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ABSTRACT

The trend in foreign language learning reflects a move from "fragmented" language to "whole" language (Rigg 1991). It includes the individual as well as the social aspect of language acquisition, and the integration of language and culture. Student international exchange programs provide the ideal atmosphere for "whole" language learning and the integration of language and culture in total language and cultural immersion.

Most research in international student exchange programs described the organization of the program or addressed a particular variable. There is a need for integrative "whole" research rather than "fragmented" research. The method chosen as most appropriate for this research is four ethnographic case studies of second language learning.

The following questions were addressed: a) what were the subjects motives for participating in the foreign exchange program and for learning English? b) What were the subjects perceptions, feelings and attitudes towards Americans? c) Did these change during their stay in the U.S.A? d) How and to what degree did the students develop communicative competence? The subjects are four Senior High School foreign exchange students, one each from the Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Spain and Colombia. They were observed during a nine month period.
Canale and Swain's (1980) integrative definition was used to study the emergence of communicative competence and its four parameters.

The gains in grammatical competence were estimated with a) T formula repeated-measure statistical design of the English Placement Test of the English Language Institute of the University of Michigan, taken at the beginning and at the end of the program. b) Comparison of the students' oral interviews and written work used to assess improvement throughout the nine month period. c) Student's self evaluation of their progress.

The other parameters of communicative competence were assessed through methods congruent with ethnographic research. Data were collected through participant observation, interviews, questionnaires, biographies, etc. The method of analysis used included through triangulation, constant study and recurring analysis of data in search for patterns, and comparison of notes from different observers.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

As a teacher of Spanish in an American public high school, I was impressed by the degree of proficiency reached by two of my former students who participated in a nine month international student exchange program in South America. During that time they reached what I judged to be between an advanced plus and superior degree of proficiency according to the ACTFL/ETS Proficiency Scales. As described in the ETS Oral Proficiency Testing Manual, these students were "able to speak the language with sufficient structural accuracy and vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations." These exchange students also acquired an understanding and appreciation for the culture in which they were immersed. They made close friendships and have maintained contact with their host families.

In contrast, in a regular college program "only one in five candidates who takes the Foreign Service Examination, including graduates with a foreign language major, obtain the "3" rating "superior" (Stokle 1988).

Carroll (1967) conducted a large scale study of 2,782 college seniors majoring in French, German, Italian, Russian, or Spanish at 203 institutions. A fairly consistent pattern emerged from the data: "a year of overseas study, on the average, brings students from around level two on the ESL
speaking scale (limited working proficiency) to around level three (minimum professional proficiency).

The learning environment plays a crucial role in foreign language acquisition. Yet, "the limited research on foreign language acquisition that has been completed to date has focused on methodological manipulation of classroom interactions" (Chadron 1988 and Freed 1991). Freed states that students, in increasing numbers, are participating in other learning environments. Among these are immersion programs, study-abroad experiences and the emerging technological environment. For the purpose of this dissertation immersion programs and the study abroad experience are addressed. Since these learning environments share in common with bilingual education the fact that the learners are immersed in the target language for at least part of the day, and that the target language is used for instruction in the subject area, bilingual education is also addressed.

IMMERSION PROGRAMS

Immersion programs are one of the oldest successful content-based foreign language programs in existence. The practice of providing educational instruction in a language different from that which the students normally use is not new or recent. Such instruction may date back as early as 3,000 B.C. (Mackey 1978). Immersion programs use the target language to teach regular academic subjects such as math,
science, and social studies in addition to language arts. In an immersion program, second language learning is incidental to learning cognitive skills and acquiring knowledge (Genesee 1987).

Immersion programs have clearly defined goals. Curtain and Pesola (1989) cite four primary goals of immersion instruction: 1) functional proficiency in the second language, 2) mastery of subject-content material of the curriculum, 3) cross-cultural understanding, and 4) achievement in English language arts comparable to that of the students in English only programs.

Immersion programs have clearly defined forms in order to structure curriculum properly along the time dimension. Differentiation of alternate forms of immersion are made between partial and total, and early (begins in kindergarten), delayed (begins in the fourth or fifth grade), late (begins in the secondary school), and sheltered (begins at the University level). To be considered an immersion program the target language needs to be used to teach at least fifty percent of the curriculum for at least one school year (Genesee 1989).

Immersion has had a role in promoting Canada's two official languages and in revitalizing heritage languages. In the United States the first immersion program began in Culver City, California, in 1971. It provides all curriculum instruction in kindergarten and first grade in Spanish.
English is introduced progressively until it reaches fifty percent English and fifty percent Spanish at the end of elementary school (Genesee 1985). A summary of United States immersion programs, developed by the Center for Applied Linguistics shows that 25 states and Washington, D.C. have immersion programs with 139 schools participating and a total enrollment of approximately 28,206 students. In Louisiana, there are 11 immersion schools with 894 students enrolled in French immersion and 3 schools with an enrollment of 348 in Spanish immersion. The oldest is a French immersion program which has been operating for nine years at Prien Lake Elementary School in Lake Charles.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Researchers see bilingual education and immersion programs as different because they do not address the same needs or use the same methods. Genesee (1987) defines immersion as "a form of bilingual education in which students who speak the language of the majority of the population receive part of their instruction through the medium of a second language and part through their first language." In immersion programs the students speak the language of the majority while in bilingual education they constitute the minority, for example, a Vietnamese immigrant learning English in the United States would be in bilingual education learning English as a second language. Also in bilingual education the target language is taught as a subject. This is
usually not the case in immersion programs. Nevertheless, both bilingual education and immersion have the same underlying concepts: a) the primary language is maintained, b) a second language is acquired, and c) content areas are taught in L2 and LI.

Bilingual education in the USA originated out of the needs of its ethnically diverse population (Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Native Americans, political refugees, etc.). An example is the large number of Cuban immigrants who started arriving in Florida in the early sixties. This group wished to maintain their mother tongue while acquiring English. As a result the Spanish/English bilingual programs were started in Dade County. These programs allowed the Cubans to maintain their mother tongue and acquire English while at the same time gave the Anglophone population the opportunity to acquire Spanish.

Two judicial landmarks assured the development of bilingual education in the United States: 1) The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 which allowed schools to establish bilingual education programs though they were not mandatory for individual schools (Romaine 1989), 2) The Lau vs. Nichols case in 1970 involving the Chinese parents of a public school student and the San Francisco Unified Schools. The Supreme Court decision stated that this student and others must either be taught their subjects in Chinese or be taught special English classes until they were proficient
enough to learn their subjects in that language (Paulston 1980). In 1975 guidelines dubbed Lau remedies were written by members of the Office of Civil Rights of the department of Health, Education and Welfare. These guidelines specified but did not mandate that school districts should provide bilingual education when they have twenty or more students of the same non-English group. Federal funds could be lost with non compliance (Ovando and Collier 1985; Paulton 1980).

There are two types of bilingual education: transitional and maintenance. Transitional programs try to get students out of bilingual education while the maintenance model does not (Ovando and Collier 1985). The students starting in the transitional program are taught in their native language at the beginning with English taught as a second language (ESL). They are mainstreamed as soon as they are able to comprehend the academic subjects taught in English, usually two years, during which time these students are segregated from the English speaking students. Ovado and Collier maintain that it takes about 3 or 4 years for students in (ESL) to attain an academic performance similar or better than monolingual students. Therefore, mainstreaming after two years seems premature. Also psychologists and educators feel that segregation perpetuates the existing barriers between students in these programs, who usually belong to economically disadvantaged groups, and the majority group population.
Maintenance bilingual education students are given content-area instruction in both LI and English. This type of instruction usually lasts only through the sixth grade. An advantage of this program is that it allows for more than two years to master English. Also, it allows for the maintenance of native languages and the development of ethnic pride.

THE STUDY ABROAD EXPERIENCE

Study abroad for the acquisition of a foreign language in the country where it is spoken is more akin to immersion programs than to bilingual education in its purpose and its method. Students studying abroad usually do not take any courses in their native language while students in bilingual education take courses in both LI and L2. Also, the type of students that participate in each program is different. Though like in bilingual education study abroad learners constitute a minority in their new environment, they usually belong to the middle class or higher and plan to return home. On the other hand, in the USA students in bilingual education are individuals considered at risk when performing tasks, especially academic ones and usually come from a low economic background.

The study abroad experience differs from immersion programs in that it provides both cultural and linguistic immersion. The international exchange students live in the country of the target language while students in immersion
programs remain in their own country. Study abroad provides
the best means for integrating culture and language, and the
ideal way to end prejudice and promote understanding among
people. Mark Twain says it best in the following quote:

Travel is fatal to prejudice, bigotry, and narrow
mindedness, and many of our people need it sorely
on these accounts. Broad, wholesome, charitable
views of men and things cannot be acquired by
vegetating in one little corner of the earth all
one's lifetime.

Mark Twain, The Innocents Abroad.

There are several broad categories of the study abroad
experience or linguistic and cultural immersion:

- a) organized exchange programs for the high school student,
- b) organized study abroad programs for the university
  student,
- c) organized work exchange programs,
- d) organized exchanges in elementary and middle schools,
- e) personal unstructured immersion in a foreign country for work,
  pleasure or professional growth. A general description of
  each of the organized programs follows.

Organized exchange programs for the high school student
may vary in duration from one month to a school year, and may
be privately, publicly or federally funded. The private not-
for-profit organization, the Council on Standards for
International Educational Travel (CSIET), was established in
1984 to develop standards and to provide a system for the
evaluation of programs. Its Advisory List (1987-88) provides
a list and a brief description of programs that have met
their standards (Moeller 1988). The list describes 36 different programs.

Most of the high school organized exchange programs provide for students to attend a regular secondary school in the country they are visiting; and for the students to reside with local host families. Some programs offer special academic components. For example, the four-week exchange program held by the Youth Council under the auspices of the Bavarian Ministry of Education consists of two distinct parts: culture and language. Culture, by topics is discussed in L1 and the target language is used to converse on specific themes such as family and school (Moeller 1988).

Course choices for the study abroad college student may be "in-house" or foreign institutional. "In-house" programs are organized specifically for foreign students. In the United States, English for foreign students is offered in institutions of higher education. At Louisiana State University this program consists of 22.5 hours of intensive English per week for foreign students enrolled in the program. The weakness of "In House" courses, confined as they are to program participants, is that "they perpetuate the narrow 'ghetto' environment and dilute the foreign experience" (Stokle 1988). Stokle warns against the "ghetto syndrome." He defines ghettos as the academic centers, bars, discos, hang-outs, or apartments shared with fellow compatriots.
In foreign institutional study abroad programs students attend regular courses in the university of the target language. To ensure the survival of the student in this environment, many programs have developed a tutorial support system.

Work exchange programs attract students from high schools and colleges as well as teachers. Participants are matched with host families and employment is found in corporations, government and other organizations. The only prerequisite is that participants must speak the target language well enough to "survive" the job situation.

Many exchange programs have been developed in elementary and middle schools. One of the goals of the programs is to reduce stereotyping and to help students understand that "different" is not necessarily "inferior." The Homewood School District (k-8) in Illinois, for example, has participated with France in an exchange program for fifth and sixth graders (Miller 1983). It was developed on the belief that ten and eleven year olds are more open minded and flexible in their beliefs and attitudes, and, therefore, more open to the target culture.

In general, study abroad programs have been very successful. Studies by Armstrong (1982), of the Indiana University cross-cultural immersion experience for advanced high school students of French, German and Spanish, showed that in six (6) weeks these students gained more in
listening, reading and writing skills than students enrolled in one full year of traditional high school Spanish. They also proved that study abroad programs motivate students to continue advanced foreign language study.

Research by Hansel and Grove (1980) demonstrates that in addition to the acquisition of linguistic skills in the target language, participants in linguistic and cultural immersion programs increased their understanding of peoples and cultures.

Most of the research done in the area of study abroad has been descriptive of the administration and organization, or has addressed affective variables such as attitude and motivation (Bicknese 1974; Hamers 1984; Stitsworth 1988; Tucker and Lambert 1970). In teaching functional language use, studies of naturally occurring social situations are needed. Both Swaffar (1989) and Kramsch (1991) feel that there is a need for more research on the ethnography of second language learning with focus on the learner, negotiation of meaning and authentic context.

RATIONALE

The trend in foreign language learning reflects a move from fragmented language to "whole" language study (Rigg 1991). It includes the individual as well as the social aspect of language acquisition; includes the importance of cooperative meaningful interaction for the development of communicative skills; and integrates language and culture.
Student international exchange programs provide the ideal atmosphere for "whole" language learning and for the integration of language and culture in total linguistic and cultural immersion. There is a large number of these programs. The Institute of International Education describes six hundred and ninety-nine programs in fifty four countries (Cohen 1977) and the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE) lists four hundred and seventy programs (Moeller 1988).

As mentioned previously, most research done in the area of student exchange has either been a description of the administration and organization of the program or it has addressed a particular variable such as motivational or linguistic gains. There is a need for integrative "whole" research rather than "fragmented" research that would reflect the trend in second/foreign language acquisition. This type of research would consider the context as a determinant of a person's intentions and would consider the learner variable as it looks at the learner (Swaffar 1989).

This dissertation develops such a research. It considers the cultural and situational context, the learner, and the interactional and social aspects of language acquisition.

The learning of another culture is a very crucial aspect of the communicative process. Becker (1986) describes culture as "shared meanings." It is what enables people to
act together, to be understood and to interpret the language and behavior of others.

The students' communicative competence, their ability to understand and to be understood by others of the target language, therefore, involves the sharing of meaning (culture) and the process of acculturation, "the process of becoming adapted to a new culture" (Brown 1987).

Gertz (1973) states that there is a difference between knowing the behavior and lingo of a group of people and being able to do it oneself. Therefore, there is a need to observe the exchange students' behavior, their language production and their interaction with others of the target language to ascertain whether they are assimilating and integrating into the new culture.

Culture is the context within which social events, behaviors or processes can be intelligently, that is thickly described (Gertz 1973), and the attempt to describe culture or aspects of culture is called ethnography (Bogdan and Biklen 1992). Consequently, any "whole" language research should be ethnographically informed.

Ethnographically informed case studies offer the ideal method to combine an in depth description of the learner; his/her motives; personality and traits that help/hinder language learning; his/her development of communicative competence; his/her rejection/adaptation to the new culture;
and the circumstances and social milieu within which language learning occurs.

This dissertation consists of ethnographically informed case studies that describe the emergence of communicative competence and acculturation of four foreign exchange high-school students.

The development of communicative competence of the exchange students is described within the framework of Canale and Swain's (1980) integrative theoretical model. Its four components are: 1) grammatical competence, 2) sociolinguistic competence, 3) discourse competence, and 4) strategic competence.

Grammatical competence refers to the degree to which the language user has mastered the linguistic code. Sociolinguistic competence refers to the way language is used and understood appropriately in various contexts. The topic, the role of the participant, and the setting will determine the attitude and choice of style of the speaker. Discourse competence is the ability to combine ideas to achieve cohesion in form and coherence in thought. Strategic competence is the use of verbal and nonverbal communication strategies to compensate for gaps in the linguistic code. An explanation of how each of these competencies will be assessed is explained in Data Analysis and Evaluation.
PURPOSE

The primary goal of this dissertation then is to investigate the connection between language, attitudes, culture, motivation, and the emergence of communicative competence. The following questions are addressed:

1) What were the subjects' motives for participating in the foreign exchange program and for learning English?

2) What were the subjects' perceptions, feelings, and attitude towards the USA when they arrived?

3) Do these change during their stay in the USA?

4) Is there a relationship between the students' attitudes and feelings towards the USA and the success of language acquisition?

5) How and to what degree do the students develop communicative competence?
   a) grammatical competence?
   b) sociolinguistic competence?
   c) discourse competence?
   d) strategic competence?

It is hoped that from this dissertation:

1) Others may learn more about the process of acculturation and second language acquisition through a detailed description of the processes as they occur in specific persons.
2) Future exchange students may learn through the experience of other students in situations similar to theirs.

3) Future host families may be able to understand better the students they host.
CHAPTER II
RESEARCH OF LITERATURE

A long review of the literature is usually inappropriate in qualitative research. Excessive reviewing of the literature might be too influential in determining themes and might curtail inductive analysis (Bogdan & Biklen 1992). Rather than a review of the methods and procedures used in other research, this review intends to give the reader a clearer understanding of international exchange programs, their advantages and disadvantages. One of the stated purposes of this research is that it be useful to future exchange students. Consequently it should give the information, or means of obtaining the information, that future participants in international exchange programs may need. Therefore, this research of the literature concentrates on the areas of immersion and of the study abroad experience which are relevant to future participants, or that directly affect this dissertation.

The areas of direct interest are:

a) description of what is currently available to exchange students
b) major concerns in student exchange programs
c) effects of immersion and of the study abroad experience on students
d) previous case studies
DESCRIPTION OF WHAT IS CURRENTLY AVAILABLE TO EXCHANGE STUDENTS

Two articles give a particularly good description of what is commonly available in foreign exchange programs. The article by Stokle (1988) describes the study abroad opportunities for college students, while the article by Moeller (1988) describes study abroad programs for the younger student.

Stockly describes the criteria for student selection for study abroad experience. He regrets that this criteria, which is usually based upon the students foreign language skills and grade point average, discounts the most important criterion of all: the students' receptivity to the foreign experience. His article includes recommendations for survival techniques within the foreign university and recommendations on how to make the most of the foreign exchange experience. He advises exchange students "to plunge headlong into the unknown, to explore what is for them uncharted territory."

Moeller's research includes a list of 36 existing exchange programs that meet the standards of the Council on Standards for International Educational Travel, a description of some federally supported exchange programs, and a chart comparing the personal growth of foreign exchange students with non traveled students.
MAJOR CONCERNS IN THE STUDENT EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Three major concerns come to mind that affect the success and availability of the study abroad programs: cost, credit transfer and hosting dynamics. They are addressed in that order.

Cost

The cost of an exchange program abroad may be high for families of moderate income. A school year program in Europe costs about $5,000 dollars in fees and about $2,000 in personal expenses. Fees cover round trip airfare from New York to final destination in Europe, health and accident insurance, and host family recruitment. The fee for a five week summer language/culture program in France or Spain is around $3,500 plus pocket money. The fee for a semester program in France is about $4,700 plus personal expenses. Exchange programs in Australia are about $400 higher than in Europe.

The U.S. federal government is interested in promoting exchange programs and helps finance them. The international focus on higher education has been boosted through a major U.S. initiative that tripled federal spending on undergraduate study abroad. The United States is also cooperating with foreign representatives in working with the Economic Community and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to standardize educational credentials, reporting, licensing, and
certification. Governments are also looking with increased regulatory fervor upon joint educational business ventures (Pickert 1992).

Several large foundations have provided funds to finance foreign study abroad. The Ford Foundation provided postgraduate scholarship to approximately 12,000 people from Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East to study abroad between 1960 and 1980 (Myers 1983).

More than 120 nations have Fulbright agreements with the United States. The program is intended to increase understanding between nations and foster peaceful communication and discussion among people of the world (Ammerman 1984). A report of the Board of Foreign Scholarships on the Fulbright - Hays Program during the years 1949-71 focuses on the increasing importance of educational exchange. It tells the story of the experience of more than 100,000 participants in more than 100 countries under the Fulbright program. The study presents sections on the laws behind the program, the bilingual approach, the focus on academic merit, the foreign relations component. Also included is a listing of grants.

