. Other top-rated methods in her study include interview, case studies, narrative diaries, and student presentation.
In a word, the complexity of ICC makes it difficult to be assessed accurately and comprehensively. Nevertheless, ICC assessment research is important and deserves more researchers’ attention. As Fantini (2000) explains, “Assessment provides information that is both about individual achievements towards the stated competences as well as collective programme outcomes” (p.31). The methodological issues were taken into account when the project reported in this thesis was designed.

2.5 Developing ICC

According to Byram (1997), there are three broad categories of location for the youths to develop their intercultural communicative competence: the classroom, pedagogically structured experience outside of the classroom and the independent experience. He also discusses the advantages and disadvantages of these three contexts for developing different dimensions of ICC as follows.

Firstly, the classroom, whether with an emphasis in cultural learning in subject courses or language learning courses, is the main context for children to develop ICC, especially the acquisition of knowledge about another country and culture. Byram (1997, pp.65-68) argues that the classroom has three advantages. It provides the space for systematic and structured presentation of knowledge: knowledge of one’s own and other cultures and knowledge of the communication styles of other cultures. The classroom also provides opportunities for teaching and learning the skills of interpreting and relating documents or events by reading about an event in a document or watching a video. Moreover, the classroom provides the location for reflection on skills and knowledge acquisition outside and therefore for the acquisition of attitudes towards what they have experienced. However, the classroom cannot usually offer the opportunity to develop the intercultural interactional skills in real time. Although it is possible for children to interact with someone from another country or culture in their classroom due to massive immigration in some countries (e.g. the USA, the UK), it would still be an exceptional experience for most children.

Secondly, the pedagogically structured experience outside of the classroom, called “fieldwork” by Byram (1997, p. 68), can be a short visit or long-term residence abroad organized by schools or some international youth exchange education organizations. Fieldwork allows the development of all the skills of ICC in real time, particularly the
skill of interaction. Firstly, it allows learners to bring the knowledge they learned in the classroom or from books into reality, which helps to renew their understanding of the cultural differences between their own culture and the host country’s culture in the field. Secondly, learners have the opportunity to communicate with people from different cultures in real life. It allows them to not only learn about communication behaviour including non-verbal behaviour, but also learn to manage their interaction in any situation. Thirdly, the most important advantage of fieldwork is to change students’ attitude towards people from different cultures. It provides learners with the opportunity to develop attitudes towards other people, other cultures and languages which results from reflection on their own living experiences. I refer to the ‘fieldwork’, the pedagogically structured experience outside of the classroom, as ‘international youth exchange’ in this thesis. International youth exchange as a means of intercultural education for young people will be exclusively introduced in section 3.4 of Chapter 3.

Thirdly, individuals’ independent learning can be both subsequent to and simultaneous with classroom and fieldwork, which can be a trip to a foreign country or casual visit to a foreign friend. Byram (1997) suggests that independent learning will be effective only if learners are able to continue to reflect upon as well as develop their knowledge, skills and attitudes, as a consequence of previous intercultural learning experiences. Independent learning requires learners’ high autonomy to consciously refine and increase their knowledge, skills and attitudes. However, independent learning is very important for life-long intercultural learning and developing ICC in the long-term.

2.6 Summary

This chapter has discussed three issues concerning the concept of intercultural communicative competence: the components of ICC, assessment of it and its development. It is clear that ICC is a complex and multi-component construct. Due to the complexity of this concept, it is very challenging to comprehensively assess individuals’ ICC and its development. A series of methodological issues needs to be considered in assessing ICC. Also, three main locations and means to develop students’ ICC are reviewed. In the next chapter, I will explore three other key concepts: intercultural education, intercultural learning and international youth exchange.
Chapter 3  Intercultural Education, Intercultural Learning and International Youth Exchange

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will focus on three interrelated key concepts for my investigation in this thesis: the concepts of intercultural education, intercultural learning, and international youth exchange. This chapter consists of four main parts: the scope and the importance of intercultural education in the world today and its relationship to other related areas of education is introduced in 3.2; the educational goals of intercultural learning, approaches to intercultural learning, and the process of intercultural learning are discussed in 3.3; 3.4 introduces the history and current development of international youth exchange as a kind of intercultural educational programme together with its types and characteristics; finally, 3.5 gives a brief summary of this chapter.

3.2 Intercultural education

Intercultural education has been used as an umbrella concept to include many related concepts such as multicultural education, anti-racist education, the education of minorities, as well as other concepts, like diversity and citizenship education (Allemann-Ghionda, 2009). In this section, the concept of intercultural education will be explored in two aspects: 1) a brief description of its conceptual development and 2) the relationship of intercultural education to other related sub-disciplines of education.

3.2.1 The concept

Intercultural education has been a topic of discussion in educational sciences or pedagogy since the 1970s. In the USA, ‘multicultural’ education was initially used in scientific articles in the early 1970s, and is still the most widely used term. Likewise, curricula for multicultural education were introduced in Canada in the 1970s, mainly in response to Franco-Canadian movements and other anti-angularised minorities. In Australia, the policy on multicultural education was initiated in the 1970s. In Europe, most countries with relatively high immigration flows (such as France, the Netherlands
and the UK) show a similar line of development with respect to intercultural education (Portera, 2008).

In the 1970s, a strategy of multiculturalism and multicultural pedagogy was adopted by the USA and the Council of Europe. In the field of European pedagogy, there was a positive recognition that ‘being different’ or ‘being other’ should be respected and that someone from another country should be given the same rights as a local person. The educational aim is both to know and to tolerate people with different cultural backgrounds and live in peaceful co-existence. In a practical application, the main risks are the tendency to see other cultures as static and rigid, as well as the danger of stratification; that is, placing of single persons or ethnic groups in a hierarchy. The multicultural pedagogy in many European schools has become one of assimilation of the minority perhaps because of the impossibility of respect all diversities (Allemann-Ghionda, 2009).

It was until the 1980s that the theoretical considerations and practical intervention strategies shifted from *multiculturalism* to *interculturalism*. The importance of the ‘intercultural dimension’ in education was highlighted for the schooling of migrant children. The difference-driven gradually replaced the assimilation-driven pedagogy. In the 1990s, the Council of Europe defined intercultural education in terms of ‘reciprocity’. An intercultural perspective has an educational and political dimension: interactions contribute to the development of cooperation and solidarity rather than to relations of domination, conflict, rejection and exclusion. After the event of 11 September, 2001, ‘intercultural and inter-religious dialogue’ has been widely promoted in Europe.

Despite the theoretical development of intercultural education, both the concepts of multicultural and intercultural education are used simultaneously in scholarly discourse. *Multicultural education* still seems to be more frequently used than *intercultural education* in the UK, the Netherlands and the USA, to name a few, while *intercultural education* has often been used in the majority of European countries (Allemann-Ghionda, 2009). However, these two concepts do differ from each other in conceptual meanings according to recent discussions by many scholars (Portera, 2008; Bleszynska, 2008). Multicultural education aims to respect the cultural diversity of human societies and develop students’ awareness of cultural differences, as well as to
develop anti-discriminatory attitudes. Banks (1993) said, “The major goal of multicultural education is to restructure schools so that all students will acquire the knowledge, attitudes and skills needed to function in an ethnically and racially diverse nation and world” (p.27). Intercultural education, referred to by Portera (2008) as ‘the Copernican revolution in Education’, switches the attention of learners from static and stereotypical images of cultures and cultural differences to the dynamic interaction between cultures in contact and intercultural relations.

Recently, scholars became aware of the ambiguous theoretical position of intercultural education and called for a new round of theoretical reflection on the subject and hoped to achieve consensus on the basics of this discipline (Gundara & Portera, 2008). As a response to this call, for example, Bleszynska (2008) identifies the functions and main objectives of IE at the macro-, mezzo-, and micro-levels of society for the first time. He claims that intercultural education is an applied social science that engages in exploratory-explanatory, adaptive and transformational functions for individuals, institutions and social groups and the specificity of intercultural education is its interest in education and socialization processes in a global and multicultural society. He identifies the main objectives of intercultural education at the macro-, mezzo- and micro-levels of society which are implemented within those functions as below:

(1) **Macro-social/global**: Awareness of the multiplicity of existing cultures and civilizations; respect for other cultures, individuation processes as well as the sense of human solidarity; development of the recognition of human rights as well as the ability to co-exist peacefully with other nations; awareness of the problem areas of migration and transnational spaces.

(2) **Mezzo-social/national**: Support for the development of a culturally diverse democratic civic society; fighting social inequalities resulting from ethnic and racial differences; prevention of intercultural conflicts as well as the reconstruction of social bonds and social capital in the context of culturally heterogeneous groupings.

(3) **Micro-social/individual**: Development of the ability to understand and to develop harmonious and effective functioning at the cultural borderland; tearing down the barriers limiting intercultural contact, such as ethnocentrism, racial and ethnic prejudices or xenophobia; development of intercultural competences and facilitation of acculturation processes.

(Bleszynska, 2008, p.538)

Concerning the importance of intercultural education in today’s world, Portera (2008) suggests that intercultural education is the most appropriate response to
globalization and complexity, as he explains:

Since intercultural education takes into consideration both the common objectives of all human beings and specific peculiarities, it transcends the mere acknowledgement of equal dignity of all people of the world, regardless of skin colour, language and religion (basic principles of trans-cultural education), respect for differences (right to have the same opportunities though being different), or peaceful coexistence (basic principles of multicultural education, which is a desirable goal when we consider wars and injustices in many parts of the world). Intercultural education offers the opportunities to ‘show’ real cultural differences, to compare and exchange them, in a word, to interact: action in the activity; a compulsory principle in every educational relationship. (Portera, 2008, p.488)

Despite the same global challenges faced by all countries, the status and defining characteristics and the practice of IE differs greatly in countries, reflecting the conditions of a given country’s development, its demographic structure and ethnic relations as well as its policy towards immigrants and ethnic minorities. Many edited books (e.g. Cushner, 1998; Banks, 2009) and special issues of journals include articles on the development of intercultural education in various countries. Since it is not the aim of this thesis to examine the development of intercultural education in any particular country, the literature on this will not be discussed in this chapter.

3.2.2 Intercultural education and other sub-disciplines of education

The scope of intercultural education makes it inevitable to overlap with other sub-disciplines. These similar and related sub-disciplines are global education, international education, and peace education. The relations of these areas on education are ambiguous and have never been clear-cut. On the one hand, they overlap with one another in some sense. On the other hand, they are slightly different from each other because they have different focuses.

Intercultural and global education both focus on global processes with regard to cultural globalization and migration in particular, as well as intercultural co-operation and conflicts. Both areas are geared towards raising awareness of the mutual interrelatedness of global problems and processes. Global education is considered both as a political response to the process of globalization and as a way of enabling learners to engage with it and in it (Osler & Vincent, 2002). As Osler and Vincent (2002) describe ‘global education’ as:
Global education encompasses the strategies, policies and plans that prepare young people and adults for living together in an interdependent world. It is based on the principles of co-operation, non-violence, respect for human rights and cultural diversity, democracy and tolerance. It is characterized by pedagogical approaches based on human rights and a concern for social justice which encourage critical thinking and responsible participation. Learners are encouraged to make links between local, regional and world-wide issues and to address inequality. (Osler & Vincent, 2002, p.2)

The link between IE and international education (IEd) seems more complicated. The concept of IEd has only recently become existent within American universities and no firm definition has been constructed up to now. In documents and books, IEd usually refers to study abroad arranged by the institutions of higher education. Study abroad is considered as a major element in the institutions’ efforts to internationalize their campuses. The variety of study abroad options has expanded dramatically from the traditional junior year abroad to semester-long, month-long, even week-long experiences hosted by a variety of institutions (Savicki, 2009). International education can be viewed as a means of changing the world by increasing international understanding through bringing together young people from many different countries. Intercultural education is an inherent part of international education.

Intercultural education and peace education complement each other. The idea of education for peace has emerged in the works of Dewey (1916; 1922), Galtung (1969), etc. The basic belief of peace education ranges from the promotion of peace, as opposed to war and violence, to the resolution of conflicts. Peace education has found its legal and institutional ground within the United Nations Organization as a programme for protecting future generations from war and conflict by promoting mutual understanding and tolerance aimed at the welfare of humankind. UNESCO and UNICEF have become the main international institutions responsible for the promotion of peace education programmes. The areas of mutual interest for IE and peace education fall under the rubric of human rights recognition, tolerance, and combating prejudice and discrimination resulting from ethnic, racial and religious diversity (Bleszynska, 2008).

All these areas of education - intercultural, global, or international, peace education - are the responses to increased diversity of culture and interaction between different cultures witnessed across the globe. They intertwine with each other. Although
education alone cannot eradicate many problems that exist today, it can influence the future by preparing the minds of young people to include a diversity of viewpoints, behavior, and values.

3.3 Intercultural learning

The concept of intercultural education is seen from the perspective of educators and policy makers in nations, while intercultural learning is a concept perceived as being initiated by individuals. They are like two sides of a coin. Although the concept of intercultural learning has been discussed at great length, its exact meaning continues to be the source of much debate and disagreement (O’Dowd, 2003). Intercultural learning has been seen by some as a learning objective, by others as a process of learning, and yet by others as a process of intercultural communication (Kaikkonen, 1997). This section will discuss the concept of intercultural learning from three aspects: 1) educational goals of intercultural learning, 2) approaches to intercultural learning, and 3) the process of intercultural learning.

3.3.1 Educational objectives

Intercultural communicative competence is regarded as the educational goals and desirable outcome of intercultural education and intercultural learning (Shaules, 2007; Byram, 1997; Byram, Nichlos, & Stevens, 2001; Bennett, 2009; Deardorff, 2008). According to Fennes and Hapgood (1997), the educational objectives of intercultural learning are:

- to overcome ethnocentrism, which implies a consciousness that one’s perception is influenced by one’s culture and experience;
- to acquire the ability to empathize with other cultures, which implies an openness towards the foreign and unknown;
- to acquire the ability to communicate across cultural boundaries; and
- to develop a means of co-operation across cultural boundaries and in multicultural societies.

Cushner (1998) describes the educational goals of intercultural education as:

- eliminating prejudice and racism by creating an awareness of the diversity and relative nature of viewpoints and thus a rejection of absolute ethnocentrism;
• assisting people to acquire the skills needed to interact more effectively with people different from themselves; and

• demonstrating that despite the differences that seem to separate people, many similarities do, in fact, exist across groups.

The goals and objectives listed above correspond to the components of intercultural communicative competence, as Byram (1997) and Byram, Nichlos and Stevens (2001) describe the goals of intercultural education as the ‘intercultural speaker’, one who attains intercultural communicative competence.

3.3.2 Approaches to intercultural learning

Section 2.5 of Chapter 2 discusses the advantages and disadvantages of the three common contexts for young people’s intercultural learning and the development of their intercultural communicative competence: the classroom at school, international youth exchange programmes and independent intercultural experiences. This section will discuss the main approaches to intercultural learning. The rare knowledge on the approaches to intercultural learning can be borrowed from the approaches to intercultural training or ICC development interventions in a professional context, which has been developed and used in the field of intercultural training for more than twenty years.

Most approaches to ICC development interventions can be classified on the basis of two sets of contrasting concepts: the degree to which the method is experiential versus didactic, and the extent to which it is a culture-general or culture-specific development (Gudykunst & Hammer, 1983; Gudykunst, Guzley, & Hammer, 1996). The experiential approach is based on the assumption that culture learning is best realised when people have direct or simulated experiences from which to draw on. The didactic approach assumes that a cognitive understanding is essential before individuals can effectively interact with people of another culture. Such understanding can be achieved through traditional means such as lectures, videotapes, and group discussions centred on specific issues such as how to cope with anxiety in communication with people from different cultures. Culture-general training attempts to sensitize people to the kinds of experiences they are most certain to encounter as they interact with people from other cultures. Culture-specific training rests on the
assumption that information about a specific culture or about specific intercultural interactions is essential.

The combination of these two dimensions can lead to four kinds of ICC training interventions: experiential-culture-general, experiential-culture-specific, didactic-culture-general, and didactic-culture-specific (Gudykunst & Hammer, 1983; Gudykunst, Guzley, & Hammer, 1996). The experiential culture-general approach allows learners to have experiences that are designed to mimic real-life intercultural encounters. The didactic culture-general strategy can attempt to present a culture-general content using such cognitive approaches as lectures, videos or films. The experiential culture-specific approach can be an experience, like an overseas business assignment or a year abroad, which involves a host of culture-specific experiences from which people typically learn a great deal about themselves, others, and other cultures and interact with members of a specific group. Finally, the didactic culture-specific approach is aimed at providing opportunities for learners to gain information about specific cultures and their people, which can include background about a country, specific attitudes, values, and behaviour of the people or specific problems that sojourners may face in a given culture.

The most common approaches to intercultural training in the educational context are experiential culture-specific and didactic culture-specific approaches. The experiential culture-specific approach to intercultural learning can be a school link or exchange or international youth exchange experience abroad, while the didactic culture-specific approach is usually implemented in the teaching of geography, world history and foreign language teaching in the school curricula. International youth exchange as a special intercultural training intervention or programme for young people will be introduced in 3.4 later in this chapter.

3.3.3 The process of intercultural learning

This section will discuss the process of intercultural learning from an individual’s perspective. The process of intercultural learning is a complex and multiple-dimensional process of personal learning and development. According to Fennes and Hapgood (1997), the process of intercultural learning has two facets. The first one is related to a mental frame of reference that incorporates the individual’s
value system and filters any new or different experience. This frame of reference expands, adapts and changes during the intercultural learning process, from an ethnocentric position to a confused state to a more balanced frame of reference which involves openness and flexibility. The second facet relates to how an individual’s patterns of behaviour are changed to be consistent with the behaviour patterns of others. In other words, the process of intercultural learning is not only a body of knowledge and skills but also a state of mind that develops a greater capacity for tolerance and ambiguity, an openness to different values and behaviour. In this section, I will review three models on the process of intercultural learning.

### 3.3.3.1 Fennes and Hapgood’s model

Fennes and Hapgood (1997) suggest that the process of intercultural learning takes place along a continuum from ethnocentrism at one end to intercultural competence at the other, as they believe that the desirable outcome of intercultural learning is intercultural competence. There are six steps before arriving at intercultural competence: ethnocentrism, awareness, understanding, acceptance and respect, appreciation and valuing, and change (see Figure 3.1). They regard ethnocentrism as a natural condition as long as one is not confronted directly or indirectly by other cultures. People at the stage of ethnocentrism always have no awareness of culture and cultural differences and view their own culture as the standard. The first step out of ethnocentrism, according to Fennes and Hapgood (1997), is to become aware that there is something different from one’s own culture. This does not mean that a cultural self-awareness is developed. Understanding in this model refers to developing a concept of culture and of cultural differences — a person can become aware of prejudices and stereotypes and develop an understanding about how thinking and behavior are affected. The next step is when a person accepts the cultural differences that he or she encounters and respects other cultures without judging it against his or her own - even though they may contradict his or her own culture. Appreciation and valuing refers to the ability to understand cultural diversity as a resource for growth and development. Change refers to the development of new attitudes, skills and behaviour when a person consciously or unconsciously reacts to characteristics encountered in another culture. This can mean the adoption of attitudes and behaviour of another culture or a ‘third culture’ as a result
of an intercultural experience, which are not inherent in one’s own or the other culture. All these steps together gradually lead to a person’s intercultural competence development.

3.3.3.2 Bennett’s model

Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) is the most accepted model describing the stages of intercultural learning. In his model, Bennett describes in detail what he sees as universal stages that sojourners go through in the process of gaining intercultural sensitivity: denial, resistance, minimization, acceptance, adaptation, and integration (see Figure 3.2). These six stages are a developmental progression on the orientation towards cultural differences from ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism. Bennett (1993) defines ethnocentrism as “assuming that the worldview of one’s culture is central to all reality” (p.30) and ethnorelativism as “assuming that cultures can only be understood relative to one another and that particular behaviour can only be understood within a cultural context” (p.46). The characteristics of these six stages from ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism can be briefly summarised as following:

1. **Denial** The first stage posited by Bennett is denial. In this stage of denial, learners simply do not recognize that cultural difference exists. Someone in denial stage always lives in physical or psychological isolation and the reality of other cultural viewpoints does not exist at all.

2. **Defence** Bennett describes the stage of defence as a “posture intended to counter the impact of specific cultural differences perceived as threatening” (p.34). Cultural difference poses a threat to one’s identity and by extension to one’s cultural reality. There are three kinds of defence described by Bennett: denigration, superiority and reversal. Denigration is one in which negative evaluation is focused on some aspect of cultural difference. Superiority, on the other hand, is a positive evaluation of one’s own culture. Finally, Bennett describes the state of reversal, which involves someone denigrating one’s own
cultural background and believing in the superiority of another.

(3) *Minimization* The final ethnocentric stage for Bennett is *minimization*, which involves “an effort to bury difference under the weight of cultural similarities”. Cultural difference is recognised, but it is seen as less important than certain cultural universals. Bennett describes two forms of minimization: *physical minimization* and *transcendental universalism*. He describes physical minimization as corresponding to the assumption that people everywhere share a fundamentally similar physical biology, which reflects a similar set of needs and motivations. Transcendental universalism refers to some transcendent law or principle, such as the same religious belief.

(4) *Acceptance* Bennett (1993) describes acceptance as marking a fundamental shift in how cultural difference is dealt with. He describes acceptance as ‘cross the barrier’ from ethnocentrism to ethnonrelativism and describes two forms of acceptance, respect for behavioural difference and respect for value difference. Respect for behavioural difference refers to the recognition that how people act reflects deep-seated differences in culture. Bennett sees the acceptance of other values as more difficult than the acceptance of behaviour. Because values are personally offensive. The acceptance of value must be seen as an ongoing process.

(5) *Adaptation* At the stage of *acceptance* the framework of appreciating cultural difference is created, while at the stage of *adaptation* skills for functioning within the cultural viewpoints of others are developed. These skills are seen as an additive process, in which new ways of communicating and looking at things are added to a learner’s personal repertoire. In adaptation learners develop the ability to shift among multiple perspectives, either involves temporary and intentional shifts of a frame of references, called ‘empathy’ or unintentional and tied to more permanent frames of reference, referred as pluralism.

(6) *Integration* Bennett describes the state of adaptation to be ‘good enough’ for most intercultural settings, but he defines integration as one final stage beyond the ability to shift into different cultural points of view. Integration is described as a state in which a sojourner goes beyond cultural difference in the sense that
their cultural identity and criteria for behaviour go beyond the ethnocentric assumptions of any single cultural framework.
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Figure 3.2 Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity

The underlying assumption of this model is that as one’s experience of cultural difference becomes more complex and sophisticated, one’s potential competence in intercultural relations increases (Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003). This model provides a clear criterion for determining a person’s level of intercultural sensitivity and it does not rely on behavioural or subjective emotional measures (Shaules, 2007). In addition, the stages are described in detail, giving us clues about how best to interpret an individual’s intercultural learning experiences.

### 3.3.3.3 Shaules’s model

Shaules (2007) interprets the process of intercultural learning as a sojourner’s cultural learning process in his ‘Deep Culture Model’, a model of intercultural learning focus on the degree of depth of intercultural learning experiences. This model is based on the implicit versus explicit nature of cultural phenomena (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998), which is a foundation of intercultural communication theory. The concept of *deep culture* refers to “the unconscious meanings, values, norms and hidden assumptions that allow us to interpret our experiences as we interact with other people.” (Shaules, 2007, p.11) He claims that the process of intercultural learning is related to the depth of an intercultural experience. Shaules (2004) uses the terms *resistance*, *acceptance* and *adaptation* as labels describing whether an intercultural experience provokes change within a sojourner. Resistance describes “a [conscious or unconscious] unwillingness or inability to allow for internal change in response to the patterns or expectations of a new environment.” (Shaules, 2007, p.114) Acceptance implies “a willingness to perceive as valid the cultural differences encountered, without necessarily implying a change in order to better align one’s internal patterns with those
of the environment” (ibid). Adaption implies “a willingness to allow for internal change in response to adaptive demands in the environment” (ibid). A key concept for understanding these terms is adaptive demands (Shaules, 2007), which refers to the fact that being in a new cultural environment does not automatically constitute a demand for change.

Shaules (2007) argues that all of these reactions to the differences are involved in the intercultural learning process. He holds that acceptance is of central importance as it indicates the recognition of the validity of other worldviews and implies a construal of cultural difference as valid and is thought to encourage cognitive empathy, the increased ability to construe other worldviews as valid. However, adaptation as defined by Shaules does not presuppose acceptance, as it does in Bennett’s (1993; 2004) schema. He argues that the intercultural experiences at different levels (e.g. tourists, short-term visitors, longer-term sojourners) will face adaptive demands at different levels (i.e. deep or surface). A short-term visitor might face adaptive demands at an explicit level or surface level and resist, accept or adapt to them, while a longer-term sojourner may face deeper adaptive demands. They are both going through an intercultural learning process, but at different depths. It means that long-term sojourners could have similar intercultural learning experience as short-term visitors if they try to or are able to isolate themselves from adaptive demands and end up like long-term tourists rather than host community residents. This model distinguishes the degree of depth of intercultural experience as deep versus surface, which provides an important perspective to evaluate the effects of intercultural learning.

Although these models emphasize the cognitive dimension of an intercultural learning process and thus lack sufficient consideration of its emotional and behavioural aspects, they can be useful for understanding a learner’s change or development in an intercultural experience.

3.4 International youth exchange

International youth exchange (IYE) is one kind of intercultural education programme to provide opportunities for young people to broaden their horizons and international perspectives. As Bleszynska (2008) remarks, intercultural education programmes can be realized at different levels (pre-school education, school education,
education at the graduate and postgraduate level), in various types of activities (short training courses and developed education formats), in different modalities (regular education, e-learning) and organization formats (media training, education institutions, or organizations specializing in promoting cross-cultural understanding and peace education). For this thesis, ‘international youth exchange’ refers to the youth exchange and intercultural learning programmes provided by international youth exchange organizations for young people. It is important to distinguish international youth exchange from another level of intercultural education programme - ‘study abroad’, which usually refers to “credit-bearing [overseas] study programmes for undergraduates” (Hoffa & Pearson, 1997, p. xiii). Study abroad programmes are usually led by a member of staff from the home institution, while other students travel on their own and take courses with local students in the host institution. Study abroad programmes are usually academic in nature (Cushner, 1994), officially recognized and accredited by educational institutions usually responsible to an accrediting agency.

In this section, the nature of international youth exchange as a means of intercultural education for young people will be further explored from four aspects: 1) the history and current development of international youth exchange; 2) the theoretical framework of international youth exchange; 3) the types of international youth exchange programmes; and 4) the characteristics of an international youth exchange experience.

### 3.4.1 History of IYE

The concept of international youth travel and exchange originated from the intergroup education movement of the 1930s in the United States. In 1933, the Service Bureau for Intercultural Education was set up in the United States, and thus was born the beginning of the intergroup education movement. Throughout the 1940s, the intergroup education movement sought to reduce racial and ethnic tensions among citizens across and U.S.A. Among its activities, it developed and presented school assemblies and in-service programmes to intensify ethnic consciousness among minority and immigrant children (Cushner, 1998). The movement gave birth to many institutions and organizations devoted to intercultural pursuits. For instance, the American Field Service (known as AFS Intercultural Programmes today), the world’s
largest student exchange organization, traces its roots back to those years when American Field Service volunteer ambulance drivers began an exchange between France and the United States.

Most like-minded international youth exchange organizations that aimed to promote peace and mutual understanding across borders were founded around the 1950s, for instance, ICYE (International Cultural Youth Exchange) in 1949, CISV (Children’s International Summer Villages) in 1950, YFU (Youth for Understanding) in 1951, the Experiment in International Living in 1954 and Peace to Peace International in 1956. In fact, the objective of most educational exchange organizations set up after World War II was to promote peace, reduce prejudices towards out-group people and mutual understanding across borders (Fennes & Hapgood, 1997). Exchange organizers from the beginning recognized that intercultural encounters not only were a source of tension and conflict but could also be an enrichment and a resource and contribute to personal development (ibid).

During the 1980s many youth exchange organizations shifted their objectives towards intercultural education to prepare young people for an increasingly international and globalised environment (Fennes & Hapgood, 1997). Developing youths’ intercultural communicative competence and thus global citizenship has become one of the main educational objectives of international exchange organizations. For instance, AFS aims to “provide intercultural learning opportunities to help people develop the knowledge, skills and understanding needed to create a more just and peaceful world”⁴; CISV wants to “develop cross-cultural understanding in children, youth and adults from around the world. By encouraging respect for cultural differences and the development of self-awareness, CISV empowers each participant to incorporate these values into their lives as they become global citizens and strive for a more peaceful world”⁵, and ICYE’s desire is to “promote young people’s active and global citizenship” and “to enhance young people’s intercultural understanding and commitment to peace and justice”⁶. Although the statements of purpose of these exchange organizations may differ slightly, all these organizations share similar belief, mission and aims.

⁴ AFS website: http://www.afs.org/afs_or/home
⁵ CISV website: http://www.cisv.org/
⁶ ICYE website: http://www.icye.org/
As the process of globalisation and internationalisation gathers pace throughout the world, the educational goals of the international youth exchange have been multiplied; the aim now is not just peace education, but also to absorb ideas of intercultural and global education as well as tackling other areas such as the environment, human rights and development. However, intercultural learning and peace education is still the core of their international youth exchange programmes for most exchange organizations.

According to the advisory list provided by the Council on Standards for International Educational Travel (CSIET) (2009), a US based non-profit organization committed to qualifying international travel and exchange for youth at the high school level, there are at least over 80 qualified international travel and exchange organizations. Most of these exchange organizations are independent, non-profit making, charitable and voluntary in nature. Tens of thousands of young people from at least 60 nations around the world participate in one of these various youth exchange programmes each year. It seems that an international youth exchange experience has become an important part of young people’s international education.

3.4.2 Theoretical framework of IYE

The value of contact for reducing prejudices between members of different groups was widely discussed among eminent social scientists after World War II (Watson, 1947; Williams, 1947). Prejudice is created mostly without concrete personal experience with the group concerned. Nevertheless, prejudice influences attitudes, feelings, thinking and subsequent actions and decisions (Allport, 1954). The early practices and organizations of intercultural youth exchange were very much influenced by the intergroup contact theory, especially Allport’s ‘contact hypothesis’ famously articulated in his work The Nature of Prejudice, which is summarised in this very famous quote:

Prejudice (unless deeply rooted in the character structure of the individual) may be reduced by equal status contact between majority and minority groups in the pursuit of common goals. The effect is greatly enhanced if this contact is sanctioned by institutional support (i.e. by law, custom or local atmosphere), and provided that it is of a sort that leads to the perception of common interests and common humanity between members of the two groups. (Allport, 1954, p.281)

In this hypothesis, Allport suggested four critical situational conditions for intergroup contact to reduce prejudice and enhance mutual understanding in his
hypothesis: 1) equal group status within the situation; 2) common goals; 3) intergroup cooperation; and 4) the support of authorities, law, or custom. In the 50 years that followed, Allport’s intergroup contact theory received support from empirical evidence across different situations and societies in the 50 years that followed (Pettigrew, 1998).

It is believed that intergroup contact is important for people’s intercultural learning and their ICC development (Fennes & Hapgood, 1997; Deardorff, 2008; Shaules, 2007). First, many studies have now revealed that when individuals from different cultural groups meet and communicate with each other, such contact can lead to more positive attitudes towards the other group in general and not merely towards the specific individual with whom the interaction has taken place. Second, intergroup contact, especially face-to-face interactions with people from different cultures, helps to develop an individual’s intercultural communication skills. As Baraldi (2009a) notes, ICC may be observed as both a learned and a displayed competence. In other words, ICC is learned through direct contact and interactions with people of other cultures; through face-to-face intercultural interactions, learners could test their knowledge and the perceptions towards others and learn more about their interlocutors through direct observation of their behaviours and contact with them. Therefore, the activities of intercultural contact with people from different cultural backgrounds (e.g. homestays, group activities in a multicultural setting) are always essential in international youth exchange programmes or study abroad programmes (Deardorff, 2008).

Allport’s contact hypothesis not only had inspired the idea of international youth exchange in the first place which hoped to develop people’s positive attitudes towards people from other cultures through intercultural contact, but also has been the guidance of youth exchange programme design. The importance of Allport’s intergroup contact theory is always made reference to in the design of successful intercultural exchange or study abroad programmes (Cummins & Sayers, 1995; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004). For example, the conditions under which intercultural contact in an international youth exchange could be:

- The individuals who meet and interact in the programme are of roughly equal status (when both are school students of the same age);
- The different cultural group memberships of these individuals are made salient within the contact situation (all memberships are emphasized and attention is
drawn to them rather than underplayed);
- They engage together on some cooperative activity (as in a cooperative learning task where the participating students are interdependent on each other for successfully completing the task);
- There is external institutional support for the principle of equality (for example, the exchange organizer lays down clear and explicit expectations and rules about the unacceptability of any kind of harassment, discrimination or racism).

Following Allport’s conditions, most international youth exchanges are pedagogically structured programmes. Medina-Lopez-Portillo (2004), for instance, suggests that “the context in which study abroad programmes are embedded – the way that programmes are structured, in terms of duration, language of instruction…will impact the development of students’ intercultural sensitivity and their understanding of the target culture” (p.181). Allport’s intergroup contact theory has been an important theoretical framework for international youth exchanges.

### 3.4.3 Types of IYE programmes

The international youth exchange programmes provided by the exchange organizations around the world are various. They can be classified into different types according to four criteria: 1) a ‘culture-specific’ or ‘culture-general’ approach, 2) the educational content of the exchange programme, 3) the length of an exchange and 4) the age of the participants.

Firstly, there are ‘culture-specific’ and ‘culture-general’ international youth exchange programmes when the context and purpose of intercultural learning is concerned. As discussed earlier in section 3.3.2 of this chapter, there are ‘culture-general’ and ‘culture-specific’ approaches to intercultural training. However, I would like to use ‘culture-general’ to describe those international youth exchange programmes in the format of international youth camps and with an international and multicultural learning nature; these programmes bring young people from a number of different countries together. It is not the aim for students to learn about the culture of the host country or any specific culture and language, instead these camps provide a platform for the participants to learn about all the different cultures present in the camp and interact with peers around the world. These kinds of international youth camps
usually provide some special training (e.g. leadership training) or address international concerns as the theme. For example, Rotary Youth Exchange provides some short-term exchange programmes in the format of international youth camps. Most of CISV’s youth exchange programmes are global, international youth camps, where children from ten or twelve countries live together in an international camp for four weeks (see section 5.2.3 of Chapter 5 for more information about CISV programmes). In contrast, culture-specific IYE programmes aim at achievement in a particular targeted culture and are closely connected to specific language learning. Most IYE programmes are culture-specific where students usually stay with a host family or several host families and attend school in their host country, such as AFS’s High School Student Exchange Programme. In these programmes, students focus on studying the language and culture of the host country during the exchange.

Secondly, the various exchange programmes have different contents, such as travel and sightseeing in one or more foreign countries, language training, cultural studies, voluntary community service, educational study and other cultural immersion activities. The content of an exchange is always two-fold. Although the content of exchange programmes might differ from one another, exposure of participants to some degree of cultural contact and the potential for significant intercultural learning is always of the uppermost in importance in the exchanges (Cushner, 1994). Moreover, homestay as a means by which individuals from one culture could learn about another is common in most exchanges, along with other activities. Homestay provides students with extensive experiences relating to others from foreign cultures in their day-to-day activities. As Grove (1989) commented, “the participants are completely, constantly, and more or less exclusively in contact with the people and culture of the host community. No other type of international exchange programme routinely comes closer to attaining the complete immersion of its participants than an intercultural homestay programme.” (p.2)

Thirdly, there are short-term and long-term IYE programmes in terms of the duration or length of an exchange. Short-term exchanges vary from several days to several weeks. Long-term exchanges can last from a semester to an academic year. Most exchange organizations provide both short-term and long-term exchange programmes, such as CISV, IYCE, Rotary, AFS etc. The short-term programmes are always summer or intensive programmes, providing specific training or under specific
themes, while the long-term ones are usually school programmes where participants stay with a host family and study at a local school in a foreign country for a period of time. Although many intercultural and international educators (Selby, 2008) think that longer term programmes are better than shorter ones in developing students’ intercultural communicative competence, more and more short-term exchange programmes appear to satisfy the newly developed needs of young people in the fast-growing exchange market.

Fourthly, considering the age of participants, most exchange organizations offer exchange programmes mainly for high school students of 15 or older. To name a few, YFU’s (Youth for Understanding) exchange programmes are especially for those from 15-18 years old. People to People only accepts 16-18 years olds as exchange participants. Rotary Youth Exchange programmes are open to 15-19 years old. Seldom do exchange organizations target children or young teenagers as participants in youth exchange. So far CISV is the only organization which offers some short-term international exchange programmes for children and young teenagers from 11 to 14 years old (for information about all CISV programmes, see section 5.2.3 of Chapter 5). CISV’ Village programme is the only exchange programme for children as young as 11-years old (for more information about CISV Village programme, see section 5.3 of Chapter 5).

