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ABSTRACT

StARR STUDY ABROAD RE-ENTRY RETREAT: A TRAINER’S GUIDE

By Janet Meadows

Master of Science in Counseling,
College Counseling and Student Services

This proposal is for the development of a trainers’ guide which describes lessons to conduct with American study abroad students returning from their sojourn in the format of a one-day retreat. The trainers guide will be used to plan and implement a re-entry retreat for their students at their own institution. The goal for this instructional product is for American Undergraduates to minimize the effects of reverse culture shock upon return from a semester of study abroad. This type of product is needed because returnees experience adjustment issues and changes in values, relationships, skills and abilities. Reverse culture shock is a transition and addressing it provides the student with the opportunity for intercultural transformation. The retreat will assist the study abroad professionals to provide integrated learning experiences so that in and out-of-class experiences can be more relatable instead of fragmented.
CHAPTER ONE

Introduction to the Project

"Travel is fatal to prejudice, bigotry, and narrow-mindedness." Mark Twain

Many American undergraduates are attracted to studying abroad and the idea that it is a life-changing adventure. By doing so, they will have the opportunity to experience the world. With hundreds of programs available to choose from, it can be exciting for students to consider the prospect of immersing themselves in another group's daily practices and language.

When students study abroad, they encounter the host country, and, as well, they encounter themselves. They have the opportunity to reflect on their own values and their national identity (Dolby, 2004). They benefit from the opportunity to appreciate different points of view, gain perspective, and cultivate their ability to reside in an interdependent global society (Walker, 1999).

The opportunity to grow and develop is at the forefront of their daily experience, as little of their daily environment or experiences are similar to their home lives. However, it is also a challenge for study abroad students to be outsiders in a foreign country (Hartung, 2002). These challenges include learning a new language while simultaneously deriving a sense of self and of the new culture. The sojourners question things that the host nationals take for granted as a part of everyday living. It takes time for students to adopt the countries' cultural patterns and for the students to feel as though they belong. Despite the challenges, study abroad students often transform from new strangers to acculturated sojourners.
Impact of Study Abroad

The impact of study abroad on student development is as yet inconclusive. There are though, generally three areas in which development has been found to occur: in their global perspective, personal development, and (as relevant) in language acquisition (Carlson, Burn, Useem, & Yachimovicz, 1990; Gillespie & Slawson, 2002; McCabe, 1994).

Global perspective

Students develop a global perspective through study abroad experiences. For example, students may participate in a Semester at Sea program in order to develop cross-cultural understanding by both spending time on board and in port. McCabe (1994) found increases in five dimensions of global perspective through being involved in a study abroad program: students' degree of openness, ability to classify people from other cultures as being the same and/or different, cross-cultural understanding, ability to embrace positive and negative aspects of American culture, and increased level of globalcentrism.

Personal development

Participating in study abroad influences students’ career choices, future international work, as well as personal and social development. The top two ratings of personal and social development were “learned something new about myself,” and “allowed me to better understand my own cultural values and biases” (Gillespie & Slawson, 2002). Of the students who participated in an internship abroad, 64% reported that it assisted their career (Gillespie & Slawson). When comparing a study abroad group to a home group, there were no significant differences for the initial scores. But the study
Language acquisition

When students return home, improved language skills was in the top five characteristics of their study abroad experience (Raschio, 1987). For students who study where English is not the primary language, learning a foreign language can be a highlight of the experience. Language acquisition is an important factor for students in integrating into the host institution (Carlson, Burn, Useem, & Yachimovicz, 1990). Study abroad students were found to increase their commitment to foreign language learning and 40% of study abroad alumni were still using their host country language regularly (Gillespie & Slawson, 2002).

When Study Abroad Ends

When the experience is over, students say “good bye” to new friends and to the adventure they took part in. Some may believe that this chapter in their lives is over, and place their memorabilia in a box, to only take it out occasionally and reminisce (LaBrack, 1993; Martin & Harrell, 2004). It is also not common for the sojourner to anticipate challenges upon arriving back in the U.S. since the challenge they experienced was the study abroad (Adler, 1981; Christofi & Thompson, 2007; Gaw, 2000; Rogers and Ward, 1993). They expect to return home to a familiar place, but they have changed and the familiarity is often lost.

For example, upon re-entry, one person that Koehler (1986) interviewed was shocked to find out that everything in her home country was not as perfect and problem-free as she remembered. Koehler asks, “Who would ever expect to feel like a stranger in
her own country?" (1986, p. 91). Students return to their home institution, their friends and family with new skills and values. Some of these things may have changed or stayed the same. The student is faced with the task of reintegrating back into the home country and to their old life.

Statement of the Problem

Re-entry after study abroad has been shown to result in a variety of struggles for the returning sojourners (Hess, 1997; Porterfield, 2002; Rohrligh & Martin, 1991; Sussman, 2001; Uehara, 1986). Returning home is not as simple as picking up where one left off. Students may experience what is called reverse culture shock, which will be reviewed in detail in Chapter Two.

Returnees might view coming home as an instantaneous event, such as walking off the plane. But, in reality, re-entry is like other transitions: coming home unfolds over time. It is complicated and difficult, particularly because the struggles are so unexpected. Conversely, college students who anticipated difficulties were less likely to experience reverse culture shock (Gaw, 2000).

Purpose of the Project

The purpose of this project is to develop a program of re-entry training for students returning from abroad. If student affairs professionals can assist in the transition to maximize student academic learning and personal growth, then programs should be developed and implemented in offices that provide study abroad program administration. One possible intervention that student affairs professionals could provide is re-entry training.
This project will contribute to the field of student affairs and international education in particular, by examining an aspect of programming that student affairs professionals have the ability to change and develop, depending on student needs. Study abroad re-entry training needs to be addressed because study abroad programs provide the link from the experiential opportunity to the domestic classroom and the greater world at large.

Importance of the problem

The public is interested in students being prepared to work in a diverse world and a global economy (Commission on the Abraham, 2005; Easter, 2002). A federal commission was formed in 2004 called the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program. It was formed to investigate and make a recommendation about increasing the number of Americans studying abroad. The commission argued that the U.S. faces new demands on an international stage, such that what nations don’t know “exacts a heavy toll” (Commission on the Abraham, 2005, p. v). The commission concluded that our nation depends on our citizen’s knowledge in diplomacy, commerce, finance, politics, and language in a globalized world. The nation’s security is tied to study abroad in the commission’s report since over 65 federal agencies depend on foreign language speakers.

Furthermore, most students who study abroad are in non-English speaking countries, which supports the federal agencies’ needs. For instance, in the 2004-2005 academic year, 75% of study abroad students were in non-English speaking countries, which made up about 155,359 students (Institute of International Education, 2006a). The commission compared the information about the nation’s international demands, national
security, and dependency on foreign language speakers to the ability of study abroad programs to address these issues. Democratizing education was a key next step. Their vision is to send one million students abroad annually by 2015. Their view is that study abroad ought to be the norm and not the exception in higher education.

Increasing the number of Americans abroad will likewise increase the number of returnees. This provides study abroad advisors with the opportunity to assist students in engaging in a thoughtful reflection about their experiences, to discuss cross cultural transitions, and to prepare the student to live more meaningfully in their home country (Arthur, 2003).

Moreover, the focus of education is moving from transferring information to transformation of identity and development as expressed in a document produced by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators and the American College Personnel Association called Learning Reconsidered (Keeling, 2004). Re-entry training of American undergraduates is the link to transformational learning through asking the student to “evaluate both new information and the frames of reference through which the information acquires meaning” (Keeling, 2004, p. 9). By taking the time to reflect on re-entry and their study abroad experience, students are engaging in a transformative learning opportunity. At that point, learning, development, and identity formation will be integrated instead of viewed and experienced as separate processes.

Target Population

The population for this project includes American undergraduates returning from one or two semesters of study abroad. The rationale for focusing on this population was because in the 2004-2005 academic year, 73.7% of study abroad students were
undergraduates, with 35.8% being juniors (Institute of International Education, 2006b). Additionally, the target population is made up of students whose study abroad experience was their first time in a foreign country. The ideal institution would have relatively few study abroad students as compared to the rest of the student body. Accordingly, these students would not be that likely to find support in the general student body, so a retreat would be appropriate for the students to find alliances.

This section will discuss the target populations’ characteristics, problems, and needs. Characteristics of the population are arranged in two categories: university students and study abroad students. Problems of the population are arranged in five categories: end of an adventure, relationships, awareness of personal changes, questioning nationalism, and integrating knowledge and skills. Finally, limitations of the project are described and definitions of key terms are provided.

**Characteristics of the Population**

This section presents several characteristics of university study abroad students. The first part addresses university students in general and their identity development challenges. The second part discusses study abroad students more specifically.

**University students.** During the college years, students face a variety of developmental challenges. Chickering presented seven vectors of identity development (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). While all of the vectors could be applied to study abroad students, only three will be introduced here. Students during this time are developing competence and, particularly, developing intellectual competence. This development is parallel for study abroad students since they are increasing their intellectual competence through, as previously mentioned, increasing their language skills while studying abroad.
The vector *moving through autonomy toward interdependence* means the student has an understanding of interconnectedness. This is most related to the increased global perspectives which study abroad students often have post-sojourn. The last developmental challenge which will be discussed here for university students is *establishing identity*. This vector parallels the impact of study abroad on students' increased personal development and self-knowledge (Gillespie & Slawson, 2002).

*Study abroad students.* The number of students studying abroad has more than doubled in the last decade (Institute of International Education, 2005a). During the 2003-2004 academic year, about 191,321 students, including both graduate and undergraduate students, studied abroad, which is a record high, and a 9.6% increase from the previous year (Institute of International Education, 2005a). Most students studied in Europe, but there were also increases in enrollment in countries in which English was not the primary language. For example, study abroad numbers increased in China by 90%. The top four countries for study abroad students in the 2003-2004 academic year were: the United Kingdom, Italy, Spain, and France (Institute of International Education, 2005a). These increases in enrollment suggest to student affairs professionals that students will continue to seek support and advice about their cross-cultural experience. Across the United States, the racial make up of the study abroad students was: 83.7% Euro American, 6.1% Asian American, 5.0% Hispanic American, 3.4% African American, 1.3% Multiracial, and 0.5% Native American (Institute of International Education, 2005b). About 65.6% of study abroad students were female in the 2003-2004 academic year (Institute of International Education).
As compared to college students in general, study abroad students tend to be risk takers and more critical of aspects of the U.S. (Carlson, Burn, Useem, & Yachimovicz, 1990). Students who opt not to study abroad are more concerned about obtaining their degrees as quickly as possible and are focused on the immediacy of their own financial goals (Carlson et al.).

To elaborate, the Study Abroad Evaluation Project (SAEP) was a study on the impact of study abroad on American students (Carlson et al., 1990). The study selected two groups of students from four major universities across the U.S. The first cohort was composed of students who had studied abroad for one year in one of four countries: France, Germany, United Kingdom, or Sweden. Questionnaires were distributed before departure and after return. A comparison group was selected who did not study abroad and were comparable to the sample based on several demographics. The second cohort was comprised of study abroad alumni from the same four institutions between 5-25 years ago. The following measures were used: Institutional Profile, Departmental Profile, Program Profile, Student Questionnaire, and Long Term Student Profile. The student questionnaire consisted of background, motivation, learning style, language proficiency, knowledge of other countries, and career objectives.

The study abroad group had a significantly greater interest in international affairs after their sojourn than the comparison group (Carlson et al., 1990). Ways of thinking and learning that were more important to students after studying abroad were: systematic thinking, developing one’s own point of view, independent work, familiarity with different schools of thought, obtaining intercultural perspectives, and out-of-class communication with students and teachers. Students began to value systematic thinking...
and development of one’s own point of view more than good grades and learning facts. Both the study abroad students and the comparison groups were established in their future career aspirations after their junior year, but the study abroad students were less committed than the comparison group. Those students who had studied abroad rated their intellectual development higher than those students who had not (Carlson et al.).

Students’ level of satisfaction with studying abroad was predicted with 22% of the variance by the following variables: academic accomplishment and intellectual development while abroad, change in knowledge about the host country, and lack of academic and other problems (Carlson et al., 1990). There were several variables that accounted for 24% of the variance of integration into the host institution. These included academic accomplishment and intellectual development while abroad, improvement in language proficiency, academic style, and desire to travel while abroad. Students’ change in knowledge about their host country was predicted with 26% of the variance by the following variables: language proficiency, positive opinions concerning the host country, general satisfaction with the year abroad, and the students’ level of intellectual development.

The second cohort (i.e., study abroad alumni) reported attaining post baccalaureate degrees at higher rates than students who did not study abroad (Carlson et al., 1990). Those study abroad alumni with advanced degrees were found to be more likely to incorporate their study abroad experience into their career values and employment practices as compared to study abroad alumni without advanced degrees.

As previously explained, study abroad students tend to be risk takers, have greater interest in international affairs, value developing their own points view, and attain post
baccalaureate degrees at higher rates than the norms. As high achieving as this group appears to be, the next section addresses the challenges they experience in the re-entry transition.

Problems of the Population

Study abroad students often experience a number of challenges upon returning to the United States. The following section explains some typical problems, themes, and feelings that they encounter: (a) end of an adventure, (b) relationships (c) awareness of personal changes, (d) questioning nationalism, and (e) integrating new knowledge and skills.

End of an Adventure. Leaving the host culture can feel like a profound sense of personal loss for many students. It signals the termination of relationships, daily routines, and aspects of the host culture (Arthur, 2004). Re-entry is a signal of the end of an adventure. Sojourners may grieve the loss of a period marked by intense personal growth and stimulation (Storti, 2001). When interviewing 248 returning college students six weeks post return from study abroad in Western Europe, Rohrlich and Martin (1991) found that students were more satisfied with their study abroad experience than with their life upon return. Life at home can seem boring, recalled one student:

I was sitting around one day after I got home. It was a cold December day. I think it was drizzling. I was so tired of lying around. My overseas travels were such a big adventure, and all of a sudden I had no stimulation whatsoever. I had nothing to look forward to except going back to school. I remember just getting up, putting on some sweats, and just running. All of a sudden I realized that this
was cathartic and I ran as fast as I could – ran and ran and ran (Hess, 1997, p. 136).

Returning back to the home country can prompt feelings of longing for the host country. This student describes the disappointment of returning home.

I missed being in France. It was good being around people, getting back into the swing of things, but when I came home, I was a little disappointed. It seemed like I had done so much and changed so much and everything at work was exactly the same. No one had changed. It was like a time warp. It was a very strange feeling. It seemed to me when I came home that people were shocked; my hair was so short. But I was different (Kauffmann et al., 1992, p. 24).

This student appeared to have experienced a sense of loss and perceived that the passage of time and the environment did not align.

Dealing with the loss and coming to a place of acceptance and integration appears to be important for the returnees. One returnee complained, “I’ve had to accept that it is over, but still keep it in my life” (Porterfield, 2002, p. 168). The memories of living in the host country become perfect and idealized, which makes the present moment seem all the more disappointing (Werkman, 1986). Unfortunately, being preoccupied with the host country is a distraction from the efforts required to engage in a new life as a returning sojourner.

*Relationships.* The re-entry transition affects the sojourners relationships. Three types of relationships are covered in this section, parents, siblings, and peers. The relationships with all three of these groups tend to change in some way, either positively or negatively.
The perceptions of positive and negative changes in relationships was investigated in a study of 350 American exchange students ranging in age from 17-21 (Martin, 1986). Four months after return to the U.S., the students completed an author-designed questionnaire. The type of relationship predicted the perceived positive and negative relationships. Siblings and parents were rated with higher positive changes than negative changes, with relationships with parents changing the most positively (Martin, 1986). Relationships with friends were seen as changing more negatively than positively (Martin, 1986). Sibling relationships had the least change overall, both positively and negatively (Martin, 1986).

Even though parent relationships were found to change the most positively, it has also been found that returning sojourners often feel frustrated that their parents are not able to understand and relate to their overseas experience (Porterfield, 2002; Storti, 2001). Often, their parents are unable to fully grasp their accomplishments abroad and, therefore, are unable to give the students the validation they need.

One student explained the emotional problems related to the change in feelings towards their family:

Moving from the Costa Rica pace of life [back] to this [life] was just emotionally and physically exhausting. After that I was really grouchy. It was good to be back, but I didn’t feel the strong ties that I once did. Maybe that was upsetting, that I didn’t feel the closeness that I did with my family in Costa Rica. Here was my natural family and I didn’t feel as close (Kauffmann, Martin, & Weaver, 1992, p.10).
This student reflected about his/her family’s reactions to the student’s changes upon return.

My natural family wanted me to be the person I was before I left. They were not really accepting me as I was in the way I had changed. That was disconcerting. I remember people making remarks like, ‘what has happened to you? You have changed a lot.’ Yes I had. But that negative connotation was really a thorn in my side. I wished they could have celebrated the changes with me (Kauffmann et al., 1992, p.116).

The changes that study abroad students undergo influence their perceptions of their identity as well as influences their perceptions of their interpersonal relationships.

Upon re-entry, many students must learn again to live with their families. For several months or a year, the students have freely lived without their parents in their daily lives. Now, with the return, all of a sudden their parents play a more significant role in their lives again (Storti, 2001). The students have matured, perhaps more than their parents expected, but the parents continue to treat them the same as before they left. One student comments on this experience:

I had to get back into the family on different terms. I don’t think they expected all the changes or the magnitude of growth that really happened. The only time that we really sat down and talked about what happened to me was the first two or three hours that I was back (Kauffmann, Martin, & Weaver, 1992, p. 11).

Parents may get involved in the students’ life, second guess decisions, and criticize new behaviors, which may undermine the students’ new found independence (Storti, 2001).
Students may feel confused about not wanting to be back, while still being happy to see their parents again (Hess, 1997).

