Evaluation of a State of Intercultural Competence

through Completion of Cultura Project Tasks

by

Tetiana Vaskivska

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Approved April 2015 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Barbara Lafford, Chair
Veronica Gonzalez
Alvaro Cerron-Palomino

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2015

ABSTRACT

Drawing on previous empirical works in the field of Intercultural Competence (ICC) and telecollaboration (Chun, 2011; Elola & Oskoz, 2008; Furstenberg, 2004; Schulz, 2007), this study investigates how a completion of Cultura Project tasks in L1 and L2 helped to determine students' cultural values and behaviors, find out how their mental lexicons are structured, and assess a state of their critical cultural awareness. The theoretical framework for this study is based on Byram's (1997) work on ICC. As a part of their course work, Spanish language learners from a lower-division class participate in three Cultura Project tasks and provided their comments afterwards. The findings revealed cultural values and believes of the participants, as well as the organization of their mental lexicons. Moreover, the findings illustrated how the level of critical cultural awareness, as one of the components of ICC, could be assessed using the rubrics developed based on Byram's (1997) work on ICC and Bloom's (1990) revised taxonomy of learning skills. The results of the study contributed to the field of SLA on what is known about the roles of culturally-based questionnaires in critical cultural awareness assessment and the structure of mental lexicons of L2 learners.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Over the past two decades the possibility of interacting with members of different cultures and nations has been significantly increased by the existence of the Internet (Furstenberg, 2004). For this reason, it becomes apparent that foreign language students need not only to learn skills related to the acquisition second language (L2) knowledge (e.g. grammar and vocabulary), but they also need to learn skills that will help them interact effectively across different cultures, namely, skills that are developed through the acquisition of pragmatic and intercultural competence (ICC).

In view of the increasing communication across languages and cultures, a notion of what constitutes culture as well as the role of foreign language instructors in teaching culture as a component of foreign language curricula has been widely discussed across disciplines. Vacas Hermida & Benevente (2002) stated that "*cada cultura es una manera de clasificar la realidad, cada cultura es una visión del mundo como tantas otras: visión que se refleja en el pensar, en el sentir y en el actuar. Supone por tanto una manera de percibir y organizar lo que nos rodea y que se manifiesta en la manera de comunicarse*" ('each culture is a way of classifying reality, each culture presents a vision of the world like so many other cultures: vision reflected in the thinking, feeling, and acting. It therefore represents a way to perceive and organize what surrounds us and which manifests itself in the way we communicate') (online).

Considering that the construct of culture is broad and embraces different aspects that are tightly interrelated, the role of a foreign language instructor becomes particularly important. In this regard, McCloskey (2011) argued that a good teacher is a one who

guides students "*a través de los procesos de interpretación de [estas] perspectivas contradictorias que surgen, sintetizando información, absteniéndose de juicios y desarrollando nuevas líneas y cuestiones para el análisis. El docente debe modelar su proceso de análisis intercultural posicionándose como co-aprendiz, co-investigador y co-etnógrafo*" 'through the process of interpretation of [these] arising contradictory perspectives, synthesizing information, refraining from judgments and developing new lines and issues for analysis. The teacher should model his process of intercultural analysis positioning himself as co-learner, co-researcher and co-ethnographer.' (McCloskey, 2011, p.45).

In her keynote speech at the Conference on Trilingualism held at Haifa, Israel, Kramsch (1996) posed a question about the approach to be taken while teaching culture. In particular, she inquired whether teaching should stress similarities between cultures or emphasize the differences. In light of this dilemma, Bauer, deBenedette, Furstenberg, Levet, and Waryn (2006) pointed out the obligation of a foreign teacher to help students "bring together different interpretations to their work, to reflect on them, and to try to make sense of the often contradictory viewpoints" (p. 41). This approach resonates with Furstenberg's (2004) advocating for a shift in education practice from teacher-centered learning to student-centered learning.

This shift in education practice can be facilitated by the use of technology. A variety of web-resources available nowadays links together foreign language learners from different cultures and makes the process of language learning in general, and intercultural competence acquisition in particular, not only easier, but also more productive. Through the use of computer mediated communication (CMC), students from

2

across the world can learn from each other, and by reflecting on other's views and beliefs, they can learn to recognize the multiplicity of cultural identities, as well as evaluate their own preconceptions and attitudes towards the other culture.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Although intercultural competence has gained importance in foreign language

curricula, the dilemma of ICC assessment still presents certain challenges as only a few

comprehensive treatments exist to date. Two models of ICC that widely discussed in this

field are (1) that proposed by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign

Languages (ACTFL) National Standards (1996) and (2) the one suggested by Byram

(1997).

ACTFL National Standards

In 1996 ACTFL published National Standards for foreign language education that

identify five major goals also known as the five Cs: *Communication*, *Cultures*,

Connections, *Comparisons*, and *Communities*. The field of Cultures is presented by three

sub-fields (3Ps): *practices*, *perspectives*, and *products*. According to standard 2.1,

cultural practices refer to "patterns of behavior accepted by a society and deal with

aspects of culture such as rites of passage, the use of forms of discourse, the social

'pecking order,' and the use of space."(online reference). In short, they represent the

knowledge of "what to do what and where" (National Standards in Foreign Language

Education Project, 1996, online reference).

While standard 2.1 emphasizes that students demonstrate an understanding of the

relationship between the practices and perspectives, standard 2.2 focuses on students'

understanding of the relationship between the products and perspectives of the studied

culture. Namely, this standard focuses on the products and how they reflect the

perspectives of the culture. Cultural products, according to this standard, may be tangible

or intangible; in other words, examples would be a painting, or a literary work as representations of tangible products, and a dance and a tale as examples of intangible cultural products. With regard to the nature of the cultural products, standard 2.2 points out that regardless of its form, "its presence within the culture is required or justified by the underlying beliefs and values (perspectives) of that culture, and cultural practices involve the use of that product" (National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project, 1996, online reference), therefore, the Standards make evident how the 3 Ps are interrelated within one culture. For example, a big Hispanic family that consists of two or more generations live together (practice) in a big apartment or house with multiple rooms (product) because they believe in the importance of close ties with extended family (perspective).

Although ICC is explicitly present only in the area of Culture of National Standards, it is also implicitly evident in other goals/standards. For example, standard 1.1 that is embraced within Communication, focuses on interpersonal direct oral or written communication between individuals. Therefore, telecollaboration as one of the processes of ICC acquisition also develops the interpersonal mode of the Communication standard. The presence of ICC is also apparent in the Communities standard. According to standard 5.1, students use the language both within and beyond the school settings; thus, by using telecommunication students form a community of practice online.

Acquisition of the Culture, Communication, Comparisons and Communities Standards of the National Standards. Although the interlocking logo of the Standards acknowledges the interconnection of the five goals identified by the National Standards, it has been argued that they are presented in a hierarchal order and are to be reexamined

and repositioned (Magnan, 2008). Considering the intimate and inseparable relations between language and culture, Magnan (2008) mentioned the notion of *linguaculture* introduced by Kramsch (1993) and *languaculture* proposed by Agar (1994), and argued that language and culture cannot be viewed as a dichotomy. Within these frameworks, it would be incompatible to treat Communication and Culture standards as two separate units, the way they are presented in the National Standards.

Moreover, Magnan (2008) drew attention to the Community standard by emphasizing its continuous influence on cultural norms. Given the order in which the five goals are positioned now, the Community standard is at least importance. However, according to Magnan (2008), its role is equally significant because of its potential to focus on practical application of what has been learned in the foreign language classroom. Magnan (2008) concluded that "we need to abandon the hierarchical nature of the five Cs, allowing for Cultures and Communities to take precedence over Communication, which necessarily is embedded in these broader notions" (Magnan, 2008, p.364)

The importance of the Community standard has also been emphasized by the interview responses of postsecondary students in the study conducted by Magnan, Murphy, and Sahakyan (2014) to determine how students' view of educational goals is consistent with the National Standards. According to the authors, participants of the study prioritized the Communities and Communication standards: this prioritization differs from the established tendency in the literature to place value on the Communication and Culture goals.

Ter Horst & Pearce (2010) raised the question of adapting the National Standards in higher education, focusing on the last three standards (Connections, Comparisons, and Communities), which received the least support among foreign language teachers. The research had an interdisciplinary approach that combined the study of the German language with instruction in environmental issues. Students from an upper-division German course, German Conversation and Composition, (N=10) and a group of students taking an Independent Study in German (N=3) participated in the project. A group of students from the Independent study translated materials (English (L1) to German (L2)) from the webpage Appropedia.org, a web site for collaborative solutions in sustainability. When the translations were posted, native German speakers were invited to edit the translations for accuracy and students were notified by e-mail when changes were made.

Another phase of the project involved students from the upper-division German class. They first discussed environmental issues in German-speaking countries mentioned on Appropedia.org, and then had to complete a set of assignments. The participants had to choose an article from a sustainability web site according to their interests, translate it into German, do an oral presentation explaining the project and the concepts of sustainability that it includes, and, finally, write a paper assuming they worked for a German organization that deals with international development. Surveys were conducted at the beginning and at the end of the project to determine students' knowledge about concepts related to sustainable development, and their beliefs about global dimension of environmental issues. The results of initial surveys revealed that all of the students believed that it is important to connect to German-speaking communities outside the

classroom. The results also determined that students considered environmental issues to be important and were aware that Germany is more advanced than the United States in this area. The final survey showed that a majority of students (70%) felt more connected to the German-speaking communities after working on the project. All students believed that their proficiency in German improved as a result of the project and they felt they learned about sustainable development and the German language at the same time.

The results of the study (Ter Horst & Pearce, 2010) showed that interdisciplinary approaches to language learning (the Connection Standard) helped students link to German-speaking communities (the Communities standard) that naturally led to cultural and linguistic comparisons between German-speaking (the Comparison Standard). This approach also helped students to increase their understanding of issues related to sustainable development.

Acquisition of Intercultural Communicative Competence: Byram's (1997) Model of ICC

The model of ICC which embraces the theoretical framework for the current study is based on Byram's (1997) definition of ICC that is comprised of basic sub-competencies, such as *attitudes*, or the ability to show curiosity and openness towards the other culture; *knowledge,* or understanding of general processes of cultural and individual interaction; *skills of interpreting and relating* that refer to identifying ethnocentric perspectives in authentic documents; *skills of discovery and interaction* that include acquiring new knowledge about new cultures and cultural practices in order to interact in different ways with people from this culture.

Byram (1997) introduced a concept of *intercultural speaker* to describe interlocutors involved in intercultural communication and their interaction. The successful interaction depends on the level of intercultural speakers' acquisition of aforementioned intercultural sub-competencies - knowledge, attitudes, skills of interpreting and relating, skills of discovery and interaction, and critical cultural awareness. According to Byram (1997), it is in the process of acquiring intercultural sub-competencies and getting to know a different culture (C2) that an intercultural speaker also develops an awareness of aspects of one's own culture (C1). During the comparison of C1 and C2, students come to better understand and appreciate their own culture, recognize beliefs about their own culture and suspend them when necessary, and question the values and presuppositions (perspectives) in cultural practices and products in one's own native environment.

Three fundamental features of Byram's (1997) model are:

1. It rejects the notion of the native speaker as a model for foreign language learners and proposition of an attainable ideal, the intercultural speaker

2. It proposes a model for ICC acquisition in an educational context with educational objectives

3. Considering its education dimension, it also includes the roles of the teacher and learner as well as specifications of locations of learning (Byram, 1997)

With regards to the last fundamental feature of Byram's (1997) model which is a location of learning, nowadays a development and progress of electronic media worldwide has significantly increased a number of learning contexts. Among them, incorporation of virtual internet spaces into learning has created a shift in educational

9

practice from teacher-centered to student-centered and enhanced learning opportunities for students.

Telecollaboration and Language Learning

With the introduction of new digital technologies into the foreign language classroom their role in language teaching has been increased. Students telecollaborate with other learners from different cultures and counties by using online tools both in synchronous and asynchronous modes. According to Belz (2003), telecollaboration "involves the use of Internet communication tools by internationally dispersed students of language in institutionalized settings in order to promote the development of (a) foreign language (FL) linguistic competence and (b) intercultural competence" (p. 68). A number of studies have been conducted in the field of SLA to determine the influence of telecollaboration on language learning. Some of the studies report the episodes of miscommunication between students from different cultures that participated in online exchanges (Ware & Kramsch, 2005), and others communicate the evidence of a raise of learners' cultural awareness and aspects of intercultural competence (Belz, 2003; Chun, 2011; Furstenberg, 2004).

Analyzing a telecollaborative exchange, Hauck & Youngs (2008) reported that there are a number of interrelated factors that determine success or failure of telecollaboration. While some of them are related to learner's personality and his/her familiarity with online learning environment, the others are connected to the tasks completed by learners and the learning context.

In her study of a German-American telecollaborative partnership, Belz (2002) also emphasized the importance of a variety of factors that stipulate the "multifaceted

human activity" that telecollaboration happens to be. The complexity of this activity is determined not only by idiosyncratic characteristics of learners and their competence in computers and digital tools, but also by social and institutional constrains that influence the learning context and settings.

To date, a number of empirical studies have looked at ICC acquisition by students in different telecollaborative contexts (Bauer, deBenedette, Furstenberg, Levet, Waryn, 2006; Chun, 2011; Elola & Oskoz, 2008; Furstenberg, 2004; Lee, 2011; Schulz, 2007). Several of these will be reviewed below in order to understand what still needs to be researched in this area.

Review of Studies on ICC Acquisition through Telecollaboration. Byram's (1997) model of ICC is widely accepted in foreign language education since its components provide clear objectives for the foreign language classroom (Bauer, deBenedette, Furstenberg, Levet, Waryn, 2006; Chun, 2011; Elola & Oskoz, 2008; Furstenberg, 2004; Schulz, 2007). Web-based resources and electronic communication tools help students to *telecollaborate* in order to connect students from different cultures and facilitate their achievement of ICC goals.

One of the projects designed to develop cross-cultural understanding between students with different cultural and linguistic backgrounds is the *Cultura Project* initiated at MIT in 1997. This project is aimed at "providing students with the skills and knowledge that will enable them to communicate effectively across different cultures" (Furstenberg, 2004, online recourse-no pages). Through the use of computer mediated communication (CMC), American students at a US university and French students at a French university worked individually and collaboratively during a semester to analyze

11

cultural materials, including each other's posted opinions on certain topics. According to Furstenberg (2004), the main strength of this approach is that students themselves are actively engaged in a process of discovery and exploration. The findings illustrated that this approach helped students to make their own observations about another culture by exploring, analyzing, and constructing their understanding of the foreign culture. Although the study took a significant step in bridging a gap between cultures using CMC, and in this way allowed students to acquire ICC, the data analysis was lacking a more rigorous and structured reasoning. Finding emerging patterns in the data and discussion those patterns would have helped to structure the data analysis.

Elola and Oskoz's (2002) study of ICC development and telecollaboration examined how ICC was developed between study abroad (SA) and at home (AH) students who used blogs as a mediating tool. This study, like the previous one, was a longitudinal, semester-long study that involved a group of American students who studied abroad and another group who studied at home. Students at home (n=15) participated in cultural activities and discussions as a part of their course work, and posted their comments and questions generated by those activities on the blog. The study abroad students (n=23), based on their everyday observations of the culture in which they were immersed, responded to the questions posted by their peers and posted their own reflections. Through blogs, they acted also as mediators between the at home students and the foreign culture.

Over the course of the semester, four general topics related to AH students' class assignments were addressed in blogs. There were total of ten blogs, each blog had 3-5 participants that represented both educational contexts (SA and AH). Each blog-related

task followed 5 phases: (1) AH students discussed a certain topic in the class, (2) researched it, (3) presented their findings/posted questions on the blogs, (4) SA students reflected on those questions and got engaged in the dialogue (via blogs), and (5) AH students presented findings from their SA blog peers in the class. Blog communication between students in both contexts was conducted in the students' L1 that, according to authors, help students benefit more from this interaction.

The data, including blogs and two questionnaires, were analyzed quantitatively by applying a t-test and qualitatively by using Byram's (2000) assessment guidelines. Three independent t-tests were conducted to compare the following for SA and AH students: (1) students' perceptions of the relevance of learning about Spanish culture, (2) students' understanding of attitudes toward family, money, education, and religion, and (3) students' change in perception after interacting with blog partners. The findings of the study illustrated that blog interactions had a positive impact on the development of both groups' ICC. They also demonstrated that the study abroad students were able to change their perspectives about the other's culture more easily and with more depth than the at home students. However, it was the at home students who benefited the most from their blogs partners' information and reflections. Byram's (2000) assessment criteria comprise different components that to some extent were reflected in the qualitative data analysis from the blogs and questionnaires. However, adding the rubrics would help to see not only if the instances of ICC were present in the students' blogs entries, but would also identify to which extend those instances correspond to the five sub-competencies of Byram's work on ICC.

Chun (2011) explored how online communicative exchanges could play a role in second language learners' development of pragmatic competence and intercultural communicative competence (ICC). Online exchanges were established between the American students (learners of German) (n=23) at the US university and the German students at the German university (n=23). Students in both groups were multilingual and multicultural. The author used online discussion boards, text chats, and surveys to collect data. First, the participants filled out word association questionnaires (12 words/phrases) as proposed by a *Cultura Project*; second, they commented on associations written by their peers; third, the participants on both sides had a chat session to talk about previously written posts; lastly, the students from the US university filled out a questionnaire to evaluate the success of the online exchanges.

The findings of the study illustrated that the discourse of the synchronous chats contained more evidence of developing ICC than the entries in the asynchronous forum postings. The findings also showed that students demonstrated ICC by using appropriate combinations of knowledge, skills, and attitudes in order to interact with interlocutors from a different culture or country, although sometimes their interactions resulted in a clash of expectations. Students also showed curiosity about and interest in the other culture, reflected on their own culture, and suspended disbelief about the other's culture. In addition, they kept the conversation going by hedging and avoiding conflict. However, multicultural and multilingual participants' backgrounds were not taken into consideration (some students were raised bilingually in English/Vietnamese, English/German, English/Spanish, Spanish/German, Chinese/German). This factor might have brought into question whether the results of the study were due solely to the

variables identified by the author. Moreover, the students in the German class had regular, required assignments about the online exchange, while the students in the English course were not required to participate in that activity. This factor contributed to an unequal number of participants of both groups in the synchronous chat: 23 students in the German class and 7 in the English course. Students in the English course also demonstrated less activity in online forums and, unlike their peers in the German class, did not fill out a questionnaire at the end of the experiment to evaluate the success of the online exchange. Therefore, the conclusions of the study that are based on the comparison between the types of discourse produced in the chats where only students at the US university evaluated chat success, revealed perspectives of the students from the US university more than those from students from the German university.

Justification of the Present Study

The goal of this study was to determine to what extent completion of *Cultura Project* tasks in both L1 and L2 helped to identify (1) participants' cultural values and behaviors, (2) how their mental lexicons are structured, and if they lean towards the Spanish or English end of the continuum. Although direct online exchanges would provide more opportunities for dialogue and interaction between students from different countries and cultures, possibilities for setting up an online exchange are not always available for language teachers. In addition, once these exchanges are initially set up, participation from students in other countries is not always reliable, as sometimes they are not required to participate in these activities by their instructors (Chun, 2011). Therefore, although telecollaboration theoretically offers excellent possibilities for ICC development, due to logistical constraints, the current study had Spanish L2 students

compare and contrast their own responses to *Cultura Project* tasks with archived

responses to the same tasks from native speakers of Mexican Spanish. Using archived

data of foreign students' responses to *Cultura Project* tasks was also be beneficial for

students, because it exposed the L2 learners to perspectives of native speakers of the

target language. In addition, the comparison/contrast tasks in the current study allowed

the students to work on attaining the culture standard from the National Standards for

foreign languages as well as one of the sub-competencies of Byram's ICC model, *critical*

cultural awareness.

Therefore, this current study builds on previous research in intercultural

competence and adds to the current literature review on what is known about raising level

of critical cultural awareness through completion of *Cultura Project* tasks. Moreover, this

study provides structural and rigorous analysis of the data and takes into account

participants' language backgrounds and assessing their responses based on rubrics created

following Byram's (1997) discussion on one of the component of ICC, *critical cultural*

awareness, and Bloom's (1990) revised taxonomy of the important learning skills. The

following research questions are addressed in this study:

(1) How do English word associations and answers to culturally-based sentence

completion and hypothetical situations provided by intermediate L2 learners

of Spanish differ from or resemble those made by native speakers of Spanish?

(2) What insights into their level of ICC can be gleaned from the reflections of the

participants on the comparison and contrast of their responses in English and

Mexican students' responses to the word associations and answers to

culturally-based sentence completion and hypothetical situations?

16

(3) How do Spanish word associations and answers to culturally-based sentence

completion and hypothetical situations provided by intermediate L2 learners

of Spanish differ from or resemble those made by native speakers of Spanish

and their own responses to the same words and Prompts when given to them

in English? What do their differences/similarities tell about the structure of the

participants' mental lexicons?

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The pilot study of the proposed study was conducted in Spring 2014 to test the instruments for this research project. The current proposal incorporates lessons learned from the pilot study.

Subjects

The participants in this study were L2 Spanish learners (n=12), 7 females and 5 males. All the participants were university students at a large American university in the Southwest from two intermediate online Spanish classes, ASUONLINE and iCourse. The ASUONLINE class was held during the first half of the Fall 2014 semester, session A, and the iCourse took place during the second half of the semester, session B. Although the courses were designed identically, the populations in both classes were different. The average age of the participants from section A (ASUONLINE) was 35.3 , while the average age of the participants from section B (iCourse) was 22. Moreover, ASUONLINE students tend to be part-time students working full time wanting to complete their degree, while iCourse students usually are full-time students who do not work or work part time (P. Feldman & B. Lafford, personal communication, March 10th, 2015).

All the participants were born in the United States, with an exception of one who was born in Germany and moved to the US at the age of 4 years old. One ASUONLINE student reported that her native language is Navajo and that she speaks it at home. The rest of the participants stated their L1 is English which they use at home, with an exception of one ASUONLINE student who mentioned she speaks Spanish at home. All

the participants reported they received the majority of their precollege education in English, and English is the language they feel more comfortable using on a daily basis.

All participants studied Spanish in High School for one to three years. Two participants from session B traveled to the Spanish speaking countries for two to five weeks, and one participant from session A lived in the Spanish speaking country for 1.5 year. There was one heritage speaker in the initial group of the participants, but her data were eliminated from the analysis because there were not enough heritage speakers to make it a variable.

Instruments and Procedures

To collect demographic data and students' language backgrounds, the students were invited to fill out the contact language profiles at the beginning of the study (Appendix A). After looking at the results of the demographic questionnaire, it was determined that the number of heritage speakers was not high enough to constitute a variable. For this reason, data from the heritage learners was gathered but not analyzed. These data were collected because these assignments constituted a part of all students' grades.

The second instrument (Appendix B) was cultural questionnaire 1, based on tasks from the *Cultura Project* (Furstenberg, 2004) in which students were asked to provide English word associations for 4 words (*US, family, Mexico, success*), complete 2 sentences (1. *My greatest worry is ...* 2. *A good leader is someone who...*) and write their response to 2 hypothetical situations (1. *If somebody on the street asks me for money, I…* 2. *If I see somebody cheating on the test, I...*) in their native language (English). The

19

choice of the English words, sentences and situations was determined from archived

Spanish data from Mexican students from the *Cultura Project* website.

Two weeks after completion of cultural questionnaire 1, cultural questionnaire 2

was administered (Appendix C). This questionnaire was designed to determine how the

participants' L2 Spanish system is structured, in other words, is it more similar to their

English system or the Spanish system of native speakers found in the activities. This

questionnaire asked students to provide Spanish word associations for four words in

Spanish (*EEUU, familia, México, exito*), to complete sentence (1. *Mi mayor*

preocupación es... 2. *Las mejores fuentes de información son..*) and to write responses to

the hypothetical situations (1.*Si alguien en la calle me pide dinero, yo....* 2. *Si veo alguien*

copia en un examen, yo...) in Spanish. Students also were asked not to refer to the

English answers they gave earlier and were encouraged to be as spontaneous as possible.

It is important to note, that in order to avoid order effect, the participants from session B

filled out the cultural questionnaire 2 first, and two weeks after they completed the

cultural questionnaire 1 and the order of the words were also changed.