3.4.4 Characteristics of a youth exchange experience

The main characteristics of an international exchange experience can be illustrated from two aspects: 1) three phases of an exchange experience and 2) the experiential learning nature of an exchange experience.

An exchange experience typically involves three phases: pre-departure, during the experience and post-return. Well conceived and monitored exchange programmes usually provide participants with orientation right from the moment when they apply to the programme of their choice (Cushner, 1994). A number of pedagogical events will be carried out before the visit abroad (preparation), during the experience in another country (guidance) and after return to the home country (assessment or reorientation). These events are intended to support and deepen the learning experiences and to enable participants – as well as host families - to reflect on their experience in a structured and
cognitive way.

An intercultural youth exchange is inevitably an experiential learning experience. The positive effects of the experiential learning approach to intercultural learning and international development have been supported by a bulk of research. As Cushner (1994) points out, experiential learning, as opposed to a didactic or cognitive approach, provides opportunities for students to engage in real-life and simulated encounters that simultaneously engage cognitive, affective and behavioural domains. Fennes and Hapgood (1997) also claim that it is necessary to experience being confronted with new and unknown situations, to experience insecurity, fear, and rejection as well as security, trust and sympathy, and to deal with the subject of culture on an emotional level and to learn from and with people of other cultures for intercultural learning. Hansel (1988) suggests four factors that set experiential learning for international development apart from traditional didactic classroom learning:

1. In the experiential context, the student’s motivation comes from the situation itself. Survival within the family, community, or school becomes the motivating factor for further learning, not external factors such as grades imposed by a teacher.

2. The experience itself is direct and real - not vicarious. Students must use all their senses as well as all of their information and problem-solving skills to accommodate their new surroundings, not just the cognitive domain, as is so often the case in the classroom setting.

3. Immediate feedback is provided in the day-to-day living situation. As such, individuals must question, adapt and respond in a manner they feel appropriate, and in return, promptly learn from their mistakes in understanding and their errors in thinking and behaviour. Individuals can then decide whether to change or not.

4. Learning in this manner is holistic. It is assumed that relationships between parts are better grasped when experienced as an entire system than when each part is studied individually, which is often the case in a traditional approach to teaching.
One major goal of intercultural education has been to help young people and teachers not only to understand the diversity of thought, expression, belief and practice of those who are different from themselves, but also to guide development so individuals are better skilled at living and working effectively with others (Cushner, 1998). International youth exchanges provide a good chance for young people to encounter cultural diversity and experience living with people from different cultural backgrounds in a foreign culture. In a word, international youth exchanges have played a major role in promoting intercultural learning among young people.

3.5 Summary

This chapter has explored the concepts of intercultural education, intercultural learning and international youth exchange. Intercultural education is important for today’s world at the global, national and individual levels. It has also been pointed out that ICC development is educational objectives of intercultural education and intercultural learning and the development of ICC is also a developmental process of intercultural learning. International youth exchange as an experiential intercultural learning opportunity for young people was also comprehensively introduced in this chapter. In the next chapter, the research on the effectiveness of intercultural learning through international youth exchanges will be discussed and reviewed.
Chapter 4 Educational Impact of International Youth Exchange

4.1 Introduction

The previous two literature review chapters have explored the key and interrelated concepts and theoretical frameworks for the present project: intercultural education, intercultural learning, intercultural communicative competence and international youth exchange. This chapter will focus on the educational impact of international youth exchanges. The effectiveness evaluation of intercultural learning through international youth exchanges is of vital importance for both the youth exchange participants and the international exchange organizations (Fennes & Hapgood, 1997). For youth exchange participants, effectiveness evaluation will help them to become aware of how they have changed and what they have learned; to understand what effect this can have on their actions and behaviours and to decide how they want to implement what they have learned in the future. For the exchange organizers, evaluation helps to find out whether the programmes have achieved their original educational goals; to analyse the impact of the design of the programme, specific activities, materials or approaches used in the programme, and to demonstrate the learning outcomes of their exchange programmes to the public for marketing purposes. Therefore, the effectiveness evaluation has now become a standard element for a youth exchange programme or any intercultural learning project.

Research on the educational impact of intercultural learning through international youth exchanges has been carried out since the late 1970s (Fennes & Hapgood, 1997). Compared to the extensive research that has been done on the intercultural learning and educational impact of study abroad at college level (e.g. Ross, 2009; Savicki, 2008), the research on international youth exchange is fragmented. The variety of the educational impact studies of IYEs can be classified into two strands: short-term impact studies and long-term impact ones. These two strands of educational impact studies will be reviewed respectively in this chapter.

This chapter is structured as follows: the importance of the educational impact evaluation of intercultural learning through international youth exchanges and overall review of the research on this topic has been briefly discussed in 4.1; then the previous
short-term and long-term educational impact studies of the international youth exchanges will be reviewed respectively in 4.2 and 4.3; 4.4 will summarise the recent development of the research in the field of international youth exchange and point out the research gaps; finally, a brief summary of this chapter will be given in 4.5.

4.2 The short-term impact of IYE

This section will review several short-term impact studies of international youth exchanges. For the purposes of this thesis, short-term impact means the evaluation of the impact of an IYE programme on participants in less than one year after the youth exchange. Typically, these studies aim to examine the participants’ learning outcomes in intercultural exchange or to evaluate the effect of intercultural exchange programmes in meeting the educational purposes and goals. Table 4.1 below lists a number of short-term impact studies of intercultural exchanges conducted by youth exchange organizations. Most of the short-term impact studies investigate the immediate effects of the youth exchange experience on the changes or growth in youth exchange participants through the pre- and post-exchange comparison. Although the intercultural exchange programmes reported in these studies may vary from one other in terms of the level of participants (e.g. young children, high school students or youth adults), programme format and duration, promoting intercultural learning is one of the core aims of these educational organizations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (year)</th>
<th>Education organization / programme</th>
<th>Participant Programmes format</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Research methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hansel (1985)</td>
<td>American Field Service (AFS)</td>
<td>high school students for school year</td>
<td>3 months-1 year</td>
<td>before-after questionnaire (with control group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammer (2005)</td>
<td>American Field Service (AFS)</td>
<td>high school students for school year</td>
<td>3 months-1 year</td>
<td>before-after questionnaire (with control group); Student reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stitsworth and Sugiyama (1990)</td>
<td>4-H/Labo Exchange</td>
<td>15 host family</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>before-after questionnaire (with control group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickhoff (1994)</td>
<td>CISV</td>
<td>11-15 camps or host family</td>
<td>2-4 weeks</td>
<td>before-after questionnaire; learner report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassard (1997)</td>
<td>Global Thinking Project (GTP)</td>
<td>High school students for school year</td>
<td>Reciprocal 3-weeks</td>
<td>mixed methods research (including before-after questionnaire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams (2000)</td>
<td>The International 4-H Youth Exchange (IFYE)</td>
<td>19-25 host family</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>before-after questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantini (2006b)</td>
<td>Federation of the Experiment in International Living (FEIL)</td>
<td>18 or over host family community</td>
<td>4 weeks -1 year</td>
<td>before-after questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hansel (1985) did a large-scale study on the impact of participation in AFS intercultural exchange on secondary school students. Several hundred AFS students and a control group of the same age, who had applied to take part in exchange programme but eventually did not participate, completed the pre- and post-test questionnaires. Hansel found that five out of the seventeen variables which were
identified as potential developmental characteristics were most related to the intercultural experience: awareness and appreciation of the host country and culture; foreign language appreciation and ability; understanding the other culture; international awareness, and adaptability. The least related dimension was personal development, such as variables of self-confidence, personal growth and maturity. She also found that the length of the intercultural exchange (2 months or 1 year) only really affected the host country language ability development and understanding of the host country and culture. For other variables, the learning effects seemed to be similar.

A more recent short-term impact study on the effects of AFS study abroad experience was conducted by Hammer (2005). A total of 1,500 AFS students who lived in host families and studied in another country for 10 months and 600 ‘student friends’ comprising the control group participated in the study. Compared with Hansel’s (1985) study, a more rigorous ‘pre-test, post-test, and post-post test, control group research design’ was used in Hammer’s study to assess the immediate and near-term(over time, from post-test to post-post test) impact of the AFS study abroad experience on AFS students. Data from multiple sources were collected: 1) AFS students and a control group (self-assessment); 2) questionnaires filled in by AFS students’ parents; 3) surveys by host families; 4) electronic journals by AFS students during the programme. It was found that the AFS participants were significantly higher in initial intercultural competence level at pre-test; AFS participants achieved higher levels of intercultural competence as a result of their study abroad experience compared to the control group and these differences remained at the same level over time. Besides, AFS participants developed friendships with people from other cultures to a much greater extent and achieved a higher level of foreign language skills. The results of this study suggest that the AFS study abroad experience can bring significantly positive changes to the participants in intercultural communicative competence and the impact can be sustained even five months after the participants had returned home.

Sitsworth and Suyiyama (1990) reported the changes in attitudes and behaviour that occurred in Japanese teenagers participating in one-month homestay intercultural exchange in 26 states in the USA. This study involved 426 Japanese exchange participants (along with their parents) and 265 control group members (and their parents) who were nominated by the exchange group but did not travel abroad.
Pre-exchange questionnaires were used to collect demographic information along with a family history of international experiences of both groups and participants and their parents. Before the exchange and after the participants returned homes, all youths (the exchange participants and controls) and their parents responded to a series of 13 pairs of opposite adjectives (e.g. flexible/inflexible; tolerant/intolerant). The only significant demographic difference between exchange students and members of the control group appeared to be a greater degree of previous international experience amongst the exchange students who were members of a Japanese youth organization which offered an integrated programme of language learning and cultural exploration called “Labo”. It was found that the overseas homestay exchange experience was related to the exchange group becoming more sociable, extroverted, responsible, spontaneous, self-confident, individualistic, informal, competitive and independent compared to the control group who did not travel abroad. This study documented that exchange participants showed greater personal growth compared with similar youths who did not have the opportunity to travel abroad.

Dickhoff (1994) conducted a study to evaluate the impact of CISV participation on dimensions of individuals’ intercultural learning, language and communication, friendship making, self development, group dynamics, global awareness, and social responsibility. Three-hundred and fifty-four participants taking part in CISV Village and Interchange programmes from ten different countries filled in a closed questionnaire before and after their participation. In addition, 384 participants responded to an open-ended questionnaire about participants’ own perception of intercultural learning. Both village and interchange participants perceived that intercultural education was by far the most important area of learning in CISV followed by personal development education. And it was found that a) participants entered the programmes already with high motivation and positive attitudes; and b) participants increased on 16 out of 30 items in the direction of an even more positive attitude and on 14 items they moved in a contrary direction, but only the changes on four items in the positive direction were statistically significant. However, this study did not tell us on which dimensions participants showed positive changes and on which dimensions they showed reverse changes.

Hassard (1997) studied the effects of an exchange programme, focused on
environmental education, between high school students in Georgia, USA and Moscow, Russia. In this Global Thinking Project (GTP) exchange, the students worked collaboratively using electronic communication for several months before mutual exchange visits lasting 21 day. Multiple sources of data were collected for this study. Questionnaires were administrated at the end of each of the exchange phases. Students’ logs and written reports during the exchange visit were collected. Observations and interviews of students were also made during the two exchange visits. There were some differences in how the American and Russian students perceived that their ideas about global thinking had changed, but they all believed that the opportunity to cross cultures and collaborate with their peers in another country was of more value than the scientific work that they did. Although Hassard approached this project from the perspective of a science educator, this study illustrated how young people developed intercultural understanding alongside a learning project on a specific topic.

Williams (2000) examined the extent to which the six-month International 4-H Youth Exchange (IFYE) programme influenced participants’ development of cross-cultural attitudes, life leadership skills, and host culture knowledge. The IFYE programme was developed to promote intercultural understanding among young people that would contribute to lasting international peace. In this programme, the young people aged 19-25 went to live and work with a host farm family in a foreign country for six months. In 1999 twenty-one IFYE six-month exchange participants were surveyed before and after the exchange experience. The major finding of this study was the participants’ significant gain in host culture knowledge. The participants’ positive cross-cultural attitudes and perceptions had existed before their exchange experience. Participation resulted in greater appreciation of the host country, strengthened global awareness, improved communication skills, and their ability to overcome prejudices towards the host country. Exchange participants did develop their leadership skills but not significantly.

Fantini (2006b) explored and assessed the impact of intercultural learning experiences provided through service projects by the Federation of the Experiment in Intercultural Living (FEIL). In a service project, the subjects in this study helped members of their host community in Ecuador. Twenty-eight British and Swiss participants completed the questionnaires of pre- and post-tests and six out of them
were subsequently interviewed. The results of the quantitative data showed that participants clearly improved in overall ICC development and in its individual components (i.e. knowledge, attitude, skill and awareness). With responses from only 28 service participants, limitations on statistical reliability were noted. However, the analysis of the qualitative data from the participants’ responses to the open-ended questions in both the questionnaire form and the interview showed that the participants had changed their lives in a positive and new direction and developed their intercultural communicative competence in a positive way.

In sum, the research focuses of these short-term impact studies naturally vary according to the origin and purpose of each organization. Although generic aspects of ICC development can be found in the evaluation focuses of these studies, these short-term impact studies are more programme-oriented. Stitsworth and Suyiyama (1990) specifically focused on the impact on participants’ personal growth. In terms of the research designs of these studies, two main ones were used: ‘one-group pre-test-post-test design’ (Dörney, 2007, p.117) (e.g. Dickhoff, 1994; Williams, 2000; Fantini, 2006b) and ‘pre-test-post-test control-group design’ (e.g. Hansel, 1985; Stitsworth & Sugiyama, 1990). Hammer’s (2005) study, however, is the only research which did a third test several months after the post-test. This design not only examines the effects of intercultural exchange but also captures the participants’ development or changing pattern of ICC over time. Additionally, in terms of the research instrument to measure the effects, some of these studies used only quantitative questionnaires (e.g. Hansel, 1985; Williams, 2000), while the other studies collected both quantitative and qualitative data using mixed methods research (e.g. Hammer, 2004; Hassard, 1997; Dickhoff, 1994). The findings of these studies suggest that the intercultural learning experiences in international youth changes facilitate participants’ intercultural learning and personal growth in the short-term perspective. However, very little has been shown about how the effects on participants of the intercultural learning in intercultural exchanges are sustained over time and how participants develop or change after they have been home for a while following that intercultural learning experience. The literature reviewed in this section is specially related to the discussion of the short-term educational impact of CISV Village reported in Chapter 8.
4.3 The long-term impact of IYE

This section focuses on the long-term impact of intercultural learning experiences through international youth exchanges. The last decade has seen a remarkable upsurge of interest in research on the long-term impact of intercultural exchange programmes. In this thesis, the long-term impact means the impact of international youth exchange programmes on the participants at least five years after their exchange experiences. The long-term impact studies usually take a retrospective view by asking people to reflect on their experience and several aspects of their lives to measure the longitudinal effects. A few intercultural educational organizations have conducted research projects on the long-term effects of their intercultural exchange programmes. Table 4.2 summarises the key studies on the long-term impact of international youth exchange programmes. As can be seen from the table, the programmes reported in these studies also target different age groups of young people, mainly high-school level students, and have different programme formats in terms of the length of stay and the content.

To my knowledge, the first substantial study on the long-term effects of participation in international youth exchanges was done by Bachner and Zeutschel (1994) on German and American high school exchange participants. In their longitudinal and retrospective study, Bachner and Zeutschel examined to what extent and in what ways former high school exchange students claimed that the exchange experience had influenced the subsequent course of their lives. The respondents were questioned through a combination of in-depth exploratory interviews and a comprehensive questionnaire survey which was based on the findings from the interview study. Six-hundred and sixty-one exchange students and 381 individuals, each nominated by the exchange students, who had not participated in high school-level exchange but were of the same gender, similar age, and similar educational background as the nominator, responded to the questionnaire survey. They found that the exchange experience had an impact on the participants in a broad array of aspects regarding their personal development, including self-reliance, problem-solving, foreign language learning, academic possibilities, career, life choices, empathy and respect for differences, etc. They claimed that participation in intercultural exchange results in meaningful, long-lasting changes in knowledge, attitudes, skills and behaviours. The methodological model of this retrospective study and creative way of recruiting a
control group by participants’ nomination had been followed by other researchers who assessed the effects of intercultural exchange programmes later on (e.g. Thomas, 2005; Hammer, 2005; Hansel, 2008; Watson, 2003; 2004). This study is still one of the most important and influential pieces of research on the long-term impact of intercultural exchange.

Table 4.2 Examples of studies on the long-term impact of IYE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (year)</th>
<th>Educational organization /programme</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Programme format</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Research methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachner and Zeutschel (1994)</td>
<td>Youth for Understanding (YFU)</td>
<td>American and German high school students (15-18)</td>
<td>host family for school year</td>
<td>1 school year</td>
<td>mixed methods research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachner and Zeutschel (2009)</td>
<td>Youth for Understanding (YFU)</td>
<td>American and German high school students (15-18)</td>
<td>host family for school year</td>
<td>1 school year</td>
<td>qualitative interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas (2005a)</td>
<td>“Mutual Student Exchange Programme”</td>
<td>Australian and German students</td>
<td>reciprocal host family and school exchanges</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>qualitative interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas (2005 b)</td>
<td>IjAB</td>
<td>German youths between 14-20</td>
<td>four different types of intercultural exchanges</td>
<td>1-4 weeks</td>
<td>mixed methods research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansel (2008a,b)</td>
<td>AFS</td>
<td>High school students from different countries</td>
<td>host family for school year</td>
<td>1 trimester to 1 school year</td>
<td>questionnaire survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright and Allen (1969)</td>
<td>CISV</td>
<td>children aged 11 from different countries</td>
<td>camp</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>questionnaire survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson (2004)</td>
<td>CISV</td>
<td>11-18 youth from different countries</td>
<td>camps or host family</td>
<td>2-4 weeks</td>
<td>mixed methods research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bachner and Zeutschel (2009) conducted follow-up interviews of 15 former YFU participants in Germany who had participated in their 1994 questionnaire survey to re-assess their perspectives on the exchange experience from a longer-term vantage point. They claim that the findings of the follow-up interviews together with the
survey-based findings from the original study verify the notion that an exchange experience contributes to positive and long-lasting attitudinal, behavioural, and cognitive changes in the majority of individual participants. They came to eight conclusions from the research study (which spanned 14 years) as follows:

1. Exchange is a multivariate and complex reality.
2. Contact and relationships between students and their host families are singularly important aspects of exchanges.
3. Exchange typically results in personal changes that can be characterized as significant, demonstrable, positive and enduring.
4. Educational and professional directions are not a significant result of exchange for most participants.
5. Involvement with exchange after the sojourn is not typical.
6. An international perspective is a significant result of exchange.
7. Problems which participants expected to experience occurred, but these did not have a negative effect on the perceived success of exchange.
8. Specified variables can be used to predict satisfaction with the exchange experience.

Thomas (2005a) investigated the long-term effects of an international student exchange programme, entitled “Mutual Student Exchange Programme” between Australian and German youths, on young people’s personality development and the course of their lives. Out of 60 former exchange students, 11 Australian and 12 German exchange students were interviewed about their experiences during the exchange some 10-13 years previously. These former participants had had their exchange stay for three months at their own home and then had gone to the target country for three months home stay with their counterparts. Each participant gained intercultural experiences in the target country as well as in their own home country with their counterpart. Thomas found that intercultural experiences, occurring within the framework of a specific international youth exchange programme, have lasting effects on these young people’s personality development in three aspects: 1) an increase in self-efficacy (i.e. general confidence in one’s own abilities, increased willingness to take risks, staying power, improvement of psychological well being); 2) an increase in self-decentralization (i.e. understanding of other points of view, increased readiness to learn new things, interests
in other worldviews, etc), and 3) individual variations in the chronology of influential
effects. The results shows the effects on the development of an individual’s personality
but little about the impact on the course of their lives, such as their educational and
career development, which is regarded as an integral part of the long-term effects of
intercultural exchange (Hansel, 2008).

Thomas (2005b), working with a research team of psychologists and many
international educational youth organizations, carried out an extended study to look at
the long-term effects of the participation in international youth exchange programmes
more than six years ago. This study examined 532 former participants who had taken
part in four different types of programmes, including A) an exchange of secondary
level students with home stays; B) mutual exchange of youth groups at the respective
home town of the partner; C) project-oriented cultural exchanges of young people with
common accommodation; D) multinational work camps. All these programmes are in
the “short-term” format lasting about 1 to 4 weeks for youngsters aged from 14 to 21
years old. The categories of long-term effects were identified from the interview
findings and constructed in three dimensions: 1) self-related characteristics and
competences (i.e. openness, flexibility, composure; self-awareness; social competence);
2) intercultural competence (i.e. intercultural learning; cultural identity; relationships
to the host country); 3) domain-specific, practice-oriented activities and competences
(i.e. follow-up activities; vocational development; foreign languages). The preliminary
findings suggest that there are slight differences on the long-term effects among the
four types of exchange programme: only type A (the high school student exchange
programme) has an advantage concerning the promotion of foreign language skills and
the furthering of intercultural competence and type C (the project-oriented programme)
has a slight advantage in vocational development; otherwise no differences among the
four types were found affecting other categories. Yet, whether the differences are
statistically significant is not known. In a word, Thomas’s (2005b) large scale study
has been a pioneering one in comparing the long-term effects of different types of
international youth exchange programmes.

Hansel (2008a, b) did a long-term impact study with AFS alumni 20-25 years after
their exchange experience. This study adopted the same approach in recruiting a
control group as Bachner and Zeuschel’s (1994) study. The AFS returnees were
required to nominate two individuals, who would have been peers of theirs in high school, to become the control group. One thousand, nine hundred and twenty of the alumni and 511 from the control group participated in the questionnaire survey. Hansel (2008a) found that the AFS group overall showed fluency in a greater number of languages and a different attitude concerning other cultures that was manifested in their friendship networks, in their choice of careers, and in the way they encouraged their own children to meet people from other cultures. Also, AFS participants experienced greater comfort and self-assurance when dealing with other cultures and tended to minimize cultural differences. They also found that AFS participants were more likely to seek additional intercultural experiences, such as university-level study abroad, careers that involve interaction with other cultures, opportunities to work abroad, and cross-cultural marriages. In addition this study compared the impact of university study abroad experience and the AFS experience. Hansel found that the university study abroad had a strong impact on intercultural sensitivity development, more than the secondary school AFS experience alone. The AFS participants who also studied abroad in their university years showed greater development in intercultural competence. This finding suggests that intercultural learning in adulthood can enhance the effects of intercultural experiences at the adolescent stage and multiple intercultural learning experiences are beneficial to participants’ intercultural development.

Two studies about the long-term impact of CISV participation were conducted by Wright and Allen (1969) and Watson (2004). Wright and Allen (1969) conducted a follow-up study of CISV Village programme participants who had already reached the age of 20 or more. They found that CISV participants had attained a high level of education and were still pursuing an even higher level; CISV participants maintained an international interest, evident from the number of languages studied and the number of other countries visited since attending the CISV Village. However, nothing about the pattern of occupations which could be attributed to CISV influence was found. This study about CISV participants who had reached adulthood told us about the impact of the CISV Village programme on participants’ education pursuits and occupations, but gave very limited information about their personal development and intercultural competence development.
Watson (2004) evaluated the long-term effects of participation in CISV programmes for age 11-18. This study adopted the methodological approach of interview first followed by a questionnaire survey, which had been used by others doing long-term impact research (e.g. Bachner & Zeuschel, 1994; Thomas, 2005b). One hundred and fifty-one usable questionnaires were returned out of 956 during the questionnaire distribution in 2003. Watson (2004) found that the majority of the respondents (73%) commented that CISV participation had helped to develop their intercultural competence in fields such as developing awareness of other people and different cultures, creating favourable attitudes towards people who are culturally different, development of intercultural friendships and cross-cultural communication abilities. The great majority of respondents (92%) thought that participation at the young age of 11 years old was important for intercultural learning. However, it was shown that CISV participation had little impact on participants’ careers, study choices and their orientation to work abroad. Less than 8% of the respondents perceived that CISV participation had affected their career development, less than 5% perceived that CISV participation affected their choice of study subject, and less than 3% of the respondents perceived that CISV participation had affected their decisions to choose to work abroad.

In sum, most of these studies are programme-oriented and few follow any theoretical framework; only Thomas (2005a) examined the long-term impact in the theoretical framework of acculturation and Epstein’s self-theory. Three main kinds of research methodologies were used by these studies: a questionnaire survey, a qualitative interview and retrospective, mixed methods research. Some of these studies included a control group for comparison in examining the long-term impact, such as Bachner and Zeuschel (1994) and Hansel (2008a, b); the other studies just investigated the exchange participants only. Bennett (2009) suggests that the results of the descriptive studies using self-report methodology are not enough to claim that international youth exchange programmes “caused” participants to change in the longitudinal perspective. The literature reviewed in this section is specially related to the discussion of the long-term impact results of CISV Village experience on the participants reported in Chapter 9.
4.4 Research gap in IYE field

Bachner, Zeutchel, and Shannon (1993) commented on the weaknesses of the research in the field of international youth exchanges at that time:

Weaknesses identified in the body of research include, among others: little attempt to develop theory or formulate hypotheses; a dearth of longitudinal studies that focus on the enduring residual effects of exchange; an inattention to the concrete behavioural manifestations of change; a lack of knowledge of background data or of the context from which personal are responding; an overreliance on tabulator survey techniques; a seeming reluctance to use less conventional but highly promising “depth” approaches (e.g. life stories, autobiography, intensive taped interviews) from sociology and anthropology; and a traditional emphasis on college-level, versus pre-university, exchange. (Bachner et al., 1993, p. 44)

From the review of the impact studies in the above subsections, we can see that the development on this topic in many ways has been witnessed in the past twenty years. In recent years an increasing number of studies of the long-term effects of youth exchange experiences on the participants have been undertaken. Secondly, more variety in the research methods has been used, such as a mixed use of quantitative and qualitative measures rather than only quantitative ones. Thirdly, most of the impact studies focus on the high-school level.

Despite the development in this field, there are still some research gaps. The majority of the studies adopted a pre-post design with or without a control group to examine the immediate effectiveness of an exchange programme on participants after the programme. Very few longitudinal studies (c.f., Hammer, 2005) examine the participants’ longitudinal development over time after the exchange experiences with a post-post test. Vande Berg (2003) comments that participants’ development should be measured three times: at the beginning and end of the programme, and several months after the students’ return. He suggests that, immediately following their return, students may not have internalized the intercultural learning that had begun during their sojourns, and that this learning may continue to occur during the months following their return home. Moreover, little ethnographic research has been undertaken on the intercultural learning experience in a youth exchange. Little about the context or the process of intercultural learning in those international youth exchange programmes reported in the impact studies is known.
4.5 **Summary**

This chapter has discussed the importance of educational impact evaluation of international youth exchanges and reviewed the short-term and long-term impact studies of international youth exchange programmes. It has also pointed out the research gap in the field of international youth exchange. The next chapter will turn the attention to the present project by introducing CISV – the intercultural educational organization this project worked with – and its Village programme.
PART III  THIS PROJECT
Chapter 5 CISV

5.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to introduce the education organization which this project investigates, CISV and its Village programme. CISV is an international volunteer organization promoting intercultural friendships and peace education among young people through their various educational programmes. It is one of the few exchange organizations that provides an intercultural learning opportunity for children as young as 11 years old. The CISV Village programme remains the CISV flagship since the early days. It brings children from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds together for a period of four weeks in a camp.

This chapter is organized as follows: the general introduction about the educational organization based on my document analysis of CISV documents on the internet and distributed by the organization including its characteristics, educational principles, goals and approach, and programmes is provided in 5.2; then how a CISV Village programme works, mainly based on my fieldwork in a CISV Village, is described in 5.3; the early and recent research about the educational programmes of CISV is briefly reviewed in 5.4; finally, a summary of this chapter is given in 5.5.

5.2 The organization- CISV

5.2.1 What is CISV?

CISV (formerly, Children’s International Summer Villages), is an international education organization that promotes intercultural learning and peace education among young people. It was founded by Dr Doris Allen, an American psychologist at the University of Cincinnati, who believed that young people from different nations could learn to live together amicably and would later successfully utilize that experience in working to create a peaceful world. In 1951, the first CISV Village was hosted in Cincinnati, U.S.A. In more than 50 years of development after the first village, CISV now has branches in over 60 countries. And several thousands of people participate in CISV programmes around the world every year.

CISV is a charitable and volunteer organization, whose work is carried out by a
large, international network of dedicated volunteers of all ages. Programmes and activities are organized and staffed by volunteer members, who also raise most of the necessary funds (CISV, 2008a). Their administrative work is supported by the paid staff of the International Office (IO) in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, England.

Similar to the other voluntary organizations, CISV inevitably faces many challenges as it seeks to fulfil its mission and achieve its objectives, for example, how to raise funding to keep pace with the demand for its services in difficult economic situations and how to recruit and retain volunteers who can contribute their time and energy to organize the programmes for the young participants. As an international education organization, CISV also has some specific challenges. The first challenge is how to preserve the consistency between programmes in different countries. CISV’s international programmes are promoted and coordinated by the IO but are hosted by CISV local chapters around the world. Although the policy, structure and quality of the international programmes are monitored by an International Board of CISV, it is still difficult to ensure that the qualities of these programmes are consistent in meeting up with their educational objectives without an effective evaluation mechanism. The second challenge is how to sustain and improve the quality of their educational programmes and thus ensure the participants have positive experiences and benefit from the CISV participation in their development in both short-term and long-term perspectives.

5.2.2 Educational principles, goals and approach

The purpose of this organization is “to educate and inspire action for a more just and peaceful world” as stated in the Education Guide of CISV (CISV, 2009). Through the peace education in its programmes, CISV hopes to bring young people from different countries, cultures and backgrounds together to meet and develop friendship with each other, and to inspire the participants to become active global citizens. The spirit of the CISV organization’s mission is further illustrated in its educational principles as:

We appreciate the similarities between people and value their differences. We support social justice and equality of opportunity for all. We encourage the resolution of conflict through peaceful means. We support the creation of sustainable solutions to problems relating to our impact upon each other and the natural environment. (CISV, 2009, p.13)
Developing participants’ intercultural communicative competence is one of the core educational goals of CISV programmes. CISV hopes that the individuals can develop awareness of different cultures, foster positive attitudes towards others, increase the skills and gain the knowledge to live, work, and play with other people, irrespective of cultural background through participation in their educational programmes (CISV, 2009). The concept of ICC adopted by CISV is Fantini’s construct of intercultural communicative competence, “A+ASK” multiple dimension model of ICC. As reviewed in Chapter 2, this model involves five dimensions: awareness, attitudes, skills, knowledge and proficiency in the host language. Fantini (2000) claimed that awareness is at the core of the five dimensions: it both affects the other four and develops through them.

Besides the educational goal of developing participants’ intercultural communicative competence, CISV aims to stimulate participants’ life-long development of amicable relationships, effective communication skills, cooperative abilities, and appropriate leadership towards a just and fair world. These educational goals are designed into the educational activities in the camp.

The educational approach of CISV programmes is “learning by doing” (CISV, 2009, p.36), a simple way to refer to “experiential learning” (Kolb, 1984), that is, learning from direct experiences through participating in activities rather than reading books or listening to lectures. For participants, experiential learning means getting involved and doing, learning from other participants and on your own, learning how to learn, etc. Through different educational activities, CISV programmes are normally “interactive, fun, culturally sensitive and experiential” (CISV, 2009, p. 37).

As shown in Figure 5.1, the experiential learning process in a CISV camp is implemented through CISV activities in four steps: 1) Do: participants are involved in an activity, which can be a game, role play; 2) Reflect: the activity is followed by reflection, which can be done individually, in pairs or small groups; 3) Generalize: participants build upon their observations and reflections to think about what they have learned; 4) Apply: participants can apply their learning to new experiences in the remainder of the programme or in their daily lives in the future. However, it often takes some time. This four-step approach is adapted from K. Lewin’s “experiential learning cycle” which includes elements of (1) concrete experience, (2) observation and
reflection, (3) forming abstract concepts, and (4) testing in new situations (Kolb, 1984, p.21).

Due to the space limit, this section only gives a brief introduction about CISV’s educational principles, goals, and approach. More comprehensive information about them can be found in CISV’s latest Big Education Guide (CISV, 2009).

5.2.3 Programmes

CISV organizes and provides many short-term, intercultural education programmes in international, national, and local contexts. In the international context, six programmes for participants at different ages were provided: Village, Interchange, Summer Camp, Seminar Camp, International Youth Meeting (IYM) and International People’s Project (IPP). The information about the age group, duration and size of these programmes is summarised in Table 5.1 below. For more information about these programmes, please refer to the official website of CISV: www.cisv.org.
Table 5.1 CISV international programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28 days</td>
<td>Delegations from 10 - 12 countries. Each delegation comprises 2 boys and 2 girls with an adult leader (age 21+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interchange</td>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>14-28 days per phase</td>
<td>Delegations from 2 countries. Each comprise 6 - 12 youths with an adult leader (age 21+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Camp</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>23 days</td>
<td>Delegations from 6 or 9 countries. Each comprise 4 - 6 youths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Camp</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>21 days</td>
<td>30 participants plus international adult staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Meeting</td>
<td>12-19+</td>
<td>8 or 15 days</td>
<td>Approximately 25 - 35 participants plus staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International People’s Project</td>
<td>19+</td>
<td>14 or 23 days</td>
<td>Approximately 25 participants including staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Summer camp used to be for 13-15 years, but the rule changed from 2008.
(Adopted from Watson, 2008, p.4)

Interchange is run exclusively between participants from two countries. It encourages a deeper encounter between two cultures by placing young people within families. Many other international educational organizations have programmes with a similar structure to Interchange. For example, the High School Exchange programme provided by AFS Intercultural Programs shares the same structure but with a longer duration (e.g. one academic year, semester or trimester). In contrast, the other programmes are camp-based programmes which promote participants’ multilingual and multicultural experiences. The participants in these programmes are not expected to learn about the language and culture of the camp host country or any other specific language and culture, but to learn about and interact with all the participants from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds who are represented in the camp. In general, most CISV international programmes are culture-general intercultural learning programmes while Interchange is a culture-specific programme in terms of the approach to intercultural learning (see section 3.3.2 of Chapter 3 on approaches to intercultural learning).

In national and local contexts, two programmes are run by local CISVers (i.e. all people who participate in, organize, and help with issues of CISV activities): Junior Branch (for 11-25, varying from country to country) and Mosaic. Junior Branch comprises young local CISVers, who organize and manage their own activities in the local chapters. Junior Branch is a good chance for the potential participants to learn.
about CISV and the current participants to be continuously involved with CISV locally after their participation of some CISV international programmes. Mosaic is a project-based programme which empowers CISV local chapters and participants to bring some changes or benefits to a wider community in reaching and involving as many people as possible. Each project is a separate CISV experience that relates to a local need and interest and involves a different target group.

5.3 CISV Village programme

This section focuses on introducing the CISV Village programme that the subjects of the present project participated in. The Village programme was the original programme of CISV and is still its flagship. The introduction to this programme in this section is mainly based on the researcher’s fieldwork at a CISV Village camp in the UK which is also part of this research project (see Chapter 6 for the research design of the project) and supplemented by the information from some relevant documents published by CISV.

5.3.1 Camp site

The camp site for this CISV Village programme is an outdoor activity centre located in a small village near the city of Sheffield, UK. The centre is very spacious with good facilities. It has two large blocks for accommodation and separate buildings for kitchen, laundry, dining and indoor activity. It also has a huge playground and some outdoor activity equipment. It is a very pleasant and safe place for holding a children’s summer camp. Picture 5.1 below shows parts of the camp site.

Picture 5.1 Photos of the camp site
5.3.2 Participants

The main participants of the camp in my fieldwork are 40 eleven year-old children from ten different countries: the UK, Germany, Spain, Portugal, Netherlands, Norway, the U.S.A., Jordan, Philippines and Japan. Each delegation consisted of two boys, two girls, and an adult leader who was older than 21 years old. These children were selected by the committees of the local CISV chapters in their own countries. Children who can make friends easily, live away from their parents for four weeks, and can communicate the experience to others upon return home were more likely to be chosen as the participants of the camp (CISV, 2008b). Most of these children came from middle-class families in their own countries. Some were from very rich and upper class families. The children in the camp thus had similar socio-economic backgrounds.