While away, the sojourners’ siblings have become accustomed to his or her absence. Upon return, they may feel less inclined to share things, such as the bathroom, bedroom, television, or the stereo. They may resent the sojourner, because his/her accomplishments may appear to diminish their own. One returnee complained that his/her siblings “didn’t seem to consider me to be a full-fledged member of the family any longer” (Storti, 2001, p. 144). Along the same lines, one student commented on not being informed, “I was struck by how many things have happened that I didn’t know about. I was almost mad in a way—like ‘why didn’t you guys tell me?’” (Hess, 1997, p. 135).

As mentioned above, relationships with peers were perceived to change more negatively than positively (Martin, 1986). Peers may not be especially interested in the sojourners’ adventures abroad. Again, sojourners may have trouble explaining their experience, and feel a lack of validation (Storti, 2001). Freedman (1986) explained that returnees cannot just pick up where they left off. Their friends continued on with their lives while the sojourner was away, yet sojourner is expected to be the same as when he or she left. The sojourner may feel the pressure to modify foreign behaviors in the presence of his/her peers. When sojourners talk to others about their experiences, they are asked naive questions. Hence, returnees may feel anger about the ignorance of those who have not traveled (Hess, 1997).

Awareness of Personal Changes. The home environment has changed, but students also realize how much they have changed. One student explained, “I guess
within that struggle of coming back and trying to live and study and finish up here, it
definitely has hit me that I have changed” (Porterfield, 2002, p. 170). The confusion may
be related to the feeling of being homesick even though they are home. The more
sojourners believed that they had changed as a result of their sojourn, the more they
experienced problematic re-entry (Sussman, 2001). Along those same lines, the greater
the returnees change in values, the greater their experience of re-entry culture shock
(Uchara, 1986).

A theme revealed by a qualitative study by (Christofi & Thompson, 2007), called
Changing/Static revolved around the new awareness that certain aspects changed and
some remained the same and is reviewed in further detail in the research section. The
participants explained this in terms of their personality, identity, and behaviors and also
in terms of their home country.

*Questioning Nationalism.* Porterfield (2002) observed the students reported
comparing cultures. Many of the students in this study found the culture of the United
States to be more superficial than that of the country they lived in while studying abroad.
They were also found to be more critical of the United States.

Returnees might feel guilty about their critical feelings towards their home culture
and keep them inside. A returning student shared, “When I came back to the states, I
found Americans shallow and plastic... somehow America seemed like Archie
Bunker...I couldn’t share this with my neighbors. They’d have thought me a traitor or a
snob” (Sobie, 1986, p. 97).

The following is an example of the criticisms of the United States: “once I got to
the U.S., I was repulsed. The grocery store was the worst...I was amazed at how much
excess we have, and how I had never even thought of it as excess” (Hess, 1997, p. 135). It is common for returnees to ask themselves if they are happy to be an American. Some returnees may feel rootless or may not want to settle down (Werkman, 1986).

A theme illuminated through a qualitative study of study abroad returnees by Christofi and Thompson (2007) called Conflict/Peace was expressed through the simultaneous feelings of missing and rejecting their home country. The theme of Freedom/Restriction elaborated on the participants’ struggles in realizing the lack or abundance of freedoms when they compared their home and sojourn countries.

*Integrating New Knowledge and Skills.* Returning sojourners may feel frustrated when they cannot integrate their newly acquired language and problem solving skills into their home environments (Woody, 1998). As well, many corporations are unequipped to handle employees who have gained international experience (Arthur, 2004). The sojourner may feel dissatisfied at being unable to use their international expertise.

This section presented an overview of problems of the population, their accompanying feelings, and changes they experienced.

*Needs of the Population*

The intercultural sojourner, without re-entry training, faces the risk that the experience may become encapsulated (Martin & Harrell, 2004). The student then loses the opportunity to integrate the personal growth into his or her academic and social life. LaBrack (1993) also found that most students simply compartmentalize their experience and leave it fragmented from their whole person, which is referred to as a “shoebox” effect. Many fear that they will lose the impact of their experience when they have difficulty in fitting it into their academic life. The returning sojourner needs assistance in
coping with the reverse culture shock and problems as previously mentioned. Ideally, the students will find ways to practice their new language skills, share international understanding, and use their new knowledge to revise their perceptions of the home and host country.

Limitations of the Project

This project is intended for American undergraduate students and may not address the needs of International Students. One reason it may not be appropriate is the project is meant to be implemented upon returning to the home country. As well, this project does not address aspects of saying goodbye and preparing for departure which might be important to international students while they are still in the U.S. The project includes activities which focus on gaining perspective on American culture and how that changed over time for American students. Finally, this project is intended for a college or a university where the majority of the student population does not experience study abroad during their undergraduate education.

Definitions of Technical Terms

The following operational definitions are provided.

Cross-cultural readjustment: “the transition from a foreign culture back into one’s home culture” and “is the experience of facing previously familiar surroundings after living in a different environment for a significant period of time” (Adler, 1981, p. 343).

Culture shock: Culture shock was defined as responses to unfamiliar cultural environments and an active process of dealing with change (Ward, Bochner, & Furnham, 2001).
Experiential Learning: a theory of how people learn through a cycle that begins with an experience and moves to reflection, conceptualization, and action, and starts over again with experience (Kolb, 1984).

Globalcentrism: the ability to look at issues from the standpoint of a citizen of the world rather than perceiving the world singularly (McCabe, 1994).

Intercultural Sensitivity: the ability to recognize, respond, and adapt behavior appropriately to the differences, values, and expectations of another culture (Anderson, Lawton, Rexeisen, & Hubbard, 2006).

Learning: “A comprehensive, holistic, transformative activity that integrates academic learning and student development process that have been considered separate” (Keeling, 2004, p. 2).

Re-entry: the process of re-acculturation to one’s home country after living in a foreign culture (Adler, 1981).

Repatriation: “a return to one’s country of origin” (Sussman, 2001, p. 110).

Repatriation distress: readjustment discomfort felt by sojourners after they returned to their home country (Sussman, 2002).

Reverse culture shock: “the process of readjusting, reacculturating, and reassimilating into one’s own country after living in a different culture for a significant period of time” (Gaw, 2000, p. 83).

Study abroad students: American college students, typically undergraduate students, who travel to countries outside the U.S. and participate in various academic courses or programs sponsored or offered by U.S. postsecondary institutions or special
foreign student programs provided by host country institutions (United States Department of Education, n.d.).

*Sojourn*: a temporary stay somewhere (Ward, Bochner, & Furnham, 2001).

*Sojourner*: a voluntary temporary resident who expects to return home after the completion of their assignment or project (Ward, Bochner, & Furnham, 2001), and who may be either a student or an employed professional (Martin, & Harrell, 2004).

*Transition to Chapter 2*

Chapter One introduced the topic of study abroad in the field of student affairs and the issues of re-entry. The population of American undergraduate study abroad students was identified and their needs and problems were discussed. Chapter Two will introduce research that has been conducted about re-entry and review several theories that are relevant to the design and implementation of a re-entry program.

How shall I talk of the sea to the frog,
If it has never left his pond?
How shall I talk of the frost to the bird of the summerland,
If it has never left the land of its birth?
How shall I talk of life with the sage,
If he is a prisoner of his doctrine?
Chung Tsu, 4th Century B.C.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of Literature

The purpose of this project is to design a program for American undergraduate students returning from study abroad. Accordingly, this chapter is divided into three sections: themes of re-entry research, purpose of re-entry training, and theoretical approaches.

Introduction to the Literature on Re-Entry from Study Abroad

The first section will provide a broad understanding of the research on re-entry and reviews the surprisingly sparse research on the re-entry experience. Re-entry research is arranged in two categories, Themes in Re-entry Research and Re-entry Variables. Each category contains several sub-sections.

The second section, Purpose of Re-entry Training, identifies the goals of re-entry training and discusses the controversy regarding delivery of re-entry programs, psycho-educational programming, or personal counseling.

After a short discussion of the historical foundation of adjustment literature called the W-Curve theory, the final section focuses on two theoretical approaches: Kolb’s Experiential Learning Theory and Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity.

Themes in Re-entry Research

Four themes have emerged in re-entry research from study abroad. The following sections will be discussed: (a) mistaken expectations; (b) reverse culture shock; (c) change in interpersonal relationships; and (d) integrating new aspects of self.
Mistaken Expectations

A major theme in re-entry research is that returning sojourners do not expect any difficulty in returning home, in contrast to the difficulties they anticipated in arriving in their host countries. There are two basic ways to understand the relationship between re-entry and expectations (Rogers & Ward, 1993). First, realistic expectation facilitates adaptation during re-entry (Weissman & Furnham, 1987). Secondly, unmet high expectations results in adjustment problems or that overmet low expectations results in better adjustment (Cochrane, 1983).

One aspect of expectations revealed by the research is that returnees generally do not expect problems during re-entry. Using questionnaires and surveys, Adler (1981) studied 200 returning Canadian governmental employees who had stayed in their host country for about two years. Expatriate employees returning home were found to not expect culture shock or trauma (Adler, 1981). Some had planned on slipping back into their previous lives. However, these results need to be interpreted with caution since no explanation of the method, instrumentation, or data analysis was provided.

Going into more depth about expectations, Rogers and Ward (1993) investigated the discrepancies between expectations and actual experiences. Participants in their study were 20 students from New Zealand who studied in seven different countries during a one-year period. These students had a mean age of 18.8 years. While abroad, participants were surveyed with the Expected and Experienced Difficulty instrument about their expected re-entry difficulties. Within four to ten weeks of return to New Zealand, participants completed the Beck Depression Inventory and the Spielberger State Anxiety Inventory to assess their current psychological adjustment in terms of depression.
and anxiety. Expected difficulty scores were not found to be related to anxiety or depression. Expected difficulty was also not found to be related to experienced difficulties. However, when students' actual experiences were more difficult than expected, they were more likely to have psychological distress. Specifically, larger discrepancies were related to larger re-entry problems. Rogers and Ward concluded that expectations alone cannot predict successful re-entry, but, rather, discrepancies between expectations and experiences makes the likelihood of re-entry problems increase. The results need to be interpreted with caution, because the students in the sample reported below normal depressive scores and perhaps were hardy and resilient students. In addition, these students are younger than the typical U.S. study abroad student as well as from a different country which may or may not impact the findings' generalizability with U.S. students.

Gaw (2000) confirmed the results of Rogers and Ward (1993) and found that students felt increased levels of psychological distress when experiences were more difficult than anticipated. Gaw examined the relationship between reverse culture shock, personal problems, and help-seeking behaviors. The Personal Problems Inventory and the Reverse Shock Scale were completed by 66 overseas-experienced returnees, who were American citizens, but who had graduated from high school outside the United States. Gaw found that students who experienced the most reverse culture shock were more likely to report personal problems.

As well, those who had the highest levels of reverse culture shock were less likely to use student support services (Gaw, 2000). Seeking assistance from a counselor was not predicted by level of reverse culture shock. International educators need to be aware
that the returnees who have experiences which are more difficult than anticipated may not seek student support services though they may need to do so.

The students who participated in a study by Christofi and Thompson (2007) reported how helpful it was to share their conflicts with the investigators, even though the act of sharing was not the intent of the study, the benefits were unforeseen. Christofi and Thompson conducted a qualitative research study using the existential-phenomenological model of individuals who returned home after studying abroad. There were 3 males and 4 females in this study who ranged in age from 25 to 45 years old. They had lived and studied abroad between 3 to 10 years and lived in their home countries between 1 to 3 years before deciding to return to their sojourn country. Most of the participants were international students studying abroad in the U.S. and therefore generalizability to U.S. is limited. Interviews were open-ended and unstructured and were analyzed through transcription and a theme analysis.

The exploration led to a ground theme and five sub-themes of which two will be discussed here (Christofi & Thompson, 2007). The ground theme was that participants compared their home and sojourn countries’ advantages and disadvantages. The second theme of Reality/Idealization was most related to expectations. The researchers uncovered the participants’ frustration with false expectations or an idealized perception of what it would be like to return home. One participant explained, “There was stuff that didn’t bother me before me before I left, but it bothers me now that I have been away” (Christofi & Thompson, 2007, p. 58).

As previously discussed, returning from a sojourn proves problematic when the students’ assumptions are proven wrong. Ramsey and Schaetti (1999) listed five main
false assumptions made by returnees. One, important relationships will maintain their importance. Two, family and friends will listen eagerly to the returnees' stories. Three, they will continue to be motivated by the activities or employment that they left behind. Four, they will feel comforted by being home in a familiar environment. And finally, their new values and worldly perspectives will be valued and recognized. These assumptions need to be interpreted carefully, recognizing that they are not based on empirical research.

The implication of mistaken expectations for study abroad advisors is that students may not initially believe that they need re-entry programming since the return home is not anticipated to be problematic (Arthur, 2004). The relationship between real and expected difficulties during re-entry remains unclear, given the inadequate research in the area. Also problematic is the extent to which sojourners' expectations are accurate. Researchers Rogers and Ward (1993), as discussed above, pose some of the reasons for the lack of research on expectations of re-entry including the difficulty in conducting research in longitudinal cross-national locations, difficulty in overseas mailings, and the challenges involved with locating pre- and post-departure sojourners' addresses.

Reverse Culture Shock

Reverse culture shock is "the process of readjusting, re-acculturating, and re-assimilating into one's own country after living in a different culture for a significant period of time" (Gaw, 2000, p. 83). Through teaching a re-entry course through the University of the Pacific, La Brack has collected over 400 student papers analyzing their own re-entry experience (1993). LaBrack explained that two main elements contribute to reverse culture shock: an idealized view of home and a taken for granted familiarity with
the home culture. After studying abroad, many students become more aware of American culture thereby providing a clearer understanding of the values, ideas, and behaviors which are influenced by culture.

There are several factors which appear to influence re-entry adjustment. Uehara (1986) investigated re-entry experiences of American students returning from an extended sojourn abroad. The variables studied were re-entry shock, age, length of sojourn, level of adjustment to foreign culture, level of political concerns, value changes, and level of desire to return home which were measured by questions constructed by the author.

A relatively homogeneous group of 58 participants were used for this study (Uehara, 1986), with most of the participants being in their twenties, traveling to Europe, and spending between 6-12 months abroad. The length of time since their return from abroad ranged from three months to six years. A control group of non-travelers consisted of 74 students from undergraduate courses in the same university were also assessed.

The results indicated a statistically significant difference between the returnees and the control group on the variable of culture shock (Uehara, 1986). The greater the returnees change in values, the greater their experience of re-entry culture shock. Changing views about friends, relationships, individualism, and clothing were the strongest factors in re-entry culture shock. The correlation between the students’ international and political concerns and re-entry shock was not significant, but most of the students reported enduring changes in their political views. The students became more aware of aspects of both their home and host countries. Adjustment in the foreign culture was not predictive of the students’ re-entry shock. However, it has now been
twenty years since this study, so it may no longer be representative of today’s study abroad students.

The troubling effect of the awareness of changes in the self was also found by Raschio (1987). He conducted a qualitative study of 11 undergraduate students returning from study abroad, which varied in length from three months to a year in the host countries of Italy, France, Peru, Spain, and Germany. Their interviews demonstrated that problems in re-entry arose when students compared the physical and cultural differences, social norms, and world issues between the host and home country. Student experiences conflicted when they became aware of the changes in themselves. Some students reported a lack of support from friends and family because few were willing to listen. Other students reported being supported throughout and after the experience.

The students’ adjustment lasted between a few weeks to a few months (Raschio, 1987). They learned four main things: the value of their experiences, how to integrate the values of their sojourn experience into their home culture, the frustration of the integration process, and realizing that other students had the same feelings which alleviated some of the perceived sense of isolation. The students expressed five characteristics of their experience: a sense of personal change, a feeling of uniqueness, improved language skills, a greater sense of independence, and values clarification. Some students requested meetings with other returnees to discuss their experiences. They also requested a formal, individual helping plan. They would have liked to have been able to contact other study abroad students so that communication could begin during the trip continuing upon return to the home country.
Based on his research, Raschio (1987) suggested a two phase re-entry program. The first phase would be an assessment of each returnee's individual needs. The second phase would deal with the expressed needs of the student in individual or group sessions. Raschio also suggested returnees should share their new perspectives in discussion groups, participate in focus groups to plan future re-entry activities, and serve as peer advisors.

Awareness of personal changes were also relevant to the re-entry adjustment for not only students, but managers as well. Sussman (2001) researched preparedness and cultural identity change in terms of the repatriation experience of 44 American managers. The managers lived abroad from six months to over four years and had been back in the U.S. between 1 to 22 months. Sussman used an author designed Repatriation Experience Assessment Scale which measured the repatriates' general psychological distress, work-related distress, and family adjustment. Only the general psychological distress subscale was used which had the highest internal reliability (α=0.80). The Revised Causal Dimensions Scale was used to measure the attributions of the causality of the repatriation difficulty. Using an author-designed scale, psychological preparedness, repatriation training, and self-change were also measured. Cultural identity was measured by feeling less American and was correlated to repatriation distress in that the less American the manager felt, the more repatriation distress.

Sussman's (2001) results showed that the less the participants believed that they had knowledge of the repatriation process (less preparedness), the more distressing the re-entry. Higher levels of repatriation distress were also correlated to the more the
managers thought they had changed as a result of their international experience. And finally, those who experienced higher levels of distress attributed it to external control.

The re-entry process was difficult for sojourners when they became aware of their personal changes. One influence on the personal changes was related to the quality of interaction that the sojourners had with their host country. Interaction with the host country was studied more closely by Rohrlich and Martin (1991) in terms of communication. Using an author constructed questionnaire, Rohrlich and Martin examined 248 undergraduate students six weeks post-return from study abroad in western Europe for their satisfaction of re-entry life. Whereas the degree of communication with the host country was not related to re-entry satisfaction, two individual communication items were related. Specifically, the more frequently the students reported going on walks, outings, or evenings with host people and discussing significant issues with people of the host country, the less likely they were satisfied with life on their return. This study suggests that the kind and the frequency of communication with the host country people are important in the understanding of re-entry adjustment.

Reverse culture shock appears to be moderated by a number of interacting variables. What these studies had in common was that when the sojourner perceives changes in themselves, such as their values or cultural identity, reverse cultural shock becomes increasingly problematic.