Transfer of credit

One of the major concerns of study abroad students is the transfer of credit. European Community Course Credit Transfer System (ECTS) addresses this concern. It is an experimental pilot project designed to evaluate possibilities
of credit transfer within the European Community as a means of academic recognition. The ECTS program furthers student mobility within the Community Member State. A study conducted in the program's first year involved a 70-question questionnaire administered to 510 students of whom 66 percent responded. The students were surveyed in the months after they completed their study abroad experience. Results indicated the following: that 25 percent had serious problems regarding the award of credits and credit transfer; that the formal mechanisms of the ECTS pilot were not well established in the first year; that students were admitted to 98 percent of courses they had chosen originally; that the average number of credits transferred was 95 percent of those awarded during the study period abroad; that knowledge of the host country's culture and society increased substantially during the study abroad period; that the personal value of the experience was viewed positively by most students; and that student's experience varied in relation to field of study (Maiworm and Friedhelm 1992).

One of the functions of student exchange program coordinators is to facilitate the transfer of credit for the exchange students. They arrange for the placement of the students in the public schools of the host country and negotiate the acceptance of credits earned in that school system by the school system of the home country.
Hosting

Hosting is an important element of the foreign exchange programs. One of the means of improving the opportunities of acquiring the target language is to seek accommodations with host families: "no other arrangement affords a more intense cultural and linguistic immersion" (Stokle 1988). Many college programs and foreign exchange programs for elementary and high school students do place the students with host families. However, it is very hard to find host families willing to host students for a school year without remuneration; and to make a good match between students and hosts is not easy. Often they turn out to be incompatible. Some of the exchange students have mentioned this to me and program coordinators are very aware of the problem.

It is the main function of the exchange program coordinators to arrange for a successful hosting experience. For this purpose the coordinators of the American Intercultural Student Exchange (the organization that brought the exchange students described in this dissertation) interview the exchange students and their parents beforehand and visit volunteer hosts in order to make a good match. They allow exchange students to change host families as many as three times during the hosting experience. Either party, host or student may terminate the arrangement at any time.

Some research has been done in the area of hosting. Grove and Hansel (1982) conducted a study of the experiences
of 12 American families who hosted American Field Service (AFS) international exchange students ages 16-18. Seven families experienced the somewhat normal adjustment cycle that began with satisfaction with the student's integration into the household followed by disillusionment or moodiness on the part of the student, and ending on an upswing after problems had been worked out. Dynamics working in these cases were lack of enthusiasm on the part of host siblings, hypercritical stance taken by the exchange students, absence of a host sibling in the home, difficult personality of the student, unwillingness of the student to participate in family life, and a clash of student goals and family expectations. Four families experienced no negative adjustment periods. One hosting experience was terminated early, the reason being lack of communication between the family and the student.

A second article by Grove (1984) studies the dynamics of hosting by means of a longitudinal documentation of the experience of 15 U.S. families before, during and after they hosted an American Field Service exchange student. Findings indicate that a successful host experience was directly related to positive personality factors rather than cultural factors, positive student-host sibling relationships rather than student-host parent relationships, exchange student willingness to become involved in host family activities, and
infrequency of telephone contact with the exchange student's natural parents.

Hosting is also the topic of a doctoral dissertation which examines the experience of a Brazilian secondary school international exchange student. This dissertation documents, in a case study, the difficult relationship of the Brazilian student with an unprepared and sometimes hostile host family in the United States and with an unprepared coordinator. As a result of his negative experience, the student became depressed, angry, and manipulative. The author stipulates that making placement arrangements well in advance and requiring sponsors to contact students and host families periodically could have averted the unfortunate situation.

**EFFECT OF IMMERSION AND OF THE STUDY ABROAD EXPERIENCE ON THE STUDENT**

Extensive research has been done on several aspects of the effects of immersion on students. The first aspect is the effect on native language development when at least fifty per cent of the academic subjects are studied in a second language. Research by Genesse (1985), and Campbell, Gray, Rhodes, and Snow (1985) of immersion programs in the United States; and by Genesse, Holobow, Lambert, and Chartrand (1989) of immersion programs in Canada, indicate that English speaking students experience no long-term deficits in their English language development as a consequence of participation in an immersion program of either total or partial type.
A second aspect is whether the students will be able to understand and learn the subject matter when taught in a second language. With respect to academic achievement, and mathematics in particular, results indicate that the students in immersion programs both in Canada and the United States had no difficulty assimilating new academic knowledge and skills even though they were taught through a second language (Genesse 1985; Genesse, Holobow, Lambert, and Chartrand 1989).

A third aspect is whether there is significant difference in second language achievement to justify immersion programs. In general, it has been found that immersion students in all types of immersion programs are more likely to demonstrate native-like levels of proficiency in second language comprehension than in second language production, be it in reading and writing or in listening, even though there are often linguistic errors in their phonology, vocabulary and grammar (Genesee 1987). A comparison of American Immersion Programs with regular foreign language in the elementary schools (FLES) programs by Gray, Rhodes, Campbell, and Snow (1985) found that students in American immersion programs outperformed students in FLES programs in all language skills: speaking, listening, reading, and writing.

On the other hand, Hammerly (1987), is highly critical of the linguistic accuracy of immersion students. He
surveyed five different studies of immersion students in Canada and from the results of these studies, he reaches the conclusion that "Immersion programs may be communicatively and culturally successful, and politically very successful, but linguistically they are a failure." Hammerly proposes a program with "semi-intensive systematic step-by-step teaching/learning of the second language for about two hours a day." This program would start in fifth grade and continue through eighth grade. A stage of partial immersion could follow.

Swain and Lapkin (1989) disagree with Hammerly's position: "observational data from immersion tell us just the opposite, that where language practice is isolated from the substance of content lessons, linguistic competence does not appear to improve." They recommend "consistent and creative error correction strategies, broadening the functional range of classroom discourse, and insisting on varied and extended opportunities for language use."

Allen, Cummins, Harley, Lapkin, and Swain (1989) also disagree with Hammerly. They stipulate that he limits his discussion to the issue of accuracy in oral production and fails to address all other aspects. They state, "Historically, French immersion was initiated so that children could attain a level of bilingualism well above what could be achieved by a core French program." Nowhere does Hammerly acknowledge that the second language skills of
French Immersion students are typically much superior to those of core French students. These authors recommend that ways should be provided to "maintain and develop their growing skills outside of the context of school in recognition of the fact that the school setting cannot do it all." Genesee, Holobow, Lambert, and Chartrand (1989) express a similar opinion "if the goal is native-like second language proficiency, then serious consideration needs to be given to how to extend the language environment of programs that lack peer model."

Study abroad programs respond to these recommendations. They provide ways to maintain and develop language skills outside of the context of the school advocated by Allen, Cummins, Harly, Lapkin and Swain (1989), and extend the language environment through total immersion in the culture of the target language.

Study abroad programs have been very successful. Studies by Armstrong (1982), of the Indiana University cross-cultural immersion experience for advanced high school students of French, German and Spanish, showed that in six (6) weeks these students gained more in listening, reading and writing skills than students enrolled in one full year of traditional high school Spanish. They also proved that study abroad programs motivate students to continue advanced foreign language study.
Research by Hansel and Grove (1980) demonstrates that in addition to the acquisition of linguistic skills in the target language, participants in linguistic and cultural immersion programs increased their understanding of peoples and cultures.

They further confirmed these results in another study conducted by them (1985). It surveyed 1,100 newly returned American Field Service (AFS) foreign exchange students to measure personal development in 17 characteristics. Results showed students identified rapid development in ideals and skepticism of stereotypes.

The American Council of Teachers of Russian conducted a six year longitudinal study of the gains in Russian language competence achieved by American students in semester-long language programs in Moscow and Leningrad. Analysis of results in oral, listening and reading proficiency shows that the immersion experience produces significant gains in language proficiency. One of the conclusions is that at any given initial level, the better prepared the student is on reading/grammar the more the student tends to gain (Braced 1991).

The effect of visiting foreign exchange college students on the people they come in contact with in the host country and the benefits to their own developing countries are studied in a book written by Rao (1979). Data from a survey of foreign students in Australia conducted from 1973-75 by
the Education Research Unit of the Australian National University are compared with data obtained from similar surveys in the United States, Canada, and France. Findings reveal that although the origin of the countries is different, the social background, attitudes, experiences, and future career plans of overseas students in different developed countries are very similar. For instance, it is noted that 98 percent of the sponsored students return upon completion of their studies to their home countries.

DESCRIPTION OF OTHER CASE STUDIES DONE

Many of the case studies done deal with specific aspects of the influence of a stay abroad on the individual. The following case studies deal exclusively with language development.

The German researchers (Moehle, 1984; Moehle and Raupach, 1983; Raupach, 1983, 1984, 1987) have done case studies documenting the speech of German college students of French and French college students of German. The results of the study by Moehle (1984) indicate that grammar, in terms of frequency of mistakes or length and syntactic complexity of sentences, did not change in any noticeable way as a result of several months spent in France by the German students, but their fluency or speech rate increased. In contrast, the grammar of French learners of German improved enormously, but there was little change in fluency.
Raupach (1984) did a case study of a German learner's French after a stay in France. He concluded that the more fluent character of the learner's French after her stay in France was largely due to her use of formulas which freed the learner from resorting to hesitation strategies.

DeKeyser did case studies of 7 students who went to Spain for a semester and of a control group of 5 who remained studying in the USA. He followed closely two of the students who went to Spain, comparing and contrasting their monitoring and communication strategies. His conclusion was that the group differences were far less important than the individual differences. While students undoubtedly gained in fluency and vocabulary in Spain, they did not drastically change their monitoring behavior or their use of communicative strategies.

The following case studies differ from the others in that the subjects are adult immigrants with none or very little formal instruction in English. They became immersed in the language and culture out of different motives which were not a specific desire to learn the language and culture.

In the first case study, Shapira (1978) explores the connection between language learning and motivation. It is the case of Zoila, an adult Spanish speaker learning English. After three years in the USA there was practically no evidence of progress in her acquisition of English grammar. The only area which learning was observed was in fluency.
Shapira attributes Zoila's lack of success to the fact that she did not come to the United States out of choice. She had an instrumental rather than an integrative motivation. Her performance did not improve beyond a certain point which satisfied her needs.

The second case is the study by Shuman of a 33 year old Costa Rican named Alberto. During the ten-month period of study, little linguistic growth was observed. Shuman attributes Alberto's failure to acquire English to social and psychological distance. Alberto belonged to a social group designated as lower class Latin American worker immigrant whose modal socio-economic status is lower than that of Americans in general. This view is shared by both the worker immigrant and the Americans. Though Alberto showed positive attitude and motivation in his answers to questionnaires designed to assess attitude and motivation, his actions contradicted his responses. He made little effort to get to know English speaking people. He did not own a TV or watch it because he did not understand English, yet he purchased an expensive stereo set and tape on which he played mostly Spanish music. He did not seek to attend English classes available to him.

The last case study reviewed is by Schmidt (1989), which is similar in organization to this dissertation. It provides relevant evidence for the acculturation model by looking at the development of communicative competence of an adult
Japanese with no instruction in English and with low social and psychological distance from target language speakers. Schmidt analyses the learner's accomplishments in terms of Canale's four part communicative competence framework. Schmidt concludes that Wes' high integrative motivation led to considerable increase in communicative competence but had little effect in improving grammatical competence.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

I came to this research, not with a specific theory in mind, but with the purpose of discovering and describing the process of language acquisition and acculturation. Qualitative research lends itself best to this purpose. It "allows the theoretical construct to emerge from the field" (Munro 1990). It is also ideal for the development of "whole" language study and research. As defined by Bogdan and Biklen (1992), qualitative research has the natural setting as the direct source of data, is descriptive, is concerned with process rather than simply outcomes or products, and is concerned with point of view of the people being described.

This research is concerned with students who are linguistically and culturally immersed in the language and culture. The natural setting context or culture is an essential element of the study. The research describes not only the outcome but the process the students go through as they learn the language and adapt to the culture. The learners' perspectives, affect and motivation as well as their interaction with others is also considered.

Baker (1986) describes culture as "shared meaning." Acculturation occurs when the personal and transactional barriers presented by two cultures coming in contact are broken and there is a "sharing of meaning" and true
understanding. Second language learning is second culture learning. It involves the "sharing of meaning" and true understanding through language and culture. To grasp the development of communicative competence, studies of naturally occurring social situations are needed. Both Swaffar (1989) and Kramsch (1989) feel that there is a need for more research on the ethnography of second language learning with focus on the learner, negotiation of meaning and authentic context.

This type of study would be ethnographically informed. As Munro (1990) states, "At the heart of ethnography is cultural interpretation." In this study we will be seeing American culture through the eyes of foreign exchange students. The student will be an ethnographer as he makes sense of the culture in which he is immersed. The exchange student's manifestation of his native culture will be interpreted by the host family, coordinator, his/her teachers, myself, and readers of this dissertation.

Case studies are excellent vehicles to describe the emergence of communicative competence in each student. They give an opportunity for an in depth description of the learners both as they see themselves and as the researcher, teachers, and others perceive them, and also an opportunity to describe the social and interactional aspect of language learning.
Robert Donmoyer (1990) lists three advantages of case studies:

1) Accessibility and vicarious living: case studies allow us to experience vicariously unique individuals and unique situations.

2) Case studies allow us to look at the world through the researcher's eyes, and in the process, to see things we otherwise might not have seen. A researcher's repertoire of schemata will develop. It is important that one see through the subject's eyes and through the eyes of others that come in contact with the subjects. The researcher's view adds a third dimension.

3) Decreased Defensiveness: vicarious experience is less likely to produce defensiveness to learning. Others reading the case studies may learn and profit from them without feeling challenged or threatened.

Robert Donmoyer further articulates that the ability of case studies is rooted in a conception of experiential knowledge. This kind of knowledge is not purely intellectual. It is often affect-laden.

The impact of case studies has been well expressed by Skulman (1986):

Most individuals find specific cases more powerful influences on their decisions than impersonally presented empirical findings; even though the latter
constitute better evidence. Although principles are powerful, cases are memorable and lodge in memory as the basis for later judgement.

SUBJECTS

To answer the questions posed in the research, four case studies were conducted. The participants were four foreign exchange students under the auspices of the American Intercultural Student Exchange (AISE). They resided in the USA for nine months. They include an Ukrainian, an Uzbekistanian, a Spaniard and a Colombian. They were observed for nine months, from August 1993 through February 1994.

The Ukraine and Uzbekistan formed part of the former Soviet Union. Since the failure of communism in Russia and the disintegration of the Russian Empire, there has been an improvement of relationships between the US and Russia.

I chose the students from the Ukraine and Uzbekistan because it seemed interesting to discover the way these people feel towards the USA and to follow their process of acculturation. The two Spanish-speaking students were chosen out of a personal interest in the acquisition of English by Hispanic students.

My first contact with the students was through participant observation during the first student orientation conducted by the Coordinator of the American Intercultural Student Exchange program, two weeks after their arrival, August, 1993. This orientation is mandatory. The
Coordinator interviews each exchange student to see how they are getting along in their foster homes and to go over the rules for the students participating in the program. This orientation took place in a relaxed atmosphere. Students played games, got acquainted and had private interviews with the coordinator of the student exchange program. At this time I distributed an informative leaflet (see appendix I) describing the research to be done and a questionnaire requesting the students' consent to participate in it. From the positive responses I chose the four students who participated.

Ximena was the youngest. She was fifteen when she arrived in the USA and entered her junior high school year. Her family belongs to the upper middle class or upper class in Colombia. Her father owns several businesses, one of which is a printing enterprise. Ximena is the youngest of 11 children. One of her brothers and an aunt live in the USA. Ximena had been to the States several times before.

Oidin was sixteen when she arrived, and a senior in high school. Her family belongs to the labor class. Her father is a chauffeur. She has a younger brother. Her trip and stay in the States was financed by the Freedom Support Act Secondary School Program which is funded by the United States Government to promote respect for cultural diversity and friendship between the United States and the Newly Independent States of the former Soviet Union.
Valentina was seventeen when she arrived and a senior in high school. Her family belongs to the labor class. Her father is a chauffeur. Her trip and stay were also financed by the Freedom Support Act Secondary School Program and like Oidin she also has a younger brother.

Rafael was seventeen. He attended a private Catholic High School. His family belongs to the upper class in Sanlucar de Barrameda, Spain. They own a winery that has been in the family for over two centuries. When I visited their offices in Sanlucar, I saw business documents dated earlier than the Declaration of Independence of the United States. His father is a pharmacist and owns the pharmacy. Rafael is the fourth of six brothers and sisters and also the fourth one to come as an exchange student to the States.

DATA COLLECTION

This research moves from a broad exploratory beginning to more directed data collection and a detailed examination of four subjects in the case studies. The trend in educational ethnography today is to collect both qualitative and quantitative data (Borg 1989). Questionnaires, scales, tests, and interviews, have been combined with participant and non-participant observation.

Data was collected using Labov's (1981) field methods for research projects on linguistic variation which are: systematic participant observation combined with face to face interviews. Participant observation is necessary to observe
the vernacular (natural unmonitored speech) which is not observable in face to face interviews, no matter how friendly the speaker may appear to be, and to observe the subjects behavior and actions in context. Face to face interviews are necessary to have the needed volume and quality of recorded speech; to address issues that may not come up during participant observation and to clarify what has been observed.

The main sources of data were: 1) participant and non participant observation, 2) interviews, 3) tests and instruments, 4) students written work, and 5) video tape. A description of each of these follows.

Participant and Non Participant Observation

The students were shadowed at school for a school week; They were observed during the social gatherings (3 or 4) sponsored by the student exchange program, at a basketball game, and at a reception immediately following the game, at their foster homes where I visited them an where I was invited to dinner to meet Ximena's parents, and at a party given by myself in which other American students were present. The party allowed me to see how the exchange students interacted with American students. I also invited the students to two excursions to New Orleans and to a weekend in Houston where they stayed at my home. They were observed during these trips and videotaped in Houston. Field notes were taken on each of these occasions.
Interviews

There were at least four interviews each spaced over the nine months period of data collection. This allowed me to discover emergent patterns, to ask questions in different ways to obtain conformation of original statements; to address different matters that came up during the student's stay; and to become friends with the subjects who then felt at ease and were more natural and open. All interviews were taped and transcribed.

There were two types of interviews: non-structured and directed. The first interviews were non-structured and open-ended. The purpose was two-fold: to assess the competence level of the subjects in English and to allow the students to talk spontaneously on the subjects that interested them. Other interviews were directed to address specific questions that help assess the development of the four areas of communicative competence.

The two students from the former Soviet Union could express themselves well in English. The two Spanish-speaking students could not. With the latter it was absolutely necessary to conduct part of the interviews in Spanish. The last interviews were conducted completely in English to permit the assessment of the students progress and proficiency in English.

The study also included the following interviews with other individuals: one with the coordinator of the exchange
program, two interviews with each of the host families, and
one with the English or Social Studies teacher of each
student. Interviewing different persons with whom the
students came in contact allowed me to see the students from
different perspectives.

Tests and Instruments

To assess the students' feelings and attitudes towards
Americans and the USA, a pair of instruments described by
Madelaine Cook (1988) were administered. These instruments,
the Bogardus Social Distance Scale and the Semantic
Differential tests, measure different aspects of the
students' attitudes towards the bearers of the target
language.

The Bogardus instrument measures the behavioral aspect
of attitude, how the student would act toward a person of the
country in question. To score the Bogardus scale (see
Appendix II) a value is assigned to each social distance and
these are then summed. The scale is organized from the
furthest distance to the closest.

Thus a visitor to my country would receive one point, a
citizen of my country two points and so on progressively with
"into kinship by marriage receiving seven points. If the
student placed an x on: visitor= 1 pt., citizen of my
country= 2 pts., member of my church= 3 pts. The score would
be the sum of 1+2+3+ or 6 pts. If he placed an x on 1 & 3
the score would be 1 + 3 or 4 pts. An x on all the boxes would add up to the maximum of 28 points.