In the camp there was a hosting team consisting of four staff members and a camp director. Their responsibilities were to manage the camp and provide all the needs. In addition, the camp also had six adolescents aged 16-17 called Junior Counsellors (JC) from four countries, whose roles were to facilitate the organization of the activities and take care of the children in the absence of adults (staff and delegation leaders). Most of these JCs had participated in some CISV international programmes when they were young. So they knew the routines and the activities in the camp very well. Last but not the least, there were two kitchen staff who prepared meals and snacks for all the people in the camp. All these adult leaders, JCs and host staff had been properly trained in their local chapters before they came to the camp. Table 5.2 summarises the relevant information of all participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of participants</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult leaders</td>
<td>over 21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host staff</td>
<td>over 21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior counsellors</td>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen staff</td>
<td>over 16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.3 Camp schedule

The Village camp of my fieldwork was well structured with two main parts: regular camp life and special events in between. The daily routine on the camp site is
mainly composed of four parts: activity time, meal time, free time and delegation time. The daily schedule of this camp is presented in Picture 5.2. It is a good example of the daily routine in a CISV camp, which may vary a little from camp to camp. From this photo, we can see that a day at this camp starts with flag time after everybody has woken up. In the flag ceremony, all the participants stand in a circle and hold each other’s hands singing the CISV song. This is followed by breakfast. Cereals, milk, toast, butter and jam were usually provided for breakfast. The seats for breakfast and the other two meals were arranged by the delegation on rota. Thus, participants had the chance to sit next to different people and talk with them at mealtimes, which were an important informal context for social interaction on the camp. After breakfast, children were divided into groups and cleaned up the communal spaces in the centre with an adult’s guidance, such as toilets, lounge, dining hall and activity room, etc. The activities were held at three main time slots of a day: 10:00-12:00, 14:30-16:30, and 19:45-21:45. Usually four to five different activities were held per day. Except for the group activity time, children had some free time for themselves, when they could deal with some personal stuff or play with their friends in the camp. In the delegation time after dinner, children were supposed to stay with the other members of the delegation and their adult leader, to exchange ideas and reflect about what they had learned or experienced on that day and bring up issues they had encountered. Delegation time was also an important occasion for the leader to tell the children about the next day’s plan and activities, which helped children to prepare and get ready for the coming day. In brief, we can see that the daily schedule on the camp is very intensive, with different structured and unstructured activities.

Another two interesting rituals which are very important for creating and maintaining the sense of community in the camp are also worth mentioning. One is the kitos, a kind of non-denominational chanted blessing, intoned in chorus after the three meals. Kitos literally means thanks in Finnish. In doing kitos all participants held hands together and children were very excited about it. Another ritual is lullabies time in the evening before children go to bed, which sees all the participants in pyjamas sitting or lying down together in a room and singing many beautiful songs in the CISV song book to celebrate a great day in CISV.
Special events refer to the one-day events specially planned and different from the regular camp routine. The first special event for the children in the camp is a *Family Weekend*. When all delegations had arrived at the camp’s host city, the young participants were allocated to stay with some local families for a weekend rather than going to the camp site directly. Children within the same delegation went to the same local family together. Those hosting families usually had children of a similar age to the participants in the camp and were always very friendly. During this weekend children could have a rest after their journeys, especially for those who were from countries very far away, and adjust themselves physically and emotionally to a new place. Adult leaders and JCs came to the camp site for the first weekend. During their first two days in the camp, adult leaders, JCs and staff got to know each other, discussed the daily issues in the camp (e.g. health, safety, camp site facility use, food and laundry requirements, etc), prepared the site, and planned the programme for the first week. Then there was another *Family Weekend* after two weeks’ regular camp life. On this family weekend children from different delegations were mixed and they could choose their partners for the host family weekend stay. In addition, there were another
four special events in the second half of the programme. On the 16\textsuperscript{th} day of the camp, there was a one day \textit{excursion} to a local hill. On the 20\textsuperscript{th} day of the camp, all the participants went to \textit{a theme park} on a coach for a whole day. And children went to a local town for \textit{swimming and shopping} for a day a few days before the closure of the camp. These different special events bring diversity to the programme and give children the opportunities to explore the locality and culture of the host country outside of the camp site.

5.3.4 Educational activities

The educational activities were organized by leaders and JCs in planning groups, working with the support and supervision of host staff. The planning group developed a plan for a day’s activities and presented it at the leaders’ meeting, usually two days prior to the actual date of the implementation. This allows the adult group to review, understand and approve the activities. The rules or announcements of the activities were translated for the children by the leaders in their native languages following the English instructions of the planning group before the game kicked off. The activities were usually recorded by the delegation on the rota by drawing a picture.

Most activities in the CISV camp were original CISV activities. These include running games, arts and crafts, communication, discussions, drama, quizzes, ice-breaking games, name games, outdoor games, role games, simulation games, social and trust games and others. Usually the activities in the camp progress from ice-breaking games to name games, cooperation games, communication games, trust games to assimilation games step by step in the experiential learning approach. Most of the group activities played in the CISV camp encourage interaction and cooperation rather than competition among participants. Picture 5.3 shows some activities held in the camp.
5.3.5 Communication in the camp

English was used as a working language for communication in this multilingual, multicultural camp. Adults spoke English in meetings and administration. English was also used as the language of instruction for explaining the rules and regulations of activities to the children before the adult leaders translated the instructions to their delegations in their native languages. Although children did not necessarily have to speak English in the camp, they were still encouraged to communicate with their friends from different countries in English.

In this camp all the adult leaders from non-English speaking countries could speak fluent English. Most JCs could also speak English very well. However, there is a great disparity among children’s English proficiency. Children from different countries had different levels in their command of English language in general. Children from the UK, the U.S.A and Philippines generally have English as their native language; children from Netherlands, Portugal and Jordan could speak almost native-like English;
children from Germany, Norway and Spain speak intermediate English; children from Japan speak the least English. This was based on a combination of the researcher’s observation and the comments from the adult leaders. Of course, there were individual differences within one delegation. For instance, one child from Japan could speak better English than the other three.

Children used many channels to communicate with each other in the camp, such as gestures, drawing a picture, non-verbal behaviour and calling for help from adult leaders. However, whether the problem of language disparity would influence children’s communication and further their participation in the activities was not obvious which seemed very interesting to me in the process of my fieldwork in the camp. Children’s interactions in the group activities were examined and reported in Chapter 7.

5.3.6 Linguistic and cultural diversity

In this multinational camp, a variety of languages and cultures were represented. As mentioned earlier, the young participants were from ten different countries and JCs were from four different countries. Therefore, over ten different cultures and languages were represented in the camp. These languages and cultures are British, American, Spanish, German, Norwegian, Japanese, Pilipino, Dutch, Swedish, Arabic (Jordanian culture), Portuguese, Luxembourgian and Chinese. Although the delegations from the UK and the USA share the same language, the use of British English and American English is different in some ways. Moreover, British culture is definitely different from American culture.

The linguistic and cultural diversity was not only represented by the participants in the camp, but also highlighted in the activities of the camp. There are many occasions where participants were exposed to and learned different languages. Firstly, participants say “good morning” and “good night” to each other in all the different languages represented in the camp at flag time every morning and evening. Secondly, participants were required to keep quiet and listen to the translations by the adult leaders delegation by delegation after the English instructions about the activities. Participants learned to respect the language diversity and appreciated the differences of languages in the camp. Thirdly, leaders, staff and the JCs went to children’s
dormitories to say “good night” “sleep tight” to the children when the children were preparing for bed. Participants always greeted each other in all the languages they had learned. Apart from these three regular occasions, learning different languages and cultural knowledge was used as a task in some activities. For example, in the “Mini Olympic” activity in this camp, children were required to learn some Japanese, sing a Spanish song or quiz each other about the U.S.A as different tasks.

Participants’ awareness of linguistic and cultural diversity is enhanced by some culture-sensitive activities in the camp, such as National Nights in the evening activity and open day special event. From the second week in the camp, the evening activity time were assigned to a cultural activity, called “National Night”. During national nights, the participants and their leaders of each delegation presented an exhibition of the native language, national costume, songs, dances, games, legends and traditional food. The presentations were made in different formats by the delegations. Some delegations, for instance, made a DVD video introducing their country to the participants. Some delegations presented the key information about their countries to the audience by showing some pictures and posters. Apart from these cultural knowledge introductions, there were always interactive activities in the national nights, such as learning to sing a song in Dutch, learning a Spanish dance, learning to write Japanese with a writing brush, playing a Portuguese game, etc. They also distributed some special snacks and souvenirs brought from their home countries to everybody as a gift. In brief, there are ample presentations about aspects of the cultures in the national nights. National nights not only provide a good opportunity for the participants to introduce their countries, but also provide a platform for the participants to share the similarities and differences between their cultures. Similarly, the linguistic and cultural diversity of the camp was presented to the general public at the open day event. On that day, each delegation had a table where they had exhibits specific to their countries and then some selected performances from the national nights were presented to the guests. Meanwhile, the sense of CISV as a family and similarities among the delegations were presented by singing a CISV song and playing some CISV activities. Picture 5.4 exhibits photos of activities which represent the linguistic and cultural diversity in this camp.

In sum, learning about different languages and cultures is inherent in the
programme and daily camp life. Children could learn about the cultural similarities and differences in many subtle ways, such as observing others’ non-verbal behaviour in interactions, dress styles, etc. And children learned about others from different cultures by sharing a dormitory with them and living together as well.

Picture 5.4 Linguistic and cultural diversity

Legend of above pictures:
(Top left) ‘Welcome’ poster in 12 different languages
(Top right) Participants learning to sing the Dutch national anthem
(Middle left) Japanese delegation showing a poster of famous Japanese architecture
(Middle right) Children learning to write Japanese using a traditional writing brush
(Bottom left) Spanish delegation showing their national costume
(Bottom right) Japanese delegation performing a traditional dance to the guests

5.4 Research in CISV

Research work on the effectiveness of CISV’s educational programmes had been
done ever since the first Village programme was held in Cincinnati in 1951. However, most of the early research work with CISV participants were only reported internally within the organization; seldom was it published in academic or public journals. The early research reports before 1970 which are reviewed in this section were photocopied from the CISV Archive in the International Office of CISV in Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Some of the research projects after 1970 were published in the journal *Interspective* owned by CISV, which is an interdisciplinary journal which includes topics like education, psychology, communication, peace and conflict resolution, and cultural studies. Some of them were unpublished graduate students’ dissertations, kept within CISV.

All the early research work (before 1970) concerned only the participants of the CISV Village programme and addressed two general questions: 1) Are CISV youths distinguishable from non-CISV ones?; 2) Are changes in the 11-year-old child delegate distinguishable at the end of four weeks in a CISV Village programme?. Most of this early research was conducted by Allen and her colleagues from the perspective of psychology. For example, Bjetstedt (1960) compared CISV boys and non-CISV boys in their involvement in international affairs and global concerns; Allen (1956) investigated the changes of CISV children on stereotype and prejudice. The results of these research studies showed that: 1) CISV youths participating in the village programme were different from their non-CISV counterparts, and 2) the changes in the children at the end of the village programme were distinguishable but not necessarily statistically significant.

More recent research in CISV has diverse research interests. For example, Paulsrud (1996, cited in Watson, 2008) examined the development of networks of relationships among Village participants; De Leon (1999) evaluated the effects of CISV participation on the self-esteem of Guatemalan children; Dickhoff (1994) evaluated the impact of CISV participation on individuals who attended programmes in 1991. Among this recent research, the most substantial and influential is the longitudinal follow up project done by Watson (2004). She investigated how the CISV experience had impacted on the life of participants who participated in CISV programmes from 1951 to 1991. The most recent research concerning CISV focuses on the effective intercultural dialogue among children and adults in educational activities.
of CISV programmes which was conducted by Baraldi (2009b) and his research team. Some of the important CISV studies are reviewed in detail in Chapter 4 and section 7.2 of Chapter 7.

The research already done in CISV provides a strong context for the current research project. It is hoped that the present project could do a comprehensive investigation about the impact of the CISV Village programme on participants. Although the research scope overlaps with some of the previous research, nevertheless this project investigates children’s interactions in the activities for the first time and has a longitudinal design for the short-term impact investigation which is innovative in methodology. The research design and methodology of the present project is reported in the next chapter.

5.5 Summary

This chapter has illustrated the main features of CISV as an international educational organization including its educational principles, approach and programmes. It has especially introduced the Village programme for 11-year-old children in some detail, based on my fieldwork in a Village camp. Finally, this chapter provides the research context for the present project by a brief review of the previous research in CISV.
Chapter 6 Research Design and Methodology

6.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to explain the research design and methodology that was employed in order to accomplish this project. The project consists of three separate but related studies with different focuses. This chapter is organized as follows: the mixed methods research design of this project is explained in 6.2; then the rationales of adopting three different research methods for the three studies in this project are generically discussed in 6.3; 6.4 illustrates the ethical issues concerned in the three studies of this project; finally, a summary of this chapter is given in 6.5.

6.2 Project design: a mixed methods research

6.2.1 What is mixed methods research?

Mixed methods research is referred to by researchers as the class of research that mixes or combines quantitative and qualitative research techniques, methods, approaches, concepts or languages (Creswell, 2003; Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2004; Dörnyei, 2007). In other words, mixed methods research involves the mixing of quantitative and qualitative research methods or paradigm characteristics in one study or project. According to Onwuegbuzie and Johnson (2004), the goal of mixed method research is not to replace either quantitative and qualitative approaches but to draw from the strengths and minimize the weaknesses of both in single research study and across studies. Mixed methods research recognises that both quantitative and qualitative research is important and useful. Recently, mixed methods research has become more and more popular among many researchers and scholars. It is the third research paradigm in social sciences research after the traditional quantitative and qualitative research paradigms (Dörnyei, 2007). A substantial introduction and discussion about mixed methods research can be found in the recent Handbook of Mixed Methods in the Social and Behavioural Sciences, edited by Abbas Tashakkori and Charles Teddlie (2003).

There can be many different types of mixed methods designs concerning how different components of quantitative and qualitative research combine in a study.
Several complex taxonomies have been proposed to cover all the possibilities of mixed methods designs (for reviews, see Creswell, 2003; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003; Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2004). The two most widely accepted organising principles in typological approaches have been the *sequence* and the *dominance* of the method constituents. In a typical mixed methods design with a combination of both quantitative and qualitative research, for instance, both sequence and dominance dimensions can have three categories (qualitative first, quantitative first or concurrent; and the qualitative dominant, quantitative dominant or equal status). Thus, the combinations in different sequences and dominances have resulted in nine types of mixed methods:

- concurrent with both quantitative and qualitative research the dominant design (i.e. triangulation);
- concurrent with qualitative research the dominant design;
- concurrent with quantitative research the dominant design;
- sequential with quantitative research first and both the dominant design;
- sequential with quantitative research first and the dominant design;
- sequential with quantitative research first but qualitative research dominant design;
- sequential with qualitative research first and both the dominant design;
- sequential with qualitative research first and the dominant design;
- sequential with qualitative research first but quantitative research the dominant design.

However, Dörnyei (2007) argues that such a typological approach is problematic, although typologies can be beneficial in organising and labelling varied practices. The problem is twofold: on the one hand, none of the typologies can adequately encompass all the actual or potential diversity in mixed methods studies; on the other hand, the typological approach seems detached from the actual research practice: in actual research far fewer combinations have been used, with the combination of questionnaires and semi-structured interviews in particular dominating (ibid, p.168). Dörnyei (2007) therefore proposes an “examplar-based” typology that emphasizes the most frequent method combinations to describe the main types of mixed methods.
designs.

According to the “examplar-based” typology, Dörnyei (2007, pp. 170-173) lists eight main types of mixed methods design which are organized in terms of the actual data collection methods applied and the main functions of the mixing:

- questionnaire survey with a follow-up interview or retrospection;
- questionnaire survey facilitated by a preceding interview;
- interview study with a follow-up questionnaire survey;
- interview study facilitated by a preceding questionnaire survey;
- concurrent combination of qualitative and quantitative research;
- experiments with parallel interviews;
- longitudinal study with mixed methods components;
- combining self-report and observational data.

Compared with the typological approaches, this “examplar-based” typology is more pragmatic and easier to follow. However, the list that only includes the most dominant basic combinations is selective rather than comprehensive.

6.2.2 Strengths and weaknesses of mixed methods research

Compared with the traditional quantitative and qualitative research, mixed methods research has its strengths and weaknesses (Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2004; Onwuegbuzie & Teddlie, 2003). The strengths of mixed methods research are many:

- It can use the strengths of an additional method to overcome the weaknesses of another method by using both in a research study.
- It can answer a broader and more complete range of research questions.
- It provides stronger evidence for a conclusion through the convergence and corroboration of findings.
- It can increase the generalizability of the results.
- It can produce more complete research outcomes necessary to inform theory and practice.

The weaknesses of mixed methods approach are:

- It can be difficult for a single researcher to carry out both quantitative and qualitative research, especially when two or more approaches are expected to
be used concurrently.
- More challenging for the researcher, because he/she has to learn multiple methods and approaches and understand how to mix them and integrate the data appropriately.
- More time consuming.
- More expensive.

Bearing the above strengths and weaknesses in mind, a mixed methods research design was adopted for this project. The rationale for this decision is given in the next section and the mixed methods design for this project is explained in 6.2.4.

### 6.2.3 Why a mixed methods research for this project?

The principle of selecting a research design for a study is the matching between the research problem and the design (De Vaus, 2001; Creswell, 2003). Creswell (2003) claims that the most fundamental factor on choosing a research design is the research question: research methods should follow research questions in a way that offers the best solutions to obtain useful answers. Many research questions or combinations of questions are best and most fully answered through mixed methods research solutions. So the nature of the three main related research questions, but with different focuses in the present project, determines a mixed methods design.

According to Sandelowski (2003), there are two main purposes for combining methods: (a) to achieve an elaborate and comprehensive understanding of a complex issue and (b) to validate one’s conclusion by presenting converging results obtained through different methods, namely the traditional goal of triangulation. The purpose for the mixed methods research of the present project is the former one, by the expansion function, i.e. seeking to expand the scope and breadth of a study by including multiple inquiry components. Combining a number of different research components within this particular project can broaden the scope of this investigation on the complex nature of intercultural learning in an international youth exchange programme together with its effects and can enrich the researcher’s ability to draw conclusions about the questions under study.
6.2.4 Mixed methods design of this project

The mixed methods design for this research project does not fit into any of the main types of mixed methods designs listed by typologies in the earlier section. The visual model of the mixed methods design for this project is displayed in Figure 6.1. The complexity of the research design is considered in three dimensions: the number of quantitative and qualitative research components, the priority of the method constituents, and the level of mixing. First, this project has three components rather than the typical two as in most mixed methods designs: two qualitative and a quantitative (i.e. participation observation for examining children’s intercultural learning experience in a CISV camp; a questionnaire survey for examining the short-term impact of the CISV international camp experience on young participants’ intercultural development; a semi-structured interview for examining the long-term impact of the CISV international camp experience on former participants’ intercultural development). These three research components are operated in a separate but parallel manner in which they do not influence each other. Secondly, there is no greater priority or weight given to any specific quantitative or qualitative component of this project. It means that all the three research components have equal status in this research project. Thirdly, the design has two levels of mixing: in the overall level of the project, mixing is among the three components: qualitative study + quantitative study + qualitative study; within the questionnaire survey, both quantitative and qualitative inquiry measures were used (i.e. using closed questions for collecting quantitative data and open questions for collecting qualitative data). Although a questionnaire is often regarded as a quantitative data collection tool, it is possible to include some open questions, thereby providing data that is qualitative and exploratory in nature. The quantitative measures can tap group change trends in a period of time, while qualitative measures can provide a micro-analysis of how the impact is perceived by the individuals themselves.
The present project is a “concurrent design” regarding the implementation sequence of the three research components, although three data collections started at slightly different times. And the time spans of the three data collections differ from each other because of the nature of three different kinds of data and the sequence of getting access to three different subject groups. Table 6.1 shows the concrete time spans of the three data collections. As can be seen, there are some overlaps between the three data collection processes. The data collection methods of the three research components are discussed in the next section.

Table 6.1 Time span of data collections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Data collection method</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Time scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study 1</td>
<td>participant observation</td>
<td>participants in a CISV village</td>
<td>7/2006-8/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 2</td>
<td>questionnaire survey</td>
<td>young CISV participants and a control group</td>
<td>7/2006-10/2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 Research methods

This section will generically discuss the research methods used in the three research components of the project. It includes a discussion of the understanding of the research methods and the rationale for adopting them in the three research components. Three research methods were used: 1) participant observation, 2) a questionnaire survey, and 3) a semi-structured interview. The corresponding research questions are given for reference. More detailed information about these research methods, such as the participants, instruments, procedure, and data analysis methods, are provided in the method section of the following three data analysis chapters (Chapters 7, 8 and 9) respectively.

6.3.1 Participant observation

Research question 1:
What is the young participants’ intercultural learning experience in a CISV Village?
(i) How do the young participants from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds in the village negotiate and manage their participation in the group activities?
(ii) What factors influence the young participants’ active participation in the multi-party interactions and the group activities in the CISV Village?

Participant observation is both an overall approach to inquiry and a data collection method. It requires the researcher to hear, to see and to experience daily life as the participants do (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Jorgensen (1989) claims that participant observation is especially appropriate when the phenomenon of interest is somewhat obscured from public view or when there are important differences between the views of insiders and outsiders. It may therefore be considered a promising method of studying children’s intercultural learning experience in an international summer camp which is little known publicly. It was decided that participant observation was the most appropriated data collection method for the above research questions of this study for two reasons:

- Little is known with regard to children’s intercultural learning experience in a multicultural and multilingual camp. Participant observation offers an insider
The present study aims to discover children’s communication practices especially their interactions in group activities when there is disparity of their language ability in English at the micro-interactional level. Participant observation allows the researcher to document and interpret children’s social interactions in naturally occurring contexts.

I participated in the camp as a researcher and a helper in the kitchen for the entire duration of the programme. Participant observation and audio- or video-recordings of children’s interactions in the activities were made and fieldnotes were kept. The description about a CISV camp in Section 5.3 of Chapter 5 was based on the researcher’s fieldwork as a participant observer in the CISV camp for this study.

6.3.2 Questionnaire survey

Research question 2

What is the immediate and short-term impact of CISV Village participation on the young participants?

(i) What are the immediate effects of the CISV Village experience on the young participants’ ICC development?

(ii) How do the young participants develop their ICC nine months after their participation in the CISV villages?

(iii) What is the impact of the CISV experience on the young participants’ personal growth during the period of this longitudinal investigation?

The method of the questionnaire survey was used to collect the data for examining the impact of intercultural learning in CISV villages on young participants’ intercultural communicative competence development. This research method was chosen for three reasons. Firstly, a questionnaire is the most feasible way to reach the subject group, 36 British participants of CISV Village programme, for the short-term impact study because they were resident in different cities around the UK. Secondly, a questionnaire is the most efficient for longitudinal study in terms of researcher time, effort and financial resources compared with other survey methods, for instance,
interviewing the same number of participants. Thirdly, the gatekeeper (CISV Great Britain) of these young participants would like to protect these children from being influenced too much by the research. A questionnaire was the most acceptable way of getting access to these children because all the questionnaires were anonymous and all the information about these children and their families were kept private.

Since the participants of CISV Village programme lived around the UK, the questionnaire surveys for a CISV group were undertaken using the postal service through the assistance of the Secretary of CISV Great Britain. A postal survey has many advantages, such as relatively cheap costs, reaching subjects over a wide geographical area within a limited time span and no interviewer effects (David & Sutton, 2004). However, the researcher could not have any control of the questionnaire completion process. For example, whether the participants filled in the questionnaires independently or with help from their parents or even if someone else filled in the questionnaire instead was not known. These factors may influence the validity of the data obtained through postal questionnaires. In contrast, questionnaires were distributed to the children of the control group in two classes at a school and completed under the monitoring of both the researcher and their teachers.

6.3.2.1 A longitudinal study

A longitudinal study design was adopted for the questionnaire survey to measure CISV children’s intercultural learning and development over time. Longitudinal studies have been claimed to be particularly useful when studying age-related development and individual differences (De Vaus, 2001). The longitudinal design for this questionnaire survey study was a classic type of longitudinal study, which involved a group of 36 British 11-year-old children who participated in CISV Village programmes and followed their changes by multiple investigations over a considerable period of time (i.e. pre-camp test, post-camp test, post-post-camp test in this study). This kind of design is usually labelled as a ‘panel study’. Proper panel designs enable researchers to observe all the specific changes across time. In the example of this study, it aimed to capture young participants’ group changes in different aspects of ICC and also individuals’ changes in all aspects of ICC over time. Thus, a panel study can offer a powerful non-experimental method for examining development and causality.
However, a panel study usually suffers from attrition, namely an increasing number of participants drop out of the group with time. This study is not exceptional. In order to reduce non-response rate, a reminder and another copy of the questionnaire were sent to the non-responding participants after the date due for returning a completed questionnaire had passed. This tracking strategy worked well with this subject group.

In order to examine whether CISV children’s intercultural development over time were due to the impact of CISV Village programme participation, a control group of children who did not participate in any CISV Village programme were included for comparison. In fact, as Dörnyei (2007) points out, in most educational settings random assignment of students by the researcher is rarely possible. In this study, the children who participated in the CISV Village programme were not randomly selected by the researcher; they were selected through the combination of both themselves and their parents’ self-selection and the programme organizer’s selection. Nevertheless, the researcher still tried to minimise pre-camp test differences between the CISV group and the control group by matching the participants in both groups. Because of the practical constraints, a case-by-case matching was not possible. The two groups are only matched by age. The study is more rigorous than without a control group. Children of the control group were tested twice with 10 months in between. Table 6.2 shows the arrangement of the longitudinal study with a control group.

Table 6.2 The longitudinal design of the questionnaire study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Investigation 1</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Investigation 2</th>
<th>Investigation 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CISV group</td>
<td>pre-camp test</td>
<td>CISV Village camp participation</td>
<td>post-camp test</td>
<td>post-post-camp test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control group</td>
<td>1st test</td>
<td>no CISV Village camp participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:*
- *pre-camp test* = test before participants departed for the CISV villages;
- *post-camp test* = test immediately after participants returned home from the CISV villages;
- *post-post-camp test* = test nine months after the participation in CISV villages.*
6.3.3 Semi-structured interview

Research question 3:

What is the long-term impact of CISV Village participation on former participants?

(i) What is the long-term impact of CISV Village experience on the former participants’ ICC development and personal development?

(ii) How do the former participants themselves perceive the impact from the long-term perspective?

A qualitative interview is characterised by repeated face-to-face encounters between the researcher and his or her informants to gain an understanding of their lives, experiences or situations, expressed in their own words. It is one of the most common and powerful ways to obtain in-depth data for research. Increasingly, the qualitative interview is not only regarded as a neutral tool of data gathering but an active interaction between the researcher and the respondents leading to negotiated, contextually based results (Fontana & Frey, 2000). Therefore, it especially requires good communication skills on the part of the interviewer. This, however, can be challenging for some researchers, especially when the interviewer is not a native speaker of the language that the informants use (as is the case in the current study). In addition, a qualitative interview can be of different types, depending on the formatting and the schedule of the questions, such as unstructured and semi-structured interviews (David & Sutton, 2004).

A semi-structured interview is used to investigate how the former CISV participants perceive their experiences in the CISV Village at a young age, how it influences their personal lives and the development of intercultural communicative competence in the long-term perspective. This format lets the interviewer have some control over the broad questions about the topic but also gives interviewees space and freedom to elaborate on certain interesting issues. Ideally, it would be better to investigate the same group who participate in the short-term impact study for the long-term impact. But obviously it is impossible for this researcher to wait for the 11-year-old subject group of the short-term impact study to grow up in order to investigate them about their perception of the long-term impact. Thus, a group of former participants who took part in CISV Villages when they were 11 years old were
chosen as a replacement. Although the societal contexts of the former CISV Village participants’ experiences are different from the young participants in the short-term impact study, their experiences in CISV Village camps are similar. More information about the interviewees is given in the method section of Chapter 9.

6.4 Ethical considerations

Ethical aspects of research need serious consideration throughout the entire journey (David & Sutton, 2004). Ethics concerns the morality of human conduct. In relation to social research, it refers to the moral deliberation, choice and accountability on the part of researchers in the research process (Edwards & Mauthner, 2002). Ethical considerations in social science research always include issues of codes and controls, privacy and confidentiality, informed consent and anonymity (Homan, 1991). These ethical issues were considered seriously throughout the research process.

The ethical considerations in this research project are complex and difficult to handle for two reasons. Firstly, three different research methods were adopted for the three research components with three different subject groups. As Kelman (1982) argues, different ethical issues arise as a function of the particular research methods employed in social science research. Therefore, three research methods in this project bring in different ethical issues. Moreover, as Punch (2005) points out, qualitative research involves more ethical issues because it is inherently interested in people’s views and targets sensitive matters compared with quantitative research. In this project, the ethical considerations for the fieldwork in the CISV Village camp weigh the most in the whole project. Secondly, the majority of the subjects in this project are 11-year-old children, who were involved in reporting or displaying their experiences themselves. As Hill (2005) points out, some special ethical considerations need to be taken into consideration when doing research with children, which is different from researching with adults. The main relevant differences between children and adults are with respect to ability and power. Compared with adults, children are usually perceived as less competent to express and understand abstract ideas and they often find it more difficult to dissent or disagree on something that makes them feel uncomfortable. These factors make children especially vulnerable to persuasion and harm in research, as in the rest of life. However, they deserve similar rights to adults: to be informed
about the research and make their own decisions about participating in any research. How I dealt with the ethical issues in this research project is presented in the following subsections.

6.4.1 Ethical code and conduct guideline

The conducting of the present research project strictly follows code and control from three parties. Firstly, this project follows the professional ethical code in the research field “Revised Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research” provided by the British Educational Research Association (BERA) (2004). As suggested, these Ethical Guidelines are especially for researchers who carry out educational research in any given context (from student research projects to large-scale funded projects). The guidelines from BERA fits in the research scope of the present project appropriately as it mainly examines the effectiveness of an intercultural education programme on developing participants’ intercultural communicative competence. Secondly, this research project also follows the “Research Project Approval and Research Guidelines” set up by CISV, the international children’s charity organization that the project works with. The CISV research guideline is aimed to regulate the research activities conducted within CISV and protect the benefits and rights of the young participants in their activities. I signed a “Research Declaration Form” after getting approval from the Educational Development Research (EDR) committee of CISV International for my project. Thirdly, according to the regulations of the university research ethical committee and the relevant child protection regulations in the UK (i.e. codes developed by some children’s organizations, for example, Barnardo’s and the National Children’s Bureau), I was required to have a criminal record check because most subjects of my research were children under 18 years old. All these professional, organizational ethical codes and conduct guidelines over my research helped to remind me to be sensitive and careful in doing the research later.

6.4.2 Consent by gatekeepers

The issue of consent was addressed through the gatekeeper of the subjects in this research project. The CISV organization works as a gatekeeper of all the subject groups including both the young Village programme participants and former adult
participants. Gatekeepers are those who control access to data and to human subjects. According to Homan (1991, pp. 82-84), there are four types of gatekeepers: 1) gatekeepers who have the right or legal responsibility which obliges the researcher to approach them in a formal way (e.g. managers of organizations, head teachers of schools); 2) individuals and collectives who hold raw data that is useful for research (e.g. the research section of an organization, the archive centre of a school); 3) gatekeepers who are in a position either objectively or subjectively defined to give vicarious consent for subjects deemed not able or entitled to judge for themselves (e.g. parents, guardians, teachers); and 4) associates who help to introduce the research purpose to the subject to those who exercise the right to give clearance or to the subjects themselves (e.g. a teacher at a school). Due to the diversity of the subject groups, this project involves all the above four types of gatekeepers. The corresponding gatekeepers for the three subject groups in this project are summarised in Table 6.3.

Ideally consent should be obtained in person from the child or his/her guardian following the presentation of written and verbal information about the research and its implications, and after opportunities to discuss queries and concerns by the child (Hill, 2005). However, the practical constraints made it impossible for the researcher to gain formal written consent from all those children or their parents individually for this project. For instance, the researcher did not have any contact information of the children from the 10 different countries in the camp for the fieldwork. However, the fieldwork did not start until approval from all the children’s parents had been obtained. Instead of a formal consent form, cover letters including all the essential information about the research project, such as the aims of the research, what time and commitment is required, whether there will be feedback, whether confidentiality is promised, and voluntary participation, were sent to the gatekeepers of those participants.
Table 6.3 Gatekeepers of the three subject groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Gatekeepers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| participant observation study of a CISV Village camp | children from ten countries in a CISV village | 1) CISV International  
2) 10 CISV National Associations  
3) 40 children’s parents  
4) camp host staff and adult leaders |
| questionnaire survey study | young CISV village participants (British) | 1) CISV International  
2) CISV Great Britain  
3) local branches of CISV Great Britain  
4) children’s parents |
| interview study        | former CISV village participants (adults) | 1) CISV International  
2) CISV Great Britain |

6.4.3 Confidentiality and anonymity

Confidentiality in research stipulates “not being identified in research reports and presentations and not passing on the information of participants to any unauthorized parties” (Hill, 2005, p.75). All the information about the subjects and the data in this project were kept by the researcher only and not passed to anyone else. For the children of the CISV group participating in the questionnaire surveys, codes (e.g. “B1” represents the first boy on the list of participants) were put on the questionnaires for tracking purposes in the longitudinal study rather than asking the children to fill in their names. Moreover, all the questionnaires for the three investigations were sent by and returned to the secretary of CISV Great Britain instead of the researcher. In such a way all the identifiable information about the children and their families were kept private. Children in the control group were asked to fill in their name on the questionnaires only for the researcher to track the changes of the participants between two investigations. Similarly, codes consisting of both letters and number (e.g. EE1) were used to represent the interviewees in the long-term impact study in the interview transcripts and any identifiable information was not reported in the findings. However, interaction data reported in Chapter 7 is not anonymous.7

---

7 I was faced with a dilemma. If I used pseudonyms or codes to represent the participants it would break the authenticity of the interactional data because participants’ names appeared often in the turns of their multi-party interactions in the activities.
6.4.4 Practical difficulties

It is very common for researchers to encounter practical difficulties. In the field research in a CISV Village camp, I had the dual roles of a researcher as a participant observer and a helper in the kitchen. The latter role brought responsibilities such as preparing three meals and snacks, washing dishes and kitchen cleaning. Sometimes, during the activity time, I had to leave to prepare the meals or snacks in my role as a member of the kitchen staff. Sometimes, the role of helper in the kitchen conflicted with my participation in observation work as a researcher. For example, the leaders’ daily meeting in the late afternoon was a good chance for me to get the information about the planned activities for the following day, which could help me to plan the focus of my observation in the coming day. But I was supposed to help in the kitchen at that time. Another conflict of interest was between the researcher’s and the participants’ interests. After one week’s fieldwork, I modified my plan for data collection by focusing on several specific children rather than investigating all the children in the camp. It required those few children to carry a voice-recorder with them during their activities. This idea conflicted with the principles of the CISV Village camp which emphasizes equal participation in the camp. Moreover, it probably would single those children out of the group, which might influence their experiences in the camp. Finally, the priority always lay in participants’ interests.

The other problem I encountered in the fieldwork was the amount of shared information. How much information should be shared with the participants about the research is one of the basic decisions that researchers need to make (Dörnyei, 2007). Although the children were informed that research would be conducted in the camp before they departed from their home countries, it seemed that not all of them were very clear about the project. So at the beginning of the camp, the host staff and I decided to introduce me to the children only as a helper in the kitchen in order not to scare some of them away; however, the adult leaders of all delegations knew my main purpose in the camp. Some children gradually got to know about my role as a researcher and showed interest and curiosity about the research project by asking me questions about it. After the rapport between the researcher and the children was established, the children got used to the video-recording during their activities. These dilemmas were handled very sensitively - otherwise it could have cause
non-participation.

6.5 Summary

This chapter has explained the mixed methods research design of the project and generically discussed the three research methods adopted. It also discussed the ethical considerations for the mixed method research project. The next three chapters (Chapters 7, 8 and 9) will present the data analysis of the three research component studies in this project.
Chapter 7  Children’s Intercultural Learning in a CISV Village

7.1 Introduction

This chapter is to report an investigation of children’s intercultural learning experience in a CISV village by examining their interactions in the educational activities on offer. This study will provide a micro-scope perspective on children’s process of intercultural learning in an international summer camp. As reviewed in Chapter 4, participation in intercultural exchange programmes can help develop participants’ intercultural communicative competence. However, we know very little about the process of intercultural learning. One possible channel that can shed light on the process to some extent is through the analysis of participants’ interactions. It is argued that interactions can reproduce and change participants’ cultural presuppositions in the process of communication (Baraldi, 2009b). Abstract cultural presuppositions are the starting point of participants’ interactions, but they are subjected to change through interactions. Intercultural interaction as a complex communicative process which concerns more than the use of language can be an important angle for understanding the process of intercultural learning.