Change of Interpersonal Relationships

One aspect of the re-entry adjustment is the change in the sojourners interpersonal relationships. Brabant, Palmer, and Gramling (1990) examined foreign students' re-adaptation to their family and friends after studying in the United States. Ninety-six
former international students responded to questionnaires regarding their age, sex, class, population of city, religion, and difficulties with family and friends upon return from the study abroad experience. Females reported more problems with families and friends and with daily life upon return to home country. Those students who visited their home more often during their studies in the United States, reported fewer family difficulties. Religion and region were also correlated to family problems. Students who reported adapting to the U.S. also reported the most problems with readapting to friends upon returning home. But no relationship was found for levels of U.S. adaptation and problems with family or daily life. As this study was based on students coming to the U.S. to study, their findings may not be applicable with U.S. students studying abroad. However, Martin (1986), did find similar results for American college students with positive changes occurring with parental relationships and negative changes occurring with friend relationships.

Storti’s book, *The Art of Crossing Cultures*, depicted the change in interpersonal relationships by providing the following student quote: “if others don’t know what we have gone through, if they see us as the same people we were when we left (which they invariable do), we feel cheated, as if our accomplishments have somehow been diminished” (Storti, 1990, p. 102).

*Integrating New Aspects of Self*

Integrating the cultural learning which took place abroad can be a source of conflict for returnees (Adler, 1981; Raschio, 1987). One risk of incorporating new characteristics is the perception of the sojourner by co-workers. Both colleagues and managers were found to highly evaluate returning expatriates who did not have the same
characteristics of foreigners, did not use their cross-cultural skills, and had the least amount of overseas experience (Adler, 1981). This experience put the returnees in conflict because they were found to evaluate themselves highly when they were integrating the foreign and home country skills and actively using the skills they had newly acquired (Adler, 1981). As previously discussed, Raschio (1987) also found that students experienced frustration with the integration process.

This section discussed four themes of re-entry research. The next section presents more details about variables found to relate to the re-entry transition.

Re-entry Variables

A review of the literature on re-entry variables produced mixed results. Variables were found to either (a) not affect re-entry, or (b) evidence was inconclusive.

Few variables have been found that seem to directly affect the re-entry process. One example of a logistical re-entry variable is the degree of supportiveness of the re-entry environment. For instance, some administrative university policies may make it very difficult for students to transfer credits, reinstate financial aid, and meet registration deadlines (Kauffmann, Martin, & Weaver, 1992).

Variables with No Evidence of an Effect on Re-entry

Previous re-entry experience was not found to relate to problematic re-entry (Rogers & Ward, 1993). As well, the relationship between the length of time since the sojourner’s return and problematic re-entry was not found to have a significant correlation (Rogers & Ward, 1993; Uehara, 1986). However, these results can be questioned because the researchers only interviewed participants ranging from four to ten weeks after re-entry. The participants could have possibly been in what is often terms
“the honeymoon phase” of re-entry, and had not yet actually transitioned to the reverse culture shock phase. Sussman (2001) confirmed these results with American managers in their findings that time had little effect on the severity of the repatriation distress, and that 15% of the participants were experiencing discomfort more one year after return from the international experience.

Variables with Conflicting Evidence in the Role in Re-entry

Gender. Rohrlich and Martin (1991) found that women were more satisfied with re-entry life than men. In contrast, Sussman (2001) found that gender did not predict repatriation distress for American managers. Females were found to experience greater difficulties with family and daily life upon re-entry than males (Brabant, Palmer, & Gramling, 1990). It should be noted that each of these studies were not equivalent as their populations were students, working professionals, and international students.

Age. Students’ age was not found to be a factor in re-entry adjustment, according to Brabant, Palmer, and Gramling (1990) and Uehara (1986). However, Ward, Bochner, and Furnham (2001), found that younger sojourners had a more difficult time re-adapting.

Time spent abroad. Several studies compared the length of time spent abroad to re-entry. Time spent abroad was not found to predict repatriation distress for American managers (Sussman, 2001) or for American study abroad students (Uehara, 1986). Whereas, Cox (2006) found that the international students who lived abroad the longest, indicated re-entry training more helpful than those who only spent shorter times abroad.

Overseas adaptation. The literature shows conflicting evidence of the relationship between overseas adaptation and repatriation experiences. Adler (1981) found that employees overseas who successfully adapted also had successful re-entry.
Adler provided an interesting commentary on re-entry; however, the contribution of the study is questionable due to a lack of information about research design, methodology, and the participants. The opposite results were found by Brabant, Palmer, and Gramling (1990) such that adapting to the host country was related to problematic re-entry. Uehara (1986) was unable to confirm a relationship between overseas adaptation and re-entry experiences. Additionally, Rohrlich and Martin (1991) found no significant relationship between overseas adaptation related to degree of communication contact and re-entry satisfaction.

In expanding on this dilemma, Sussman (2002) found that overseas adaptation and re-entry are indirectly, but not directly related. By studying 113 American teachers who sojourned in Japan, with a range of 6 to 72 months, Sussman concluded that they are indirectly related. Cultural adaptation and transition change was measured with an author-designed scale. Cultural identity strength was measured with modified subscales of the ethnic identity scale by Cameron, Sato, Lay, and Lalonde, (as cited in Sussman, 2002). Cultural identity change was measured with the Cultural Identity Scales. Repatriation distress was measured with the Repatriation Distress Scale. The Satisfaction with Life scale and the Purpose in Life Test were also used. It was found that the more the sojourners had become emotionally attached to Japan, the less prepared they were to return to the U.S. The researcher concluded that the greater the repatriation distress, the less the satisfaction with life. Significant repatriation distress was found for those who reported a weak American identity. Also, the less central one’s American identity, the more the sojourners felt adapted to Japan. In summary, four variables were found to
contribute significantly to predicting repatriation distress: negative feelings about being American, feeling less American, feeling more Japanese, and feeling less global.

*Location.* The overseas location for expatriate managers was found to have no effect on the intensity of the re-entry shock (Adler, 1981). Conversely, Rohrlich and Martin (1991) found a correlation between sojourners' location of study and their satisfaction with re-entry. Specifically, those who studied in Spain were significantly less satisfied with their lives after returning. Again, these studies may not be generalizable given that they are dated. However, there were no other recent studies found on this topic when reviewing the literature.

This section presented a complicated web of variables affecting the re-entry transition. Most variables had conflicting evidence as to their effect except for sojourner expectations, as previously discussed. Despite the wide range of individual differences, re-entry transitions can be addressed in higher education and the following section discusses the limited research on re-entry training.

*Purpose of Re-entry Training*

The purpose of programming is to transmit knowledge, affect skills development, change attitudes, and help students reach their potential (Liddell, Hubbard, & Werner, 2000). More specifically, Martin (1993) explained that the purpose of re-entry training is to assist sojourners in one type of adult transition. It should be viewed as a part of a long-term process. Arthur (2004) recommended that re-entry programming can assist students with the closure of leaving the host country, integrating their experiences, and creating their new life at home. Since the emphasis for study abroad is on personal and intellectual growth, the goal of re-entry training should assist students in understanding
the changes in their cultural identity, feeling more comfortable in their home environment, and evaluating the skills and knowledge they obtained during their sojourn (Martin & Harrell, 2004).

Psycho-educational workshops are a cost effective way for counselors to connect with students and might plant the seed for students to inquire about personal counseling (Arthur, 2001). As well, LaBrack (1993) suggested counseling as a natural extension of both orientation and re-entry programming. Another benefit of psycho-educational workshops is that group interaction can prompt new learning and reframing of the common re-entry problems (Westwood, 1986). Groups can also generate new strategies for coping.

Initial studies show that re-entry training appears to be generally useful to students. Sixty-six international students participated in a re-entry training at a large private southern California institution prior to departure to their home countries (Cox, 2006). The workshop was 80 minutes in length and the topics included re-entry theory, career planning, growth and changes, negotiating relationships with friends, and re-entry strategies. All 66 participants completed the evaluation survey immediately after the workshop which gathered perceptions of usefulness of the training. A second web-based questionnaire was sent to the students to gather perceptions of the usefulness of the training after returning home, of which nine students completed. The results of the web-based survey indicated that most of the students agreed that the workshop was useful to them and helpful in reducing the symptoms of re-entry shock. Five students either agreed or strongly agreed that the re-entry workshop helped them to successfully make the transition to life back home. The components which were found to be most helpful in
order from best to least were: growth and changes, strategies for a successful transition, and negotiating relationships with friends. It is important to note the low response rate and sample size of survey respondents limits generalizability of the results. Cox implemented this training to students prior to return to their home country which was in agreement with Arthur (2004) who insisted that the responsibility for re-entry programming lies with the host institution.

Since expectations is a major topic for cross culture transitions, Cox also addressed this issue. Cox (2006) found in preliminary surveys that most of the students would not like to attend or were neutral to attending a re-entry workshop. Only 39% agreed or strongly agreed that they would like to attend. This is in alignment with previous research that students do not expect problems surrounding re-entry and do not anticipate a need for re-entry training (Adler, 1981; Christofi & Thompson, 2007; Gaw, 2000; Rogers and Ward, 1993). This poses a challenge to student affairs professionals who need to market to students to persuade them of the educational and personal value of re-entry training. However, once they return from their sojourn, they may have better understanding of the need and value for such a re-entry training.

Therefore, it can be argued that the responsibility of the re-entry training lies with the home institution (and not with the host institution as Arthur suggested). When the students are experiencing the transition itself, the study abroad program professional can implement and market to students who may better understand the need for the training.

*Theoretical Approaches*

To develop this instructional product, two theoretical approaches were used: one learning based theory, and one developmental theory. The theories influence how this
product frames individual learning and the best ways of providing instruction. This section begins with a historical context of the W-Curve theory on cross cultural transition and then explains Kolb’s Experiential Learning Theory and Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity

One of the major historical theoretical influences on re-entry research was the W-Curve. The W-Curve, was an extension of the U-Curve hypothesis. According to this theory, the highs and lows are predictable and time is the crucial variable (Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963). During the sojourn, the individual experiences an initial high, followed by the low period of culture shock, and leading to feeling of comfort. Then the U is repeated again during re-entry, which makes the W-curve hypothesis. The returnee initially feels the satisfaction of being home, following by feeling disappointed and disoriented, but gradually, the returnee readapts to his/her home environment (Martin & Harrell, 2004). It is important for study abroad program professionals to be familiar with the W-curve hypothesis, as a basic way of understanding possible trends students may experience.

However, as previously mentioned, time was not found to be a variable in re-entry which is the foundation for the W-curve hypothesis. It also fails to address several themes. First it does not address the nature of events experienced as stressful during re-entry (Arthur, 2001). Additionally, it does not discuss coping responses which may lead to positive or negative adjustment (Arthur, 2001). The type of relationships is also not considered (Martin, 1986). Taken alone, the W-curve hypothesis is insufficient, but provides an important context for understand the re-entry research.
While multiple theories have contributed to the study abroad re-entry literature, this project will focus on two theories: Kolb’s Experiential Learning Theory and Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity.

Kolb’s Experiential Learning Theory

The first section will provide a broad overview and description of Kolb’s Experiential Learning Theory. The overview and description is arranged in three categories: learning cycle, learning style, and theory strengths. The second section provides research that supports the theory, while the third section provides research that challenges the theory.

Overview and Description

Experiential learning theorists John Dewey, Kurt Lewin, and Jean Piaget provided Kolb with the foundation for his model. Kolb’s Theory of Experiential Learning (Kolb, 1984) describes the learning cycle from experience to reflection to concepts and finally to new choices of experiences.

Learning cycle. The learning cycle begins with concrete experience for an individual through openly participating in a new event (Kolb, 1984). This is the basis of the reflection. Reflective observation is the ability to think about experiences from several points of view (Kolb). An individual moves to abstract conceptualization which involves the integration of their observations into their own theories (Kolb). And finally, active experimentation is putting their own theories to use with decision-making and problem solving by testing out the implications (See Figure 1). Kolb defined learning as “the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience” (Kolb, 1984, p. 38).
Each stage fits into one of two dimensions of learning: (a) prehension and (b) transformation (Kolb, 1984). When the learner moves through the learning cycle, they also experience the dimensions in the following order: prehension, transformation, prehension and transformation. Prehension is the grasping of an experience (see Figure 2). The two opposite ways to do this are through comprehension, “a reliance on symbolic representation” and through apprehension, “a reliance on the tangible…experience” (Kolb, 1984, p. 41). Transformation is accomplished by either of two opposing modes: intention, which is “internal reflection,” or extension, which is “active manipulation of the external world” (Kolb, 1984, p. 41) (see Figure 3). Comprehension and apprehension are independent modes of grasping experience, yet mutually enhancing. Just as intention and extension are independent modes of transforming experience.

**Learning styles.** In Kolb’s Theory of Experiential Learning (1984), the cycle stages are also viewed as modes. Kolb described four adaptive learning modes: (a) concrete experience, (b) reflective observation, (c) abstract conceptualization, and (d) active experimentation. Learners are suggested to develop abilities, integrate, and express their non-preferred modes in order to be most effective in their learning experience (Kolb, 1981). As all four of these modes are opposites from one another, this can be difficult to achieve (Kolb, 1981). In childhood, individuals may only develop along one mode. Accordingly, the integration and resolution of the conflicting modes of learning shows higher stages of development.

Signals of development are different for each mode. The development associated with Concrete Experience is exemplified by increases in affective complexity (Kolb, 1981), whereas the development associated with the Reflective Observation is
exemplified by increases in perceptual complexity (Kolb). The development associated with the Abstract Conceptualization is exemplified by increases in symbolic complexity (Kolb). Finally, the development associated with the Active Experimentation is exemplified by increases in behavioral complexity (Kolb).

Kolb’s learning style model describes four learning styles: accommodator, diverger, converger, and assimilator. These learning styles differentiate this theory from other adult developmental theories because other theories look at what stage the person is in. In contrast, Experiential Learning Theory looks at the stage as well as what learning style the person manifests. “When learning is conceived as a holistic adaptive process, it provides conceptual bridges across life situations such as school and work, portraying learning as continuous, lifelong process” (Kolb, 1984, p. 33).

The instrument that asserts to operationalize Kolb’s theory is the Learning Style Inventory (LSI). Participants answer 12 short statements with a rank order response. Scores indicate one of the four learning style dimensions. Freedman and Stumpf (1978) administered the LSI to 412 graduate students, and 101 students for a test-retest study. Their research demonstrated that abstract conceptualization scale was the most reliable ($r=.70$) and the concrete experience was the least reliable ($r=.40$). The test-retest reliability was low at a median of $r=.50$. Freedman and Stumpf found that the limited reliability restricts the instrument’s ability to predict learning styles and that the unexplained variance may mislead testers.

The relationship between the scores for opposite poles for each factor were negative, which supported Kolb’s theory. However, the scoring system may be the cause
of the high scores on one dimension and the low scores on the other dimensions (Freedman & Stumpf, 1980).

Experiential learning theory provided these typologies, but in the context of this project, the focus will, instead, be on the model of learning. Higher levels of development are shown by increasing complexity and integration of modes (Kolb, 1981).

**Theory strengths.** There are three strengths to Kolb’s theory. The first strength is that the theory considers the person-environment relationship to be two-way in nature, so that the environment can shape behavior and behavior can shape environment. Secondly, the theory places the learner in context, meaning that this theory has ecological validity. The person and the environment engage in a transaction where, “personal characteristics, environmental influences, and behavior all operate in reciprocal determination, each factor influencing the others in an interlocking fashion” (Kolb, 1984, p. 36). Finally, the theory is based on a dual-knowledge worldview that encompasses both forms of knowing; the empirical or positivistic form of knowing and the subjective or constructivism form of knowing.

**Research that Supports the Theory**

Work that positively supports Kolb’s theory focused on the use of the learning cycle to inform students about the process of learning. Raschick, Maypole, & Day (1998) administered the LSI to 45 graduate social work students and their 35 field supervisors at the University of Minnesota, Duluth in 1995-96. A statistically significant relationship was found for supervisor-student match of AB - RO scores and students' ratings of their overall field learning experience ($r=.0094, p=.031$, one-tailed). However, there was a lack of support for matches in student-supervisor learning style and the
Raschick et al. suggested trainers should start with the individuals' learning and move through the rest of the cycle.

Smith and Kolb's users guide (as cited in Raschick, Maypole, & Day, 1998) found internal reliability of the LSI variables to be quite high using Cronbach's alpha (n=268): .82 for Concrete Experience, .73 for Reflective Observation, .83 for Abstract Conceptualization, .78 for Active Experimentation, .88 for AC-CE, and .81 for AE-RO.

Research that Challenges the Theory

Kolb's theory has been popular in adult education and is a classical foundation in experiential learning. However, there are three problems with the foundation of the model, two arguable assumptions, and two structural problems.

The first foundational problem with the model is that a component of human interaction is missing (Miettinen, 2000). Kolb claimed to base the theory on Lewin, but Lewin's model was based upon group problem-solving techniques. Instead, Kolb individualizes the experience and omits the key aspects of the creation of joint activities, human relations skills, and collaboration (Miettinen, 2000).

A second foundational problem was related to Kolb's claim to base his theoretical model on the works of John Dewey. Dewey connected the phases of learning by explaining that a problematic experience was grounds for reflection. The reflection was the process of creating the hypothesis, which was to be tested in the last phase (Miettinen, 2000). However, for Kolb's theory, each phase was separated and does not seem to be
based on Dewey’s theory. Instead, Kolb’s theory was used to substantiate the foundation for the modes of learning and the LSI.

The third foundational problem with the model is made up of two theoretical contradictions to Kolb’s learning styles. First, Kolb claimed the theory was based upon contextualism, which emphasizes the individual learner in the environment. But he also claimed it was based upon Jung’s idealist position, which is criticized for generating stereotypes. The use of both positions are apparently contradictory and the underpinnings are problematic (Gamer, 2000). Secondly, Kolb claimed the theory was based on Tyler’s (1978) work which valued individuality and flexible styles, but Garner believed that Kolb misused the theory to place individuals into types and stable styles.