The countries chosen for this instrument were the students native lands and other countries that spoke their language; China, the United States, England, and the American negro. The test was administered twice. The first time in October, 1993 and the second time in May, 1994.

The other instrument, the semantic differential scale developed by Osgood, measures the affective and cognitive aspects of the students' attitudes. The scale used in this dissertation is the semantic differential scale revised by Cook and by me. She identifies three factors. Factor I measures the affective aspects of the students' attitude towards the people from the country tested. Factors II and III measure different aspects of the cognitive domain. She termed Factor I the valuative sociability factor (what people are like), Factor II the achievement factor (what they have done), Factor III the enthusiasm factor (how much enthusiasm they put into what they did).

To assess the semantic differential scale, positive and negative values were given to the answers. For example, an answer on the point closest to the positive quality would earn +3 points.

interesting __+3x__ __+2__ __+1__ __-1__ __-2__ __-3__ boring
An answer on the side of the negative quality would lose points depending on how close it is to that quality. In the example below the x shows a score of -1.

interesting __+3__ __+2__ __+1__ __−1x__ __−2__ __−3__ boring

The students' linguistic improvement was assessed with a pre-post test design. They took the English Placement Test of the English Language Institute of the University of Michigan in September and a parallel form 8 months later.

The Michigan English Placement Test has several advantages. It is reasonably short (75 minutes); it is easy to administer; it has three parallel forms which make it suitable for pre-post testing; the 100 problems are divided into distinct areas of expertise (20 to listening comprehension, 30 to grammar, 30 to vocabulary, an 20 to reading comprehension). This makes it possible to assess in which area each student has made most progress.

The reliability of the subtests and the test as a whole are expressed by the results of the Kuder-Richardson formula 21, a reliability formula of internal consistency. The K 21's for Listening Comprehension, Grammar, Vocabulary, Reading Comprehension, and the Placement Tests are: .78, .91, .90, .92, and .97, respectively.

Though there are no validity measures for the test, a report from the University of Michigan shows that the test has proven very successful in placing students in homogeneous levels at that university. The report is based on 133
students who were administered form A of the Placement Test on May 7 & 8, 1980. At that time students could be moved during the first two weeks of any term if it appeared that the student should be moved. Of the 133 students only 6 students were moved. For each of these 6 students, the Listening Comprehension subtest score confirmed the move; it indicated high or low performance in accordance with the direction these 6 students were moved. However, since there were occurrences of relatively high and low listening comprehension scores for students who were not moved, the report states that one should not use the Listening Comprehension scores as a predictor of a move, but rather as a confirmation of a move initiated by either the student or the teacher.

The exchange students in this study were administered form C of the placement test in September, 1993 and form B in May, 1994.

**Students' Written Work**

The student's written work done in their English classes (essays, book reports, and compositions), as well as essay questions in the Social Studies class, was kept, reported to me and analyzed. The students wrote short autobiographies. One student kept a journal.

**Video Tape**

In order to assess their non-verbal strategies, students were video taped playing the game Taboo and describing a
picture for the other students to draw from their instructions. Taboo is a vocabulary guessing game. The clue giver draws a card. The word at the top of the card is the guess word the clue-giver is trying to get his/her teammates to say. The five words below the guess word are the taboo words the clue-giver cannot say when giving clues for the guess word. For example the clue giver would try to get his/her team member to say apple without saying red, fruit, pie, cider, or core. The game is a fun way to elicit the use of both verbal and non verbal strategies.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

The first three research questions are closely related and deal with psychological and sociological factors. They are:

1) What were the subjects motives for participating in the foreign exchange program and for learning English?

2) What were their perceptions, feelings, and attitude towards the United States when they arrived? Do these change during their stay?

3) Is there a relationship between the students attitudes and feelings towards the United States and their success in acquiring the English language?
These questions are answered in the form of a descriptive narration of the psychological, sociological, and motivational profile of each of the students.

It is generally believed that the motivations of learners to acquire the second language and the feelings and attitudes of the learners towards the target language, culture and speakers of that language influence the rate of acquisition and the degree of proficiency the learner will attain. Gardner and Lambert (1972) cite intensity of motivation to learn another language and the students' purpose in studying that language as two of the four maximum predictors of success in second language acquisition.

**Motivation**

The first factor addressed is motivation. The definition of this construct has undergone a certain evolution. Gardner and Lambert (1959) were the first to differentiate between two kinds of motivation for second language learning, "integrative" and "instrumental." Integrative motivation is characterized by a desire to learn more about the second language group while instrumental motivation reflects a more utilitarian value such as usefulness in one's career.

Further subsystems have been developed that explain and expand the "instrumental" and "integrative" motivation construct. McDonough (1981) points out that the traditional integrative concept includes two separate aspects: 1) a
general desire for wider social contact, and 2) a desire to belong to a certain community by acquiring the psychological characteristics of the group. Graham (1984) introduced the term assimilative motivation referring to the drive to become an indistinguishable member of the community, distinct from integrative motivation which involves the desire to establish a social relationship with the target language community. Assimilative motivation must take place in the host environment. Dornyei (1990) also differentiates between the motivation associated with foreign language learning (FLL) which involves learning the target language in institutional/academic settings without interaction with the target language community and second language acquisition (SLA) in which the target language is learned at least partly embedded in the host environment. He developed a motivational subsystem which adds further dimensions to integrative and instrumental motivation. Need for achievement is related to instrumental motivation and the following four parameters are subsystems of integrative motivation: a) interest in foreign languages, cultures, and people, b) desire to broaden one's view and avoid provincialism, c) desire for new stimuli, and challenges, d) desire to integrate into a new community.

Views are changing. Gardner (1985) no longer treats the primacy of integrative motivation as essential. Gardner asserts that motivation is composed of four elements: a
goal, a desire to attain the goal, a positive attitude towards learning the language, and effortful behavior to that effect.

The degree of achievement that is set as a goal is an important element of the outcome. A learner may wish to attain a level that is high enough for traveling purposes, to comprehend movie pictures, tv programs, and the lyrics of songs in L2, to read in L2, for business, or to be indistinguishable from native speakers. The desire to reach this highest degree of proficiency may be differently motivated: admiration for the culture and people of the target language, the need for achievement and attain perfection, to avoid discrimination by speakers of that language, or even the need of a spy to pass as a member of the L2 population.

The source of the motivation for L2 learning need not be tied to relations between individuals and groups. The motivations for learning a new language are individualistic and multifaceted (Oxford and Shearin 1994). This broader framework for L2 learning motivation is the framework within which the data for this study is analyzed. Data was collected from different sources: a written questionnaire, participant and non participant observation, and taped interviews.
Perceptions, Feelings, and Attitudes

The next factors addressed are the students perceptions, feelings and attitudes towards Americans and the United states. These are analyzed within the framework of Shumann's (1978) acculturation model. Shumann (1978) sees language learning as an interaction between cultures in which both the attitude of the learner towards the target language culture and the attitude of the bearers of that culture towards the learner play an important role. He describes second language acquisition as an aspect of acculturation. The social and psychological distance between the learner and the people, language, and culture of the target language determines the degree of acculturation. The degree to which a learner acculturates to the target language group will control the degree to which L2 is acquired.

Social distance represents the social factors that either promote or inhibit social solidarity between two groups. The following factors are addressed under social distance: a) whether the L2 group is politically, culturally, technically, or economically dominant, non-dominant, or subordinate in relation to TL group; b) enclosure, the degree to which the two groups are integrated in schools, churches, clubs, neighborhood, etc.; and c) cohesiveness, the degree to which members of the L2 form a separate identifiable group.
Under psychological factors the different aspects of the students' attitudes towards Americans are addressed. The Bogardus Social Distance Scale is used to measure the behavioral aspect of attitude, and the Semantic Differential Scale is used to measure the affective and cognitive aspects. These instruments are described in this chapter pgs. 38-40. In order to assess changes in students' attitude during their stay in the United States, the Bogardus Social Distance Scale and the Semantic Differential Scale were administered twice, once in October, 1993 and the second time in May, 1994 and the two results were compared. Taped interviews and participant observation were also analyzed in order to confirm test results and to obtain a more global perspective.

Communicative Competence

The last research question is:

How and to what degree do the students develop communicative competence?

a) grammatical competence?
b) sociolinguistic competence?
c) discourse competence?
d) strategic competence?

Each of the four parameters of communicative competence as defined by Canale and Swain (1980), were assessed through analysis of the data.
a) Grammatical Competence

In Canale's framework, grammatical competence refers to the degree to which the language user has mastered the linguistic code. This would include the formation of words, their spelling and their meaning, the structure of the sentence, and the pronunciation and comprehension of sounds in the language.

The data source used to determine the development of grammatical competence has been the students' written school work, taped conversations and pre-post administration of the English Placement Test developed by the English Language Institute of the University of Michigan and described in this chapter, p.41-42.

The gains in linguistic or grammatical proficiency was estimated with:

1) A repeated measure design of linguistic tests taken at the start and at the end of the program. The instrument used was the English Placement Test developed by the English Language Institute at the University of Michigan.

2) Comparison of the number and types of language errors of the students in early and late oral interviews and in written work in order to assess improvement after the nine month period.
b) Sociolinguistic Competence

Sociolinguistic competence is defined by Omaggio (1986) as the extent to which language is used and understood appropriately in various contexts to convey specific communicative functions such as persuading, narrating, giving commands or declining requests. Factors such as role of the participant, and setting will determine the appropriateness of the attitude conveyed by the learner and his choice of style or register.

Sociolinguistic Competence was assessed through:

1) Analysis of notes taken during participant observation and study of videotapes.
2) Analysis of written and oral tasks such as were used by Merrill Swain and Sharon Lapkin to test sociolinguistic performance of immersion students. These written and oral tasks were analyzed for the usage of politeness markers, conditional verb forms and politeness formulas.

c) Discourse Competence

Discourse competence is the ability to combine ideas to achieve cohesion in form and coherence in thought both in oral and written text.

Discourse competence was assessed through analysis of discourse both oral and written in observing:

1) Length and complexity of sentence structure to express meaning.
2) Ability to use cohesive devices such as pronouns and grammatical connectors (i.e., conjunctions, adverbs and transitional phrases and expressions).

3) Unity of thought and continuity in a text.

4) Use of a specific category of speech markers that affects the ability to pause, hesitate, and self-correct appropriately without causing undue strain to listener as explained by Olynak (1990).

d) Strategic Competence

Swain (1984) defines strategic competence as "the mastery of communication strategies that may be called into action either to enhance the effectiveness of communication or to compensate for break-downs in communication." Since non verbal communication can undermine or reinforce the verbal channel (Wiley 1982), this study considers both verbal and non verbal strategies.

Strategic competence was assessed through analysis of video and audio tapes to identify strategies such as: asking for repetitions and clarifications in a number of ways for example, excuse me, pardon me, echo/huh; approximation, word coinage, circumlocution, translation, language switch, mime and avoidance of topic.

The video tape was analyzed considering Neu's list of non verbal factors namely:

1) the appropriate use of meaningful gestures
2) nonverbal gestures in aid of speech difficulties
3) non verbal gestures appropriately synchronized with the verbal channel

4) degree of synchrony between interactants.

Students' Self-Evaluation

Students were asked to make a self evaluation of their global progress.

EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH

Lincoln and Guba (1985) have suggested credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability as criteria for evaluating qualitative research. Donmoyer (1990) gives prime importance to richness of data. "The bottom line for assessing the quality of a case study, however, is still the richness of the data presented." I would like to consider usefulness, richness of data, confirmability and transferability as the criteria for evaluation.

Usefulness

It is hoped that this research will be useful and fulfill its purpose as stated in the rationale so that:

1) Others may learn more about the process of acculturation and second language acquisition through a detailed description of the processes as they occur in specific persons;

2) Future exchange students may learn through the experience of other students in situations similar to theirs;
3) Future host families may be able to understand better the students they host.

**Richness of Data**

To ensure richness of data and as a check on validity:

a) Data was collected from multiple sources such as direct observation, interviews, journals, biographies, subject's school work, etc. The different sources will be compared thus providing confirmation and *triangulation*;

b) Data was compared and contrasted again and again as the researcher looked for patterns;

c) Thick description of subjects was detailed and abundant information acquired during the eight month observation period was provided;

d) There was more than one observer: the students, teachers, the host families, the program coordinator and myself. The students also made a self evaluation adding yet another point of view.

**Confirmability**

Confirmability is possible when good records are kept of the data and when the inferences made are logical and traceable back to the data.

**Transferability**

Lincoln and Guba (1985) define transferability as "fittingness" or the degree of congruency between sending and receiving contexts. If two contexts are sufficiently
congruent, the working hypotheses from the sending original context may be applicable in the receiving context.

Donmoyer (1990) explains the transferability of "experiential knowledge." An experience in one situation leads to the development of a working hypotheses; when a person moves to a new situation he or she simply compares the sending situation to the receiving situation, determines the degree to which that situation is similar to the other and then applies the hypothesis made from the old situation that may be applicable to the new. It is hoped that future exchange students may live vicariously the experiences of the subjects in the case studies, and form hypotheses that may be applicable to their own lives as exchange students.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Very special consideration was made to the vulnerability of the subjects. These students were away from home, in an alien environment. The researcher should be empathetic and should avoid all causes of stress.

One of the fragile relationships that the exchange students acquire is between them and their host families. It is of utmost importance that the researcher does not divulge anything that may jeopardize this relationship during or after the students stay.

The process of interpretation and of writing up the final text includes the researcher's interpretation of the data and the participant's contributions and views as the
research unfolded. Because the students left the United States before the writing of the dissertation was finished, it was not possible to share the finished dissertation with them for comments.

Since the students did not opt for anonymity utmost care was taken not to divulge any confidential information obtained through friendship or to express any views that could be in any way offensive.

To help safeguard the participant's rights:

1) Each participant was given a full overview of the project before they agreed to participate.
2) Participants were given the option of confidentiality.
3) Participants were given a full transcript of their interviews.

RESEARCHER'S ROLE

Like LeCompte (1987), I feel that qualitative researchers should be concerned with the effect of their own subjectivity. The researcher should: 1) state the data source for his/her conclusions and 2) be specially careful not to be biased in the selection of the data to be considered.

I have tried to keep my relationship with the exchange students from coloring my views, and I would like to share some of the feelings that I experienced during the research. In the beginning I felt like an intruder in their lives and
felt that I was invading their privacy. I felt most at ease with the students who reassured me through their actions that they welcomed me.

I became close to two students in particular, Valentina and Ximena. Valentina approached me and introduced herself when she found out that I was working on a research for my dissertation. She was very happy to participate. Ximena also showed an interest in contributing to the research. I received a note from Ximena's teacher stating that it had been a pleasure to give Ximena the tests that I had requested because Ximena had been very interested in taking them in order to help me.

On most occasions, I was a participant observer participating in the social activities. On one occasion, I chose the role of complete observer, and that was during the time that I shadowed the students at school. Nevertheless, both Valentina and Ximena introduced me to their friends and invited me to eat lunch with them at the school cafeteria.
CHAPTER XV

VALENTINA

This chapter and the following ones aim to reveal how the four young teenagers Valentina, Rafael, Ximena, and Oidin developed linguistically and socially during their sojourn in the United States. As I listened to their tapes, they came to life in my mind. I feel that nothing I will say will do them justice. For this reason I intend to quote them extensively so that the readers also may hear their voices.

The narration for each student starts with the description of their motivation to come to the States to learn English, of their acculturation or period of adaptation to the new culture, and the psychological and sociological factors that helped or hindered them in their process of acculturation. I feel this is the ideal way to introduce you to the students, because each of them, candidly describes how they felt during the initial difficult period away from home.

Next, comes the description of the development of communicative competence and of each of its four parameters as defined by Canale and Swain (1980), namely: a) grammatical competence, b) sociolinguistic competence, c) discourse competence, and d) strategic competence. They will be discussed in that order.

MOTIVATION

Valentina wanted to study English because: "I would like to choose the road in my future life closely connected with
the foreign language. So English will help me in my future life....It's the most widespread language in the world....It is the best way to communicate with people from other countries....If I didn't know English, I wouldn't be now in the USA."

Valentina viewed her stay in the USA as an opportunity for cultural exchange. She considered herself an emissary and a model sharing her country's culture with Americans while at the same time learning about, understanding better and experiencing the American culture. When asked why she wanted to come to the USA she answered. "I'd like to improve my English, to get acquainted with American people culture to get acquainted Americans with my culture." She brought with her a historical account and pictures of Ukraine.

Valentina wanted to extend her stay in the USA. "I, I want to stay in America because I love this country and I can't. It's easy to make a career here than in my country, and it's very difficult now in the Ukraine ... because I watched news one day and they said unemployment rate now in Ukraine 30%. And..mm..my mom writes me that 'You won't be able to enter that little college in our town, because you missed one year of school and it's not so important. Like here at LSU. It's University of Louisiana!"

My perception is that Valentina was being candid and sincere. Her statements reveal that she was instrumentally and integratively motivated. She wanted to learn English
because she needed it for her career (she wants to be a translator); with English she can communicate with most of the world; knowing English opens up new opportunities (if she hadn't known English she would not have been provided a grant to come to the United States); She likes the United States and would like to live here to further her career. From my observations I would add that Valentina had a strong desire to experience success and that she enjoyed a challenge. Her favorite class was English literature because the teacher was very demanding, and Valentina was the only student with an A in her class. Valentina was very proud to be selected to participate in the exchange program. She was one of just five students selected from the Ukraine out of a group of 50 eager applicants. "I had to take exams, write compositions and show my level of knowledge with English." Valentina also has a great zest for life and a desire to experience the new.

CULTURAL SHOCK AND ACCULTURATION

When I visited Valentina's school in September, Miss Wilford, her English teacher seemed concerned that although Valentina was friendly and the other students accepted her and treated her well, she had not made friends. The only person she seemed close to was Ivan, a Russian boy. Valentina was lonely and spent her weekends at home in her room. Miss Wilford decided to take her to the home-coming football game. They went the week after my visit. Valentina loved it.
During our interview at my home in October 1993, Valentina was upset that she had still not made any friends. "What I have the problem here, I think that maybe its true that if I want to make friends with American children I, I have to make the first step. Because if we have new kids, new student in our school, mm. our kids I think they are more friendly. At first time how they ask a lot of questions of the student, so at the same time they begin friends. I can't make friends and Janet, Janet tells me: 'You have to have friends because it is the purpose of the program.' But how, I can't, I can't go to the one girl for example or boy and say: I, I want to be friends with you its, I, I can't understand how to make friends."

By October 1993, it was evident that Valentina was suffering from culture shock. She was extremely unhappy and spent the evenings in her room. She came to me crying and told me that she wanted to change homes. She had been living with Janet, a middle aged single mother who had a two year old adopted son. Janet realized Valentina was unhappy. She felt Valentina was used to having a mother who would spend hours in the kitchen cooking with her. Valentina, she said, did not want to eat any of the American foods: hamburgers, pizzas, etc. She also felt that home phone calls were upsetting Valentina. Valentina's mother had been telling Valentina how high inflation was in the Ukraine and asking her to save money to buy her brother shoes. On the other
hand, Janet worked and in the evenings took care of her boy. She did not take Valentina out very much.

Valentina was eager to experience new things and to take advantage of the greatest opportunity in her life, her stay in the United States. She wanted to learn as much as she could about this country and to visit other cities. She was eager to make friends.

Her decision to change homes changed her life. She moved in with a divorcée who had a daughter, Tammy, close to Valentina's age. Valentina explains: "When I just came and I told Tammy and Mary that I didn't do anything at Janet's house, I was boring. And Tammy from the first day she told me, 'You won't be boring here, you will do things'...We went two times to see basketball games and we went to Mississippi state. It was so great!"