The interactional analysis of children’s participation in educational activities has advantages and limitations for a general analysis of their intercultural learning in a CISV village. The in-depth, interactional analysis of the activity participation is particularly important for understanding how participants construct their intercultural interactions. Children’s intercultural interactions constitute a privileged field of observation for their intercultural learning (Baraldi, 2009b). The main expectations which are observable in intercultural interactions concern: 1) learning and 2) ways of participating in an intercultural learning process (i.e. required role performances and opportunities for personal expression). In other words, interactions show how children achieve their communicative competence in the intercultural contexts. Moreover, the interactional analysis of children’s educational activities can help analyze the potential problems or conflicts among the participants in the participation of the activities. However, the communication pattern and linguistic variables found in the specific interactions and their contexts only display the behavioural performance of children’s intercultural learning in the international camp but no clue is given on the cognitive and affective process (internal change) of their intercultural learning,
such as the development of intercultural awareness, their attitudes towards peers from different cultural backgrounds, etc.

The following research questions are addressed by the study reported in this chapter:

1. How do the young participants from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds in the village negotiate and manage their participation in the group activities?

2. What factors influence the young participants’ active participation in the multi-party interactions and the group activities in the CISV village?

The present chapter is organized as follows: previous research on children’s interactions in a lingua franca is reviewed in 7.2; the research method of this study including information about participants, data collection procedure and data analysis approach is reported in 7.3; 7.4 presents the results of the interaction analysis of two episodes of children’s multi-party interactions in group activities in a CISV village – children’s interaction and participation pattern in multi-party communication and their linguistic and interactional resources in the interactions; the implications of the findings to the research questions are discussed in 7.5; the conclusions drawn from this study are given in 7.6.

7.2 Children’s interactions in a lingua franca

Social interactions amongst children and adolescents have been investigated in a number of different, yet related, fields of enquires such as language acquisition (e.g. acquisition of conversational competence, Ochs & Shieffelin, 1983; Romaine, 1984), language and communication disorders (e.g. compensation strategies among children with pragmatic impairments, Perkins, 2007), bilingualism (e.g. use of code-switching, Auer, 1984), and social psychology (e.g. language as social interaction, Kyratzis, 2004; Cromdal, 2009). The general findings of these fields seem to agree on the resourcefulness of the young and developing language users not only in acquiring several different linguistic means to communicate, but also in using the linguistic means to negotiate meaning and co-construct social relationships in a variety of contexts, including the family (e.g. Zhu Hua, 2008; in press), school (e.g. Church, 2007; Li Wei & Wu, 2009) and friendship circles (e.g. Cromdal, 2004; Kyratzis, 2004). However, very few studies have examined how children and adolescents from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds negotiate and manage
multiparty interactions using a lingua franca (cf. Baraldi, 2009b).

Baraldi (2009b) conducted a substantial investigation of young participants’ interactions in the educational activities in the camps of two CISV programmes for different age groups: “Village” and “Summer Camp”. The corpus of the interaction data in this research was collected in eight CISV villages and four summer camps run in Italy in 2006 and 2007. Comparing the overall interaction pattern in villages and summer camps, they found that in villages the interactions among children (11 year-old) are only informal and educational activities always feature some adults’ working with the children, while in summer camps adolescents (average age = 14.5 years old) can work without adults. Through the analysis of the interactions in the villages, they found that children who spoke poor and sometimes very poor English had major difficulty in participating in the activities. The limits of communication in the lingua franca are evident above all in the most complex activities, where the verbal participation is important and the children’s contributions are restricted by their linguistic difficulties. However, few efforts were observed in promoting children’s active participation and personal expressions from the facilitators in the games. In contrast, it was found that interactions among the adolescents in the summer camps have been much more reciprocal. It demonstrates that the promotion of participation and autonomy in working together is very effective. Based on the findings of the study of young participants’ interactive communications in CISV camps, Baraldi (2009b) proposed that the awareness of the importance of promoting children’s active participation and contributions with their own ideas and proposals through coordination and dialogic mediation might be useful in training the leaders and staff members within CISV.

The current study shares a similar research scope with Baraldi’s research on the interactions in CISV camps. Both studies are interested in children’s participation in the educational activities through their interactions. Baraldi’s research focuses on the macro organization of the interactions and the relationship between adults and young participants in the participating in the activities from the perspectives of both a pedagogical approach and the sociology of childhood. The present study focuses on the micro organization of children’s multi-party interactions and the construction of an interactional mechanism in communication when there is a disparity of linguistic abilities. It takes a different analysis perspective into children’s interactions for which a small amount of interaction data does not matter.
7.3 Method

7.3.1 The setting and participants

This study was conducted at a CISV village held in an outdoor activity centre in the UK in 2006. The main participants of the village were 40 11-year-old children from ten different countries, which included Jordan, Japan, Philippines, U.S.A., Netherlands, Portugal, Norway, Germany, Spain, and the UK. As mentioned in Chapter 5, each country’s delegation consisted of four children (two boys and two girls) and an adult leader. These children were interested in intercultural living and able to live independently for the duration of four weeks. The working language of the camp is English. Adult leaders are responsible for facilitating communication by translating into the native languages of the children whenever appropriate and possible. They are further assisted by ‘junior counsellors’ (JC), who are aged between 16 and 18 and volunteer themselves to help out with the camp activities. For more information about the village, please refer to section 5.3 of Chapter 5.

7.3.2 Data collection

Participant observation was carried out in the camp by the researcher for the complete duration. However, only children’s naturally occurring interactions in some important and meaningful educational activities were video-recorded or audio-recorded because of certain practical limits. The participants’ informal and unstructured activities (e.g. the free time, delegation time, etc; see the daily routine of the camp in Section 5.3.3 of Chapter 5) is excluded because (a) logistically, it would be difficult to video-tape this part of their experience when they were scattered at different places, and (b) ethically, it would have been challenging to scrutinise participants’ private life, although it is important for understanding children’s experiences in the international village. The total length of these audio- and video-recordings in the camp is given in Table 7.1. In addition, informal interviews were conducted with some of the children, adult leaders and the host staff in the camp. Most of the delegation leaders, JCs, and host staff had participated in CISV Village programmes when they were young. And they were very experienced with the educational activities and the dynamics of the experience in a CISV camp. Research diaries and fieldnotes were also kept every day during my residence in the camp. The researcher was given full access to the activities of CISV and permission was sought and granted to record and analyse the interactions.
Table 7.1 Information on recordings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data type</th>
<th>Length of time (in total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>video-recording</td>
<td>6 hours 45 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voice-recording</td>
<td>4 hours 50 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3.3 The data

Two episodes of children’s multi-party communication in group activities are analysed in this chapter. These two episodes were selected mainly because the interactions among the participants in these two activities were very representative of what took place in the village. In addition, the composition of the participants within the groups in these two episodes is common. The first episode is a children’s multi-party interaction in a group skiing game using English as a lingua franca. In this group, all interactants are not native-speakers of English. The second one is a multi-party interaction amongst a group of children with the mixture of both English native-speaking and non-native-speaking children in a bridge-building game. These two games played by these two groups of children are part of a big activity, called ‘Mini Olympic’. In this activity, participants were required to finish a series of various games, which included sports games, a knowledge quiz, language learning, singing a song in a specific language, etc. These activities and games require a high level of cooperation and good teamwork. This group activity was played on the 15th day of the camp when children had got to know each other, got used to camp life, and had already established some friendships. Further detailed information about the activities and the participants of those two groups is given in the results section of this chapter.

7.3.4 Data analysis

The recorded children’s multi-party interactions in the educational activities during the CISV camp were transcribed by the researcher according to the transcription conventions designed by Atkinson and Heritage (1984) (see Appendix I). All the features of the verbal utterances and nonverbal behaviours (e.g. gestures, movement, laughter) occurring in those multi-party interactions were transcribed. After an overall analysis of the process of the interactions in the activity, I first measure the level of participation in the activity by each participant and direction of interaction in a group, as they are good indicators of the dynamics of group communication (Dimbleby & Burton, 1992). Then I examine the linguistic and interactional features of these children’s multi-party interactions in the activities by using some principles and concepts in conversation analysis (CA). The
combination of these two steps can capture the dynamics of children’s participation in the interactions during the activities. The focus of the analysis is the construction of the multi-party interactions and the linguistic and interactional resources children use in the local situation of the activity.

7.4 Results

7.4.1 Participation and interaction patterns

7.4.1.1 Episode 1: Skiing game

The first piece of data I present in this chapter is an episode of multi-party interaction among a group of four children and two adults in a skiing game. In this game, the children were asked to work together on two pairs of wooden skis, which were pulled forward by two ropes attached to the skis at both ends. The children chose their own position in the line. The information about the children and the two adults who were facilitating the activity is given in Table 7.2. The participants’ English language proficiency is based on a combination of self-reports, perceptions and informal assessments by the adult leaders, and observation by the researcher during the camp.

Table 7.2 Participants and their language profiles in Episode 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position in the game</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Native language(s)</th>
<th>English language proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basel</td>
<td>First in the line</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Advanced in both comprehension and production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satoko</td>
<td>2nd in the line</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Intermediate in both comprehension and production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxim</td>
<td>3rd in the line</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Intermediate in comprehension, beginner’s level in production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuri</td>
<td>4th in the line</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Beginner’s level in both comprehension and production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annika</td>
<td>Judge/ Adult leader from Germany</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Advanced in both comprehension and production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Facilitator /Junior counsellor from Luxemburg</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td>German, French Luxembourgish</td>
<td>Advanced level in both comprehension and production</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A total of 238 turns were recorded for this activity. The excerpt from Turn 12 to Turn 33 was a break before the official start of the activity, when the participants and children from another group talked for a short time. Therefore, only the excerpts with 212 turns in total of Episode 1 where examples are analysed in the present chapter are given in Appendix I. After the adult leaders explained the rules of the game, Basel chose to be at the very front of the line. The other children chose their positions. The recorded interaction starts with Basel giving out instructions and checking whether everyone in the team understands his instructions and directions (Turns 1-11). Once the others are ready, the game kicks off (Turns 34-36). However, the group is not well-coordinated and the participants make some attempts to coordinate but some problems arise (Turns 37-187). Eventually the group pulls it off and gets to the destination in good spirits (Turns 188-238).

Participants’ participation and interaction patterns in the group activity is represented in Figure 7.1, a sociogram (Moreno, 1953), which records who speaks to whom in a multi-party communication. Additional information about the use of languages other than English as the lingua franca is also provided in Figure 7.1. Table 7.3 summaries the frequency of turns by each participant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Number of turns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basel</td>
<td>73 (1 in Arabic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satoko</td>
<td>31 (12 in Japanese, 2 in mixed languages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuri</td>
<td>34 (17 in Japanese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxim</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annika</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone together</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see, children show different levels of participation and involvement in this group activity. Basel produces most of the turns (a total number of 73), followed by Kuri and Satoko, both of whom produce more than 30 turns. Maxim speaks the least with only three turns. Most of Basel’s turns are addressed to the whole group in the forms of short instructions. This fits proportionally to the role Basel plays in the game, since he stands right at the front of the skiing line and needs to coordinate and lead the team. Among the rest of Basel’s turns, three (Turns 10, 52, 85) are specifically addressed to Satoko, and one
Satoko’s turns involve most of the participants in the interaction, even though the number of turns she produces is not as many as Basel. Of Satoko’s 31 turns, seven (Turns 2, 9, 11, 44, 53, 86, 124) are addressed to Basel; 11 in Japanese (Turns 5, 7, 50, 53, 67, 69, 90, 98, 114, 139, 167) are addressed to Kuri; three turns are addressed to Annika (Turns 80, 108, 110) and Maxim (Turns 98, 119, 157), and eight turns (Turns 46, 76, 153, 159, 174, 178, 192, 203) do not appear to have specific addressees or are just some laughter and acknowledgement tokens.

Compared with Satoko, Kuri produces a similar amount of turns in the interaction. However, nearly half of his turns are delivered in Japanese. Among his Japanese turns,
some are clearly addressed to Satoko (e.g. Turns 6, 51, 55, 72, 74, 91), and some seem to have no clear addressee (e.g. Turns 61, 117). One turn in English (Turn 4) is addressed to Basel as a response to Basel’s request and 12 turns (e.g. Turns 41, 97, 100, 104) are addressed to the group as a whole in English.

Maxim produces only three turns during the interaction, two of which (Turns 120, 158) are responses to Satoko’s requests; one (Turn 102) is addressed to the group.

In summary, differences are evident among the participants in terms of both the number of turns produced and the direction of interaction in the group activity. Basel, who has self-appointed to be the leader, speaks the most in the interaction by giving instructions to the group through the whole activity. Satoko speaks to almost everyone in the group and is very responsive throughout. Kuri has little interaction with other participants individually except for Satoko. Despite this, he actively participates in the activity by repeating the instructions in English. Although Maxim speaks the least in the group activity, she cooperates with others in the movement very well.

7.4.1.2 Episode 2: Bridge-building game

The second episode I analyse in this chapter is a multi-party interaction among a group of eight children and two adults in a bridge-building game. In this game, children were asked to use planks to build a bridge on the top of wheels scattered in a sand pit and then cross the bridge. These children chose their starting position by themselves. Unlike the composition of the group in the skiing game in Episode 1, three children in this activity are English native speakers and five are non-native speakers; both the adult leader as judge and the JC as facilitator are English native speakers. The information on the young participants and the facilitators in this group activity is provided in Table 7.4.

A total of 164 turns were recorded for this group’s activity. The full transcript of the interaction of this activity is also provided in Appendix I. This episode starts with a discussion about the tactics needed for the task between the facilitator and some children of the group (Turns 1-17). After thirty seconds’ route planning within the group, the game kicks off (Turns 18-20). The group is well-coordinated and the participants adjust their positions reasonably when some problems arise and finish the building of a bridge (Turns 21-115). Finally all the participants manage to cross the bridge and reach the destination successfully (Turns 116-164).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position in the game</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Native language(s)</th>
<th>English language proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; to pass the bridge</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Filipino, English</td>
<td>Advanced in both comprehension and production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georg</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; to pass the bridge</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Intermediate in both comprehension and production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josie</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; to pass the bridge</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Advanced in both comprehension and production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makoto</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; to pass the bridge</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Beginner’s level in both comprehension and production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belen</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; to pass the bridge</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Beginner’s level in both comprehension and production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisa</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; to pass the bridge</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Beginner’s level in both comprehension and production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viliato</td>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; to pass the bridge</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Beginner’s level in both comprehension and production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellisa</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; to pass the bridge</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Filipino, English</td>
<td>Advanced in both comprehension and production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariel</td>
<td>Judge /Adult leader from Philippines</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Filipino, English</td>
<td>Advanced in both comprehension and production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifty</td>
<td>Facilitator /Junior counsellor from the UK</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Advanced level in both comprehension and production</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the same approach to analysing Episode 1, I first measure the level of participation in the activity by each participant and the interaction pattern amongst the group. Table 7.5 summaries the frequency of turns by each participant. The interaction pattern of this multi-party communication and additional information about the use of languages other than English is represented in another sociogram, Figure 7.2.
Table 7.5 Participants’ frequency of turns in Episode 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Number of turns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josie</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georg</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makoto</td>
<td>8 (3 in Japanese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belen</td>
<td>5 (1 in Spanish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellisa</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viliato</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifty</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariel</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.2 Interaction in the bridge-building activity

Note: *T* represents turn(s); arrows indicate who speaks to whom; in the case of addressing the group, the arrows point away from any participant.

Similar to the situation in Episode 1, different children in Episode 2 also show different levels of participation in the group activity. Sophia and Josie produce most of the turns, both of whom produce more than 30 turns. Both of Sophia and Josie’s turns involve all of the
other participants in the interaction. Of Sophia’s 42 turns, seven (e.g. Turns 2, 4, 7, 9) are addressed to Shifty; four (Turns 14, 15, 51, 163) are addressed to Mariel; five (Turns 33, 66, 86) to Georg; three (Turns 75, 77, 124) to Makoto; six (Turns 130, 134, 138, 145, 149) to Marisa; three to Belen (Turns 127, 134, 136); two (Turns 147, 155) to Mellisa; two to Viliato; one to Josie, and eight are addressed to the whole group. Of Josie’s 35 turns, three (Turns 8, 31, 150) are addressed to Shifty; two (Turns 49, 169) are addressed to Mariel; seven (Turns 68, 71, 78, 64, 98, 101, 109) to Sophia; three (Turns 28, 56, 104) to Georg; two (Turns 128, 135) to Belen; two (Turns 133, 146) to Marisa; one to Viliato and one to Mellisa (Turn 150), and seven (Turns 35, 52, 58, 65, 122, 154, 157) are addressed to the whole group.

Compared with Sophia and Josie, Georg produces only half the number of their turns in the interaction and Makoto produces less than 1/3 of their turns, but their turns still involve most of the participants. Of Georg’s 17 turns, two (Turns 80, 164) are addressed to Mariel; three (Turns 26, 55, 61) are addressed to Shifty; three (Turns 103, 107, 125) to Makoto; one is addressed to Viliato; one to Sophia; one to Belen, and two are addressed to the whole group. Of Makoto’s eight turns, three are delivered in Japanese. Among his three Japanese turns, one (Turn 46) is addressed to Viliato; the other two (Turns 139, 143) are addressed specifically to Marisa, another Japanese participant in the group. Among his five English turns, one (Turn 59) is addressed to Georg; one is addressed to Sophia; one to Josie, and two (Turns 92, 129) are addressed to Belen.

Belen, Marisa and Viliato’s turns only involve the participants who stand close to them. Of Belen’s five turns, one Spanish turn (Turn 99) is addressed to Viliato; one turn (Turn 16) is addressed to Mellisa; one (Turn 106) is addressed to Makoto and one (Turn 113) to Marisa. Of Marisa’s 2 turns, one (Turn 91) is addressed to Makoto and one (Turn 126) to Belen. Of Viliato’s 5 turns, two (Turns 45, 70) are addressed to Makoto; one (Turn 5) is addressed to himself and the other two turns are just laughter.

In summary, participants differ from each other in terms of both the number of turns produced and the direction of their interaction in the group activity. On a whole, the interaction in this activity is dominated by Sophia, Josie, and Shifty, the facilitator. Sophia, who volunteers to be the first person to go to build the bridge, speaks the most in the interaction by interacting with all the participants and responding to every question Mariel asks the group. Josie also interacts with almost everyone in the activity and always gives
advices to the whole group. Georg and Makoto interact with most of the participants, although his turns are always short and simple. Belen, Marisa and Viliato only interact with participants close to them, but cooperate with others in the action very well. Finally, Mellisa, who does not interact with anyone verbally, cooperates with the others by carrying and passing the planks throughout the activity.

Children’s participation and interaction patterns in the interaction of these two activities will be further explored through examining the prominent linguistic and interactional features in the multi-party interactions in the next section.

### 7.4.2 Linguistic and interactional features

In this section, I will focus on the linguistic and interactional features the children display in negotiating and managing their participation in the group activities, in particular language alternation, non-verbal communication, and repair and clarification strategies. These strategies are used frequently and effectively by the young participants to solve communication breakdowns and achieve their communication goals in the participation of activities.

#### 7.4.2.1 Language alternation

Language alternation, as the most distinctive feature of bilingual speakers’ language use, is very often used as an interactional device to construct and negotiate meaning creatively and effectively in social interaction. For example, Cromdal (2004) shows how Swedish/English-speaking children use language alternation to escalate social opposition in disputes. Li Wei and Wu (2009) demonstrate how language alternation is used by Chinese/English bilingual children as a symbolic and creative resource to resist ‘One Language Only and One Language at a Time’ policies in complementary schools. In the context of lingua franca communication, Thompson (2006) found that alternation between English and the participants’ native language correlates with the functions of exchanges: English as a lingua franca is more often used for transactional exchanges, i.e. exchanges that are primarily concerned with the transfer of information, while the participants’ native language is used when interpersonal meaning is more important. This finding seems to be similar to those by researchers in bilingualism (e.g. Gumperz, 1982; Myers-Scotton, 1995).

There are a number of instances of language alternation, especially between Satoko
and Kuri in English and Japanese in Episode 1. Satoko tends to switch from English to Japanese whenever she speaks to Kuri, who responds to Satoko in Japanese. In Example 1, Basel demonstrates his instructions to the group, in particular to Kuri. Satoko seems worried about Kuri’s understanding of Basel’s English and volunteers to explain the English word ‘step’ to Kuri. Although Kuri makes it clear in Japanese that he can understand these ‘simple’ words (Turn 6), Satoko ignores his resistance and continues to explain the word ‘left’ in Japanese (Turn 7).

**Example 1**

05 Satoko:  *hai suteppu, wakaru?*  
((Turning to Kuri))
(Step, do you understand?)

06 Kuri:  *Wakanjan wakaru sorekurai nara wakaru yo*  
(I said that I understand. I can understand such simple words.)

07 Satoko:  *Left wa hidari dakaran*  
((giggling))  
(“Left” is left).  
(2.0)

Using Japanese to relay the message to Kuri is also evident in Satoko’s later utterances, as illustrated in Example 2. Basel instructs the group to turn left (Turn 63). This ‘left’ means in the left direction, not pulling up the left leg as in his frequent instructions ‘left’ and ‘right’. Annika offers extra help to lead the group to move to the left. Satoko here worries about Kuri again and spontaneously relays Basel’s instruction to Kuri in Japanese (Turn 67) and reinforces Basel’s next request to Kuri by repeating the word ‘quickly’ three times at a quicker pace (Turn 69). Kuri seems disappointed and anxious (Turn 70) because he tries very hard to behave consistently with the group but fails.

**Example 2**

63 Basel:  =Turn le:ft.

64 Annika:  Here (. ) this [way].

65 Basel:  [Left].

66 Annika:  Yeah, [that’s good].

67 Satoko:  *[kocchino, hi]darini kite*  
(Come to the left.)

68 Basel:  Right (. ) left right (. ) quickly now.

69 Satoko:  >*hayaku, hayaku* (. ) Kuri, *hayaku*.<  
(Quickly, quickly)  
(Quickly)

70 Kuri:  Ah ((down voice))

Although Satoko clearly intends the language alternation to be helpful, it is not always
received as such by Kuri. In Example 3, after several rhythmic instructions, Basel requests Satoko to tell Kuri to help with pulling up the ropes. However, Satoko misunderstands his request and gives Kuri instruction by saying ‘right, right’ in Japanese before Basel finishes the word ‘rope’ (hence the overlap between Turns 52 and 53). Kuri clearly feels frustrated. He reinstates that he has pulled up his right leg in Japanese in Turn 55.

**Example 3**

52 Basel: Right, ri::ght, left, right, left Satoko tell Kuri to: help to help us with the [ro::].

53 Satoko: [Okay] migi, migi (Right, right)

54 Basel: With the ropes.

55 Kuri: [dakara migi agero] tiendakedo ((voice of being impatient)) (I already said ‘pull your right leg up’.)

In addition to relaying messages, language alternation also helps Satoko to select and change the addressee effectively in the interaction. There are two intra-sentential language alternations in Episode 1. In Turn 53 in Example 3, Satoko switches from English to Japanese when she is trying to respond to Basel’s request for her to relay the message to Kuri. Kuri immediately responds to Satoko in Japanese saying that he has said the same instruction as what she tells him. Satoko uses her language alternations effectively to coordinate the contributions of her peers, according to the mediator role which has been assigned to her in the organization of the interaction. However, she does not translate Kuri’s Japanese utterances into English to other team members.

Another one takes place in Example 4 when the group is trying to move the right ski forward. Basel instructs the whole group to pull up the right ski and move it forward (Turn 96). Satoko relays Basel’s message to Kuri in Japanese (Turn 98), although Kuri actually understands and repeats Basel’s instruction in his own turn (Turn 97). Meanwhile, Satoko wants to pat Kuri’s leg to remind him, but instead pats Maxim’s by mistake. Satoko immediately switches from Japanese to English to apologise to Maxim. Satoko can function effectively and flexibly in the communication within this multilingual group.
Kuri alternates between Japanese and English through the process of the activity, although most of his English utterances are imitations or repetitions of the previous speaker’s verbal and nonverbal moves – a practice referred to as ‘shadowing’ by Björk-Willén (2007). In Example 5, when Basel is checking whether Kuri understands his instructions by gazing at him, Kuri makes an appropriate response by repeating Basel’s instructions in English and nodding his head. Similar shadowing practices can be found in Turns 41, 97, 100, 104, 128, 138, 149, 175, 195, and 202 in Episode 1. Kuri’s shadowing practices serve as his way of participating in the activity despite his lack of competence in English.

Example 5
01 Basel: Guys, listen, I am gonna say right left side. When I say [right] (.).
02 Satoko: [Okay.]
03 Basel: [Left (. ) right (. ) okay? ((demonstrating by lifting up his legs and walking towards Kuri and gazes at him))
04 Kuri: [Left, right, okay. ((Nodding head))

While Kuri’s Japanese utterances are very often produced in response to Satoko as in Examples 1 and 3, there are exceptions though. In Example 6, the interaction happening immediately after Example 2, Kuri complains and protests in Japanese that he somehow cannot pull the ski up despite his effort. The overlaps between Kuri and Basel in the interaction suggest that Kuri is very anxious and impetuous at that moment. There are more examples of complaining and protesting in Japanese from Kuri after Satoko swaps position with Maxim, when the order becomes Basel, Maxim, Satoko and Kuri in the line after Turn 115 when Kuri stands right behind SatokoFor example, in Turn 140, Kuri does not respond to Satoko’s turn but expresses his confusion and frustration about what is going on. Similar examples (e.g. Turns 144, 179, 182, 204, 212 and 222) can be found near the end of activity when the tension is becoming pretty intense. However, his complaining and protests are made in Japanese. So in effect, Satoko is the only person who understands his complaints.
In Episode 2, there are also several occasional instances of language alternation. Most of these language alternations serve to select a particular addressee in the multi-party interaction. For instance, in Example 7, when Viliato is trying to pass the plank to Belen, Belen asks him to turn it around in Spanish (Turn 99). Viliato does not respond to Belen’s turn in Spanish and just laughs for some unknown reason (Turn 100). Although Belen and Viliato, who are the only two Spanish participants in this group, stand close to each other, this alternation happens just once within the whole activity.

**Example 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Speech Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 99   | Belen: *Al reves, al reves*  
(Turn it around! Turn it around!) |
| 100  | Viliato: Hhhhhh ((laughter)) |

Similarly, Makoto gives Marisa, another Japanese participant in this group, extra instructions in Japanese in Example 8. When Sophia is giving Marisa instructions about her move, Makoto gives extra instructions to Marisa in Japanese in Turn 139, telling Marisa not to move. Again in Turn 143, Makoto tells Marisa in Japanese that it is still not yet the time for her to move when the other team mates (Sophie and Josie) are concentrating on instructing Viliato (Turns 140, 141, 142). Marisa follows Makoto’s instructions in action, but does not respond to Makoto’s Japanese turns verbally.

**Example 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Speech Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Sophia: No no no no no stay stay ((Using her right hand to show “stop” to Marisa))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 139  | Makoto: *Marisa, ugokuna* ((Using his right hand to show “stop” to Marisa))  
(Marisa, don’t move!) |
| 140  | Sophia: Go [go Viliato go Viliato] |
| 141  | Josie: [Go Viliato. ((Beckoning with her left hand to Viliato)) |
| 142  | Sophia: [Go Viliato ((Beckoning with her right hand to Viliato)] |
| 143  | Makoto: *mada mada mada* ((A gesture of “stop” to Marisa with his left hand))  
(Not yet. Not yet. Not yet.) |
Makoto answers two outgroup (i.e. people with different cultural and linguistic backgrounds) participants’ requests in different ways. In Example 9, Makoto responds to a Spanish participant’s turn in Japanese in the interaction. When Viliato asks Matoko to help to take over and hold the plank when he is trying to pass it forward, Makoto responds to Viliato’s request by saying “yes” in Japanese (Turn 46). This is Makoto’s first turn since the activity started. Makoto’s use of native language word unintentionally – a slip of the tongue in this lingua franca conversation in English is a very common second language communication strategy (CS) referred to as ‘language switch’ strategy in taxonomies of CSs (Rababah, 2002). However, in Example 10, Sophia calls Makoto’s name and asks whether he can help to hold the heavy plank to touch the wheel two steps far away. Makoto acknowledges Sophia’s call by saying “yes” in English (Turn 76) but does not respond to Sophia’s request in Turn 77. At this point, Josie notices the problem and offers advice (Turn 78) on how to solve it by swapping position with Sophia. This example suggests that participants’ limited linguistic competence in English may constrain their communication and cause communication breakdowns between participants with such differing levels of linguistic competence.

Example 9
45 Viliato: [GO MAKOTO ((Lifting the long plank and passing it to Makoto.))]
46 Makoto: hai
(Yes)

Example 10
75 Sophia: [Makoto ((Sophia is too small for the heavy planks and she needs others to help.))]
76 Makoto: Yes ((Turning back and getting the plank passed by Viliato)).
77 Sophia: You can let it touch? ((Turning around and looking at Makoto))
78 Josie: Okay, Sophia. I think you should go back, okay?

The above analysis of some specific examples of language alternation in a task-oriented activity shows that different languages serve different purposes in lingua franca communication. In Episode 1, Kuri’s English utterances, mostly consisting of imitations of the previous speaker’s utterances, are primarily used to acknowledge his active participation in the activity (as in Example 5). In contrast, his Japanese utterances perform a variety of social and interpersonal functions such as complaining and protesting.
The pattern observed in Kuri’s turns is fully in alignment with Thompson’s study (2006) mentioned at the beginning of this section, that is, English is used for transactional exchanges while native language for interpersonal purpose. However, the same cannot be said for Satoko, who prefers English over Japanese for interpersonal exchanges. Throughout the transcribed conversation, she uses Japanese to primarily relay the message. In Episode 2, Makoto uses his native language to relay the same message to Marisa as other team members are instructing her and uses his very limited English to answer peers’ requests. Belen prefers to use her native language for interpersonal exchange with her friend from the same delegation. The discrepancies between the young participants in their functional use of languages may be a result of differences in their competence as furthered discussed in 7.5.4.

7.4.2.2 Nonverbal communication

According to Burgoon and her colleagues (1998), nonverbal communications (NVC) are defined as non-spoken actions and attributes of humans that have socially shared meaning, are intentionally sent or interpreted as intentional, are consciously sent or consciously received, and have the potential for feedback from the receiver. During the group activity, the children make use of NVC for various purposes. NVC is especially frequently used for the tactics discussion (Turns 1-11) among team members before the game kicks off in Episode 1, as shown in Example 11.

**Example 11**

01 Basel: Guys, listen, I am gonna say right left side. When I say [right] (.)

02 Satoko: [Okay]

03 Basel: [Left (.) right (.) okay? ((demonstrating by getting his legs up and walking towards Kuri and gazes at him))

04 Kuri: [Left, right, okay. ((Nodding head))

05 Satoko: hai suteppu, wakaru? ((Turning to Kuri))

(Step, do you understand?)

06 Kuri: Wakanjan wakaru [sorekurai nara wakaru (yo)]

(I said that I understand. I can understand such [simple] words.)

07 Satoko: Left wa hidari dakaran ((giggling))

(Left is left).

(2.0)

08 Basel: We are ready.

(2.0)

09 Satoko: Here and here anːd…
First of all, NVC is used to clarify and complement verbal messages. In Turns 9 and 10, Satoko and Basel discuss the skiing route in English. Basel responds to her suggestion and elaborates on his planned routes while pointing out the directions with his finger. Secondly, NVC is used to regulate the interaction and to select and alert the addressee. Since the participants are facing in one direction, eye contact is not possible between them unless those standing at the front turn round. There are several occasions during the interaction when Basel and Satoko turn around to look at Kuri, following their verbalized turns. For example, in Turn 3, Basel makes an effort to look at Kuri when he is checking whether Kuri understands his instruction. Satoko, in Turn 5, turns to Kuri when she is explaining the word ‘step’. Thirdly, NVC is also used to reinforce the verbal message. For example, in Turn 4, when Kuri responds to Basel’s request, he repeats Basel’s instruction while nodding his head, to show that he understands the instruction.

Except for the functions illustrated in Example 11 above, NVC is also used to express feelings. In Example 12, when Annika is praising the whole group for their performance when the group finally reaches the destination, Kuri walks towards Basel and claps his right hand with Basel’s right hand tacitly to celebrate their success without saying anything. This nonverbal action also shows their relief after the hard work in the activity. Pit also claps hands with Basel to congratulate him on their success in the group activity.

Example 12
236 Pit: Yeah::: ((voice of clapping hands))
237 Annika: Wow, really good.
   ((Kuri spontaneously walks towards Basel and claps his right hand with Basel’s.))
238 Pit: Yeah, wow::: ((clapping his right hand with Basel))

In Episode 2, NVC is also used often by the children in the bridge-building activity for different functions. Firstly, NVC is used to select an addressee. In the multi-party interaction, eye contact is often used to select an addressee. For example, in Example 13, Sophia complains that the plank is too long (Turn 54). Then Georg turns around to look at Shifty and looks for help from him (Turn 55). Shifty does not respond to Georg but Josie
does (in Turn 56).

**Example 13**

54 Sophia: This is a bit too long.

(1.0)

55 Georg: Too:: long:::. ((Turning back and looking at Shifty))

56 Josie: It’s okay, it’s fine.

Secondly, NVC is used to clarify and complement verbal messages. Especially for participants with limited linguistic competence in English, NVC helps to facilitate expressing themselves to the other interlocutors as shown in Examples 14-15. In Turn 16, Belen does not want Mellisa to come forward in front of her by pushing Mellisa’s arms to stand back a bit while saying “No, no, no”. Again, in Turn 113, Belen turns around to Marisa and tries to tell her not to move by pointing at Marisa’s legs with her figure which complements her verbal turn.

**Example 14**

16 Belen: [No no no]. ((Pushing Mellisa to stand a bit back))

**Example 15**

113 Belen: No no no no no no. ((Turning back to Marisa and pointing to Marisa’s legs))

Thirdly, NVC is used to reinforce the verbal messages. This practice is very intense in the final stage of the activity when the bridge has been erected and the participants are trying to cross it (Example 16). For example, in Turns 127 and 129, Sophia and Makoto tell Belen to wait verbally while using their right hands to make the gesture of “stop”. Using gestures to reinforce their verbal messages is also evident in the participants’ later utterances, i.e. Turns 136, 137, 138, 141, 142, and 143.

**Example 16**

127 Sophia: Wait. No, Belen ↑wait ↑wait ↑[wait ((using her hand to indicate “stop”))]

128 Josie: Wait a minute

129 Makoto: Stop. ((using his hand to show “stop” to Belen.))

130 Sophia: Go go Marisa go

131 Shifty: Go go go

132 Sophia: [Okay, go.
7.4.2.3 Repair and clarification strategies

‘Repair’ is a phenomenon in which conversation participants deal with ‘trouble’ in speaking, hearing or understanding in talk-in-interaction (Shegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). The organization of a ‘repair’ consists of a repair initiation, in which the problem is signaled, and a repair outcome, in which the problem is either solved or abandoned. Repair is very often classified according to who (self or other) initiates a repair and who (self or other) accomplishes a repair. There is a general preference for self-initiated self-repair in ordinary conversation with the exception of adult-child interaction and interaction involving ‘not-yet-competent’ participants (Shegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977).

Misunderstanding is highly probable in lingua franca communication due to its heterogeneous nature (Meierhord & Knapp, 2002). Firstly, since not all of the participants are native speakers of the language used in the interaction, it is very often the case that lingua franca participants speak the shared language with different degrees of proficiency (Mauranen, 2006). Secondly, heterogeneity is also reflected in the existence of several, and sometimes potentially conflicting, communicative norms that may be brought into lingua
franca interaction by participants: while some participants may have acquired or adopted communicative norms regulating the language as a lingua franca to various degrees, others may follow norms of their own native languages while using a lingua franca. Researchers have identified a number of clarification and repair strategies when non-understanding or misunderstanding occurs in lingua franca communication (Mauranen, 2006). Some of the strategies are evident in the multi-party interaction of the children in Episode 1. In particular, this section will focus on how the children signal and repair mis/non-understanding, given that the conversation under study is primarily task-oriented.

One example of other-initiated self-repair, in which an addressee queries about a speaker’s utterance and the speaker subsequently repairs his or her turn, occurs in Example 17. This instance of interactions happens after Example 6 where Kuri is struggling to pull up the right ski. Kuri tries to move but at that moment his body loses balance and one of his feet accidently steps on the grass. Seeing that Kuri steps on the grass, Annika gives him a warning. However, she does not complete the turn. Satoko asks Annika to clarify or to finish her turn with a direct question ‘what?’. Annika then responds to Satoko’s question by repairing her unfinished turn in Turn 82.

Example 17
75 Basel:    [Right]
76 Satoko: .hhhhhh ((laughter))
77 Annika: ↑Ah::
78 Basel: °Left°
       ((Kuri steps on the grass))
79 Annika: Oh::, Kuri next time next…
80 Satoko: What?
81 Basel:   Okay (.), ri:[ght].
82 Annika: Next time  [don’t step] on the grass.