The theory is also based on two arguable assumptions. First, Experiential Learning Theory stands on the assumption that the learner’s experience is knowledge-based. However, Michelson (1996) argued that experience is not simply knowledge-based, it is derived or constructed based on social contexts. Secondly, the theory is based on the assumption that the learner is a rational, autonomous, maker of knowledge. However, Michelson argued that learners are irrational as well as rational, and that reflection is a means of “rejecting the emotional, the sensual, and the subjective” (Michelson, 1996, p. 449). Application of Kolb’s theory in the context of Michelson’s article means that reflection needs to be accomplished without dismissing the subjective experience. Reflection should be presented by the practitioner as a means of uncovering the ideas already present as opposed to imposing order and shape to ideas of experience.

Besides the missing human interaction, as previously discussed, there is a key missing connection between each phase of the theory (Michelson, 1996), which questions
the models structure. Kolb argued that there was a ‘dialectical tension’ between experience and conceptualization, and between reflection and experimentation; however he still linked each phase, albeit inadequately.

Finally, the last structural problem is the supposed relation of the learning style with a learning preference. Kolb (1984) found learning preferences for different situations such as projects, lectures, and small group discussions were seen as helpful or not helpful for individuals with certain learning styles. However, Loo (2004) found weak linkages between learning preferences and learning style by administering the LSI and an author-developed 12-item learning preferences measure to 201 undergraduate management students. Three out of four statistically significant differences were found to moderate learning preferences with small to moderate effect sizes (0.43, 0.55, and 0.70). Loo suggested that trainers employ a variety of learning preferences without trying to match to learning type.

This section has provided an understanding of learning and the learning cycle of Kolb’s Experiential Learning Theory. The next section discusses the second theoretical orientation for this project.

Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity

The first section will provide a broad overview and description of Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity. The overview and description describes the model’s six stages. The second section provides research that supports the theory.
Overview and Description

Bennett (1993) created the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) as a framework to explain the experiences of people in intercultural settings. As it has been developed over 15 years of training and teaching experience, DMIS is both an intellectual and developmental model (Bennett, 1986). It builds upon Perry’s theory of intellectual and ethical development by including ways an individual thinks about themselves and others (La Brack, 1993). The DMIS is also based on personal construct theory, where experience is a function of categorizing of events. The DMIS is organized into six stages of increasing sensitivity to cultural differences and increasing competence in intercultural relations. Each stage of the DMIS is characterized by a different worldview that is accompanied by particular attitudes and behaviors.

The first three stages (Denial, Defense, and Minimization), are classified by ethnocentrism, which is the assumption “that the world view of one’s own culture is central to all reality” (Bennett, 1993, p.30). The last three stages (Acceptance, Adaptation, and Integration), are classified by ethno-relativism where “cultures can only be understood relative to one another and that particular behavior can only be understood within a cultural context” (Bennett, 1993, p. 46). In ethno-relativism, there is no absolute standard of goodness that can pertain to cultural behavior. The two parts and the six stages are shown in the figure Developmental Stages of Intercultural Sensitivity (see figure 4) (Bennett & Bennett, 2004).

The first stage is called denial because a person in this stage denies the existence of cultural differences (Bennett & Bennett, 2004). A person in this stage avoids the subject of diversity and refers to other groups as “them” instead of using group names.
Denial is perpetuated through isolation and living in a homogenous community (Bennett, 1993). Power is exercised by exploitation.

A person in the second stage of defense will claim that their culture is the only good one and differences are belittled (Bennett & Bennett, 2004). He or she may object to generalizations about one’s own culture and at the same time, stereotype other cultures. Power is exercised through exclusion and assuming cultural superiority (Bennett, 1986). A variation of this stage, called reversal, is expressed internationally and domestically. It is expressed internationally when a person embraces the foreign culture and rejects the one originally socialized in. It is expressed domestically when a person embraces a subordinate culture and rejects the one in which the person is originally socialized.

The third stage of minimization is characterized by viewing one’s culture as universal, so that cultures are basically similar (Bennett & Bennett, 2004). Some superficial cultural differences may be acknowledged, but the assumption is that deep down, people are the same. Similar needs, values, and desires are attributed to other cultures. A person in this stage may seek to justify assimilation and claim to be tolerant or colorblind. Power is exercised through institutional privilege.

In acceptance, the fourth stage, other cultures are accepted as different, yet just as complex (Bennett & Bennett, 2004). This is the first move into ethno-relativism. A person in this stage may face the dilemma of how to exercise power from his/her own values without imposing them on others. All cultural positions seem equally as valid, thus a person in this stage would be leaving the previous dualistic stages.
The fifth stage of adaptation is marked by a person’s newly acquired ability to potentially include different cultural worldviews (Bennett & Bennett, 2004). A person in this stage needs to think or act outside of his/her own cultural framework, such as living abroad or working with a multicultural team. It is characterized by two shifts. First, the perceptual shift is usually only related to experiences of daily interactions. Secondly, the behavioral shift is beyond the contrived etiquettes. The behaviors are still authentic to the outsider because one’s definition of oneself has broadened to include other cultures.

In integration, the sixth stage, one integrates cultural concepts into aspects of his/her identity (Bennett & Bennett, 2004). A person in this stage is often bi-cultural, yet he/she may feel marginalized in two different ways. Encapsulated marginality is characterized by shifting from cultural mode to mode inappropriately. Constructive marginality is characterized by the ability to move from cultural context to context in a flexible way.

The DMIS is measured by the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), a 50-item paper and pencil instrument. The instrument identifies the stage of development that respondents have achieved and their score indicates their degree of intercultural understanding (Anderson, Lawton, Rexeisen, & Hubbard, 2006). Each subscale indicates one of the six stages as described in the DMIS. Hammer, Bennett and Wiseman (2006) found the instrument is both valid and reliable and alpha coefficients were 0.80 or higher for each subscale. The IDI produced no effects due to age, education, or social status (Greenholtz, 2000; Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2006).
Research that Supports the Theory

There is a limited amount of research on Bennett's DMIS model, however some literature supports using the model in education and higher education in particular. The DMIS model was suggested for use by Student Services in several ways. One was to measure learning outcomes (Greenholtz, 2000). Another use was to select and train peer mentors. Finally, the DMIS model could be used as a part of the counseling process when the student is experiencing difficulties in cultural adaptation (Greenholtz, 2000).

One pilot study supported the use of the model through an evaluation of the development of intercultural sensitivity of American college students on a short-term, non-language based, study abroad program to England and Ireland (Anderson, Lawton, Rexeisen, & Hubbard, 2006). Participants were 23 seniors with an average age of 21. The IDI was administered on the first and last days of class. The results showed that students lessened their tendency to see other cultures as better than their own. The students also improved their ability to accept cultural differences. The small sample prevents this study from providing firm evidence about the development of the students' intercultural sensitivity. Also, the students started out with a mean score of 4 out of 5, leaving very little room for improvement. Even though, overall, the students' scores showed improvement, there was almost no change in the number of students in each stage. Application of this study to re-entry programming suggests that even students who engage in short-term, non-language based, study abroad programs have the potential to move forward in their development of intercultural sensitivity. Study abroad program professionals ought not to dismiss the cultural learning that could take place as participation in short-term study abroad programs is increasing.
DMIS has been applied to culture learning in the general education classroom for university students (Mahoney & Schamber, 2004). A random sample of 48 students who were enrolled in a first-year student course was selected to participate in the study. They completed a series of three ten-minute writing responses, one at the beginning, one at the middle, and one at the end of the course. A team read and coded the responses into one of the six stages of Bennett’s model. Scores revealed that after the first intervention, students were in the range of minimization. After the second intervention, scores had moved to the range of acceptance. There was a statistically significant difference in level of intercultural sensitivity after the second intervention, which included analysis and evaluation (Mahoney & Schamber, 2004). Application of this study to re-entry programming suggests that training which includes analysis and evaluation of cultural difference are more likely to be associated with improvements in students’ level of intercultural sensitivity than training with only comprehension.

There were three main limits to this study. First, the design was not experimental and there was no control group (Mahoney & Schamber, 2004). Secondly, the students change in maturity could have naturally taken place over a five month period. Finally, it may not be generalizable to populations that are not as diverse as this sample.

Researchers evaluated the effects of social desirability on IDI scores. The IDI was tested on 353 subjects who ranged in age from high school, college, and instructors (Paige, Jacobs-Cassuto, Yershova, & Joan DeJaeghere, 2003). They were also given the Marlowe-Crown Social Desirability Scale. The researchers found similar results as Hammer, Bennett and Wiseman for the Cronbach internal reliability of .80 and higher, which suggests that the IDI items match well with its intended stages. The predictive
validity was consistent: age, prior intercultural experience, prior language and culture study, friends with people from other cultures, and socialization with people from other cultures produced higher scores on the IDI. Gender did not predict scores. Scores on the Marlowe-Crown Social Desirability Scale suggested that there is no relationship between the way subjects answered the IDI and their level of social desirability.

As yet, there do not seem to be any published studies which challenge the theory. Area for future research regarding DMIS might include the factors of location of host country and degree of biculturalism at home. Further studies with experimental control groups would also be helpful in determining support for the theory. Further research needs to be done on the concept of reversal to determine how it is different from the stage of ethnorelativism. Finally, research should be conducted on the accuracy of the sequencing of the stages.

*Transition to Chapter Three*

This chapter has provided a review of the literature regarding study abroad re-entry. Research was presented about mistaken expectations, reverse culture shock, changes in interpersonal relationships, and integrating new aspects of the self. The chapter provided an overview of re-entry variables and discussed the purpose of re-entry training as found in the published social science literature. The theoretical approaches to this project of Kolb and Bennett were summarized and reviewed. The Chapter Three will cover the rationale for the proposed program and descriptions of program goals and implementation procedures.
CHAPTER THREE

Justification for the Project

This chapter will explain the rationale behind the content and structure of the re-entry training which follows in Chapter Four. The first section will discuss the rationale for the program design and will include motivational strategies, program goals, and limitations. The next section will provide a brief overview of the program implementation suggestions, along with resources and materials needed. The final section is a description of the program.

Rationale for Program Design

This section will discuss the rationale for the content of the program as well as the how the theories were used to meet the identified problems. Next, learner motivational strategies will be discussed. Finally, the program goals and limitations will be explained.

Program Content

A major theme in re-entry research is that returning sojourners typically do not expect any difficulty upon returning home. Conversely, those college students who anticipated difficulties were less likely to experience reverse culture shock (Gaw, 2000). Gaw also found that students who had the highest levels of reverse culture shock, were less likely to use student support services. Based on the above rationale, this program will include activities addressing re-entry expectations and typical re-entry problems, which is the primary theme of section two of the retreat.

A second problem related to re-entry found in the literature is reverse culture shock. LaBrack (1993) found that two main elements contributed to reverse culture shock.
shock: an idealized view of home and a taken for granted familiarity with the home culture. To address reverse culture shock, this program will include activities about perceptions of American culture and reflection about changed values, which is covered in section three and four of the retreat.

Additionally, section three covers aspects of personal change. Returnees become aware of their personal changes, which might also be related to their confusion and reverse homesickness. The more that the sojourners believe that they have changed, the more they experienced a problematic re-entry (Sussman, 2001; Uehara, 1986). Based on the above rationale, students will engage in a sentence completion activity and a values clarification exercise. Moreover, perceptions of American culture will be included in section three because returnees often question nationalism and feel both critical and guilty about the criticalness at the same time (Hess, 1997; Porterfield, 2002; Sobie, 1986).

Finally, the literature revealed the theme of integrating study abroad experiences. Returnees reported feeling frustrated if they could not integrate their new knowledge and skills back home (Adler, 1981; Raschio, 1987; Woody, 1998). Some students may simply shoebox their memorabilia and experiences, to only take them out and look at them periodically (La Brack, 1993; Martin & Harrell, 2004). To prevent students from encapsulating their study abroad experiences, section four of the retreat will address integrating their experiences into life back home. Students would visualize aspects of their life such as activities, work, friends, and academics and draw words and symbols into a picture representing this integration. Finally, they would write specific goals and objectives pertaining to integrating their experiences into life back home.
Theoretical Orientation

Besides research, this program considered two theoretical orientations as discussed in Chapter Two. The design of this program considers the learning styles as well as content objectives. Students who are in an educational program that requires them to perform in a learning mode that is dissimilar to their preference are more likely to resist. But not everyone in any one session is going to be operating from the same mode. Kolb (1984) suggested that to make students more well-rounded, programs should develop the students’ weaknesses in the learning styles so that they may have a variety of ways in which they can learn. An integrated development is where “the person is highly developed in each of the four learning modes: active, reflective, abstract, and concrete” (Kolb, 1984, p. 203). StARR is designed to cover a variety of learning modes to accommodate for a variety of different learning styles.

The implications of Kolb’s theory on this project are grounded on the idea that learning is relearning. Students enter each course with preconceived notions, as opposed to a “blank slate.” The students may have held their beliefs for years, so the educational program’s purpose is to provide new ideas and allow the student to eradicate and alter old, no longer accurate ideas (Kolb, 1984). The learning cycle of Kolb’s theory is also addressed in order to directly address the topic with the sojourners. See Figure 5 for a table listing each activity and its corresponding stage in the cycle.

Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity also aids in some of the curriculum design for this project. From stage one to six, a person has increasing levels of understanding of one’s relationship with others. An individual who moves up in stages interacts more effectively with others who are seen as different (Bennett, 1986).
They have more ability to acknowledge the legitimacy of multiple perspectives. And finally they have a broader understanding of social systems. Activities to facilitate movement to higher levels of development in this model are addressed. The basic principle is that a student must internalize the concept of *difference* (Bennett, 1986). Difference refers to the idea that cultures have different world views. Based on the above rationale, students could internalize the concept of difference through analyzing a critical incident and completing the Perceptions of American Culture activity.

The students can learn that people can live by other values systems than our own. Individuals do not have to change their values to be able to live in another culture, but the students might find that several of their values have changed with the exposure. It is likely they have adopted some of their [host country] practices and assimilated them into their beliefs.

*Motivational Strategies*

This section will discuss four instructional and motivational strategies used: (a) learners attention, (b) comprehension, (c) memory, and (d) motivation.

*Obtaining the Learners Attention.* There are five main ways StARR would obtain the learners attention: objectives, humor, relevance, accountability, and modality. During the introduction and before the ice breakers, the objectives of the re-entry retreat would be shared with the group. To include humor, cartoon images about travel and language learning from Cartoonstock.com could be shared. To make the content relevant to learners, after the ice breaker, the program would provide the participants with the opportunity to share and listen about memorabilia or a specific photo that meant something special to the student. The program guide indicates to trainers they should
instruct the students in advance to bring items to the retreat. StARR would hold learners accountable through activities based on worksheets that they would individually complete. Additionally, worksheets would be discussed as a group. Finally, StARR would use movement and creativity to address as many senses as possible. In section four of the retreat, there would be a human sculpture activity, where the students get up and express a feeling about the re-entry experience. This activity urges the participant to get up and moving, but not so demanding that most people with a physical disability could still probably participate in this exercise or a modified version of it. The last activity also engages the student by asking them to draw symbols, pictures, or words.

**Comprehension.** Comprehension is generating meaning and making relationships to prior knowledge and would be accomplished through (a) chunking and organizing, (b) cues, (c) generations, and (d) compositions. StARR would use the chunking and organizing method to present information about re-entry. A list of eight positive myths and a list of six negative myths will be presented, with the students taking turns reading the list to the group. This could help them organize some of their thought patterns surrounding their re-entry transition. A discussion surrounding these two lists would take place.

In order to provide the students with cues, the Typical Re-entry Problems exercise presents a vignette to the students with an example of a common reentry problem. For example, one of the vignettes addresses the problem of friends and family who may only be willing to listen a few minutes to the returning sojourner, rather than fully hear their experiences.
StARR would ask learners to develop explanations and engage in writing to address the *generations* aspect of comprehension. One of the best ways to understand and interpret the new cultural experiences is for the student to write about them (Wagner & Magistrale, 1995). Writing is active and individuals usually learn better by actively doing something, rather than passively receiving information. The process of writing can potentially reveal the confusion the student feels, help to organize their thoughts, and deepen their conception of the host and home culture (Wagner & Magistrale, 1995).

Based on the above rationale, this program will include two writing activities: Critical Incidents and Sentence Completion. In this activity, the students would get into small groups to think of critical incidents that they experienced and reinterpret the scenario based on the group discussions and brainstorming to develop a new explanation of how and why that situation happened.

Finally, to address the written compositions, learners would create analogies. In *Creating a New Home*, the students would draw a new home. This is based on the analogy method. An image of a “home” is compared to a “life.” The windows, doors and roof all are symbolic for parts of their life that they are creating.

*Memory.* To assist learners achieve memory and retention with the new information, StARR would implement three techniques: practice and examples, organizers, and categories. Practice and examples within StARR lessons would be combined into the same activity: *Critical Incidents.* First, a critical incident story would be provided such as a student in Denmark being shouted at on the train. Then, the facilitator would demonstrate how to reconstruct this example for the whole group. More information would then be obtained from the group concerning different ideas about what
went wrong. Finally, the new ideas that were formulated would be used to make a new interpretation of the event. The students would have the opportunity to practice by being placed into small groups to reconstruct their own critical incidents and this would be their opportunity to practice this process on their own and with the support of their peers.

An example of how StARR will use organizing is an activity where the students will complete a values clarification exercise, where they eliminate values according to their levels of preference. The final stage of the activity is where they write in their tiers of values into a table. The result of this is that they would leave with an outline of their top values.

Finally, to assist students with memory, students at a StARR program would have the opportunity to use categories and identify patterns. The patterns that would be discussed are in the context of American versus host country values. The students would look at similarities and differences between countries and rate them on a scale. Some of the home and host items they could identify with include the level time consciousness, competitiveness, individualism, autonomy, materialism, achievement-orientation, consumerism, pace of life, reliance on technology, formality, change, valuing of youth, and distrust of authority.