Valentina also made friends at her new school in St. James parish. Valentina explains: "At school they have a lot of activities, like dances. We had Sweet Heart Dance and Sadie Hawking dance. And we went there... We move during the weekends with my friends and sometimes we go see the movies...This weekend I spent a night at Patricia's house."

One of the great events of her stay was her senior prom. This is Valentina's description of how she went: "Oh, I was so excited to go to my prom...how the girls and the guys, they wear boutonnieres and corsages, and the flowers, and those beautiful dresses! But I tried to find me a date. And
month I was looking for a guy who can take me to the date. And my patience was...Monday...five days before prom...I almost was crying. I want to go to the prom! Find me somebody! And the guy, one of my friends, he came and he asked me will I go with him. So I said yes." She went on to describe the day of her prom: "And....Eric, he brought me roses. I was so excited...I was so....I was shaking. She then described how the proms are in the Ukraine and that she would miss it. "And I wanted...I wanted to come for my prom because of my dress. I got here dress. It's more beautiful...they more beautiful than ours. So I wanted to..." She then went and showed me her dress.

Valentina's life had changed. She was now enjoying her stay in the United States. So much so that she was considering staying and attending LSU. She was encouraged by her history professor who found work for her. She had made American friends and was acculturating to her new life. Several factors seemed to have helped her: taking action when she was unhappy, having a host sister close to her age, and her personality. Her most endearing quality is her zest for life. She reached out and touched our hearts.

Sociological Factors

Following Shumman's (1976) notion about the social factors that hinder or promote solidarity between two groups (the target language group and the L1 group) and consequently hinder or promote the acquisition of the target language, the
following factors are included under sociological factors: a) whether the two groups view each other as dominant, equal, or subordinate; b) enclosure, the degree to which the two groups have separate schools, recreational facilities, etc.; c) cohesiveness, the degree to which the second language learning group lives and socializes together.

The two groups view each other as equal. Ukraine used to be a part of the former Soviet Union, and individuals with whom Valentina came in contact considered her a Russian. During the cold war years Americans viewed Russia as a formidable enemy politically, culturally, technically and economically their equal. Only recently do they realize Russia's economic failure. Still, most Americans consider Russia as sociologically equal. Though Valentina views Americans as economically more successful, she considers Americans her sociological equal.

Valentina belongs to the working class. Her father is a chauffeur and her mother a technician. But her father loves to read, and he and Valentina discuss the books they have both read. Because of her polished manner and her education, her teachers and other students believed she belonged to the upper middle class.

There was low enclosure. Valentina lived with American host families who were accepted members of the community. She attended the school, church, and recreational facilities
attended by other Americans and the host families with whom she lived.

The exchange student group was not cohesive. Though Valentina felt close to other exchange students, they were few, and Valentina made friends with other Americans.

**Psychological Factors**

Psychologically, Valentina was very well disposed towards the United States and its people. "America, it is a fairyland where all dreams can come true." Upon her arrival she was impressed by the happy faces. "People when we just came to the airport and I went through the airport people all smiled...It's all happy. Our people, they seem too busy because they have a lot of problems and I think it's more sad than here. People here they seem more friendly. Maybe it is because of the life they have for many years. It is considered and it is still considered that you Americans have easy life."

**ATTITUDE**

**Results of the Bogardus Behavioral Test**

On the Bogardus Behavioral test which assesses the way the person would act towards the people of the country tested, three countries received the highest possible score of 28: Ukraine, the United States, and Spain (see Appendix IV for a sample of her test). Valentina's behavior seems to confirm these results. She became very close to Tammy, her American host, and one of her best friends was an exchange
student from Spain. Valentina developed close friendships with other American students and wished to remain in the United States.

Results of Semantic Differential Scale

This test measures the affective and cognitive components of attitude. It assesses the attitude of the person tested towards the individuals referred to in the test, in this case the Americans. Factor I measures individual sociability; Factor II measures group achievement; and Factor III enthusiasm.

Valentina took the test twice, once in October 1993, and the second time in May 1994. For a bar graph comparing October and May results in each element see Appendix V. A comparison of the totals and of the scores for each factor follows (see Table 1 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>October</th>
<th>May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>27/33</td>
<td>25/33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>13/21</td>
<td>9/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>4/6</td>
<td>3/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44/60</td>
<td>37/60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores referring to the Americans were lower in May than in the first test taken at the beginning of her stay. An explanation may be that the first test was taken during
the initial euphoria of her arrival. She had an idealized vision of the USA. The second test taken at the end of her stay may be more realistic, tempered by the realities of daily living. Nevertheless, the scores seem to indicate a positive disposition towards the American people. Probably more important than the results of this semantic differential scale, were her own actions and words which reflected enthusiasm for the United States.

In May 1994, Valentina completed three identical forms of the Semantic Differential scale, one each referring to Americans, Ukrainians, and Valentina herself. The purpose was to assess whether Valentina viewed herself closer to the American or Ukrainian characteristics. For a bar graph comparing each element see Appendix VI. A Comparison of the totals and of the scores for each factor follows, (see Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semantic Differential Scale</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Americans, Ukrainians and Valentina</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Americans</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ukrainians</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valentina</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three test results were very close, the total scores for the Americans and the Ukrainians were the same. One could not say that Valentina's scores resembled the scores of either country more. Valentina's scores and the score for
Americans were the same in sociability. Both scores were higher than scores for the Ukrainians. Test results seem to indicate that Valentina has a high self-esteem. Her total test scores were higher than both the Ukrainians' and the Americans'. Valentina expected others to treat her well. She was very surprised and disappointed when someone stole her radio at school. Her comment was: "How could they! They knew how much I liked my radio." The students felt so bad that they got together and bought her a new radio as a going away present.

GRAMMATICAL COMPETENCE

In Canale's framework (1980), grammatical competence refers to the degree to which the language user has mastered the linguistic code. The development of grammatical competence was assessed through:

1) Pre- post test of the English Placement test developed by the English Institute of the University of Michigan described in the methodology section, pgs. 41-42.

2) Analysis of Valentina's written work (such as an autobiography, and essays written at school for the English and social studies classes) and taped conversations. This analysis does not intend to provide the learner's language developmental sequence but rather to show whether there was significant improvement from the early to late
oral and written samples, and make a general assessment of the degree of proficiency Valentina achieved.

The results of the placement test are discussed first, followed by an analysis of Valentina's written and oral language. Other than in the placement test, no effort was made to elicit any particular form.

**TABLE 3**

Results of the Michigan Placement Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>* 60/100</td>
<td>95/100</td>
<td>35pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>76.7/100</td>
<td>90/100</td>
<td>13.3pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>73/100</td>
<td>90/100</td>
<td>16.7pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>60/100</td>
<td>80/100</td>
<td>20pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All scores were converted to 100% scores so that they could be compared.

In a self evaluation the students made of their progress, Valentina stated that she felt that she had improved most in listening comprehension. Her evaluation is confirmed by the test scores (see Table 3 above).

Valentina's total test scores were compared to the scores of the other students. Of all the students, Valentina reached the highest degree of Proficiency, and achieved the second highest total gain. She gained 20 pts. (see Table 4 below).
TABLE 4

Total Test Scores of the University of Michigan Placement Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>Gain in 8 mos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oidin</td>
<td>65/100</td>
<td>86/100</td>
<td>21 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafael</td>
<td>46/100</td>
<td>64/100</td>
<td>18 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentina</td>
<td>69/100</td>
<td>89/100</td>
<td>20 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ximena</td>
<td>40/100</td>
<td>59/100</td>
<td>19 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average gain per student was 19.5 pts. The standard deviations=1.29. The four students made significant gains with Oidin showing the greatest improvement.

TABLE 5

Assessment of Valentina’s Development of Grammatical Competence from Taped Interviews and Written School Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral</th>
<th>Written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copula be</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux. be</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sing.</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90% accuracy is criteria for mastery
* means mastery
N/A means that the form was not required and therefore not given.
Of the four exchange students observed, Valentina was the one who had acquired the highest degree of proficiency in English prior to her visit to the States. Valentina did not need the three weeks intensive training in English required of most of the students who were sponsored by the Freedom Support Act.

By the time of the first interview, Valentina had already acquired all the grammatical forms above, though there were no samples of the use of the conditional. There was only one sample of a question. She was able to use the embedded question without inversion, but with the redundant use of "do".

"I don't know how do you call it."

There were some samples of improper use of the gerund.

"A lot of Fightings between people"

"A lot of describings of our buildings."

There was also an occasional problem with word order.

"To get acquainted English children with our country."

There were some cases of incorrect word usage.

"To make the first step."

"At the same time they begin friends."

By the last interview in May, 1994, Valentina had mastered the use of the conditional and the formation of if clauses.
"...and if I would like to make career at LSU, he could help me."

Valentina expressed herself clearly and fluently on a wide variety of subjects. Her mistakes were random, and much less frequent. She no longer used the gerund incorrectly. The only error that persisted with some regularity was that she occasionally omitted the definite and indefinite articles:

"He was really interested in navy."
"We went to hotel."
"I watched news."
"Like some of western countries."

Valentina had mastered all the grammatical forms in her written expressions that she had mastered in her speech (see table XXIII). Though the type of errors were the same, she made fewer mistakes in her written work. The only type of error that recurred with some regularity through her latest written work was the occasional omission of the definite and indefinite article. She loves literature, enjoys writing, and has a large vocabulary. In this paragraph she describes her home town:

I like my town. Its new squares' solemn loftiness and the old streets' quietness, grandeur of new factory buildings and charm of the new parks, geometrical design of modern blocks and picturesque domes of the cathedrals merged into a harmonic unity. The Psyol River and it's surroundings are very beautiful. The Psyol landscape is charming in summer: the gardens descending the bank, the sunflowers enjoying the sun along the narrow path in the vegetable garden. But especially our town is beautiful in the
spring. They say the Earth smiles flowers, and Sumy smiles with a riot of chestnut blossoms.

Summarizing, one may say that analysis of Valentina's oral and written texts confirm the results of the English placement test. Of all the students, Valentina's total test scores were the highest 89/100. Analysis of her written work and taped conversations show that of all the students she achieved the highest degree of proficiency. She was able to express herself eloquently and fluently, both orally and in writing, on a wide variety of subjects with only random, occasional errors.

SOCIOLINGUISTIC COMPETENCE

Valentina's sociolinguistic competence was determined through analysis of a situational test patterned after a test devised by Swain and Lapkin (1990), participant and non participant observation, and interviews with her teachers and host families.

The purpose of the test was: a) to determine the extent to which students could vary their language use appropriately in response to the social demands of the different situations, b) to compare their responses to that of native speakers of the same age and school in the same situations.
The students were given one point for each politeness marker and one point for differentiating between formal and informal forms of address. Only one student had a higher score than Valentina. The students were given four different situations. The first one follows: You are trying to study in the library and two persons close to you are speaking loudly. You want them to make less noise. What would you say if they are your friends? What would you say if they are adults that you don't know?
The most common form used by the students for an adult was an introduction, excuse me or pardon me, followed by an explanation or indirect request.

"Excuse me, but I am trying to study."

Valentina used this form when addressing an adult, which would identify her as non native.

"If it's not difficult for you, talk not so loud, please."

Forty four percent of the students used the following form with their peers for the same request.

"Shut up!"

For the same situation, Valentina said to her peers:

"Excuse me, but I am really trying to study. Can you talk quiet? Tell me later what are you talking about."

The following form was used by Valentina when she asked a stranger to stop blocking her view at a football game. It is similar to the more polite forms of other students.

"Sorry, but I can't see the game, can you sit down?"

The same request above made to a peer read:

"Stay in your place or sit down, 'cause I can't see."

Although Valentina's peer language was more polite than the majority of the students, she addressed her peers in a
form that was acceptable to them and in no way appeared to be subservient.

Some of the students used the conditional when formulating polite requests.

"Mam, Sir, could you please be more quiet because it is too noisy in here."

Although Valentina had already mastered the conditional, she did not use it for any of her requests. She used the question form instead.

"Excuse me, but I am really trying to study, Can you talk quiet?"

Analysis of the test responses reveal that Valentina did vary her language appropriately in response to the social demands of the different situations. She did so slightly more than some of her peers who did not differentiate between the form used for peers and the deferential form. Valentina's score for differentiation was 2, very slightly above the average score of her classmates, 1.67. Compared to her peers, Valentina tended to use more politeness markers, her total score was 21, and her classmates' total average score was 11.88.

Interviews with her teachers reveal that they felt that Valentina had acquired sociolinguistic competence. One teacher said she expressed herself like the American students, that other than her accent there was no difference. Other teachers said that she related well to her American
peers, and that they had accepted each other. My observations confirm the teachers' assessment. Valentina emulated the manner of speaking of the area where she lived. She addressed me in the form typically used in the deep south to show respect and affection, Miss Rosita. Most importantly, she used language effectively to get along with others. She received from both the students and her teachers innumerable demonstrations of esteem.

DISCOURSE COMPETENCE

To assess Valentina's written discourse competence, her compositions were analytically scored using Jacob's et al (1981) ESL Composition Profile. Also observed were length and complexity of sentence structure to express meaning, ability to use cohesive devices such as pronouns and grammatical connectors, and unity of thought and continuity in a text. To assess her oral discourse, her taped dialogues were analyzed observing her use of a specific category of speech markers that affects the ability to pause, hesitate, and self-correct appropriately without causing undue strain to the listener (Olynak, 1990). Analysis of the oral text in the taped dialogues and monologues precedes the assessment of her written work.

From her earliest tape recorded conversation, Valentina gave the impression of fluency. She understood all the questions addressed to her, answered them clearly, and with little hesitation. Her accent did not interfere in any way
with comprehension and her dialogues contained long runs (continuous speech with no pauses). She spoke at a fast rate and her tone of voice sounded excited which gave her speech a kind of urgency. Furthermore she elaborated in her responses so that most of the questions were answered lengthily and coherently. She was also willing to take the initiative and introduce new topics.

Analysis of her taped conversations reveals that Valentina used mainly two types of fillers, "mm" at the start of sentences or phrases to collect her thoughts, and "uh" before repeats and repairs:

"Ok..mm...I think that ..mm..traits of ancient people"
"to..uh..to get independence"
"they..uh..we had a lot of wars"

Her silent pauses were few, and they occurred both for repairs and to collect her thoughts.

"They were founded far.....a lot of years ago."
"Who need.....freedom."

These pauses were not perceived as uncomfortable silence but rather as changes in rhythm.

There are some differences between Valentina's early and late oral discourse. Among these are greater linguistic accuracy and longer runs with fewer repeats and repairs. But some of the qualities that enhance her speech were evident
from the start. She is both very receptive and candid, which made conversations with her a pleasure.

To assess Valentina’s written discourse, an early and a late sample of essays written by her were analyzed. The early sample shows that she correctly uses a variety of sentence types and lengths. She generally uses cohesive devices, although the cohesion breaks down on the last paragraph. The paper shows general unity, but again, the connection of points is not as clear in the last paragraph. The paper’s ESL composition profile includes good content (26/30), average organization (14/20), good vocabulary (16/20), average language use (18/22), and very good mechanics (4/5). Total: 78.

The late sample shows varied sentence structure and length, good use of cohesive devices, and strong unity and continuity. Its ESL composition profile includes very good detailed content (28/30), excellent organization (18/20), very good vocabulary (18/20), good language use (20/25), and excellent mechanics (5/5). Total: 89.

The ESL composition profile scores serve to give a more analytical evaluation of the specific areas where there has been an improvement or decline in performance. Comparison of the ESL profile scores from early and late samples show improvement in all areas; content, organization, language use and mechanics.
Strategic competence

Swain (1984) defines strategic competence as "the mastery of communication strategies that may be called into action either to enhance the effectiveness of communication or to compensate for break-downs in communication." Since non verbal communication can undermine or reinforce the verbal channel (Wiley, 1982), this study considers both verbal and non verbal strategies.

Strategic competence was assessed through observation of Valentina, interviews with her teachers and analysis of her audio and video tapes. The video tape was analyzed considering Neu's list of non verbal factors namely:

1) the appropriate use of meaningful gestures
2) non verbal gestures in aid of speech difficulties
3) non verbal gestures appropriately synchronized with the verbal channel
4) degree of synchrony between interactants.

Interviews with Valentina's teachers and my observation of Valentina reveal that she is a perfectionist. She is always prepared for class and works as hard as possible. She studies even when there is no pressure and she uses the word processor at school to correct all her work before she hands it in. She loves to read. She told me how much she had enjoyed reading Macbeth. She was the student with the highest grade in her English class. This interest in academic endeavors translates in improvement in her language ability as well.
To assess body language, Valentina was taped performing two different activities: describing a picture so that the other students would draw it from her description, and playing the game Taboo (for a description of the game, see p. 44 of the methodology section). These activities were very successful, not only because they indeed encouraged the use of strategies, but because the students enjoyed the activities and there was a strong spirit of camaraderie.

Valentina and the other students submerged themselves so deeply in the object of the game, communicating by signs and circumlocutions, that each player helped even the opposing team to succeed. Before the game started Valentina leaned forward expectantly, and placed herself within view of the video recorder. She listened carefully to the instructions leaning forward and making eye contact with the person giving the explanation.

When she started speaking, she synchronized her movements with the verbal channel, slapping her hands on the table in rhythm with each word. Valentina used body language and facial expressions to show excitement and disappointment. When her team made a point she lifted her arm and swayed it with her hand in a fist. When her partner did not get her point she would slap her hand and squint.

During both activities, Valentina used input elicitation and conversational strategies. She paid close attention to her friends' body language, noticing their reaction to her
words, and tried to find the knowledge that they shared in common and might aid in communication. To express herself, she used synonyms and circumlocution. To describe the picture she used descriptors such as in the middle, to the right, far, close, etc.

SUMMARY

Valentina was the student who reached the highest level of proficiency and who also acculturated. Several factors contributed to her success. She performed well academically because she applied herself and was a perfectionist. She also had a great love for literature. But the main factor contributing to her success was her personality. She had a great zest for life. Valentina was eager to experience new things and to take advantage of the greatest opportunity in her life, her stay in the United States. She wanted to learn as much as she could about this country and to visit other cities. She was eager to make friends.
CHAPTER V

RAFAEL

MOTIVATION

At first glance, it seems that Rafael has solely a strong instrumental motivation. On the questionnaire he answered two weeks after his arrival, August, 1993, he stated he wanted to learn English because: "I think is a important thing to know two languages and the English is an international idiom." The reason he wanted to be an exchange student in the United States is: "because is the best form of learn the English. I must Study in English and it's a great thing."

In January 7, 1994, during an interview with his host mother, she asked him if he thought it had been worthwhile to come as an exchange student to the States. He answered: "Mm..I think it is the best. If you want to learn a language you have to go to a country and stay. I think the best is can speak two or more languages. If you have two languages you can work. You can..eh..find work very easy. I think eh..that eh.. everything eh..you need the English for everything."

On the interview of January 31, 1994, he introduces the idea that he has gained more than just the knowledge of a second language: "It's a special year in my life. It's like I left my life there, five months ago and start other life, and when I go back to Spain, I am going to left this life mm..and continue the same. I am knowing new things about
this country, about the people of this country. I think that I am not going to forget it, not any more."

Upon closer scrutiny, and considering observation of Rafael's behavior and the comments of former teachers, a broader pattern emerges. Rafael comes from a very close family. He is motivated to work hard not only to achieve his own goals but also in order to please his parents and to fulfill their expectations. On an interview describing why he studied hard in Spain at the school he attended, he explains: "I have to study. If I don't pass any subject, I can't go back to the school... and my father loves the school."

Rafael's motivational profile reveals the four elements of motivation as defined by Gardner (1985): a goal, a desire to attain the goal, a positive attitude towards learning the language, and effortful behavior to that effect.