The fourth instrument consisted of answers to these same questions that were

given by native speakers of Spanish, specifically Mexican students from the Pachuca

Technical Institute in Fall 2010. After the L2 students in the study completed the two

aforementioned cultural questionnaires, the researcher provided them with two

worksheets. The first one juxtaposed the American students' responses to the questions in

English with archived Mexican students' responses to those same questions (Appendix

D). The second worksheet juxtaposed American students' responses in (L2) Spanish with

their responses in (L1) English and Mexican students' responses (Appendix E). These two

worksheets were given to students two weeks apart. Looking at both columns of responses, the students were first asked to analyze (compare and contrast) their responses in (L1) English to the archived ones from Mexico (cultural questionnaire 3). To do so, the students reflected on the similarities and differences they saw between their answers provided in English to those of native speakers of Spanish and provided a hypothesis that, according to them, would explain those differences and similarities in each culture (Appendix F). After that, students were asked to compare their (L2) responses to both their (L1) responses and to those of native speakers of Spanish (cultural questionnaire 4). Students were encouraged to provide examples that reflected either similarities or differences between two out of three sets of responses (Appendix G).

Rubric based on Byram's (1997) work on one of the components of ICC, *critical cultural awareness*, (Appendix H) were applied to the students' comments (Cultural questionnaire 3) in order to measure students' critical cultural awareness as one of the components of ICC. The rubrics that were developed initially included all five components of ICC and were modified after the data were collected. The modifications happened due to the following reasons. First of all, the nature of data suggested that only one category of the rubrics, *critical cultural awareness*, could be applied to the analysis of the students' responses to the cultural questionnaire 3. This category assessed an extent to which students were able to understand, analyze, evaluate, and hypothesize, critically and on the basis of explicit criteria, perspectives, practices, and products in their own and other cultures and countries. The rest of the categories in the rubrics, *attitudes*, *knowledge*, s*kills of interpreting and relating*, s*kills of discovery and interaction*, require

21

data that would emerge out of the interactions between the participants with native speakers. Thus, these rubrics were not included in the analysis of the data for this study.

Secondly, the rubrics were finalized taken into consideration Bloom's revised taxonomy (1990) that reflects classification of the levels of intellectual learning skills that are important in the learning process. The critical cultural awareness was evaluated taken into consideration the following cognitive skills from the Bloom's taxonomy: *remembering*, *analyzing*, *evaluating*, and *creating*, and based on them five levels of assessment of the critical cultural awareness were developed. The first one, *incomplete understanding*, characterizes skills of an individual who demonstrates unsatisfactory understanding of perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries. The second one, u*nderstanding*, refers to an ability of an individual to demonstrate understanding and to list differences and similarities between perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries. The third level is labeled as *analyzing*, and it describes skills of an individual who analyzes, compares and contrasts perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries. The forth level, *evaluating*, makes a reference to abilities of an individual who profoundly evaluates, critically and on the basis of explicit criteria, perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries. The highest level, *creating*, characterizes skills of an individual who creates hypothesis and demonstrates abstract thinking with regards to perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries.

Based on the experience gained from the pilot study, all instruments for this project were put online and students had time outside classroom to complete assignments in order (1) to have enough time for reflections and for writing down their thoughts, (2) not to take up valuable class time and put pressure on students to finish in designated amount of time. Students were required to complete all activities as a part of their coursework.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

The answer to the first research question determined certain cultural values and behaviors of the participants; the answer to the second research question helped to assess the participants' levels of critical cultural awareness as a part of their intercultural competence, while the answer to the third research question helped determine how participants' mental lexicons are structured, and if they lie more towards the English or Spanish end of the continuum.

To get an idea of the certain cultural values and behaviors held by the participants and to understand the structure of their mental lexicons (RQs 1&3), a content analysis was carried out the students' responses to the first and second cultural questionnaires. Content analysis took into consideration all words and phrases, or *tokens*, given by students as a response to a prompt word, sentence, or situation in the first and second cultural questionnaires.

First, a list was made, consisting of all words and phrases provided by students to each word association, sentence completion, and response to the hypothetical situation. Then, the number of tokens was counted; and calculated were the number of times each word/phrase was used. Each word or phrase in that list is called *type*, which means a different word response. While most types arise from single instances (i.e. only one participant gave that word/phrase in response to the prompt word association, sentence completion, or hypothetical situation), there are also types that arise from high frequency responses (i.e. several participants gave the same word in response to the prompt word association, sentence completion, or hypothetical situation).

The next step consisted of a close examination of the types for each word, sentence, and situation in order to determine if there are any similar types and what criteria make them similar. Once the similar types were determined and criteria for their similarity were established, the types were organized into bigger *categories* that defined the common themes for participants' responses in English and Spanish. The same type of analysis was administered to the Mexican students' responses, after which the common themes were detected for those responses. At this point the percentage value of each category as it refers to the number of all tokens given in each set of responses was calculated.

The last step was a comparison of the themes that emerged from the analysis of participants' responses in English with the themes that characterized Mexican students' responses. This comparison helped to get an insight into cultural values and behaviors of the participants, and how their cultural values and behaviors are similar to or different from the cultural values and behaviors of the native Spanish speakers.

Finally, themes of the participants' responses in Spanish were compared with the themes that became apparent during the analysis of both (1) students' responses in English and (2) Mexican students' responses. This comparison helped to understand how participants' mental lexicons are structured, and if they lie more towards the English or Spanish end of the continuum. The percentage value of each category aided the data analysis as it made possible the comparison of frequencies of the occurrences of the categories in each set of responses.

To answer the second research question, that gauged the students' level of critical cultural awareness, the rubrics were developed based on Byram's (1997) work on critical

cultural awareness as a component of ICC (Appendix H). Each student' response to the cultural questionnaire 3 (N=8) was assessed based on the rubrics and number from 1(incomplete understanding) to 5(creating) was given to each comment. After, the number of all comments were added up and divided by eight to calculate the average for each student. The average in this study represents a level of critical cultural awareness of the participants.

The results of the comparisons, as well as samples of students' responses that were measured by rubrics and students' respective levels of critical cultural awareness, are presented in the following section.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The results were gleaned from (1) content analysis of the participants' responses to the cultural questionnaires, and (2) rubric-based analysis of the students' reflections based on comparison of their English comments with native Spanish speakers' comments.

Twelve intermediate Spanish learners participated in the study. Spanish speakers' responses are represented by Mexican students (N =10 for word associations, N=16 for sentence completion and hypothetical situations).

Research Question 1

Participants' responses to each word, sentence and situation are presented in the tables below. Each table reflects the categories that became apparent after the analysis of the similar types, it also reflects the number of tokens in each category, and the percentage value of that category with regards to all number of tokens. The types that form each category are listed under the category in the table, and the number of tokens in that type is given in the column to its right.

Table 1 illustrates results gleaned from the comparison between the ASU students' responses to the prompt USA and the Mexican students' responses to the prompt EEUU.

Table 1

Comparison of the ASU students' responses to the prompt USA with the Mexican students' responses to the prompt EEUU

ASU students' responses (N = 12)		Mexican students' responses (N = 10)	
Prompt: USA		Prompt: EEUU	
Category and types	N of tokens/ %	**Category** and types	N of tokens/ %
Well-being	3/ 13%	**Well-being**	8/ 30%

27

prosperity	1	oportunidad	1
land of opportunity	1	trabajo	1
peace	1	dinero	3
		dólares	1
		seguridad	2
Government	4/ 17%	**Government**	7/ 26%
military	1	power	3
president	1	government	2
patriot	1	obama	1
history	1	leyes	1
Physical symbols	2/ 8%	**Physical symbols/monuments**	3/ 11%
flag	1		
red, blue and white	1	estatua de libertat	1
		Manhattan	1
		empire state	1
Geographical location	1/ 4%	**Geographical location**	1/ 4%
		Norte	
South	1		1
Home	3/ 13%	**Sports/videogames**	3/ 11%
home	2	Baseball,	1
country I grew up	1	AVGN	1
		GTA IV	1
Diversity	2/ 8%	**Sciencetech**	4/ 15%
Melting pot	2	Tecnología	3
		ciencia	1
Freedom	6/ 25%	**Migration**	1/ 4%
land of the free	1	Migración	1
freedom	4		
liberty	1		
Food	2/ 8%		
fast food	1		
hamburgers	1		
Thinks it is superior	1/ 4%		

Thinks it is superior	
1	

N of categories = 9	**N of categories = 7**
N of types = 19	**N of types = 19**
N of tokens = 24	**N of tokens = 27**

As Table 1 demonstrates, there are 9 categories that emerged from the analysis of

the ASU students' responses (19 types and 24 tokens) to the prompt USA, and 7

categories that arose from the analysis of the Mexican students' responses (19 types and

27 tokens) to the prompt EEUU. The categories *well-being*, *government*, *physical*

symbols, and *geographical locations* are common for both sides of responses, however,

the types that constitute these categories, as well as their percentage values, differ. For

example, for the ASU students the embodiment of the USA well-being is *prosperity*,

opportunity, and *peace*. These responses constitute 13% of all ASU students' responses to

this prompt. Of the three types on ASU side, only *opportunity* is also mentioned by the

Mexican students. Other types on the Mexican students' side illustrate that their view of

well-being in the USA is tightly related to money, jobs, and security. These are values,

that, perhaps, do not represent their former state of well-being in Mexico, and values that,

according to their bigger percentage value on this side (30%), are thought to be

frequently associated among Mexican students with the image of the American Dream.

Another category that appears on both ASU and Mexican sides is *government*,

with frequencies of 17% and 26% respectively. In this category, as in the previous one,

the types that constitute each category on each side are slightly different. ASU students

mentioned *military*, *president*, *patriot*, and *history*, while for the Mexican students' the

USA government if affiliated with *power*, *government*, *Obama*, and *laws*. It is interesting to notice that students on both sides mention the president, but a Mexican student references him by name, *Obama*, while an ASU student names only a title, *president*. These two types of responses suggest different ways in which the power is conceptualized. On the one hand, a power resides with the person, as in a case with the Mexican students; on the other hand, as in a case with the ASU student, a power rests with the title, as it is established by the constitution which is a rule of law and not a rule of personality.

  Physical symbols is the third category that is common for the ASU and Mexican students' responses. This category is less frequent on both sides compared to the previous two categories and constitute 8% of occurrence between the ASU students' responses and 11% among the Mexican students' responses. The major physical symbol for the ASU students' is the flag of the United States, this conclusion becomes apparent from the analysis of the two types in this category, which are *flag*, and *red, blue and white*. The category that emerged from the Mexican students' responses is called *physical symbols/monuments*, because two out of three types that constitute this category are representations of major monuments in New York City, such as *Statute of Liberty* and *Empire State,* with the third type, *Manhattan*, adding on to the landmarks of New York City and making that city an embodiment of the USA for a certain number of Mexican students. As such, it is interesting to notice that the symbol of the United States for the Mexican students is related more to the US cultural and financial power, rather than to the US nationalism, as it is the case for the ASU students.

Another category that is common for both sets of responses is *geographical location*. This category has the same frequency of occurrence on both sides (4%). The student from ASU who gave a response *South* to the prompt USA is most likely a resident of one of the southern states of the USA. Mexican student mentioned *North* to indicate that a geographical location of the USA is to the North of Mexico.

The rest of the categories for the ASU and Mexican students' responses are different. The biggest category that emerged out of the ASU students' responses is *freedom*. The idea of American freedom is one of the highest values held among the ASU students. One fourth of all students (25%) mentioned *land of free*, *freedom*, *and liberty* as responses to the prompt USA. This value has its root in the Bill of Rights that set forth rights and freedoms guaranteed to all Americans. A few centuries have passed since then, but the idea of the United States as a land of the free is still present. Interestingly, this value seems to be held by ASU students only, given that none of the Mexican students' gave an association related to this category.

Another categories formed from the ASU students' responses are *diversity*, *home*, *food*, and *think it is superior*. Thirteen percent of the ASU students think of *home* when they think of the USA. ASU students also recognize *diversity* that exist within the country, as 8% of them mentioned *melting pot* as a response to the prompt USA. Another 8% of all responses go the category *food*. There is something about *fast food* and *hamburgers* that come to mind to some of the ASU students when they picture USA. One student believes that USA *thinks it is superior* (4%).

The categories that are left on the Mexican side are *sports/videogames*, *sciencetech*, *and migration*. Fifteen percent of Mexican students think of the USA as a

31

country of *technology* and *science*, these types constitute a category *sciencetech*. The relatively high percentage value of this category can be related to the widespread news about the technological advancements that originate in the USA, and perhaps, some of the Mexican students are able to enjoy the fruits of the technological development that happens in the US (e.g. iPhones, iPads, computers). The types *baseball* and v*ideogames* (AVGN and GTA IV) form a category *sports/videogames* (11%), and 4% of the responses are attributed to the *migration*.

Table 2 shows the results revealed from the comparison of the ASU students' responses to the prompt Mexico with the Mexican students' responses to the prompt México.

Table 2

Comparison of the ASU students' responses to the prompt Mexico with the Mexican students' responses to the prompt México

ASU students' responses (N = 12) Prompt: Mexico		Mexican students' responses (N = 10) Prompt: México	
Category and types	N of tokes/ %	**Category** and types	N of tokes/ %
Culture	4/ 16%	**Culture**	6/ 23%
quinceañera	1	cultura	4
culture	1	diversidad	1
diversity	1	variedad	1
Spanish	1		
Food & drinks	6 / 25%	**Food & drinks**	4/ 15%
food	4	comida	2
burritos	1	cerveza	1
spicy	1	chile	1
Problems	3/ 12%	**Problems**	6/ 23%
cartels	1	corrupcion	2

boarder crisis	1	narcotrafico	2
poverty	1	delincuencia	1
		injusticia	1
Sports	1/ 4%	**Sports**	1/ 4%
soccer	1	soccer	1
Geographical location	1/ 4%	**Home**	1/ 4%
		casa	1
South of US	1		
Tourism	7/ 28%	**Beauty**	6/ 23%
fun	2	hermoso	2
beaches	1	bonito	1
spring break	1	calidez	1
Aztecs	1	playas	2
Teotihuacan	1		
warmth	1		
Physical symbols	1/ 4%	**Freedom**	1/ 4%
Sombreros	1	Bicentenario	1

N of categories = 7
N of types (different responses words) = 19
N of tokens (words given in response to a prompt word) = 25

N of categories = 7
N of types (different responses words) = 17
N of tokens (words given in response to a prompt word) = 26

As Table 2 shows, the analysis of the ASU students' responses to the prompt *Mexico* (19 types and 25 tokens) and the Mexican students' responses to the prompt *México* (17 types and 27 tokens) generated seven categories on both sides. The categories *culture*, *food & drinks*, *problems*, and *sports* are common for both sets of responses, however, the percentage value of each category slightly differs. With regards to the types, while they are somewhat similar in the categories *culture*, *food & drinks*, and *sports*, for the category *problems* they types are significantly diverse. ASU students describe problematic situation in Mexico using such associations as *carteles, boarder crisis*, and

poverty. This image presents an *etic* view onto the life in Mexico, or a view of an outsider. The percentage value of the category *problems* on the ASU students' side is 13%.

The Mexican students show an *emic* perspective, or a perspective of an insider, when it comes to the problems in their country. Not only have they more to say about it (the percentage value of the category on this side is almost twice as high compared to the ASU students' responses and constitutes 23%), but they also demonstrate more familiarity with the difficulties and challenges in their country naming *corruption*, *drug trafficking*, *crime*, and *injustice* when they describe problems in Mexico.

Another common category for the ASU and Mexican students' responses to the prompt *Mexico* is *culture*, with frequencies of 16% and 23% respectively. Although the percentage values on both sides differ, the types that form categories are similar. Both ASU and Mexican students mention *diversity* and *culture* when they talk about Mexico. ASU students also specify one of the Mexican traditions, *quinceañera*.

Two other categories that appear on both side with similar types are *food & drinks* and *soccer*. One student on each side thinks of *soccer* when they think about Mexico. This category has a percentage value of 4% on both sides. The category *food & drinks* is larger for the ASU students' responses (25%) than for the Mexican students' responses (15%). The ASU students mention *food*, *burritos*, and *spicy,* and Mexican students name *food*, *beer*, and *chili* for the category *food & drinks*. The type *food* is the most common on both sides, which demonstrates that the image of Mexico is often related to the gastronomy, both inside and outside the country.

The rest of the categories for the ASU and Mexican students' responses are different. The biggest category that emerged out of the ASU students' responses to the prompt Mexico is *tourism* (28%). The types that form this category are associated with the traditional activities and well-known places that make Mexico a popular tourist destination. For example, ASU students think of *fun*, *beaches*, *warmth*, *spring break*, *Aztecs*, and *Teotihuacan* when they think about Mexico.

Another two categories that are characteristic for ASU students' responses only are *geographical location* and *physical symbols*. The percentage value for both categories constitutes 4%. The type *South of US* forms the category *geographical location*, referring to the fact that Mexico is situated to the South of the US. The category *physical symbols* comprises the type *sombreros* that are recognizable icons of Mexican culture and labor.

The categories that appear among the Mexican students' responses only are *home*, *beauty*, and *freedom*. Twenty three percent of the Mexican students find *loveliness*, *beauty*, *warmth*, and *beaches* when they think of their own country. The relatively high percent of this category indicates that, although Mexican students are aware of the problems in the country, they also recognize the beauty of it. It is interesting to observe that the category beauty appears among the Mexican students' responses only when they talk about their country, and is not mentioned by the ASU students when they talk about the *United States*.

The percentage values of the categories *freedom* and *home* constitute 4% on both sides. One students gives an association *home* as response to the prompt *México*. This type forms the category *home*. The category *freedom* is formed by the response

35

bicentenary, mentioned by one students, who is most likely referring to the 200

anniversary of independence of Mexico celebrated in 2010.

Table 3 illustrates the results of the comparison between the responses of the ASU

students to the prompt *family* and the responses of the Mexican students to the prompt

familia.

Table 3

Comparison of the ASU students' responses to the prompt family with the Mexican students' responses to the prompt familia

ASU students' responses (N = 12)		Mexican students' responses (N = 10)	
Prompt: Family		Prompt: Familia	
Category and types	N of tokes/ %	**Category** and types	N of tokes/ %
Love	8/ 38%	**Love**	7/ 27%
love	7	amor	5
happiness	1	felicidad	1
		comprension	1
Closeness	4/ 17%	**Closeness**	9/ 35%
together	2	union	5
support	1	apoyo	3
home	1	cuidado	1
Family members	4/ 17%	**Family members**	5/ 19%
parents	1	mama	1
mom	1	papa	1
dad	1	hermano	2
children	1	compania	1
Esteem	1/ 4%	**Esteem**	4/ 15%
important	1	respeto	3
		importante	1
Reliance	4/ 17%	**Calmness**	1/ 4%
safety	3	Tranquilidad	1

36

commitment	1	
Alliance	1/ 4%	
marriage	1	
Geographical Location	1/ 4%	
Arizona	1	

N of categories = 7
N of types (different responses words) = 14
N of tokens (words given in response to a prompt word) = 23

N of categories = 5
N of types (different responses words) = 13
N of tokens (words given in response to a prompt word) = 26

As it becomes apparent from Table 3, there are 7 categories that emerged out of the ASU students' responses (14 types and 23 tokens), and 5 categories that became revealed out of the Mexican students' responses (13 types and 26 tokens). The categories *love*, *closeness*, *family members*, and *esteem* are common for both sets of responses. The category *love* is the biggest on the ASU side (38%), and the second biggest on the Mexican side (27%), which makes this value an integral part of the families of the students from both cultures. The types *love* and *happiness* form the category among ASU students' responses. For the Mexican students' responses, in addition to the types mentioned on ASU side, there is also the type *understanding*.

The second common category is *closeness*. The percentage value of this category for the Mexican students' responses is more than twice as high as for the ASU students' responses, and constitutes 35% for the Mexican students' side and 17% for the ASU students' side. The types *together*, *support*, and *home* form the category from the ASU students' responses. This category is composed out of the types *union*, *support*, and *care*

on the Mexican students' side, with the type *union* having a high frequency of occurrence (N=5). The high rate of occurrence of the type *union* among the Mexican students' answers can be explained by the fact that a term *familia* in Hispanic culture usually goes beyond the nuclear family, and includes not only parents and their children, but extended family as well. Family ties are very strong and most Hispanic families are close-knit with moral responsibility of *caring* for each other, placing the needs of the family ahead of any individual concerns.

Another common category that appears in the ASU and Mexican students' responses to the prompt *family* is *family members*. This category has very similar percentage values on both sides, 17% for the ASU students' responses, and 19% for the Mexican students' responses. Moreover, not only has this category similar frequencies of occurrence, but it also is composed out of the similar types. For example, the types that constitute the category on the ASU side are *parents*, *mom*, *dad*, *children*; and the categories on the Mexican side are *mom*, *dad*, *brother*, *company*.

The last mutual category shared by the two sets of responses is *esteem*. It is interesting to note that the percentage value of this category for the Mexican students' responses is more than 3 times higher than for the ASU students' responses, and constitute 15% and 4% respectively. The common type is *important,* however, on the Mexican side there is also a second type, which is *respect*. The high occurrence of the type *respect* on the Mexican students' side might be explained by the importance of the respectful and reverent treatment of the elderly in the Hispanic culture (Fuligni et al., 2007). For example, grandparents, parents, and children may live in the same household, and one generation takes care of the previous one: parents would take care of

grandparents and set up an example of respect and deep sense of family responsibility for their children, who (in the future) will take care of them. This practice explains a relative lack of need for nursing homes in the Hispanic culture, compared to their high demand in the United States.

In contrast, the type *respect* does not occur on the ASU side. The absence of the type *respect* might be rooted in the lack of a deep sense of responsibly that families should take care for the elderly instead of nursing homes. However, that depends on the sub-culture in the US as well. For instance, the Southern US culture also believes in "taking care of their own".

The three categories that appear on the ASU side only are *reliance*, *alliance*, and *geographical location*. The category *reliance* consists of the types *safety* and *commitment*, and has a relatively high percentage value of 17%. The high occurrence of the type *safety* (N=3) among the ASU students' responses indicates the importance that families of the ASU participants place on safety while building the strong foundations for their families. They feel safe and secure with their family members, and, at the same time, feel certain *commitment* or obligation towards their family members. The categories *alliance* and *geographical location* both have a percentage value of 4%. The latter one consists of the type *Arizona*, most likely indicating the place where participant's family resides. The category *alliance* is formed out of the type *marriage*, that points out to the institution of marriage between a man and a woman. The category that appears among the Mexican students' responses only is *calmness* (4%), and it is formed by *tranquility* that can be often found in the family circle.

39

Table 4 reflects the results gleaned from the analysis of the responses of the ASU

students' to the prompt *success*, and the Mexican students' responses to the prompt *éxito*.

Table 4

Comparison of the ASU students' responses to the prompt success with the
Mexican students' responses to the prompt éxito

ASU students' responses (N = 12)		Mexican students' responses (N = 10)	
Prompt: Success		Prompt: *Éxito*	
Category and types	N of tokes/ %	**Category** and types	N of tokes/ %
Achievement	5/ 20%	**Achievement**	11/ 44%
achieving a goal	2	esfuerzo	4
accomplishment	2	metas	3
winning	1	capacidad	1
		triunfos	1
		alcanzar	1
		desempeño	1
Academic achievement	3/ 12%	**Academic achievement**	3/ 12%
degree	3	escuela	2
		buenas calificaciones	1
Professional life	4/ 16%	**Profesional life**	6/ 24%
career	1	trabajo	4
good job	1	emprendedor	1
hard work	1	traje	1
independence	1		
Contentment	9/ 36%	**Contentment**	1/4%
satisfaction	1	felicidad	1
content	1		
fulfilling	1		
happiness	4		
awesome	1		
proud	1		
Power	4/ 16%	**Power**	2/ 8%
money	1	dinero	2

power	1		
stability	1		
finances	1		
		Globalization	1/ 4%
		Globalizacion	1
		Individuality	1/ 4%
		Yo	1
N of categories = 4		**N of categories = 7**	
N of types (different responses words) = 18		**N of types (different responses words) = 15**	
N of tokens (words given in response to a prompt word) = 25		**N of tokens (words given in response to a prompt word) =25**	

As Table 4 indicates, 4 categories were created out of the ASU students' responses (18 types and 25 tokens) to the prompt *success*, and 7 categories were created out of the Mexican students' responses (15 types and 25 categories) to the prompt *éxito*. All five categories on the ASU side, *achievement*, *academic achievement*, *professional life*, *contentment*, and *power* appear also on the Mexican students' side in addition to the other 2 categories, *globalization and individuality*, that emerged out of the Mexican students' responses only.