Motivation. Motivating learners will assist them to continue learning. The StARR program will motivate learners in three ways: variety, self-direction, and recognition. One example of the retreat providing variety is through engaging students individually, in dyads and in groups. They will learn through discussion, writing, physical expression, and drawing.
Self-direction is accomplished through learner choice. The students would have choice in their responses for each activity that is accomplished. For example, they would be able to choose what memorabilia that they want to share with their peers. In the Critical Incidents activity, they could choose what incident to use and how to reconstruct it. With the Human Sculpture activity, they could choose which feeling that they want to express. Overall, the students are making meaning out of their experiences. The activities are already pre-set, but it would be up to the participants exactly how they choose to delve into the material.

Finally, recognition is also built into the facilitator resources. This section will include information about going from group to group, checking on progress, and providing praise and encouragement to the students. The facilitator can build in recognition, especially with the Critical Incidents activity, since it is probably the most difficult activity of the retreat day. Also, the praise for effort can be built in to the group brainstorming for the Perceptions of American Culture, since some students may not want to speak if they fear that they are wrong. In that situation, the facilitator would have to be sensitive to this fear and praise the students for the ideas that they came up with.

Program Goals

Students who participate in StARR would have the potential for more realistic expectations about the re-entry challenges that they may face, thus reducing the impact of reverse culture shock. They would have the opportunity to reflect upon how they have changed, the cultural encounters that they experienced, and how they would like to integrate their study abroad experience into their life back at home. Three instructional goals are presented below, each with several objectives that address the above topics.
Goal A. Students would have the opportunity to fully share their sojourn experiences with at least one other person.

Objectives:

1. Within a month of the Re-entry Retreat, students will identify at least one supportive person to listen to the student’s stories in order to minimize the effects of reverse culture shock.

2. Students would contact the ally at least three times during the semester after their return.

3. Students would discuss with their ally, at least one way they have personally changed and/or discuss their concerns about or criticism towards the U.S.

4. By the end of the first semester of return, the students would self-reflect whether he or she felt the need to share more with others, and if so, would reconnect with the ally to do so.

Goal B. Students would effectively use coping strategies when confronted with re-entry problems.

Objectives:

1. Students would utilize at least one of the techniques included in the Re-Entry Retreat in order to handle a re-entry problem, if relevant, within a semester of returning.

2. Students would identify at least three positive and at least three negative denials about re-entry that they have believed, and identify which ones are being disproven within a semester of returning.
Goal C. Students would utilize the “New Home Life” activity and resources regarding academics and social settings to integrate their study abroad experiences.

Objectives:

1. Students would identify and implement at least one on-campus means to help them use their new cross cultural skills or knowledge (e.g., involvement with international students on their home campus, provide guest lectures in relevant classrooms, participate in language or culture-learning related activities) within the first semester after the Re-entry Retreat.

2. Students would identify and implement at least one off-campus outlet to help them use their new cross-cultural skills or knowledge (e.g., listen to the radio or watch movies in the language of their sojourn country, provide slide shows to local and civic groups) within the first semester after the Re-entry Retreat.

Limitations of the Program

The limitations of the development of StARR is related to the vast number of countries in which study abroad students go, the format of individual versus group psycho-education, continuing re-entry support, logistical issues, and the career development levels and needs of the participants. First, a group of study abroad students from one institution may represent upwards of 20 different host countries each semester, depending on the institution. StARR, while addressing culture from a developmental point of view, will not be able to provide cultural interpretations or expert teaching for the hundreds of possible countries in which students have studied. The development of StARR is constrained from providing interpretations to students regarding their specific host country experiences or interpretations regarding the variability in re-entry from
different host countries. Since this program is focused on individual growth and development, it does not provide a reference point for understanding how culture plays into global problems, or local multicultural problems. This training is also developed to be present-focused, in that there are no strategies provided for locating another study abroad site, overseas internship experience, or research and graduate schools abroad.

Secondly, StARR will not be a manual for study abroad professionals in how to counsel students individually regarding the re-entry experience. The activities are structured for groups and group processing. While several of the activities are conducted on worksheets individually, this product is not intended for professionals' individual appointment use.

Additionally, this product does not prescribe a specific method for continuing the support of the student through their re-entry. StARR could be used in conjunction with other pedagogy, such as online blogs, message centers, or WebCT. It would be up to each individual trainer how they would like to encourage students to continue exploring their re-entry transition.

This program is designed for international educators to adapt their own campus. This program does not address logistical issues that the returnees will face. There are very real issues and struggles such as finding a new job or apartment, ensuring that their classes transfer units and grades, enrolling or applying for classes and financial aid, applying for outstanding medical claims, and informing various businesses of their change of address. Each advisor is still individually responsible to review transcripts, make final approvals, and inform students of policies that are specific to their institutions. However, the retreat built in a section called Newsflash for the purpose of any specific
institutional updates, announcements, or changes in policies related to housing, financial aid, or academic advising.

Finally, while résumé building is important, this training does not attempt to duplicate the services of a campus career development center in incorporating experiences into a skills and competencies format. It is suggested that study abroad advisors recommend and refer students to a career counselor for further résumé development and articulation, to further integrate their experiences abroad into their academics and career.

Program Implementation

This section will address steps in implementing a StARR program which includes reserving a meeting room, promoting the program, securing food and refreshments, and preparing a programming tool box.

A meeting room that would be accessible to students with disabilities and have appropriate technology such as access to an overhead projector, digital projector, and screen should be reserved well in advance to ensure the appropriate space for the retreat. The meeting room should have tables for writing and work space, but should be fairly moveable for students to arrange themselves in small groups as needed (See Figure 6, Room Configuration). Determine the number of participants that would be accommodated according to the space and number of available facilitators.

Promoting the program would be accomplished with well-designed marketing materials that clearly imply the benefits to the participants (Hartwig, 2000). The marketing materials need to have a statement to request participants to inform the campus coordinator of the need for interpreters, which is also known as communication requests.
Campus policies would need to be reviewed for size and posting location guidelines before flyers are posted (Hartwig, 2000). Follow the guidelines related to using campus logos in promotional materials. Some marketing strategies could include: folded paper table tents, sending invitations or personal emails, target audience listservs, departmental newsletters, events in campus newspapers, and/or meetings where the announcements can be made.

Invite participants and record confirmations of planned attendance. A reminder email should be sent a few days before the event. It is very important to emphasize that the students should bring a photo(s) or a souvenir that is meaningful to them to share with the group. Include a statement on the invitation and remind them before the event that one of the activities involves sharing this memorabilia.

Food, snacks, and other refreshments should be arranged and purchased. The agenda included 45 minutes for lunch with no activities planned. This would allow the retreat participants to freely mingle with each other and take a mental break from the structure of the day. Use the confirmation count to estimate the number of required lunches to purchase. Plan to accommodate for vegetarian and Kosher meals.

Secure a facilitator or co-facilitator as necessary. Handouts and lecture notes would need to be duplicated including program outlines and evaluations forms. The visual aids should then be finalized with interpreters before program if necessary.

A programming tool box which would include both supplies and program documents needs to be created:
Supplies

a. flip charts/markers
b. chalk/dry erase pens
c. tape
d. scissors
e. stapler
f. pens/pencils
g. paper clips
h. name tags/file folders
i. markers/colored pencils
j. wax paper
k. blank sheets of paper
l. tissues

Program Documents

a. list of confirmed students (and others invited in case they decide to attend without confirming)
b. sign-in sheet
c. copy of the program outline
d. program evaluation forms
e. room and equipment confirmations
f. lunch delivery confirmation and contact numbers
g. copies of agreements or contracts
There are several procedures that would need to be accomplished on the day of the training. Directional signs from the parking lot to the meeting room would need to be hung. Nearby restrooms need to be located and snacks and refreshments brought and set up.

*Program Description*

The StARR trainer's guide will be used by study abroad program professionals to plan and implement a re-entry retreat for their students at their own institution of higher education. It will describe lessons to conduct with American study abroad students returning from their sojourn in the format of a one-day retreat.

Section One assists students to get to know one another through an ice breaker. They will view some cartoons related to travel to start the day out with some humor. The first section is also a time to establish norms and expectations that they have for themselves and each other. Finally, they will share memorabilia with each other about their study abroad experience.

The main focus of Section Two is cross-cultural re-entry. Students are exposed to expectations about their re-entry experience. They have the chance discuss common re-entry problems and possible solutions. Through analyzing critical incidents, students will deconstruct their own cross-cultural mishaps to develop a new perspective.

Section Three covers personal reflection of growth. This is accomplished through expressing their feelings about returning to the U.S. and through comparing home and host cultural values. Students will also engage in a sentence completion activity and discuss their responses.
Section Four is focused on solidifying a plan of action for the student when the retreat is over. The student will review their values. They will imagine and use their creativity to create a new life now that they are back in the U.S. The retreat will close with a discussion about integrating their new found skills into their academic and social lives.

*Transition to Chapter Four*

Chapter Three discussed the rationale for the program design, content, and structure by referencing the literature as well as two theoretical orientations. The program goals, limitations, motivational strategies were described. Several implementation strategies were presented. Chapter Four will contain the actual retreat curriculum with step-by-step trainers’ instructions.
CHAPTER FOUR
Program Content

Please refer to Appendix B for a mock up of the proposed program.

Evaluation of Methodology

To evaluate the Study Abroad Re-entry Retreat: A Trainer’s Guide, feedback was requested from several study abroad program professionals. A reviewer evaluation was emailed with the trainer’s guide and pertaining handouts which inquired about usefulness, relevance, and ease of use (see Appendix A). Reviewers evaluated the trainers guide and responses will be discussed in Chapter Five.
CHAPTER FIVE

Summary and Conclusions

This program focused on assisting American study abroad students re-enter into American life and culture, and higher education in the United States. This chapter will discuss the applications of the theories to the re-entry program. An evaluation summary by the study abroad program professionals who reviewed this program will be presented. Ideas for future research and a summary of the paper will conclude the chapter.

Application of Theories

Both theories discussed in Chapter Two are applied to this project below: Experiential Learning and the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity.

Application of Kolb's Experiential Learning Theory to Study Abroad

There are four stages in the Experiential Learning Theory cycle: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation. An individual has a concrete experience through openly participating in a new event (Kolb, 1984) which provides the basis of the reflection during reflective observation. When an individual integrates their observations into their own theories, they are in the stage of abstract conceptualization (Kolb). And finally, active experimentation is putting their own theories to use with decision-making and problem solving by testing out the implications.

Study abroad students can cycle through the stages while abroad, and then continue the cycle upon returning home. Students go abroad and encounter their host country through concrete and tangible experiences. They live amongst the host nationals,
try new foods, and possibly practice different language skills and religious practices. They are grasping through apprehension and are in the Concrete Experience stage.

While abroad, students may take time to reflect about their new found independence, host county and cultural encounters, who they are at home, and adventurous lifestyle. This suggests a transformation through intention into the Reflective Observation stage. Next, the sojourner might begin to have an understanding of the cultural norms and traditions in broadening his/her global view. This is grasping via comprehension and takes place during the Abstract Conceptualization stage.

Finally, the sojourner may try out some of the newly acquired host country behaviors in culturally appropriate situations or may adopt some of the values of the host country. This transformation takes place through extension and is called Active Experimentation.

The same cycles of concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation can take place upon returning to the United States. The returnee has the concrete experience of returning home to friends and family. They have the reflective observation of themselves as different, while they may view their families and community as the same. The next stage is the Abstract Conceptualization of deciding whether to keep or let go of their new cultural behaviors. And finally, in Active Experimentation, the returnee can work toward integrating their experiences abroad into their home and academic life.

The re-entry training serves as a microcosm of the experiential learning cycle. Activities and worksheets facilitate the reflective observation about their re-entry experience. It can assist with encouraging the formation of abstract conceptualization,
and finally, provide a safe space to create a plan of action for their next stage which they complete after re-entry training, which may be an example of Active Experimentation.

*Application of the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity on Study Abroad*

Bennett’s (1993) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) was a framework created to explain the experiences of people in or previously in intercultural or foreign settings. The six stage model is made of two parts, ethnocentrism and ethno-relativism, each with three stages. The first three stages (Denial, Defense, and Minimization), are classified by ethnocentrism. The last three stages (Acceptance, Adaptation, and Integration), are classified by ethno-relativism. The DMIS is organized into six stages of increasing sensitivity to cultural differences and increasing competence in intercultural relations.

The DMIS model helps the trainer assess the developmental level of the learners (Bennett & Bennett, 2004). After assessment, the trainer can assist individuals to reflect upon their assumptions and attitudes and bring up additional considerations (La Brack, 1993). Various approaches can be applied during different stages.

At the first stage of Denial, the trainer’s goal is to discuss cultural differences and information about different cultures (Bennett, 2003). At the Defense stage, the trainer’s goal is to work on illuminating cultural similarities so that the student can move from an “us-them” attitude to a “they’re not so bad” attitude (Bennett, 2003). To move the student from the third stage, Minimization, the trainer’s goal is to question the students’ assumptions about other cultures and to ask them to examine their own culture. Learners in this stage need to be exposed to cultural competencies such as open-mindedness, cultural self-awareness, listening skills, non-judgmentalness, and accurate perceptions.
For trainers to work with a student in the Acceptance stage, they need to assist the student in analyzing differences with increasingly complex categories. Activities that have higher levels of risk are appropriate, such as role plays, simulations, home stays, and experiential activities. Critical incidents are particularly useful during this stage. To move to the next stage, the student needs to resolve the dilemma of: "if I accept ___ culture, does that mean that I have to think everything they do is right?" In the fifth stage of Adaptation, the trainer discusses relevant intercultural skills, such as cultural interviewing, frame-of-reference shifting, and intercultural empathy. Since not everyone in the classroom will be in one stage, the trainer needs to be prepared to assess the audience for their developmental continuum (Bennett, 2003). It is reasonable to assume that 18-21 year olds might fall into a normal curve distribution, with most in the minimization stage with several outliers in denial or integration.

The DMIS model also helps the trainer with appropriate sequencing of activities (Bennett & Bennett). Bennett suggests opening training with statements to displace the potential negative responses. She suggests that trainers say to students in Denial or Minimization stages, “many of you may be wondering why intercultural competence is relevant to our work” (Bennett, 2003, p. 167). Or, “these intercultural concerns are soft skills anyone can pick up on the job” (p. 167). Being attentive to learner readiness assists the trainer in limiting the stress on the students and the trainer by providing a theoretical rationale for the sequencing of activities.

This project utilized the DMIS model in activity selection. The Critical Incidents activity was chosen because it assists students to analyze situations from different perspectives. The students may come to a new understanding of their cultural encounter
so that in future situations, they will approach them while remembering the cultural context. In Perceptions of American Culture, students are asked to examine their perceptions of their own culture. Both of these activities are essential for moving students from the third stage, Minimization to the fourth stage, Acceptance, with Critical Incidents also being helpful to move students from Acceptance to Adaptation.

Experiential Learning and the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity were used to develop this project. These theories assisted with activity selection, sequencing, and experiential approach. The activities were designed to address a variety of learning preferences and facilitate movement through the learning cycle. Additionally, the activities were designed to facilitate movement towards increasing intercultural sensitivity.

Evaluation of Project

This project was reviewed by five program professionals from the following universities: California State University Chico, the University of Southern California, University of California San Diego, Santa Clara University, and California Polytechnic State University Pomona out of eight potential reviewers. The five reviewers were current professionals and carried the title of Director, Assistant Director, Associate Director, or Study Abroad Coordinator/Adviser.

Potential reviewers were study abroad program professionals from the California State University, University of California, and several private California colleges. Reviewers were contacted by email and asked to assist. Eight professionals agreed to participate, and five returned the evaluations. A summary of their responses follow.

Responses to Project by Program Professionals
All five program professionals stated that StARR would promote successful student re-entry. One reviewer stated the program was well-balanced and seems to promote the much needed reflection on students’ experiences abroad. Another reviewer found that the retreat could provide the students the opportunity to share their international experiences. The following aspects of the review will be discussed: usefulness, most useful, least useful, and additional topics to include.

Usefulness. The five program professionals reported that the trainers’ guide would be useful for implementing and conducting a re-entry retreat. Four of the five stated they would use the materials to implement a retreat. One reviewer stated if they did not already have materials, they would use a guide such as this. Additionally, the choice of activities and the gradual build-up to more personal sharing was found to be well balanced – not too intrusive, but not too illusive to the point of shallowness. One reviewer commented that the retreat offered the students some closure with the goal setting activity. One comment maintained that the information was clearly and logically presented and that the exercises have been designed to meet a variety of preferred learning styles.

Most useful. In general, the reviewers found the most useful aspects of the materials were the clearly outlined goals, objectives, materials, and instructions, along with the handouts. More specifically, two activities were highlighted; the Typical Re-entry Problems Activity 2.3 and the Sentence Completion Activity 3.3. Two reviewers felt that the activities promoted a lot of discussion.

Least useful. Two items were identified as least useful. It was suggested by two reviewers that the presentation of Kolb’s theory was oversimplified. One comment was
that a facilitator of this type of program would need more theoretical and practical
background knowledge than is presented in order to make this retreat feasible. While the
project in Chapter Two provided background information, the project itself contained
minimal explanation. It might be helpful to include a “Suggested Reading” bibliography
of books and articles.

Secondly, the retreat implementation section received mixed opinions. A
reviewer felt that the retreat implementation information was the least useful. One
reviewer found the assistance with the event planning and preparation useful. Another
reviewer suggested including samples of flyers, posters, and emails that could be sent out
to students and parents in the recruitment phases leading up to the retreat. Perhaps,
previous experience in implementing a one-day program might influence the level of
need for such a section, which might vary from trainer to trainer.

*Additional topics to include.* Several suggestions were made about further
clarification or additional topics to include in this project. One reviewer would have
preferred further explanation of retreat implementation issues such as cost, location, and
staffing. Additionally, a concern was mentioned regarding the role of former study
abroad students who serve as Peer Advisors in the retreat. The reviewer was looking for
helpful tips on training student leaders on their role.