In Example 18, questioning is used to signal non-understanding and serves as a request for clarification for a lexical item. In Turn 107, Annika asks the whole group to go backwards two steps. Satoko signals her problem in understanding the word “backwards” by asking a wh-question and partial repetition or substitution of the previous turn in a rising intonation in Turn 108. Annika misinterprets Satoko’s question as checking for the exact number of steps to go backwards and therefore gives a confirmation in Turn 109. It is only when Satoko asks a further question in Turn 110 that Annika understands what the problem is and reinstates her instruction but replaces the problematic word “backwards” with “go
down” in Turn 111 and elaborates further in Turn 113.

**Example 18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Annika</td>
<td>Oh, you have to go backwards two steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Satoko</td>
<td>What, two steps?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Annika</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Satoko</td>
<td>Go on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Annika</td>
<td>You go down go down here( ), please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Kuri</td>
<td>Er: ((voice of disappointment))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Annika</td>
<td>Go down here, please (.)(okay and start here again.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also examples of self-initiated self-repairs. In Example 3 cited earlier in this chapter, Basel makes a self repair for the word ‘rope’, which he previously has difficulty in retrieving in Turn 52. Similarly, In Example 19, after a whole series of instructions (right, left), Basel says ‘left’ when he is moving his right leg and he repairs himself immediately in the next turn.

**Example 19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Basel</td>
<td>[Ri:ght.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Basel</td>
<td>Le::ft ()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>You can come here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Basel</td>
<td>Le:::ft ((moving the right leg when saying ‘left’.)) ()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Basel</td>
<td>Right, right ()</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the repairs that occur in the activity in general conform to the organisation and structure of repairs, there are more other-initiated repairs than self-initiated ones, contrary to the often-commented preference for self-initiated repair in conversation as reported in Shegloff, et al. (1977). The predominance of other-initiated repairs in this activity may be a direct result of the task-oriented nature of the conversation under the circumstance, i.e. to mediate the activity within a short time frame.

**7.5 Discussion**

**7.5.1 Children’s role construction in the group communication**

A role is “a way of behaving which is considered to be suitable for a particular situation” (Dimbleby & Burton, 1992, p.90). We adopt roles in our lives from the time we are born and play different roles simultaneously, and gradually evolve from basic roles (e.g.
sex roles, age roles and kinship roles) to general roles (e.g. professional role) and to more independent roles (e.g. leisure role: football fan) (Banton, 1965). Roles are not only a system for forming social relationships with other people but also a reflection of social distribution (Dimbleby & Burton, 1992). In a group activity, a common goal or task brings a group of people together and different members of the group play different roles in the activity. It seems that the roles the children play in the group activities are co-constructed by what position they choose to be in and the way in which they interact with others. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, children in these two groups chose their own positions in the activity. It is by no means accidental that Basel, who appears to have more self-confidence and a better level of perceived language proficiency, plays the leading role, whereas Satoko plays a mediator role between Kuri and the others in the group. In the meantime, the turns produced by Kuri and Maxim seem to be entirely appropriate and conducive to the roles they adopt for themselves in the game. Similarly, Sophia in Episode 2 is the first and right at the front person to build the bridge, whereby each plank needs to be put on top of the wheels by her first. Josie stands behind Georg and plays a mediator role connecting the rest of the group and the two in front of her. The other members of the group cooperate very well in their own positions. As with Basel in Episode 1, it is not accidental that Sophia and Josie in Episode 2, who are more confident and have better English language ability, play the leading roles.

Moreover, the participants’ roles in the group activities are also constructed by how they interact with others in the activities. Among the four young interactants in Episode 1, Basel is the most dominant in the interaction by frequently giving instructions to the whole group and his turns take up one third of the total number of turns in the interaction. Basel’s level of participation and interaction pattern in the multi-party group communication constructs his role as the leader and coordinator of the game. In Episode 2, both Sophia and Josie are dominant in the interaction by making decisions and giving instructions to other participants. The total of the other five non-native speaking children’ turns just equals the turns produced by this pair: their turns take up nearly half of the total number of turns in the interaction. However, Josie acts more like a leader than Sophia in the activity by giving comments or suggestions to the whole group, although Josie produces seven less turns than Sophia in total during the activity. For example, in Example 20, Josie calls everybody in the group to help each other after the facilitator asks everybody to hold the plank. In Example
21, Josie suggests someone steps on the green plank to make it stable. The facilitator of the team enhances Josie’s suggestion by giving instructions to the group. Josie’s performance in the multi-party interactions constructs her as a leader in her group.

Example 20
57 Shifty: Okay, everyone hold it.
58 Josie: [Careful we all have to help each other.

Example 21
122 Josie: Somebody has to step on the green bit otherwise it’s gonna fall.
123 Shifty: Get two people on the green a bit if you want. You won’t need it for me.

7.5.2 Children’s linguistic and interactional resources

The analysis of these two episodes in the present chapter shows that the young participants are very resourceful in participating in the multi-party interactions using English as a lingua franca in the group activities. In the multi-party interactions in the group activities, children employ a range of linguistic and interactional resources, in particular, language alternation, nonverbal communication, clarification and repair, and shadowing, to negotiate and manage their participation, despite the disparities in their English ability. This is especially true in Satoko’s and Kuri’s cases in Episode 1. Although Satoko’s utterances in English are fairly limited in length, diversity of vocabulary and syntactic complexity - no more than three words in most of the utterances - she is very responsive throughout the activity and interacts with most of the participants. This is partly to do with the fact that she makes frequent use of clarification and repair strategies by asking other speakers to clarify and repair at places of mis/non-understanding. Similarly, although Kuri’s English appears very limited, he actively contributes to the interaction by repeating others’ instructions and making use of acknowledgement tokens such as ‘ah’, as shown in Examples 22-24. In Episode 2, Belen often uses NVC to help to complement her short and simple English utterances when she needs to interact with others.

Example 22
69 Satoko: >hayaku, hayaku (.) Kuri, hayaku.< (quickly,quickly) (quickly)
70 Kuri: [Ah:] ((Voice of disappointment ))
In fact, most of these linguistic and interactional resources used by the children in these interactions where English is used as a lingua franca are commonly regarded as communication strategies in the second language communication research. Communication strategies refer to the ways in which foreign or second language learners deal with the difficulties they encounter during communication when their linguistic resources are inadequate (Selinker, 1972). It is evident that the non-native speakers in these two episodes often use communication strategies because of the limited language resources they possess.

The analysis of the interactional analysis of children’s activities suggests that children at the age of 11 years old can use linguistic and interactional resources to negotiate and manage their participation in the activities to overcome the communication barriers due to the disparity among their linguistic competence. However, two issues have been noticed in the analysis of these two episodes in this chapter: tension in children’s interaction using English as a lingua franca, and the impact of language proficiency in English on their participation in the activity. These two issues will be discussed in the next two sections.

7.5.3 Tensions in children’s lingua franca communication

As can be seen from the observations and analysis of Episode 1, there are differences in the young participants’ language proficiency in English. However, one’s linguistic superiority or lack of it is not a priori in effective communication in a lingua franca. Instead, it can be ascribed, negotiated and reinforced through interaction, and very often there are differences in self- and other-perceived linguistic abilities. At the very beginning of the interaction in Episode 1, ascription of linguistic superiority and the consequent resistance and acceptance are evident among the participants. In Turn 3 of Episode 1, Basel specifically looks at Kuri and checks out his understanding. Again, the fact that Basel does not check anyone else is not a coincidence. It suggests that Basel is concerned about Kuri’s comprehension in English. His checking thus serves as an act of ‘ascription of
incompetence’ (Auer, 1984, p.49) towards Kuri. Satoko’s subsequent explanation in Japanese reinforces the impression of Kuri’s lack of competence in English to other members. Kuri does not accept that and, in fact, resists Basel and Satoko’s ascription of incompetence to him. In his subsequent turn, he claims in Japanese that he can understand the ‘simple’ words (Turn 6). Despite this, Satoko continues to explain the word ‘left’ to him again in Japanese in the following turn. In doing so, Satoko establishes herself as a bilingual mediator for Kuri, a position Kuri seems to resent.

Satoko’s established relative linguistic superiority and her mediator role are readily accepted by other speakers, which inadvertently results in the contrast between self- and other-perceived linguistic abilities in Kuri. On the one hand, other participants perceive Kuri as someone that needs extra help with his English; on the other hand, Kuri resists and challenges the ascription of incompetence. For example, in Turn 52, Basel asks Satoko to relay his message to Kuri and Satoko switches from English to Japanese immediately. Kuri expresses his resistance towards their assumption of linguistic superiority by claiming in Japanese that he has already done the requested action correctly (Turn 55). However, his protest, made in Japanese, is ignored. In what follows, Satoko voluntarily and selectively translates Basel’s utterances into Japanese and instructs Kuri (e.g. Turns 67, 69), without translating Kuri’s Japanese utterances back into English.

In contrast, no obvious tension among children in the activity is observed in Episode 2 probably because the interaction of this group is dominated by three native-speaking participants, Sophia, Josie and Shifty as the facilitator. Non-native children with little English language competence in the group comply with the three leading participants’ instructions and do not contribute a lot in the interaction. Moreover, there is much less misunderstanding among the participants in this group because they could move their bodies about flexibly and had face-to-face communication.

In summary, despite children’s resourcefulness in managing multi-party interactions using a lingua franca, disparity in language ability does bring tension into the interaction, especially when there are differences between self- and other-perceived language abilities. Nevertheless, the young participants in these two episodes seem to be able to deal with the tension in lingua franca communication effectively and amicably and they completed the group activity successfully.
7.5.4 The impact of linguistic competence on the participation in interactions

There are differences in terms of each participant’s level of participation and direction of interaction in the multi-party interaction as the analysis of both Episodes 1 and 2 demonstrates. The question is whether the observed differences are directly caused by the disparities in language proficiency of the participants. I would like to argue, first of all, that advanced linguistic proficiency does seem to give some participants (e.g. Basel in Episode 1, Sophia in Episode 2) advantages in the activity participation, especially with their self-selection positioning at the start -as mentioned earlier, young participants in both episodes selected their own positions in the games. The fact that Basel in Episode 1 volunteers himself to be the first person standing on the wood ski is not a coincidence. It is likely that the linguistic superiority gave him the confidence needed to put himself forward as well as the resources necessary to coordinate and lead the team. Similarly, Sophia in Episode 2 volunteers herself to be the first person to build the bridge, which is not accidental as well. Compared with the other five non-native English-speaking young participants in her group who are just at beginner’s level in both comprehension and production, Sophia has the linguistic superiority which gives her confidence to take a challenging position in the activity.

Secondly, children with less proficiency in English face more difficulties in participating in the activities when verbal communication is necessary. For example, Kuri in Episode 1 cannot express his opinions in English because of his very limited English; meanwhile, the other participants in the group - except Satoko - cannot understand his Japanese utterances. It means that his responses, opinions and feelings are never understood by the others. Makoto in Episode 2 is very responsive and active in the activity participation. However, he cannot understand complex or long English sentences. In Example 10, he replies to Sophia’s calling but then keeps quiet probably because he cannot understand Sophia’s request in the following turn. Makoto’s English proficiency limits his interaction with other participants and thus his participation in the activity to some extent. In general, linguistically less competent children in both episodes are not sufficiently involved in the interaction and decision-making compared to the linguistically more competent ones. The different competence in English as the lingua franca creates inequalities in children’s opportunities for active participation. The observation in this study confirmed the finding of Baraldi’s (2009b) study which examines children and adolescents’ interactions in the
educational activities in many CISV villages and summer camps.

However, there are exceptional cases in which other factors other than the participants’ proficiency in English might influence their active participation in the interaction, such as their personality. Many theorists in second language acquisition research claim that, extrovert learners, who tend to be more sociable, are more likely to join groups and more inclined to engage in conversations (Cook, 1991). Personality could also be an important factor in children’s active participation in their interaction using English as the lingua franca in this study. For example, Mellisa in Episode 2 is the same as Sophia and Josie in that group, a native English-speaking participant. She produces no utterances at all in the multi-party interactions throughout the whole activity. According to the researcher’s observation of Mellisa’s performance in the camp, she is an introvert and quiet girl. Even when she talks, she speaks in a low voice. Sophia, who is from the same delegation as Mellisa, is much more active in all activities in the camp. She steps in as the first person in the team to build the bridge and interact actively with most participants in the activity. Another example is Maxim in Episode 1. Maxim, the German girl, is more competent in English than Kuri in both comprehension and production, but she produces the least utterances in the interaction during the activity. This might also be related to her personality. Maxim, like Mellisa, is also an introvert and quiet girl in the camp. These two examples might demonstrate that participants’ language proficiency in English is not only factor influencing their participation in the interactions. The analysis of children’s participation shows that children appear extroverted and introverted because they act differently in the interaction.

7.5.5 Children’s competence in managing participation and coordination

Although the language disparity brings up some obstacles in the communication, children are competent in coordinating with each other and manage their participation in the activity. The use of English as lingua franca among these children with different native languages makes it possible for them to work together and collaborate with each other. In Episode 1, Basel as the leader addresses everybody as “guys”, often to get everyone’s attention and get them involved in the activity. In Example 25, Basel requests that they lift their legs up once together. In Example 26, Basel requests everybody to push quickly in Turn 123.
Example 25
48 Basel: Right left, guys, [you go up once].

Example 26
121 Basel: Left
122 Kuri: Left dayo.
   (It is “left.”)
123 Basel: Guys, quickly push ((turning backwards to the other group members))
124 Satoko: =Okay
125 Basel: Right

In Episode 2, participants were able to coordinate the contributions of the group members and manage participation in the activity competently. For example, in Example 27, Josie is concerned about Sophia’s ability to carry the heavy plank and put it on the top of the wheels by checking it with Sophia. Georg helps Sophia and together they try to put the plank on top of the wheels but still fail. Consequently, Josie suggests having a stronger person at the front (Turn 65). Later on in Example 28, after a few attempts Sophia and Georg still fail to manage the plank, Sophia asks Makoto to help with the task (Turn 77). However, Makoto does not respond to her request. Instead, Josie steps in to help with this but requires Sophia to go back and switch position with her (Turn 78).

Example 27
59 Makoto: [Georg, Georg] ((Lifting another plank and tries to pass it to Georg))
60 Shifty: Everyone just get at least one hand to it.
61 Georg: Okay, ... ((Sound of trying very hard to carry the plank))
          (2.0)
62 Sophia: Uh:::
63 Shifty: ((inaudible)) ((giggling))
64 Josie: Are you okay? ((Turning towards Sophia and staring at her, trying to move it))
          (1.0) ((Georg helps Sophia to put the plank on top of the wheels but fails.))
65 Josie: Maybe we should have like (,) like a strong person at the front.

Example 28
75 Sophia: [Makoto ((Sophia is too small for the heavy planks and she needs others’ help.))]
76 Makoto: Yes ((Turing back and gets the plank passed by Viliato)).
77 Sophia: You can let it touch? ((Turning around and looking at Makoto))
78 Josie: Okay, Sophia. I think you should go back, okay?
This analysis shows that the 11-year-old children in this study are not only able to cope with the problem of language disparity but can also manage their participation in the activity successfully. In the activities, the children may act as coordinators of the interaction and they may also coordinate the contributions of their peers, according to the role which has been assigned to them in the participation of the activity. This is similar to Baraldi’s (2009b) experience with adolescents in CISV summer camps: he found that they can coordinate the interaction and manage participation and they are able to promote their interlocutors’ participation without any hierarchical structures. According to participatory theories, children and adolescents may be competent in communication in their own way if they are given the opportunity to act autonomously and if they are supported in their right to be social agents (ibid). This seems to suggest that children should be given more freedom and independence in the activity participation.

7.6 Conclusion

This study reported in this chapter provides a linguistic and sociological analysis of children’s interactions in educational activities in a CISV village. Through detailed analysis of the interactions of two group activities, it is found that the 11-year-old children employed a range of linguistic and interactional resources effectively and creatively to negotiate and manage their participation in the activities despite disparity of their English language abilities, in particular, language alternation, nonverbal communication, and repair and clarification strategies. Shadowing practice (i.e. repeating previous turns) and providing acknowledgement tokens are also used by the participants as a means of active participation. However, the disparity of language ability and the unequal access to the linguistic resources do bring tension into the interaction during group activities. As demonstrated in this chapter, it gives some children advantages in dominating the interaction, while it puts the participants with less linguistic competence in a vulnerable position. In this way, participants’ linguistic competence can impact on children’s equal participation in the activity. Meanwhile, the analysis of children’s participation shows that children appear extroverted and introverted because they act differently in the interaction. The interactional analysis of the interactions also demonstrates that young participants could manage their participation and coordinate with each other according to the roles assigned to them. The detailed analysis of children’s participation in the educational activity at the interactional
level provides a micro-perspective in understanding their intercultural learning at an international camp where participants come from different ethnic, linguistic and cultural backgrounds. The lingua franca interactions in the group activities play an important role in the construction of their intercultural experiences in the camp.
Chapter 8 The Short-term Impact of CISV Village Programme

8.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, children’s intercultural learning experience in a CISV village was examined through the analysis of their multi-party interaction in the educational activities in a CISV camp. The study reported in this chapter is to examine the short-term impact of the intercultural learning experience in a CISV Village programme on the young participants’ intercultural communicative competence development and personal development. In this longitudinal study, a group of children participating in CISV Village programmes in 2006 was surveyed before, immediately after and several months after the villages. Meanwhile, a group of children who did not go to CISV Village programmes were surveyed as a control group for this study. The following three research questions are addressed by the study reported in this chapter:

1. What are the immediate effects of the CISV Village experience on the young participants’ ICC development?
2. How do the young participants utilize their CISV Village experience and develop their ICC nine months after their participation in CISV villages?
3. What is the impact of the CISV Village experience on the young participants’ personal growth during the period of this longitudinal investigation?

This chapter is organized as follows: 8.2 describes the research method of this study including participants, research instrument, data collection procedure and data analysis method; the results of this study are presented in 8.3; 8.4 interprets the results and discusses the implications of the findings, and the conclusions drawn from the results of this study will be given in 8.5.

8.2 Method

8.2.1 Participants

Thirty-six British children who were participating in the CISV Village programmes in the summer of 2006 were sampled for this study. The villages these children went to were held in nine different countries: Germany, Japan, Italy, Ecuador, Netherlands, Portugal,
Austria, Korea and the UK. Most of these children came from middle class family backgrounds. Among these children, only 16 out of the group fully participated in all three investigations and formed the eligible sample for data analysis in this chapter. The average age of these 16 CISV children at the first investigation was 11.50 years old (SD=0.20). Meanwhile, 32 Year 7 children from a local school in the city of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, England, who did not participate in any CISV villages, constituted a control group. According to the inspection report about this school provided by Ofsted (the Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services and Skills) (2007), a governmental organization in the UK, it is a comprehensive school with ninety-six percent of the students having English as their first language and coming from White British backgrounds. The average age of the 32 children of the control group was 12.70 years old (SD=0.28) when they participated in the first investigation 5 months later than CISV participants. Table 8.1 below summarises the information about participants’ age and gender distribution.

### Table 8.1 Participants’ age and gender distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CISV Group</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**8.2.2 Research instrument**

**8.2.2.1 Questionnaire development**

The questionnaire used as the research instrument of this study was designed and developed by this researcher. No sophisticated assessment tool had previously been designed to be suitable for assessing 11-year-old children’s ICC at that moment. In the light of this gap, the researcher first did an extensive review of the ICC assessment instruments (e.g. Fantini’s Intercultural Competence Assessment Tool, 2006b; Byram’s Autobiography tool, 2005) used in the empirical research. Thus, the questions designed for the questionnaire are not imaginary but very relevant to children’s potential experience in a CISV camp. Secondly, the researcher revised the items and questions of the questionnaire accordingly in order to make the items generated in the questionnaire align with the 11-year-old children’s level of literacy. Occasional informal discussions with some teachers who worked with children of a similar age to the participants in this study were carried out during the process of questionnaire drafting.
8.2.2.2 Pilot study

Before administrating the questionnaires with the participants of this study, a piloting of the instrument was conducted with ten 11-year-old children from a local school in the city of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, England. The results of the pilot study and the feedback from those children and their teacher led to some changes in the wording of questions and a decrease in the total number of questions in the questionnaire. To avoid the possibility of non-participation because of the length of the questionnaire, only one A4-page, double-sided questionnaire was finally developed and used.

8.2.2.3 Measures

The questionnaire developed for this study consists of three main parts. The first part is five questions about the participants’ demographic information and their previous international travelling experiences and language competence. The second part contains twelve closed question items. The third part contains several open-ended questions. Open-ended questions can provide a greater freedom of expression and a far greater richness than fully quantitative data. According to Dörney (2007), the combination of both quantitative and qualitative measures in one questionnaire can provide different perspectives into the issues examined and produce more integrated results than using only one type of measures. The quantitative data from the questionnaire is the participants’ self-report to the measures set up by the researcher, while the participants’ responses to the open-ended questions can provide more in-depth perceptions about their intercultural learning experience in CISV villages from their own perspective.

The quantitative measures of the questionnaire are a 12-item Likert scale in which participants express their agreement/disagreement with each statement on a 5-point scale ranging from 1(“strongly disagree”) to 5 (“strongly agree”). The self-assessed scale contains a mixture of both positively and negatively worded statements (e.g. “I feel uncomfortable when I sit at a table next to someone of a different culture”, “I always try to understand others who have a different cultural background when I disagree with them”). Three dimensions of intercultural communicative competence are measured by these 12 items: attitudes towards different languages (AL), attitudes towards different cultures (AC), and flexibility/empathy in intercultural encounters (FE). The items are categorized into the three aspects as shown in Table 8.2 below. These measures focus on the affective dimension
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of ICC (Byram, 1997; Deardorff, 2004; Chen & Starosta, 1996). This dimension refers to attitudes towards cultural differences and people who are perceived as different in respect of the cultural practices, beliefs and behaviours they exhibit. The traits of this dimension in this study specifically include attitudes of curiosity and openness (i.e. AL and AC), a non-judgemental attitude and empathy which respect others’ culture and beliefs (i.e. FE).

Table 8.2 Dimensions of ICC in the Likert-format scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes towards other languages (AL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Like to listen to songs in other languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interested in learning other languages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes towards other cultures (AC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Like to play with children from different cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interested in learning about other cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Like to try some new food apart from English food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Happy to share my stories and experiences with my friends from different cultures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flexibility/empathy in intercultural encounters (FE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Hard to have a conversation with those who cannot speak English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uncomfortable sitting at a table next to someone of a different culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Worried about living together with people from other countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Confident doing a task together with children from other cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Try to understand others from different cultures when I disagree with them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Happy to change my mind if people from different cultures give me better reasons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The qualitative measures are several open-ended questions in the questionnaires: CISV participants’ expectations about the coming CISV Village camps, what the participants perceive they had learned from the Village, how the participants perceive they have changed because of CISV experience, intercultural friendships and confidence in intercultural communication. Because children in the control group did not participate in any CISV programme, the open-ended questions related to CISV experience did not apply to them. Therefore, there were four versions of the questionnaire with differences in the part containing open-ended questions: the pre-camp, post-camp, and follow-up questionnaires for CISV participants and the questionnaire for the control group (see the questionnaires in Appendix II).

8.2.3 Procedure

Questionnaires were mailed to the home addresses of the 36 CISV participants three times: before their departure for the CISV village; immediately after and nine months after their participation in the CISV villages. In this thesis, I refer to the above three surveys at
different times respectively as pre-camp test, post-camp test, and post-post-camp test. A covering letter introducing the research project and this study was enclosed together with the questionnaire in the mail sent to the CISV participants. In addition, a stamped, addressed envelope was enclosed for the participants to return the completed questionnaire. The questionnaires were sent by and returned to the Secretary of CISV Great Britain because of the confidentiality issue. In addition, in order to increase the response rates, a reminder was sent to the participants who had not responded after each due date for returning the completed questionnaire. This tracking strategy seemed to work well. The response rates for the three surveys were respectively 56% for pre-camp test, 75% for post-camp test, and 67% for the post-post-camp test. In fact, these response rates are an excellent result because postal questionnaires generally come up with low response rates (Oppenheim, 1992). However, only 16 (44%) out of the total 36 participants of CISV Village programme, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, participated in all the three surveys and formed the sample for data analysis.

The control group was surveyed twice with ten months apart. The researcher gained access to the control group in person so the two questionnaire surveys were administrated by the researcher and the teachers together at the students’ once-a-week tutorial classes in two classrooms. Before distributing the questionnaires to the students, the teacher introduced the researcher to them. The researcher briefly introduced the research study and explained the purpose of the questionnaire. Students were then required to fill in the questionnaires independently but they could ask either the teachers or the researcher questions when they needed help. The majority of the questions the students had concerned their understanding of the word ‘culture’ - which appeared often in the questionnaire. Once the students had completed the questionnaire, they handed them back to the teachers or researcher. Compared with the postal administration method of the questionnaires to CISV participants, this self-administrated method of doing questionnaire survey ensures a much higher response rate and a minimum of interview bias (Oppenheim, 1992). The response rates of both these two questionnaire surveys with the control group were 100%. Students were required to fill in their names on the top of the questionnaires for the purpose of tracking. Because of the student fluctuation, 38 students participated in the first survey and 46 students in the second. Only 32 out of these students participated in both two surveys and thus these 32 students’ responses to the questionnaires were finally analysed.
8.2.4 Data analysis

The scoring for the negatively worded closed question items was reversed before including them in multi-item scales (e.g. in question 11, I feel uncomfortable sitting next to someone from a different culture, a “strongly disagree” was recorded as 5 and a “strongly agree” was recorded as 1). The quantitative data of the surveys was analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Science for Windows 15.0 (SPSS 15.0) software. Levels of significance were set \textit{a priori} at \(p<0.05\) for all statistical tests. Open coding and pattern-matching techniques were used to analyse the narrative responses to the open-ended questions.

8.3 Results

The results of this study are presented in the following subsections: 8.3.1 reports the information about both CISV participants and the control group on the pre-test intercultural profile measures; 8.3.2 presents CISV participants’ changes on the quantitative measures over three tests and the comparison between CISV participants and the control group on the quantitative measures at their respective two tests; 8.3.3 presents CISV participants’ narrative responses to the open-ended questions as their understanding and perception of the intercultural learning experience in CISV Village camps over the period of this longitudinal study.

8.3.1 Intercultural profile of both groups

Apart from the questions about the participants’ age and gender, three intercultural-related questions were asked in their first tests: about the intercultural friendships that the participants already had, their perceived linguistic competence in foreign languages other than English, and their previous international travelling experiences. The responses of CISV participants and the control group to these questions are reported below.

8.3.1.1 Intercultural friendships

For the question “Do you have any friends from other countries or cultures?” more participants from the control group than CISV participants reported “yes”. As can be seen from Table 8.3, 78% of the participants in the control group reported that they had friends
from other countries, while 68% of CISV participants did.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Having intercultural friends</th>
<th>Not having intercultural friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n percentage</td>
<td>n percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CISV Group</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>5 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>7 22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.1.2 Self-perceived language proficiency in other languages

Two questions were asked about proficiency in other languages: How many languages can you speak other than English? What languages are they? Most participants in both groups perceived that they could speak one or two languages apart from English. From Table 8.4, it can be calculated that 81.3% of CISV participants and 92.5% of the control group reported that they could speak one or two languages. The other languages reported by both groups were predominantly French, German and Spanish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Languages</th>
<th>CISV Group (16)</th>
<th>Control Group (32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n percentage</td>
<td>n percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 12.5%</td>
<td>1 3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8 50%</td>
<td>24 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 31.3%</td>
<td>6 18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 6.3%</td>
<td>1 3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.1.3 Previous international travelling experiences

In the question asking about how many countries they had travelled to before, CISV participants reported a higher frequency in travelling abroad than the participants in the control group. As we can see from Table 8.5, all of the CISV participants had previous experience of travelling to other countries, while four participants of the control group had never been to any other country; the majority of CISV participants had been to 3-5 countries, while the majority of participants in the control group had been to 1-2 countries.
### Table 8.5 Previous international travelling experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel experience</th>
<th>CISV Group</th>
<th></th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never travelled to any country</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travelled to 1-2 countries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travelled to 3-5 countries</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travelled to over 5 countries</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the answers to the demographic questions on their respective first test of both groups, we can see that CISV participants and the children in the control group have similar intercultural backgrounds.

### 8.3.2 Changes on the quantitative measures

This section first reports the CISV participants’ changes on the quantitative measures over the three tests: before the CISV village; immediately after the CISV village and nine months after the intercultural experience in the CISV villages. Then CISV participants’ scores on the quantitative measures are compared with the control group’s on their respective two tests nine months apart.

#### 8.3.2.1 CISV participants’ changes on the quantitative measures

A repeated $t$-test was conducted to measure the CISV participants’ changes on the score of quantitative measures assessed on the pre-camp test, post-camp test, and post-post-camp test. Overall, CISV participants reported higher scores on all the quantitative measures after their participation in the CISV villages than before they went to the villages, as the descriptive data in Table 8.6 demonstrates. But there were decreases on all of the ICC measures at the test nine months after the post-camp test. The patterns of the change on the three quantitative measures are individually displayed in Figures 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3.

### Table 8.6 CISV participants’ mean scores on the quantitative measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Pre-camp</th>
<th></th>
<th>Post-camp</th>
<th></th>
<th>Post-post-camp</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>18.1250</td>
<td>1.50000</td>
<td>18.3750</td>
<td>1.68333</td>
<td>18.1250</td>
<td>1.92787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>7.9375</td>
<td>1.69189</td>
<td>8.1250</td>
<td>1.14746</td>
<td>7.7500</td>
<td>1.06458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>24.5625</td>
<td>2.63266</td>
<td>25.6250</td>
<td>2.33452</td>
<td>25.0956</td>
<td>3.50359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $AC$=Attitudes towards other cultures; $AL$=Attitudes towards other languages; $FE$=Flexibility/empathy in intercultural encounters.
As we can see from Figure 8.1, CISV participants showed a dramatic increase on attitudes towards different cultures immediately after their participation in the international camp. But the mean score nine months later on AC fell to the same score as they had reported in the pre-camp test.

Figure 8.2 also shows an increase in attitudes towards different languages when the participants returned from the CISV villages. However, the positive change in this aspect was not sustained but decreased to an even lower score than that of the pre-camp test.
Different from the change pattern on aspects of AC and AL, Figure 8.3 shows that CISV participants still reported higher scores on FE in the post-post-camp test than pre-camp test, although there was a slight regression from the higher score on the post-camp test.

Nevertheless, statistical $t$-tests for related samples run for the above set of data (Table 8.6) showed that almost all the mean differences on the aspects of AC, AL and FE between pre-camp, post-camp and post-post-camp tests were statistically non-significant at the .05 level of confidence except that the difference on FE between the pre-camp and post-camp tests was statistically significant (.036). All other differences, including those two on AC and AL between pre- and post-camp tests, were statistically non-significant. The statistical results are shown in Table 8.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Pre-camp test – Post-camp test</th>
<th>Post-camp test – Post-post-camp test</th>
<th>Pre-camp test – Post-post-camp test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>p&gt;.05</td>
<td>p&gt;.05</td>
<td>p&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>p&gt;.05</td>
<td>p&gt;.05</td>
<td>p&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>p&lt;.05 ($p=.036$)</td>
<td>p&gt;.05</td>
<td>p&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8.3.2.2 Comparison of CISV participants and the control group

CISV participants and the control group’s scores on the quantitative measures at their two tests with nine months apart were compared. The two tests of the control group with ten
months apart correspond to CISV participants’ pre-camp and post-post-camp tests: the first test of the control group corresponds to the pre-camp test of CISV participants; the second test of the control group ten months later corresponds to the post-post-camp test of CISV participants. Both groups’ first tests are referred to as Test 1; their tests ten months later are referred to as Test 2 in the tables and figures in this section.

The statistical *t*-tests for independent samples were conducted to compare CISV participants and the control group in both tests. The descriptive statistics, as presented in Tables 8.8 and 8.9, demonstrate that generally CISV participants reported higher scores than the control group on the quantitative measures in both the pre-camp and post-post-camp tests. Figures 8.4 and 8.5 clearly evidence the differences between the two groups in both tests. From these two figures, we can see that the differences between the two groups are gradually narrowing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CISV participants</td>
<td>control group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>18.1250</td>
<td>15.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>7.9375</td>
<td>5.8125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>24.5625</td>
<td>20.1244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.8 Two groups’ mean scores on Test 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CISV participants</td>
<td>control group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>18.1250</td>
<td>16.4375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>7.7500</td>
<td>6.5313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>25.0956</td>
<td>22.1472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.9 Two groups’ mean scores on Test 2
Moreover, the statistical \( t \)-test for independent samples for the above sets of data (Tables 8.8 and 8.9) showed that all of the mean differences on the three measures at both tests were statistically significant at the .05 level of confidences as shown in Table 8.10. It means that CISV participants outperformed the control group in both tests significantly on all these quantitative measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Test 1 difference</th>
<th>Test 2 difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>P&lt;.05</td>
<td>P&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>P&lt;.05</td>
<td>P&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>P&lt;.05</td>
<td>P&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3.3 Narrative responses to the open-ended questions

8.3.3.1 Pre-camp: expectations for the CISV village

When CISV participants were asked about what they expected from the coming CISV Village programme at the pre-camp test, two of the most common expectations were to have fun and to meet with people from around the world and make friends with them:

- “I expect to meet lots of new people and friends from other cultures. I am also hoping to enjoy the camp and have fun.”
- “I would expect fun and enjoy meeting new people from around the world.”
- “Lots of fun. I’m meeting children from across the world.”
- “I am expecting to make lots of new friends and hope to keep in contact with them. Apart from that, I am not expecting anything else – apart from just to learn and have fun.”
- “I will expect to make friends with everyone. I expect to learn new games and songs. I also expect to have lots of FUN!”
- “I expect to meet lots of new friends and have lots of stories to tell when I get back.”

Some children had more specific expectations for their intercultural learning experience in the CISV Village, such as learning about the different languages and cultures, games, trying new food, communication and teamwork. These reflect young participants’ open attitudes towards and curiosity about different cultures and strong motivation for the coming intercultural experience.

- “I expect to learn different languages and cultures of other people and to meet a lot of new friends.”
- “Games and getting to know each other, teamwork.”
- “How to co-operate with people that can’t speak English.”
- “For it to be good, to be able to play football with kids from other countries, to make new friends and to eat loads of new food.”

Some children hoped the CISV experience would make a huge difference to their life, not only enjoyable but educational, and some expected the learning in their CISV Village to be interactive. Some children expressed rather noble wishes - building a peaceful world and
establishing intercultural friendships with other participants in the camp.

- “I expect it to be enjoyable and a once in a life time experience.”
- “Lots of fun and interactive learning and building friendship.”
- “I expect world peace and friendship.”
- “I expect it to be fun and in a way also educational.”

8.3.3.2 Post-camp: things learned from the CISV village

The participants reported what they had learned from their CISV experiences when they came back from the camps. The themes of their reflection of experience in CISV can be subsumed into five points: (1) appreciation of the similarities and differences between cultures; (2) respect for the equality among people from different cultures or countries; (3) intercultural friendship; (4) intercultural communication skills, and (5) belief in world peace and respect for diversity. These themes in the reflection of learning show the participants’ development of global citizenship after the camp.

Some participants appreciate the human similarities while acknowledging the cultural differences among them. They can make the connections between people despite the fact that they are from different cultural backgrounds.

- “It doesn’t matter where you come from; everyone is the same in some way.”
- “I learnt that everyone is the same and that even though we have different cultures, ideas and languages to us, we can still be friends.”
- “I learnt we are all the same although we may look different or come from a different background.”
- “That all children want and like the same type of thing, we are not different.”

Some participants demonstrate their respect of human equality and diversity as they believe that people from different cultures or countries should be equal to each other.

- “That everybody should be treated equally and many people can be my friends from many different countries.”
- “That even if everyone came from different places, different backgrounds or a different race we are all equal in one way.”
- “That everyone is different but we should be treated in the same way.”
Some participants realized that they can be able to get along and make friends with people from different cultures despite the cultural differences among them.

- “You can still be friends with someone from different cultures.”
- “I learned that you can make friends with anyone and you can work with different people.”
- “That children from different cultures can all be friends.”
- “That no matter what country, culture or religion you are, we can still get on with each other. You may think that people from different countries are different but we are not. It is amazing how similar we are to people with different cultures.”
- “I learned that people are different but can work together.”

Some participants learnt how to communicate with someone from different cultures despite the language barrier. For instance:

- “How to interact with children who cannot speak good English.”
- “I learnt that you can communicate and get along with people from a different culture even if you don’t speak the same language.”

Some participants learnt of the importance of peace for the world and thought that people in the world should respect the diversity and live together happily.

- “I learnt peace is a very important fact of life and we can be a family but we need to stop wars. Respect diversity, we are different, that’s what’s good about the world. I learnt a lot more as well.”
- “I learnt that peace is the best policy and we should all live together happily.”