Although there are more types on the Mexican student's side that compose the category *achievement* than on the ASU students' side, the types on both sides are similar in their nature. For examples, on the ASU students' side the three types are *achieving a goal*, *accomplishment*, and *winning*. On the Mexican students' side there are also types *achieving*, *goals*, *victory*, and the other two types that are inherent for this set of responses only are *capacity* and *effort*. With regards to the latter type, *effort*, it is interesting to observe its high frequency of occurrence among the Mexican students'

responses (N=4), and its absence on the ASU students' side. This fact might suggest that if Mexicans accomplish certain task, either related to work or study environment, it is usually because they have put lots of effort into it, and things do not come easily to them.

Moreover, despite the fact that the types that compose the category *achievement* are somewhat similar, the noticeable difference lies in the percentage values of this category on both sides. The frequency of occurrence of the category *achievement* among the ASU students is relatively high (20%); however, the frequency is more than twice as high on the Mexican students' side (44%). This difference in the percentage values might suggest a higher level of self-efficacy in the Mexican students, who believe that the final outcome and success of the events rests in their hands; and a compared lower level of self-efficacy in the ASU students', who regard the final outcome and success of the events as determined primarily by external factors. These findings, however, are surprising because the Hispanics tend to believe in metaphysical power and credit their achievements to destiny or fate rather than personal abilities; while the US society, in contrast, believes that man has power over nature (Enriquez & Pajewski, 1996).

The next category that appears on both sides is *academic achievement*. Twelve percent of the ASU students' think of *degree* when they visualize *success*. At the same time, 12% of the Mexican students picture *school* and *good grades* as an image of the *success*. These results suggest that ASU students' think of a long-term success in a form of the university *degree*, while the Mexican students are more concerned about short-term outcomes of their academic achievement and consider *good grades* to be a success. The type *school* on the Mexican students' can be interpret ambiguously and can be related either to the long-term or short-term success.

42

The third mutual category is *professional life*, with a percentage value of 16% among the ASU students' responses (18 types and 25 tokens), and 24 % for the Mexican students' responses (15 types and 25 tokens). The ASU students' mentioned *career*, *good job*, *hard work*, and *independence* as responses to the prompt *success*. The Mexican students' made reference to *job*, *entrepreneur*, and *suit*, with the type *job* occurring 4 times. These results suggest that having a job has a significant value in the culture of the Mexican participants. For the Mexican students having a job can by itself be equivalent to be successful, because what is considered to be a "good job" in the American society, is not frequently encountered in the Mexican society. For this reason, and also their willingness to survive and provide for their families, Mexicans tend to open their own business and become *entrepreneurs* (Mizrahi, 1994), as is also mentioned by the Mexican students in association to the prompt *success*. The ASU students also point to job and work as attributes of success, but they also want to have a *career* and be *independent*.

The fourth common category is *contentment*. The ASU students' believe that 36% of time success is *happiness*, *satisfaction*, it means to feel *proud, awesome, fulfilling*, and *content*. This frequency is 8 times bigger than a frequency of this category among the Mexican students' responses. Only one Mexican student (4%) mentioned *happiness* as responses to the prompt *success*. These findings might suggest that work and career constitute important environments for the ASU students to create happiness and contentment. Erickson (2001) noticed that while Hispanics also value success, they would define success differently, and it is not a dominant value. The Mexican students consider having a job only as means to provide for their families, and they find a feeling

43

of contentment and happiness in other contexts, for example, spending time with family, celebrating holidays, etc.

The last common category is *power*. The percentage value of this category constitutes 16% for the ASU students' responses, and 8% for the Mexican students' responses, which indicates that the ASU students associate *power* with *success* twice as often as the Mexican students. The type shared by both sets of responses is *money*. On the ASU students' side there are also references to *stability*, *finances*, and *power*. The close relationship between the ideas of success and financial stability among the ASU students' responses, and their less frequent connection between the Mexican students' responses, can be explained by the essential values of the families in both cultures discussed earlier. While the ASU students might feel a need for economic security, because they enjoy more independence and more responsibilities, particularly after leaving parents' house, the Mexican students do not seek economic security that profoundly, given that the close ties with their extended family almost always provide for their basic needs, such as food and place to sleep.

The categories that stand along on the Mexican students' side are *globalization* and *individuality*. Both categories have a percentage value of 4%. The type *globalization* constitutes the category *globalization*, and the personal pronoun *I* forms a part of *individuality*.

Table 5 provides results of the analysis of the responses to the prompt *My greatest worry is...* for the ASU students, and *Mi mayor preocupación es..* for the Mexican students.

Table 5

44

Comparison of the ASU students' responses to the prompt My greatest worry is..
with the Mexican students' responses to the prompt Mi mayor preocupación es...

ASU students' responses (N = 12)		Mexican students' responses (N = 16)	
Prompt: My greatest worry is...		Prompt: Mi mayor preocupación es...	
Category and types	N of tokes/ %	**Category** and types	N of tokes/ %
Personal	8/ 67%	**Personal**	4/ 19%
not being successful	2	escuela	2
fail out of school	1	no cumplir con mis metas	1
provide myself without help	1	no pasar a una buena uni	1
not having a passionate career	1		
outliving my savings	1		
not accomplishing goals	1		
death	1		
Family/loved ones - related	3/ 25%	**Family/loved ones - related**	6/ 29%
not provide for my family	1	perder a ser querido	2
safety and happiness of my children	1	pase algo a mi familia	1
		pase algo a las personas que quiero	2
me being disappointment to my children	1	que mi familia no pueda estar conmigo	1
Global	1/ 8%	**Global**	10/ 48%
me not making a bit change in the world as I want	1	narcotráfico	1
		contaminación mundial	1
		que mi país pueda salir adelante	1
		inseguridad	2
		pobreza mundial	1
		el curso del futuro	1
		incertidumbre	1
		no poder hacer nada si algo está mal	1
		mi país	1
		Miscellaneous	1/ 5%
		no tengo	1

N of categories = 3	N of categories = 4
N of tokens (responses to a prompt sentence) = 12	N of tokens (responses to a prompt sentence) = 21

As Table 5 demonstrates, there are 3 categories that emerged out of the responses of the ASU students (12 tokens) to the prompt *My greatest worry is...*, and 4 categories that arose out of the responses of the Mexican students (21 tokens) to the prompt *Mi mayor preocupación es....* The types of *worries* listed were clustered into three emergent categories that included: *personal worries*, *family/loved ones related worries*, and *global worries*. One Mexican student's response, *I don't have any*, did not correspond with an emergent category and, consequentially, was categorized *miscellaneous* (4%).

The biggest category among the ASU students' worries (67%) was *personal* worry related to their own *success*, *finances*, *academia*, and *achievement*. In contrast, only 19% of the Mexican students were concerned about their *personal* achievements. Those achievements, as it becomes apparent from their responses, were primarily related to the *academic accomplishment*.

The ASU students, as well as the Mexican students, are almost equally concerned about their *family members* and *loved ones*. While the percentage values for both sets of responses are nearly identical, the character of the responses that fall under this category is different on both sides. For example, three family related worries on the ASU side are associated with *not providing for family*, *disappointing children*, and *worrying about safety and happiness of the children*. However, the Mexican students' responses accounted not only for their family members, but for loved ones as well. They worry that *something can happen to their family or loved ones*, or *they can lose them*, or *cannot be*

together with them. The character of these worries suggests again the importance of the union and support as essential values of the Mexican participants' families, as it was mentioned by the Mexican students to the prompt *family* earlier in the study. The nature of the responses also indicates that some Mexican families are separated, and not being together with one's family is the most troublesome thought for some Mexican students.

The last common category of worries is *global worries*. *Global* issues occupy the minds of almost half of the Mexican students' (48%), and only one ASU student (8%). The ASU student worries about *him/herself not making a big change in the world as he/she would like*. Although there is a part of the *personal* worry in this response, the impact of the change that a student wants to make is *global*. For this reason, this response was classified as *global* worries. The Mexican students worry a lot about *world poverty and contamination*, *insecurity* and *uncertainty*, *drug trafficking* and the *course of the future*. They are also worried about *success of their country* and *not being able to do anything if something goes wrong*.

The differences in the types and percentage values between both sides of responses to the prompt *My greatest worry is...* could be related to the different ways Mexican and American societies are structured. It is a common practice to differentiate between the *individualistic* and *collectivistic* cultures (Shkodriani & Gibbons, 1995). While it is important to realize that values in both societies fall along a continuum and there are elements of both individualism and collectivism in any culture, the American society tends to be viewed as *individualistic*, which depends on the values of freedom and independence, while the Mexican society is most often described as *collectivistic*, which holds value in group harmony and interdependence.

The high rate of the *personal worries* and low rate of the *global worries* on the

ASU students' side can be explained as a tendency of the individualistic society to praise

self-sufficiency and independence, where an individual's needs should be satisfied before

the needs of the group, and where taking care of oneself reassures a well-being of the

group. In contrast, Mexican students worry less about their *personal* welfare, and are

concerned more with *globally* related issues, because in the collectivistic society the

survival and well-being of a group guarantees the prosperity and success of the

individual.

The differences between the types within the category *family/loved ones related*

worries might also be explained in a same fashion. The Mexican students' worry that

something can happen to their family or loved ones, or they can lose, or they can be

separated. This is a value of a collectivistic culture, where people are close emotionally

and any sort of separation is destabilizing for this culture.

Table 6 provides results of the analysis of the responses to the sentence *A good*

leader is someone who... for the ASU students, and *Un buen líder es alguien que..* for the

Mexican students.

Table 6

Comparison of the ASU students' responses to the prompt A good leader is
someone who... with the Mexican students' responses to the prompt Un buen líder es
alguien que...

ASU students' responses (N = 12)		Mexican students' responses (N = 16)	
Prompt: A good leader is someone who...		Prompt: Un buen líder es alguien que...	
Category and types	N of tokes/ %	**Category** and types	N of tokes/ %

Personal qualities	14/ 58%	Personal qualities	20/ 74%
is humble	1	entiende y sabe trabajar con su equipo	1
is honest	1	sabe cuales son las habilidades de los integrantes	1
is understanding with a solid vision	2	sabe mantener a un grupo	
knows how to effectively redirect her people without bickering with them	1	sabe que hacer	1
wants to progress as a whole not as an individual	1	es responsable de sus actos	1
honestly has her peoples' best interest at heart	1	es una persona organizada	2
is stern, but fair		es perseverante	1
is consistent	1	sabe cómo tomar las mejores decisiones	1
is benevolent	1		1
is tolerant	2	sabe como controlar a las personas	1
can inspire others to be the best version of themselves	1	sabe dirigir un grupo	
confidently assist others in making strides toward success	1	sabiendo superar dificultades	3
		sabe tratar a la gente	
		es emprendedor	
		se preocupa por los demás	1
		es inteligente	1
		tiene claro sus objetivos	2
		tiene iniciativa	1
			1
			1

Takes actions	10/ 42%	Takes actions	7/26%
seeks to give praise rather than earn praise	1	contesta todas tus preguntas con respuestas creíbles	1
works well with others	1	estudia para mejorar cada día	1
cares about others more than him/herself	1	escucha y hace que lo escuchen	1
takes action when necessary		acepta a las personas que lo rodean	1
never asks others to do something he/she wouldn't do themselves	1	bajo cualquier reto logra sus metas	1
takes multiple opinions into consideration when making a decision	1 1	mueve a las masas	
does what is right		toma las mejores decisiones para sus seguidores	1
takes control			1
leads by example	1		
	1		
	1		

N of categories = 2
N of tokens (responses to a prompt sentence) = 24

N of categories = 2
N of tokens (responses to a prompt sentence) = 27

As is shown is Table 6, the ASU and Mexican students' responses to the prompts *A good leader is someone who...* and *Un buen líder es alguien que...*were classified into two categories, *personal qualities* and *takes action*. The participants' responses that describe what good leader's qualities and characteristics are formed the category *personal qualities*. It is necessary to make a distinction between this category, and the category *takes action*, because, even though a leader might possess certain qualities, he/she does not necessarily takes any actions. As such, a leader who takes actions is more proactive compared to the one who only has certain qualities.

The results in Table 6 demonstrate the difference in the percentage values for both sets of responses. The category *personal qualities* has a frequency of occurrence of 58% for the ASU students' responses, and 74% for the Mexican students' responses. The types of the responses are also similar. The ASU students' appreciate *honesty*, *tolerance*, and *consistency* among other characteristics of a good leader, who *can* also *inspire* and *effectively lead others towards success*; the Mexican students acknowledge *responsibility, intelligence*, and *initiative* as some of the qualities of a good leader, who *is* also *capable of making good decisions* and *knows the abilities of his/her group members*.

The category *takes action* constitutes 42% of all ASU students' responses to the prompt *A good leader is someone who...* and 26% of all Mexican students' responses to the prompt *Un buen líder es alguien que...*. The difference in the percentage values shows that the ASU students value more proactive leader who *takes control*, *seeks to give praise rather than earn praise*, and *works well with other* among other actions. The responses of the Mexican students for the category *takes action* indicate that they appreciate someone who, among other actions, *studies to improve each day*, *listens and have others listen to*

50

them, and *achieves goals despite all challenges*. The higher percentage value of the

category *personal qualities* and relatively lower percentage value of the category *takes*

actions on the Mexicans students' side might signify that the Mexican students are not as

motivated by final outcomes as the ASU students are. Bass (1997) found that "in the

individualistic societies of North America, more participative leadership would be

expected of its transformational leaders", at the same time "leaders in collectivistic

cultures likewise already have a moral responsibility to take care of their subordinates"

(p.136). Bass's findings might explain why the ASU students value a leader who acts, or,

as Bass has it, "participates", and why the Mexican students tend to place more value on

the personal characteristics of a leader, and have faith in him/her ability to take care of

them.

      Table 7 shows the results gleaned from the comparison between the ASU students'

answers to the prompt *If I see anybody cheating on the exam, I...*, and the Mexican

students' responses to the prompt *Si veo alguien copia en un examen, yo...*

      Table 7

      Comparison of the ASU students' responses to the prompt If I see someone
cheating on the exam with the Mexican students' responses to the prompt Si veo alguien
copia en un examen...

ASU students' responses (N = 12)		Mexican students' responses (N = 16)	
Prompt: *If I see someone cheating on the exam, I...*		Prompt: *Si veo alguien copia en un examen, yo...*	
Category and types	N of tokes/ %	**Category** and types	N of tokes/ %
Confront a person	6/ 40%	**Confront a person**	5/ 29%
would tell to stop to avoid	1	hablaría con esta persona, le diría que	1

51

trouble		tiene sentido copiar	
talk to them about it	1	hablaría con mi compañero y le haría	2
confront them later and ask if they need help	1	recapacitar	
		le digo que no lo haga	1
tell them it is not benefiting them	1	le digo que sea honesto consigo	1
tell them they need to stop because cheating is not fair or ethical	1	mismo	
confront them myself	1		

Ignore/loose trust	5/ 33%	**Ignore/lose trust**	10 / 59%
complete my test and tell somebody if asked	1	continuo con mi examen, no es asunto mío	1
ignore them	1	los mirones son de palo	
walk away with less respect feel uncomfortable	1	pensaría mal de esta persona	1
lose trust in that person	1	fingiría que no vi nada	2
		no digo nada ya que no debo meterme en problemas que no se me corresponden	1
		es el problema de la persona que lo está haciendo	1
		no me parece justo	
		no estudió y está perjudicando a si mismo	1
		pensaría que no aprenderá nada al final del curso	1

Notify authority	4/ 27%	**Notify authority**	2 /12%
tell teacher	2	aviso a la maestra	2
notify someone in charge	2		

N of categories = 3
N of tokens (responses to a prompt sentence) = 15

N of categories = 3
N of tokens (responses to a prompt word) =17

As it is indicated in Table 7, there are 3 categories that emerged out of the ASU

students' responses (15 tokens) to the prompt *If I see somebody cheating on the exam, I...*

and the Mexican students' responses (17 tokens) to the prompt *Si veo alguien copia en un examen, yo....* The categories that emerged out of analysis are the following: *confront a person*, *ignore/lose trust*, *notify authority*. Forty percent of the ASU students and 29% of the Mexican students *would talk to a person* who is cheating. The nature of the types on both sides is quite similar, both the ASU and the Mexican students would *tell to stop cheating because it is not benefiting them*, or *because it is not fair or ethical*, or *because it does not make sense to do so*.

The percentage value of the second category, *ignore/lose trust*, differs in both sets of responses, and constitutes 33% for the ASU students' responses, and 59% for the Mexican students' responses. These numbers indicate that one third of the ASU students and more than half of the Mexican students would not interfere with the situation, and either pretend they do not see the cheating happening, or think that cheating is completely another person's business. The ASU students' mentioned that they *would lose trust in that person*, or *walk away with less respect*. The Mexican students' responses imply that some of them believe *it is a problem of those who are cheating*, and *they are causing harm to themselves*, and others think that *they do not want to get into problems that do not related to them*, and simply *would continue with their own exam*.

The third category, *notify authority*, is more than twice as big on the ASU students' side (27%) than on the Mexican students' side (12%). The types on both side are similar, and indicate that the ASU and Mexican students *would tell teacher* or *someone in authority* when they see someone cheating on the exam. It is interesting to observe that 67% of the ASU students would interfere into the situation by either talking to the person

53

themselves, or notifying a person in charge. In contrast, only 41% of the Mexican students would confront a person who is cheating themselves or tell a teacher.

The apparent differences between two groups' responses could be tracked back again to the diverse societal features their cultural possess. Enriquez & Pajewski (1996) stated that in the Hispanic societies, group needs are more important that individual needs. The authors argue that Hispanics are raised to be cooperative and to share, while the US culture usually encourages students to be more competitive and individualistic. For this reason, sharing can be extended to helping each other during exams, that is considered cheating in the US culture. Enriquez & Pajewski (1996) reported a case, where in ESL class with Hispanic students a non-Hispanic teacher reprehended a student who was copying form another student. Both students were stunned by the instructor's behavior, as they both considered they were helping each other, not cheating. While this incident does not characterize exactly the answers given by the Mexican students, it explains why in the collectivistic cultures copying from another student during the exam is not considered "cheating", and that is why the majority of the Mexican students would neither report the person who cheats to authorities, nor confront them personally. In contrast, the ASU students in the majority of cases would confront a person who is cheating, because in their individualistic society the value is placed on competitiveness rather than cooperation.

Table 8 illustrates the results of the analysis of the ASU students' responses to the prompt *If someone on the street asks me money*, I... compared with the Mexican students' responses to the prompt *Si alguien en la calle me pide dinero, yo...*

Table 8

Comparison of the ASU students' responses to the prompt If someone on the street asks me money, I... with the Mexican students' responses to the prompt Si alguien en la calle me pide dinero, yo...

ASU students' responses (N = 12) Prompt: *If someone on the street asks me money,* *I...*		Mexican students' responses (N = 16) Prompt: *Si alguien en la calle me pide* *dinero..., yo...*	
Category and types	N of tokes/ %	**Category** and types	N of tokes/ %
Offer alternatives	6/ 50%	**Offer alternatives**	2/ 11%
buy them a meal rather than give them cash	2	si lo veo que lo quiere para drogarse, prefería darle comida	1
give them food or clothing as they might have an addiction prefer to give them food/water, I feel that giving money could enable bad habits	1 1	le compro algo de comida	1
ask what they need money for and offer what I can	2		
Give money	5/ 42%	**Give money**	5/ 26%
give them whatever change I have	2	si de verdad lo necesita y yo puedo darselo se lo daría	1
give them a dollar	3	le doy cualquier aportación que tenga darle a la mano	1
		le doy unas monedas	3
Do not give money	1/ 8%	**Do not give money**	5/ 26%
don't give them any	1	le digo que se ponga a trabajar o vender algo	2
		le ignoro y sigo caminando	1
		me negaría si fuera alguien desconocido	1
		pensaría que quiere dinero para alimentar algún vicio	1
		Depends	7/ 37%

	si es una persona que realmente se ve necesitada le doy, si es una persona que puede trabajar no le doy	3
	si es un niño o anciano les doy dinero	2
	le daría si es incapacitado pero si está sano no le daría nada y pensaría que mejor se pusiera a trabajar	2

N of categories = 3
N of tokens (responses to a prompt sentence) = 12

N of categories = 4
N of tokens (responses to a prompt word) =19

As Table 8 shows, there are 3 categories that arose out of the analysis of the ASU students' responses to the prompt *If someone on the street asks me money, I...*(12 tokens), and 4 categories that were created based on the Mexican students' responses to the prompt *Si alguien en la calle me pide dinero, yo...*(19 tokens). The common categories that appear on both sides are *offer alternatives*, *give money*, and *do not give money*. On the Mexican students' side there is a fourth category, *depends*, which is absent on the ASU students' side.

Half of the ASU students' (50%) and 11% of the Mexican students would offer alternatives to people who would ask them money on the street. The ASU students *would offer to buy a meal*, *water*, *clothing* believing that a person who asks money might have an addiction and giving money would foster bad habits. The Mexican students would also suggest *buying food* to people who most likely want to use money for drugs.

The percentage value for the second common category, *give money*, differs for both sets of responses, and constitutes 42% for the ASU students' responses and 26% for

the Mexican students' responses. The types of the responses are similar in their nature, students on both sides said that they would give some money to those who ask.

As to the third mutual category, *do not give money*, one ASU student (8%) would not give money to those who ask in the street. Twenty six percent of the Mexican students would not give money either, and would encourage a person *to start working or selling something*. The idea of hard work that comes with money for the Mexican students, and that is revealed in this prompt, resonates with a high frequency of the type *effort* to the prompt *success* earlier in the study, and indicates that only with putting hard work and effort one can succeed, because, as one Mexican student has it, "el dinero no llega alzando la mano" ('money does not come by raising a hand').

The category *depends*, that occurs on the Mexican students' side only, has a percentage value of 37%, and is the biggest category among all for the Mexican students' responses. The types in this category indicate that if someone on the streets asks them for money, the Mexican students would first take a look and evaluate the person. If that person appears to be *disabled*, or *elderly*, or it is *a child,* they would give them money. If, however, the person *looks healthy and looks capable to do work*, they would not give them money.

Research Question 2

The answer to the second research question included the rubric-based analysis of the students' reflections based on comparison of their English comments with native Spanish speakers' comments (Cultural questionnaire 3). As mentioned before, the rubrics were modified taking into consideration the Bloom's revised taxonomy (1990) and only the category *critical cultural awareness* was used to analyze the data for this study, as the

rest of the categories of the rubrics would require data collected from the interactions with native speakers or from interpretation of authentic documents.

Critical cultural awareness was evaluated taken into consideration the following cognitive skills from the Bloom's taxonomy: *remembering*, *analyzing*, *evaluating*, and *creating*, and based on them five levels of assessment of the *critical cultural awareness* were developed. Each student's response to one of the eight sections (e.g. *USA*, *family*, *my greatest worry is..*, etc.) of cultural questionnaire 3 was assessed on a scale from 1 (poor) being the lowest to 5 (excellent) being the highest using the category *critical cultural awareness* from the rubrics.

The first level, *incomplete understanding*, characterizes skills of an individual who demonstrates unsatisfactory understanding of perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries. The second one, u*nderstanding*, refers to an ability of an individual to demonstrate understanding and to list differences and similarities between perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries. The third level is labeled as *analyzing*, and it describes skills of an individual who analyzes, compares and contrasts perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries. The forth level, *evaluating*, makes a reference to abilities of an individual who profoundly evaluates, critically and on the basis of explicit criteria, perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries. The highest level, *creating*, characterizes skills of an individual who creates hypothesis and demonstrates abstract thinking with regards to perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries.

Each student' response to the cultural questionnaire 3 (N=8) was assessed based on the rubrics and number from 1 (incomplete understanding) to 5 (creating) was given to each comment. Finally, the number of all comments were added up and divided by eight to calculate the average for each student. The average in this study represents a level of critical cultural awareness of the participants.

The analysis revealed that three participants demonstrated the highest level of critical cultural awareness based on the rubrics, and the majority of their comments fell in the level of *creating*. The comments of another three participants fit into the category *evaluating*. The comments of four students were averaged out to the level *analyzing*. At the same time, the critical cultural awareness of two participants were assessed at the level of *understanding*.

The three examples of the comments that were assessed on the level *creating* come from students ## 1, 9, and 12.