Rafael has a clearly defined goal, to learn English. He has expressed a strong desire to attain that goal. He has a positive attitude towards learning English and feels that he has chosen the ideal method to do so: living in the United States with an American family, and taking all the school subjects in English.

Rafael has made extraordinary efforts to attain his goal. He has family here in Baton Rouge, who speak mostly Spanish, and he avoided seeing them often so as not to revert to speaking in Spanish. He has avoided contact with foreign exchange students and concentrated in making American
friends. For example, he did not attend any of the parties sponsored by the foreign exchange program. He could have gone back to Spain during the Christmas vacation but did not do so because he felt he would lose some of the proficiency he had gained. He listened only to American music and read all assigned literary works in English. He concentrated in getting good grades at school, which he accomplished, making mostly As and Bs. His behavior has been consistent with the recommendations of his teacher in Spain: "Rafael has a strong will-power which undoubtedly will help him to adapt to his new life and be successful in everything he really wishes."

CULTURAL SHOCK AND ACCULTURATION

Rafael experienced the classical culture shock as described by Brown (1980): a) initial euphoria followed by b) culture shock, leading to feelings of estrangement, then c) gradual vacillating recovery, and finally d) assimilation or adaptation to the new culture.

a) initial euphoria

Rafael states: "When I arrived I think I was not going to miss my family and in the first three weeks I didn't miss them.

b) culture shock leading to feelings of estrangement

"The first two months is like a year. Christmas and the special days where all the family is together...very hard. The relationship with the people is hard...because there is some people that are very gentle with you and
other people are...ah... they don't care. You don't know the language very well and it's very hard. You are in class and maybe the people are talking about you...and I don't know. If they say anything about you and you don't understand, it is very hard. Most of the time in class I don't understand anything. I have to copy the notes from other people."

"Life in America is completely different from Spain. I think that in the United States everything is work. I don't expect that. When you see the TV. and the movies...I think that when you see the TV, you think completely different life. I see the happy life, no problems, the Americans, the country of the...the...choice. It's not the same. I think the life in this country is very hard. In Spain if you want to obtain anything is more easy. Together anything it seems more easy."

c) gradual vacillating recovery

"January and February felt fine. Make friends. Went out with them. March, April, fine. People are the same. We are young, teenagers. We like to go out."

d) assimilation or adaptation to the new culture

Rafael did not assimilate to the new culture. He came for one purpose, to learn English, and was very anxious to go back home. On the last interview in May 1994, he said: "Last month ... another year... it's bad."
Sociological Factors

Rafael belongs to the upper class in Sanlucar. His father is a professional and owns his own businesses. Rafael attended a private school in Baton Rouge, where most of the students belong to the middle or upper class, so Rafael considered them his social equals. Rafael's cousin and a very close friend from Sanlucar had attended that school the previous year, so the students were familiar with other Spanish students and accepted them as their social equals. Also, Rafael's host brother attended the same school and had some classes with Rafael. He is planning to visit Rafael in Spain during the summer.

There was low enclosure. Rafael lived with an American host family. He participated in the social activities of that family and he and his host brother became friends. The family was eager to help Rafael adapt to the new environment and help him learn English.

The exchange student group was not cohesive. There were no exchange students in the school Rafael attended. Rafael did not seek other exchange students and did not participate in the activities sponsored by the exchange student program.

Rafael came to the States by choice. He felt that participating in the exchange program was the ideal means of accomplishing a very important goal, to learn English. He was determined to achieve his goal.
ATTITUDE

Results of the Bogardus Behavioral Test

The Bogardus Behavioral test assesses the way the person would act towards the people of the country tested. Rafael took the test twice. Once in October, 1993, and the second time in May, 1994. On the first test only Spain had the highest score of 28, followed by Italy and Mexico with a score of 21. The United States scored 19 (see Appendix VII). On the test taken in May, four countries scored the highest score of 28: the United States, Spain, Italy and Colombia (see Appendix VIII). There seems to be no explanation for the switch between Mexico and Columbia, but Rafael's behavior and comments reaffirm the high score for the United States. Rafael had overcome the initial cultural shock and made friends: "People are the same. We are young, teenagers. We like to go out." Rafael is looking forward to the visit to his home in Spain, by his American host brother.

Results of the Semantic Differential Scale

This test measures the affective and cognitive components of attitude. It measures the attitude or opinions of the person tested towards the individuals referred to in the test, in this case the Americans. Factor I measures individual sociability, Factor II measures group achievement, and Factor III measures enthusiasm.

Rafael took the test twice, once in October 1993 and the second time in May 1994. For a comparison of each element
tested in both test scores, see Appendix IX. A comparison of the totals for each factor follows, Table 7.

**TABLE 7**

**Semantic Differential Scale**

**Scores for Americans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>October</th>
<th>May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociability</strong></td>
<td>14/33</td>
<td>19/33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement</strong></td>
<td>19/33</td>
<td>12/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enthusiasm</strong></td>
<td>3/21</td>
<td>4/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>18/60</td>
<td>35/60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the first test in October, the Americans scored the highest in the social factors, which would seem to indicate that Rafael perceived them to be generally kind and friendly. There was considerable improvement from the first test taken in October to the second test taken in May in all factors, especially in achievement and enthusiasm. This is consistent with Rafael's comments that the Americans worked very hard. In the first test Americans received the highest score of 3 in the following elements: kind, good, and active. In the second test Americans scored the highest in the following elements: sociable, friendly, progressive, and productive (see Appendix IX). There were very few negative scores, which would seem to indicate that Rafael had a positive attitude towards Americans and the United States and that this attitude improved during his stay in the United States.
In May 1993, Rafael took three identical tests, one each referring to Americans, Spaniards, and Rafael himself. The purpose was to assess whether Rafael viewed himself closer to the characteristics of the Americans or those of the Spaniards. For a comparison of each element tested in the three tests, see Appendix X. A comparison of the totals and of the scores for each factor follows.

**TABLE 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Differential Scale</th>
<th>Americans, Spaniards, and Rafael</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americans</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaniards</td>
<td>9/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafael</td>
<td>16/21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rafael scored higher than both Americans and Spaniards in all scores except enthusiasm, where Americans scored the highest. In all other scores the order was first Rafael, then Americans followed by the Spaniards. One may say that Rafael's scores were closer to the scores of the Americans. The Spaniards scored the highest score of 3 in being warm, kind and friendly, which may indicate that Rafael felt affectively closer to them.

**GRAMMATICAL COMPETENCE**

In Canale's framework (1980), grammatical competence refers to the degree to which the language user has mastered the linguistic code. The development of grammatical competence was assessed through:
1) Pre-post test of the English Placement test developed by the English Institute of the University of Michigan

2) Analysis of Rafael's written work (such as an autobiography, and essays written at school for English and social studies classes)

3) Analysis of taped conversations.

This analysis does not intend to provide the learner's language developmental sequence but rather to show whether there was significant improvement from the early to late oral and written samples, and make a general assessment of the degree of proficiency Rafael achieved.

The results of the placement test are discussed first, followed by an analysis of Rafael's written and oral language. Other than in the placement test, no effort was made to elicit any particular form.

**TABLE 9**

Results of the Michigan English Placement Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>26.7 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>33.4 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores were converted to 100% scores so they could be compared
Rafael made remarkable improvement in vocabulary and grammar and no apparent improvement in listening or reading comprehension. The test results for listening comprehension seemed suspect because besides Rafael, Ximena also showed very little progress. Rafael showed no progress at all even though his host mother thought he had improved most in listening comprehension, and Rafael himself thought he had greatly improved. It was stipulated that the test may have a very high floor and does not record improvement in the lower levels. Analysis of the following taped conversation reveals that though it may very well be true that the test does have a high floor and that undoubtedly Rafael improved more than the test indicates, nevertheless Rafael and his host mother may have been a little optimistic in their appraisal. This conversation was taped the 17th of January.

Host mother: Here at Catholic High School, do you find it easier to get along with the other boys and communicate and talk to them?

Rafael: I think that Catholic High is hard school because when I talk with my friends in Utah or Kansas they tell me that they don't study. They don't need to study. They go to class and maybe read the matter and they have Bs, As and I have to study.
Host mother: Well, Catholic High has a reputation, you know, very college prep school.

In this conversation, Rafael did not understand the question, but he gave an answer that caught the host mother's interest, so that she responded to Rafael's statement and continued the conversation. Rafael was never made aware that he had not understood, and since she was distracted by Rafael's answer, she may have not registered in her mind that he had misunderstood.

**TABLE 10**

Assessment of Rafael's Linguistic Accuracy from Taped Conversations and Written School Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oral Early</th>
<th>Late</th>
<th>Written Early</th>
<th>Late</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept.-Dec</td>
<td>Jan.-May</td>
<td>Sept.-Dec</td>
<td>Jan.-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copula be</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux. be</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sing.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90% accuracy is criteria for mastery  
* means mastery  
N/A means that the form was not required and therefore not given.  
O means that the particular form was required but never given.
It was difficult to discern whether Rafael mastered the plural, the third person singular "s", and the possessive in his speech, because of his pronunciation. As a native of Andalucia he had a tendency to aspirate the final "s" in some words, hence the question mark in Table 10. In his early written work he had already mastered the plural and used the "s" in the third person singular 50% of the time.

There was a great difference in grammatical proficiency between Rafael's oral and written samples. The earliest samples of his written work show he had already mastered the use of the preterit, but his speech shows only 87% correct usage, see Table 10. There were some misunderstandings in our earlier conversations because often he did not enunciate the "ed" of the preterit nor the "s" or "es" of the third person singular and did not use the necessary conjunctions.

"Rafael; He pass the four subjects."

I thought he meant "he passed the four subjects", since he often omitted the "ed" of the preterit. Rafael had meant "if he passes the four subjects".

It was perplexing to observe an apparent drop in the correct use of the preterit in Rafael's speech from 87% in the earlier conversations to 75% in the later ones. A possible explanation for this decline may be that he was at ease in his later conversations with his host mother and therefore used the vernacular (natural unmonitored speech). Another interpretation would be in the assessment. The
following examples seemingly contain a switch from the preterit to the present tense when the preterit should have been maintained.

"We went to Calendars to dinner and I meet some girl..exchange student from Italy."

"The first week I didn't miss my family, but after... it is very hard."

This two particular cases could be assessed differently, e.g. Rafael may have meant "met" instead of "meet" and have mispronounced the word. In the second sample he could mean "I missed them and I am still missing them," hence the use of the present tense.

In his early oral expressions, Rafael occasionally confused the masculine and feminine pronouns. This switch was never evident in his written work. In this conversation Rafael is speaking about his sister Marmen.

"Marmen, he is finished the first year pharmacy...

She studies much."

Globally, Rafael was the student who progressed the most in grammar. In his early use of the possessive, Rafael either omitted the "'s" of the possessive or used "of" to show possession as is customary in Spanish.

"Don Quixote life."

"The husband of Delia."

By February, Rafael consistently used the correct form of the possessive.
In his written work, he mastered all the grammatical morphemes as seen in Table 10. He went from 50% correct usage of the 3rd person singular "s" and 50% correct usage of the possessive to the mastery of both.

The progress in grammatical competence evident from the analysis of Rafael's oral and written expressions in English confirms the results of the pre-post English placement test, where Rafael was the student who progressed the most with an increase of 26.7 points.

**SOCIOLINGUISTIC COMPETENCE**

**TABLE 11**

Sociolinguistic Assessment of Request Forms
Rafael and Classmates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rafael</th>
<th>Classmates (n=17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question form</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attenuating phrase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite formula</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indirect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rafael's responses resembled closely that of his classmates. His total score was 8 and the class average was
7.53. He used the terms "excuse me," or "I'm sorry" more often than his classmates. His score was 3 and his classmates' average was 1.88. He also scored higher in differentiation than his classmates. His score was 3, and their average was 1.59. On the other hand, Rafael never used the interrogative, the conditional or attenuating phrases which his classmates occasionally used. Though in the following response Rafael differentiates between peer and adult address, the form used to address an adult is not correct.

Form Rafael used to address an adult:

"Shut up, please"

Form used to address a peer:

"Shut up."

However, another classmate used the same form as Rafael to ask an adult to be quiet.

This is the form Rafael used with an adult who was cutting in line in front of him:

"Excuse me, I think you're wrong."

This response would seem culturally inappropriate, for in American culture, one usually does not tell a person directly that he is wrong, while it is appropriate in Spanish culture.

This is the form he used in the same situation with a peer:

"Get out my way. "
Rafael does differentiate between adult and peer address, but two of his responses are not appropriate. For one of them, another one of his classmates used the same form. However, his other response would be considered culturally different and would identify him as non-native. In general his responses closely resembled that of his classmates. Of all the schools, his is the one that had the lowest total average score, 7.53, while the other schools' averages were 11.89, 12.4, and 12.2, respectively. The difference may be due to the fact that Rafael attended an all boys school. There may be a difference of response between the sexes.

Based on my observations and the comments of his teachers and host mother, it seems that Rafael both acted and expressed himself in a manner appropriate and similar to his peers. His chemistry teacher stated: "Rafael is totally Americanized; he uses slang, raises his hand to ask questions, and participates in the jokes going on in the class." In our last interview, May, 1994, Rafael's host mother said: "within the last two months, his personality is coming out more. Before he was a little reserved. Now he kids around, and is always cracking jokes. He is just right on top of it."

**DISCOURSE COMPETENCE**

To assess Rafael's written discourse competence, his compositions were analytically scored using Jacob's et al.
(1981) ESL Composition Profile. Also observed were length and complexity of sentence structure to express meaning, ability to use cohesive devices such as pronouns and grammatical connectors, and unity of thought and continuity in a text. To assess his oral discourse, his taped dialogues were analyzed observing his use of a specific category of speech markers that affects the ability to pause, hesitate, and self-correct appropriately without causing undue strain to the listener (Olynak, 1990). Analysis of the oral text in the taped dialogues and monologues precedes the assessment of his written work.

In conversations, Rafael gave the impression of fluency even though his knowledge of English was very limited. Several elements contributed to this effect. He had an air of self-assurance and he covered up his misunderstandings. Also, he had few repairs in his spoken discourse.

Though Rafael's spoken discourse gave an impression of fluency, it lacked coherence partly because he sometimes misunderstood the questions, so he seemed to wander into a different subject. However, the subjects he brought up were usually related to the matter of the conversation and he seemed to instinctively choose topics of interest to the interlocutor.

Even in the earliest conversations, Rafael was able to use cohesive devices such as pronouns, conjunctions, and adverbs, in order to achieve unity of thought. For example:
"In September he had the second time and he don't pass. If he pass maybe he come to the States."

The construction "if.....maybe" helps provide the idea of the future, which Rafael did not yet master, and adds cohesion to the sentence.

Analysis of Rafael's spoken discourse reveals that he has a number of repeats (repetition of a word or phrase) but very few cutoffs (repeats within the word initiation e.g. hun/hundred), or repair conversions (modification of an element of speech that has been produced). Rafael's ratio of higher number of repeats than cutoffs and repair conversions may help give the impression of fluency. According to Olynak (1990) "repeats" and "uhs" are progressive and forward moving, while cutoffs and repair conversions are postpositioned and cause a syntactic readjustment on the part of the listener."

Rafael uses mainly "mm" and "ah" as pause fillers, but unlike Americans, he also uses elongation of syllables as pause fillers. He may have transferred the latter strategy from his native language, Spanish.

"He has toooo get examination."

Another difference in Rafael's use of speech markers is that he was the only one who used "get it" instead of the commonly used filler, "you know". He seemed to expect the interlocutor to share in the burden of communicating, of understanding him and of being understood. For example:
"Now he have to pass... ah... four... Get it?"

The expression "get it" seems to tell the listener: "are you being able to understand me?"

Rafael's pattern of pauses and pause fillers was initially excellent and gave an impression of fluency. He maintained mainly the same pattern throughout his stay in the United States, but he improved greatly in vocabulary and in linguistic accuracy. However, there were still some misunderstandings which affected the coherence of his spoken discourse.

Analysis of Rafael's early written sample, an essay on Don Quixote, shows poor discourse competence. Although he tries to use varied sentence lengths and types, his meaning is often obscured. He uses cohesive devices in sentences, but uses few to connect sentences or paragraphs. All the material is about Don Quixote, but the paper is a random collection of points without a central focus.

Rafael shows some knowledge of his topic but offers little detail and no clear focus (22/30). His organization is poor with disconnected ideas and poor sequencing (11/20). His vocabulary is poor to average with several errors in word choice and usage (14/20). His language use is poor. He has major problems with run ons and syntax (12/25). His mechanics are fair with punctuation errors and poor handwriting (3/5). Total points: 62.
Rafael's later sample (Don Juan) shows solid improvement. He shows some variety in sentence structure and length, but occasional fragments are a problem. He uses cohesive devices effectively within paragraphs, but the paper as a whole lacks unity. It contains much material but no clear focus.

The ESL composition profile of the Don Juan paper is better than that of the Don Quixote paper. Rafael shows knowledge of his topic, but again the thesis is unclear (23/30). Organization is loose but main ideas stand out (14/20). Vocabulary is adequate and generally clear (16/20), and language use is average with occasional problems, including a few fragments (18/25). Mechanics are average (4/5). Total: 75.

The compositions were analytically scored to allow for more precise diagnosis of the areas of improvement. The areas of greatest improvement were in language and vocabulary which are the areas where he showed greatest improvement in the Michigan English placement test. Though there is improvement in discourse competence with some improvement in cohesion, there is still a need for better focus and organization.

STRATEGIC COMPETENCE

Swain (1984) defines strategic competence as "the mastery of communication strategies that may be called into action either to enhance the effectiveness of communication
or to compensate for break-downs in communication." Since non verbal communication can undermine or reinforce the verbal channel (Wiley, 1982), this study considers both verbal and non verbal strategies.

Strategic competence was assessed through observation of Rafael, interviews with his teachers, and analysis of his audio and video tapes.

Early observations of Rafael revealed that he tried to cover up his lack of understanding. He sometimes answered yes when he did not understand what was said, and he rarely asked for clarification. Self corrections were few and done inconspicuously. He gave the impression of calm self assurance. This strategy combined with his excellent use of pause fillers, gave an impression of fluency and proficiency, but kept him from improving his understanding through clarification.

I observed Rafael at school during the month of March, 1994. By that time his English had greatly improved. Though he daydreamed a little, he was attentive in class and took notes. The strategy that helped Rafael the most was that he actively sought opportunities to practice English. There were some Spanish speakers in his school, but he did not seek them. He became friends with Americans, read books in English and listened to American music. When he talked to me he always spoke in English.
Rafael was video taped playing the game Taboo and describing a picture for others to draw. The same characteristics present in his oral interviews were evident here. Rafael gave an impression of self assurance. He seemed relaxed. When the game started he was leaning forward with his legs open and his arms between them almost touching the floor. There was not much body movement. When he was pleased, he would lean back and smile. He paid close attention to his partner. When he didn't understand his partner, he rubbed his chin in a thoughtful manner, and a few times scratched his ear. Rafael relied very little on mimic, signs or gestures to communicate. He used his hands only once to describe a podium. His main strategy was circumlocution. He described a computer in this way:

"a machine that looks like a TV."

Rafael relied more on mental strategies than on body movement for communication, but his body movements gave an impression of self assurance and of being content which encouraged communication with others.

SUMMARY

Rafael was the student who improved most in grammar and vocabulary. He also adapted well. He was the only student whose scores for Americans, in the semantic differential scale, improved at the end of his stay. He had an ideal host family situation with a host brother his same age who attended his same school. Also Rafael is persevering and goal
oriented. He came to the States to learn English, and sought every opportunity to do so.
CHAPTER VI
XIMENA

MOTIVATION

Ximena's motives for coming to the States were varied. On the first questionnaire she stated: "I wish to come to the U.S. because I want to learn English, met people, learn about life in the United States, Culture and History. I think is an experience that make me mature, more responsible and independent." In another questionnaire she replied that she wanted to learn English because: "Is important, I like English, and can communicate with people of the whole world, because many persons of the whole world speak English." Though Ximena feels that knowing English is important, and this may imply a utilitarian or instrumental motivation, her main interest seems to be to expand her horizon. She wants to "met people, learn about life in the United States, Culture and History...communicate with people of the whole world."