One recommendation was to include a brief lecturette on the theories behind
reentry shock so students can better understand the concepts involved. This would
benefit those students with a preferred learning style of reflective observation. An
appropriate section which a lecturette might fit would be as a part of Denials and
Affirmations Activity 2.1. Additionally, it might be helpful to allow for some brainstorming about adapting to life in the U.S.

Finally, a missing aspect for one reviewer was the connection to technology. The reviewer was expecting some activities to integrate today’s technology savvy, music-loving, Facebook-centric student traits into the retreat experience. While the review made no suggestions, StARR provided possible websites in which trainers could refer their students to blog about their study abroad re-entry experience after the retreat is over.

*Suggestions to improve the project.* Three design aspects concerned the reviewers. First, the Schedule-at-a-Glance was helpful, however, it would be preferable to have the actual time of each activity right on the page so the trainer does not have to keep going back to the schedule during the actual retreat. Secondly, the certificate of completion and the assessment appeared to be placed in an odd location. To counteract this problem, it was suggested to place these items in the appendix, which would help the trainer move through the materials and then refer to miscellaneous handouts at the end. Finally, the retreat format was a concern for one reviewer who thought that the activities might be more effective if implemented over a period of several weeks, due to the various timing of intensity of reverse culture shock.

The reviewers offered suggestions to improve the activities. A reviewer was concerned that the Human Sculpture Activity 3.1 would face resistance from college-age students and that the benefit of the kinesthetic approach does not outweigh the disadvantages.

For Activity 3.2, Values Clarification, it was suggested to have a worksheet of the values, attitudes, and beliefs. While the values were listed on the instruction page, it
would be helpful to write them on a sheet for convenience with clearer instructions on copying them to a labels page.

*Final recommendations and comments.* It was suggested that a list of campus resources could be provided to students who want to join international organizations/clubs, language partners, counseling services, or gain international career information. Additionally, at the end of the retreat, a 30-60 minute resource fair could provide guest speakers from the various international organizations, career services areas, Peace Corp, or international club, etc to further assist students to integrate and expand upon their study abroad experience.

While overall, the results of the evaluation were positive regarding usefulness and promotion of successful student re-entry, several suggestions were provided to improve and expand on this program. Additional explanation of the relevant theories would have been preferred. Further details about cost, marketing, location, and staffing could have been provided. Some design elements about the activities and sequencing of items were critiqued. The reviewers provided specific feedback about improving certain activities and suggested adding a resource fair to the end of the retreat.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

It is important for students to understand that their cultural learning abroad was only a fraction of the totality of the culture and took place within a very specific context (Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004). Study abroad program professionals could encourage students to avoid claiming to be host country experts and continue their host country learning. That, in fact, their host country learning continues after return to their home country.
Future re-entry trainings could utilize specific assessments to measure student’s development. Students could take Bennett’s Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), a 50-item paper and pencil instrument, before they depart and after the re-entry retreat. The instrument identifies the stage of development that respondents have achieved and their score indicates their degree of intercultural understanding (Anderson, Lawton, Rexeisen, & Hubbard, 2006). Trained IDI facilitators could work with the students individually to understand their scores and relevant changes in subscores to develop a plan to move to the next stage.

Several study abroad programs offer internships abroad. The students may spend most of their week at their internship. Future research could examine the relationships between those who had internships abroad and career decision making as compared to those who did not. Programming to assist students integrate their work experience abroad directly into their career development may need to be addressed.

To expand upon this program, previous returnees could attend the retreat to act as peer mentors during the re-entry process. The mentors could share their own journey to re-acclimate to the U.S. and their own tips on integrating their study abroad experiences.

**Summary of Project**

Chapter One introduced the topic of study abroad and cross-cultural re-entry. The population of study abroad students was discussed and several key terms were defined. Chapter Two reviewed the literature on re-entry and the purpose of re-entry training. Two relevant theories were described, and supporting and non-supporting literature was presented. Chapter Three provided the rationale for the project and descriptions of program goals and implementation procedures. Chapter Four referred the reader to the
appendix where the actual project materials and curriculum were presented in a design to show the look and feel for this guide. Chapter Five discussed the applications of the theories to the re-entry program, the professionals’ evaluations, and ideas for future research.

While re-entry marks an important transition in the lives of study abroad students, the end of the study abroad experience, it also marks the beginning of their new lives as experienced sojourners. It is recommended that study abroad program professionals take the opportunity to maximize the students’ potential to develop and successfully transition through periods of re-entry shock. The students could potentially acquire more realistic expectations about the re-entry challenges that they may face, reduce the impact of reverse culture shock, reflect upon how they have changed, and how they would like to integrate their study abroad experience into their life back at home through their participation in the re-entry retreat.
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**DEVELOPMENT OF INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY**

**EXPERIENCE OF DIFFERENCE**
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Figure 5: Activities and Corresponding Learning Cycle Stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Activity Names</th>
<th>Kolb Learning Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Welcome</td>
<td>Getting Acquainted Workshop Expectations and the Declaration of Good Participation Sharing Memorabilia</td>
<td>Concrete Experience Concrete Experience Concrete Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cross Cultural Re-entry</td>
<td>Denials and Affirmations Typical Re-entry Problems Critical Incidents</td>
<td>Reflective Observation Reflective Observation Abstract Conceptualization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Reflecting on Personal Change</td>
<td>Human Sculpture Perceptions of American Culture Sentence Completion</td>
<td>Abstract Conceptualization Reflective Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Creating a New Home</td>
<td>Values Sort New Home Goal Setting</td>
<td>Reflective Observation Abstract Conceptualization Abstract Conceptualization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6: Possible Room Configuration for StARR retreat
Appendix A

Evaluation Form
StARR Study Abroad Re-entry Retreat: A Trainer's Guide for Study Abroad Professionals

After reviewing the retreat sessions, activities, and handouts, please complete the following evaluation. For questions 1-8, indicate whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the statements.

1. It is feasible to implement a StARR Retreat with the information provided.
   Strongly Agree ____  Agree ____  Disagree ____  Strongly Disagree ____

2. Each section of the guide has an appropriate theme.
   Strongly Agree ____  Agree ____  Disagree ____  Strongly Disagree ____

3. StARR activities are presented in a logical sequence.
   Strongly Agree ____  Agree ____  Disagree ____  Strongly Disagree ____

4. The procedures described are easy to understand.
   Strongly Agree ____  Agree ____  Disagree ____  Strongly Disagree ____

5. StARR provides relevant activities for students.
   Strongly Agree ____  Agree ____  Disagree ____  Strongly Disagree ____

6. StARR activities would likely engage students who have different learning preferences.
   Strongly Agree ____  Agree ____  Disagree ____  Strongly Disagree ____

7. StARR activities provide sufficient interaction.
   Strongly Agree ____  Agree ____  Disagree ____  Strongly Disagree ____

8. Program handouts have an appropriate design.
   Strongly Agree ____  Agree ____  Disagree ____  Strongly Disagree ____

Please elaborate on any problems and/or concerns from questions 1-8:

9. Overall, do you feel this trainer's guide would be useful for implementing and conducting a re-entry retreat?
   Yes ____  No ____

   Why or why not?
10. Overall, do you believe that the components of the StARR program would promote successful student re-entry?
   
   Yes____ No____
   
   Please elaborate:

11. Would you (or, if relevant, your staff in your office) use this type of guide with returning sojourners?
   
   Yes____ No____

12. What is the most useful and informative section of the trainer's guide?

13. What is the least useful section of the trainer's guide? (Please explain if you feel sections should be taken out or modified.)

14. What additional information would you like to see included in the trainer's guide?

15. Recommendations/Additional Comments.
Appendix B
Mockup of StARR: Study Abroad Re-entry Retreat: A Trainer’s Guide
StARR
Study Abroad Re-entry Retreat: A Trainer’s Guide

How to facilitate a retreat for American Study Abroad Students returning to the U.S.
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Introduction

When students study abroad, they encounter the host country, and as well they also encounter themselves. They have the opportunity to reflect on their own values and their national identity (Dolby, 2004). They benefit from the opportunity to appreciate different points of view, gain perspective, and cultivate their ability to reside in an interdependent global society (Walker, 1999).

When the experience is over, students say, “good bye” to new friends and to the adventure they took part in. Some may believe that this chapter in their lives is over, and place their memorabilia in a box, to only take it out occasionally and reminisce (LaBrack, 1993; Martin & Harrell, 2004). It is also not common for the sojourner to anticipate challenges upon arriving back in the U.S. since the challenge they experienced was the study abroad (Adler, 1981; Christofi & Thompson, 2007; Gaw, 2000; Rogers and Ward, 1993). They expect to return home to a familiar place, but they have changed and the familiarity is often lost.

Re-entry after study abroad has been shown to cause result in a variety of struggles for the returning sojourners (Hess, 1997; Porterfield, 2002; Rohrlich & Martin, 1991; Sussman, 2001; Uehara, 1986). Returning home is not as simple as picking up where one left off. Returnees might view coming home as an instantaneous event, such as walking off the plane. But, in reality, re-entry is like other transitions: coming home unfolds over time. It is complicated and difficult, particularly because the struggles are so unexpected.

Purpose of this Guide

This guide is intended for study abroad advisors who need to implement a training activity for their students returning from study abroad. Study abroad advisors are program professionals who assist students with program selection, preparation, or program coordination.

How to Use this Guide

The next section discusses steps to prepare for and implement a re-entry retreat. Then, the activities of the retreat are presented on chronological order and clustered into sections. All activities have the goals, objectives, materials, and instructions provided. Handouts, if any, can be found immediately after the activity instructions.

References from which this work was based are provided.
Retreat Format

The retreat is structured as a one-day training. The retreat should be implemented within the first 2-4 weeks after return from abroad. Each institution is different, but retreats will probably need to be scheduled three times per year for those completing the fall, spring, and summer study abroad sessions. Hence, most institutions will probably have to host a retreat in January, June and August.

The activities were sequenced in increasing skill and risk level over the event.

Required Knowledge and Skills

It is advisable that retreat trainers have an understanding of culture learning and development, possess strong facilitation skills, and have a past experience in cross cultural re-entry.

A facilitator needs to determine the level of trust in the group and the level of risk the students are willing to take. A good facilitator will understand that the more didactic the workshop, the more impersonal it is. Which means it requires low involvement, low disclosure, and low interaction with others. Whereas, activities that are more experiential are more personal, require more disclosure, more interactive, and the more internal the learning. Effective facilitators bring a set of interpersonal skills to their workshops (Lindell, Hubbard, & Werner, 2000). They know their own biases, suspend judgment, and accept the learned at the stage they are in. They use the principles of effective feedback such as it is specific and focuses on behaviors and observations. They are adept at pacing and allow enough time for reflection and discussions.

Additionally, trainers might want to develop several of the following personal attributes to assist with the facilitation process (Paige, 1993):

1. Tolerance of ambiguity
2. Cognitive and behavioral flexibility
3. Personal self-awareness
4. Cultural self-awareness
5. Patience
6. Enthusiasm and commitment
7. Interpersonal sensitivity
8. Tolerance of differences
9. Openness to new experiences
10. Empathy
11. Sense of humility
12. Sense of humor
Instructional Goals

Goal A. Students would have the opportunity to fully share their sojourn experiences with at least one other person.

Objectives:
1. Within a month of the Re-entry Retreat, students will identify at least one supportive person to listen to the student’s stories in order to minimize the effects of reverse culture shock.
2. Students would contact the ally at least three times during the semester after their return.
3. Students would discuss with their ally, at least one way they have personally changed or concerns about criticism towards the U.S.
4. By the end of the first semester of return, the students would self-reflect whether he or she felt the need to share more with others and if so, would reconnect with the ally to do so.

Goal B. Students would effectively use coping strategies when confronted with re-entry problems.

Objectives:
1. Students would utilize at least one of the techniques included in the Re-Entry Retreat in order to handle a re-entry problem, if relevant, within a semester of returning.
2. Students would identify at least three positive and at least three negative denials about re-entry that they have believed, and identify which ones are being disproven within a semester of returning.

Goal C. Students would utilize the "New Home Life" activity and resources regarding academics and social settings to integrate their study abroad experiences.

Objectives:
1. Students would identify and implement at least one on-campus means to help them use their new cross cultural skills or knowledge (e.g., involvement with international students on their home campus, provide guest lectures in relevant classrooms, participate in language or culture-learning related activities) within the first semester after the Re-Entry Retreat.
2. Students would identify and implement at least one off-campus outlet to help them use their new cross-cultural skills or knowledge (e.g., listen to the radio or watch movies in the language of their sojourn country, provide slide shows to local and civic groups) within the first semester after the Re-entry Retreat.
The theoretical orientation upon which this trainers’ guide is based is Kolbs’ Learning Theory. The theory is structured as a cycle. The learning cycle begins with concrete experience for an individual through openly participating in a new event (Kolb, 1984). This is the basis of the reflection. Reflective observation is the ability to think about experiences from several points of view (Kolb). An individual moves to abstract conceptualization which involves the integration of their observations into their own theories (Kolb). And finally, active experimentation is putting their own theories to use with decision-making and problem solving by testing out the implications.

Kolb’s Learning Theory

- Concrete Experience
- Reflective Observation
- Formation of Abstract Concepts
- Active Experimentation
Retreat Implementation

The following section contains procedures to be accomplished prior to beginning of the program such as reserving space, designing marketing strategies, and preparing materials.

Reserve meeting room

A meeting room that would be accessible to students with disabilities and have appropriate technology such as access to an overhead projector, digital projector, and screen should be reserved. The meeting room should have tables for writing and work space, but should be fairly moveable for students to arrange themselves in small groups as needed. Determine the number of participants that would be accommodated according to the space and number of available facilitators.

Design marketing strategies

Promoting the program would be accomplished with well-designed marketing materials that clearly imply the benefits to the participants (Hartwig, 2000). The marketing materials need to have a statement to request participants to inform the campus coordinator of the need for interpreters, which is also known as communication requests. Campus policies would need to be reviewed for size and posting location guidelines before flyers are posted (Hartwig, 2000). Follow the guidelines related to using campus logos in promotional materials. Some marketing strategies could include: folded paper table tents, sending invitations or personal emails, target audience listservs, departmental newsletters, events in campus newspapers, and/or meetings where the announcements can be made.

Invite participants and record RSVPs. A reminder email should be sent a few days before the event. It is very important to emphasize that the students should bring a photo(s) or a souvenir that is meaningful to them to share with the group. Include a statement on the invitation and remind them before the event that one of the activities involves sharing this memorabilia.
Preparation

Secure a facilitator or co-facilitator as necessary. Handouts and lecture notes would need to be duplicated including program outlines and evaluations forms. The visual aids should then be finalized with interpreters before program if necessary.

Food, snacks, and other refreshments should be arranged and purchased. The agenda included 45 minutes for lunch with no activities planned. This is so that the students can freely mingle with each other and take a mental break from the structure of the day. Use the RSVP count to estimate the number of required lunches to purchase. Plan to accommodate for vegetarian and Kosher meals.

Prepare supplies

A programming tool box which would include both supplies and program documents needs to be created:

Supplies
a. flip charts/ markers
b. chalk/dry erase pens
c. tape
d. scissors
e. stapler
f. pens/pencils
g. paper clips
h. name tags/file folders
i. markers/colored pencils
j. wax paper
k. blank sheets of paper
l. tissues

Program Documents
a. list of RSVP students
b. sign in sheet
c. copy of the program outline
d. program evaluation forms
e. room and equipment confirmations
f. lunch delivery confirmation and contact numbers
g. copies of agreements or contracts

There are several procedures that would need to be accomplished on the day of the training. Directional signs from the parking lot to the meeting room would need to be hung. Nearby restrooms need to be located and snacks and refreshments brought and set up.
Certificate of Completion

For StARR Study Abroad Re-entry Retreat:

Presented by

School Name
Office of Study Abroad

To: Students Name

Name of Presenter ___________________________ Date ______________
This section includes information and tips for trainers. Remember to move around from group to group during small group discussion, checking on progress, and providing praise and encouragement to the students. Try to build in recognition to difficult activities, such as praising for effort or participating in groups. Some students may not want to speak if they fear that they are wrong. The trainer will have to be sensitive to this fear and praise the students for the ideas that they share.

The trainer should recognize that different cultures may take more time to adapt to. Trainers can encourage students to continue on the re-entry transition by blogging or seek ongoing support individually. Some of the possible ways to connect to blogs include the following:

- [http://www.goabroad.net](http://www.goabroad.net)
- [http://blogger.com](http://blogger.com)
- [http://blogsearch.google.com](http://blogsearch.google.com)
- [http://blogstream.com](http://blogstream.com)

Facilitators should have an awareness that some students may not have had a positive experience abroad and may have a hard time relating to other students who had wonderful stories to tell. The facilitator should be sensitive to the processing of bad experiences and willing to hear stories of disappointment.

Room set up is very important for engaging learners with the facilitator and with each other in dyads or groups. The diagram shows an effective way of allowing learners to be attentive to the front as well as able to quickly break off into their discussions.

If the students so desire and provided approval, collect their contact information ahead of time and provide the students, on the day of the retreat with a name and contact sheet so that they can more easily keep in touch after the retreat is over.

At the end of the retreat, provide participants with a certificate of completion. This could be built into the marketing of the event. Introduce the certificate in the morning to motivate students to stay for the entire length of the program.

Solicit a few donations from local restaurants for dining certificates or other products and services commonly used by students at your institution to provide to participants as a drawing at the end of the retreat.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Activity Names</th>
<th>Agenda Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrivals</td>
<td>Enjoy light refreshments, sign in, table top name cards</td>
<td>9:00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News Flash- updates about campus policies, deadlines, financial aid, advising appointments etc.</td>
<td>9:15am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Welcome</td>
<td>Getting Acquainted Workshop Expectations and the Declaration of Good Participation Sharing Memorabilia</td>
<td>9:30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>10:30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cross Cultural Re-entry</td>
<td>Denials and Affirmations Critical Incidents Typical Re-entry Problems</td>
<td>10:45am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>12:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Reflecting on Personal Change</td>
<td>Human Sculpture Perceptions of American Culture Sentence Completion</td>
<td>1:15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>2:45pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Creating a New Home</td>
<td>Values Clarification New Home Goal Setting</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribute and collect evaluation Provide Certificates of Completion Goodbyes</td>
<td>4:45pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 to 5:00pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is very important to conduct assessments of the implementation of the StARR program. The following page provides a sample instrument which could be duplicated for completing a summative evaluation by the student participants at the end of the retreat. Maintain distance during the assessment delivery and collect in an envelope to assure anonymity of the students.