Student #12 M/21/B in the majority of his responses demonstrated skills that fell under the category *creating* of the rubrics. For example, here is his reflection after comparing and contrasting the ASU and Mexican students' answers to the prompt *My greatest worry is...*:

> The Americans seemed to lean more towards worrying that they won't be successful and that they won't be the best person they can be. I think this is because the American dream is more planted in their heads. It is like the thing they must achieve in life. The Mexican responses seem to be much more negative and if anything a lot scarier. They bring up drug trafficking, losing a family

member, and poverty. It shows that maybe Mexicans have a better view at some

much bigger problems in society than Americans have.

As it becomes apparent from the comment, the student is able to connect the

major types of worries related to the personal failure of his fellow classmates to the idea

of the American Dream. He speculates that this idea is deeply rooted in the mentality of

the North American society (e.g. "the American dream is more planted in their heads")

and puts a pressure on everybody who does not live the life of the American Dream (e.g.

"It is like the thing they must achieve in life"). Although the student does not dig deeper

and try to find why the idea of the American Dream is present in the North American

culture, he is still able to hypothesize about the Mexican culture, and to distinguished the

traits of the collectivism of the Hispanic culture (Enriquez & Pajewski, 1996) (e.g. "They

bring up drug trafficking, losing a family member, and poverty. It shows that maybe

Mexicans have a better view at some much bigger problems in society than Americans

have").

Student #9 M/21/B is also able to come to a conclusion about the differences of

the societal structures and how those differences are reflected in the cultures on the

example of the responses to the prompt *A good leader is someone who..* "You must work

well with them otherwise you would not be a good leader. I think that the differences

here is that the students from the United States believe that to be a leader you are not lead

by anyone else and make the decisions you want whereas in Mexico you all work

together to make a difference."

This comment illustrates that the student is able to abstract from the narrow issue

of the characteristics of a good leader and see a bigger picture of how both societies are

60

structured. The participant is capable of discerning the features of the individualistic Northern American society that depends on the values of independence (Enriquez & Pajewski, 2006) (e. g. "the students from the United States believe that to be a leader you are not lead by anyone else and make the decisions you want"), as well as to understand the idiosyncrasies of the Mexican collectivistic culture which holds value in group harmony and cooperation ("in Mexico you all work together to make a difference").

The majority of the comments of student #1 F/35/A were also assessed using category *creating*. For example, for the section *If I see somebody cheating on the test, I...* the student commented the following:

> Americans sometimes gain praise by putting others on the spot in a negative way. This may the reason that more student would be motivated to tell the teacher. On the other hand, in America, fairness and what is ethical is a big issue so that may be another reason why more people from our group would tell the teacher. The Mexican students seems to care only about themselves and their progress. Not that that is a bad quality but maybe because they know they have to fight hard or study hard to get where they want to be and if they see someone taking the easy way out, they probably think that it only brings that person down and doesn't impact anyone else.

As the comment illustrates, the student not only thoroughly evaluates the apparent differences between the two sets of responses, but she is also able to abstract from the concrete issue of the *cheating on the exam* and to reflect on the common values of the Northern American culture that might have caused possible responses among the students of her group (e.g. "in America, fairness and what is ethical is a big issue"), as

well as to hypothesize about why the Mexican students would not intervene (e.g. "because they know they have to fight hard or study hard to get where they want to be and if they see someone taking the easy way out, they probably think that it only brings that person down and doesn't impact anyone else"). Moreover, the participant is also capable of developing a critical perspective of her own culture, even though this perspective is not necessarily favorable one (e.g. "Americans sometimes gain praise by putting others on the spot in a negative way").

The majority of the comments of students ## 6, 7, 8 fell under the category *evaluating*, as the participants were able to profoundly evaluate products, perspectives, and practices in their own and other cultures, but did not go further to create a hypothesis and to use the skills of abstract thinking. The students whose comments fell under this category were able to conceptualize the differences between the two sets of answers and discern the ideas of *etic* (view of the outsider) and *emic* (view of the insider) perspectives without necessarily using these terms. For example, student #7, F/21/B provided the following insightful comment to the section *USA*:

> I think that these responses were prompted because in the US we are more lucky than we think and we complain about things that other people wish they had. Some of the differences that I see are that people from the US gave more lengthy responses and were more personal, whereas people from Mexico focused more on money and government... the US feels this way because they experience the USA first hand, where as Mexico is observing from a distance.

Here the student is able to critically analyze and hypothesize about the *emic* perspective of the ASU students when it comes to the USA, and the *etic* perspective of the Mexican students, or "observing from a distance," as the student explains.

Another example of the student's comments that touches upon the *etic* and *emic* perspectives and also fit into the category *evaluating* is the comment from student #6 M/35/A for the section *USA*:

> I think answers from ASU mostly represent pride of their country, while the TEC answers vary and just point out popular topics or things that are interesting to them. I think the differences between ASU and TEC in this response are due to the fact that the ASU students are talking about their home while the TEC students are giving their impressions of a distant place.

The student in this comment, as his fellow classmate in the previous, talks about "a distant place" from which the Mexican students ponder about the USA, implying that those students have a perspective of an outsider. At the same time, he attributes more detailed responses of the ASU students' to the view of an insider of their own country (e.g. "the ASU students are talking about their home").

Yet another comment that supports the same line of thought comes from student #8 M/22/B in the section *Mexico*:

> The American response was generally all positive and included phrases such as great food, beaches, vacation, and beauty. The responses with the Mexican students were generally positive with a recurrence of phrases such as drug culture, drug cartels, poverty, corruption, and drug trafficking. While both sides all mentioned Mexico's beauty, the Mexican students had a much more negative

63

view towards their country than did the American responses. I think this is clearly

from cultural perspectives. What we as Americans usually see from the outside is

just simply the good and fun stuff. The amazing food, sandy beaches, and spring

break spots. We usually only see the glamour, whereas those actually living in

Mexico probably have seen more of the details and negative aspects that are not

put out on display.

As it becomes apparent from this comment, the student realizes that the ASU

students, even though some of them might have traveled to Mexico, still have an obvious

perspective of an outsider on the order of things in Mexico, that are mainly associated

with tourism (e.g. "What we as Americans usually see from the outside is just simply the

good and fun stuff. The amazing food, sandy beaches, and spring break spots"*)*. At the

same time, the student recognizes that those are the Mexican students who have a first-

hand experience of their country (e.g. "those actually living in Mexico probably have

seen more of the details and negative aspects that are not put out on display").

The responses of students ## 2, 3, 4, 5 were found to be at the level *analyzing* on

the category *critical cultural awareness* on the rubrics. These participants were able to

analyze, compare and contrast perspectives, practices, and products in their own and

other cultures and countries, but they fell short of evaluating or creating hypotheses. The

following are the samples of students' responses that fell into this category.

Here is what student #4 F/36/A had to say about the two sets of responses in the

section *family*: "I think that on the American side we see family as a security and

protection, we see our children and commitment, whereas on the Mexican side they see

family as respect and unity, but there are no children mentioned on the Mexican side."

The student is able to spot the major differences between the two sets of the responses and connect them in the prose by using "whereas" (e.g "on the American side we see family as a security and protection, we see our children and commitment, whereas on Mexican side they see family as respect and unity"), nevertheless, even though she starts her comment with "I think that...", a phrase that usually implies some sort of assumption on the part of an individual, she neither continues with a hypothesis about what stipulated the differences in the students' responses, nor provides a thorough evaluation of the comments. For this reason, her level was assessed as *analyzing*.

Another student, student #5 M/58/A was somewhat able to touch upon the reason behind the differences in students' responses in the section *My greatest worry is...* : "The Mexican responses had more concern over the death of loved ones. Mexicans seem to have much stronger family ties". Although student mentioned the practice of the Hispanic culture ("to have much stronger family ties"), yet, his responses is lacking the profound evaluation of the practices, products and perspectives in his own culture, which are characteristics of the evaluating category.

Student #3 F/25/A gave the responses and also were averaged out at the level *analyzing*. One of her comments in the section *If somebody on the street asks me money, I...* in the cultural questionnaire 3 mentioned the following:

> I think the US and Mexican people are similar in that they care for those less
> fortunate, but also don't want to give somebody money if they are only in their
> situation for being lazy or refuse to put forth any hard work. Mexico's side
> mentions the type of person that is asking for money while the US side does not.
> Only one person mentioned not giving them anything on the US side while

several on the Mexican side mention refusing and/or offering advice to the
person.

As this comment illustrates, the student found similarities and differences
between the two sets of responses and noticed that Mexican students are more attentive to
the person who is asking money (e.g. "Mexico's side mentions the type of person that is
asking for money while the US side does not"), notwithstanding, she did not elaborate on
the hypothesis about the cultural values and believes that determined various reactions
across two groups of students.

The last example of the comments that were assessed at the level *analyzing* came
from student #2 F/25/A who responded in the section *Mexico*: "The US seems more
fortunate and somewhat spoiled so that it sees Mexico as more of a place to visit for fun,
while the Mexican side seems to value their cultural diversity and the beauty of their
home more." This comment illustrates that the student notices the differences between the
responses of two groups of students to the prompt *Mexico*, however, she neither attempts
to explain where the differences are coming from, nor provides a thorough evaluation of
the two sets of responses.

The responses of students ##10 and 11 fall into the category *understanding*, that
includes ability to identify and list differences and similarities between practices,
products and perspectives in one's own and in other culture. For example, student #10
F/23/B provided the following answer to section *If I somebody on the street asks me
money, I..* on the cultural questionnaire 3:

Based on the responses, it seems that the English side would interfere with the
situation more and the Spanish side would not give anyone money. The English

side seemed to differ on their opinion of what to give, but they seemed to give more than the Spanish side. The Spanish side would decide if they would give based on their need. This may be due to a cultural difference.

As it becomes apparent from this comment, the student is able to bring into comparison the two sets of the students' responses and elaborate on differences that they contain (e.g. "The English side seemed to differ on their opinion of what to give, but they seemed to give more than the Spanish side... The Spanish side would decide if they would give based on their need "). However, as her last sentence indicated, even though she realizes that there might be some cultural values that stipulate the differences in the responses, the student does not compare and contrast these perspectives and is unable to evaluate or hypothesize about what those values are and how they determine diverse cultural behavior of the participants in this situation (e.g. "This may be due to a cultural difference").

Another example for the level *understanding* of the ICC comes from the student #11 F/24/B in the section *If I see somebody cheating on the exam, I...*:

The majority of the students in Mexico choose not to say anything to their fellow student who is cheating and just ignore it. The ASU students had about half choosing not to say anything, but many had significant reactions. I felt as if the difference was the students in Mexico were more calm in their response. It seems that the vasty majority of the comments were neutral and the student chose to worry about themselves instead of the cheater.

The student in this comment, as her fellow classmates in the previous, is able to discern what are some differences between the two sets of the responses and list them.

67

She also intends to indicate that the ASU students would intervene more if they see somebody cheating on the exam (e.g. "The ASU students had about half choosing not to say anything, but many had significant reactions"), while the Mexican students would not get involved in the situation (e.g."The majority of the students in Mexico choose not to say anything to their fellow student who is cheating and just ignore it"). However, she does not analyze (compare and contrast) or profoundly evaluate this practice in both cultures.

Taken as a whole, the differences in students' comments and their different levels of critical cultural awareness provoke a though about the relations of interdependency between the linguistic or cognitive skills of an individual and his/her ability to understand cultures. That is to say, a person is unable to process complex, sometimes invisible language-based ideas and to hypothesize about practices, perspectives, and products of other cultures and reflect on the values of one's own without reaching a superior or distinguished level of proficiency in their L1. This might explain why some participants were not able to provide profound evaluations, abstract and hypothesize about practices, products, and perspectives in the target culture and in their own.

It is also important to notice that the majority of the students (n=4) whose level of critical cultural awareness fit into either a category *evaluating* or *creating* of the rubrics come from session B compared to only 2 students from session A. These differences are significant when considering types of classes that were offered during session A and session B. Although both classes followed the same syllabus and curriculum, as mentioned before, the participants from the session A are ASUONLINE students, and the

68

participants from the session B are regular ASU students who were taking this particular class online (as an iCourse).

The differences in their responses might be explained by the students' attitudes towards the grades. In general, the ASUONLINE (session A) students are part-time students full who work full time, and are not as concerned about their GPA as the ASU students from iCourse (session B) who are typically fully enrolled and do not work full time, and who believe that their GPA will play an important role when it comes a time to apply for jobs (P. Feldman & B. Lafford, personal communication, March 10th, 2015).

For this reason, the students from session B put more effort in the assignments, and their efforts resulted in more lengthy and deeper comments to the cultural questionnaire 3 than those of the students from ASUONLINE class.

Research Question 3

To answer the third research questions, the ASU students' responses in Spanish were compared to their responses in English and the Mexican students' responses. The results of the comparison are presented in the tables below.

Table 9 illustrates results gleaned from the comparison of the of the ASU students' responses in Spanish to the prompt *EEUU* with their responses in English to the prompt *USA* and the Mexican students' responses to the prompt *EEUU*.

Table 9

Comparison of the ASU students' responses in Spanish to the prompt EEUU with their responses in English to the prompt USA and the Mexican students' responses to the prompt EEUU

ASU students' responses	ASU students' responses	Mexican students' responses
(N = 12)	(N = 12)	(N = 10)

Prompt: USA		Prompt: EEUU		Prompt: EEUU	
Category and types	N of tokens/ %	**Category** and types	N of tokens/ %	**Category** and types	N of tokens/ %
Well-being	3/ 13%	**Well-being**	3/ 11%	**Well-being**	8/ 30%
prosperity	1	rica	1	oportunidad	1
land of opportunity	1	felicidad	1	trabajo	1
peace	1	empleo	1	dinero	3
				dólares	1
				seguridad	2
Government	4/ 17%	**Government**	3/ 11%	**Government**	7/ 26%
military	1	historia	1	power	3
president	1	democracia	1	government	2
patriot	1	obama	1	obama	1
history	1			leyes	1
Physical symbols	2/ 8%	**Physical symbols**	2/ 7%	**Physical symbols/monuments**	3/ 11%
flag	1			estatua de libertat	1
red, blue and white	1	barras y estresllas	1	Manhattan	1
		rojo, blanco y azul	1	empire state	1
Geographical location	1/ 4%			**Geographical location**	1/ 4%
				Norte	1
South	1				
Home	3/ 13%	**Home**	6/ 21%	**Sports/videogames**	3/ 11%
home	2	casa	2	Baseball,	1
country I grew up	1	país de origen	3	AVGN	1
		hogar	1	GTA IV	1
Diversity	2/ 8%	**Diversity**	3/ 11%	**Sciencetech**	4/ 15%
Melting pot	2	crisol	1	Tecnología	3
		diversidad cultural	1	ciencia	1
		el campo	1		
Freedom	6/ 25%	**Freedom**	8/ 29%	**Migration**	1/ 4%
land of the free	1	libertad	7	Migración	1
freedom	4	opciones	1		
liberty	1				
Food	2/ 8%	**Sports**	1/ 4%		
fast food	1 1	beisbol	1		

hamburgers

Thinks it is superior	1/ 4%	**Problems**	1/ 4%		
Thinks it is superior	1	muchos problemas	1		
		Size	1/4%		
		Grande	1		

N of categories = 9 **N of types (different responses words) = 19** **N of tokens (words given in response to a prompt word) = 24**	**N of categories = 9** **N of types (different responses words) = 19** **N of tokens (words given in response to a prompt word) = 28**	**N of categories = 7** **N of types (different responses words) = 19** **N of tokens (words given in response to a prompt word) = 27**

As Table 9 demonstrates, there are 9 categories that emerged out of the ASU students' responses in Spanish (28 tokens, 19 categories) to the prompt *EEUU*. The first category, *well-being*, is composed out of the types *rich*, *happy*, and *employment*. The former type is equivalent to the type *prosperity* on the ASU students' side of the responses in English, and the type *employment* resonates with the type *work* on the Mexican students' side. The percentage value of the category *well-being* is 11% and its rate is closer to the percentage value of this category among the ASU students' responses in English (13%), than among the Mexican students' responses (30%).

The next overlapping category is *government*, which is composed of the types *history*, *democracy*, and *Obama*. The type *history* also occurs among the ASU students' responses in English, while *Obama* appears among the Mexican students' responses. The percentage value of this category is the lowest among the three sets of responses, and constitutes 11% compared to the 17% for the ASU students' responses in English and 26% for the Mexican students' responses.

The third mutual category, *physical symbols*, has two types: *stripes and stars*, and *red, blue and white*. These types resonate with the nationalism symbols mentioned on the ASU students' side of the English responses, *red, blue and white*, and *flag*, and do not correspond to the types of this category on the Mexican students' side: *statue of liberty*, *Manhattan*, and e*mpire state building*.

The categories *home*, *diversity*, and *freedom* are also similar in types and percentage values to the categories that emerged out of the responses in English, and occur only among the ASU students' responses. The categories *sports*, *problems*, and *size* are unique to the ASU students' responses in Spanish only, and do not appear among the other two sets of responses.

Taken as a whole, the ASU students' responses in Spanish to the prompt *EEUU* demonstrate many similarities with the participants' responses in English. The majority of the categories, as well as their types and percentage values, are similar on both sides. The exception constitute the types *employment* and *Obama*, that are similar to the Mexican students' responses.

The analysis of the students' cultural questionnaires, where they were invited to compare three sets of responses and to determine if their responses in Spanish are more similar to their responses in English or to the Mexican students' responses, also reveals that 100% of the students believe that their Spanish responses to the prompt *EEUU* are more similar to their English responses, rather than to the Mexican students' responses.

Table 10 illustrates results gleaned from the comparison of the of the ASU students' responses in Spanish to the prompt *México* with their responses in English to the prompt *Mexico* and the Mexican students' responses to the prompt *México*

72

Table 10

Comparison of the ASU students' responses in Spanish to the prompt México with their responses in English to the prompt Mexico and the Mexican students' responses to the prompt México

ASU students' responses (N = 12) Prompt: Mexico		ASU students' responses (N = 12) Prompt: México		Mexican students' responses (N = 10) Prompt: México	
Category and types	N of tokes/ %	**Category** and types	N of tokes/ %	**Category** and types	N of tokes/ %
Culture	4/ 16%	**Culture**	6/ 21%	**Culture**	6/ 23%
quinceañera	1	idioma español	2	cultura	4
culture	1	cultura	1	diversidad	1
diversity	1	hispaña	1	variedad	1
Spanish	1	fiesta	1		
		cinco de mayo	1		
Food & drinks	6 / 25%	**Food & drinks**	4/ 14%	**Food & drinks**	4/ 15%
food	4	comida	4	comida	2
burritos	1			cerveza	1
spicy	1			chile	1
Problems	3/ 12%	**Problems**	2/ 7%	**Problems**	6/ 23%
cartels	1	drogas	1	corrupcion	2
boarder crisis	1	migración ilegal	1	narcotrafico	2
poverty	1			delincuencia	1
				injusticia	1
Sports	1/ 4%			**Sports**	1/ 4%
soccer	1			soccer	1
Geographical location	1/ 4%	**Geographical location**	3/ 11%	**Home**	1/ 4%
				casa	1
South of US	1	sur de américa	1		
		país que limita con eeuu	1		
		país	1		
Tourism	7/ 28%	**Tourism**	10/ 36%	**Beauty**	6/ 23%

73

fun	2	Vacaciones	1	hermoso	2
beaches	1	Caliente	1	bonito	1
spring break	1	Playas	3	calidez	1
Aztecs	1	Pirámides	1	playas	2
Teotihuacan	1	Cancún	1		
warmth	1	Aztecas	1		
		Mexico City	1		
		Piña coladas	1		
Physical symbols	1/ 4%	**Physical symbols**	1/ 4%	**Freedom**	1/ 4%
Sombreros	1	sombreros	1	Bicentenario	1
		Closeness	2/ 7%		
		friends	1		
		pronto familia	1		
N of categories = 7 **N of types (different responses words) = 19** **N of tokens (words given in response to a prompt word) = 25**		**N of categories = 7** **N of types (different responses words) = 22** **N of tokens (words given in response to a prompt word) = 28**		**N of categories = 7** **N of types (different responses words) = 17** **N of tokens (words given in response to a prompt word) = 26**	

As Table 10 shows, there are 7 categories that emerged out of the ASU students' responses in Spanish (28 tokens and 22 types) to the prompt *México*. The percentage value of the first category common for all three sets of responses, *culture*, is 21% for the ASU students' responses in Spanish. Although this percentage value is closer to the percentage value of the Mexican students' responses for this category (23%) rather than to the ASU students' responses in English (16%), the types that occur in this category demonstrate more similarities with the types on the ASU students' English side. For example, the category *Spanish language* occurs only among the ASU students' responses, and does not appear among the Mexican students' responses. The next mutual category, *food & drinks*, has a percentage value of 14%, that is again closer to the percentage value of the Mexican students' responses (15%) than to the ASU students' responses in English

(25%). However, the type *food* that constitutes this category is common among all three sets of responses.

The third overlapping category, *problems*, is more similar in its percentage value (7%) to the percentage value of this category on the ASU students' side of the responses in English (12%), than on the Mexican students' side of responses (23%). The types of which this category is composed of, *drugs* and *illegal migration*, are unique to this set of responses only, and do not appear among the two other sets of responses. The types *geographical location*, *tourism*, and *physical symbols* are common among the ASU students' responses in English and Spanish only. These three types constitute half of the students' responses to the prompt *México*, and have a percentage value of 11%, 36%, and 4% respectively. The last category, *closeness*, has the types *friends* and *soon-to-be family*. This category does not occur among the two other sets of responses, and most likely indicates the intimate relationships that 7% of the participants have with the Mexicans.

Taken into account the analysis of all categories, it becomes apparent that the ASU students' responses in Spanish are more similar to their responses in English than to the Mexican students' responses. This evidence comes from the categories that are shared by these two sets of responses only (*tourism*, *geographical location*, *physical symbols*), and also from the similarities of the types that belong to the same categories (*Spanish language*).

The analysis of the students' questionnaires illustrated that 67% of the students find their responses in Spanish more similar to their responses in English. For example, one student mentioned in the questionnaire: "Two examples: in the English list there is Spanish and in the Spanish list there is Español. If we thought in Spanish those words

would be in there. Vaccaciones is mentioned in our Spanish response list when a

Mexican would not think of their own country as being a vacation spot." (Student #3). At

the same time, 17% of the participants report that all three sets of responses are similar,

and 8% find that their responses in Spanish lie closer to the Mexican students' responses.

The rest 8% of the students did not follow the instructions well.

Table 11 shows the results revealed after the comparison of the ASU students'

responses in Spanish to the prompt *familia* with their responses in English to the prompt

family and the Mexican students' responses to the prompt *familia*.

Table 11

Comparison of the ASU students' responses in Spanish to the prompt familia with
their responses in English to the prompt family and the Mexican students' responses to
the prompt familia

ASU students' responses (N = 12) Prompt: Family		ASU students' responses (N = 12) Prompt: Familia		Mexican students' responses (N = 10) Prompt: Familia	
Category and types	N of tokes/ %	**Category** and types	N of tokes/ %	**Category** and types	N of tokes/ %
Love	8/ 38%	**Love**	11/ 34%	**Love**	7/ 27%
love	7	amor	8	amor	5
happiness	1	corazón	1	felicidad	1
		feliz	2	comprension	1
Closeness	4/ 17%	**Closeness**	5/ 16%	**Closeness**	9/ 35%
together	2	simpatico	1	union	5
support	1	diversión	1	apoyo	3
home	1	reuniones	1	cuidado	1
		casa	2		
Family members	4/ 17%	**Family members**	9/ 28%	**Family members**	5/ 19%
parents	1	hermanos	2	mama	1
mom	1	padres	1	papa	1
dad	1	sobrinos	2	hermano	2

children	1	mama	1	compania	1
		papa	1		
		niños	1		
		nietos	1		
Esteem	1/ 4%	**Esteem**	2/6%	**Esteem**	4/ 15%
important	1	primera cosa	1	respeto	3
		prepósito	1	importante	1
Reliance	4/ 17%	**Reliance**	2/ 6%	**Calmness**	1/ 4%
safety	3	seguridad	2	Tranquilidad	1
commitment	1				
Alliance	1/ 4%	**Celebrations**	2/ 6%		
marriage	1	fiestas	1		
		quinceañera	1		
Geographical Location	1/ 4%				
Arizona	1				
N of categories = 7 **N of types (different responses words) = 14** **N of tokens (words given in response to a prompt word) = 23**		**N of categories = 6** **N of types (different responses words) = 22** **N of tokens (words given in response to a prompt word) = 33**		**N of categories = 5** **N of types (different responses words) = 13** **N of tokens (words given in response to a prompt word) = 26**	

As Table 9 illustrates, there are 6 categories that emerged out of the responses in Spanish of the ASU students (33 tokens, 22 types) to the prompt *familia*. The category *love* has a percentage value 34%, and by the rate of its occurrence is situated slightly closer to the percentage value of this category on the ASU students' side of the responses in English (38%), than on the Mexican students' side (27%). The first two types of this category, *love* and *happiness*, appear also among the other two sets of responses.