8.3.3.3 Post-post-camp: intercultural friendship sustainment

In the post-post-camp test, an open-ended question was asked about whether the participants managed to keep in touch with the friends they made in CISV Village camps. Most CISV participants kept in touch with the friends they met in the CISV villages nine months after they their return. Modern communication technology and the internet made it possible for these children to contact their friends easily and frequently. The participants contacted their friends mainly by emails or message network (e.g. MSN) and on-line talking tools. Some participants chose to write letters to each other. Some participants
contacted their friends every day while some did not make contact so often, for example, once a month.

- “Yes, I am talking to someone every day.”
- “Yes, I contact them by MSN and telephone. I am talking to a few people about visiting them or them coming here.”
- “Yes, I have with MSN. I also sent one letter. I don’t get to talk to them much because of time differences”
- “Yes, but not that often, maybe every month, say 1 or 2 times.”

Only very few participants did not keep up the intercultural relationships because of lack of time or for other reasons. For example:

- “No, because I don’t have enough time.”

8.3.3.4 Post-post-camp: confidence in intercultural communication

Most CISV participants reported that they had been more confident in communicating with people from different cultures in the post-post-camp test nine months after their experiences in CISV villages. The participants gave various reasons why they felt more confident and provided examples showing how they behaved confidently in some intercultural encounters. Some participants felt that they had become more confident, because they knew more about other languages as they put it:

- “Yes, because I can speak more words from different languages now.”
- “Yes, I feel more confident speaking to people from different cultures and when I email I try to use phrases in other people’s own languages.”

Some participants thought that they were more confident with intercultural communication because they knew more about people from other cultures and could understand them more than before.

- “As I know them more.”
- “Yes, I know how to understand different people and cultures much better and clearly.”

Several participants described how they could get along with and talk to their peers
from different cultures at their schools.

- “Yes, I feel more confident in myself and talking to others. There are some people in my class that are a different religion but I still get along the same as everyone else.”
- “Yes. A girl at my new school is from China and she didn’t speak any English (she does now) but no one really talked to her till I did.”

However, very few participants did not think that they were more confident in intercultural communication. One participant thought that no confidence was needed in communicating with people from other cultures:

- “I don’t feel any more confident as I don’t believe you should need confidence and treat them as you would with your own friends back home.”

Another participant commented that she was already very confident in talking with different people before her experience in CISV.

- “Not really. I was quite good at it before.”

One participant did not directly comment on whether he felt more confident or not, but shared his understanding of intercultural communication and he believed that people could communicate with each other even without a shared language.

- “Whatever culture they’re from doesn’t affect how I talk to them or what we talk about. If they don’t share a language with me we can still communicate using signs and actions.”

And one participant who never had any chance to talk to people from different cultures, after his experience in the CISV camp believed that he would be confident in the future if he encountered it.

- “I have not had to put this in practice after returning from the village as I do not have different cultural people in my school etc. But I am sure I will in future, maybe I will not feel nervous.”
8.3.3.5 Post-post-camp: reflections on personal changes

CISV participants described how they have changed and offered the insights they had about the intercultural learning experience nine months after their participation in CISV villages. The greatest change children saw as a result of their one-month CISV experience was in personal growth. They described themselves as being happier, more confident, independent, and responsible.

- “I am much more confident.”
- “A bit because I am just a lot happier now.”
- “I do think I have changed in confidence because I went back to my primary school to talk about CISV and all the teachers said I was much more confident.”
- “I have become more independent and responsible.”

Some participants felt more confident, more patient about getting on with other people from different cultures and braver towards new people and new experiences.

- “I have changed a lot. I feel much more happy and confident being around people from different cultures.”
- “I am more patient, calm and I can understand others better. I speak to different people and get on better with them. I also find it easier to speak to people who cannot speak English.”
- “I have become braver towards new people and new experiences.”

Some participants found that their CISV experience helped them to build a broader world view and developed their interests to know about different cultures and to meet and talk to people from different cultural backgrounds.

- “I have a broader view of the world and I now see beyond my immediate group of friends. I now have more interest in worldwide issues.”
- “I have become much more worried about things happening in other cultures.”
- “I have changed my views on different countries and have tried to make everyone welcome like new people in our school. It is great now knowing about different countries. I am a lot happier now because it has helped me to meet new people in England and all over the world.”
- “I think I have changed, because I now prefer talking to new people and finding
Some participants reported that the CISV experience had impact on their performance at school, such as being confident to answer questions in class, making friends with different people at school and talking more to a group of a different gender. They applied what they had learned from the CISV experience to the school context.

- “I am now happy to answer in class.”
- “I bond with lots of different people at school and my friends so I think I have become more confident in myself.”
- “I feel I understand more on what people think and why they think it. More confident. Before I didn’t really communicate with boys much and now I do. I am so small and the world is so big, and I want to know what’s out there.”

One participant used her experience in the camp as a vivid example to illustrate how she had changed since the beginning of her staying in the village: she changed from staying with her delegation to being confident to make friends with different people.

- “When I first arrived at camp for the first two days (approx.) I stuck mostly with my delegation. Soon I realized that we were all the same and began to make friends with the other children. I am now more confident to make friends with all people.”

And one participant reported how the CISV experience influenced her future plans: she wants to travel and learn more things and also wants to help others because she has a more open mind and has been more confident in herself.

- “I have more of an open mind towards things. Also I believe in myself more. I want to travel and discover more things. And also help people in need, maybe some charity work.”

8.4 Discussion

8.4.1 Participants’ self-assessed changes on intercultural attitudes

The results reported in 8.3.2 demonstrated CISV participants’ and the control group students’ changes on the attitudinal aspect of ICC. In Chen and Starosta’s (1996), Byram’s
(1997), and Deardorff’s (2004) conceptual frameworks of intercultural communicative competence, intercultural attitudes play a vital role in intercultural learning. Positive attitudes are necessary for one to become interculturally competent communicator. CISV participants showed an increase on the intercultural attitudes measures (i.e. attitudes towards different cultures/people from different cultures, attitudes towards different languages, and flexibility/empathy in intercultural encounters) immediately after their participation in the CISV villages, but regressed somewhat nine months after they had returned home. The statistical tests of these scores between any two of the pre-camp, post-camp, post-post camp tests showed no significant differences except for the difference on the measure of FE between pre-camp and post-camp tests, which was significant. This indicates that the intercultural learning experience in a CISV village prompted these participants’ positive attitude change immediately on these measures but the positive development did not seem to be sustained over time. Moreover, CISV participants outperformed the control group significantly on these measures at both the pre-camp and the post-post-camp tests but neither the CISV participants nor the control group showed any significant changes on the attitudes between their respective two tests with nine months in between. A number of explanations can be explored which may explain the results.

First, the sample size (n=16) of CISV participants in this longitudinal study might be too small to be valid showing the differences in statistics. In the statistical t-test, the smallest sample size should be 30 at least. The original sample size of CISV participants not randomly selected is 36, which is relatively small in a survey study. The longitudinal design of this study also made it impossible to get a very high response rate, although the average response rate of 44% for the three tests of CISV participants is a reasonable result.

Second, CISV participants achieved a median score of 18.12 out of 20 on AC, 7.93 out of 10 on AL, and 24.56 on FE out of 30 on the pre-camp test, the scores are relatively high. Before going to the villages, CISV participants have already hold a highly motivation and positive attitude towards the coming intercultural experiences. Although self-assessment in the form of questionnaires has been a very popular method in large-scale surveys, there have been reports of ‘inflated’ or ‘biased’ self-assessments (e.g. Jackson, 2008). The inflation and bias, as argued in Fischer, Greitemeyer and Frey (2007) and Kruger and Dunning (1999) (both cited in Jackson, 2008), may be due to positive illusions people might have about themselves, biased reference points, or lack of sufficient metacognitive
ability. In the context of children, the changes in reference point and metacognitive ability are unavoidable, as children constantly develop their knowledge about the world as well as their identity and sense of belonging. It may well be the case that with the growth in their metacognitive ability and more experience, (often including a change of school at this age) the children’s reference points moved between the different rounds of data collection.

Third, the differences between CISV participants and the control group on the pre-camp test should not come as a surprise that CISV participants entered the Village camp with high motivation and positive attitudes already, as selection procedures had taken place within CISV. Children who are highly motivated and socially capable of taking part in the programme are more likely to be selected by CISV. CISV participants had attended orientation programmes in their local chapter before their departure, which could boost their positive attitudes and high expectations towards the coming programme. The CISV participants’ initial high level of intercultural communicative competence is similar to the findings of other short-term impact studies. Hammer (2005) found that AFS participants were significantly higher in the initial intercultural communicative competence level than the control group. Williams (2000) also found that the participants already had positive cross-cultural attitudes and perceptions before the exchange. This is the result of the combination of participants’ self-selection and youth organization selection.

Fourth, the control group showed a slight increase in average on their second test but not statistically significant. Although children of the control group did not take part in any CISV villages, they might have other intercultural exposures which could have had a positive impact on their ICC development. CISV participants regressed to a similar level comparable to the result of the pre-camp test. As the control group was tested only twice but CISV participants were tested three times, this might limit the comparison effect on the changes between the two tests with nine months apart.

Overall, the longitudinal change pattern of CISV participants on the attitude measures in this study is different from Hammer’s (2005) longitudinal observation of AFS high school level intercultural exchange participants. In Hammer’s study, the AFS study abroad experience can bring significantly positive changes to the participants on intercultural communicative competence and the impact can be sustained five months after the participants’ return home. This difference between these two studies suggests that participants at different ages could have different longitudinal development patterns on
intercultural communicative competence as a result of an intercultural exchange experience. Compared with 11-year-old children, older adolescents at high school level are more mature and able to reflect on their intercultural experience and utilize what they have learned from that experience which means they can maintain the positive development and build on it later by themselves. Other factors could also account for the difference on the exchange participants’ longitudinal development of ICC, such as the duration of the intercultural exchanges or the programme format.

8.4.2 Participants’ perceptions of intercultural learning in a CISV Village

Compared to self-assessment, CISV participants’ narrative responses to the open-ended questions in the questionnaires presented a rich and detailed picture of the children’s perspectives on their expectation and experiences as well as self-perceived changes in their language and communication skills, intercultural attitudes and awareness, and personal development during the period of this longitudinal investigation. The main themes emerging out of the responses were:

- High expectation: the CISV participants were highly motivated for their forthcoming intercultural learning. Cognitively the children associated intercultural learning with making friends, language, food and games at this stage.
- Positive learning experience and attitudinal changes: the CISV participants were overwhelmingly positive about their intercultural learning experience. They reported attitudinal changes towards the relationship between cultural differences and friendship, showing a greater respect for cultural differences.
- Long-lasting personal development: Among the long-term impact self-reported by the children were aspects of personal development (such as confidence in a general sense as well confidence in making friends) and sustained interest in global issues.
- Enhanced confidence and competence in intercultural communication: there was a significant change in the children’s confidence in communicating with people from different cultures. Many children held the view that ‘being culturally different’ would not impede communication. They tried to communicate with and make friends with people from different cultural backgrounds in new contexts (e.g. at school) in their later experiences.
These findings suggest that although the global spaces created in the intercultural Village were different from the highly localised ‘world cities’ or ‘global cities’ (Block, 2006), the ethnically, culturally and linguistically diverse groups in the Villages provide adequate opportunities for children as young as 11 years to develop greater respect for cultural differences and to make intercultural friends beyond language and cultural barriers. What is particularly significant about the intercultural learning by the children of this age is, perhaps, that friendship is their primary concern. Many children voiced their expectation for making more friends before the Village and commented on the impact of their participation on their ability to make more friends and get on well with other children as well as on the development of their communication skills among their friendship circle. For them, intercultural learning was not just limited to finding out similarities and differences between ‘us’ and ‘them’. Instead, it was a social activity. It was more about building up a relationship with someone else who might look different, speak different languages, or come from a different background. There have been a number of studies in sociology that investigated the relationship between children’s friendship and participation in social activities (see a brief review in Deengan, 1996), but very little is known about how friendship can motivate intercultural learning, which, in return, may strengthen intercultural friendships.

In terms of intercultural communicative competence, children’s self-reported learning or changes reflected the development on these three aspects: intercultural attitudes, intercultural awareness, and language and intercultural communication skills. Before and after the Village, these children expressed their high expectations towards the forthcoming intercultural learning together with positive attitudes to the cultural differences between participants respectively. They thought that cultural differences and diversity presented in the camp should be respected and people from different countries and cultural backgrounds should be treated equally. According to Chen and Starosta (1996) and Byram (1997), these positive affective traits are an important outcome of intercultural learning and ICC development. Meanwhile, these children also gained knowledge about different languages and cultures and showed long-lasting interest in learning about other cultures as well as global issues. In this process, children developed their intercultural awareness and a wider worldview. By interacting with peers and adults from different cultures in daily routines and various educational activities during the Village, the children gained confidence in their
communication skills and were more willing to communicate with others. The language policy in the Village, which both facilitates the use of a common language (English in most cases) and promotes the right to use and respect for different languages, results in multilingual practices and helps the children to explore linguistic and non-linguistic resources for communication. A better ability to communicate beyond the language barrier is one of the long-lasting impacts of participation. The development in the behavioural aspect of ICC suggests a critical stage in their intercultural learning (Fennes & Hapgood, 1997). The development of these aspects of ICC might result in the enhancement of their ability in making friends beyond linguistic and cultural barriers. As reported by these children, they went on to make friends with their peers from different cultural or religious backgrounds at school.

In the long-term perspective, the one-month Village experience brought not only development in ICC to these children but also personal development. They deemed that (1) they had become more confident, independent and responsible; (2) they had improved their performance at school, such as being more confident to answer in class and making many new friends at school. This finding is similar to the findings of many other short-term impact studies of IYE (e.g. Hansel, 1985; Sitsworth & Suzyama, 1990). In addition, other factors need to be considered about the children’s long-term personal development during the investigation. By the time of the post-post-camp test, most CISV participants had moved to secondary schools, which meant starting a new school, beginning to learn a foreign language at school, meeting new people, making new friends, a general expansion of experience, etc. The change from Year 6 to Year 7 can be very influential in a young person’s development. This can provide these children with opportunities to apply what they learned from the intercultural learning experience in Village to new circumstances.

8.4.3 Methodological issues in measuring intercultural learning

This study raises two related methodological issues: (1) how to measure the development of ICC, and (2) the advantages of qualitative measures in understanding the process of intercultural learning.

Firstly, this study adds to the current debate on which method can best measure the

---

8 In the UK, students transfer from primary school to secondary school from Year 6 (11 years-old) to Year 7 (12 years-old).
development of ICC. As reviewed in Chapter 4, a quantitative questionnaire survey is the most commonly used method in assessing participants’ development of intercultural communicative competence by youth exchange organizations. However, the problems of using such quantitative measures only have been criticized by some researchers. As Medina-Lopez-Portillo (2004) claims, using only quantitative measure tools to examine the development of intercultural communicative competence is not enough in that the overall scores fail by themselves to capture the complexity of the phenomenon of ICC development. According to the leading intercultural experts in Deardorff’s (2004) Delphic study on intercultural communicative competence, it is important to use a variety of assessment methods in measuring the development of ICC. They agreed that the best way of assessing the development of ICC is through a mixture of quantitative and qualitative measures. The findings of this study confirm this point. The data collected from both the quantitative and qualitative measures provide rich evidence of children’s intercultural development from multiple perspectives (self-assessment and self-perception). The quantitative data shows us how children’s intercultural attitudes changed in the period of this investigation; the qualitative data reveals how they perceive and reflect their development in multiple aspects of intercultural communicative competence including their attitudes towards and awareness of cultural differences, intercultural communication skills and perspective on other global issues. Given the complexity of intercultural communicative competence, it is important to assess participants’ development of ICC through a mixture of quantitative and qualitative research by using multiple methods.

Secondly, the findings of this study suggest that qualitative measures have advantages in investigating the process of intercultural learning. Qualitative measures are a powerful tool to understand how intercultural learning is experienced by individuals and in what manner intercultural sensitivity is exhibited in behaviours or in narratives. This is in alignment with the implications of some recently published qualitative studies of intercultural learning (e.g. Helm, 2009; Fursca, 2009; Jackson, 2010; Yashima, 2010). Jackson (2010), for example, conducted an ethnographic investigation of the language and cultural learning of English majors from the Chinese University of Hong Kong who took part in a short-term sojourn in England by using both quantitative and qualitative measures. She found that the participants tended to overestimate their level of intercultural sensitivity in the quantitative measurement, while the analysis of the students’ oral and written
narratives complemented each other to explain how they became more effective intercultural speakers in the period of residence abroad. In this study, the analysis of children’s narratives to the open-ended questions which were designed to draw out their views about their intercultural experience in a CISV village provides us with evidence of their intercultural development in the period of this investigation. It also brings some less visible aspects of intercultural learning to light. Immediately after the camp, for example, these children reflected on what they had learned from the camp, such as that people from different cultures are similar to each other in many ways and that different cultures should be respected and treated equally. The children’s development of intercultural awareness suggests their progress towards global citizenship to some extent, which promotes an international perspective and calls for a commitment to humanist principles and respect for human equality and diversity (Osler & Vincent, 2002; Starkey, 2007). As I have discussed, quantitative measures cannot in themselves provide a complete picture of intercultural development. Qualitative measures are a necessary complement to quantitative ones in studying intercultural learning, particularly in longitudinal research.

In addition to the issues that have been discussed, it is also important to consider other factors when we are developing a research design with regard to assessing ICC or intercultural learning, such as the features of participants (e.g. age, intellectual competence, distribution), for what purpose, to what benefit, the time frame allowed, the level of cooperation between researchers and participants, and the social, cultural and situational contexts involved in the research (Deardorff, 2004).

8.5 Conclusion

The study presented in this chapter explored the children’s perceptions of their intercultural experiences in a CISV Village as well as self-perceived changes in their intercultural communicative competence and personal development. Amongst the research findings, the most important one is that children perceived intercultural learning as a social activity. Establishing, expanding and maintaining friendship thus constituted the primary aim as well as the outcome of their intercultural learning. Participation in an intercultural educational programme has brought some long-lasting changes to the children, such as respect for other nations, a sense of cultural relativism, a desire for peace and equality, a desire to interact with foreigners, less concern with the language barrier in intercultural
communication, becoming more open-minded towards cultural differences and having more interest in global issues, which are essential to the development of global citizenship. Moreover, the children had become more confident, independent and responsible and could apply the learning from their CISV camp to new intercultural situations in their daily life later on as demonstrated by a higher level social involvement at school. The findings of this longitudinal study suggest that participation in a short-term intercultural educational programme can bring positive changes to young participants and their intercultural learning continues after the programme.
Chapter 9 The Long-term Impact of CISV Village Programme

9.1 Introduction

The previous chapter examined the short-term impact of the participation in a CISV Village programme on young participants’ ICC development and personal growth. This chapter is to investigate the long-term impact of the participation in a CISV Village programme at a young age on the former participants. A series of interviews were carried out to investigate how the former participants of CISV villages perceive the impact of their CISV Village experience on their intercultural communicative competence development and their personal development in the long-term perspective.

This chapter is structured as follows: the detailed information about the research method of this study including participants, data collection procedure, data analysis method is reported in 9.2; 9.3 presents the results of the interview data analysis; the interpretation and discussion of the results can be found in 9.4; and the final section of this chapter (9.5) concludes the findings of this qualitative interview study.

This qualitative interview study reported in this chapter is designed with the following research questions in mind:

- What is the long-term impact of CISV Village experience on the former participants’ ICC development and personal development?
- How do the former participants perceive the impact from the long-term perspective?

9.2 Method

9.2.1 Participants

The subjects of this interview study were nine former participants who had taken part in a CISV Village programme many years ago when they were 11 years old. For reasons of logistics and financial practicality, the potential subjects were initially targeted in one geographical region of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, where I was resident at that time. The contact details of 20 potential participants were given by the Secretary of CISV Great Britain. The researcher contacted these people by sending them a covering letter that introduced the research project and this study. Nine out of 20 people replied to the researcher by email or
phone expressing their willingness to participate. Among these nine interviewees, five were male and four were female; only one participant was Finnish then working in UK and the other eight participants were British, living in the Newcastle-upon-Tyne area, in the North East of England. The interviewees were from a wide age range: in their 20s to their 60s. All of them had received higher education. Some of them had or were doing a postgraduate degree. Most of them were school teachers or students at university. These self-selected nine participants within one geographical area are not meant to represent all former CISV Village participants; however, their life experiences do elucidate the complex and long process of intercultural learning, providing insight into individual differences and contextual elements that may impact on their intercultural development.

9.2.2 Procedure

Semi-structured in-depth one-to-one interviews were conducted with the nine interviewees. The interview questions were open-ended which allows for extended discussion and development of any points that were raised. A list of questions was used as a guide in the semi-structured interview (see Appendix III). The length of each interview was between 0.5 - 1 hour. The interviews were carried out at various places including interviewees’ house, the common room in a university department, a coffee shop and the researcher’s house. The place for interviewing was decided by the interviewees. All these interviews were recorded by using a digital voice-recorder (Olympus WS200s) after the interviewees’ permission was granted.

9.2.3 Data analysis

The voice-recordings of the interviews were transcribed immediately after the interviews by the researcher. This not only helped the researcher to write down as much useful information as possible but also to improve the way of questioning in the following interviews. In order to make the quoted text in the result section more coherent and concise, gap-filler utterances in the conversations such as “you know”, “I mean” were left out. The interview data was analysed by using the thematic content analysis approach (Grbich, 2007; Silverman, 2006). According to the guidelines for the phenomenological analysis of interview data (Hycner, 1985), I first listened to the interviews as a whole, delineated units of meaning relevant to the research questions, and then determined themes from the clusters.
of meaning. Finally, I wrote a summary of both each interview and clusters of messages from different interviews with the same theme to a research question. The analysis focused largely on the research questions given in the introductory section of this chapter, which are the participants’ own perception of their CISV Village experience and impact on their intercultural communicative competence development and personal development. To best illustrate variations in participants’ long-term intercultural development, five interviewees from different age groups ranging from their 20s to 60s were selected for closer scrutiny instead of limiting a discussion to the group as a whole. These interviewees had supplied detailed and interesting life stories which might represent the variations among former participants.

9.3 Results

The results of the interview data analysis are reported in a case study approach – following the unique life stories of the selected five former participants. A brief profile of each case participant including information on his/her age, educational background, profession, and the history of their involvement with CISV will be provided before presenting the participants’ experiences and perception of the long-term impact of their CISV experiences. Pseudonyms were used to ensure the confidentiality of interviewees’ identity.

9.3.1 Case 1: Aamos

- **Profile**
  
  Aamos, 25 years old, was a Finnish male who worked as a marketing manager in a non-profit making organization. He had a BA and MA degree relating to international business. His family had been involved with CISV for a long time. Both of his elder brothers had been to one of the CISV programmes before he went to a Village when he was 11. He also participated in an Interchange programme when he was 15. He had been involved with CISV over the years in some way. For Aamos, “the Village was by far the strongest experience”.

- **CISV experience**
  
  Aamos attended a CISV village camp held in Norway. Although Norway is near
Finland, Aamos felt that “When you are 11, it seems very far.” Fourteen years later, Aamos can still vividly remember the scenarios of life in the camp – a room where they played various games and the regular daily routine of the camp. He particularly mentioned that he had made many friends there. For Aamos, it was an impressive experience.

“Yeah, there’s a room with all sorts of activities, where we play different role games. And all that stuff, and cooperation games. And getting up every morning and doing the village circle...Going to bed, singing lullabies with people and I really made lots of friends.”

As mentioned earlier in this thesis, participants in a Village camp come from ten or more different countries and they speak different languages, although English is supposed to be used as a common language. How these children communicate and get along with each other is always a concern. From his experience in the village, Aamos believed that children can easily make friends with each other despite the language and cultural barriers.

“I just remember that people had foreign languages. You had to find different ways to communicate with them. But you are still able to make friends with them quite easily. So I think we were mostly concerned about just making friends rather than worrying about the cultural differences.”

Aamos compared his two CISV experiences – one Village experience at 11 and one Interchange experience at 15, and he felt that the CISV Village experience was a far more influential and positive one for him because he felt that the 11-year-old children in the Village camp were less prejudiced and found it easier to get along with each other than the teenage participants (about 14-15 years old) in the Interchange programme. Thus, he commented: “the village was by far the strongest experience”.

“You can see that in that Interchange, people are not innocent any more as kids. I had the feeling on my Interchange. There are people judging each other a lot although we were just 15. I can feel that there was a lot of judging. When you are kids, you don’t judge the other kids. You just accept it and that’s it. You just play. Whereas, when you are getting to your teens, you start to get the prejudice. ‘I don’t like the guy’, you gossip about something. So it was a lot more negative experience for me.”
Aamos deemed that the Village programme is a unique international youth exchange programme, because most programmes start with adolescents at the age of 15-16. He pointed out that 11 years old was a good age for children from different cultural backgrounds to bond together and had many advantages compared with teens. According to Aamos, this is because children at 11 years old can easily bond with each other and they don’t have pre-conceptions of people from different countries.

“It’s the village programme. Definitely, I mean it’s the whole idea that you need to meet people from different cultures and backgrounds before you hit the teens. ... And that age is, before you are a teenager. That’s like 11 years old or something. You don’t have your prejudices. You know, you meet those people and you just instantly, naturally bond. And you build natural relationships; whereas, there’re a lot of organizations that start with older age groups. And the older you get, the more stereotypes you got in your mind. And the more distance you want to be from some people and things like that.”

Aamos’s personal experience and feeling underscores the importance of age in influencing intercultural learning. The developmental characteristics of different age groups can influence how individuals perceive their intercultural experience.

- **Reflection on the impact of CISV village experience**

  Aamos considered that his experience in a CISV Village helped develop his intercultural communicative competence. First of all, he felt that he could understand other people based not only on his own beliefs but seen from others’ perspectives.

  “I just felt that I was able to understand other people from different perspectives. And not just from my own culture. And I was more aware of my own cultural background properly because of that.”

This quote demonstrated that Aamos embraced positive intercultural attitudes (savoir être) in Byram’s (1997) term – readiness to suspend disbelief about other cultures and beliefs about one’s own culture. His ‘open-mindedness’ and ‘nonjudgmental attitudes’ are key personal elements in the dimension of intercultural sensitivity in Chen and Starosta’s (1996) ICC theory. Moreover, Aamos can critically reflect on his own culture and keep learning more about his own culture.

“I guess I’m thinking many times about how does my Finnish culture background
Aamos often questioned the impact of his Finnish culture on his growth. This kind of critical cultural awareness (savoir s’engager) (Byram, 1997) is one of the important components featuring the skills deemed necessary for successful communication across cultures and languages.

Aamos noticed that his experiences of playing and living together with people from different countries at a young age helped develop his ability to make friends with people from different cultural backgrounds. He did not realize this impact until ten years later when he went to England to study. Aamos’s retrospective experience suggests that the long-term impact of CISV village experience exists without you realizing it.

“Well I think for me, it was quite a strong experience. Because …and I don’t think it was until I came to England to study that I really started to understand what the impact was. It was until I came to England ten years later that I started to realize that I was able to make friends with foreign students quite easily.”

Aamos was very interested in international-oriented things in his life. For example, he chose an international first degree taught in English in his home country rather than a conventional degree taught in Finnish. His courses and learning experiences were always international-oriented. As found by other exchange studies (e.g. Bachner & Zeutschler, 2009), the development of an international perspective demonstrates a significant impact of an intercultural exchange experience.

“I mean that I chose a degree that was totally in English, even in Finland. And it was an international degree with a lot of international students. I guess that I was always strong on stuff like that.”

The link built through CISV participation also led him to choose to do a voluntary project in Costa Rica for his gap year after he finished his MA degree, because one of his best friends in the camp was from there. His friendship with his friend from Costa Rica and
his initial knowledge about that country through his friend prompted him to want to explore more about that country. This is a good example of the ripple effects of his CISV experience.

“I am taking a gap year next year. I’ve chosen doing a volunteer project in Costa Rica and I think the reason why I chose to go to Costa Rica is one of my best friends in the Village was from Costa Roca. ... So I think it was at the back of my mind. I’m still kind of thinking that it has an impact because I have a positive association with Costa Rica. So now I want to go there. You know. And I’m going there next year to see what Costa Rica is like.”

From Aamos’s narratives, it can be seen that CISV village experience has been a positive and influential experience for him. He valued it very much emotionally and personally. This is also related to his family, who have engaged with CISV for a long time.

9.3.2 Case 2: Rebecca

- **Profile**
  Rebecca, 33 years old, mother of two young children, is a vet. She has an undergraduate degree. She went to a CISV village when she was 11 and had been a JC twice in her adolescence.

- **CISV experiences**
  More than twenty years later, Rebecca can still remember her experience in a CISV village very well. She vividly recalled what happened in the local family stay, the friends she met there and the local facilities in the camp. In her own words, she could remember almost everything that happened in the camp.

  “I can remember all of it; I can remember the camp; I can remember my friends that I made there. I remember the hospitality families and having waffles and making cereals and singing in the hospitality family’s backyard. I remember the swimming pool in the camp, the woods. I remember the whole games, everything, really. Well, not everything, a lot of it I can remember.”

After the village, Rebecca continued to participate in local CISV activities and helped with fund raising in her local chapter. Apart from that, she also took part in other CISV camps as
a junior counsellor twice. She thought it was very important to help keep CISV going because she had gained a lot from her own CISV experience.

“I think because I had such a good time as a child and enjoyed my time. These things just kept running if people kept helping. So I remained with CISV helping with the fundraising and then to be JC, because I got a lot out of it. With every organization, it takes hard work and commitment for people to keep going.”

This is a common reason why so many CISVers kept being involved with CISV after their first experience (Watson, 2004). Continuing involvement with the organization after the sojourn is very typical for CISV village participants. This is different from the situations in other exchange organizations where the participants are over 15 years old (Bachner & Zeutschel, 2009). This is probably because of the organization’s emphasis on building a CISV community in local chapters.

- **Reflection on the impact of CISV village experience**

As regards the general impact of a CISV village, Rebecca became more aware of other cultures after her own stay in a CISV village although she was relatively aware even before she went there.

“As far as the whole making me more racially aware or whatever, I think I was relatively aware before I went. But it certainly made me think about the whole, the different cultures and different races. I think at 11 years old, you never really think about that. So it definitely made me think about it more even though I didn’t have prejudices beforehand.”

When asked whether her experience helped develop her intercultural communication skills, Rebecca did not give a direct ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer but narrated one of the intercultural interaction scenarios that often happened in her workplace with staff from different cultural backgrounds. In a busy working situation, Rebecca did not take her Dutch colleague’s impolite reply to her question as being rude, which was often regarded as such in normal situations by native speakers, and tried to understand her colleague’s behaviour as the way she speaks English as a non-native speaker.

“Sometimes if I was really, really busy at work, busy doing an operation on the table.....
And I had the Dutch vet and said to her ‘Have you done such and such?’ She might answer you ‘Yes, of course I have.’ I got a little bit ‘yeah, oh, I am just asking you’ then I have to remind myself that it’s just the way she is speaking English….In a busy working environment, it can be really irritating. And the nurses in my practice would be ‘Gosh, she is so rude.’ I would say ‘No, no, she is not rude. It’s just the way she is speaking English.’ She doesn’t mean it. She is a nice girl. She is not for one minute blitzing you or making you feel stupid. It’s just the way her comment or her sentences come out.”

This story implies that Rebecca had a critical cultural awareness and communicative sensitivity towards the communication behaviours of people for whom English was not their native language. She acknowledged and respected the differences in language use between an L1 speaker and L2 speaker and performed appropriate interaction management skills in that situation. Emotionally, she was very tolerant and empathetic. These awareness and skills, in Chen and Starosta’s (2008) views, are important for becoming a competent intercultural communicator and a world citizen.

In terms of personal development, Rebecca felt that the experience of leaving home for a whole month at that young age made her more broad-minded, more independent, and confident to travel abroad in her later life.

“Yeah, I think it made me a lot more broad-minded for sure, and the effect of being away in that summer by myself at that age is quite a big thing. A lot of my friends even didn’t do anything like that being away from family for the whole month. That independence really made me not be worried about travel and going abroad from an early age. Since then I have been almost all of the time by myself and feel quite happy and confident to go away by myself. So in that aspect I think it made the difference.”

The ability to cope with new situations would lead to the possibility of further intercultural explorations and travel in the exchange participants’ lives (Jackson, 2010). Rebecca extended her intercultural experiences tremendously after the CISV village.

“Yeah, lots and lots. I was a JC and I went to Brazil working as a Junior Counsellor as that. And then I have been travelling, I have been to Africa, Indonesia, Hong Kong. I have been to Australia a couple of times. I have been to Europe a lot. I have extended
Rebecca, as a mother of two young kids, perceived that her CISV Village experience had some impact on how she was educating her own children. Because of her own intercultural learning experience in a CISV village at a young age, she wanted to expose her children to new and different things as much as possible when they were young. Rebecca believed that the younger one exposed children to new stuff, the easier it was for them to accept.

“Yeah, definitely I think the younger you’re exposed to anything. Me now, I have two young children, one 2 years old, one 6 months-old. I try to expose R, which is the two-year-old, to everything, to have a pet. We got a little guinea pig, take her to the seaside, take her to a little pond. I just think the more you can stimulate the children with, the more you expose them to from a young age. … So definitely, the more you expose your kids to and the younger they are, the more they accept that normal is not a big deal for them.”

Although Rebecca felt that her experience in CISV had a lot of impact on her life, she did not think that her CISV experience influenced her career choice. She chose to be a vet, though she was an outgoing person who liked to be around people.

“I am a vet researcher. ...I don’t think that was the case for me. I wouldn’t say so.”

9.3.3 Case 3: James

- **Profile**

  James, 46 years old, is a teacher in a college. He got a BA degree in English. He has always been working related to English language teaching and education. He went to a CISV village in Germany in 1974 when he was 11. He had been involved with CISV for a long time until he worked abroad. James had nearly 20 years’ international working experience before he settled down in Newcastle.

- **CISV experiences**

  Unlike Aamos, James was introduced to CISV through the local school’s recommendation. His parents had great confidence in the school and thought that the suggestion of a CISV village would be a worthwhile thing for James to try. James had been
intensively involved with CISV activities for 12 years ever since his first CISV Village experience at the age of 11. James could remember all his experiences very clearly and he seemed very enthusiastic when he recalled his CISV memories. After narrating the long story of his local and international voluntary experiences with CISV, he summarised his active involvement as follows:

“Particularly between the age of 11 and the age of 23 when I left Manchester and went overseas for the first time, I was fully involved in all of the Junior Branch’s activities, first in Newcastle and then in Manchester. So I suppose most of the time was probably spent week-to-week basis in the local branches in those two chapters in the UK.”

In his experiences with CISV, James had been a JC once, a delegation leader several times, on the staff and international staff once at least. His rich experiences with CISV made him very familiar with the process of how children get used to the camp life. James thought that it was challenging for everybody at the beginning of every village. However, children have managed to integrate very well by the end of camp, though language and communication could be an issue for those who did not speak English very well at the beginning of every village.

“I think at the beginning of every village, it was difficult, partly because of language and partly because everybody come from such a long way. And this is new and you were all 11. And I know 11 is a magic number. But I mean it is not easy for everybody and having a type of nearly a group of four people who spent a month together, getting ready for this big experience. That’s challenging for everybody. But I know within all the villages, the dominance of English language was critical, really. The delegations who can speak English to some extent, it was a natural communication from the start. And it also includes some of the delegations who didn’t speak English, for example, the Far East ones. It took longer: I would think it was good when there was a translation period. And I always think that was really important. ... Perhaps the Japanese children, they didn’t speak much English at the beginning, but at the end fully integrated into the life of the camp. So that kind of working on a level of communication for the whole village over the course of four weeks always happen. There was never a village at the end there was difficulties in communication. Never, at the end if I could remember.”
Reflection on the impact of CISV experiences

When asked how he perceived the biggest impact of the CISV village on him, James thought that the CISV experience broadened his world-view. James appreciated the chances to meet people from different cultures personally through CISV participation, which was very different from travelling and sightseeing in foreign countries.

“I think it gives me a world picture which a lot of people from my town will never have. ... Because you didn’t know anything about it, you are about thinking in terms of international travel. But it gave you not just the travelling experiences and going to those different places and different activities but for meeting people from other countries you never heard of, really. And I do think it opens your eyes to the fact that just what you see in your local village or town is not the whole picture.”

James’s CISV experiences made him very curious about different cultures. And he became a brave and independent person who could challenge himself in trying something new. James noted that his willingness to go abroad in the gap year after school and work abroad later on was partially influenced by his CISV experience.

“When I finished school in 1978, I didn’t want to go to university straightaway. I wanted to have a gap year off. Well, in those days, 1970s, it was not as usual as it is now. And I ended up going to work in a company in Israel for six months. And I do think that willingness to go overseas and get on the planes, go somewhere else and try something different, very much stemmed from that entire introduction I had in CISV. So I had my gap year and came back to get my degree. And at the end of my degree, I had two choices, one was either to join in the theatre company, children’s educational theatre company or the thing I really wanted to do was to go overseas for some time, little time. Not to travel but to be based in one place. And I think that was part of CISV influence they had.”