Additionally a sample instrument for trainers is provided to reflect on the effectiveness of the retreat.
StARR EVALUATION- Students

In reflecting on what you learned in this retreat, please complete the following questionnaire. Your responses will assist to improve this program. There are 17 questions and will take no more than 10 minutes to complete.

1. What was one thing you learned about yourself during the sentence completion activity?

2. Name one way to cope with the re-entry challenge as you discussed in your group.

3. Explain one value and how it is different from your host country to the U.S.

4. What was one value of yours that you noticed has changed since your study abroad experience?

5. Why is it important to locate a supportive person to listen to your study abroad stories?

6. Name at least two aspects of your life to engage in integrating with study abroad experiences.

For questions 7-13 please use the following scale: (Circle your response to each item.)
1=Strongly disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neither agree nor disagree 4=Agree 5=Strongly agree

7. The handouts were pertinent.

8. The difficulty level of the activities was appropriate.

9. The pacing of the event was appropriate.

10. The facilitator(s) were approachable.

11. The facilitator(s) were knowledgeable.

12. The room/facilities were satisfactory.

13. Overall, the retreat met my expectations.

14. What was the most valuable about this retreat?

15. What was the least valuable about this retreat?

16. What topics were not covered, that you would like more information about?

17. What suggestions do you have to improve this retreat? (use other side as needed)
StARR EVALUATION - Trainers

In reflecting on what your experiences facilitating this retreat, please complete the following reflection activity.

When answering questions 1-4, consider:
• Students' level of attention.
• Students' level of participation and engagement in discussions.

1. What was effective/ineffective for Section 1?

2. What was effective/ineffective for Section 2?

3. What was effective/ineffective for Section 3?

4. What was effective/ineffective for Section 4?

5. To what degree did you feel that students reflected on their cross-cultural experience?

6. What was the easiest activity for the students and why?

7. What was the most difficult activity for the students and why?

8. Did the sequencing of the activities increase satisfactorily in level of difficulty and risk?

9. Are the materials directly related to the objectives? Which material, if any, is not directly related to the objectives? What was most surprising about this retreat session?

10. What suggestions do you have for the next facilitator?
Welcome and News Flash is a section the trainer could customize. Depending on the campus, some policies, deadlines or financial aid information may have changed since the students departed for their study abroad. This first part of the day is an opportunity to share key information with the students that they may have missed or remind them to see their academic advisors to complete the course and grade transfer forms.
Section one contains activities that orient the student to the day, allows them to get to know one another better, and share memorabilia from their study abroad experiences with one another. Handouts for the students necessary for duplication can be found in the back section.

The trainer should start the retreat with a welcome and introduction of the program of the day. Provide an opportunity for students to ask questions.

The welcome could also contain a light and humorous mood by presenting the cartoon drawings on an overhead projector. The cartoon drawings can be found on the following pages. The first cartoon might be relatable since students often carry too many bags and overpack for their study abroad experience. The second cartoon shows a cross-cultural faux pas. Students who traveled to a non-English speaking country might remember their first few weeks struggling to communicate in the most common place situations.

As students enter and check into the retreat, provide them with materials to make table top name cards (file folder, markers). Instruct students to fold the file folder into a triangle so that it can sit on the table top for others to view. The design of the name card should be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper left corner</td>
<td>Name of host country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper right corner</td>
<td>Picture of a memorable person you met/ or symbol of a favorite study abroad memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower left corner</td>
<td>Leave blank for now, more instructions to follow in 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower right corner</td>
<td>Leave blank for now, more instructions to follow in 3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Share program objectives with the participants:
1. to develop realistic expectations about the re-entry process
2. to reflect about the challenges you may face
3. to integrate your study abroad experience with your life back home
YOU LOOK LIKE A DEAD GUY I USED TO KNOW.
It's a good thing Chuck raised his voice, because Pedro understood loud English.
Activity 1.1: Getting Acquainted Activity (modified from Blohm & Mercil, 1982)

**Goal:** For students to get to know one another and share common experiences

**Objectives:** Students will learn each others’ names

**Time:** 30 minutes

**Format:** Whole group

**Facilitator Materials:** Flip chart with the following list written on it: “Name, host country, favorite memory/thing I miss the most,” tape, markers

**Student Materials:** None

**Procedure:** Each participant introduces him or herself (from the following list located on flip chart)

1. Name
2. Host country
3. Favorite study abroad memory or thing I will miss the most

2. Have one participant volunteer to start

3. Continue until everyone has introduced themselves
Activity 1.2: Workshop Expectations and the Declaration of Good Participation

**Goal:** For students to gain an understanding of the norms of behavior and expectations.

**Objectives:** Students will name several rules and expectations that they have of themselves and others for the workshop.

**Time:** 10 minutes

**Format:** Whole Group

**Facilitator Materials:** Flip chart, Markers

**Student Materials:** None

**Procedure:**

1. Begin by explaining: "It is important that we establish an agreement of some of the expectations that we have for ourselves and each other. My goal is to create a safe environment for open discussion and sharing. I am operating under the assumption that all participants have something to offer as well as something to learn. In order to do this, we are going to generate our own list of expectations".

2. Followed by, "What would you need from each other to feel comfortable during this retreat?"

3. Write the expectations they generate on the flip chart on one side.

4. The following list is a backup list of rules and potential norms for participating in the workshop in case the students have a difficult time generating a list.
   a. Active listening – listening carefully first to the speaker rather than focusing on formulating your responses
   b. Honoring and respecting confidentiality and one another
   c. Speaking from your own experiences - don't make broad generalizations
   d. We get what we give - your level of enthusiasm will determine the quality of your experience
   e. We are the only ones who change ourselves - you may hear information that does not align with your attitudes and beliefs

5. Have the group come to a consensus about the listed expectations.

6. Instruct the group to generate a list of expectations that they hold of themselves and write their responses on the other side of the flip chart. Facilitator has a back up list in case they cannot generate any. The list may resemble the expectations that they have of each other.
   a. Notice when I am feeling defensive and reflect on why that might be so (this may need to be modified depending on the group of students)
   b. I will fully participate to the best of my ability
   c. I will assume the role of teacher and student
   d. I will use I-statements as a foundation for my opinions

7. Post the flip chart in a visible place in the room for the remainder of the retreat.

Meadows © All Rights Reserved
Activity 1.3: Sharing memorabilia or a photo - (modified from Lerstrom, 1995)

| **Goal:** To provide an opportunity to be heard by another person and validated for their experiences since their family and friends may dismiss their changes and experiences. |
| **Objectives:** Students will understand the need to support their fellow returnees as well as express their need to be listened to. |
| **Time:** 20 minutes |
| **Format:** Groups of four |
| **Facilitator Materials:** None |
| **Student Materials:** Students are encouraged to bring their own photos or memorabilia of their choice from their study abroad experience. Inform students of this prior to attending the retreat. |

**Procedure:**
1. “Now you will share about experiences abroad in groups of four. Use photographs or memorabilia as triggers to explain why they are important to you. Partners, listen and ask one or two probing questions. Each person has a turn to share.”
2. Some types of probing questions that the partner may want to ask include:
   a. What do you remember about the moment you bought/created your memorabilia?
   b. Have you been able to share this with anyone else since your return?
   c. What aspect, if any, of your memorabilia contributed to your culture learning of your host country?
3. When everyone has shared, return to the group to debrief common experiences.
4. Discussion questions:
   a. What did it feel like to share your personal experience or memorabilia?
   b. What have you noticed about sharing with other friends or family? Did sharing with friends and family meet or not meet your expectations?
   c. Who can you talk to frankly and openly about your time abroad?
5. Students return to the groups of four and each share one or two of their greatest concerns about returning home.
6. Return to the group to debrief common concerns and write on a flip chart for later use.
The second section covers information about cross-cultural re-entry. The students will have the opportunity to dive a little deeper into the material and in self-reflection.

Activity 2.1 opens with a discussion about expectations the students have about their transition re-entering the U.S. The Denials and Affirmations exercise will help students to gain an understanding of certain thoughts that can manifest and are myths or assumptions.

Activity 2.2 is common in cross-cultural training. Critical incidents will allow the students to reevaluate and develop new perceptions of some of the challenges that they faced while abroad.

Activity 2.3 will cover typical re-entry problems and assist students to determine possible solutions as a group to some of these challenges.
Activity 2.1: Positive and Negative Denials Exercise (modified from Austin, 1986).

| **Goal:** For students to gain an understanding of certain thoughts that can manifest and are myths or assumptions |
| **Objectives:** Students will understand the pitfalls of these thought myths. |
| **Time:** 20 minutes |
| **Format:** Lecturette/group discussion |
| **Facilitator Materials:** Handout with the denials and affirmations cut apart into slips of paper |
| **Student Materials:** none |

Procedure:
1. Introduce the idea of culture shock and reverse culture shock. The students may not anticipate reverse culture shock since they are returning to their home culture which they believe is familiar to them.
2. Also introduce the concepts of positive and negative denials. “Positive Denials are thoughts that you might have about your re-entry into the United States. But these thoughts are myths or assumptions. A positive denial is a thought that is overly optimistic and probably not very realistic.”
3. “Negative denials are thoughts that set yourself up to be more miserable than you need to be.”
4. Distribute slips of paper with the positive and negative denials and ask students to read their slips out loud.
5. Ask each student to identify if the statement is a positive or a negative denial.
6. Discussion Questions
   a. “Were there any positive or negative denials you wanted to add to our list?”
   b. “Did any of these denials seem familiar to you?”
   c. “Which ones strike a chord with you?”
   d. “Which denials have you experienced?”
   e. “Which denials have you learned weren’t true?”
Positive and Negative Denials
Cut apart statements into slips of paper

I should be able to cope easily because it's my culture. No adjustment problems.

I can pick up on relationships where I left off.

Everything is great back home.

Everything will be the same as it was when I left.

I won't experience reverse culture shock.

The adjustment process should last no more than three months.

People will be interested in hearing about my exotic experiences abroad.

This change is going to be so overwhelming, I'm not going to be able to cope.

I shouldn't be feeling so __________. (for example: upset, depressed, disorganized)

I know I'm going to be lonely.
No one can understand what I'm going through.

Everyone is ahead of me now.
Activity 2.2: Critical incidents (modified from Hess, 1997)

**Goal:** To reconstruct a critical incident, gather more information, and to make a new interpretation of the event.

**Objectives:** Students will illuminate different perspectives from their own critical incidents they encountered while in their host country

**Time:** 20 minutes

**Format:** Triads

**Facilitator Materials:** Sample Critical Incidents worksheet, Volunteer Script

**Student Materials:** Critical Incidents Worksheet

Procedure:

1. Introduce activity by explaining Critical Incident. A critical incident is a situation where there is an intercultural misunderstanding (Baxter & Ramsey, 1996). Critical incidents may have left you feeling angry and diminished when you experienced them in your host country. In this exercise, you will experience something similar to reliving an instant replay such as from a sporting event on TV. Cameras show the move from all angles multiple times and even in slow motion. Using such technology, watching a game or sporting event can be more enjoyable and understandable. Reviewing critical incidents are like reliving an instant replay.

2. Demonstrate how to deconstruct a critical incident using the example on the next page. Ask for two volunteers: one to read the incident and one to assist with deconstructing the incident. Provide the volunteer with the Volunteer Script.

3. Explain to the students that the first step in this activity is to ‘Recognize the Critical Incident’. Delineate a particular moment of frustration that was an intercultural encounter. Instruct the students to jot down a few phrases to describe it.

4. Address the following questions related to your critical incident:
   a. What was the setting?
   b. Who was involved?
   c. What happened unexpectedly?
   d. Include all the facts and feelings you can remember.

5. Provide the following tips about how to analyze a critical incident
   a. New information can come from a variety of sources, brainstorm different ideas about what went wrong.
   b. For example, involve an informant who is knowledgeable about the culture and try to gain other background information
   c. Gather opinions from several points of view of the participants about what the other people involved might have been thinking.
6. Explain that the students need to use the new ideas that they formulated to reinterpret the situation. They should try to see things as they had not seen them before.

7. Divide the group into smaller groups and distribute the critical incidents handout so that they can analyze their own critical incidents based on the demonstration. Move from group to group to observe and assist as needed. Provide encouragement and praise for students and groups.
Activity 2.2 Sample: Critical Incidents Worksheet

Step 1: Remember a particular moment of frustration that was an intercultural encounter. Sit for a moment and jot down a few phrases to describe it.

Location: Copenhagen, Denmark
Student: Female, 21

After my first full day of classes in Copenhagen, I was exhausted. I could not wait to get back to my host family's house and write in my journal about all of the new things I had encountered. But, first, I had to take the train home. It was raining slightly, but I only had to wait five or ten minutes for my train to show up since, in Copenhagen, they are always on time. When it [the train] stopped, I opened the doors, like I had seen so many other people do, and took the first empty seat. Since it was after commuting time, the train wasn't full, and the seat in front of me was empty. In an effort to get more comfortable, I propped my feet up on the empty seat and reclined. The ride was much nicer than I had anticipated; there were lots of picturesque houses and stores along the route to daydream about, so I wasn't bored. About halfway home an older woman came up to me and gave me an odd look. I thought she wanted to sit in the seat in front of me so I put my feet down to make room. However, instead of sitting she started yelling at me in Danish and walked off.

Source: this critical incident is from Bruce La Brack's "What's Up With Culture?" web site <http://www.uop.edu/sis/culture/welcome.htm> hosted by the School of International Studies

Step 2: Reconstruct it:
   a. What was the setting? A train in Denmark
   b. Who was involved? A student and an older woman
   c. What happened unexpectedly? The older woman started yelling at the student

2. Brainstorm different ideas about what went wrong.
   The student reclined, propped feet up on the seat, took the first empty seat.

3. Make a new interpretation of the event using your answers from #2 above.
   Try to bring to light new aspects of the situation. Because of how often it rains in Denmark, it is a general rule not to put your feet up unless you take your shoes off to avoid getting the seat dirty. I finally found this out by asking a man sitting on the other side of me what I had done to make the woman so angry. When I asked why he didn't tell me earlier he said he hadn't wanted me to feel uncomfortable.
Activity 2.2: Volunteer Script for Critical Incidents

Location: Copenhagen, Denmark
Student: Female, 21

After my first full day of classes in Copenhagen, I was exhausted. I could not wait to get back to my host family's house and write in my journal about all of the new things I had encountered. But, first, I had to take the train home. It was raining slightly, but I only had to wait five or ten minutes for my train to show up since, in Copenhagen, they are always on time. When it [the train] stopped, I opened the doors, like I had seen so many other people do, and took the first empty seat. Since it was after commuting time, the train wasn't full, and the seat in front of me was empty. In an effort to get more comfortable, I propped my feet up on the empty seat and reclined. The ride was much nicer than I had anticipated; there were lots of picturesque houses and stores along the route to daydream about, so I wasn't bored. About halfway home an older woman came up to me and gave me an odd look. I thought she wanted to sit in the seat in front of me so I put my feet down to make room. However, instead of sitting she started yelling at me in Danish and walked off.

Source: this critical incident is from Bruce La Brack's "What's Up With Culture?" web site <http://www.uop.edu/sis/culture/welcome.htm> hosted by the School of International Studies
Critical Incidents Worksheet

1. Remember a particular moment of frustration that was an intercultural encounter. Sit for a moment and jot down a few phrases to describe it.

Reconstruct it:
   a. What was the setting?

   b. Who was involved?

   c. What happened unexpectedly?

   d. Include all the facts and feelings you can remember.

In triads:
2. Brainstorm different ideas about what went wrong.

3. Make a new interpretation of the event using your answers from #2. Try to bring to light new aspects of the situation.
Activity 2.3: Typical Re-entry Problems, (modified from Grove, 1996)

**Goal:** To minimize the effects of reverse culture shock by preparing returnees for some problems that they may face

**Objective:** Students will identify several typical re-entry problems. Students will reflect on their return to their home families and culture. The students should be less surprised and better equipped to readjust.

**Time:** 1 hour  
**Format:** Small groups  
**Facilitator Materials:** None  
**Student Materials:** One vignette for each group from the handout "Typical Re-entry Problems" which describes five typical problems faced by people returning home from a long trip in a foreign culture. Some groups may have the same vignette. Duplicate handouts as necessary.

**Procedure:**

1. Remind participants of the orientations they had before they left for their study abroad. One topic was probably “expectations.” This activity is also about expectations, but those related to returning home to their families and communities.
2. Divide the group into small groups of four.
3. Provide each group with a vignette from the handout on the following pages, which has an actual reverse culture shock problem. The vignettes may even reveal several problems. The group could uncover one or more problems to focus on.
4. Instruct the students to spend 30 minutes discussing possible ways they would handle the problem. Students should identify the nature of the problem and to identify at least two practical suggestions.
5. Circulate among the groups.
6. Reconvene the large group.
7. Each group reports back to the retreat (for no more than 5 minutes).
   a. State the nature of the problem  
   b. Describe two ways of effectively dealing with the problem
8. Open the workshop to general discussion, with some of the possible discussion questions
   a. Which of the returnees, if any, do you identify with?  
   b. Which of the suggestions that your groups came up with, do you feel like you can actually try out?  
   c. Refer to the students answers from exercise 1.3. Ask for the similarities or differences from the typical re-entry problems to the ones they previously identified.
Typical Re-entry Problem #1

Christina came back from studying abroad. She had changed and matured in numerous ways. She was more self-assured, especially about her knowledge and competence. Christina had found her independence, but her family and friends back home didn’t really understand. They treated her like the Christina that they knew before she had left. It was hard for Christina to accept being treated as though she hadn’t changed and she really became frustrated being treated like a child. It was as if her family noticed some of the changes, but didn’t value or accept the changes (Kauffmann et al., 1992).