The next category, *closeness*, has a percentage value of 16% , which is situated very close to the percentage value of this category among the ASU students' responses in English (17%), and constitutes almost a half of the percentage value of the category *closeness* on the Mexican students' side (35%). This fact, as well as the absence of the types that constitute this category on the Mexican students' side, *fun*, *reunion*, *home*, and *nice*, suggest the proximity of the students' responses in Spanish to their responses in English.

The category *family members* appears to be the second biggest category among the ASU students' responses in Spanish (28%). The participants named *brothers*, *parents*, *mom*, *dad*, *children*, *cousins*, and *grandchildren* as associations to this prompt. Some of this categories, for example, *mom* and *dad*, appear also among the other two sets of responses. However, on a whole, the results of the comparison of this category do not provide evidence if the responses are more similar to the ASU students' responses in English or the Mexican students' responses.

The category *esteem* is composed of two types, *first thing* and *superior*. The former type shares certain similarities with the type important that appears between the other two sets of responses. The lower percentage value of 6% of this category, that also occurs on the ASU students' side of responses in English (4%), as well as the absence of the frequent type *respect* that appears on the Mexican side, suggest the greater similarity between the ASU students responses in English and Spanish.

The category *reliance* appears also on the ASU students' side of the responses in English, but is absent on the Mexican students' side. The last category, *celebrations*, is composed of the types *fiestas* and *quinceañeara*, and is absent among the other two sets

of responses. With regard to the latter category, one of the ASU students' mentioned in the cultural questionnaire "Also, we seem to be "trying" to think as if we were Mexican so we mention things like quinceañera, but the Mexican students don't mention anything of the sort" (Student #1)

All in all, the results of the analysis of the ASU students' responses in Spanish to the prompt *familia* suggest their close proximity to the participants' responses in English, rather than to the Mexican students' responses. For instance, there is an occurrence of the relatively low percentage value of these two sets of responses (the ASU participants' responses in Spanish and English) for the category *closeness* compared with a high occurrence of this category on the Mexican students' side. Moreover, there is also a comparatively lower rate of the category *esteem* among the participants' responses in English and Spanish (4% and 6% respectively) and the absence of the type *respect* for this category, that is common among the Mexican students' responses.

The analysis of the participants' questionnaires revealed the following results. Sixty seven percent of students believe that their responses in Spanish are more similar to their responses in English. For example, student #11 wrote "ASU's Spanish responses for this one [family] resembles ASU's English responses more so than the Mexican responses. They appear to follow the same line of thought and mention specific family members in both ASU responses, whereas the Mexican responses seem to focus more on the idea of unity, respect, and companionship that family offers". The rest of the students, 33%, found all three sets of responses similar to each other.

Table 12 illustrates results gleaned from the comparison of the of the ASU

students' responses in Spanish to the prompt *éxito* with their responses in English to the

prompt *success* and the Mexican students' responses to the prompt *éxito*

Table 12

Comparison of the ASU students' responses in Spanish to the prompt éxito with their responses in English to the prompt success and the Mexican students' responses to the prompt éxito

ASU students' responses (N = 12) Prompt: Success		ASU students' responses (N = 12) Prompt: Éxito		Mexican students' responses (N = 10) Prompt: Éxito	
Category and types	N of tokes/ %	**Category** and type	N of tokens/ %	**Category** and types	N of tokens/ %
Achievement	5/ 20%	**Achievement**	4/ 16%	**Achievement**	11/ 44%
achieving a goal	2	ganar	1	esfuerzo	4
accomplishment	2	superar retos	1	metas	3
winning	1	lograr objetivos	1	capacidad	1
				triunfos	1
				alcanzar	1
				desempeño	1
Academic achievement	3/ 12%	**Academic achievement**	2/ 8%	**Academic achievement**	3/ 12%
degree	3	título	1	escuela	2
		universidad	1	buenas calificaciones	1
Professional life	4/ 16%	**Professional life**	4/ 16%	**Profesional life**	6/ 24%
career	1	carrera	1	trabajo	4
good job	1	trabajo	3	emprendedor	1
hard work	1			traje	1
independence	1				
Contentment	9/ 36%	**Contentment**	10/ 40%	**Contentment**	1/4%
satisfaction	1	feliz familia	2	felicidad	1
content	1	orgulloso	2		
fulfilling	1	felicidad	4		
happiness	4	contento	1		
awesome	1	encontrar paz	1		
proud	1				

Power	4/ 16%	**Power**	4/16%	**Power**	2/ 8%
money	1	dinero	3	dinero	2
power	1	buen sueldo	1		
stability	1				
finances	1				
		Chores	1/ 4%	**Globalization**	1/ 4%
		limpear casa	1	Globalizacion	1
				Individuality	1/ 4%
				Yo	1

N of categories = 4 **N of types (different responses words) = 18** **N of tokens (words given in response to a prompt word) = 25**	**N of categories = 5** **N of types (different responses words) = 18** **N of tokens (words given in response to a prompt word) =25**	**N of categories = 7** **N of types (different responses words) = 15** **N of tokens (words given in response to a prompt word) =25**

As Table 12 illustrates, there are 6 different categories that emerged out of the ASU students' responses in Spanish (18 types and 25 tokens) to the prompt *éxito*. Four of the categories, *achievement*, *academic achievement*, *contentment*, and *power*, are similar to those that appear also among the ASU students' responses in English and the Mexican students' responses, and two categories, *sharing wisdom* and *chores*, are unique to this set of responses only.

The category *achievement* is composed of the types *win*, *overcome challenges*, and *achieve goals*. These types share similarities with the types on both the ASU students' side of responses in English, and the types that appear on the Mexican students' side. However, the salient type of the Mexican students' responses, *effort*, is present neither among the ASU students' responses in Spanish nor in English. Also, the percentage value of this category (16%) among the ASU students' responses in Spanish is

situated closer to the percentage value of this category among the ASU students' responses in English (20%) than among the Mexican students' responses (44%).

The comparison of the types for the category *academic achievement* revealed that a type *degree* is similar between the ASU students' responses in English and Spanish, while a type *university* can be related to the type *school* among the Mexican students' responses. The percentage value of this category is lower among the ASU students' responses in Spanish, and constitutes 8%.

The next common category, *professional life*, is comprised of the type *career* (4%) which is also shared by the ASU students' responses in English, and does not occur on the Mexican students' side.

The analysis of the category *contentment* shows that the types in this category, *happy family*, *happiness*, *content*, *to find peace*, *proud* are almost identical to the types on the ASU students' side of the responses in English. Moreover, the percentage value of the category, 40%, is also very close to the percentage value of this category on the ASU students' side of the responses in English (36%). The last mutual category, *power* (16%), consists of the types *money* and *good salary*, with both types occurring among the ASU students' responses in English and the Mexican students' responses.

Taken as a whole, the results of the ASU students' answers to the prompt *éxito* do not exhibit unique similarities with the response of the Mexican students that are not present also on the ASU students' side responses in English. At the same time, they do show similarities with the ASU students' responses in English, for example, a high rate of the occurrence of the category *contentment*, and relatively low occurrence of the category *achievement* on both sides. Consequently, for the prompt *éxito* the ASU students'

responses in Spanish lie more towards their English responses than to the Mexican students' responses.

When the ASU participants were asked if their Spanish responses to the prompt *éxito* are more similar to their English responses to the prompt success, or to the Mexican students' responses to the prompt *éxito*, 50 % of them mentioned that they are more similar to their responses in English. For example, one student wrote: " I would still say that our Spanish responses are more similar to our group English responses because we don't mention "Esfuerzo" at all. Additionally, we added a phrase which none of the Mexican students mentioned which is, "Share wisdom from their experiences". This makes me assume that we are "trying" to think like Mexican students however it is very obvious that we are trying. That response does not seem very natural for the topic of success." (Student #1) Twenty five percent of the participants said that all three sets of the responses are similar, while 17 % of the students believed that their responses in Spanish are more similar to the Mexican students' responses. The rest 13% did not follow the instructions, so their responses were not categorized accordingly.

Table 13 shows results gleaned from the comparison of the of the ASU students' responses in Spanish to the prompt *Mi mayor preocupación es...* with their responses in English to the prompt *My greatest worry is...* and the Mexican students' responses to the prompt *Mi mayor preocupación es...*

Table 13

Comparison of the ASU students' responses in Spanish to the prompt Mi mayor preocupación es.. with their responses in English to the prompt and the Mexican students' responses to the prompt Mi mayor preocupación es...

ASU students' responses (N = 12)	ASU students' responses (N = 12)	Mexican students' responses (N = 16)

Prompt: My greatest worry is...		Prompt: Mi mayor preocupación es...		Prompt: Mi mayor preocupación es...	
Category and types	N of tokes/ %	**Category** and types	N of tokes/ %	**Category** and types	N of tokes/ %
Personal	8/ 67%	**Personal**	9/ 69%	**Personal**	4/ 19%
not being successful	2	terminando la escuela	3	escuela	2
fail out of school	1	sobreviviendo a mis	1	no cumplir con mis metas	1
provide myself without help	1	ahorros		no pasar a una buena uni	1
not having a passionate	1	no conseguir mis metas	1		
career		no ser un éxito en la	2		
outliving my savings	1	vida			
not accomplishing goals	1	encontrar la carrera que	2		
death	1	me encanta			
Family/loved ones - related	3/ 25%	**Family/loved ones - related**	4/ 31%	**Family/loved ones - related**	6/ 29%
not provide for my family	1	haciendo mi familia	1	perder a ser querido	2
safety and happiness of my	1	feliz		pase algo a mi familia	1
children		beinestar de mis hijos	1	pase algo a las personas	2
me being disappointment	1	mi novia que tiene	1	que quiero	
to my children		problemas con salud		que mi familia no pueda	1
		poder cuidar a mi	1	estar conmigo	
		familia			
Global	1/ 8%			**Global**	10/ 48%
me not making a bit change	1			narcotráfico	1
in the world as I want				contaminación mundial	1
				que mi país pueda salir	1
				adelante inseguridad	2
				pobreza mundial	1
				el curso del futuro	1
				incertidumbre	1
				no poder hacer nada si	1
				algo está mal	
				mi país	1
				Miscellaneous	1/ 5%
				no tengo	1
N of categories = 3 **N of tokens (responses to a prompt sentence) = 12**		**N of categories = 2** **N of tokens (responses to a prompt sentence) = 13**		**N of categories = 4** **N of tokens (responses to a prompt sentence) = 21**	

As it is demonstrated in Table 13, there are 2 categories that emerged out of the

ASU students' responses in Spanish (13 tokens) to the prompt *Mi mayor preocupación*

es.... The biggest category, *personal worries* (69%), exhibits more similarities with the percentage value of this category among the ASU students' responses in English (67%). Furthermore, the character of the types between these two sets of responses is also much the same and relate to the concerns about *graduation* and *being successful*.

The second category are worries related to *family/loved ones*. This category has a percentage value of 31%, and by this rate is closer to the percentage value of this category on the Mexican students' side (29%) than on the side of the ASU students' responses in English (25%). The nature of the worries demonstrate similarities with the students' responses in English, for example, similar concerns about *providing for family*; they also show resemblances with the responses of the Mexican students, for instance, concern about *health of the loved ones*.

Taken as a whole, although the ASU students' responses in Spanish show certain comparability with the Mexican students' responses in terms of *family worries* (i.e. concern about *health of the loved ones*), the character of the personal worries and their numbers, as well as the absence of the *global worries* that constitute almost half of the responses on the Mexican students' side, point to the closer resemblance of the ASU students' responses in Spanish to their responses in English.

When students were asked to compare the three sets of responses and to determine if their responses in Spanish to the prompt *Mi mayor preocupación es...* are more similar to their responses in English or to the Mexican students' responses, 75% of the students think that their responses in Spanish are more similar to their responses in English. Seventeen percent find that all three sets of the responses are similar, and 8 % of

students believe that their responses in Spanish are more similar to the Mexican students' responses.

Table 14 demonstrates results gleaned from the comparison of the of the ASU students' responses in Spanish to the prompt *Un buen líder es alguien que..* with their responses in English to the prompt *A good leader is someone who...* and the Mexican students' responses to the prompt *Un buen líder es alguien que..*

Table 14

Comparison of the ASU students' responses in Spanish to the prompt Un buen líder es alguien que.. with their responses in English to the prompt A good leader is someone who... and the Mexican students' responses to the prompt Un buen líder es alguien que..

ASU students' responses (N = 12) Prompt: A good leader is someone who...		ASU students' responses (N = 12) Prompt: A good leader is someone who...		Mexican students' responses (N = 16) Prompt: Un buen líder es alguien que...	
Category and types	N of tokes/ %	**Category** and types	N of tokes/ %	**Category** and types	N of tokes/ %
Personal qualities	14/ 61%	**Personal qualities**	12/ 67%	**Personal qualities**	20/ 74%
is humble	1	puede tomar decisiones firmes	1	entiende y sabe trabajar con su equipo	1
is honest	1	es simpático	1	sabe cuales son las habilidades de los integrantes	1
is understanding with a solid vision	2	es responsable	1		
knows how to effectively redirect her people without bickering with them	1	puede trabajar bien con otros	1	sabe mantener a un grupo	1
		es consistente	1	sabe que hacer	1
wants to progress as a whole not as an individual	1	tienen confianza en sí mismo	1	es responsable de sus actos	2
honestly has her peoples' best interest at heart	1	es capaz de inspirar a la gente	1	es una persona organizada	1
is stern, but fair	1	es inteligente	1	es perseverante	1
is consistent	2	es fuerte	1	sabe cómo tomar las mejores decisiones	1
is benevolent	1	es amable	1		
is tolerant	1	es comprometido	1	sabe como controlar a las personas	1
can inspire others to be the best version of themselves	1	es apasionada	1		
confidently assist others in making strides toward success	1			sabe dirigir un grupo sabiendo superar dificultades	3
				sabe tratar a la gente	1

				es emprendedor	1
				se preocupa por los demás	2
				es inteligente	1
				tiene claro sus objetivos	1
				tiene iniciativa	1

Takes actions	9/ 39%	**Takes actions**	6/ 33%	**Takes actions**	7/26%
seeks to give praise rather than earn praise	1	escucha a la gente	2	contesta todas tus preguntas con respuestas creíbles	1
works well with others	1	ayuda a otros tener éxito	1		
cares about others more than him/herself	1	respeta la cultura de su gente	1	estudia para mejorar cada día	1
takes action when necessary	1	encuentra solución a los problemas	1	escucha y hace que lo escuchen	1
never asks others to do something he/she wouldn't do themselves	1	anima a otros a tener éxito	1	acepta a las personas que lo rodean	1
takes multiple opinions into consideration when making a decision	1			bajo cualquier reto logra sus metas	1
does what is right	1			mueve a las masas	1
takes control	1			toma las mejores decisiones para sus seguidores	1
leads by example	1				

N of categories = 2 **N of tokens (responses to a prompt sentence) = 23**	**N of categories = 2** **N of tokens (responses to a prompt sentence) = 18**	**N of categories = 2** **N of tokens (responses to a prompt sentence) = 27**

As it is showed in Table 14, there are 2 categories that emerged out of the ASU students' responses (18%) in Spanish to the prompt *Un buen líder es alguien que...* The percentage value of the category *personal qualities* is situated in between the percentage value of this category among the students' responses in English (61%) and the Mexican students' responses (74%). The same tendency is observed for the category *takes actions*. The percentage value of this category is 33% and it is located just in the middle between the rate of this category among the ASU students' responses in English (39%) and the Mexican students' responses (26%). These results might suggest that for this prompt ASU students' responses in Spanish start leaning towards the Mexican students' responses and

value less a proactive leader who *takes action*s, and more a person who has certain *personal characteristics*.

The analysis of the students' questionnaires illustrates that 42% of students believe their responses in Spanish are more similar to their responses in English and 33% find all three sets of responses similar. Seventeen percent of the students think that their responses in Spanish demonstrate more resemblance to the Mexican students responses, and 8% of the students did not follow the instructions, so their responses were not categorized accordingly.

Table 15 illustrates results gleaned from the comparison of the of the ASU students' responses in Spanish to the prompt *Si veo alguien copia en un examen, yo...* with their responses in English to the prompt *If I see someone cheating on the exam, I....* and the Mexican students' responses to the prompt *Si veo alguien copia en un examen, yo...*

Table 15

Comparison of the ASU students' responses in Spanish to the prompt Si veo alguien copia en un examen, yo... with their responses in English to the prompt If I see someone cheating on the exam, I.... and the Mexican students' responses to the prompt Si veo alguien copia en un examen, yo...

ASU students' responses (N = 12) Prompt: *If I see someone cheating on the exam, I...*		ASU students' responses (N = 12) Prompt: *Si veo alguien copia en un examen, yo...*		Mexican students' responses (N = 16) Prompt: *Si veo alguien copia en un examen, yo...*	
Category and types	N of tokes/ %	**Category** and types	N of tokes/ %	**Category** and types	N of tokes/ %
Confront a person	6/ 40%	**Confront a person**	6/ 43%	**Confront a person**	5/ 29%
would tell to stop to avoid trouble	1	yo abordarlo directamente diciendo	3	hablaría con esta persona, le diría que tiene sentido copiar	1
talk to them about it	1	que no deben copiar		hablaría con mi compañero y	2
confront them later and	1	después del examen	1	le haría recapacitar	
ask if they need help		pregunto si necesitan		le digo que no lo haga	1
tell them it is not	1	ayuda		le digo que sea honesto	1

benefiting them		les advieto de consecuencias	1	consigo mismo	
tell them they need to stop because cheating is not fair or ethical	1	le diría que no es buena idea	1		
confront them myself	1				
Ignore/loose trust	5/ 33%	**Ignore/loose trust**	3/ 21%	**Ignore/lose trust**	10 / 59%
complete my test and tell somebody if asked	1	completo mi examen, digo la verdad si alguien pregunta	1	continuo con mi examen, no es asunto mío	1
ignore them	1	evito esta persona	1	los mirones son de palo	1
walk away with less respect	1	estoy incomodo	1	pensaría mal de esta persona	2
feel uncomfortable	1			fingiría que no vi nada	1
lose trust in that person	1			no digo nada ya que no debo meterme en problemas que no se me corresponden	1
				es el problema de la persona que lo está haciendo	1
				no me parece justo	1
				no estudió y está perjudicando a si mismo	1
				pensaría que no aprenderá nada al final del curso	1
Notify authority	4/ 27%	**Notify authority**	5/ 36%	**Notify authority**	2 /12%
tell teacher	2	le diría alguien de autoridad	2	aviso a la maestra	2
notify someone in charge	2	digo al profesor	3		
N of categories = 3 **N of tokens (responses to a prompt sentence) = 15**		**N of categories = 3** **N of tokens (responses to a prompt word) = 14**		**N of categories = 3** **N of tokens (responses to a prompt word) =17**	

As Table 15 shows, there are 3 categories that emerged out of the ASU students' responses in Spanish (14 tokens) to the prompt *Si veo alguien copia en un examen, yo...*. Both categories that indicate that the students would interfere with the situation, *confront a person* and *notify authority*, have a high percentage value of 43% and 36% respectively. These high rates are similar, and even higher, to those among the students' responses in English for these categories (40% for the category *confront a person* and 27% for *notify authority*). The last category, *ignore/lose trust* has a lowest percentage value, 21%, that is

lower than the percentage value of this category among the ASU students' responses in English (33%) and the Mexican students' responses (59%). This analysis reveals that for the prompt *Si veo alguien copia en un examen, yo...* the ASU students' responses in Spanish are more similar to their responses in English and prove to be more confrontational in their nature than the Mexican students' responses.

The analysis of the students' responses to the cultural questionnaires shows that 50% of the students believe their responses in Spanish are more similar to their responses in English, while 8% find more similarities between their responses in Spanish and the Mexican students' responses. At the same time, 25% think that all three sets of the responses are the same, and 17% of the students did not follow the instructions.

Table 16 illustrates results gleaned from the comparison of the of the ASU students' responses in Spanish to the prompt *Si alguien en la calle me pide dinero, yo...* with their responses in English to the prompt *If someone on the street asks me money, I...* and the Mexican students' responses to the prompt *Si alguien en la calle me pide dinero, yo...*

Table 16

Comparison of the ASU students' responses in Spanish to the prompt Si alguien en la calle me pide dinero, yo... with their responses in English to the prompt If someone on the street asks me money, I... and the Mexican students' responses to the prompt Si alguien en la calle me pide dinero, yo...

ASU students' responses (N = 12)		ASU students' responses (N = 12)		Mexican students' responses (N = 16)	
Prompt: *If someone on the street asks me money, I...*		Prompt: *Si alguien en la calle me pide dinero..., yo...*		Prompt: *Si alguien en la calle me pide dinero..., yo...*	
Category and types	N of	**Category** and	N of	**Category** and types	N of

	tokes/ %	types	tokes/ %		tokes/ %
Offer alternatives	6/ 50%	**Offer alternatives**	5/ 42%	**Offer alternatives**	2/ 11%
buy them a meal rather than give them cash	2			si lo veo que lo quiere para drogarse, prefería darle comida	1
give them food or clothing as they might have an addiction prefer to give them food/water, I feel that giving money could enable bad habits	1	a ir comprar lo que necesita ofrecería comprar comida	1 4	le compro algo de comida	1
ask what they need money for and offer what I can	2				
Give money	5/ 42%	**Give money**	5/ 42%	**Give money**	5/ 26%
give them whatever change I have give them a dollar	2 3	le doy dinero	5	si de verdad lo necesita y yo puedo darselo se lo daría le doy cualquier aportación que tenga darle a la mano le doy unas monedas	1 1 3
Do not give money	1/ 8%	**Do not give money**	2/ 16%	**Do not give money**	5/ 26%
don't give them any	1	no les dan ninguna les digo que no tengo ninguna	1 1	le digo que se ponga a trabajar o vender algo le ignoro y sigo caminando me negaría si fuera alguien desconocido pensaría que quiere dinero para alimentar algún vicio	2 1 1 1
				Depends	7/ 37%
				si es una persona que realmente se ve necesitada le doy, si es una persona que puede trabajar no le doy si es un niño o anciano les doy dinero le daría si es incapacitado pero si está sano no le daría nada y pensaría que mejor se pusiera a trabajar	3 2 2
N of categories = 3 **N of tokens (responses to a prompt sentence) = 12**		**N of categories = 3** **N of tokens (responses to a prompt sentence) = 12**		**N of categories = 4** **N of tokens (responses to a prompt word) =19**	

As Table 16 demonstrates, there are 3 categories that emerged out of the ASU students' responses in Spanish (12 tokens) to the prompt *Si alguien en la calle me pide dinero, yo....* All three categories, *offer alternatives*, *give money*, and *do not give money*, have a very similar percentage value to the percentage value of these categories among the ASU students' responses in English, and constitute 42%, 42%, and 16% respectively. This fact, as well as the absence of the category *depends* that is unique to the Mexican students' side of the responses, might indicate again the greater resemblance among the ASU students' responses in English and Spanish.

The analysis of the cultural questionnaires answered by the students reveals that 75% of the participants find that their responses in Spanish to the prompt *Si alguien en la calle me pide dinero, yo...*are more similar to their responses in English, 8% believe there are more similarities with the Mexican students' responses, while 17% tent to think that all three sets of the responses are similar.

Taken as a whole, the analysis of the data revealed that almost in all instances, with an exception of the responses to the prompt *Un buen líder es alguien que...*, and separate types within certain categories of other prompts (i.e. types *employment* and *Obama* in the prompt *EEUU*, concerns about the *health of loved ones* in the prompt *Mi mayor preocupación es...*) the responses of the ASU students in Spanish tent to resemble those in English. This findings suggest that the mental lexicons of the intermediate Spanish learners who participated in this study lie predominantly towards the English end of the continuum, and only in certain cases start to demonstrate the characteristics of the mental lexicons of the native speakers.