In Ximena's motivation, psychological factors play an important role: "I think is an experience that make me mature, more responsible and independent." From the interviews and private conversations with Ximena it appears that Ximena comes from a very strict environment. She considered her trip abroad a means of obtaining independence. She also has a strong need to be recognized. Coming to the States would give her an opportunity to do
something outstanding, gain recognition and be more independent.

CULTURAL SHOCK AND ACCULTURATION

Of the four students, Ximena had the hardest time adapting to the new culture. She called home often and cried after the phone calls. Her parents came to visit her in October 1993 against the recommendations of the coordinator of the student exchange program, who suggested that they wait till after Christmas.

One of the reasons Ximena had come to the States was to become more independent, but the family she stayed with was very strict. Also, they were a young couple with small children and there was no one Ximena's age that Ximena could go out with and that would help her make friends with other teenagers. The young couple was outgoing and tried to make things easier for her. Ximena praised the host mother's cooking and tried to learn from her. But though she got along well with her host family and made no effort to change families, she complained that the four young children sometimes got on her nerves.

Ximena missed her friends, her family, her two dogs, and her horseback riding lessons. She was very proud to have been first in the regional competitions in Colombia. Also she came from a big city, Bogota, and was now in a small town, Gonzalez. She had wanted to go to California. Her advice to
other exchange students was: "do not come to Gonzalez and have fun."

Ximena had a hard time making friends because she is shy and because she talks in a low voice which, combined with her difficulty expressing herself in English, made it hard to understand her. When asked what was the most difficult time for her, she replied: "The first day I come here and Christmas." She did not start enjoying her stay till March, 1994.

During the second semester, Ximena started to adapt. Her English had improved considerably and she was able to communicate. Also, a new exchange student from Paraguay arrived at the school, and she and Ximena became good friends. Ximena also became friends with other American students. By May, 1994 Ximena was considering remaining in the States to finish high school and attend college.

**Sociological Factors**

Ximena belongs to the upper class in Bogota. Her father is a professional and owns his own businesses. Ximena dressed well and wore brand-name clothes. Though she did not make friends easily at the beginning it could be because she is shy and had difficulty communicating in English. From my observations of her at school it seemed that the other students treated her well.

Ximena acknowledges the economic and political power of the United States, hence the importance of learning English
(the language necessary to communicate with the rest of the world), still she considers herself culturally and socially equal to the educated people of her social class (upper middle or lower upper).

There was low encumbrance. Ximena lived with an American host family and participated in their social and religious activities. The family was an accepted member of the Gonzalez community, where they had been born and raised. They encouraged Ximena to make friends and were hoping to visit Ximena and her parents in Colombia.

The student exchange group was not cohesive. There were few foreign exchange students in Ximena's school and no one else from Colombia, yet Ximena became friends with another exchange student from Paraguay who arrived at her school at the start of the second semester.

**Psychological Factors**

Ximena was well disposed towards Americans and the United States. She had traveled several times to the States and has an aunt, cousins and a brother living in the United States.

Her motives for coming to the States were mainly psychological. She felt that living in the States would make her more mature and independent. It would also be a means of obtaining recognition from her family and friends.
ATTITUDE

Results of the Bogardus Behavioral Test

Ximena took the test once, in May, 1994. Only Colombia had the highest score of 28, followed by Spain, Mexico and the United States with a score of 21,(see Appendix XI). If one were to consider behavior the natural consequence of attitude, these scores seem to be confirmed by the scores of the semantic differential scale where Colombia scored higher than the States in all factors except enthusiasm.

It is my opinion that Ximena's expectations were very high when she came. The results of the semantic differential scale reflect the disappointment she experienced because of the difficulty she had adapting to the new culture. Evidence of this is the decline in scores from October 1993 to May 1994.

Results of the Semantic Differential Scale

Ximena took the test to measure her attitude toward Americans twice, the first time in October, 1993, and the second time in May, 1994. For a comparison of each element tested in both test scores, see Appendix XII. A comparison of the totals for each factor follows, Table 12.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>October</th>
<th>May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>12/21</td>
<td>6/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>2/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>13/33</td>
<td>4/33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26/60</td>
<td>12/60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test results show a marked decline in test scores from October to May. The biggest drop was in sociability, where test scores dropped from 13/33 to a very low of 4/33. This may reflect the difficulty Ximena had in making friends. Her own scores were equally low. Ximena senses that both parties, Americans as well as herself, share in the cause of her alienation. The only increase in score was in enthusiasm from 1/6 to 2/6.

In May, Ximena took three identical tests, one each referring to Americans, Colombians, and Ximena herself. The purpose was to assess how Ximena viewed herself compared to Americans and Colombians. For a comparison of each element tested in the three tests, see Appendix XIII. A comparison of the totals and of the scores for each factor follows in Table 13.
### TABLE 13

**Semantic Differential Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Americans</th>
<th>Colombians</th>
<th>Ximena</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>6/21</td>
<td>9/21</td>
<td>5/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>2/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>4/33</td>
<td>20/33</td>
<td>4/33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12/60</td>
<td>30/60</td>
<td>11/60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ximena's evaluation of herself and of Americans was almost identical not only by factors but in each individual element. The only factor where there was any difference was in achievement where Americans scored one point higher than her. Colombians scored higher than both Ximena and Americans in all scores except enthusiasm, where they scored one point lower in being less active. Colombians scored the highest possible score of 3 in being refined and polite. Ximena did not give herself or Americans any 3 scores. The biggest difference in scores between Ximena, Americans, and Colombians was in the sociability factor, where Colombians scored 20/33 and Ximena and Americans scored 4/33. It is interesting to note that the American scores dropped so much from October to May even though Ximena stated in her interview that she had started to enjoy her stay in March.
TABLE 14

Results of the Michigan English Placement Test

Ximena

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>*50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>5 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>23.3 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>23.3 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>25 pts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All scores were converted to 100% scores so that they could be compared.

Test results show great improvement in reading, vocabulary, and grammar and very little improvement in listening. Taped interviews on the other hand show improvement in listening comprehension. Where there were breaks in communication in the early interviews, there are none in the later ones. It is stipulated that the test for listening may have a high floor and not record improvements in the lower levels.
TABLE 15
Assessment of Ximena's Development of Grammatical Competence from Taped Interviews and Written School Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oral Early</th>
<th>Oral Late</th>
<th>Written Early</th>
<th>Written Late</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copula be</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux. be</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sing.&quot;s&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90% accuracy is criteria for mastery.
* means mastery.
N/A means that the form was not required and therefore not given.
O means that the particular form was required but never given.

During our first interview in October, there were some breaks in communication both because I did not understand her and vise versa. But on most occasions, when I did not understand her or she had difficulty expressing herself, Ximena did not revert to Spanish but rather made an effort to explain further.

Interviewer: "What are you doing in Physics?"

Ximena: "Dynamics, Newton law."

Interviewer: (Does not understand her pronunciation) "What is that?"
Ximena: (spells the word) "L A W, Newton's."

It is interesting to note that in the first reply, Ximena did not use the "'s" for the possessive in Newton's Law, but used it later when she was explaining herself.

Ximena's answers consisted mostly of single words with an occasional short sentence. These are some of her sentences.

Interviewer: "What does he look like?"
Ximena: no answer
Interviewer: "Is he big or small?"
Ximena: "Oh, now he is small."
Interviewer: "How old is he?"
Ximena: "He has maybe two ..ah..months."
Notice the interference from Spanish in the use of the verb "has " to tell the age.

Ximena used the correct negative form in the sentence "I don't know" which she used several times during our conversation, but it may have been learned as a ready made chunk. She did not produce other negative sentences with the auxiliary system nor with the use of "not".

"Vicki sometimes tell me call friends, but no. "
"She say OK, but Troy no."

Some of Ximena's most common mistakes were the deletion of "to" in the infinitive and the omission of the "s" in the third person singular. These two errors were also evident in
her written work. By May she already used the infinitive correctly, but she still omitted the "s in the third person singular.

The greatest improvement in Ximena's oral communication came between October and January. Though Ximena continued to make grammatical errors, there were no breaks in communication. Ximena successfully negotiated meaning through the use of strategies such as circumlocution and definitions.

Ximena: "I need buy rinsing after shampoo."

Interviewer: "Conditioner."

Ximena progressed from answers consisting of single words and simple sentences to complex sentences and coherent paragraphs. Ximena recorded this monologue in early January.

Well, I told you that the last Christmas was very boring and new year's day worse. Here we, I don...did nothing ..mmm..that day. I talked with my parents and I cried much because I missed...I missed everybody.

Also Ximena used many new grammatical morphemes not present in her earlier speech or writing. She used the correct form of the preterit consistently, the progressive, and the possessive.

In her earliest communications, there was a marked difference between Ximena's oral and written expressions. Though the type of errors were similar, in her written work she did not have to deal with oral comprehension and she could choose to write about what she could express. The
misunderstandings and difficulties in communicating logically could not be observed.

Her first written work was a descriptive paragraph for school. This is an excerpt from that paragraph. In this sentence she successfully used conjunctions for cohesion.

"He has a difficult time because he don't know what to do, so the man go sit and thinking about that."

This is another sample of Ximena's early written work with a successful use of conjunctions and the omission of "to" in the infinitive.

"When I begin jump was very fun but when I begin fall no too fun."

Ximena's written work improved significantly from December 1993 to May, 1994, but Table 15 does not adequately make evident Ximena's progress. It shows only an improvement of 9% in the use of the preterit, an improvement of 17% in the use of the progressive, and the mastery of the possessive. But Ximena had improved immensely in vocabulary, had overcome some of her most common errors such as the deletion of "to" in the infinitive, and by May, Ximena had progressed from writing short paragraphs to writing a cohesive coherent essay.
### Sociolinguistic Assessment of Request forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ximena</th>
<th>Classmates (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question form</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attenuating phrase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite formula</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indirect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ximena varied her language use appropriately differentiating between adults and her peers. Though her total score was lower than that of her peers, 10, compared to 12.4, her differentiation score was higher, 3, compared to 2.5.

This is how she addressed an adult and a peer when she asked them to be quiet in the library.

Request to an adult:

"Please be quiet."

Request to a peer:

"Shut up."
Ximena's answers closely resembled that of her classmates. Only one out of her eight answers would identify Ximena as non-native. The main difference between her and her peers, which caused her to have a lower score, is that she never used the conditional. Her score was 0, while her classmates' average score was 1.5. Whereas Valentina substituted the interrogative form for the conditional, Ximena never used the interrogative form either.

When interviewed, Ximena's English teacher was very vague in reference to her sociolinguistic competence. The teacher rather opted to talk about Ximena's academic progress and also stated that Ximena got along well with others. My observations indicated that Ximena acted and expressed herself in a manner similar to the average American student. The differences were due to linguistic accuracy rather than to meaning or social form.

DISCOURSE COMPETENCE

When we had our first interview, Ximena knew very little English. Her proficiency level was probably between a 0 and 0+. There were breaks in communication, and her answers consisted mostly of single words and memorized phrases. Still, in the few sentences she produced, she was able to use cohesive devices such as the adverbs and conjunctions in the following utterances:

Sandra too, but Angela more.
Analysis of her taped discourse shows that there is a transfer from Ximena's native language, Spanish, in her use of pause fillers and interaction markers. To check on understanding, she used a rise in intonation common to the formulation of questions in Spanish, instead of the commonly used filler in English, "you know". To keep a turn or to organize her speech, Ximena used an elongation of the last syllable of words also typical of Spanish speakers. There were also unfilled pauses, the pause filler "mm", and the interaction marker, "I don't know". These usually occurred in transitionally relevant places.

Her later taped discourse basically follows the same pattern of pauses and pause fillers, but the quality of her discourse improved greatly. There were no breaks in communication and Ximena progressed from the single word, short sentence proficiency level to complex sentences and structured coherent speech.

Analysis of Ximena's early written sample shows good use of basic cohesive devices. It is coherent and unified. Its ESL composition profile includes limited content (21/30), good organization (16/20), limited vocabulary (10/20), poor language use (11/20), and fair mechanics (3/5). Total: 61.

The later sample shows more details, but some run ons and garbled wording. The sentence structure is mostly simple sentences with some compound structures. The paper is basically unified and connected. Its ESL composition profile
includes average content (22/30), choppy organization (14/20) average vocabulary (15/20) fair language use (16/25) and fair mechanics (3/5) Total:70

The analytical method of scoring was helpful in identifying the areas of progress. Ximena shows improvement in vocabulary and language use, and a small decline in organization. The earlier sample consisted in a single paragraph, while the later sample contained a two page composition which required organization beyond the paragraph level.

STRATEGIC COMPETENCE

Swain (1984) defines strategic competence as "the mastery of communication strategies that may be called into action either to enhance the effectiveness of communication or to compensate for break-downs in communication." Since non verbal communication can undermine or reinforce the verbal channel (Wiley, 1982), this study considers both verbal and non verbal strategies.

Strategic competence was assessed through observation of Ximena, interviews with her host mother, and analysis of her video tapes.

Ximena was video taped twice. Once at my home with the other exchange students in early May, 1994, and a second time at the end of May, 1994 at her host family's home. There were great differences between the two tapes. In the first tape, Ximena was very uncomfortable. She sighed, she turned her
head away from the camera and sometimes covered her face with her hand. She gave negative body signals. At the start of the game, she left her hands hanging next to her body and leaned her body against the table. As the game progressed, she got interested and started participating. Her main communication strategy was mime.

When Ximena was videotaped the second time, she was relaxed. Her hands were in front of her holding the book with the picture she was describing, and she would look over the book and smile. The main strategy she used at this time was circumlocution. For example, she did not know the word trunk, so she described it as "the part of the tree without the branches."

After the end of the taped activity, Ximena's host mother, Vicky, explained the strategies Ximena used to learn English when she first arrived. Ximena would point to an object and Vicky or her husband would identify it. Then they would write the word on a board they kept in the kitchen so that Ximena would have it there for future reference until she learned it. Ximena also used the dictionary often. As her English improved Ximena started reading American magazines. She loved to listen to American music and learned some of the lyrics.
SUMMARY

Ximena's motives for coming to the States were varied. She wanted to learn English, to expand her horizons, learn about American culture, and meet new people. Psychological factors played an important role in her motivation. She felt that the new experience would make her more mature, responsible and independent.

She improved greatly in grammatical and discourse competence. Her speech progressed from answers consisting of single words and simple sentences to complex sentences and coherent paragraphs. Her written work progressed from short paragraphs to cohesive coherent essays.

Ximena decided to remain in the States to finish high school and attend college. She is presently a senior in high school and resides in Atlanta.
Oidin is from Uzbekistan. She wants to learn English well because: "I am going to be an interpreter. Of course you may interest why I choose this profession, and I can answer it. At first I like this language because we have been learning this language from the second grade on, and this language aroused admiration and great love in me. Since that time my dream is to become an interpreter. I don't want to be a technical interpreter. I would like to accompany different delegations and tourist groups. It's so interesting and delightful!"

Oidin was very interested in coming to the United States. She viewed her trip as a true cultural exchange. "Of course, it is my dream to go to America and to know more about the life of American people, their world outlook, about their life, about American children, their hopes and thoughts, their likes and dislikes, and I want to come into contact with my future American friends. It is very helpful and useful for me to go abroad and to know more about the life of different countries. I hope I shall also be able to contribute to an international exchange. I'll try my best to get acquainted you with our customs, traditions, our language, music."
Oidin is instrumentally motivated. Learning English well and visiting the States will help her in her career as an interpreter. She is also integratively motivated. To her future host family she wrote: "I am eager my dream to become a member of your family will come true and then our talks face to face will tell us more than any letter." Oidin has a general desire for wider social contact and an interest in foreign cultures and people. On one of her essays Oidin states: "If I go to America, I miss my home, my family, my friends, my native land, but I broaden my world outlook."

Once in the States, love for her mother and fear of not meeting her parent's expectations motivated her to work hard to learn English, graduate from high school, and get good grades. Oidin was very proud to graduate from high school with honors. She was very excited when she gave me the news: "My class rank, I'm like seventh of 81, you know I'm on honor roll...I couldn't even believe it! At the beginning when I came to this school I made bad grades. The year I started making good grades you know, because I realized that I have to graduate, and if I won't graduate everybody is gonna be mad, you know, my real parents in Uzbekistan, they would really get mad. I started studying good and I made good grades. I was so exited about that! When you graduate you wear them white things around your neck and they gave me yellow one. It means that honor."
CULTURAL SHOCK AND ACCULTURATION

a) initial euphoria

When Oidin arrived, she first went to Boston for three weeks of intensive training in English. In her journal she wrote: "The most beautiful place I've ever seen is Boston at night. When we study 3 weeks in Boston, in Bentley College, our teachers brought us to the highest building in Boston, and I saw the Boston at night. We can see only a lot of lights. It was very beautiful."

b) culture shock leading to feelings of estrangement

This is another excerpt from Oidin's journal: "When I came to America for the first time, I didn't like everything and the food, and people, houses, and whole America. I couldn't see the beauty of this country, the politeness of American people, picturesque scenery, because I was far from my family, house, friends and from my home country."

c) recovery

This is a continuation of the paragraph above: "One month later my opinion changed. Now, I'm very happy that not other students, but I came to study to America."

Besides adapting to life in the States, Oidin had to adapt to a change in host families. Because of personal reasons the initial family could not keep her, so she had to move to a new home and a different school. These are Oidin's comments: "My first host family, I liked, I used to like 'em, but still, when I moved to another family, I realized that,
you know, I'm happier here. I met new friends at school, I thought it will be real hard, but it was kinda hard, but it's alright now, you know, I adjust to like American style, or how you say, I like my host family and friends....When I came for the first time to school they was real kind, they was real friendly and they start talking to me and you know, they became real good friends. I have some real good friends at school, and I am going to prom this year."

d) assimilation or adaptation to the new culture

Oidin adapted well to the new culture. She became close friends with her host mother, became friends with American students at school, and adopted the peculiarities of expression of her host family. Of all the exchange students she developed the best English accent. These were her comments four weeks before she left: "I got just four weeks or something, and my year in the United States is almost over and I am so glad that I came here, really, at the beginning I thought that I did wrong that I came to the United States, but now, after a year, I changed my mind. I'm so glad that I came here, you know, I got American High school diploma, I became good friends with some Americans, you know, my friends and I got just four weeks left and from one side I wanna go home faster to see all my friends, family, and everybody, but from other side I don't wanna leave my friends, my host family. I became so close with my host family, especially
with Vickie, I just don’t know, well, I guess I’ll leave, but I am really glad I came here to United States."

**Sociological Factors**

In general Americans and Russians view themselves as sociologically equal. Though Oidin belongs to the working class, both her teachers and her classmates believed she belonged to the middle class. She was refined, dressed neatly, and had a good education.

There was low enclosure. Oidin lived with an American host family and participated in their social activities. The family is very close and married brothers and sisters live in homes next to each other. Oidin was accepted as a member of the family and became friends with the niece of her host mother who was a teenager like her and who lived very close.

Though the student exchange group was not cohesive, and there were few foreign exchange students in Oidin’s school, Oidin did identify with them and became good friends with a student from Sweden, Anna. Oidin explains: "The first person whom I met at school was her, you know, because, but still, exchange students, they understand exchange students, so she is my real good friend and we have fun together, like we go to mall, to stores somewhere together and have fun...I’m so glad I met her!"