Describe the nature of the problem(s):

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

What factors and people are there to consider?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Identify at least two possible ways of effectively dealing with the problem:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Typical Re-entry Problem #2

Miguel lived with a host family for a year, and when he came back, he started to notice things about the U.S. that he never had noticed before. There were aspects of U.S. culture that he started to question since he was able to compare his host country with the U.S. When Miguel would spend time with his family and friends, some of these concerns would come across as criticisms, which would really annoy his family and friends. Sometimes Miguel was able to keep quiet, but the negative feelings he had about the U.S. was confusing, especially since it was where he called home. Home did not seem familiar anymore. Miguel explained that when he came back to the states, he found Americans shallow and plastic. He had a hard time sharing this because he was afraid that he would be viewed as a traitor or a snob (Sobie, 1986). He also commented about the difficulty he faced when shopping in a grocery story. He was taken aback by the abundance of choices and it surprised him that he had never noticed that before (Hess, 1997).

Describe the nature of the problem(s):

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

What factors and people are there to consider?

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

Identify at least two possible ways of effectively dealing with the problem:

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________
Typical Re-entry Problem #3

When Lorena returned from Italy, she was so thrilled with anticipation to tell her stories to her friends and family. She had new ideas from her classes, improved language skills, she had a fresh understanding about foreign policy, and a renewed love of art. The first few hours she had returned, she spent telling her family about her study abroad (Kauffmann, Martin, & Weaver, 1992). She was surprised that there were few other opportunities to share. Soon Lorena found that most folks she talked to would only listen for a few minutes. As well, sometimes they would ask her what she thought were the most naïve questions. Lorena grew increasingly annoyed with the lack of understanding and simplistic questions.

Describe the nature of the problem(s):

What factors and people are there to consider?

Identify at least two possible ways of effectively dealing with the problem:
Typical Re-entry Problem #4

Alex returned to the U.S. and shared that he was so bored. It was like the adventure had ended. For Alex, his memorabilia was in a shoebox and he didn’t know how to incorporate his new found sense of adventure into life back home. On a cold day in December, Alex couldn’t find anything to do. Compared to study abroad, Alex didn’t have any “stimulation.” He put on some sweats and started running. When he realized how “cathartic” it was, he just continued to run (Hess, 1997).

Describe the nature of the problem(s):

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

What factors and people are there to consider?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Identify at least two possible ways of effectively dealing with the problem:

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
Typical Re-entry Problem #5

Sandra felt homesick. What was confusing was that she was home sick for Costa Rica, but she was home. She didn’t really understand why she felt like that and felt a little guilty. Sandra reluctantly explained she felt close to her host family in Costa Rica. Now that she was back home, it was upsetting that she didn’t feel as close to her own family. All of these changes, along with getting back to the faster pace of life, were “exhausting” (Kauffmann, Martin, & Weaver, 1992).

Describe the nature of the problem(s):

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

What factors and people are there to consider?

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Identify at least two possible ways of effectively dealing with the problem:

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
Section three focuses on personal changes. Whereas Section Two was more cognitive, Section Three poses an increasing focus on feelings. These activities pose a higher level of risk for students in terms of personal sharing.

Keep in mind that the students' energy level is starting to drop after lunch. The first activity, the Human Sculpture activity, is designed to get students up out of their chairs to help to combat feeling lethargic after eating. The other two activities presented are Perceptions of American Culture and Sentence completion exercises.
Activity 3.1: Human Sculpture Activity

| Goal: To facilitate an emotional connection to the way they feel about their re-entry experience |
| Objectives: Students will physically express their feeling and identify several of the common themes which are expressed |
| Time: 30 minutes |
| Format: Whole group |
| Facilitator Materials: None |
| Student Materials: Markers to draw on their name card |

Procedure:

1. Instruct students to think about how they are feeling right now about their re-entry experience.
2. Form the group into two circles, an inner circle and an outer circle. Every student in the inner circle should have a partner with another student in the outer circle. The inner circle will be called partner A and the outer circle will be called partner B.
3. Partner B begins by demonstrating their pose which embodies the way they feel right now about their re-entry experience.
4. Partner A attempts to copy the pose as closely as possible.
5. Partner B then has the opportunity to "sculpt" partner A to make the sculpture more accurate to what he/she was trying to convey.
6. Instruct the partner B’s to view their sculpture and take two minutes to view all of the sculptures.
7. Have the inner and outer circle switch places and complete the activity again.
8. Reconvene the group to debrief using some of the possible discussion questions:
   a. What did you observe in the sculptures?
   b. What was it like to create and then observe your own sculpture?
   c. What message were you trying to get across?
   d. What common feelings did you notice were expressed?
9. Instruct students to draw on their name tag a picture/symbol of a concern returning home on the lower right corner.
10. Close the activity explaining that this activity was a snapshot in time of their feelings in this very moment. The students should not be surprised if their attitude toward their re-entry changes over time. It is natural to have varying degrees of frustration and comfort. The students should think about who in their lives they have as a support system that they can share their changing feelings with as they become reintegrated with the U.S. culture again.
Activity 3.2: Perceptions of American Culture (modified from Blohm & Mercil, 1982)

**Goal:** To encourage students to compare the values of their host culture and their home culture

**Objectives:** Students will determine if they have changed their values as a result of exposure to the host culture

**Time:** 45 minutes

**Format:** One large group followed by silent, individual work

**Facilitator Materials:** Prepare flip charts with the headings of the regions where the students studied abroad, tape, markers

**Student Materials:** Handout “American and host cultures” worksheet, markers to draw on their name card

**Procedure:**

1. Start out by explaining to the students, “You have likely heard that studying abroad causes people to change. The exposure to new ideas and values probably influenced you to consider aspects of your values that you had previously taken for granted. In this session, we are going to compare American values and beliefs with the values and beliefs of your host country. You will then look at some of the ways you may have changed.”

2. Continue the introduction by having a brief discussion of the meaning of the word “culture.” Ask the group, “What is meaning of the word culture?” (culture is the beliefs, attitudes, and values that a group of people hold)

3. Ask the students to think of as many American values, attitudes and beliefs as they can.
   a. Sample list: time conscious, competitive, individualistic, autonomous, materialistic, achievement-oriented, consumerism, fast pace of life, reliance on technology, surrounded by comfort, tend to be informal, highly mobile, constant change, value youth, distrust of authority

4. Facilitator lists everything on the U.S.-labeled flip chart

5. Instruct students to identify their region in which they studied and suggest their host culture’s view on each of the values listed

6. Write the students suggestions on the appropriate flip charts

7. Summarize the values by condensing the lists to the value pair. (i.e. individualistic/collectivistic, formal/informal, competitive/non-competitive)

8. Distribute worksheet, “American and Host Cultures”

9. Instruct the students: “Your worksheet has five arrows. For each arrow, write a value pair on opposite sides of the arrow. For example, write individualistic on one side and collectivistic on the other side. Place a dot on the line where you think your host country falls for the value, where you think the U.S. falls for the value and where you stand in relation to the values.”
10. Allow participants several minutes to make their markings.
11. "By yourself, answer these questions on paper":
   a. Which attitudes have you changed since your sojourn? Why do you think so?
   b. Which attitudes do you think you will leave back in your host country? Why?
   c. Which attitudes do you hope to keep even now that you have returned home and why?
   d. What are some of the possible reactions you might get from family and friends for some of your changed attitudes?
12. Instruct students to draw on their name card a symbol of how they feel they have changed in the lower left corner.
13. Ask the group if anyone would like to share their drawing or part d. "What are some of the possible reactions you might get from family and friends for some of your changed attitudes?"
14. Summarize the activity: "One of the positive outcomes of study abroad is that we learn that people can live by other value systems. We don't have to change all our values to be able to live in another culture. But now you have been exposed to another culture, chances are you have adopted some of their practices and assimilated them into your beliefs."
American and Host Cultures Worksheet

a. Which attitudes have you changed? Why do you think so?

b. Which attitudes do you think you will leave back in your host country? Why?

c. Which attitudes do you hope to keep even now that you have returned home and why?

d. What are some of the possible reactions you might get from family and friends for some of your changed attitudes? Give an example.
Activity 3.3: Sentence Completion Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal: For students to connect with their feelings about several aspects of their study abroad and return experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectives: Students will write their feelings and identify at least one re-entry challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: 20 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format: Individual activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator Materials: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Materials: Handout “Sentence Completion”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedure:

1. Introduce the activity by explaining that the retreat has engaged the students in many different ways. We have had group discussions, we sculpted our feelings in a pose, and we analyzed critical incidents. This activity will help the students connect with their intuition through writing.
2. Instruct the students to try to write the first thing that comes into their head when they complete the following sentences.
3. Provide them 15 minutes to complete their sheets
4. Ask the group if anyone wants to share.
   a. “What was surprising about completing this activity?”
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Read the statements and complete the following sentences based on your honest reactions and feelings.

1. To me, home is...

2. Remembering my host country, I miss...

3. Re-entering the US, I expected that I...

4. The culture I identify most with is...

5. What people don't understand about me now is...

6. Something that I really want others to understand about me now that I have returned is...

7. The process of returning as been...

8. When I see my family now, they...

9. When I see my family now, I...

10. When I see my old friends, they...

11. When I see my old friends, I...

12. Now that I have returned, the biggest challenge for me is...

13. Now that I have returned, I feel the US is...

14. The ways I have changed the most as a result of my experiences abroad are...
Section four is focused on solidifying a plan of action for the student when the retreat is over. The student will review their values. They will imagine and use their creativity to create a new life now that they are back in the U.S. The retreat will close with a discussion about integrating their new found skills into their academic and social lives.

Encourage the students to trade information so that they can keep in touch and share their re-entry experiences. Remind students that because the retreat is over, it doesn’t mean that the transition issues end, too. Encourage the students to journal and reflect about the re-entry challenges and to notice their new behaviors and values that they have adopted from their host country. Additionally, encourage students to keep in touch with one another throughout their re-entry process.
Activity 4.1: Values Clarification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal:</th>
<th>To clarify one's values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectives:</td>
<td>Students will sort values on labels and narrow them from 30 to 10 and then to 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format:</td>
<td>Individual and then group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator Materials:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Materials:</td>
<td>Wax paper, blank sheets, and sheet of value labels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedure:

1. Create a page of values to photocopy onto sheets of labels, enough for each student participant. Here are 30 suggested values:
   a. Excellence, growth, creativity, wisdom, making a difference, connection, education, freedom, health, spirituality, integrity, acceptance, adventure, change, challenge, reflection, excitement, fame, fulfillment, honesty, happiness, humor, independence, learning, people/relationships, recognition, security, self expression, fun, communication

2. Explain that in order to set goals, it is important to understand ones values. “Values are a set of standards which will help you to make choices about attitudes and actions. Understanding your values will help you to understand what is really important to you. It is likely that exposure to your host country influenced changes in your values. Now that you have returned home, it is a good time to reassess those values. This awareness will be helpful for when you job search as well as in your life in general.”

3. Provide each student with a sheet of wax paper and a sheet of labels. The purpose of the wax paper is so that the students can rearrange the labels as necessary on the paper.

4. Instruct students to place their top ten values onto the wax paper.

5. After several minutes, instruct students to narrow their top ten to their top three values.

6. After they are satisfied with their values, ask the students to transfer their labels to a blank sheet of paper in order from their top value to their tenth.

7. Instruct the students to write why they selected their top three values.

8. Conclude the activity by asking the group if anyone wants to share their top three values and how they selected those. Emphasize that there are no right or wrong values but they are personal because they are something that you cannot live without.
Activity 4.2: Creating a New Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal:</th>
<th>For students to integrate their study abroad experiences by drawing a picture of their ideal new home life using words, symbols, and pictures.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectives:</td>
<td>Students will visualize and draw aspects of their new home life and lifestyle using the structure of a home as a metaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format:</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator Materials:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Materials:</td>
<td>Blank paper, markers, crayons, Handout “Creating a New Home”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedure:

1. This activity provides the students with an opportunity to think of home as a metaphor for their new life. Each aspect of a house (e.g., door, window, roof) will be used to symbolize various aspects of their life (e.g., friends, activities, support systems, coping, new skills, and academics).
2. Start the activity with a discussion of the meaning of the word home. The word “home” suggests a comfortable place that is ready and waiting for us, a safe place, a place we inhabit (Storti, 1990). However, home is more; it is a lifestyle we construct related to certain people, places, and objects through habits, routines, and behaviors.
3. Distribute the handout and discuss the aspects of a house and its possible function(s). Review the example provided in the first row of the table. Students can determine their own ideas about the function of each aspect of the house. Below, you will find a table with possible interpretations of the function for the aspect of the house.
4. Students can proceed by either completing the table and then drawing a representation of the house. Or, students may immediately draw their house.
5. Instruct students to draw a house or home. They will create their own metaphor linking the aspects of the house to aspects of their own life. Instruct students to consider several of the following aspects:
   a. Who do you live with?
   b. Where do you see yourself working?
   c. What new places would you like to explore?
   d. What traits will you keep and embrace that you learned while abroad?
   e. What new classes would you like to take that you weren’t interested in before study abroad?
   f. What activities would you like to do on the weekend?
   g. Who can you go to for support?
6. Distribute markers or crayons and blank paper.
7. Reconvene the group and ask the students to share one part of their drawing to the group which was meaningful or surprising to them.

## Trainers Guide to Creating a New Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House/Home Metaphor</th>
<th>Actual Purpose</th>
<th>Symbolic for aspects of students' new life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Student's example) Wall</td>
<td>Support for the roof, protection, a boundary</td>
<td>What strengths do you have to rely on? I am independent and resourceful, I am responsible... I can talk to my roommates, the study abroad advisor, and my history professor...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door</td>
<td>Entering into it, allowing others to enter, connection to outside world</td>
<td>What ways can you connect to your host country from home?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window</td>
<td>Allowing light inside, observing what it happening outside, allowing fresh air inside</td>
<td>What will you engage in to be spiritually fed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimney</td>
<td>Allowing heat and smoke to escape, elimination of heat to prevent a buildup of smoke in the home</td>
<td>How will you release and prevent the buildup of stress?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>Protection from weather, shelter from rain</td>
<td>What resources do you have when you are coping?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Space to prepare food and nourishment for your body</td>
<td>How will you nourish and take care of yourself?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch</td>
<td>Place to gather with friends for socializing and relaxing</td>
<td>Where will you go to meet new friends? Or where will you hang out with old friends?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Tending to the garden, watching it grow, planting seeds, pulling weeds,</td>
<td>What new skills would you like to develop?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>Bringing in of water, releasing of waste</td>
<td>What myths and expectations are you ready to let go of?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power/electricity</td>
<td>Bringing in power for appliances and entertainment, able to turn it on and off (control), flows to every room</td>
<td>What is your source of energy, which motivates you to succeed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail box</td>
<td>Receiving information</td>
<td>What information would you like to learn now that you have returned to the U.S.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door Keys</td>
<td>The way to control who enters your home, safety, security</td>
<td>Who can you trust and not trust with sharing stories?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>Source of beauty, keeps the home cool in the shade, changes with the seasons</td>
<td>What sources of beauty can you bring into your life?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Creating a New Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House/Home Metaphor</th>
<th>Actual Purpose</th>
<th>Symbolic for aspects of students' new life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXAMPLE: Wall</td>
<td>Support for the roof, protection, a boundary</td>
<td>What strengths do you have to rely on? I am independent and resourceful, I am responsible… I can talk to my roommates, the study abroad advisor, and my history professor…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch/patio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power/electricity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door Keys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Activity 4.3: Integrating New Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal:</th>
<th>To assist students set goals in integrating their study abroad experiences with their life back home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectives:</td>
<td>Students will develop three goals and write at least two objectives for each goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format:</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator Materials:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Materials:</td>
<td>Handout “Re-entry Goal Setting”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedure:

1. Distribute worksheet, “Re-entry Goal Setting.”
2. Review the three suggested goal themes.
   a. To use my new skills gained from studying abroad (e.g., academics, language, daily life, on-campus, community organizations, etc.)
   b. To share my stories (e.g., involvement with international students, guest lectures in relevant classrooms, listening to radio in that country’s primary language, present slide shows to local and civic groups, write articles for the campus newspaper)
   c. To further my cultural and/or country learning
3. Instruct the students to select at least two of the three to develop their own specific goal related to the theme.
4. Additionally, instruct students to write one personal goal of their own choosing. Remind them of the symbols, words, and pictures that they drew from the “Creating a New Home” activity as a source of ideas for their personal goal.
5. Review the definition of an objective: an objective is an activity which helps us to achieve the goal and is more precise and narrow than the goal.
6. Instruct the students to write at least two objectives to help accomplish each goal. Each objective should also have a time frame for when they would like to complete the task.

Goodbyes
At the end of the retreat, distribute and collect the evaluation. Use the sample certificate to create a Certificate of Completion and distribute it at this time.
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Re-entry Goal Setting

Below, you will find three suggested goals. Pick at least two of the three to develop your own specific goal related to the theme. Then write one additional personal goal of your own choice. Use your drawing from the “Creating a New Home” activity as a source of ideas for your personal goal. Write at least two objectives to help you accomplish each goal.

Goals:
1. To use my new skills gained from studying abroad (e.g., academics, language, daily life, on-campus, Community organizations, visit campus career center, etc.)
2. To share my stories (e.g., involvement with international students, guest lectures in relevant classrooms, listening to radio in that language, give slide shows to local and civic groups, write articles for the campus newspaper)
3. To further my cultural and/or host country learning

Goal 1:
__________________________________________________________

Objectives
a.  Time Frame ____________________________________________
   
   b.  Time Frame ____________________________________________

Goal 2:
__________________________________________________________

Objectives
a.  Time Frame ____________________________________________
   
   b.  Time Frame ____________________________________________

Goal 3:
__________________________________________________________

Objectives
a.  Time Frame ____________________________________________
   
   b.  Time Frame ____________________________________________
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