The fact that the mental lexicons of the participants in this study lie more towards the English end of the continuum can be explained by the lack of the study abroad experiences and interactions with native speakers among the participants. Only two participants spent from 2 to 5 weeks in Spanish speaking countries, and one participant lived in the Spanish speaking country for 1.5 year. The responses in Spanish of the participant who lived abroad for 1.5 year, however, did not demonstrate the resemblance of those of the native Spanish speakers. For example, for the prompt *EEUU* the student wrote *hogar*, *libertad*, for the prompt *éxito - ganar*, *contento*, his major *worry* is *no encontrar la carrera profesional que me apasione*, and for the prompt s*i veo alguien copia en un examen, yo...* the student replied *le diría que no es buena idea*. All these responses are very common types among the ASU students' responses in English to the respective prompts. In the contact language profile, this particular student mentioned that his interactions abroad were in English with his wife and children, and in Spanish with the rest of the people. Although these data were collected from one participant only, the assumption might follow that, despite the fact that an extensive time was spent abroad, the student only lived there and did not receive any academic instructions that typically happen in SA language classroom. Moreover, his interactions were most likely happening in English with his family members for the most of times, and were less frequent in Spanish with native speakers. Another reason for his mental lexicon resemblance to English and not Spanish end of continuum could be a *threshold hypothesis* discussed by Lafford & Collentine (2006). According to the threshold hypothesis, the learners who go to study abroad need a certain level of cognitive and grammatical abilities to facilitate L2 acquisition in a target language. For this reason, advanced learners benefit more from

their study abroad experience than beginning or intermediate students (Ife, Vives Boix and Meara, 2000).

In order for the L2 Spanish learners' lexicons to take on characteristics of Spanish instead of English, the learners need to be exposed to an extensive L2 input. Lafford, Collentine, & Karp (2003) stated that comprehensive reading and listening, along with frequent interactions with native speakers during lengthy study abroad periods help L2 learners to increase their lexicon by adding pragmatic, sociolinguistic, dialectic, and metaphoric features to the lexical items they already know, the process that is referred to as *packaging*. These experiences, combined with an extensive sociocultural knowledge about the target culture, ensure that the connections among acquired words take on the shape of the target culture.

According to Lafford, Collentine, & Karp (2003), packaging is not easy to accomplish, because the learners often assume that the word in the L1 has its exact equivalent in L2. Relationship between L1 and L2 cognates, while sometimes aid understanding (e.g. true cognates), very often can also impede the process of packaging (e.g. false cognates). The formulaic language (e.g. proverbs, sayings) adds on to the challenges of L2 lexicon acquisition, as very often the learners lack sociocultural background of the target culture. Frequent interactions with different types of native speakers of Spanish is mentioned by Lafford & Collentine (2006) as a chance to increase pragmatic awareness and to use language appropriately in different communicative contexts. The authors also emphasized the importance of the use of L2 authentic video materials, as well as videotaped or alive interactions between native speakers in the target language classroom in order to demonstrate to L2 learners how appropriately use

94

language in a variety of situations. While outside the classroom, it is important to encourage students to look for internships (domestic and international) and service-learning opportunities within the Spanish speaking communities. These types of L2 naturalistic and immersive input experiences help learners restructure their mental lexicons and to establish connections between the words in their L2 similar to or close in their nature to the connections made by L2 native speakers, which, eventually, will help them think as native speakers (Lantolf, 1999).

The present study was based in part on empirical works in the field of SLA as they relate to ICC development and telecollaboration (Bauer, deBenedette, Furstenberg, Leyet, Waryn, 2006; Chun, 2011; Elola & Oskoz, 2008; Furstenberg, 2004; Lee, 2011; Schulz, 2007), as no research has been conducted to date that would have included participants' word associations, completion of culturally-based sentences, and responses to the hypothetical situations both in L1 and L2. In addition, unlike previous similar research in the area (Chun, 2011; Furstenberg, 2004) the current study is based on Byram's (1997) work on one of the component of ICC, *critical cultural awareness* and rubrics created based on Bloom's (1990) revised taxonomy that reflects level of intellectual learning skills and that is used to assess the different levels of the participants' critical cultural awareness in this study.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

The present study assessed the level of critical cultural awareness of intermediate Spanish learners using the rubrics created based on Byram's (1997) work on one of the components of ICC, *critical cultural awareness*, and Bloom's (1990) revised taxonomy of the cognitive learning skills. This study also used the participants' answers to words associations, completion of culturally-based sentences, and reflections on the hypothetical situations in L1 and L2 to determine (1) their cultural values and behaviors and (2) how their mental lexicon is structured. The findings demonstrated that the ASU students' have a perspective of an insider (emic point of view) when they talk about their country. The common themes that emerged out of the ASU students' responses touched upon, among other less popular, ideas of *freedom*, *government*, *well-being* and *home*, the notions with which US citizens have first-hand experience.

At the same time, the ASU participants showed a perspective of an outsider (etic point of view) when they provided answers to *Mexico*. The popular themes that emerged for this category, *tourism*, *food and drinks*, and *culture*, are those that make Mexico a popular tourist destination. In contrast, the Mexican students showed a perspective of an outsider when the *USA* was discussed and mentioned, among others, ideas of *technology*, *well-being*, and *government* that often depict the US outside the country borders. Similarly, they have a first-hand experience when it comes to portraying the actual state of things in *Mexico*, and mentioned both, their country *beauty* and its *problems*.

While both groups of students shared certain family values, such as *love* and *family member,* there are also significant differences in their values. The ASU students

96

emphasized the importance of *safety* in their family circles, whereas the Mexican students accentuated ideas of *union* and *respect* as some of the important values in their families. Also, both groups have identified the similar themes for the prompt *success*, such as *achievement*, *academic achievemen*t, *professional life* and *contentment*. However, the importance of these themes among two groups of students is different. Thus, for example, the Mexican students often identify s*uccess* with *effort*, *goals*, and *work*, while the ASU students think of *success* as *happiness*, *degree* and *money*.

The majority of the ASU students have *major worries* related, firstly, to their *personal life* and, secondly, associated with their *family and loved ones*. In contrast, the Mexican students are firstly concerned with *globally related* issues, and after, they worry that something might happen to their *family members* or *loved ones*. Both groups consider *a good leader* to be someone who possesses valuable *personal qualities*, however, the ASU students also believe that a good leader should *take actions*.

When the ASU and Mexican students *see someone cheating on the exam*, the ASU students in the majority of cases would *confront a person* either personally or would *notify authorities*, while the Mexican students would most like *ignore* that person or *lose trust* in him/her. In the situation when *somebody on the street asks them money*, the ASU students most likely would *offer that person an alternative*, for example, *buying food*, *water*, *clothes*, while the Mexican students in the majority of cases *would consider who the person is*, and only after make a decision whether to give money or not.

The apparent differences between the two groups' responses to aforementioned prompts might be explained by a diverse societal features that characterize the environment the students live. The US society is often refer to as individualistic, that

97

places emphasis on the independence, competitiveness, and person goals. At the same time, the Hispanic society tends to be collectivistic, values cooperation, and places group needs before personal goals (Enriquez & Pajewski, 1996; Shkodriani & Gibbons, 1995).

The findings also suggested that the mental lexicons of the participants lie predominantly towards the English end of the continuum with a couple exception where some students gave associations in Spanish that resembled those of the native speakers. These findings can be supported by the lack of study abroad experience and interactions with native Spanish speakers that the majority of the students mentioned in their contact language profiles. In order for the participants' mental lexicons to take on characteristics of Spanish instead of English, they have to be exposed to an extensive L2 input (Lafford, Collentine, & Karp, 2003). Wide-ranging reading and listening in L2, frequent interactions with native speakers, and study abroad experiences would increase learners' mental lexicons and ensure that the connections among acquired words take on shape of the target culture, which eventually help them to think as native speakers (Lantolf, 1999)

In addition, the findings demonstrated that the state of critical cultural awareness, as measured by the rubrics created based on Byram's (1997) work on one of the component of ICC, *critical cultural awareness*, and Bloom's (1990) revised taxonomy of learning skills, fell into four different levels. The level of three students was assessed as *creating*, when the students were able to create hypothesis and demonstrated abstract thinking with regards to perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries. The level of another three participants was gauged as *evaluating*, where students profoundly evaluated, critically and on the basis of explicit criteria, perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries. The

98

level of four students was measured as *analyzing*. At this level the participants were able to analyze, compare and contrast perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries. Finally, the responses of two students were assessed at the level u*nderstanding*, where they demonstrated understanding and listed differences and similarities between perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries.

It is important to notice that the participants from iCourse gave more extensive responses to this assignment than the ASUONLINE students. This difference might be explained by the typical student's profile in each course. While both courses followed the same curriculum, the ASUONLINE students tend to be part-time students who work full time. At the same time, iCourse typical student is a full-time student who does not work or work part-time, and who places more emphasis on the grades that impact his/her GPA and future job search (P. Feldman & B. Lafford, personal communication, March 10th, 2015)

Implications

The possible pedagogical implication of this study is the use of the words associations, completion of culturally-based sentences and reactions to the culturally-based situation both in L1 and L2 in the second language classrooms. As this study has shown, the cultural awareness of L2 learners can also be raised by using archived data from the native speakers. Setting up online exchanges usually takes some time and students in international settings may not be required to participate in the tasks, they way the US students would be. Besides, K-12 teachers and their students do not always have online access for this type of interactions. That is where archived students' responses can

be used to help teachers provide native speakers' opinions and perspectives needed in teaching cultural units. However, online exchanges would help clarify any incorrect assumptions L2 students might make about the target language and culture based on responses from native speakers.

       Another pedagogical implication of this study is the use of the words associations, completion of culturally-based sentences and reactions to the culturally-based situation to facilitate development of critical cultural competence. This study did not use pre and post tests, and data for each questionnaire was collected only once. The language teachers might use assignments from cultural questionnaire 1 (responses in L1) in order to track and facilitate development of one or all components of ICC as suggested by Byram (1997) in their students. They can introduce assignments at the beginning of teaching a unit about specific country or culture, it will be pre-assessment. After, they will develop a cultural context by the means they usually do, it will constitute treatment. Finally, students will do assignments again, it will be post-assessment. By analyzing, comparing and contrasting common themes that emerged out of data collected from pre and post assessments a teacher will be able to see if students have advanced in their level of critical cultural awareness and where those advanced have happened. Thus, these tools can be used to evaluate students' perspectives and knowledge before they start a unit on a new culture and after it, as well as to make students reflect on their beliefs and disbeliefs about their own culture.

       Another pedagogical implication of this study is the use of rubrics is the assessment of critical cultural awareness that also incorporates levels of learning skills from Blooms' (1990) revised taxonomy. Applying a classification of different levels of

100

learning skills (*understanding*, *analyzing*, *evaluating*, and *creating*) from Bloom's

taxonomy to the description of *critical cultural awareness* from the Byram's (1997) work

on ICC is a first attempt to synthesize these two important works into one that resulted

into a creation of rubrics to measure students' critical cultural awareness.

Limitations

One of the limitations of this study is a type of data collected. The data collected

for this research comes from (1) the ASU students, and (2) Mexican students from TEC.

However, the data from the Mexican students is limited to their responses to the first and

second cultural questionnaires where they provided answers in Spanish to the word

associations, completed culturally-based sentences and reflected on the culturally-based

situations. Although it was possible to collect the ASU students' comments to the cultural

questionnaire 3 where they compared and contrasted their responses with those of the

native speakers from Mexico, the analysis of their answers was limited to only one

component of Byram's (1997) work on ICC, *critical cultural awareness*, on the rubrics.

Another limitation of this study is the fact that data were collected from two

different groups of students. Even though all of the participants were enrolled in Spa 202,

followed the same curriculum and syllabus, and had the same length of the study (7.5

weeks) the first group of participants commented on their responses and the Mexican

students' responses only, and was not able to see the responses of another group of

students, since two sessions were held one after another.

 Also, one group of students were ASUONLINE students and another group was

iCourse students. Although the students in both groups followed the same curriculum, the

"type of learner" is different in two groups with iCourse students most likely being more

motivated to success and to get a better grade than ASUONLINE students. This difference might lead to more comprehensive and profound answers coming from iCourse students.

Future Research

One of the possible directions for future research is designing follow up tools for this study that would require interactions with native speakers. As mentioned before, this study was based on data collected from the ASU students and archived data from the Mexican students. The assessment of the ASU students' answers fit only into the category *critical cultural awareness* on the rubrics. The future research might design assignments and collect data that would require online or face to face interactions with native speakers. These types of assignments and data they yield will provide opportunities for participants to follow up on each other's comment and to ask more question, that will lead to more comprehensively assessment of ICC of the participants based on all its components (*knowledge*, *attitudes*, *skills of interpreting and relating*, *skills of discovery and interaction*, and *critical cultural awareness*).

Another potential direction for scholars in the future research might be an investigation of the differences, if any, between the structure of the metal lexicons among the students who studied abroad and stay at home students. Ife, Vives Boix and Meara (2001) found that students with advanced level of language skills were able to reconstruct their mental lexicon to match that of the native speaker. More studies are needed to find out how SA and AH learners would behave in different cultural contexts and if their cultural values and behaviors would vary. However, here also it is important to consider study abroad experiences that students have, the types of teaching methodologies that are

used in SA language and content-based classrooms, as well as students' pre-experience

level of knowledge (Lafford & Collentine, 2006).

At the same time, in the future it will be worth comparing responses from the

heritage learners and non-heritage learners. Supposedly, the responses from the heritage

learners of Spanish would tend towards either the Spanish or English end of the

continuum depending on their dominant language. However, this is only a hypothesis and

studies are needed to test it in the future.

Another direction for future research in need of mention is comparison between

the levels of critical cultural awareness between students from different language levels.

The participants of this study were intermediate level students. The future research might

compare and contrast the responses to the similar types of assignments between the

students from intermediate and advanced levels. Also, this study looked at the responses

of the participants who live in the societies that place emphasis on different types of

values. The US society is often characterized as individualistic and the Mexican society is

often referred to as collectivistic (Enriquez & Pajewski, 1996). Comparing learners'

responses that live in either two collectivistic or two individualistic societies will most

likely reveal different type of data.

REFERENCES

American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2012). ACTFL Proficiency guidelines. Retrieved from http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/ACTFLProficiencyGuidelines2012_FINAL.pdf

Bass, B. (1997). Does the transactional–transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, *52*(2), 130-139.

Bauer, B., deBenedette, L., Furstenberg, G., Levet, S., & Waryn, S. (2006). Internet-mediated intercultural foreign language education: The cultura project. In J. Belz & S.Thorne (Eds.), *Internet-mediated intercultural foreign language education* (pp. 31-62). Boston: Heinle & Heinle. Retrieved from http://www.personal.psu.edu/slt13/589_s2007/BauerEtAl_2ch_1st.PDF

Belz, J. (2002). Social dimensions of telecollaborative foreign language study. *Language Learning & Technology*, *5*(1), 60-81. Retrieved from http://www.llt.msu.edu/vol6num1/pdf/belz.pdf

Belz, J. (2003). Linguistic perspectives on the development of intercultural competence in telecollaboration. *Language Learning & Technology*, *7*(2), 68-99. Retrieved from http://llt.msu.edu/vol7num2/pdf/belz.pdf

Bloom's revised taxonomy (1990). Retrieved from http://ww2.odu.edu/educ/roverbau/Bloom/blooms_taxonomy.htm

Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and accessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevendon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Byram, M. (2000). Assessing intercultural competence in language teaching. *Sprogforum*, *18*(6), 8-13.

Chun, D. M. (2011). Developing intercultural communicative competence through online exchanges. *CALICO Journal, 28*(2), 392-419.

Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2008). Blogging: Fostering intercultural competence development in foreign language and study abroad contexts. *Foreign Language Annals, 41*(3), 454-77.

Enriquez, L., & Pajewski, A. (1996). *Teaching from a Hispanic Perspective a Handbook for Non-Hispanic Adult Educators*. Retrieved from http://literacynet.org/lp/hperspectives/contents.html

Erickson, H. (2001). Before you go: A preparation guide for short-term mission trips. Retrieved from http://www.themastersview.com/pdf/Before_You_Go.pdf

Fuligni, A. et al. (2007). Family obligation, college enrollment, and emerging adulthood in Asia and Latin American Families. *Child Development Perspectives*, 1, 96-100.

Furstenberg, G. (2004). Using communication tools to foster cross-cultural understanding. In I.Thompson & D.Hiple (Eds.), *Selected papers from the 2004 NFLRC symposium: Distance Education, Distributed Learning and Language Instruction (online resource, no pages)* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center. Retrieved from http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/networks/nw44/furstenberg.htm

Gettys, S. (2003). Incorporating Comparisons Standard 4.1 into Foreign Language Teaching. *Foreign Language Annals,* 36, 188–197

Hauck, M., & Youngs, B. (2008). Telecollaboration in multimodal environments: The impact on task design and learner interaction. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *21*(2), 87-124

Ife, A., Vives Boix, G., & Meara, P. 2000. The impact of study abroad on the vocabulary development of different proficiency groups. *Spanish Applied Linguistics*, *4*(1), 55-84

Kramsch, C. (1996). The cultural component of language teaching. *Zeitschrift fur Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterrich* (online), *1*(2), 13. Retrieved from http://zif.spz.tu-darmstadt.de/jg-01-2/beitrag/kramsch2.htm

Lafford, B., Collentine, J, & Karp, A. (2003). The acquisition of lexical meaning by second language learners: An analysis of general research trends with evidence from Spanish. In B, Lafford, & R. Salaberry. *Spanish second language acquisition: State of the science*. Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press.

Lafford, B. & Collentine, J. (2006). The effects of study abroad and classroom contexts on the acquisition of Spanish as a second language: From research to application. In B.Lafford and R.Salaberry (Eds.) *Spanish second language acquisition: From research findings to teaching applications,* 103-126. Washington, D.C: Georgetown University

Lantolf, J. (1999). Second culture acquisition: Cognitive considerations. In E. Hinkle (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning*, 28-46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Lee, L. (2011). Blogging: Promoting learner autonomy and intercultural competence through study abroad. *Language Learning & Technology, 15*(3), 87-109.

Liaw, M. (2006). E-learning and the development of intercultural competence. *Language Learning & Technology, 10*(3), 49-64. Retrieved from http://llt.msu.edu/vol10num3/pdf/liaw.pdf

Mizrahi, Y. (1994). Rebels Without a Cause? The Politics of Entrepreneurs in Chihuahua. *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 26, 137-158.

Magnan, S. (2008). Reexamining the priorities of the National Standards for Foreign Language Education. *Language Teaching,* 41, 349-366.

Magnan, S., Murphy, D., & Sahakyan, N. (2014). *Goals of collegiate learners and the standards for foreign language learning. Modern Language Journal*

McCloskey, E. (2011). Docentes globales: un modelo para el desarrollo de la competencia intercultural on-line. *Comunicar, 38,* 41-49.

National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project. (1996). *Standards for foreign language learning: Preparing for the 21st century.* Yonkers, NY: American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Retrieved from http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/StandardsforFLLexecsumm_rev.pdf

Seliger, H.W., & Shohamy, E. (1989). *Second language research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shkodriani, G. & Gibbons, J. (1995). Individualism and collectivism among university students in Mexico and the United States. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *135*(6), 765-772.

Ter Horst, E. & Pearce, J. (2010). Foreign Languages and Sustainability: Addressing the Connections, Communities, and Comparisons Standards in Higher Education. *Foreign Language Annals,* 43, 365–383

Vacas Hermida, A., & Benevente, J.C. (2002). Hacia la competencia intercultural en el aprendizaje del español. *Tierra abierta*. (online). Retrieved from http://www.tierradenadie.de/articulos/intercultura.htm

Ware, P., & Kramsch, C. (2005). Toward an intercultural stance: Teaching German and English through telecollaboration. *The Modern Language Journal*, *89*(2), 190-205.

APPENDIX A

CONTACT LANGUAGE PROFILE

The responses that you give in this questionnaire will be kept confidential, only the researcher will see your names, and every effort will be made to keep your responses confidential.

Thank you for your cooperation. The information that you provide will help us to better understand the background of students who are studying Spanish. Your honest and detailed responses will be greatly appreciated.

1.Name _____

2. Gender: _____

3. Age_____

4.Country of birth_____

5.If not born in the US, age you arrived here_____

6. What language(s) did you speak at home as a child? 1)English 2)Spanish 3) Other_____

7.What language do you speak at home now? 1)English 2)Spanish 3) Other_____

7a . If you currently communicate regularly in more than one language, with whom do you speak each of these languages?_____

8. In what language did you receive the majority of your precollege education? 1)English 2)Spanish 3) Other_____

9. Which language you feel more comfortable using? 1)English 2)Spanish 3) Other_____

10. Do you consider yourself a heritage speaker of a language other than English? ____Yes _____ No If so, of what language? _____

Heritage speaker - a person who speaks or understands a language other than English, who either was born in another country and immigrated to the US at early age, or born in the US and whose parents or grandparents are immigrants from another country.

For question 11, please list all countries in which you have spent two weeks or more:

TIME ABROAD 1:

11. Have you spent time abroad in another country (not US)? _____Yes ____ No

11a. If so, what country? _____For what length of time? _____

11b. With whom did you live?_____ What language(s) were spoken in the home/environment in which you lived? _____

TIME ABROAD 2:

11. Have you spent time abroad in another country (not US)? _____Yes ____ No

11a. If so, what country? _____For what length of time? _____

11b. With whom did you live?_____ What language(s) were spoken in the home/environment in which you lived? _____

12. For how many years have you studied Spanish in school?

Elementary school: _____

High School:_____ _____

University: _____

13. If you have studied another language in school, what was it? _____For how many years have you studied that language in school?

Elementary school: _____

High School:_____ _____

University: _____

14. Year at school (ASU)_____

15. Your major_____

16. email address_____

APPENDIX B

CULTURAL QUESTIONNAIRE 1

Please, fill out the following questionnaire (3 tasks). Try to be as spontaneous as possible and write the first things that come to your mind.

1. Word associations
Provide 2-3 associations (words or phrases) for each of the following words.

United States   _____

Mexico _____

Family _____

*Success*_____

2. Sentence completion

A good leader is someone who..

_____

My greatest worry is..

_____

3. Reactions to situations

If I see someone cheating on the test, I...

_____

_____

If someone on the street asks me for money, I...

_____

_____

APPENDIX C

CULTURAL QUESTIONNAIRE 2

Por favor, rellene el siguiente cuestionario (3 tareas). Intente ser lo más espontáneo posible y escribir las primeras cosas que vienen a su mente.

1. Asociaciones de palabras

Escriba en español 2-3 asociaciones (palabras o frases) para cada una de las siguientes palabras..

Familia _____

México _____

Éxito _____

Estados Unidos _____

2. Termine las oraciones

Un buen líder es alguien que...

_____

Mi mayor preocupación es..

_____

3. Escriba cómo reaccionaría a las siguientes situaciones

Si veo alguien copia en un examen, yo...

_____

_____

Si alguien en la calle me pide dinero, yo...

_____

_____

APPENDIX D

WORKSHEET 1

American students' responses (sessions A&B) to the word associations, completion of culturally-based sentences and responses to the hypothetical situations in English, and archived Mexican students' responses to the word associations, completion of culturally-based sentences and responses to the hypothetical situations in Spanish.

N.B. This worksheet contains responses of all students in classes. However, not all of them gave informed consent to use their data. For this reason, although during the assignment the students were able to see all responses, only comments from the students who gave their informed consent were analyzed in the study.

Session A

ASU students responses in English	Mexican students responses

USA

- Land of opportunity, fast food, military
- my home country
- Flag, patriotism, home
- President, History
- Home, Land of the free
- greed
- freedom, democracy, home
- Freedom
- melting-pot, South

Estados Unidos

- AVGN, GTA IV, oportunidades
- ciencia, tecnologia
- dolares, norte
- Empire state, baseball, Estatua de la libertad
- Manhattan, migración, dinero
- poder dinero gobierno
- Poder, obama, leyes
- poder,dinero, buen gobierno
- Tecnología, Trabajo, Seguridad
- Tecnología,seguridad

Mexico

- Cartels, produce, spring break
- Juarez, my culture, my life
- Warmth, in-laws, fun
- Spanish, Culture, Fun
- Food, border crisis
- immigrants
- exotic, hot, scenery
- Food

Mexico

- belleza
- Bicentenario, narcotrafico, cultura.
- bonito,delincuencia,playas
- Calidez, Comida, Playas
- Casa, comida
- Chile, soccer, cerveza
- Corrupción
- corrupción, pobreza, hermoso
- cultura narcotrafico injusticia

- Aztecs, Teotihuacan
- beaches, violence, immigration

- Diversidad, cultura
- Hermoso, cultura, variedad

Family

- Love, support, safety
- love and miss them everyday
- My children, love, safety
- Dad, Home
- Love, commitment
- support
- love, caring, protection
- Marriage
- love, security
- my husband, my daughter, sacrifice

Familia

- amor comprension respeto
- Amor, respeto, union
- amor, unión, cuidado
- Amor, apoyo, compañía
- Hermano, papá, mamá
- lo mas importante
- Tranquilidad
- Unión, hermanos, apoyo
- Unidad, Soporte, Felicidad
- union, amor, respeto

Success

- Good job, college degree, happiness
- Money, no debt
- Proud, accomplishment, degree
- Degree, Independence
- Winning, feeling accomplished
- progress
- money, career, work
- Hard work
- stability, finances, achievement
- sacrifice, hard work, not wanting for anything

Exito

- Buenas calificaciones, metas, destacar
- dinero, traje, emprendedor
- escuela, estudio, trabajo
- esfuerzo metas capacidad
- Esfuerzo, metas y triunfos
- Esfuerzo, desempeño
- Felicidad
- Globalización, Trabajo, Escuela
- trabajo
- trabajo, dinero
- Yo, alcanzar, esfuerzo

A good leader is someone who...