Based on his personal life experiences, James commented that it was critical to have such interactions with people from different cultures at a young age. He believed that the impact of the intercultural learning experience at 11 years old was longitudinal, even for those who were never involved with CISV again after that experience.

“If I hadn’t had anything to do with CISV until 21 or college or whatever, would it have
the same impact? I don’t think so. I think all those formative years growing up with this kind of interaction with the other cultures influence you, however limited. And that’s the thing: to get them young, CISV demonstrated that very effectively. And I know lots of people doing the 11 years old village have nothing to do with the organization and that happens a lot. But I think if you spoke to those people now, even if they had done nothing within these 30 years, it would stay with them and had some kind of impact. And I think it was to do with that ideal: you’re still fresh faced enough and open enough at that age to register, there’s a word about that. So I think working with children, lots of other organizations do it. But I would say that what CISV does works particularly well at that age group as a primary target. I still think 11 had the impact.”

In the interview, James narrated many interesting stories of what happened during the years when he was working abroad, such as how he got used to the eating habits in a different country. Since he had been living in countries which were very different from his own culture, he encountered hundreds of awkward situations due to cultural differences. It is worth noting that James was an advanced intercultural communicator who had experienced several different deep intercultural learning (Shaules, 2007) journeys which stood him in good stead to be a global citizen. He expressed a simple but interesting understanding of culture as follows:

“What is culture? I don’t know. No, I have no concept. I can remember the Indian delegation in one village, we had tomato soup and they put sugar in it. I would have that stay with me for life. And what is culture? Culture is eating tomato soup full of sugar. That’s how you do it in that county.”

From James’s life story, it can be seen that the deepest impact of CISV on him is that it opens a door of the world to him and leads him to pursue an international life style. He has travelled around the world and used his knowledge and skills to help people in other countries learn English. He is a ‘global citizen’ with lots of intercultural experiences.
9.3.4 Case 4: Paul

- Profile
  Paul, 55 years old, is a maths teacher in a middle school. He got a BSc in Aeronautical Engineering. He went to a CISV village in 1963 and he had been actively involved with other CISV activities until he got settled with a job.

- CISV experiences
  Similar to the other former participants, Paul could also remember something about the CISV village he went to. It was very impressive that he could still remember the good friends he made in the camp. Paul also visited one of his American friends some years after the camp.

  "I can remember lullabies. I remember doing arts and crafts. And I can still remember some very good friends very clearly. The boy I shared a room with was Adam, who was from Sweden. He was a lovely lad. And next door, there was a Japanese boy, who I got along with well, although we spoke no common language at all. And I get along with an American boy, M, whom I went to visit in the America some years later, which was fantastic."

After his first experience in a CISV village, Paul was involved with CISV a lot. He joined the junior branch in Newcastle and helped organize many activities. When he was 16, he went to some CISV camps abroad as a Junior Counsellor. And when he was 21, he went to a camp working as a member of staff. He had been actively involved with CISV in his early 20s until he got a permanent job which meant he could not get time off work easily. It has been nearly thirty years since his last involvement with CISV.

- Reflections on the impact of CISV experience
  When asked about the impact of CISV village experience, Paul firmly believed that the experience in the CISV Village camp at that young age made him more aware of and more tolerant towards different cultures. The intercultural awareness and tolerance towards cultural differences are essential for intercultural communicative competence by interculturalists (e.g. Chen & Starosta, 1996; Byram, 1997; Deardorff, 2004). The happy intercultural experience of meeting people from different countries at the CISV camp at a young age of 11 years old, in turn, led him to become more willing and confident to explore different countries and meet people from different cultural backgrounds in his later life.
Looking back, Paul was very proud of his rich intercultural experiences. These experiences have been an important part of his life.

“I think it made me more tolerant and more aware of different cultures. It made me want to find out more about different cultures. It’s given me a little more confidence to travel, and to engage with people with different backgrounds. Because at 11 years old, you do learn that you are very similar: Cause you just get along with each other. And the cultural differences are there. But 11 years old don’t let it get them away.... Yes, so I think it’s given me the opportunity and desire to travel to meet people. And I can look back now on the travels to various countries and I am pleased to have that. I feel privileged to have certain wealthy experience of meeting people from different cultural backgrounds.”

Paul also reflected that his CISV experience prompted his interest in languages although he never learned one language seriously. Because English was used as the working language in the camp, the British participants might have advantages in the camp compared to those children whose English were not good and he must have faced fewer difficulties in the process of communication. However, the translation time in the activities provided chances for these children to come into contact with other languages.

“I am always interested in languages and I am rather disappointed of that I never ever learned one. Because wherever I go, I like to learn a little bit of the language. I am always interested in looking at connections between languages and how meanings of words are connected to their roots. How meanings are involved. ...Yeah, it might have been influenced by my CISV experience.”

When reflecting on the impact of CISV village experience on his career, Paul was convinced that the rich interpersonal experiences he gained through CISV participation made him prefer people-oriented jobs. As mentioned earlier in this section, Paul was an engineering graduate but chose to be a teacher as he felt he wanted to work with people rather than with things. This was unique among the interviewees because most of them did not think that their CISV experience was influential on their career choice.

“I think possibly yes, that if you found that the sort of intense interpersonal experience you get through CISV, I think you are more likely to want to work with people than
with things. ... I found myself drawn towards a very people-oriented job, which must be one of the most ‘people jobs’. How many kids in a day as a teacher?! So that’s certainly what I wanted. I wanted to work more with people than with things.”

Although Paul did not have as much work experience in foreign countries as James, the other participant, he asserted that CISV experience was influential on his life by reflecting on the past, and he felt there was a causal relationship between his CISV experience and his life.

“Yes, I think so. It’s impossible to tell. You know, I can’t analyse scientifically and find for sure what was the cause and what was the effect. But as you grow older, you reflect on your past, and you think about it. And you formulate your opinions. And my opinion is it has been very influential on my life.”

9.3.5 Case 5: Judy

- Profile

Judy, 61 years old, is a retired teacher. She participated in a CISV Village in Norway in the very early years when CISV was first established. Because of her family and personal interest, Judy has been involved with CISV until now. She has played many different important roles in the organisation.

- CISV experiences

Judy not only still remembered the experience in the camp like the other participants, but also still kept her diary and photographs from the camp. She had a lovely experience in the village held in Norway.

“I still have my diary, my black and white photographs. And the short notes I made each day. And I still remember some of the people who were there. I still write to the lady who was the leader of the delegation from Germany. ... I still got some very good memory of that. All the walls in the house we all lived in, which has been pulled down since then. And the camp fire that we had, the lake where we went to swim and doing arts and crafts in the outside.”

After that Village, Judy had been actively involved with the local CISV chapter. She
contributed to forming the junior branch in her local chapter and took part in many different activities. Apart from the CISV village programme, she also had an exchange visit with the girl from Belgium who was her good friend in her village and she also participated in an interchange with Norway when she was 17. She also volunteered as a delegation leader, member of staff or committee member for other CISV activities.

- **Reflection on the impact of CISV experiences**

  Judy felt that her CISV experiences made her have a different outlook on things. For example, she visited one of her Belgian friends at Christmas time when people usually stay at home with their family.

  "In some ways, yes. I remember when I was in college, one of my Belgian friends was getting married at Christmas time and I was invited to the wedding. My friends at college said 'You can't go, you'll be away from your parents, from your family on Christmas day.' And I said 'I've had some Christmas with them, I hope I would have some more, but I would only have one chance to go to a wedding in Belgium at Christmas time. So I'm going to.' So yes, you do have a different outlook on things."

  She also reflected on how the experience in the village helped form her different perspectives into things.

  "During the village, because you have been challenged to actually plan activities for the other people, you then come home start thinking about how you are doing things on a different level. These experiences let me have different perspectives into many things."

  Similar to Rebacca’s opinion, July thought that her career choice was not so much related to the CISV experience, although she was always interested in how people live in other countries.

  "I don’t think it is so much why I wanted to be a teacher. I think one of the main subjects I studied was geography and that was the subject I studied at college as my main course along with the education side of things. So I was always interested in how people lived in the other countries."
Judy, an experienced teacher working with children for over thirty years, believed that 11 years old are intellectually mature enough to learn things together with others and reflect on their intercultural learning experience from an educational perspective. And she perceived that children in the CISV villages could learn from each other by doing things together and reflect on it in a certain depth.

“I think the uniqueness of CISV is that fact that you are struggling at intercultural - deliberately intercultural - mixing with young people, as young as 11. … Before they reach that stage of doing everything intellectually first, they do it through action first, and then they can reflect on it. And they’ve got sufficient maturity to be able to reflect on it, understand it at a deeper level. Younger children don’t have the same ability to reflect in depth. But at the age of 11, they can do, they are still able to relax and play with each other and do things together. But also they have the maturity to reflect on it and think about how it’s impinging on the other part of their life.”

Judy regarded her life involvement with CISV not only as “giving something”, but also as “something gained”.

“"My life has not just been given to CISV, but I gained a lot personally through CISV. Through knowing the people like the Kangalahti. My good friend D, we met through CISV and I’ve got friends, well, yes, I’ve got friends all over the world.”

Judy, as a CISV participant and an exchange insider, offers many insights into the beliefs of this organisation. She has devoted a large part of her life to it and is still very active. This is because she believes that positive intercultural contact (Allport, 1954) experience at a young age would bring benefits not only to the participants but to the world in general to some extent. She hopes that this ideology will continue and attract more people to participate in the programmes, get involved with the whole idea and keep the organization going.

9.4 Discussion

This multi-cultural, intercultural exchange programme provided by CISV is perceived by the former participants to have enduring impact on them. The life story analysis of five case participants shows the individual variations of the long-term impact of CISV Village.
Three main categories can be derived from the case stories: (1) the impact on the participants’ intercultural communicative competence development; (2) the impact on their personal development and life; (3) participants’ comments on the CISV Village programme. The results will be discussed by comparing with those of other long-term impact studies of intercultural exchanges.

9.4.1 Participants’ ICC development

In terms of the ICC development, three main aspects of the long-term impact of the intercultural learning experience in a CISV Village can be derived from the stories: awareness of and attitudes towards people of other cultures, cross-cultural communication skills and intercultural friendship.

- **Intercultural awareness and attitudes**

  Participants perceived that they became more aware of the similarities and differences of cultures and more tolerant towards other people. This impact on aspects of awareness and attitudes towards others is similar to the findings of Watson’s (2004) long-term impact study of participants in all CISV international programmes and other long-term impact studies. The majority of the respondents in Watson’s study indicated that their CISV participation had influenced their awareness of people from other cultures or countries and positively changed their attitudes towards others. Thomas (2005a) found that the young people participating in exchange programmes were more interested in other worldviews, more interested to learn new things and understand others more. Similar findings were reported by Bachner and Zeutschel (1994) and Hansel (2008b) as well. These results suggest that development of intercultural awareness and positive intercultural attitudes is a powerful impact of international youth exchanges.

- **Intercultural communication skills**

  Participants perceived that CISV Village participation had developed their intercultural communicative awareness in some way in the long-term perspective, especially making them able to be empathetic in communication with people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Bachner and Zeutschel (1994) also found that the exchange experience increased participants’ capacity for empathy because they had to explore the possible reasons why others thought or behaved differently. The respondents in Watson’s (2004) study did not give a direct answer to the question of whether their CISV
participation had helped them to develop skills in intercultural communication; instead they just commented on their understanding of intercultural communication. We need to be cautious that the development on intercultural communication skills, the behavioural dimension of intercultural communicative competence, is difficult to measure in an interview study or a questionnaire study.

- Intercultural friendships

Most interviewees felt that CISV participation had developed their skill at making friends with other people from different cultural backgrounds. It made them feel easier about getting along with people from different cultures. And they are open and flexible in meeting and getting along with people from different cultural backgrounds. The long-term impact on the ability to establish intercultural relationships is evident in other studies as well. Hansel (2008) finds that the AFS alumni are more likely to have friends from other cultures than their peers.

To sum up, CISV experience is perceived by the former participants as influential on developing their awareness of different cultures and positive attitudes towards people from different cultures together with their capacity to make intercultural relationships. Participants did not perceive that their CISV participation directly improved their intercultural communication skills but showed how they behaved in some intercultural encounters. The most significant result of this intercultural exchange is the development of an international perspective.

9.4.2 Participants’ personal development and their life

The CISV experience at a young age is perceived as having some impact on the former participants’ personal development and their lives. This is indicated in their personal development, influence on their subsequent academic, professional choices, decisions of other international-oriented activities, and the way of influencing and educating their children.

- Personal development

The long-term impact of CISV Village participation on personal development is mainly perceived as independence, confidence and open mindedness. The long-term positive impact on personal development is consistent with the long-term impact research of other international youth exchange programmes. Thomas (2005a) found that intercultural
experiences have lasting effects on young people’s personality development, such as general confidence in one’s own ability, and increased ability to take risks. Bachner and Zeutschel (1994; 2009) also found that the large majority of respondents attributed significant and positive personal development to the YFU exchange experience. This finding suggests that the impact of CISV Village experience on personal development is significant, positive and enduring.

- **Academic and career choices**

  It was perceived by the participants that CISV experience, although not having a direct impact on their academic and career choices in general, did certainly have some impact. Similar findings were reported by other long-term impact studies. Wright (1969) found that the choice of occupations of CISV participants was in keeping with their level of educational achievement, but there was nothing about the pattern of occupations which could be attributed to CISV influence. Watson (2004) found that it was not sufficient to determine the effects of CISV participation on participants’ occupation choices, although it seemed that the great majority had careers in which the ability to build effective professional relationships is important in her study. Bacher and Zeutschel (2009) also conclude that educational and professional directions are not a significant result of exchange for most participants in YFU programmes in their follow-up study.

- **Subsequent international involvement and travel**

  The long-term impact of CISV experience on other life choices of the participants is mostly represented by their subsequent international involvement and travel. The international-oriented activities that participants had planned or engaged in were partially due to the impact of their CISV experience, such as taking a gap year to do a volunteer project in a country where one of the friends made in their CISV Village camp came from or working abroad and travelling around the world. These intercultural experiences indicate other intercultural learning having occurred after the CISV experience. The finding about the life choices or styles of these CISV participants is consistent with the results of most long-term impact studies. Bachner and Zeutschel (1994) found that the exchange participants developed a commitment to support international activities, such as attending other youth exchange programmes, and other efforts aimed at making a social contribution, either as paid or voluntary staff. Hansel (2008b) also found that the AFS alumni were more likely than their peers to seek additional international experience, such as university-level
study abroad, opportunities to work abroad and cross-cultural marriages.

- *Ways of educating children*

  The participants in this study reported how they had been influenced and how they planned to educate their children because of what they had learned from the CISV Village experience. They would like to expose their children to new things when the children are young and plan to let their children have similar intercultural learning experiences when they are young. According to Bachner and Zeutschel (1994), this influence on their children is part of the ripple effect of benefitting from exchanges which is defined as the degree to which one actually has applied the results of exchange and influenced others’ attitudes and behaviours based on the results of exchange. This is consistent with the findings of Hansel's (2008a) AFS long-term impact study: that the AFS programme alumni are more likely to encourage their children towards involvement with other cultures and study abroad, by trying to instill in them attitudes about meeting people from other cultures and giving encouragement to study abroad.

  The above discussion suggests that the short-term and multicultural format intercultural exchange at a young age (CISV Village programme) has a similar long-term impact on the former participants’ personal development and their lives as those longer term exchanges for older high school students (usually aged 16+) organized by other educational organizations (e.g. AFS, YFU). The enduring effects of the intercultural learning experience in a CISV Village programme demonstrate the potential of children and young teenagers for intercultural learning. Compared to older adolescents, children and young teenagers could also utilize their intercultural learning experience in their later growth and personal development. From the comparison of results between this study and other studies, it seems that the effects of long and short international youth exchange programmes on the participants do not differ a lot in the long-term perspective, while Bachner and Zeutschel (2009) claim that the longer the exchange, the longer its impact in their study of YFU participants.

### 9.4.3 The merit of CISV Village programme

Three aspects of CISV Village programme were commented on and supported by the former participants: the early age of the participants - as young as 11 years old; the experiential learning approach of the programme; and the multilingual and multicultural
format. The combination of these comments acknowledges the uniqueness of CISV, especially its Village programme, in the youth exchange field. As Watson (2008) points out, CISV is unique in providing an international programme for children as young as 11 when other international exchange programmes are generally for those of 16 years or older.

As reflected by these former participants, 11 is a good and critical age for starting intercultural learning. On the one hand, the participants felt that their experience at 11 years old in the Village programme was more positive and influential than an intercultural exchange experience at an older age (e.g. the age of adolescents) because they believed that children of 11 are open enough and not yet prejudiced. This opinion about 11 years old children’s attitudes towards out-groups is supported by the findings of some psychological research on children’s feelings towards the people who belong to their own national in-group and to another national out-group. Barrett (2005) found that there was an increase in the number of positive characteristics attributed to out-groups, between 5-11 years of age and feelings towards other national groups tend to become more positive through the course of middle childhood. However, after the age of 11, this general increase in having a positive regard for other national groups typically levels out, and there are indications that there may even be a slight reduction in positive regard for national out-groups in early adolescence (Lambert & Klineberg, 1967, cited in Barrett & Buchanan-Barrow, 2005). On the other hand, they feel that 11 years old are mature enough to work together and co-operate with others and reflect on learning. The critical value of intercultural learning at this age is echoed in a study by Hahn, Lanspery and Leavitt (2006) in their assessment of the development of life skills among participants in a variety of programmes as part of the Nokia-International Youth Foundation Global Youth Development Initiative. They note that the age group of 10-13 years is most useful for integrating the development of such skills into educational programmes. This support for the young age of CISV Village programme can be found in Watson’s (2004) questionnaire study of the longitudinal evaluation of CISV participation. The great majority of respondents in her study agreed with the proposition that participation at a young age is important and provided similar comments on the value and importance of participation at a young age.

The experiential learning approach and the multicultural and multilingual format of the CISV Village programme were supported by the former participants. The experiential learning in the camp through participating in different educational activities by the children
themselves made them feel relaxed and happy. The multicultural format of a CISV Village camp also made it possible for the participants to learn about different people and different cultures in the world in one camp. This format is very different from those traditional intercultural exchange programme offered by most education organizations; that is, participants stay in a host family of a different culture and study in a local school for a semester or a year.

9.5 Conclusion

The study reported in this chapter has examined the long-term impact of participation in a CISV Village programme on former participants. It is found that the participants had a good and happy memory of their experience in a CISV Village and had been involved in CISV-related activities for quite a while after their own programme. The friends they made in the camp, in particular, were regarded as one of the most important memories and outcomes of their intercultural learning there. In retrospect, participants perceived that the one-month experience in a CISV Village when they were just 11 brought some positive and long-lasting changes to their intercultural learning, such as having a greater intercultural awareness and critical cultural awareness, open and non-judgmental attitudes towards others from a different culture, being tolerant of cultural differences, having better communication skills beyond language and cultural barriers, becoming interested in international issues and, most importantly, the development of an international perspective. It also brought personal changes to the participants that can be characterized as significant, positive and enduring, such as being more confident, independent and more bold when travelling abroad. However, educational and professional directions are not a significant result of CISV experience for most participants. The findings suggest that the participation in a multicultural programme at the age of 11 has similar long-term effects on participants as those typical high-school level IYE programmes (i.e. culture-specific exchange programmes). Moreover, the case study of the five selected participants’ life stories and experiences in this study suggests that there are individual variations in the process of their intercultural development in terms of the longitudinal impact of the programme.
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10.1 Introduction

As described in Chapter 1, this thesis aims to investigate the intercultural learning experience in an intercultural youth exchange programme for those at a young age (11-year-old) and its educational impact on participants’ intercultural development. In order to achieve these objectives, three related studies were conducted in the present project. The final chapter first summarises the main findings of the three studies in 10.2. The theoretical and methodological implications of the findings of this project are discussed in 10.3. The significances and limitations of the three studies are noted in 10.4. Then the practical implications of this project for CISV are highlighted in 10.5 and the directions for future research are suggested in 10.6.

10.2 Summary of findings

Three studies have been reported in this thesis. They are:

- A participant observation study of children’s intercultural learning in a CISV village. Participants’ multi-party interactions in educational group activities were recorded (Chapter 7).
- A longitudinal study of the impact of CISV Village programme on the young participants’ intercultural communicative competence and personal growth. Data were collected from 36 CISV participants who were asked to fill in questionnaires before, immediately after and nine months after the camp and a control group (Chapter 8).
- A qualitative interview study of nine former CISV Village participants about the long-term impact of CISV Village participation on their intercultural communicative competence development and personal life (Chapter 9).

These studies together have investigated many aspects of children’s intercultural learning in a multi-national children’s summer camp and its educational effects. The main findings of these three studies will be reviewed in the following sections.
10.2.1 Children’s intercultural learning in a CISV Village

The first study of this project reported in this thesis was to examine the children’s intercultural learning experience in a CISV village, especially how children with a disparity of linguistic abilities in their shared language (in this case, English) manage their participation in the group activities in the camp. The fieldwork reported in section 5.3 of Chapter 5 described the main characteristics of a CISV village: an international camp where children of 11-year-old live together for one month with their peers and adults from 10 nations. In this village, children participate in a mix of educational, cultural and sports activities, spend two weekends with host families and visit some local places for excursions, swimming, shopping and cultural learning. Children not only have the chance to share the knowledge with and learn from participants from different cultural backgrounds in the global village but also have the opportunity to interact with local people in the host country.

The detailed analysis of two episodes of children’s interactions in group activities in a CISV village reported in Chapter 7 explores how children from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds use English as a lingua franca to negotiate meanings and manage their participation in the group activities. It is found that these children can use their linguistic and interactional resources (e.g. language alternation, nonverbal communication, repair and clarification, shadowing and acknowledge tokens) effectively and creatively to deal with the problem of language disparity among them. Alternation between native language and the working language (in the case of this study, English) in conversation helps to relay their messages and to solve local mis/non-understanding. Nonverbal communication complements linguistic means by helping to select next turn addresses and clarifying messages to be conveyed. Questioning is used either in the direct form of wh-questions or in the form of repetition of the previous turn to signal ‘repair’ and clarify mis/non-understanding. Shadowing practice (i.e. repeating previous turns) and providing acknowledgement tokens are also used by the participants as a means of active participation. However, there are tensions amongst the young participants in lingua franca communication. Although most existing studies emphasize the cooperative nature of lingua franca interaction (e.g. Firth, 1996), the disparity of language ability and the unequal access to the linguistic resources as demonstrated in Chapter 7 give some children advantages in dominating the interaction. Meanwhile, this situation also puts the children with less linguistic competence in a vulnerable position, thus influencing their participation in the
group activities, especially when verbal communication is necessary. Children with better English show a greater tendency in securing the leadership position and decision-making right during activity participation. Except for the linguistic ability in the working language, other factors such as children’s personality and their chosen positions and roles in the activity also affect their active participation in the interactions that take place during group activities.

The interactional analysis of children’s participation in group activities suggests that intercultural interactions are important for their intercultural learning. Intercultural interactions created through the participation in a group activity are a good opportunity for children to manifest their understanding of different cultures and practice their communication skills in real intercultural situations. These task-oriented activities in CISV camp require a degree of trust building, cooperation and collaboration among participants from different cultural backgrounds. During the intercultural interactions in the activities, children learn to negotiate and manage their participation in the activity by using different linguistic and interactional resources. Meanwhile, their experiences in intercultural interactions in the camp can help change, enhance, and develop these children’s intercultural attitudes towards cultural others and awareness of cultural differences. These experiences will naturally build into their intercultural profile, which might lead to their intercultural development. As Deardorff (2008) claims, meaningful interaction with those from different cultures is one important way to develop exchange participants’ intercultural communicative competence.

10.2.2 The impact of CISV Village on participants’ ICC development

The results of the two studies which are reported in Chapters 8 and 9 demonstrate that the one-month CISV Village experience facilitates participants’ intercultural communicative competence development both in the short-term and long-term perspectives. The short-term and long-term impact on participants’ ICC development are compared and discussed in the following dimensions.

- Intercultural awareness

Both the young participants in the short-term impact study and the former participants in the long-term impact study believe that their CISV Village experience make them more aware of cultural differences. The young participants acknowledge the differences between
them and the other participants in the camp as regards appearances, backgrounds, races, religion, ideas, languages, etc. Meanwhile, the young participants also emphasize and appreciate the similarities between people from different cultures. In contrast, the former participants can reflect a deeper understanding of the cultural differences and become more aware of their own cultures. They also demonstrate the ability to evaluate otherness critically on the basis of both one’s own and other cultures, called by Byram (1997) the dimension of ‘critical cultural awareness’.

- **Intercultural attitudes**

  Both the young participants and former participants believe that their CISV Village experience positively changes their attitudes towards people from other cultures. The development outcome of the young participants in their attitudes aspect is reflected in the following attributes: the awareness of the equality between different cultures, openness, a wider worldview, an ability to see people of different cultures from a different perspective and curiosity about other world issues. Former participants’ attitudes towards cultural differences are reflected in a growing curiosity about different cultures and respect for other cultures, tolerance of different cultures, and the kindling of a spirit of adventure (this is related to their subsequent international and intercultural experiences in their lives).

- **Intercultural communication skills**

  The young participants develop skills to communicate with people who cannot speak English well. In the longer-term reflection in the longitudinal study, the young participants find it easier to talk with people from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds and they become more patient and tolerant when they interact with people from different cultures. In contrast, the former participants feel that they are not afraid to use their limited foreign language ability to communicate with local people when they travel abroad. More importantly, the former participants have better ‘intercultural communicative awareness’ (Roberts, 1998), which means that they are more aware of the different linguistic and non-verbal communicative conventions, the effects of these different conventions on discourse processes and the ability to negotiate rules appropriate for intercultural communication under these conditions. They show more empathy and accommodation when communicating with foreign colleagues or friends for whom English is not their native language. In Byram’s (1997) term, these skills are the characteristics of discourse competence in the linguistic dimension of being an ‘intercultural speaker’.
• **Knowledge**

The young participants acquire some knowledge about different countries represented in the camp together with their languages, food, religions, races and other implicit features of a culture from their one-month CISV experience, having played and lived together with such children. Since the CISV Village programme is not aimed at learning about any specific culture, it is very hard to measure any increase in participants’ knowledge about other cultures. Although it is not obvious how much knowledge about other cultures participants gained through their CISV experience, it would probably increase the participants’ interest to learn about other cultures. The participants’ knowledge about other cultures would be expanded and enhanced through their subsequent international travelling, education at school and university, foreign language learning, and other informal learning channels.

• **Intercultural friendship**

The last important dimension for the participants’ intercultural development as a result of their CISV Village experience is the establishment of intercultural friendships. In the CISV village, the young participants learn that they can get along with people from different cultures and make friends with them. This relational outcome of their intercultural experience helps them learn more through maintaining contact with their friends after they return home. Meanwhile, the positive intercultural friendships motivate them to make more new intercultural relationships in their daily lives in the longer-term. The former participants feel it easy to make new international friends in their later studies and professional life.

The above comparison between the young participants and former participants’ perception on how the CISV Village experience influences their ICC development can be summarised in Table 10.1. It suggests that the various sub-competencies of ICC can be developed to a varying extent as a result of an intercultural learning experience in an international youth camp. However, we should be prudent in recognizing that the former participants’ ICC development is not only the result of the CISV Village experience alone but the co-effects of their other intercultural experiences, family education, school education, socialization, and life experiences at a later stage.
### Table 10.1 Comparison of the young and former participants’ ICC development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of ICC</th>
<th>Young participants in the short-term impact study</th>
<th>Former participants in the long-term impact study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Intercultural awareness | • Aware of different looks, races, backgrounds, languages, ideas and cultures  
• Emphasis on the similarities between people from different cultures | • Aware of cultural differences in general  
• More aware of one’s own culture  
• Critical cultural awareness  
• Communicative awareness |
| Intercultural attitudes | • Every culture and people from different cultures are equal  
• Change of views on different countries  
• Broader worldview  
• Interest in world issues  
• More open to people from different cultural backgrounds | • Curiosity about different cultures  
• Respect and tolerance of cultural differences  
• Spirit of adventure |
| Knowledge | • Know more about different cultures in general  
• Know more words of some foreign languages | • Know different cultures in general  
• Foreign language learning |
| Intercultural communication skills | • Know how to communicate with children who speak different languages  
• Find it easier to talk with people who cannot speak English or from different cultures  
• More patient and confident to talk to people from different cultures | • Empathy and accommodation in intercultural communication  
• Use foreign languages in foreign countries |
| Intercultural friendship | • Can get along with and make friends with people from different cultures despite the cultural and linguistic differences  
• Make new friends with people from different cultures at school | • Easy to make intercultural friends later on in life |

### 10.2.3 The impact of CISV Village on participants’ personal development

The two studies reported in Chapters 8 and 9 also demonstrate that the CISV Village experience has contributed to both the young participants’ and the former participants’ personal growth and development in the short-term and long-term perspectives respectively. In the third survey carried out nine months after their CISV Village experience, the young participants perceived that they had become more confident, more independent, responsible,
patient, calm and a lot happier. Cognitively, they felt that they had a wider worldview and more open mind towards the world around them. The young participants also reported that their CISV Village experience of living together with children from different countries for one month had changed their behaviour at school when they returned, such as being more active in class, making more friends with different people at school, talking more with peers of a different gender, etc. These changes suggest that the CISV Village experience can bring longer-term changes in the young participants’ personal growth in the aspects of personality, attitude and behaviour months after their CISV participation. And all these changes are a positive transformation for these children.

Compared to the longitudinal investigation of young participants, the impact of CISV Village experience on the former participants aged from their 20s to their 60s reported in Chapter 9 is long-term. The former participants interviewed for this study perceived their CISV Village experience at a young age as having had a profound impact on their personal development and their lives in many aspects. They attributed significant and positive personality development - such as becoming more independent, more confident and more open - to the CISV Village experience. But they felt that the impact of CISV experience on their academic (what subject to study at high school or university levels) and career choices (what professions or jobs to take) was somewhat less significant. However, the majority of the former participants believed that their additional intercultural experiences, such as taking a gap year in a foreign country, taking a job abroad for several years, frequent international travel, were due to the inspiration of their CISV experience at 11 years old, which made them curious to visit and confident to live in different countries, meet people from different cultures and try new things. As a result of their own personal growth experiences after a CISV village sojourn, these former participants wanted to pass their beliefs and ideas of intercultural learning on to their children and educate them in an intercultural way.

These findings suggest that the one-month, rich and experiential intercultural learning experience in an international youth summer camp at a young age (11 years old) not only can bring participants development in ICC to a varying extent but also have an impact on their personal growth and development in both the short-term and long-term perspectives. From both the young participants’ and the former participants’ reflections, it can be seen that participants’ intercultural communicative competence development and their personal
development is interrelated and intertwined in the process of intercultural learning. In other words, participants’ development in intercultural communicative competence in the journey to become intercultural cannot be separated from their personal development. The integrated development in both dimensions helps to prepare the participants to become competent intercultural communicators and global citizens.

10.3 Implications of findings

Overall, this mixed methods project provided preliminary evidence that this short-term, international (culture-general) children’s summer camp programme can have positive impact on participants’ intercultural development in both the short-term and long-term perspectives. The findings of the three studies in this project also help us to evaluate the theories and models of intercultural communicative competence that were reviewed in Chapters 2 and 3. The theoretical and methodological implications of the findings will be discussed in this section.

10.3.1 The model of ICC

The exploratory investigation of CISV participants’ intercultural development in both the short-term and long-term perspectives reported in this thesis offers some insight into the modelling of ICC. Firstly, the impact studies in this project offer empirical evidence to evaluate the various ICC models. The components identified in Byram’s (1997) general model of ICC are much related to participants’ intercultural development in current research. His model is also very useful for assessing participants’ intercultural development based on the analysis of their narratives. It is because the components of his model are explicitly explained and easy to follow. However, the scale of these components is a bit limited to cultural development in a L2 learning context. Deardorff’s (2004) process model of intercultural competence identifies certain attitudes, knowledge and skills as essential for intercultural communicative competence. The linkage between internal change and outcomes is a good angle from which to understand the process of an individual’s intercultural development. However, her model is difficult to apply and too complex to be used for assessing intercultural development. The skills and attributes of ICC identified by Chen and Starosta’s (1996) model are relevant to participants’ intercultural learning but not complete for understanding their intercultural development. Fantini’s (2000) model is
comprehensive but not explicit enough.

Secondly, the impact studies in this project suggest that the ability to establish intercultural interpersonal relationships (making intercultural friendship) should be an important component of ICC and an outcome of effective intercultural communication. On the one hand, the establishment of intercultural friendships can be regarded as the outcome of successful and long-term intercultural communication. On the other hand, the lasting intercultural friendships between the children can prompt further intercultural contact between them and thus enhance further development in other dimensions of ICC in the future. For the children in this project, establishing, expanding and maintaining friendship with peers from different cultural backgrounds constituted the primary aim as well as outcome of their intercultural learning. In fact, the importance of the ability to establish intercultural friendships for intercultural communication and effectiveness has been emphasized extensively in the early empirical work on the identification of ICC, by such as Hammer, Gudykunst and Wiseman (1978), Abe and Wiseman (1983), and Imahori and Lanigan (1989). However, it has been ignored in the more recently developed models of ICC (e.g. Byram, 1997; Deardorff, 2004).

Most of the ICC models are develop in a culture-specific learning context where learners are immersed in a particular culture or are learning a foreign language and culture (culture-specific learning). However, the variety of intercultural contact is far more complex than what has been presumed in the theories. For example, intercultural contact can happen between only two cultural groups or among multiple cultural groups. In terms of the depth of intercultural experience, in Shaules’s (2007) theory, there are deep intercultural experience and surface intercultural experience. These factors and the contextual factors (e.g. the camp, homestay, etc) of intercultural encounter will make a difference to an individual’s intercultural experience and need to be taken into account when we anticipate and assess their ICC development. Since the dynamics of intercultural experience is far more complex than the current models of ICC can cover, more ethnographic research of intercultural learning in different contexts is needed to refine the models of ICC.

10.3.2 Assessing the development of ICC

This project has methodological implication for assessing ICC development. As mentioned in Chapter 4, assessment of ICC development as an educational outcome of the
intercultural learning through IYE programmes or study abroad programmes at college
level has been important in the current effectiveness research. The longitudinal investigation
of the young CISV participants’ ICC development and the interview study of the former
participants’ ICC development in the long-term perspective of this project have some
suggestions to put forward on two key issues on ICC development assessment: 1) the
method of assessment and 2) the functions of ICC assessment.

The method of measuring ICC development has been recently discussed by Deardorff
(2004; 2008) in her Delphi study with experts in intercultural communication. Since no
single assessment instrument or method can assess all the aspects of ICC, intercultural
experts in her study agreed that it is important to use a variety of assessment methods in
measuring ICC. Although there are a few widely used instruments in intercultural training
and research, such as the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), the Cross-Cultural
Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) (Kelly & Meyers, 1993), none of these ICC assessment
instruments was deemed suitable for assessing 11-year-old children. Thus, the questionnaire
used for assessing the young CISV participants’ ICC development was specifically
developed by the researcher for the study. The results of this study suggest that the
combination of quantitative and qualitative measures in this longitudinal investigation
works very well. Although the quantitative measures can show the changes, probing
measures (open questions) seem to provide more information about the young participants’
changes or development in aspects of ICC. For the subject group in this study, the
qualitative measures or methods seem to be more reliable and effective in capturing the
longitudinal development of ICC than the quantitative ones. The qualitative measures
provide space for children to report their own understanding and development while the
quantitative measures cannot assume and cover all the potential and possible changes in the
developmental process. Moreover, Hammer (2005), who adopts a similar research design as
this longitudinal investigation, also uses a variety of methods including the IDI instrument
and students’ journals to carry out a solid investigation of AFS students’ longitudinal
development in ICC. A reliable quantitative instrument can be very useful in predicting the
extent of ICC development, but qualitative measures are essential for us to understand how
the participants reflect their development on ICC. Therefore, the combination of
quantitative and qualitative measures might be the effective approach to measuring the
longitudinal development of ICC and understanding participants’ process of intercultural
Second, this project provides an opportunity to reconsider the functions of ICC assessment in IYE. Traditionally, assessment of ICC is an important means to evaluate the effectiveness of an IYE programme in promoting participants’ intercultural learning. However, the assessment instruments are now used more often for broadly pedagogical and developmental purposes (Spencer-Oatey & Franklin, 2009). Byram, Gribkova, and Starkey (2002) argue “The role of assessment is therefore to encourage learners’ awareness of their own abilities in intercultural competence, and to help them realize that these abilities are acquired in many different circumstances inside and outside the classroom.” (p.26)

Self-assessment tools are in themselves a teaching and learning procedure which stimulates greater self-awareness and reflection in an individual and thus usefully form a phase in a guided development process. For example, the most recently released Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters by the Council of Europe is aimed to be used as both a self-evaluation and developmental tool to promote ICC development. The results of the ICC assessment months after the CISV Village experience in the short-term impact study suggest that it serves well as a self-evaluation tool to encourage children’s reflection on their past intercultural learning experiences in CISV Village camps and promote new changes. Deardorff (2008) points out that journals, blogs or papers with similar well-designed leading questions concerning the development of ICC can be used as a tool for participants’ reflection on the participants’ reentry - and even again after the initial reentry when possible.