**Psychological Factors**

Oidin was thrilled to come to the States and anxious to make friends and to belong and become a member of an
American family. Of all the students she was the one that had the easiest time adapting. Her success was mainly due to psychological factors, namely her personality.

Her teachers in Uzbekistan described her as straightforward, witty, kindhearted and thoughtful of others. They felt that her cheerfulness and optimism would help her to tolerate failure and to adapt to differences in her life. They also described her as outgoing, good-natured and gentle. My observations of Oidin, remarks by her teachers in the States, and comments of her host mother reaffirm this description. Her host mother narrated that shortly after Oidin moved to her house they had stayed up till two in the morning talking. They had both enjoyed the conversation, She also remarked that Oidin had a great sense of humor.

ATTITUDE

Results of the Bogardus Behavioral Test

Oidin took the test in May, 1994. Only Uzbeks obtained the highest score of 28 followed by Ukrainians and Americans with 25. The reason Ukrainians and Americans did not make a perfect score is because Oidin did not mark as a member of my church. She explained that she is Moslem and the others are not. All the other nationalities scored 18 point except the chinese who scored 0, see Table XIV.

Results of the Semantic Differential Scale

Oidin took the test to measure her attitude toward Americans twice, the first time in October, 1993, and the
second time in May, 1994. For a comparison of each element tested in both test scores, see Appendix XV. A comparison of the totals and of each factor follows in Table 17.

**TABLE 17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Differential Scale</th>
<th>Scores for Americans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>16/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>3/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>26/33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>45/60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a big drop in test scores from October to May, especially in sociability and enthusiasm. Totals went from 45/60 to 21/60. An analysis by element (Appendix XV), shows that in October, Americans received the highest score of 3 in the following elements: warm, kind, nice, friendly, good, polite, and productive. There were no negative scores. In May, Americans did not receive any maximum scores and there were two negative scores: inconsiderate and passive.

In May, Oidin took three identical tests one each referring to Americans, Uzbeks, and Oidin herself. The purpose was to assess how Oidin viewed herself compared to Americans and Uzbeks. For a comparison of each element tested in the three tests, see Appendix XV. A comparison of the totals and of the scores for each factor follows.
### TABLE 18

**Semantic Differential Scale**  
**Americans, Uzbeks, and Oidin**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Enthusiasm</th>
<th>Sociability</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americans</td>
<td>11/21</td>
<td>0/6</td>
<td>10/33</td>
<td>21/60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbeks</td>
<td>7/21</td>
<td>4/6</td>
<td>31/33</td>
<td>42/60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oidin</td>
<td>6/21</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>10/33</td>
<td>17/60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is hard to tell why Oidin gave herself such low scores. She did not seem to have low self esteem, but rather confidence in herself. One may speculate that she did so out of modesty. On the top of her test paper she drew a sad face, while she drew smiling faces for the Americans and the Uzbeks. Uzbeks scored higher on all factors except achievement, where Americans, scored higher. The general order was Uzbeks first, then Americans, and Oidin last.

### GRAMMATICAL COMPETENCE

### TABLE 19

**Results of Michigan English Placement Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>25pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>20pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>13.3pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>35pts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores were converted to 100% scores so they could be compared.*

Oidin made remarkable improvement in reading and listening comprehension. She went from 50% score in reading
to 85% and from a 65% in listening to 90%. She was the student who improved most in reading and on her total score.

TABLE 20
Assessment of Oidin’s Linguistic Accuracy from Taped Conversations and Written School Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oral Early Sept.-Dec.</th>
<th>Oral Late Jan.-May</th>
<th>Written Early Sept.-Dec</th>
<th>Written Late Jan.-May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copula be</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux. be</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sing.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90% accuracy is criteria for mastery
* means mastery
N/A means that the form was not required and therefore not given.
0 means that the particular form was required but not given.

By the first interview, Oct. 1993, Oidin had already mastered the following grammatical morphemes in oral English: copula be, plural, 3rd singular, possessive, and the final stage of negation as described by Ellis (1985) (See Table 20 above). She had developed an auxiliary system and used "not" regularly as the negative particle.

"They won't smile."

"They don't have driving education."
Oidin was not consistent in forming questions. During her second interview, Dec. 12, 1993, she used all these forms:

Declarative word order, but spoken with rising intonation
   "You have this things?"

Wh- questions without inverting the order
   "What she will think?"
   "What I have to do?"

Inversion of order with wh- questions
   "What did you say?"
   "What is it?"

Embedded question without inversion
   "I saw where I will go."

Oidin seemed to have difficulty with the verb "finish" both in the preterit and in the third person. In two consecutive sentences she used the preterit of finish both correctly and incorrectly:

   "I finished school in Russia, like high school, we have 11 grades. I finish this."

Though she had mastered the third person, she said:

   "It finish at 2 O'clock."

By May 1994, Oidin had acquired, in oral English, the grammatical forms shown on table 20. The use of the preterit improved from 77% correct usage to mastery. She mastered the use of the conditional and was consistent in the correct
formation of questions. She still made random mistakes in syntax especially when she became excited:

"I'm on honor role students, you know, I'm on top ten students, you know, and I'm 7th of 'em."

There was also an occasional error in subject verb agreement in the past.

"Yesterday, we was talking."

The host family was concerned that Oidin had acquired from them some of their "bad speaking habits", such as the incorrect use of the object pronoun them for the demonstrative adjective "these":

"You wear them white things"

and the incorporation into her language of the terms "gonna" and "wanna".

It is surprising how closely Oidin's written and oral language match. She mastered the same grammatical structures in written and spoken language at the same time, (see Table 20). Nevertheless, on her earlier written work, Sept. 9, 1993, she had difficulty the negative sentences in the past. This was not evident in her taped conversations, but she was first taped at a later date in late October.

"She didn't wants."

She would occasionally use that same structure correctly:

"My friend's boyfriend didn't drink anything."

By May, 1994, she had mastered this structure.
By the end of her stay, Oidin had achieved a degree of proficiency that enabled her to discuss a wide range of topics both orally and in writing. She still displayed random errors in grammar such as occasional errors with subject verb agreement, but her errors never interfered with communication.

**Sociolinguistic Competence**

**Table 21**

Sociolinguistic Assessment of Request Forms
Oidin and Classmates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oidin</th>
<th>Classmates (n=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ques. form</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attenuating phrase</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite formula</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though Oidin's score was much higher than that of her classmates, 22, compared to 11.66 (see Table 21), she did not differentiate between her peers and adults. She would use a form that would be appropriate for adults and though a little elaborate for her peers was acceptable to them. e.g.
"Excuse me, I am doing a work, can y'all be a little quiet? Please."

Because of the linguistic form, this request would also identify her as non native, though the format is standard for the more polite requests of her classmates: introduction, reason for the request, request, attenuating phrase, question form, and polite formula. Though this form had several mitigators it does not seem to be too obsequious.

Another difference between Oidin and her classmates is that she never used the conditional, which she substituted with the question form. Her score for the interrogative is 5, while her classmates scored .66. The score of her classmates for the conditional was .55 (see Table 21).

She used this form for both an adult and a peer cutting in front of her in line.

"Excuse me, I am staying here, can you move to the end of the line?"

This request would be appropriate for an adult except for the phrase "I am staying here", which seems a little confrontational.

Results of the situational test show that Oidin used a greater number of politeness markers than her peers, that her linguistic form would sometimes identify her as non native, and that she did not differentiate between requests made to an adult or, person of higher status, and her peers.
Interviews with her teachers reveal that they consider her to have acquired sociolinguistic competence because she was more polite than her classmates, and because she seemed to have adapted. Her social studies teacher remarked: "She was shy in the beginning and overwhelmed by the noise of other students. Later she became more self confident and was well accepted by her friends. There was teasing back and forth, badinage."

My observations confirm the assessment of her social studies teacher. Oidin had a great sense of humor compatible with the American wit. She emulated closely the speech of the region. Her accent was very slight, almost imperceptible. Like Valentina she addressed me as Miss Rosita, and in her writings she adopted the American custom of drawing smiling and sad faces to express approval or disappointment.

DISCOURSE COMPETENCE

To assess Oidin's written discourse competence, her compositions were analytically scored using Jacob's et al (1981) ESL Composition Profile. Also observed were length and complexity of sentence structure to express meaning, ability to use cohesive devices such as pronouns and grammatical connectors, and unity of thought and continuity in a text. To assess her oral discourse, her taped dialogues were analyzed observing her use of a specific category of speech markers that affects the ability to pause, hesitate, and self-correct appropriately without causing undue strain to the listener.
(Olynak, 1990). Analysis of the oral text in the taped dialogues and monologues precedes the assessment of her written work.

Oidin's early tapped recorded dialogues reveal that she already knew enough English so that conversations developed smoothly without breaks in communication, misunderstandings, or undue strain from either speaker. Oidin would occasionally ask for clarification and would easily understand the explanations given. Her pronunciation was excellent and it was easy to understand her.

Analysis of her taped spoken discourse reveals that she had some repeats (repetition of a word or phrase), very few repair conversions (modification of an element of speech that has been produced) and practically no cutoffs (repeats within the word initiation). Her silent pauses were few and they occurred when it was transitionally appropriate. Her most commonly used pause filler was "you know" and she used it often.

Oidin's early written sample is composed of mostly simple sentences with some cohesive devices and general unity. Her ESL composition profile includes average content with limited development and few details (22/30); average organization with loose, incomplete organization and choppiness (14/20); average vocabulary (14/20): fair language use (16/25); and average mechanics (4/5). Total points: 70
Oidin's later written sample shows more complete thought and organization, but in trying to write more sophisticated sentences, she is simply tacking one point onto another without separating them into different kinds of sentences. Her use of cohesive devices is average, but the paper shows strong unity. The paper's ESL composition profile includes good content (25/30); good organization (16/20); average vocabulary (15/20); fair language use due to the tense shifts and agreement problems (17/25) and average mechanics (4/5). Total points: 77.

The ESL composition profile scores serve to give a more analytical evaluation of the specific areas where there has been an improvement or decline in performance. Comparison of the ESL profile scores from early and late samples show improvement in all areas with the greatest improvement in content and organization. Her later sample also shows strong unity.

STRATEGIC COMPETENCE

Swain (1984) defines strategic competence as "the mastery of communication strategies that may be called into action either to enhance the effectiveness of communication or to compensate for break-downs in communication." Since non verbal communication can undermine or reinforce the verbal channel (Wiley, 1982), this study considers both verbal and non verbal strategies.
Strategic competence was assessed through Observation of Oidin, interviews with her teachers, and analysis of her video tapes.

Analysis of the video tape showed that Oidin felt at ease and in control. She organized the way the cards were to be placed and picked them up placing them the way she wanted while explaining to the students how it should be done. She used facial expressions effectively opening her eyes wide when she wanted to get someone's attention. She alternately gazed at her friends or at the camera. When she played the game she used hand gestures to emphasize what she was saying. She made good use of circumlocution and approximation, describing a butterfly as a "beautiful insect."

Observations of Oidin and interviews with her teachers, reveal that she took good notes in class and used both a dictionary and a thesaurus. She would also ask for clarification when needed. Because of her outgoing personality she made friends easily and this gave her more opportunities to practice English. Her friends were high performers, the valedictorian and salutatorian of her senior class, so she was among friends who valued an education.
CHAPTER VIII
SUMMARY AND DISCUSSIONS

The primary goal of this dissertation is to investigate the connection between language, attitudes, culture and the emergence of communicative competence. The following questions are addressed:

1) What were the subjects' motives for participating in the foreign exchange program and for learning English?
2) What were the subject's perceptions, feelings, and attitude towards the USA when they arrived?
3) Did these change during their stay in the USA?
4) Was there a relationship between the students' attitudes and feelings towards the USA and the success of language acquisition?
5) How and to what degree did the students develop communicative competence?
   a) grammatical competence?
   b) sociolinguistic competence?
   c) discourse competence?
   d) strategic competence?

It is hoped that from this dissertation:

1) Others may learn more about the process of acculturation and second language acquisition through a detailed description of the processes as they occur in specific persons.
2) Future exchange students may learn through the experience of other students in situations similar to theirs.

3) Future host families may be able to understand better the students they host.

The method chosen for the research was four ethnographically informed case studies. The period of observation was nine months, from August 1993 through May, 1994.

Chapters four, five, six and seven of the dissertation open with the four subjects, the teenagers Valentina from the Ukraine, Rafael from Spain, Ximena from Colombia, and Oidin from Uzbekistan narrating their motives for coming to the States and learning English. They also candidly and openly discuss their feelings during their initial cultural shock, their acculturation or adaptation to the new culture, and their problems and achievements.

Next, comes an assessment of their attitudes and of the development of communicative competence and its four parameters as defined by Canale and Swain(1980).

To ensure triangulation, data was collected from multiple sources. Triangulation is an effective method to validate ideas, sometimes reinforcing the emerging concepts and at other times bringing out differing views. The three main sources of data used to achieve triangulation were:
video and audiotapes of the student

written sources
autobiographies
students' school work
tests, questionnaires
scales and tasks

observations, and interviews
with the students
with the host family
with the teachers
with program coordinator

To ensure a more global perspective, data was collected from different informants. An important perspective came from the host families who knew the students well, having lived with them for nine months. The teachers at the schools that the students attended in the United States also shared their perceptions of the students. Because these students applied to come to the States through an organized exchange program, their teachers in their native lands also contributed with an evaluation of their qualities that might help them be successful in their studies abroad. I myself got to know them well. We spent many hours together at home where they spent an evening or a week-end, and on longer trips to Houston and to New Orleans.

To ensure richness of data, in each of the areas of development observed data was collected in different contexts (at their home, at school, during parties, during trips and at my home) and through different mediums. For example, for each of the parameters of communicative competence, both oral and written discourse as well as the
students were also videotaped to show the contribution of body language to communication.

A summary of the results in each area observed follows. These areas include motivation, acculturation, attitude, and the four parameters of communicative competence: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence. Under each of these headings there will be a statement of the data source, a summary and discussion of the findings and when appropriate, suggestions for further study.

MOTIVATION

The data sources for the assessment of the motivations of the students consisted of questionnaires, taped conversations, autobiographies, observations by the students' teachers and my own personal observations.

Analysis of the data reveals an expanded motivational framework as described by Oxford and Shearin (1994). The students motivation for coming to the States and learning English were individualistic and varied. They included instrumental motivation to learn English for their careers and other types of motivation such as: for travel; interest in foreign languages, cultures, and people; love for parents and a desire to please them; interest in and love for the American culture.

Certain motivations that lead exchange students to come to the United States in an attempt to try to learn the
language well are not commonly associated either with learning L2 or tied to relations between individuals and groups, but rather they are psychological in nature, for example, the desire to expand their horizons, the desire for new experiences, the need for achievement, the need for recognition, and the need to avoid failure.

In this study, instrumental motivation contributed significantly to the desire of these students to come to the States to learn English since English is the universal language for travel and business. All the students expressed this idea in some way. For some students, like Rafael, this was the primary motivation, yet his motivation was so strong that he capitalized on all practice opportunities to learn English so that his behavior typified the behavior of those with integrative motivation. He sought the company only of Americans, read only in English, and listened only to American music.

The students shared some common characteristics similar to the elements of motivation defined by Gardner (1985), which in this case led to their success. All the students were highly motivated, goal oriented, and they made, as expressed by Gardner (1985), "effortful" behavior to accomplish their goal. From these observations one may conclude that the intensity of the motivation, the effort the students exercise to achieve their goal, and personal characteristics such as perseverance are an intrinsic part of
success in language learning and are a part of the motivational construct. The types of motivation observed among the students varied, but in all cases their motivation was strong enough for them to act upon. Even though some of the students had little knowledge of English, they all passed all their academic subjects and one graduated with honors. All made significant progress in L2 proficiency.

Granted the importance of the intensity of motivation, further studies should include not only an identification of types of motivation, but also an attempt to develop instruments to measure intensity of motivation, and the means by which the motivation develops.

ATTITUDE

The data source for the assessment of the attitudes of the students consisted of the Semantic Differential scale and the Bogardus Social Distance scale, interviews with students and with the host families, and my own personal observations.

All the students exhibited positive attitudes towards Americans and the United States. On the Bogardus Social Distance scale, two of the students gave Americans the highest possible score. For the other two students Americans were second only to their own countries.

There was a considerable drop in the scores for Americans from October, 1993 to May, 1994, in the semantic differential scale. Rafael's evaluation was the exception. The scores for Americans actually increased in his second
test. A comparison between Rafael and the other three students reveals these differences. Rafael was the only student that gave Americans a higher score than to the people of his own country. When the students took the test the first time, they were evaluating only the Americans. The second time they evaluated Americans, themselves, and the people from their native country. It may be that some of the scores for Americans dropped because they wanted to differentiate the scores of Americans from those of their people, so that where Americans had formerly scored the highest possible (3), these scores dropped to 2 and the highest of 3 was reserved for the people of their native land.

Another difference between Rafael and the other three students was that Rafael attended a private school, one which is selective in its admission of students. Some of the other exchange students expressed concern over the behavior and achievement of their classmates. The following is an excerpt from an essay by Valentina: "There are some things about the school that I don't like. The behavior of the students during the lessons and their communication with the teachers are among them. A big number of school fights really frightens me up. American students, I think, should be more helpful to each other. There are a lot of low students at school who, I'm sure, need some help."

Since the scores on the semantic differential scale were the only ones to show a drop in attitude among students
toward the States, further studies are needed using different instruments. In addition, the number of students observed needs to be increased to determine whether this backsliding is a trend.

CULTURE SHOCK AND ACCULTURATION

All four subjects experienced culture shock and recuperation as described by Brown (1987). The duration of their period of recuperation and the effectiveness of their adaptation seems to have been influenced not so much by their attitude towards the States but rather by their personality, their initial knowledge of English, the presence of peers close to their age in their host home, and their interaction with the host family.

One student had great difficulty adapting, and experienced a long period of recuperation. She adapted to her American host family's culture, but had difficulty adapting to the broader social context. There were several contributing factors. First the student's initial knowledge of English was very poor, between a 0 and 0+ on the ACTFL proficiency scale. Generally when language proficiency is low, other students don't want to make the extra effort needed to understand and communicate. Secondly, the student was very shy and did not actively seek communicative exchange with others. Students in these circumstances need a support group such as a person their own age residing in the host family who is available to help them make additional
friendships. There was no one close to her age in this student's host family, and yet she, like the others, felt that her stay in the States had very positive results. All students were very pleased with their progress in learning English, considered their stay a memorable experience, and expressed a desire to return to the States to further their careers.

**GRAMMATICAL COMPETENCE**

The data source for the assessment of the grammatical competence of the students consisted of pre and post tests of the Michigan English Placement test, taped conversations, and written data (school work in English and social studies classes).

Results of the pre-post administration of the English Placement test developed by the English Institute at the University of Michigan showed considerable gain in grammatical competence for all subjects. The average gain was 19.5/100 pts., the standard deviation was 1.29. Analysis of the students' written work, and taped conversations in most instances corroborate the results of the placement test.

There was great disparity in the initial proficiency of the students. Valentina and Oidin had attended schools that specialized in teaching English beginning in second grade, and they competed for a grant from the United States government. They were selected first by a review board in their native country, and later by a panel of Americans as
the most likely candidates to succeed. Rafael and Ximena on the other hand, were average performers in their native land who attended regular schools which did not specialize in the teaching of English, and whose parents paid for their stay in the United States. Still they improved as much as the other two students. The fact that these very different initial circumstances culminated in similar results in improvement of proficiency seems to reinforce the impact of the program of study abroad.

Sociolinguistic Competence

The data source for the assessment of the sociolinguistic competence consisted of observations, interviews with the host families and teachers, task formulating requests patterned after the one developed by Swain and Lapkin (1990).