- is humble, honest and understanding with a solid vision. Knows how to effectively redirect her people without bickering with them. Seeks to give praise rather than earn praise. Wants to progress as a whole not as an individual. Honestly has her peoples' best interest at heart.
- Can lead but also can coach other people to be leaders.
- is stern, but fair and always consistent.
- cares about others more than

Un buen líder es alguien que...

- …entiende y sabe trabajar con su equipo. …sabe cuales son las habilidades de los integrantes
- Contesta todas tus preguntas con respuestas creíbles y estudia para mejorar cada día.
- es alguien que sabe mantener a un grupo y alguien que sabe que hacer.
- es responsable de sus actos.
- Es una persona organizada, perseverante, responsable, con una mision en mano.

- him/herself.
- is consistent and never asks others to do something he/she wouldn't do themselves.
- is capable of working well with and guiding a team.
- thinks about what is best for others instead of himself.
- takes action when necessary
- benevolent, tolerant, and works well with others.
- wants to get the project (data/metrics) completed by being supportive and putting the people above the things. They want the people to be successful and as they support the people the things get done.

- escucha y hace que lo escuchen, acepta a las personas que lo rodean
- sabe cómo tomar las mejores decisiones
- sabe como controlar a las personas
- sabe dirigir un grupo sabiendo superar dificultades.
- sabe llevar por un buen camino a un grupo de personas.
- Sabe tratar a la gente y es emprendedor
- Se preocupa por los demás,es inteligente y sabe liderar un grupo.
- tiene claro sus objetivos y bajo cualquier reto logra sus metas
- Tiene iniciativa y mueve a las masas
- tiene la capacidad de ver por los demás y no solo por el.
- Un buen líder es alguien que: se preocupa por los demás. Un buen líder es alguien que: toma las mejores decisiones para sus seguidores

My greatest worry is ...

- for the safety, good health and happiness of my children.
- so much debt that my life will not be enjoyable, and I will always be working to pay debt.
- that I will fail and be a disappointment to my children.
- being able to provide for myself without any help.
- going through life never finding a career that I am passionate about.
- failing to achieve my goals.
- that something bad will happen to my son when I'm gone.
- outliving my savings
- being unable to accomplish my goals.
- not being able to provide for my daughter
  .

Mi mayor preocupación es..

- el narcotrafico, la inseguridad y la contaminacion mundial
- La escuela y mi país
- la escuela.
- la inseguridad en mi país, la pobreza mundial
- Mi mayor preocupación es: el curso del futuro, la incertidumbre de no saber lo que pudiera llegar a pasar.
- no cumplir con todas mis metas.
- no pasar a una buena universidad
- No tengo
- Perder a algún ser querido
- que algo le pase a mi familia
- que le pase algo a las personas que quiero
- que le pase algo malo a algún ser querido
- que mi familia no pueda estar conmigo y que las personas que quiero sufran
- que mi pais pueda salir adelante.
- que un ser querido muera
- sabiendo que algo esta mal y no poder

hacer nada.

If I see somebody cheating on the test, I...

- would probably walk away with less respect for that person. However, if it was an important test that affected many others, such as a driver's license test, or a drug test, I would notify someone in charge.
- tell a professor.
- tell them they need to stop because cheating isn't fair or ethical.
- ignore them and continue working on my own test; what is important is that I don't cheat.
- would tell them it is not benefiting them any to do that.
- allow them to do so. They're only shortchanging themselves.
- would mind my own business.
- would mention it to the teacher.
- feel uncomfortable.
- ask them why and tell the professor.

Si veo alguien copia en un examen, yo...

- Aviso a la maestra
- Continuo con mi examen, no es asunto mío
- Es problema de la persona que lo está haciendo, no hago nada
- Hablaría con mi compañero lo haría recapacitar, pero si posteriormente lo sigue haciendo, hablaría con el profesor.
- hablaria con esa persona para hacerlo recapacitar y decirle que eso no es honesto y habla muy mal de quien es –
- Le digo que no lo haga porqué se está haciendo mal a él no a los demás
- Le digo que sea honesto consigo mismo
- Le diría que no tiene sentido copiar, no se aprende nada de esa manera
- No digo nada, los mirones son de palo.
- no diria nada ya que no debo meterme en problemas que no me corresponden.
- no hago nada
- No me parece justo ya que tenemos que esforzarnos por nuestras metas.
- pensaría mal de esa persona.
- pensaria que no aprendera nada al final del curso y que ya esta bastante maduro para saber lo que hace
- seguramente no estudió, se está perjudicando a si mismo
- sinceramente no diría nada, y fingiría que no vi nada.

If somebody on the street asks me money, I..

Si alguien en la calle me pide dinero, yo..

- Creo que sí le daría dinero.

- first ask if I may pray with them. Then offer to buy them a meal rather than give them cash.
- give them money if I have enough.
- discuss what they need the money for and go and buy them the items that they require, rather than just giving them money.
- ask them why they need it and offer what I can.
- will give them a dollar.
- give what I can if it's available.
- would give something if I had it.
- don't give them any
- give them some if I have it because if it is within one's power to give, one should.
- give them a dollar if I have it
.

Probablemente lo necesite, pero también dependería de la situación de la persona y el contexto en el que se me pida el dinero.
- depende de quien sea, si es una persona que realente se ve necesitada le doy, si es uan persona que puede trabajar no le doy.
- Depende quien sea y si en verdad está necesitado
- dependeria de quien fuera, si yo veo que lo quiere para drogarse preferiria darle comida, si de verdad lo necesita y yo puedo darselo se lo daria.
- Dependiendo de su apariencia tal vez le doy un poco o le compro algo de comida
- le daria si es incapacitado pero si esta sano no le daria nada y pensaria que mejor se pusiera a trabajar
- Le digo que se ponga a trabajar o a vender algo, que el dinero no llega alzando la mano.
- le doy cualquier aportación que tenga darle a la mano.
- Le doy unas monedas.
- Lo ignoro y sigo caminando.
- Me negaría si fuera alguien desconocido
- pensaria que quiere el dinero para alimentar algun vicio
- Pues depende de como vea a la persona, habitualmente no es bueno fomentar esto.
- si es un niño o un anciano les doy dinero.
- si veo que la persona lo necesita realmente se lo doy y si es un nino o un anciano porque los adultos pueden buscar trabajo.
- stas sano y con buena edad, porfavor ponte a trabajar o a estudiar

Session B

ASU responses in English   **Mexican students' responses**

USA
- Leaders, Innovative, Strong
- New york, Food
- Stars and Stripes, No such thing as a free lunch, football
- Red, White and Blue
- red, white and blue
- Political, Military, Unhealthy
- French fries, red white and blue, diversity
- Freedom, patriot
- Freedom, Hamburgers
- Mixing Pot
- Americans, flags, war
- Freedom, liberty, peace and prosperity
- "land of the free", Freedom, life
- Home of the free and land of the brave
- Superior. Melting pot. The country I grew up in.
- Home

EEUU
- AVGN, GTA IV, oportunidades
- ciencia, tecnologia
- dolares, norte
- Empire state, baseball, Estatua de la libertad
- Manhattan, migración, dinero
- poder dinero gobierno
- Poder, obama, leyes
- poder,dinero, buen gobierno
- Tecnología, Trabajo, Seguridad
- Tecnología,seguridad

Mexico
- Cancun, Fishing, Food
- Vacation, Cartel, Beaches
- Chicharito, history, nature
- Sombreros
- tacos, salsa, sombrero
- Colorful, markets, haggle
- The beach, foreign language, delicious food
- soccer, beaches
- Quinceñera, Burritos, Spicy
- Disaster
- deorro, spanish, carne
- Amazing food, beaches, poverty,
- food, carne asada, border
- Really good food
- South of the United States. Culture and diversity.
- Country

México
- belleza
- Bicentenario, narcotrafico, cultura.
- bonito,delincuencia,playas
- Calidez, Comida, Playas
- Casa, comida
- Chile, soccer, cerveza
- Corrupción
- corrupción, pobreza, hermoso
- cultura narcotrafico injusticia
- Diversidad,cultura
- Hermoso, cultura, variedad

Family
- Parents, Love, Brother
- Pets, Siblings, Holidays
- Sundays, laughter, love

Familia
- amor comprension respeto
- Amor, respeto, union
- amor, unión, cuidado

- Parents
- siblings, parents, love
- Love, food, friendship
- Closeness, happiness, supportive, loving
- love, together
- Mom, Dad, Together
- Love
- ohio, mom, dad
- Happiness, love, Arizona
- love, trust, life
- My life and my everything
- The most important thing in my life.
- Love

- Amor,apoyo,compañía
- Hermano, papá, mamá
- lo mas importante
- Tranquilidad
- Unión, hermanos, apoyo
- Unidad, Soporte, Felicidad
- union,amor,respeto

Success
- Hard work, Discipline, Focus
- Good Job, College Degree
- Happiness, pride, money
- Happiness
- money, gold
- Happiness, achievement, love
- Journalist, graduation, stability, career
- money, power, happiness
- Awesome, Fulfilling
- Perceptive
- uncertainty, dreams, patience
- Content, satisfaction, achieving a goal
- money, freedom, goals
- Being a good mom for my kids and being a great wife
- To be successful is to be happy.
- Career

Éxito
- Buenas calificaciones, metas, destacar
- dinero, traje, emprendedor
- escuela,estudio,trabajo
- esfuerzo metas capacidad
- Esfuerzo, metas y triunfos
- Esfuerzo,desempeño
- Felicidad
- Globalización, Trabajo, Escuela
- trabajo
- trabajo, dinero
- Yo, alcanzar, esfuerzo

A good leader is someone who...
- takes control of difficult situations. A leader is strong, wise and brave.
- Is a good listener.
- who people respect and choose to follow for the right reasons. He/she is someone people look up to and go to when they need advice and provide a boost of confidence.
- takes multiple opinions into consideration when making a decision.
- takes control and leads people in the right direction.
- involves the team he or she leads directly in the

Un buen líder es alguien que...
- …entiende y sabe trabajar con su equipo. …sabe cuales son las habilidades de los integrantes
- Contesta todas tus preguntas con respuestas creíbles y estudia para mejorar cada día.
- es alguien que sabe mantener a un grupo y alguien que sabe que hacer.
- es responsable de sus actos.
- Es una persona organizada, perseverante, responsable, con una mision en mano.

task at hand by delegating responsibilities and making each member feel valuable and important to the process.
- does not need others in order to try new things or make changes.
- does what is right.
- takes control and understands what their followers want.
- takes responsibility.
- inspires, teaches, motivates, and creates
- can inspire others to be the best version of themselves.
- sets a good example and makes good decisions.
- leaves the group he is leading in a better place through trust
- is able to confidently assist others in making strides toward success.
- leads by example.

- escucha y hace que lo escuchen, acepta a las personas que lo rodean
- sabe cómo tomar las mejores decisiones
- sabe como controlar a las personas
- sabe dirigir un grupo sabiendo superar dificultades.
- sabe llevar por un buen camino a un grupo de personas.
- Sabe tratar a la gente y es emprendedor
- Se preocupa por los demás,es inteligente y sabe liderar un grupo.
- tiene claro sus objetivos y bajo cualquier reto logra sus metas
- Tiene iniciativa y mueve a las masas
- tiene la capacidad de ver por los demás y no solo por el.
- Un buen líder es alguien que: se preocupa por los demás. Un buen líder es alguien que: toma las mejores decisiones para sus seguidores

My greatest worry is...
- I will not be the best man i can be. I worry I will lose out on opportunities due to lack of focus and participation.
- Not getting a good job right out of college.
- My greatest worry is finishing this semester and graduating.
- that I will not be successful and happy in my life.
- maintaining all of my responsibilities.
- being overwhelmed with things I cannot do.
- not being as successful as I want to be.
- death.
- that I will fail out of school
- not fulfilling my purpose.
- no ones business
- not being able to provide for my family.
- not succeeding in life but I am confident that I will.
- I am not a good mom or give the best life possible to my kids and family
- that I will not be able to make as big of a change in the world as I want to.
- that I will not be successful.

Mi mayor preocupación es...
- el narcotrafico, la inseguridad y la contaminacion mundial
- La escuela y mi país
- la escuela.
- la inseguridad en mi país, la pobreza mundial
- Mi mayor preocupación es: el curso del futuro, la incertidumbre de no saber lo que pudiera llegar a pasar.
- no cumplir con todas mis metas.
- no pasar a una buena universidad
- No tengo
- Perder a algún ser querido
- que algo le pase a mi familia
- que le pase algo a las personas que quiero
- que le pase algo malo a algún ser querido
- que mi familia no pueda estar conmigo y que las personas que quiero sufran
- que mi pais pueda salir adelante.
- que un ser querido muera
- sabiendo que algo esta mal y no poder hacer nada.

If I see someone cheating on the exam, I...

- Throw my pencil at them and shake my head with disappointment.
- Mind my own business.
- I typically don't say anything. If I notice them looking at my test, then I give them a look and do my best to cover my answers.
- would tell them to stop and tell them how much trouble they can get in.
- get upset but don't usually have the guts to tell but sometimes I do!
- usually don't say anything and hope that they get caught. I don't like cheaters, but I don't like to "snitch" on people.
- give them a dirty look and hope the teacher notices.
- lose trust in that person.
- talk to them about it first and then notify a teacher.
- don't care.
- I'd be focused on my own test, not someone else's
- Confront them later and ask them if they need help.
- would inform the instructor of I may have seen.
- will not let them get away with it.
- confront them myself, and if it does not stop I tell someone of authority.
- complete my test and tell someone if I am asked.

Si veo alguien copia en un examen, yo...

- Aviso a la maestra
- Continuo con mi examen, no es asunto mío
- Es problema de la persona que lo está haciendo, no hago nada
- Hablaría con mi compañero lo haría recapacitar, pero si posteriormente lo sigue haciendo, hablaría con el profesor.
- hablaria con esa persona para hacerlo recapacitar y decirle que eso no es honesto y habla muy mal de quien es –
- Le digo que no lo haga porqué se está haciendo mal a él no a los demás
- Le digo que sea honesto consigo mismo
- Le diría que no tiene sentido copiar, no se aprende nada de esa manera
- No digo nada, los mirones son de palo.
- no diria nada ya que no debo meterme en problemas que no me corresponden.
- no hago nada
- No me parece justo ya que tenemos que esforzarnos por nuestras metas.
- pensaría mal de esa persona.
- pensaria que no aprendera nada al final del curso y que ya esta bastante maduro para saber lo que hace
- seguramente no estudió, se está perjudicando a si mismo
- sinceramente no diría nada, y fingiría que no vi nada.

If somebody on the street asks me money, I ...

- Give them the change in my pocket, or act like i don't see them.
- Give them change if I have any
- I normally say no because I don't carry cash or change but also know most people use it for tobacco and alcohol. I do offer to buy them some water and an apple.
- usually give it to them if I have some.
- give them money sometimes.
- usually don't have any to give.
- don't give them money but buy them food instead.

Si alguien en la calle me pide dinero, yo...

- Creo que sí le daría dinero. Probablemente lo necesite, pero también dependería de la situación de la persona y el contexto en el que se me pida el dinero.
- depende de quien sea, si es una persona que realente se ve necesitada le doy, si es uan persona que puede trabajar no le doy.
- Depende quien sea y si en verdad está necesitado
- dependeria de quien fuera, si yo veo

- give them some.
- give them whatever change I have
- offer food instead.
- almost never have any.
- ask them if I can buy them a meal if I do not have cash.
- give it to them or buy them food.
- will help them if I have it.
- prefer to give them something like food and/or water. I feel that giving them money could enable bad habits that will get them into a worse position, so if I give them something that will help them survive, they will benefit more.
- give them food or clothing because they may have an addiction.

que lo quiere para drogarse preferiria darle comida, si de verdad lo necesita y yo puedo darselo se lo daria.
- Dependiendo de su apariencia tal vez le doy un poco o le compro algo de comida
- le daria si es incapacitado pero si esta sano no le daria nada y pensaria que mejor se pusiera a trabajar
- Le digo que se ponga a trabajar o a vender algo, que el dinero no llega alzando la mano.
- le doy cualquier aportación que tenga darle a la mano.
- Le doy unas monedas.
- Lo ignoro y sigo caminando.
- Me negaría si fuera alguien desconocido
- pensaria que quiere el dinero para alimentar algun vicio
- Pues depende de como vea a la persona, habitualmente no es bueno fomentar esto.
- si es un niño o un anciano les doy dinero.
- si veo que la persona lo necesita realmente se lo doy y si es un nino o un anciano porque los adultos pueden buscar trabajo.
- stas sano y con buena edad, porfavor ponte a trabajar o a estudiar

APPENDIX E

WORKSHEET 2

American students' responses (sessions A&B) to the word associations, completion of culturally-based sentences and responses to the hypothetical situations in English and in Spanish, and archived Mexican students' responses to the word associations, completion of culturally-based sentences and responses to the hypothetical situations in Spanish.

N.B. This worksheet contains responses of all students in classes. However, not all of them gave informed consent to use their data. For this reason, although during the assignment the students were able to see all responses, only comments from the students who gave their informed consent were analyzed in the study.

Session A

ASU students responses in English	*ASU students responses in Spanish*	*Mexican students responses*
USA		
	• país	• AVGN, GTA IV, oportunidades
• Land of opportunity, fast food, military	• libertad, las hamburguesas	• ciencia, tecnologia
• my home country	• casa, grande, rojo y blanco y azul	• dolares, norte
• Flag, patriotism, home	• libertad, rica, muchas problemas	• Empire state, baseball, Estatua de la libertad
• President, History	• el campo, diversidad cultural	• Manhattan, migración, dinero
• Home, Land of the free	• una variedad gran de gente, todas las tipas de comidas	• poder dinero gobierno
• greed	• hogar - libertad	• Poder, obama, leyes
• freedom, democracy, home	• Libertad, democracia, industrializado, Inicio	• poder,dinero, buen gobierno
• Freedom	• libertad, felicidad, empleo	• Tecnología, Trabajo, Seguridad
• melting-pot, South	• poblacion grande, mejor, mi casa	• Tecnología,seguridad
Mexico		
• Cartels, produce, spring break	• vacaciones	• belleza
• Juarez, my culture, my life	• las playas, vacaciones	• Bicentenario, narcotrafico, cultura.
• Warmth, in-laws, fun	• Caliente, amigos, pronto familia	• bonito,delincuencia,playas
• Spanish, Culture, Fun	• comida, playas, drogas	• Calidez, Comida, Playas
• Food, border crisis	• las pirámides, cancún	• Casa, comida
	• Tenochtitlan, Aztecas, tacos, drogas	• Chile, soccer, cerveza
		• Corrupción

- immigrants
- exotic, hot, scenery
- Food
- Aztecs, Teotihuacan
- beaches, violence, immigration

- comida - migracion ilegal
- Más barato, Español, caliente, playas
- Idioma español, al sur de América, Imperio Azteca
- espanol, vecino, la playa

- corrupción, pobreza, hermoso
- cultura narcotrafico injusticia
- Diversidad,cultura
- Hermoso, cultura, variedad

Family

- Love, support, safety
- love and miss them everyday
- My children, love, safety
- Dad, Home
- Love, commitment
- support
- love, caring, protection
- Marriage
- love, security
- my husband, my daughter, sacrifice

- casa
- Te amo mi hermanita. Mi gato y my perro son mi familia.
- amor, niños, seguro
- la casa, nietos, reuniones
- seguridad, felicidad, querer
- por sangre, por elección, grande
- amor - preposito
- Pequeña, amor, mi hijo, seguridad
- Fiestas, quinceañera, catolicismo romano
- amor, mi hija, seguro

- amor comprension respeto
- Amor, respeto, union
- amor, unión, cuidado
- Amor,apoyo,compañía
- Hermano, papá, mamá
- lo mas importante
- Tranquilidad
- Unión, hermanos, apoyo
- Unidad, Soporte, Felicidad
- union,amor,respeto

Success

- Good job, college degree, happiness
- Money, no debt
- Proud, accomplishment, degree
- Degree, Independence
- Winning, feeling accomplished
- progress
- money, career, work
- Hard work
- stability, finances, achievement
- sacrifice, hard work, not wanting for anything

- trabajo
- dinero, negocio
- título, feliz familia, limpiar casa
- dinero, amor proprio
- un bueno sueldo; felicidad
- compartir sabiduría de su experiencias
- ganar - contento
- Conocimiento, carrera, dinero, casa
- las metas son realizadas, feliz
- una casa bella, me gusta mi trabajo, tengo un doctorado

- Buenas calificaciones, metas, destacar
- dinero, traje, emprendedor
- escuela,estudio,trabajo
- esfuerzo metas capacidad
- Esfuerzo, metas y triunfos
- Esfuerzo,desempeño
- Felicidad
- Globalización, Trabajo, Escuela
- trabajo
- trabajo, dinero
- Yo, alcanzar, esfuerzo

A good leader is someone who..

- is humble, honest and understanding with a solid vision. Knows how to effectively redirect her people without bickering with them. Seeks to give praise rather than earn praise. Wants to progress as a whole not as an individual. Honestly has her peoples' best interest at heart.
- Can lead but also can coach other people to be leaders.
- is stern, but fair and always consistent.
- cares about others more than him/herself.

- escucha a la gente.
- es alguien que es justo y humilde.
- ayuda a otros tener éxito.
- puede tomar decisiones firmes
- que es simpático, responsable, y puede trabajar bien con otras personas.
- enseña los empleados por su acciones

- …entiende y sabe trabajar con su equipo. …sabe cuales son las habilidades de los integrantes
- Contesta todas tus preguntas con respuestas creíbles y estudia para mejorar cada día.
- es alguien que sabe mantener a un grupo y alguien que sabe que hacer.

127

- is consistent and never asks others to do something he/she wouldn't do themselves.
- is capable of working well with and guiding a team.
- thinks about what is best for others instead of himself.
- takes action when necessary
- benevolent, tolerant, and works well with others.
- wants to get the project (data/metrics) completed by being supportive and putting the people above the things. They want the people to be successful and as they support the people the things get done.

- es consistente.
- Es inteligente, cree en el valor de otras personas y no es demasiado orgulloso todavía no sé la respuesta, pero vamos a encontrarlo.
- un hombre que respeta la cultura de su gente.
- quiere ayudar los otros se empeñan estar en plena forma.

- es responsable de sus actos.
- Es una persona organizada, perseverante, responsable, con una mision en mano.
- escucha y hace que lo escuchen, acepta a las personas que lo rodean
- sabe cómo tomar las mejores decisiones
- sabe como controlar a las personas
- sabe dirigir un grupo sabiendo superar dificultades.
- sabe llevar por un buen camino a un grupo de personas.
- Sabe tratar a la gente y es emprendedor
- Se preocupa por los demás,es inteligente y sabe liderar un grupo.
- tiene claro sus objetivos y bajo cualquier reto logra sus metas
- Tiene iniciativa y mueve a las masas
- tiene la capacidad de ver por los demás y no solo por el.
- Un buen líder es alguien que: se preocupa por los demás. Un buen líder es alguien que: toma las mejores decisiones para sus seguidores

My greatest worry is..