10.4 Limitations of the studies

This project is the first substantial study which offers both interactional research of 11-year-old children’s intercultural learning in an international youth camp and short-term and long-term effectiveness evaluation of the intercultural learning experience. The combination of the three studies, especially the fieldwork in a CISV village which provides background knowledge about the context of participants’ intercultural learning experience, is one of the innovations this project brings to the field. The participant observation study of children’s interactions in group activities in a CISV Village camp is one of a very few studies (Baraldi, 2009b, among others) that have focused on (mis)understanding and negotiation in authentic intercultural interaction in intercultural youth exchange.
programmes, and thus uncovers many unique features of children’s intercultural learning experience in the camp. The longitudinal investigation of the impact of CISV Village experience on the young participants’ ICC development and their personal growth is also unique, because longitudinal research has been a striking omission in recent effectiveness research (Spencer-Oatey & Franklin, 2009). Finally, the interview study of former participants is also a good attempt to examine former participants’ reflection on the long-term impact of CISV Village experience on their ICC development and personal development, which is different from the majority long-term effectiveness research using self-report questionnaires. Despite the methodological significances, the studies in this project have some limitations.

- **Limitations of the participant observation study**

  The analysis of children’s interactions in group activities using English as a lingua franca in the participant observation study reported in Chapter 7 would be more rigorous if the interaction data is supplemented by participants’ feedback after the events. Such data can be collected by post-event playback or interviews (e.g. Spencer-Oatey & Xing, 2004; Ryhoo, 2005). It can provide very illuminating insights into the participants’ perception of the interaction and more objective evaluation of oneself and others’ performances.

- **Limitations of the questionnaire study**

  There are a few limitations of the questionnaire study. First, the sample size of both the CISV participants and control group is relatively small, although the return rates of the surveys in the longitudinal study are reasonable. This might limit the reliability of the statistical results of the quantitative measures. Second, the control group is not perfectly matched with the CISV group, as the children in the control group are slightly older than the CISV participants and they are not all from middle-class families while CISV participants are. It is impossible for the researcher to recruit a perfect-matching control group who are similar to CISV participants in all variables because of many practical constraints. As Dörnyei (2007) points out, in most educational settings it is rarely possible for the researcher to find fully equivalent groups. Working with ‘non-equivalent groups’ has thus become an accepted norm in research methodology in field studies where randomization is impossible or impractical.
Limitations of the semi-structured interview study

The generalisability of the findings of the interview study about the long-term impact of intercultural learning experience in a CISV Village reported in Chapter 9 is restricted by the fact that it only has nine interviewees in the inquiry who are from the same region of the UK. It would have been useful to sample more former participants and those who were from other regions or countries.

10.5 Practical implications for CISV

Despite the limitations of the three studies of this project, a number of practical implications for CISV, especially for its Village programme, can be suggested.

- In CISV camps, grouping for the activities should be better planned. Both the participants’ linguistic competence and the requirements of verbal communication during activities should be taken into consideration in grouping the children. In other words, do not single out the children with limited linguistic competence in the working language of the camp or put them in a difficult position for them to function in a group activity.

- To maximize the intercultural experience in a CISV camp, it might be important for the young participants to record their experiences and emotions in a diary or regular intercultural reflection journals. Through the process of articulating and critically reflecting on their experiences, they can deepen their understanding of the process (e.g. linguistic, cultural, personal) and the awareness of the intercultural encounters they have experienced in the camp. This should facilitate participants’ self-awareness (e.g. their strengths and limitations) and stimulate further learning.

- Children’s active participation in the group activities in a CISV village should be promoted more, especially those children who could not speak English (the official language for communication in CISV activities) very well or at all at a big disadvantage. Baraldi (2009b) has argued that ‘equitable distribution of opportunities for active participation and self-expression’, among others, is essential to ensure successful and active participation in intercultural communication.

- Except for the three orientations: preparation before the camp, guidance during the camp and evaluation after the camp, the reflection component months or years after the CISV experience should be included if possible. As discussed in section 10.3.4 of this
chapter, a questionnaire, journals, blogs or papers with well-designed leading questions about intercultural experiences and ICC development can be used months or years after the CISV participation as both a participant’s self-assessment tool and a tool to prompt young participants’ reflection of their intercultural learning.

10.6 Suggestions for future research

While the three studies reported in this thesis focused upon one specific international youth exchange programme, CISV Village programme, the findings offered in this thesis is of more general implication. In this section, the directions for future research in the field of intercultural learning and international youth exchange will be suggested.

- It might be interesting to investigate the short-term and long-term impact of CISV Village experience on the participants who are from non-English speaking countries, such as Japan or Korea, to see whether the factor of linguistic competence in the working language of the camp (e.g. English) makes any difference to their intercultural experiences in the camps and their longitudinal intercultural development.

- More research on the interactional strategies of participants’ intercultural interactions during their intercultural experiences in the IYEs is needed to understand their process of intercultural learning. Natural interaction data with host family members or friends from different cultural grounds could provide a more explicit angle into participants’ intercultural learning in the setting.

- Ethnographic research of intercultural learning is needed in a variety of contexts to refine current models of intercultural communicative competence.

- More refined longitudinal research is needed to understand participants’ longitudinal intercultural transformation and development as a result of their experiences in IYEs and the enduring residual effects of IYEs.

- Comparative studies between different IYE programmes, such as culture-general and culture-specific IYE programmes, short-term and long-term programmes, and programmes in different formats (e.g. service learning, cultural learning, international camp), would be useful to examine the impact of these variables of IYEs on participants’ intercultural learning. The results would be beneficial for improving the design and organization of IYE programmes.

- Finally, the focus of IYE effectiveness research should shift from the participants in
western countries to non-western countries. The majority of current effectiveness research focuses on the intercultural learning of young people in Western countries. And our knowledge about the effectiveness of IYEIs is mostly based on the reports of young Westerners. In order to avoid the western-biased arguments, more effectiveness research needs to target non-western participants.
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Appendix I: Transcripts of Children’s Interactions in Group Activities

Transcription convention
Transcription Convention (adopted from Atkinson and Heritage, 1984)
[[ ]] Simultaneous utterances – (beginning [ ] and ( end ])
[ ] Overlapping utterances – (beginning [ ) and ( end ])
= Contiguous utterances
(0.4) Represents the tenths of a second between utterances
(.) Represents a micro-pause (1 tenth of a second or less)
: Sound extension of a word (more colons demonstrate longer stretches)
, Fall in tone (not necessarily the end of a sentence)
, Continuing intonation (not necessarily between clauses)
- An abrupt stop in articulation
? Rising inflection (not necessarily a question)
__ Underline words indicate emphasis
↑↓ Rising or falling intonation (after an utterance)
° ° Surrounds talk that is quieter
hhh Audible aspirations
·hhh Inhalations
.hh. Laughter within a word
> < Utterances delivered at a quicker pace than the surrounding talk
(( )) Analyst’s notes

In addition, Japanese is transcribed in Italics; English translation is given in parenthesis.

Transcript of Episode 1: Skiing game

Turns 1-11
01 Basel: Guys, listen, I am gonna say right left side. When I say [right] (.)
02 Satoko: [Okay.]
03 Basel: [Left (. right) okay? ((demonstrating his order by pulling his legs and walking towards Kuri and gazing at him))
04 Kuri: [ Left, right, okay. ((Nodding head))
05 Satoko: hai supeppu, wakaru? ((Turning to Kuri))
(Step, do you understand?) (Japanese pronunciation of word “step”)
06 Kuri: Wakankan wakaru [sorekurai nara wakaru (yo)]
(I said that I understand. I can understand such [simple] words.)
07 Satoko: Left wa hidari dakaran ((giggling))
(Left is left).
(2.0)
08 Basel: We are ready.
(2.0)
09 Satoko: Here and here and…
10 Basel: Yeah, like thi::s and then THIS ((pointing the directions with his fingers))
11 Satoko: Alright
Turns 34-238

34 Annika: Are you ready? (some Japanese utterances of Satoko)
35 Children: Yeah
36 Pit: Yeah, go go
37 Basel: Right, left.
38 Basel: Is that left?
39 Annika: Don’t step on the [grass.
40 Pit: [Left, left left
41 Kuri: [Left, left]
42 Basel: Left
43 Kuri: wo::, a ite (ouch)
44 Satoko: Well, okay.
45 Basel: Right, left.
46 Satoko: ze ((Sound of trying to say something)) ((unintelligible))
47 Annika: Yeah, very well. ((Sound of clapping))
48 Basel: Ri::ght le::ft, guys, [you go up once].
49 Annika: [Don’t step on] the grass.
50 Satoko: hashito kawatte ageyouka?
(Do you want to switch the position with me?)
51 Kuri: imasara murida.
(It’s impossible now.)
52 Basel: Right, ri::ght, left, right, left Satoko tell Kuri to: help to help us with the [ro:].
53Satoko: [Okay] migi, migi (Right, right)
54 Basel: With the ropes.
55 Kuri: [dakara migi agero] ttendakedo ((voice of being impatient))
(I already said ‘pull your right leg up’.)
56 Basel: [Ri:ght.]
57 Basel: Le::ft ()
58 Pit: You can come here.
59 Basel: Le::ft ((moving the right leg when saying ‘left’))
()
60 Basel: Right, right ()
61 Kuri: ((inaudible Japanese utterances))
62 Pit: You can come here=
63 Basel: =Turn le:ft.
64 Annika: Here () this [way].
65 Basel: [Left].
66 Annika: Yeah, [that’s good].
67 Satoko: [kocchino, hij]darini kite (Come to the left.)
68 Basel: Right () left right () quickly now.
69 Satoko: >hayaku, hayaku () Kuri, hayaku.<
(quickly, quickly)       (quickly)

70 Kuri: [Ah:] ((down voice))

71 Basel: [Ri::ght (-) ri::ght]

72 Kuri: [yatterundakedo. nande agan’naino?]
(I’m doing though, why can’t I pull it up?)

73 Basel: [Ri::ght].

74 Kuri: [nande agan’naino?] darega funbatteruno?
(Why I can’t pull it up? Who keeps the ski stop?)

75 Basel: [Right]

76 Satoko: .hhhhhh ((laughter))

77 Annika: ↑Ah::

78 Basel: °Left°
(Kuri stepped on the grass)

79 Annika: Oh::, Kuri next time next…

80 Satoko: What?

81 Basel: Okay (-), ri::ght.

82 Annika: Next time [don’t step] on the grass.

83 Basel: [Le::ft big ] steps

84 Satoko: ((inaudible Japanese word)) (-)

85 Basel: Can you tell him big steps?

86 Satoko: I’ll gige ((unintelligible))

87 Basel: Ri::ght (-) le::ft (-) ri::ght (-) le::ft
(0.5)

88 Basel: Okay, now, turn to the right le::ft.

89 Annika: You have to go to this way. ((pointing to the right))

90 Satoko: ((inaudible word))

91 Kuri: ore?
(Me?)

92 Basel: Left, Le::ft, [yeah]

93 Annika: [Yeah], very well

94 Annika: You are really good.

95 Pit: Good, guys.

96 Basel: [Right]

97 Kuri: Ri::ght

98 Satoko: agete, ashi, Oh sorry ((patting her hand on Maxim by mistake))
(pull up your leg)

99 Basel: Guys, ri::ght

100 Kuri: Ri::ght

101 Pit: Right.

102 Maxim: Right

103 Basel: [Ri::ght]

104 Kuri: [Ri::ght]

105 Basel: Ri::ght.

106 Kuri: Ah:: ((voice of disappointment))

107 Annika: Oh, you have to go backwards two steps.

108 Satoko: What, two steps?

109 Annika: Yeah.
Satoko: Go on?

Annika: You go down go down here (.), please.

Kuri: Er: ((voice of disappointment))

Annika: Go down here, please (.) okay and start here again.

Satoko: *ushiro.* (Back)

Annika: Don’t step on the grass.

((Satoko swapped the position with Maxim))

Basel: Okay right

Kuri: *ne, nande agan’naino?* (Why doesn’t move forward?)

Basel: [Ri::ght.

Satoko: *(inaudible word)* ((pointing to Maxim’s right leg))

Maxim: Right.

Basel: Left

Kuri: Left *dayo.* (It is “left.”)

Basel: guys, quickly push ((turning backwards to the other group members))

Satoko: =Okay

Basel: Right

Kuri: Left

Basel: [Left, yeah, right

Kuri: Right

Basel: Left

Basel: Right,left (0.5) Do it quickly yeah, right,

Basel: Left, right, left, right

Annika: Be careful that you don’t (.) step on the grass, ski on the other.

Basel: [Right Left, right

Annika: [O::kay, now you are on the right

Basel: [Right

Annika: One two three

Basel: [Right

Kuri: [Ri::ght ((struggling to pull up the rope of right handsde))

Satoko: Kuri Kuri, *kocchi* ((patting her right leg))

Kuri: *nan’nandayo mo:.* (What’s the hell going on?)

Annika: Right Is all look (.) be careful do not step on the grass, okay?

Basel: [Left, left, left, one two three 47:46:72 (1.0)

Basel: [Right, one two three, left, one two three

Kuri: *[nande kon’na (inaudible) iban maeno hitoga nanimo dekitenainjan]?* (Why is it so [inaudible]? why the first up front person doesn’t do anything?)

Basel: Right, one two three one

Pit: =Come on guys

Basel: Left [quickly, quickly, quickly
148 Pit: [Left
149 Kuri: LE::FT.
150 Pit: You have to
151 Basel: Right
152 Pit: Pull up your feet
153 Satoko: [Yeah
154 Pit: Your foot
155 Basel: Left
156 Pit: Ei, right, up, good.
157 Satoko: Maxim, up ((inaudible Japanese word))
158 Maxim: I know.
159 Satoko: Yeah.
160 Basel: Left
161 Pit: Left yeah, that was a good one
162 Basel: [Right
163 Pit: Yeah, good one. ((sound of clapping))
164 Basel: Left
165 Pit: Left (. ) yeah, that was good.
166 Basel: Right.
167 Satoko: [migiashi
(right leg)
168 Kuri: Dekiru
(I can. It’s possible)
169 Pit: hhhhhh. ((laughter))
170 Pit: That’s good. That’s good.
171 Annika: That’s good:::, really good
172 Annika: Just go straight now, go straight, in the middle
173 Basel: Right
174 Satoko: ER:::
175 Kuri: RIGHT
176 Basel: Right, one two three
177 Pit: Yeah,(( sound of clapping))
((Kuri didn’t balanced well and fell and sat on the grass; the other group members are laughing ))
178 Satoko: Ah hhhhhh. ((laughter))
179 Kuri: konoyaro::
(Jerk!)
180 Annika: [It’s all right,it’s all right, sat on the … It’s all right.
181 Pit: He’s, he’s a bit a bit too small.
182 Kuri: nandesa maeni zenzen (inaudible)?
(Why can’t we move forward at all?)
183 Basel: Arabic ((being angry and throwing away the ropes))
184 Pit: Oh no, Basel, calm down
185 Annika: [What are you doing? What are you doing?
186 Pit: Calm down, calm down.
187 Annika: =I have to give you minus points if you do it again.
188 Pit: Le::ft
189 Kuri: Left
231

190 Pit: Left, yeah, a good one
191 Annika: Okay.
192 Satoko: hhhhh. ((laughter))
193 Annika: That's five seconds left, come on.
194 Basel: Right
195 Kuri: [Ri::ght
196 Pit: Yeah.
197 Basel: Left.
198 Pit: Yeah
199 Annika: Don’t step on each other’s feet
200 Basel: Right
201 Pit: Right
202 Kuri: [Ri::ght
203 Satoko: Come on
204 Kuri: \((inaudible)\)nanimo wakatte nainoka?
(Doesn’t she/he understand at all?)
205 Annika: One two three
(1.0)
206 Pit: Yeah
207 Basel: Left, one two three
208 Pit: wow, wow, that was close
209 Annika: Yeah, that was close
210 Basel: Right
211 Pit: Right
212 Kuri: dokomade ikundayo
(Where are we going to until/where is the destination? modality: quite arrogant)
213 Basel: Left, right, big step
214 Pit: Yeah
215 Basel: [Left
216 Pit: Left, left, Kuri (.)Yeah
217 Basel: Right
218 Pit: You have to get the whole…
219 Basel: Left
220 Pit: Yeah, Maxim
221 Basel: Right
222 Kuri: \(mo::(complaining utterance)\) sokokara tomeyou anmari \((inaudible)\)
(Let’s stop there. No more [inaudible])
223 Basel: Left
224 Annika: Yeah, you are nearly there
225 Basel: Right
226 Pit: Come on, the whole, whole ski must be over the line
227 Basel: [Yeah
228 Pit: Yeah
229 Annika: Wow
230 Basel: Right
231 Pit: Yeah, come on
232 Basel: [Left
232 Pit: One more step.
233 Annika: One more, one more
234 Basel: [Right
235 Pit: Yeah::: ((voice of clapping))
236 Annika: Wow, really good
((Kuri spontaneously went to Basel and clapped right hand with Basel.))
237 Pit: Yeah. Wow ((clapping right hand with Basel))

Transcript for Episode 2: Bridge-building Game

01 Mariel: I’ll give you, like thirty seconds to map out how you guys want to do it.
((Shifty picks up a small plank.))
02 Sophia: Use this small one up here and
03 Shifty: Small one ((Using figure to show the positions to put small planks))
04 Sophia: [Small, small, small, small] ((Using her figures to show the directions))
05 Shifty: [Small, small, small, small], then we got that big, long one at the end and then small again
06 Viliato: [lala..((Using his figures to direct the positions for planks))
07 Sophia: [We kind like
08 Josie: [Are they kind of all small?
09 Sophia: We can like, if it’s not long enough pass the long one going that way ((looking at Shifty))
10 Shifty: Yeah, you don’t have to, someone helps to take that one.
11 Mariel: Wait, wait, wait. I need to time it, you can’t start.
12 Shifty: Okay
13 Mariel: So are you guys okay? Do you guys understand?
14 Sophia: Yeah.
( . )
15 Sophia: ↑Ready.
16 Belen: [No no no]. ((Pushing Mellisa to stand a bit back))
((Both Georg and Viliato hold a small plank and are ready to build the bridge))
17 Georg: [This is for] this and this for this this ((Looking at Viliato))
18 Mariel: Wait I’m gonna give you ten seconds okay(.) ten(1.0) nine(0.5)eight(.) seven (. ) six(.) five(.)
19 Sophia: Me first. ((Putting up hands and waving))
20 Mariel: Four (. ) [three (. ) two:.(.) one (. ) go
21 Shifty: [Sophia you have to carry a small one
22 Shifty: Pass it.
23 Shifty: [Sophia goes off the first to stand on the plank that Georg just put on])
24 Shifty: Pass it.
((Georg passes the plank to Sophia and Sophia put it on the top of two wheels.))
25 Shifty: Long enough?
26 Georg: °This is the one°.
27 Shifty: Yeah then pass that one along
28 Josie: Be Careful.
((Josie is helping Georg to carry the plank.))
29 Georg: °Take it°.
30 Shifty: Is it long enough to go through there?
31 Josie: °Do we, can we have it? °
(1.0)
32 Shifty: Yeah nice one
33 Sophia: Wait, okay go on
34 Shifty: Make sure that it’s on safely.
35 Josie: Yeah, I don’t think we have enough.
(0.5)
36 Shifty: At the end we will pick this one up and pass it.
37 Josie: (inaudible)
(2.0)
((Sophie put another plank on the top of another two wheels and walked several steps further.))
38 Shifty: Okay, do you want to…
39 Sophia: Do we have enough planks?
40 Shifty: Pass this one along.
41 Josie: keke ((coughing))
(1.0)
42 Shifty: °Go° (. Uhh, can everyone hold on to this a bit so you can pass it along the line.
(1.0)
((Viliato is passing a long plank.))
43 Shifty: Okay we are all
44 Georg: [I think this
45 Viliato: [GO MAKOTO ((Viliato is lifting the long plank and passing it to Makoto.))]
46 Makoto: hai
(Yes)
47 Shifty: [Go on and hold it.]
48 Mariel: [How long do you ] (. take you guys to finish rest of the tasks?
49 Josie: Um, seven.
50 Shifty: [Seven minutes, twenty-four seconds
51 Sophia: [Seven minutes (. ) Wait
(3.0)
((Josie and Georg pass the long plank to Sophia and Sophia tries to hold it, which is too heavy for her)).
52 Josie: I am afraid that it might be too long.
53 Shifty: Do you want to pass it and
54 Sophia: This is a bit too long.
(1.0)
55 Georg: Too:: long::::. ((Turning back and looking at Shifty))
56 Josie: It’s okay, it’s fine.
(1.0)
57 Shifty: Okay, everyone hold it.
58 Josie: [Careful we all have to help each other.
59 Makoto: [Geo:rg, Geo::rg] ((Lifting another plank and tries to pass it to Georg))
60 Shifty: Everyone just get at least one hand to it.
61 Georg: Okay, hh er ((Sound of trying very hard to carry the plank))
(2.0)
62 Sophia: Uh:::
63 Shifty: ((inaudible)) ((giggling voice))
64 Josie: Are you okay? ((Turning towards Sophia and staring at her move))
(1.0)
((Georg helps Sophia to put the plank on the top of wheels but fails.))
65 Josie: Maybe we should have like (.) like a strong person at the front.
66 Sophia: [Move there
67 Shifty: Do you want to (.) pass this? ((Lifting another plank and passing it to Mellisa))
68 Josie: Sophia [touch it
69 Shifty: Get everyone to hold it?
70 Viliato: Go::: Mako::to:::.
71 Josie: Touch TOUCH it don’t
72 Georg: [You can touch.
73 Mariel: [You can leave it down.
74 Shifty: Leave [it down.
75 Sophia: [Makoto
((Sophia is too small for the heavy planks and she needs others' help.))
76 Makoto: Yes ((Turing back and getting the plank passed by Viliato)).
77 Sophia: You can let it touch? ((Turing around and looking at Makoto))
78 Josie: Okay Sophia I think you should go back okay?
79 Mariel: Wait wait, do you need another chunk for that?
80 Georg: [No.]
81 Shifty: [Yeah] (.) someone walk on that plank and then put another one
82 Sophia Me. ((Putting her left hand up))
(1.0)
83 Mariel: And then put another one
84 Georg: OH
((They finally touch wheel on the other side and Sophia walks to the end
of the plank.))
85 Shifty: Okay pass this
86 Sophia: [Wait
87 Mariel: [You get
(1.0)
88 Sophia: Pass it
89 Josie: You hold on
90 Belen: [Makoto
91 Marisa: [Makoto
92 Makoto: Ahh.
93 Mariel: You got to put down on top of the other one.
94 Shifty: Yeah put on top (0.5) yeah that’s right.
(1.0)
((Sophia is connecting two planks to set up the bridge.))
95 Sophia: Wait, move it back a little.
96 Georg: ((inaudible))
97 Sophia: We have
Josie: You need someone you have to stay there and kind of hold it so that it’s steadier, right okay.

Belen: *Al reves, al reves*

(Turn it around! Turn it around!)

Viliato: Hhhhhhh(laughter)

Josie: Okay.

(Josie walks to Sophia’s side.)

Makoto: Josie

Georg: No, wait.

((Makoto wants to pass a plank to Josie, but Georg holds it and wants to wait for a while.))

(Josie walks to Sophia’s side.)

Makoto: Josie

Georg: Pass it for me

(3.0) (Georg walks to Josie and Sophia’s side.)

Shifty: Guys now pass this last one. The last one we need

Belen: Makoto [Makoto wait ((Makoto is trying to walk)]

Georg: [Makoto no Makoto no

Sophia: You two have to stand up here


Shifty: Okay, pass it along.

(5.0) (Makoto is passing the last plank to Josie and Georg.)

Sophia: Ee (sound of alerting)

Josie: (inaudible)

Belen: No no no no no no. ((Tuning back to Marisa and pointing to Marisa’s legs))

Shifty: [Be careful

Josie: One more step, step.

((Sophia and Georg walk towards the end of the bridge and reach the land.))

Sophia: Keep on going

Shifty: Okay now everyone go on it.

Sophia: *“Come on”*

Georg: Go go go (1.0) the time. come.

Sophia: Go go go go go go

Georg: Go go go go go go

Josie: Somebody has to step on the green bit otherwise it’s gonna to fall.

Shifty: Get two people on the green a bit if you want. You won’t need it for me.

Sophia: Okay Makoto [go (.) go go Makoto

Georg: [Go Makoto, go Makoto]

(3.0) (Makoto walks to the end of the bridge and reach the land.)

Marisa: Wait, Belen. Wait, Belen.

Sophia: Wait. No, Belen ↑wait ↑wait ↑[wait ((using her hand to show “stop”))

Josie: Wait a minute

Makoto: Stop. ((Using his hands to show “stop” to Belen.))

Sophia: Go go Marisa go
131 Shifty: Go go go
132 Sophia: [Okay, go.
133 Josie: [Okay, right. Marisa, you have to step on the green a bit.
134 Sophia: >Stay there stay there< both of you stay there.
135 Josie: Okay Belen
136 Sophia: Stay go Belen come, come ((Beckoning her right hand to Belen))
137 Georg: [Come].
((Belen walks down to the end of the bridge and arrives at the land.))
138 Sophia: No no no no no no stay stay ((Using her right hand to show “stop” to Marisa))
139 Makoto: Marisa, ugokuna ((Using his right hand to show “stop” to Marisa))
(Marisa, don’t move!)
140 Sophia: Go [go Viliato go Viliato
141 Josie: [Go Viliato. ((Beckoning her left hand to Viliato))
142 Sophia: [Go Viliato ((Beckoning her right hand to Viliato))
143 Makoto: mada mada mada ((A gesture of “stop” to Marisa with his left hand))
(Not yet. Not yet. Not yet)
144 Josie: Okay Shifty
145 Sophia: Okay Marisa
((Marisa moves a bit forward.))
146 Josie: [Come Marisa
147 Sophia: Stay there [STAY THERE Mellisa stay there].
148 Josie: [Stay there Mellisa Okay okay].
149 Sophia: Marisa
150 Josie: Marisa (.). Stay there Mellisa (.). Shifty go
151 Viliato: Ahh..hh…. ((Sound of struggling))((He loses the balance on the plank))
152 Sophia: Go Shifty.
153 Shifty: Just go
154 Josie: Okay be careful careful that’s it
155 Sophia: Go:: go::: go Mellisa
156 Shifty: Okay go
((Mellisa passes the last part of the bridge.))
157 Josie: [Quickly quickly
158 Sophia: [Go go go ] go go go (. ) go go Shifty go Shifty go Shifty Woo::
((Makoto and Josie clap their own hands.))
159 Mariel: Six minutes fifty seconds.
160 Sophia: Wow::
161 Mariel: What’s the name of your group?
162 Josie: "Pirate"
163 Sophia: [Paper Pirate.
164 Georg: [Paper Pirate.
Appendix II: Questionnaires for the Short-term Impact Study

Pre-village Questionnaire

We assure you that your responses are absolutely confidential. Your answers will help us to improve the educational programme of CISV.

1. Boy □ Girl □

2. Date of Birth ___________________ (DD/MM/YYYY)

3. How many languages can you speak apart from English? ___________ languages.
   a) Which languages are they?
   L 2 ________________
   L 3 ________________
   L 4 ________________

   b) How well can you speak these languages?
   Very well □ Some □ Just a little □
   Very well □ Some □ Just a little □
   Very well □ Some □ Just a little □

4. Do you have friends who can speak a different language? Yes □ No □

5. Have you travelled to other countries in the past? Yes □ No □
   If yes, please tell us which countries.

Please rate the following statements on a 5 point scale indicating to what extent you agree or disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>unsure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. I like to play with children from different cultures.

7. I am interested in learning about other cultures.

8. I like to listen to songs in other languages (e.g., Italian songs, Spanish songs).

9. I am interested in learning other languages.

10. I find it hard to have a conversation with my friend if he or she can not speak English.

11. I feel uncomfortable when I sit at a table next to someone of a different culture.

12. I am worried about living together with friends from other countries.

13. I feel confident when I am doing a task together with children from other cultures.

14. I always try to understand others who have a different cultural background when I disagree with them.

15. I am happy to change my mind if my friends with different cultures give me better reasons.

16. I would like to try some new food apart from English food (e.g., Italian food, Chinese food).

17. I am happy to share my stories and experiences with my friends with different cultures.
18. Please make a sentence which contains the word ‘culture’.

19. What will you do if your friends from other cultures use expressions or gestures that you don’t understand when you are working or playing with them? If you are going to ask them to explain, how?

20. What do you expect from the CISV Village which you are going to attend soon?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire! Please return it before you go to the CISV Village.

Date of filling in this questionnaire _____________________ (DD/MM/YYYY)
After -village Questionnaire

We assure you that your responses are absolutely confidential. Your answers will help us to improve the educational programmes of CISV.

(If you have completed this section in the last questionnaire in July, please go straight to question 6.)

1. Boy ☐ Girl ☐

2. Date of Birth ________________ (DD/MM/YYYY)

3. How many languages can you speak apart from English? ___________ languages.
   a) Which languages are they?  
   b) How well can you speak these languages?
      L 2 ______________________ Very well ☐ Some ☐ Just a little ☐
      L 3 ______________________ Very well ☐ Some ☐ Just a little ☐
      L 4 ______________________ Very well ☐ Some ☐ Just a little ☐

4. Do you have friends who can speak a different language? Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Have you travelled to other countries in the past? Yes ☐ No ☐
   If yes, please tell us which countries.

Please rate the following statements on a 5 point scale indicating to what extent you agree or disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>unsure</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. I like to play with children from different cultures.

7. I am interested in learning about other cultures.

8. I like to listen to songs in other languages (e.g., Italian songs, Spanish songs).

9. I am interested in learning other languages.

10. I find it hard to have a conversation with my friend if he or she can not speak English.

11. I feel uncomfortable when I sit at a table next to someone of a different culture.

12. I am worried about living together with friends from other countries.

13. I feel confident when I am doing a task together with children from other cultures.

14. I always try to understand others who have a different cultural background when I disagree with them.

15. I am happy to change my mind if my friends with different cultures give me better reasons.

16. I would like to try some new food apart from English food (e.g., Italian food, Chinese food).

17. I am happy to share my stories and experiences with my friends with different cultures.
18. Please make a sentence which contains the word ‘culture’.

19. Which Village did you go to this summer? How much did you enjoy the Village? Which activity did you enjoy the most and why? Which activity did you enjoy the least and why?

20. What did you do when your friends from other cultures used expressions or gestures that you didn’t understand when you were working or playing with them in the camp?

21. Please tell us a story about an experience which you had with friends from another culture in the CISV Village (If you run out of space, please use another sheet we provide).

22. What did you learn from your experience in the CISV Village this summer?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire! Please return it soon after you finish it.

Date of filling in this questionnaire: ________________ (DD/MM/YYYY)
Follow-up Questionnaire

We assure you that your responses are absolutely confidential. Your answers will help us to improve the educational programmes of CISV.

(If you filled in this section Q 1-5 in any of the past two questionnaires, please go straight to question 6.)

1. Boy □ Girl □

2. Date of Birth ____________________ (DD/MM/YYYY)

3. How many languages can you speak apart from English? ___________ languages.
   a) Which languages are they?
   b) How well can you speak these languages?

   L 2 ____________________________
   Very well □ Some □ Just a little □

   L 3 ____________________________
   Very well □ Some □ Just a little □

   L 4 ____________________________
   Very well □ Some □ Just a little □

4. Do you have friends who can speak a different language? Yes □ No □

5. Have you travelled to other countries in the past? Yes □ No □
   If yes, please tell us which countries.

Please rate the following statements on a 5 point scale indicating to what extent you agree or disagree.

6. I like to play with children from different cultures.

7. I am interested in learning about other cultures.

8. I like to listen to songs in other languages (e.g., Italian songs, Spanish songs).

9. I am interested in learning other languages.

10. I find it hard to have a conversation with my friend if he or she can not speak English.

11. I feel uncomfortable when I sit at a table next to someone of a different culture.

12. I am worried about living together with friends from other countries.

13. I feel confident when I am doing a task together with children from other cultures.

14. I always try to understand others who have a different cultural background when I disagree with them.

15. I am happy to change my mind if my friends with different cultures give me better reasons.

16. I would like to try some new food apart from English food (e.g., Italian food, Chinese food).

17. I am happy to share my stories and experiences with my friends with different cultures.
18. Please make a sentence which contains the word ‘culture’.

19. After returning home, have you been maintaining contact with your friends in CISV camp? If yes, how and how often?

20. Do you find yourself more confident in communicating with someone from other cultures? If yes, please give us an example.

21. As a result of your intercultural experience in CISV camp, how do you think you have changed? (please comment)

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire! Please return it by 15th, June, 2007.
Date of filling in this questionnaire_______________________ (DD/MM/YYYY)
Questionnaire for Control Group

Children’s Intercultural Competence Questionnaire

We assure you that your responses are absolutely confidential.

1. Name ______________ (optional)
2. Boy ☐ Girl ☐
3. Date of Birth _______ (DD/MM/YYYY)
4. How many languages can you speak apart from English? ___________ languages.
   a) Which languages are they? 
   b) How well can you speak these languages?
   L 2 _______________
   Very well ☐ Some ☐ Just a little ☐
   L 3 _______________
   Very well ☐ Some ☐ Just a little ☐
   L 4 _______________
   Very well ☐ Some ☐ Just a little ☐

5. Do you have friends who can speak a different language? Yes ☐ No ☐
6. Have you travelled to other countries in the past? Yes ☐ No ☐
   If yes, please tell us which countries.

Please rate the following statements on a 5 point scale indicating to what extent you agree or disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. I like to play with children from different cultures.
   ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

8. I am interested in learning about other cultures.
   ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

9. I like to listen to songs in other languages (e.g., Italian songs, Spanish songs).
   ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

10. I am interested in learning other languages.
    ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

11. I find it hard to have a conversation with my friend if he or she cannot speak English.
    ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

12. I feel uncomfortable when I sit at a table next to someone of a different culture.
    ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

13. I am worried about living together with friends from other countries.
    ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

14. I feel confident when I am doing a task together with children from other cultures.
    ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

15. I always try to understand others who have a different cultural background when I disagree with them.
    ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

16. I am happy to change my mind if my friends with different cultures give me better reasons.
    ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

17. I would like to try some new food apart from English food (e.g., Italian food, Chinese food).
    ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

18. I am happy to share my stories and experiences with my friends with different cultures.
    ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
19. Please make a sentence which contains the word ‘culture’.

20. What will you do if your friends from other cultures use expressions or gestures that you don’t understand when you are working or playing with them? If you are going to ask them to explain, how?

21. Please tell us a story about an experience which you had with friends from another culture? This could be a visit to your friend’s house, a birthday party or a trip abroad etc (Please continue on another sheet, if you run out of space).

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire!
Date of filling in this questionnaire_______________________ (DD/MM/YYYY)
Appendix III: Interview Guide for the Long-term Impact Study

Name: __________ Date: ___________________ Place of interview: ________________

Background information on interviewees
1. What is your profession?
2. What is your educational background?
3. What subject(s) did you study at college or high school?

Questions relating to CISV experience
4. When did you participate in a CISV Village programme? Where was the camp?
5. What motivated you to take part in the CISV Village programme at that time?
6. Can you still remember the camp? Tell me something about your experience in the camp.
7. What has been the most impressive part of your experience in the CISV camp? Why?
8. Did you participate in any other CISV programmes after your Village experience? Why?
9. How do you compare your other CISV experiences and your Village experience?
10. Are you still involved with CISV now? Why?

Questions about the impact of CISV Village experience
12. How do you think the influence of your CISV Village experience might have been on you?
13. Do you feel that your CISV experience helped to develop your intercultural competence? In what aspects?
14. What languages do you speak? Did your multilingual experience in the CISV camp help to raise your interest in learning other foreign languages later on? Why?
15. Do you feel that your CISV experience helped to develop your communication skills in the long-term perspective?
16. From a retrospective view, what impact has your CISV Village experience had on your personal growth and development?
17. What impact do you feel that your CISV experience has had on your life path? Why?
18. Apart from your CISV experience, what other important intercultural experiences in your life have you had? Please describe some of them.
19. Will you let your children take part in these kinds of international youth exchange programmes? Why?
20. What would you say has been the overall impact of your CISV experience on you?
21. What do you think is the uniqueness of your CISV experience?
22. Do you think that 11 is a good age for starting intercultural learning? Give me your reasons.
23. What hope do you have for CISV? What improvement would you recommend for the organization - CISV and its Village programme?