Analysis of student's request forms reveals that there was no pattern of similarity between the exchange students other than the fact that Valentina and Oidin both used more politeness markers than their peers. Valentina's score was 1.6 SD above the mean and Oidin's score was a high 3.3 SD above the mean. These total scores only reveal the number of politeness markers used by the students and how this number deviates from the mean of what is the custom of their American peers. Analysis of the form and content of their responses also reveals that all of them had at least one response that, either because of the linguistic form or
because of its content, would identify the student as non native.

There is significant difference in the use of politeness markers between American students attending an all boys school and American students attending a co-ed school whose many respondents are girls. Further research ought to enlighten this area of competence to make certain the tests for sociolinguistic competence are given to members of the same statistical universe and not to members of two different statistical universes.

Through interviews with the exchange students' teachers and host families, a more global definition of sociolinguistic competence emerged stressing the social aspect rather than the linguistic form. This definition is more in terms of knowing the rules of conduct, getting along, interpreting speech, being understood, feeling at home in the new culture, understanding its sense of humor, and being part of it. This is the definition that Rafael's, Valentina's and Oidin's host families and teachers applied when they stated that they felt that these students had achieved sociolinguistic competence. Ximena had a harder time than the other students, and there is no evidence that she achieved sociolinguistic competence as defined above.
DISCOURSE COMPETENCE

The data source for assessing discourse competence was the students' taped discourse and written essays for English classes.

Taped discourse was analyzed observing the use of speech markers as described by Olynak (1990). Results confirm Olynak's conclusions that progressive speech markers help communication and increase the effect of fluency. It was also found that there was transfer from the native language among the Spanish speakers in the use of elongation of syllables as pause fillers, and in the intonation of the question form used to request feedback. Longitudinal studies are recommended to assess whether these transfers are maintained or are replaced by the commonly used target language speech markers.

Students' compositions were analytically scored using Jacob's et al (1981) ESL composition profile. Also observed were length and complexity of sentence structure to express meaning, ability to use cohesive devices and unity of thought and continuity in a text. Though all students improved in language use and vocabulary, the improvements in cohesion and coherence were random with one student showing a decline. The papers selected had been previously corrected by the students' teachers. The teachers corrected all language use errors, but there were very few comments on organization. An important pedagogical implication is that discourse
competence needs to be taught and that it does not necessarily develop with an improvement in grammatical competence.

STRATEGIC COMPETENCE

The data source for the assessment of strategic competence consisted of video tapes of the students playing the game Taboo and performing a task, observations, and interviews with the host family.

Analysis of video tapes revealed that use of gestures was independent of language proficiency. Students with greater language knowledge used gestures as much as those with lower proficiency level. One student with a low proficiency level relied heavily on mime to communicate. Good communicators used body language not so much to define the meaning of a word, but rather to show interest in the interlocutor, and to give positive or negative feedback. Poor communicators had negative body language which showed a lack of interest, nervousness or discomfort.

Student observations and interviews with teachers and host families revealed that although the strategies varied among the students according to their personalities, they all made progress in their own ways. They did employ some common strategies, such as the use of the dictionary, circumlocution, and approximation.
THE ROLE OF THE HOST FAMILY

The host family plays a crucial role in the success or failure of the student concerning the acquisition of a second language and his acculturation. Consider that the host family is the major channel for the student to access the local culture.

The host family is also the major provider of comprehensible input in what generally becomes the most relaxed environment for the student, the environment where he/she is most likely to learn with the least stress.

I have observed that the success of the student depends in large measure on whether or not the socio-economic level of the host family is similar to that of the student. For example, a student from a high socio-economic background tends to feel very constrained in a much lower socio-economic environment.

The presence or absence of a willing student-peer within the host family is very important. The presence of a peer helps greatly in the process of acceptance of the exchange student by others.

The host-family-student match is a useful and challenging area for future research. A greater understanding in this area would reduce the number of mismatches and the trauma of changing hosts after the program has started.
FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE EXCHANGE STUDENTS

Students should go to the host country already possessing some knowledge of L2. While in this research the rate of increase in L2 has been found to be about the same regardless of the starting point, the fact remains that the students who came with greater initial knowledge reached higher levels of proficiency. How much initial knowledge is best should be the subject of future research.

Also, the initial level of L2 knowledge is critical for the general acceptance of the student among his/her peers. This acceptance is critical for successful acculturation.

Students should be encouraged to change host families if the pre-arranged match is unsatisfactory. It is important for the student to know beforehand how many times he/she will be allowed to change host families. The American Intercultural Student Exchange allows three changes. In the cases studied here, two students changed host families once and the changes were very successful.

A description of the accomplishments of the four remarkable teenagers that participated in this program follows.

VALENTINA

Valentina was the student who reached the highest level of proficiency. Several factors contributed to her success. She performed well academically because she was very gifted, applied herself and was a perfectionist. She also had a great
love for literature. However, the main factor contributing to her success was her personality. She had a great zest for life, was eager to experience new things, and was ready to take advantage of the greatest opportunity in her life, her stay in the United States. She wanted to visit other cities, and in general she tried to learn as much as she could about this country. She was eager to make friends.

RAFAEL

Rafael was the student who improved most in grammar and vocabulary. He also adapted well. He had an ideal host family situation with a host brother his same age who attended his same school. But most importantly, Rafael persevered, had strong will power, and was goal oriented. He came to the States to learn English, and sought every opportunity to do so.

XIMENA

Ximena's motives for coming to the States were varied. She wanted to learn English, expand her horizons, learn about American culture, and meet new people. Psychological factors played an important role in her motivation. She felt that the new experience would make her more mature, responsible and independent.

She improved greatly in grammatical and discourse competence. Her speech progressed from answers consisting of single words and simple sentences to complex sentences and
coherent paragraphs. Her written work progressed from short paragraphs to cohesive coherent essays.

Ximena decided to remain in the States to finish high school and attend college. She is presently a senior in high school and resides in Atlanta.

OIDIN

OIDIN was the student with the greatest improvement in the total score of the Michigan Placement test. In my opinion she is also the student who reached the highest degree of acculturation. She emulated closely the manners and speech of her host family and of the Port Allen community where she lived. She also had a very subtle accent in English.

OIDIN's personality was the main factor which lead to her success. She was outgoing, cheerful and thoughtful of others. She made friends quickly and through interaction with them, learned English and enjoyed herself.

INTERPRETATIVE ANALYSIS

Each of the factors studied in this dissertation has been separately described and conclusions and recommendations were made under each. It is time to consider them as a "whole" and discuss their relevance to language acquisition and their implication for foreign language teaching in the regular classrooms. It is the combination of factors, which are present in most school year international student exchange programs, that made the exchange program a success for the students observed in this dissertation. Their stay in
the United States was a linguistic success regardless of other varying factors. These are the conditions that the four exchange students had in common: a) they acted on their motivation; b) they had a positive attitude towards the United States; c) they lived with an American host family; d) they attended an American high school for nine months; e) they were in their teens; f) they all had received formal instruction in English prior to their arrival. I will discuss these factors first. The factors that varied, and their effect on the students' acculturation and development of communicative competence will be discussed later.

It was found that students made progress in grammatical competence (the average gain in the English Placement test of the University of Michigan was 19.5/100, s=1.29) regardless of type of motivation. As addressed under motivation, their types of motivation were very different, but students that participate in exchange programs have this in common. Their motivation is strong enough that they act upon it (participate in a foreign exchange program). In general, students who participate in international exchange programs take risks, like venturing into the unknown, and are willing to experience certain hardships, such as separation from family and friends.

Since students choose the language they wish to learn and the country they want to visit, one may assume that they have a positive attitude towards them. The students in this
dissertation gave Americans a high score in the semantic differential scale and the Bogardus Social Distance scale they completed shortly after their arrival.

In the exchange program observed, students lived with American host families. This is an important element of the exchange programs. The host families introduce the exchange students to the target language culture in its nucleus, the family. They provide comprehensible input in what generally becomes the most relaxed environment for the students, and introduce the students to their circle of friends and to the target language society.

By attending a school in the target language, the students are introduced to the peer culture of that language and are exposed to the type of instruction and education that their peers of that culture receive. The length of time also seems critical. A school year allows the students to earn credit for the subjects taken, and allows enough time for acculturation. The students in this study showed a marked improvement in communicative competence approximately five or six months after their arrival.

The students in this study were between fifteen and seventeen years old. There is lack of agreement as to which is the ideal age to learn a foreign language. Evidence reported by Swain and Lapkin (1989), suggests that "older is better " because adults have cognitive skills which enhance their learning of a second language, while Johnson and
Newport (1989) conducted a major study which reaffirms the long held view that young children have an overall advantage. Formerly Snow & Hoelfnazel (1978) had shown that adolescent learners progressed most rapidly. Though there is disagreement as to which is the ideal age to learn a foreign language, age was one of the common factors of the students in this study, and may have contributed to their success.

Formal instruction in the target language prior to arrival to that country appears to be an important factor for success. A certain degree of proficiency seems to be crucial for the acceptance of the student by his/her peers and consequently for acculturation. Also, as expressed by DeKeyser (1991), when the study abroad follows the explicit teaching of grammar, it provides a prolonged opportunity for an ideal mix of focus on form and focus on meaning. The sensitivity to form brought about by formal study, better prepares the student to notice certain forms in the input.

It was this combination of factors which made the year abroad a linguistic success for the students. There may be ways of incorporating some of these factors into the regular classroom. The students in exchange programs were strongly motivated, had positive attitudes towards the target language and culture, and they were risk takers. It may be possible to stimulate motivation and the development of positive attitude towards the target language and culture by doing the following in the foreign language classroom: a) by
acquainting the students with the accomplishments of that culture especially in the area of the students' interest be it in the arts, science, business, sports or entertainment; b) by inviting guest speakers from the target culture; and c) by using community resources such as ethnic restaurants, museums, and cultural activities such as celebration of cultural feast days.

It may be possible to promote risk taking by encouraging guessing and rewarding not only "correct" answers, but efforts to communicate as well.

It is possible to expose students in the classroom to the interaction of focus on form and focus on meaning that made a difference in the proficiency of the exchange students. One way is by providing opportunities for the students to express their own thoughts and engage in meaningful exchange of ideas. Small group discussions are successful at all levels. Beginners can discuss familiar topics such as school, family, and entertainment, while more advanced students can defend a point of view or engage in polemics. Another way is by creating situations which demand the use of the target language such as information gap activities where one person has information that the other one needs. Still another means of extending the use of the target language is to offer courses in subject areas of interest conducted in the target language. This has been very successful in immersion programs.
The factors that differed between the four exchange students and the ways these differences affected them is addressed next. The students differed in: a) types of motivation, b) personality, c) intensity of cultural shock and length of time of recuperation, d) degree of acculturation, e) development of sociolinguistic competence, f) degree of proficiency in English upon their arrival, f) final degree of proficiency attained.

The types of motivation, personality, and degree of proficiency in English upon their arrival varied greatly among students, and the interaction of these factors affected their degree of acculturation and their development of sociolinguistic competence. Valentina and Oidin were the two students that achieved the highest degree of acculturation and of sociolinguistic competence. This is the combination of factors that helped them. They had the highest degree of proficiency upon their arrival so that they could communicate effectively with others, they were integratively motivated, they were outgoing, they had a strong need to communicate, and they were high achievers. Valentina experienced strong cultural shock when she arrived. What helped her recuperate fast was that she took action. She sought help, and took a risk. She decided to change host families. Ximena was integratively motivated, but she had very little knowledge of English when she arrived and she could not communicate effectively with others. The problem was compounded by the
fact that she was very shy. She was the student that had the hardest time, and there was no evidence that she acculturated or developed sociolinguistic competence. Rafael was not integratively motivated, but he had more knowledge of English than Ximena, and was not shy. There was evidence that he did develop sociolinguistic competence, but he did not acculturate.

Consequently, the development of sociolinguistic competence and the degree of acculturation seem to be influenced by type of motivation, the students' personality, and their proficiency level in the target language upon their arrival. Whether there is a relationship between acculturation and degree of improvement in proficiency was impossible to assess at this point because some of the students started at a very low proficiency level. Through analysis of the students' tape recorded conversations and their written school work, an impressionistic assessment of their net improvement is that Oidin went from a 2 to a 3 in the FSI scale, Valentina from a 2+ to a 3+, Ximena from a 0+ to a 1+ and Rafael from a 1 to a 2. Considering that the proficiency scales are not linear, and that as one goes up the scale progressively more language skill is needed to attain the next level, Oidin's and Valentina's improvements become more significant. The difference made by acculturation may be in the ultimate degree of proficiency that the students achieve, and ultimately Oidin and Valentina achieved
a higher degree of proficiency. A longitudinal study of the students is necessary to ascertain whether those who did not acculturate continue to improve or whether they fossilize at a certain level.

The example set by these students, and the description of their stay in the United States, will hopefully help future exchange students prepare for a fruitful and enjoyable visit to the country of their choice. It is only fitting that this study conclude with the words of three of the four subjects as they give advice to future exchange students. Oidin, Rafael and Ximena send these messages:

Oidin: "Be ready for all kinds of weird things once you become an exchange student and remember you have to be friends with Americans first. Be outgoing."

Rafael and Ximena: "Relax and enjoy yourselves".
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APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I
DIRECTED INTERVIEW

1) Describe yourself.
2) How would you describe your family?
3) How would you describe the Ukraine?
4) How would you describe Russia?
5) What ideas did you have of the USA before you came?
6) What impression did you get of the USA when you arrived?
7) Describe your education.
8) How would you describe your school in the Ukraine?
9) What would you do to improve it?
10) How would you describe your school in the USA?
11) What would you do to improve it?
12) What did you do in your free time in the Ukraine? Here?
13) Why did you study English?
14) What do you hope to accomplish during your stay here?
APPENDIX II
MODIFIED BOGARDUS SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I would be willing to accept a person from the country listed below</th>
<th>As a visitor to my country</th>
<th>As a citizen of my country</th>
<th>As a member of my Church</th>
<th>As a class mate in my school</th>
<th>As a neighbor on my street</th>
<th>As a member of my &quot;crowd&quot;</th>
<th>Into kinship by marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Negro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL TEST

How would you describe the Americans in the U.S.A.?
For each pair of adjectives put an X in the space along the line which best represents your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsociable</th>
<th>Sociable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>Cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruel</td>
<td>Kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backward</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerate</td>
<td>Thoughtless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice</td>
<td>Nasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generous</td>
<td>Stingy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stupid</td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rude</td>
<td>Polite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive</td>
<td>Unproductiv e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined</td>
<td>Crude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td>Inconsiderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>Unaspiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccom-modating</td>
<td>Obliging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninventive</td>
<td>Creative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Modified Bogardus Social Distance Scale—Valentina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>As a visitor to my country</th>
<th>As a citizen of my country</th>
<th>As a member of my Church</th>
<th>As a classmate in my school</th>
<th>As a neighbor on my street</th>
<th>As a member of “crowd”</th>
<th>Into kinship by marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Negro</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Given</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V
Semantic Differential Scale:
Valentina's Scores for Americans
October, 1993 and May, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsociable</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruel</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtless</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stingy</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasty</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rude</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccommodating</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsiderate</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backward</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unproductive</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruel</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stupid</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninventive</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaspiring</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = Americans in October
-= Americans in May
## APPENDIX VI
### Semantic Differential Scale:
**Americans, Valentina, and Eukranians**
**May, 1994**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsociable</td>
<td>*******</td>
<td>00000000000000</td>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>*******</td>
<td>00000000000000</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruel</td>
<td>*******</td>
<td>00000000000000</td>
<td>Kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtless</td>
<td>*******</td>
<td>00000000000000</td>
<td>Considerate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stingy</td>
<td>*******</td>
<td>00000000000000</td>
<td>Generous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasty</td>
<td>*******</td>
<td>00000000000000</td>
<td>Nice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td>*******</td>
<td>00000000000000</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>*******</td>
<td>00000000000000</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rude</td>
<td>*******</td>
<td>00000000000000</td>
<td>Polite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccommodating</td>
<td>*******</td>
<td>00000000000000</td>
<td>Obliging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsiderate</td>
<td>*******</td>
<td>00000000000000</td>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backward</td>
<td>*******</td>
<td>00000000000000</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unproductive</td>
<td>*******</td>
<td>00000000000000</td>
<td>Productive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>*******</td>
<td>00000000000000</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude</td>
<td>*******</td>
<td>00000000000000</td>
<td>Refined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stupid</td>
<td>*******</td>
<td>00000000000000</td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>*******</td>
<td>00000000000000</td>
<td>Rich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninventive</td>
<td>*******</td>
<td>00000000000000</td>
<td>Creative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>*******</td>
<td>00000000000000</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaspiring</td>
<td>*******</td>
<td>00000000000000</td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*= Americans
-= Valentina
o= Eukranian
APPENDIX VII
Modified Bogardus Social Distance Scale-Rafael, Oct. 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I would be willing to accept a person from the country listed below</th>
<th>As a visitor to my country</th>
<th>As a citizen of my country</th>
<th>As a member of my Church</th>
<th>As a classmate in my school</th>
<th>As a neighbor on my street</th>
<th>As a member of my &quot;crowd&quot;</th>
<th>Into kinship by marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Negro</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX VIII
Modified Bogardus Social Distance Scale—Rafael, May, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>As a visitor to my country</th>
<th>As a citizen of my country</th>
<th>As a member of my Church</th>
<th>As a classmate in my school</th>
<th>As a neighbor on my street</th>
<th>As a member of my &quot;crowd&quot;</th>
<th>Into kinship by marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Negro</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IX
Semantic Differential Scale:
Rafael's Scores for Americans
October, 1993 and May, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsociable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stingy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccommodating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsiderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unproductive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stupid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninventive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaspiring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Americans in October
-- = Americans in May
APPENDIX X
Semantic Differential Scale:
Americans, Rafael, and Spaniards
May, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsociable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stingy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccommodating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsiderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unproductive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stupid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninventive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaspiring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*= Americans
-= Rafael
○= Spaniard
APPENDIX XI
Modified Bogardus Social Distance Scale—Ximena, May 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I would be willing to accept a person from the country listed below</th>
<th>As a visitor to my country</th>
<th>As a citizen of my country</th>
<th>As a member of my Church</th>
<th>As a classmate in my school</th>
<th>As a neighbor on my street</th>
<th>As a member of my &quot;crowd&quot;</th>
<th>Into kinship by marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Negro</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Given</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX XIX

Semantic Differential Scale:
Ximena's Scores for Americans
October, 1993 and May, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsociable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stingy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccommodating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsiderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unproductive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stupid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninventive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaspiring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = Americans in October
- = Americans in May
### Semantic Differential Scale: Americans, Ximena, and Columbians
#### May, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsociable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stingy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccommodating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsiderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unproductive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stupid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninventive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaspiring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Americans
- Ximena
- Columbians

* = Americans
<= Ximena
o= Columbians
### APPENDIX XIV
Modified Bogardus Social Distance Scale-Oidin, May 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>As a visitor to my country</th>
<th>As a citizen of my country</th>
<th>As a member of my Church</th>
<th>As a classmate in my school</th>
<th>As a neighbor on my street</th>
<th>As a member of my &quot;crowd&quot;</th>
<th>Into kinship by marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Negro</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX XV
Semantic Differential Scale:
Oidin’s Scores for Americans
October, 1993 and May, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsociable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stingy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccommodating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsiderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unproductive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stupid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninventive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaspiring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*= Americans in October
-= Americans in May
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Differential Scale:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americans, Oidin, and Uzbecks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsociable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stingy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccommodating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsiderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unproductive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stupid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninventive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaspiring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Oidin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Uzbecks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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