- for the safety, good health and happiness of my children.
- so much debt that my life will not be enjoyable, and I will always be working to pay debt.
- that I will fail and be a disappointment to my children.
- being able to provide for myself without any help.
- going through life never finding a career that I am passionate about.
- failing to achieve my goals.
- that something bad will

- terminando escuela.
- está trabajando a tiempo completo y ser un estudiante de tiempo completo.
- haciendo que mi familia sea infeliz.
- sobreviviendo a mis ahorros
- Mi mayor preocupación es no puedo para conseguir mis metas.
- a ser fiel a yo y mi familia.
- no encontrar la carrera profesional que me apasione.
- ¿Qué pasará con mi hijo cuando ya no estoy para cuidar de él?
- el bienestar de mis hijos.

- el narcotrafico, la inseguridad y la contaminacion mundial
- La escuela y mi país
- la escuela.
- la inseguridad en mi país, la pobreza mundial
- Mi mayor preocupación es: el curso del futuro, la incertidumbre de no saber lo que pudiera llegar a pasar.
- no cumplir con todas mis metas.
- no pasar a una buena universidad
- No tengo
- Perder a algún ser querido

happen to my son when I'm gone.
- outliving my savings
- being unable to accomplish my goals.
- not being able to provide for my daughter
.

- no acabo el año escolar porque no tengo tiempo

- que algo le pase a mi familia
- que le pase algo a las personas que quiero
- que le pase algo malo a algún ser querido
- que mi familia no pueda estar conmigo y que las personas que quiero sufran
- que mi pais pueda salir adelante.
- que un ser querido muera
- sabiendo que algo esta mal y no poder hacer nada.

If I see someone cheating on the exam, I...

- would probably walk away with less respect for that person. However, if it was an important test that affected many others, such as a driver's license test, or a drug test, I would notify someone in charge.
- tell a professor.
- tell them they need to stop because cheating isn't fair or ethical.
- ignore them and continue working on my own test; what is important is that I don't cheat.
- would tell them it is not benefiting them any to do that.
- allow them to do so. They're only shortchanging themselves.
- would mind my own business.
- would mention it to the teacher.
- feel uncomfortable.
- ask them why and tell the professor.

- yo evito esta persona.

- No le digo a la profesora, pero impedir que la persona usando mi examen.
- decirles que no copia más
- mencionarlo al instructor
- estoy incómodo.
- trataría a obtener su atención para influirle a terminar.
- le diría que no es buena idea.
- Me importa mi propio negocio y concentrarme en mi propia prueba.

- diría al profesor.
- digo el profesor

- Aviso a la maestra
- Continuo con mi examen, no es asunto mío
- Es problema de la persona que lo está haciendo, no hago nada
- Hablaría con mi compañero lo haría recapacitar, pero si posteriormente lo sigue haciendo, hablaría con el profesor.
- hablaria con esa persona para hacerlo recapacitar y decirle que eso no es honesto y habla muy mal de quien es –
- Le digo que no lo haga porqué se está haciendo mal a él no a los demás
- Le digo que sea honesto consigo mismo
- Le diría que no tiene sentido copiar, no se aprende nada de esa manera
- No digo nada, los mirones son de palo.
- no diria nada ya que no debo meterme en problemas que no me corresponden.
- no hago nada
- No me parece justo ya que tenemos que esforzarnos por nuestras metas.
- pensaría mal de esa persona.
- pensaria que no aprendera nada al final del

curso y que ya esta bastante maduro para saber lo que hace

- seguramente no estudió, se está perjudicando a si mismo
- sinceramente no diría nada, y fingiría que no vi nada.

If someone on the street asks me for money, I...

- first ask if I may pray with them. Then offer to buy them a meal rather than give them cash.
- give them money if I have enough.
- discuss what they need the money for and go and buy them the items that they require, rather than just giving them money.
- ask them why they need it and offer what I can.
- will give them a dollar.
- give what I can if it's available.
- would give something if I had it.
- don't give them any
- give them some if I have it because if it is within one's power to give, one should.
- give them a dollar if I have it
.

- le doy el dinero.
- Voy a tratar de comprar comida no darles dinero.
- voy a comprarlo lo que necesita.
- no les dan ninguna
- Si alguien en la calle me pide dinero, yo se lo daría a él o ella. porque si se puede la oportunidad para dar, se debe.
- sonreiría pero no sé lo que haría con el dinero. Yo pensaría mucho antes de me lo gastaría.
- le doy un poquito.,
- Daría lo que he podido.
- no daría el dinero, pero ofrecería comprarle comida.
- doy un dolar si lo tengo

- Creo que sí le daría dinero. Probablemente lo necesite, pero también dependería de la situación de la persona y el contexto en el que se me pida el dinero.
- depende de quien sea, si es una persona que realente se ve necesitada le doy, si es uan persona que puede trabajar no le doy.
- Depende quien sea y si en verdad está necesitado
- dependeria de quien fuera, si yo veo que lo quiere para drogarse preferiria darle comida, si de verdad lo necesita y yo puedo darselo se lo daria.
- Dependiendo de su apariencia tal vez le doy un poco o le compro algo de comida
- le daria si es incapacitado pero si esta sano no le daria nada y pensaria que mejor se pusiera a trabajar
- Le digo que se ponga a trabajar o a vender algo, que el dinero no llega alzando la mano.
- le doy cualquier aportación que tenga darle a la mano.
- Le doy unas monedas.
- Lo ignoro y sigo caminando.
- Me negaría si fuera alguien desconocido
- pensaria que quiere el dinero para alimentar algun vicio
- Pues depende de como vea a la persona, habitualmente no es bueno fomentar esto.
- si es un niño o un anciano les doy dinero.
- si veo que la persona lo necesita realmente se lo doy y si es un nino o un anciano porque los adultos pueden buscar trabajo.
- stas sano y con buena edad, porfavor ponte a trabajar o a estudiar

130

Session B

USA

ASU, Responses in English	ASU, Responses in Spanish	TEC de Pachuca, México

- Leaders, Innovative, Strong
- New york, Food
- Stars and Stripes, No such thing as a free lunch, football
- Red, White and Blue
- red, white and blue
- Political, Military, Unhealthy
- French fries, red white and blue, diversity
- Freedom, patriot
- Freedom, Hamburgers
- Mixing Pot
- Americans, flags, war
- Freedom, liberty, peace and prosperity
- "land of the free", Freedom, life
- Home of the free and land of the brave
- Superior. Melting pot. The country I grew up in.
- Home

ASU, Responses in Spanish
- Es muy grande.
- Casa de los valientes, el béisbol, gran militar
- la libertad , la diversidad
- Arizona, grande
- Libertad, comida, inglés
- país de origen
- el hogar de los valientes y la tierra de los valientes
- el lugar donde vivo y donde he crecido, es un crisol de diferentes pueblos y culturas.
- Diversidad
- El país, libertad, historia
- libre, opciones, Democracia
- béisbol, libertad
- New York, American Flag, Free Country
- Libertad, barras y estrellas, Obama
- mis país
- Americanos, el centro comercial y el fútbol americano

TEC de Pachuca, México
- AVGN, GTA IV, oportunidades
- ciencia, tecnologia
- dolares, norte
- Empire state, baseball, Estatua de la libertad
- Manhattan, migración, dinero
- poder dinero gobierno
- Poder, obama, leyes
- poder,dinero, buen gobierno
- Tecnología, Trabajo, Seguridad
- Tecnología,seguridad

Mexico

ASU, Responses in English
- Cancun, Fishing, Food
- Vacation, Cartel, Beaches
- Chicharito, history, nature
- Sombreros
- tacos, salsa, sombrero
- Colorful, markets, haggle
- The beach, foreign language, delicious food
- soccer, beaches
- Quinceñera, Burritos, Spicy
- Disaster
- deorro, spanish, carne
- Amazing food, beaches, poverty,
- food, carne asada, border
- Really good food
- South of the United States. Culture and diversity.
- Country

ASU, Responses in Spanish
- Un lugar que un gustaría visitar.
- Cancún, Chichén Itzá, Chicharito
- tacos , salsa, la bandera mexicana
- comida, familia, feliz
- Buena comida, fútbol
- país
- La comida mexicana
- colorido
- el idioma español, la cultura, un país que limita con los Estados Unidos.
- muy buena comida, México ciy
- hispaña, fiesta, Cinco De Mayo
- playa, comida
- drug dealer, cartel, boarder
- Playas, Sombreros y Piñas Coladas
- la ciudad
- cultura, la Cuidad de México y los colores

TEC de Pachuca, México
- belleza
- Bicentenario, narcotrafico, cultura.
- bonito,delincuencia,playas
- Calidez, Comida, Playas
- Casa, comida
- Chile, soccer, cerveza
- Corrupción
- corrupción, pobreza, hermoso
- cultura narcotrafico injusticia
- Diversidad,cultura
- Hermoso, cultura, variedad

Family

ASU, Responses in English	ASU, Responses in Spanish	TEC de Pachuca, México
	■ Amo a mi familia.	■ amor comprension respeto
■ Parents, Love, Brother	■ la cena, vacaciones, amor	■ Amor, respeto, union
■ Pets, Siblings, Holidays	■ diversión, amor, consuelo	■ amor, unión, cuidado
■ Sundays, laughter, love	■ amor. mama, hermana	■ Amor,apoyo,compañía
■ Parents	■ Mis padres, mi hermano	■ Hermano, papá, mamá
■ siblings, parents, love	■ amar	■ lo mas importante
■ Love, food, friendship	■ Proximidad	■ Tranquilidad
■ Closeness, happiness, supportive, loving	■ Tengo la mejor familia	■ Unión, hermanos, apoyo
■ love, together	■ el amor, mis hermanos, padres, sobrinas y sobrinos. La familia es la primera cosa en mi vida.	■ Unidad, Soporte, Felicidad
■ Mom, Dad, Together	■ el corazón, vida, amar	■ union,amor,respeto
■ Love	■ Mamá, papá, hermana	
■ ohio, mom, dad	■ simpático, amar	
■ Happiness, love, Arizona	■ parents, siblings, dog	
■ love, trust, life	■ Feliz, amor y momentos de diversión	
■ My life and my everything	■ las fiestas	
■ The most important thing in my life.	■ mi hermana, mis padres, y amor	
■ Love		

Success

ASU, Responses in English	ASU, Responses in Spanish	TEC de Pachuca, México
	■ fútbol, fútbol americano, jugando con mi hija	
■ Hard work, Discipline, Focus	■ dinero , trabajo, casa	■ Buenas calificaciones, metas, destacar
■ Good Job, College Degree	■ hit, Musica, y Selena	■ dinero, traje, emprendedor
■ Happiness, pride, money	■ Graduación, carrera	■ escuela,estudio,trabajo
■ Happiness	■ carrera	■ esfuerzo metas capacidad
■ money, gold	■ El exito de la autopista	■ Esfuerzo, metas y triunfos
■ Happiness, achievement, love	■ la felicidad. El éxito viene cuando a superar los retos que ha establecido para sí mismo, y si sigue desafiarse a sí mismo después de eso.	■ Esfuerzo,desempeño
■ Journalist, graduation, stability, career	■ Pasando español 202.	■ Felicidad
■ money, power, happiness	■ Felicidad, encontrar la paz, para lograr un objetivo	■ Globalización, Trabajo, Escuela
■ Awesome, Fulfilling	■ buen trabajo porque me siento orgulloso de mí mismo.	■ trabajo
■ Perceptive	■ universidad, dinero	■ trabajo, dinero
■ uncertainty, dreams, patience	■ college, job, family	■ Yo, alcanzar, esfuerzo
■ Content, satisfaction, achieving a goal	■ felicidad	
■ money, freedom, goals	■ Un buen trabajo, dinero y una familia feliz	
■ Being a good mom for my kids and being a great wife	■ bueno	
■ To be successful is to be happy.	■ trabajo, educación y tarea	
■ Career		

A good leader is someone who...

ASU, Responses in English	ASU, Responses in Spanish	TEC de Pachuca, México

- takes control of difficult situations. A leader is strong, wise and brave.
- Is a good listener.
- who people respect and choose to follow for the right reasons. He/she is someone people look up to and go to when they need advice and provide a boost of confidence.
- takes multiple opinions into consideration when making a decision.
- takes control and leads people in the right direction.
- involves the team he or she leads directly in the task at hand by delegating responsibilities and making each member feel valuable and important to the process.
- does not need others in order to try new things or make changes.
- does what is right.
- takes control and understands what their followers want.
- takes responsibility.
- inspires, teaches, motivates, and creates
- can inspire others to be the best version of themselves.
- sets a good example and makes good decisions.
- leaves the group he is leading in a better place through trust
- is able to confidently assist others in making strides toward success.
- leads by example.

- .ayuda a otros a tener exito.
- Un buen líder es alguien que cada uno respete.
- ayuda a las personas de guía en la dirección correcta .
- Escucha
- es alguien que es respetuoso y exitoso.
- puede dar y tomar la dirección muy bien.
- es alguien que escucha. Un buen líder también encuentra una solución a los problemas.
- escucha a todas las personas.
- es alguien que anima a otros a tener éxito y que tiene confianza en sí mismo.
- es capaz de inspirar a la gente a convertirse en las personas que desean ser.
- entiende lo que quieren sus seguidores, y puede ejecutar esas necesidades en la medida de sus necesidades.
- es inteligente y fuerte.
- escucha a todo el mundo
- es amable, comprometido y apasionado.
- inspirar a otros a soñar más, aprender más, hacer más y más
- tiene respeto por la ley.

- …entiende y sabe trabajar con su equipo. …sabe cuales son las habilidades de los integrantes
- Contesta todas tus preguntas con respuestas creíbles y estudia para mejorar cada día.
- es alguien que sabe mantener a un grupo y alguien que sabe que hacer.
- es responsable de sus actos.
- Es una persona organizada, perseverante, responsable, con una mision en mano.
- escucha y hace que lo escuchen, acepta a las personas que lo rodean
- sabe cómo tomar las mejores decisiones
- sabe como controlar a las personas
- sabe dirigir un grupo sabiendo superar dificultades.
- sabe llevar por un buen camino a un grupo de personas.
- Sabe tratar a la gente y es emprendedor
- Se preocupa por los demás,es inteligente y sabe liderar un grupo.
- tiene claro sus objetivos y bajo cualquier reto logra sus metas
- Tiene iniciativa y mueve a las masas
- tiene la capacidad de ver por los demás y no solo por el.
- Un buen líder es alguien que: se preocupa por los demás. Un buen líder es alguien que: toma las mejores decisiones para sus seguidores

My greatest worry is...

ASU, Responses in English

- I will not be the best man i can be. I worry I will lose out on opportunities due to lack of focus and participation.
- Not getting a good job right out of college.
- My greatest worry is finishing this semester and graduating.
- that I will not be successful and happy in my life.
- maintaining all of my responsibilities.
- being overwhelmed with things

ASU, Responses in Spanish

- terminar mis clases este semestre y graduarse en diciembre.
- el cuidado de mi hijo.
- no tener éxito en mi negocio.
- graduarse a tiempo con mi título.
- ser un éxito en la vida. Quiero el éxito pero quiero ser feliz también.
- mi hijos tendrán una vida difícil.
- no pasando español 202.
- encontrar dónde estoy más feliz en la vida. Estoy preocupado por hacerlo bien en la escuela de posgrado y la búsqueda de una carrera que me

TEC de Pachuca, México

- el narcotrafico, la inseguridad y la contaminacion mundial
- La escuela y mi país
- la escuela.
- la inseguridad en mi país, la pobreza mundial
- Mi mayor preocupación es: el curso del futuro, la incertidumbre de no saber lo que pudiera llegar a pasar.
- no cumplir con todas mis

I cannot do.
- not being as successful as I want to be.
- death.
- that I will fail out of school
- not fulfilling my purpose.
- no ones business
- not being able to provide for my family.
- not succeeding in life but I am confident that I will.
- I am not a good mom or give the best life possible to my kids and family
- that I will not be able to make as big of a change in the world as I want to.
- that I will not be successful.

encanta.
- ser perezoso
- problemas con salud de mi ser querido
- universidad graduándose.
- pagar mis cuentas.
- que no voy a tener éxito en mi vida.
- escritura y gramática en Español
- mis clases.

metas.
- no pasar a una buena universidad
- No tengo
- Perder a algún ser querido
- que algo le pase a mi familia
- que le pase algo a las personas que quiero
- que le pase algo malo a algún ser querido
- que mi familia no pueda estar conmigo y que las personas que quiero sufran
- que mi pais pueda salir adelante.
- que un ser querido muera
- sabiendo que algo esta mal y no poder hacer nada.

If I see somebody cheating on the exam, I...

ASU, Responses in English

- Throw my pencil at them and shake my head with disappointment.
- Mind my own business.
- I typically don't say anything. If I notice them looking at my test, then I give them a look and do my best to cover my answers.
- would tell them to stop and tell them how much trouble they can get in.
- get upset but don't usually have the guts to tell but sometimes I do!
- usually don't say anything and hope that they get caught. I don't like cheaters, but I don't like to "snitch" on people.
- give them a dirty look and hope the teacher notices.
- lose trust in that person.
- talk to them about it first and then notify a teacher.
- don't care.
- I'd be focused on my own test, not someone else's
- Confront them later and ask them if they need help.
- would inform the instructor of I may have seen.
- will not let them get away with it.
- confront them myself, and if it

ASU, Responses in Spanish

- ...decirles el profesor.
- Me concentro en mi prueba y trato de hacer bien
- Estoy enojado y cubro mi examen.
- decirle al maestro lo que he visto.
- me molesto pero no le diré.
- yo completo mi examen y digo la verdad cuando alguien pregunta.
- diria algo a la profesora.
- yo abordarlos directamente diciéndoles que no deben copiar a alguien más es el trabajo duro. Si no cambian lo que están haciendo, yo le diría a alguien de autoridad.
- Voy a la persona después de la prueba y preguntarles si les gustaría ayuda sobre el tema.
- advertirles que no deben hacer eso y luego notificar a un miembro de la administración.
- digo al profesor
- voy a hacer nada. Yo soy tímido.
- ocuparme de mis asuntos y terminar mi prueba
- les advierto de las consecuencias.
- Me concentro en mi propia examen
- hago mi propio examen.

TEC de Pachuca, México

- Aviso a la maestra
- Continuo con mi examen, no es asunto mío
- Es problema de la persona que lo está haciendo, no hago nada
- Hablaría con mi compañero lo haría recapacitar, pero si posteriormente lo sigue haciendo, hablaría con el profesor.
- hablaria con esa persona para hacerlo recapacitar y decirle que eso no es honesto y habla muy mal de quien es –
- Le digo que no lo haga porqué se está haciendo mal a él no a los demás
- Le digo que sea honesto consigo mismo
- Le diría que no tiene sentido copiar, no se aprende nada de esa manera
- No digo nada, los mirones son de palo.
- no diria nada ya que no debo meterme en problemas que no me corresponden.
- no hago nada
- No me parece justo ya que tenemos que esforzarnos por nuestras metas.
- pensaría mal de esa persona.
- pensaria que no aprendera nada al final del curso y que ya esta

134

does not stop I tell someone of authority.
- complete my test and tell someone if I am asked.

bastante maduro para saber lo que hace
- seguramente no estudió, se está perjudicando a si mismo
- sinceramente no diría nada, y fingiría que no vi nada.

If somebody on the street asks me money, I ...

ASU, Responses in English

▪ Give them the change in my pocket, or act like i don't see them.
▪ Give them change if I have any
▪ I normally say no because I don't carry cash or change but also know most people use it for tobacco and alcohol. I do offer to buy them some water and an apple.
▪ usually give it to them if I have some.
▪ give them money sometimes.
▪ usually don't have any to give.
▪ don't give them money but buy them food instead.
▪ give them some.
▪ give them whatever change I have
▪ offer food instead.
▪ almost never have any.
▪ ask them if I can buy them a meal if I do not have cash.
▪ give it to them or buy them food.
▪ will help them if I have it.
▪ prefer to give them something like food and/or water. I feel that giving them money could enable bad habits that will get them into a worse position, so if I give them something that will help them survive, they will benefit more.
▪ give them food or clothing because they may have an addiction.

ASU, Responses in Spanish

▪ ...decirles que no tengo dinero.
▪ Yo les digo "no" y ofrecer a comprar un sandwich
▪ a veces buscar dólares.
▪ darles dinero.
▪ los compro comida.
▪ yo compro comida o ropa porque es posible tener un adicción.
▪ daría comida a la persona
▪ trato de darles alimentos o agua en lugar. Creo que darle a alguien que vive en el dinero calles podría hacerles daño peor, ya que pueden usarlo para comprar drogas o alcohol o gastarlo en algo que podría perjudicar su situación más. Si yo les doy comida o agua, es algo que sé que le ayudará a sobrevivir y avanzar.
▪ voy a hablar con la persona
▪ Si no tengo dinero, les pregunto si puedo comprar los alimentos.
▪ les doy el cambio en mi billeter.
▪ yo pago el dinero.
▪ darles el cambio
▪ les digo que no tengo ninguna.
▪ "Lo siento, no tengo dinero"
▪ continúo caminando.

TEC de Pachuca, México

▪ Creo que sí le daría dinero. Probablemente lo necesite, pero también dependería de la situación de la persona y el contexto en el que se me pida el dinero.
▪ depende de quien sea, si es una persona que realente se ve necesitada le doy, si es uan persona que puede trabajar no le doy.
▪ Depende quien sea y si en verdad está necesitado
▪ dependeria de quien fuera, si yo veo que lo quiere para drogarse preferiria darle comida, si de verdad lo necesita y yo puedo darselo se lo daria.
▪ Dependiendo de su apariencia tal vez le doy un poco o le compro algo de comida
▪ le daria si es incapacitado pero si esta sano no le daria nada y pensaria que mejor se pusiera a trabajar
▪ Le digo que se ponga a trabajar o a vender algo, que el dinero no llega alzando la mano.
▪ le doy cualquier aportación que tenga darle a la mano.
▪ Le doy unas monedas.
▪ Lo ignoro y sigo caminando.
▪ Me negaría si fuera alguien desconocido
▪ pensaria que quiere el dinero para alimentar algun vicio
▪ Pues depende de como vea a la persona, habitualmente no es bueno fomentar esto.
▪ si es un niño o un anciano les doy dinero.
▪ si veo que la persona lo necesita realmente se lo doy y si es un nino o un anciano porque los adultos pueden

buscar trabajo.

- stas sano y con buena edad, porfavor ponte a trabajar o a estudiar

APPENDIX F

CULTURAL QUESTIONNAIRE 3

In this questionnaire you are invited to compare/contrast the responses of your group to the fist cultural questionnaire with the responses to the same words/sentences/situations of Mexican students from Instituto Technológico de Pachuca, México. Your group responses are in English, while Mexican group responses are in Spanish. For each section (N=8) of this questionnaire there is a link to the webpage, where you will find both groups responses situated side by side. Look carefully at both sides of the responses for each word/sentence/situation and address the following questions for each word/sentence/situation. Your response for each section should be at least 100 words.

1. What do the responses from both sides have in common? What similar words/phrases appear on both sides?
2. What commonly held value/idea do you think prompted these responses?
3. What differences do you see in the responses on both sides? What words/phrases appear more on one side than on another? Are there words that appear on one side only?
4. What cultural values motivate the differences that you see?
5. Are the connotations attached to the words positive, negative or neutral? Give examples
6. In the responses of the reaction to the hypothetical situation (last 2 sections), who would interfere in the situation more and who would not?
7. Based on the most relevant similarities and differences you observed in all 8 questions, write **hypotheses** to try to explain these similarities and differences.

APPENDIX G

CULTURAL QUESTIONNAIRE 4

In this questionnaire you are invited to compare/contrast your group responses in

Spanish to:

1. Responses of your group in English
          AND
2. Responses of the Mexican students.

For each section of this questionnaire there is a link where you will find 3 sets of responses: (1) your group responses in English, (2) your group responses in Spanish, and (3) Mexican students' responses. Look carefully at all there columns of responses and answer in English the following question for each section:

- Do you think that your group Spanish responses are more similar to your group English responses OR to Mexican students' responses? Justify your reasoning and give two examples

APPENDIX H

RUBRICS TO ASSESS CRITICAL CULTURAL AWARENESS

Critical cultural awareness/political education - an ability to evaluate, critically and on the basis of explicit criteria, perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries

Levels : **1**(poor) - **2** - **3** - **4** - **5**(excellent)

	1 (incomplete understanding)	2 (understanding)	3 (analyzing)	4 (evaluating)	5 (creating)
Critical cultural awareness	Demonstrates unsatisfactory understanding of perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries	Demonstrates understanding and is able to list differences and similarities between perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries	Analyzes, compares and contrasts perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries	Profoundly evaluates, critically and on the basis of explicit criteria, perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries	Creates hypothesis and demonstrates abstract thinking with regards to perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries