

Learning Tolerance Revisited: A Quasi-Experimental Replication¹

D. Christopher Brooks
Department of Political Science
St. Olaf College
1520 St. Olaf Avenue
Northfield, MN 55057
Phone: 507/646-3723
Email: brooksd@stolaf.edu

In 2005, a study entitled “Learning Tolerance: The Impact of Comparative Politics Courses on Levels of Cultural Sensitivity” published in the *Journal of Political Science Education* presented evidence in support of long-standing, but untested, claims about the normative effects of studying comparative politics (Brooks 2005). The argument advances the claim that while most comparativists are concerned primarily, if not exclusively, with disseminating empirical knowledge of cases, theories, and methodologies in the classroom, the very process of studying comparative politics has a normative bearing on students’ cognitive and behavioral makeup. Practically, students develop a modicum of civic literacy regarding their own political system vis-à-vis the systems of other states and societies, equipping them with the ability to participate deftly in the politics of their locality, nation, and world. Morally, as part of a liberal education, comparative politics improves students’ self-understanding by challenging assumptions and opinions with empirical evidence. At the same time, garnering a basic comparative education about what alternative approaches to politics exist, how politics are organized and function in varying contexts, and why widely divergent approaches to similar problems are manifest can improve students’ intercultural sensitivity. Exposure to the political and cultural diversity facilitates an erosion of stereotyping, racism, xenophobia, and nationalism while challenging unquestioned, and often unfounded, feelings of cultural and political superiority (Brooks 2005).

Using a survey instrument designed to measure levels of intercultural sensitivity, the author gathered data from students at the onset and conclusion of two comparative politics courses, one taught in an on-campus environment and another off-campus abroad setting. A comparative analysis of changes in the pre- and posttest data provided considerable support for the basic argument that studying comparative politics had a positive and significant impact on students’ levels of intercultural sensitivity. Additionally, the evidence also supported modestly the hypothesis that students who study a region of the world prior to studying in that region experience larger positive shifts in their levels of intercultural sensitivity than students who do not. Finally, the evidence did not support expectations that students studying abroad would experience greater changes in intercultural sensitivity levels than students enrolled in the on-campus course (Brooks 2005).

While these findings are an important first step to understand the normative effects of the study of comparative politics, the ability to generalize the findings is limited by the small number of students included in the study and the fact that the courses surveyed were taught by the same instructor at the same college. While the latter of these issues is more difficult to surmount given the cost of training, acquisition, administration, and evaluation of the research instrument, this study attempts to correct for the problems of the former by replicating the initial research project. First, I review the theoretical underpinnings of the developmental instrument employed in this project and suggest ways in which comparative politics might connect directly to the stages of cultural competency outlined. Second, I offer a brief discussion of the research protocol, the courses included in the study, and the descriptive characteristics of the students enrolled in those courses. Third, I present the analysis in which the original

¹ Prepared for presentation at 2007 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, 9-11 February, Charlotte, North Carolina. The author wishes to thank Eric Lund and Jo Beld, for their financial and technical support of this project, and Patrick Quade for his assistance with instrument interpretation. The author also wishes to thank the twenty-three students who participated as subjects in this study.

hypotheses are retested using the newly acquired data and the findings are discussed. I conclude that further study is warranted, but that the present evidence suggests that comparative politics courses play an important role in the cognitive and behavioral development of students with regards to cultural difference.

Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI)

The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) is an instrument developed by Milton J. Bennett and Mitchell R. Hammer for the purposes of assessing individual and group levels of intercultural sensitivity (Hammer 1998; Hammer and Bennett 2001).² The IDI is based closely on Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS), a linear model that assumes exposure to and interaction with cultural difference increases levels of cultural competence and intercultural sensitivity (Bennett 1986; Bennett 1993). The model is comprised of six progressive stages, each of which represents a particular stage of cognitive development related to cultural difference. The fifty questions included on the IDI instrument are divided into operationalized clusters that discreetly measure the degree to which respondents have unresolved issues at each stage. The measures for each stage of development are aggregated finally into an overall IDI score that profiles an individual's level of intercultural sensitivity.

The first three stages of the DMIS are referred to as ethnocentric stages since they emphasize the importance of one's own culture to one's worldview. Denial, the first stage, is defined by the disposition to lack interest in cultural difference and the tendency to avoid interacting with cultural difference. People at this stage of development respond positively to statements such as "It is best to form relationships with people of your own culture" and "There would be fewer problems in the world if cultural different groups kept to themselves." As one resolves issues related to the Denial stage, they move into the Defense stage. Individuals whose scores fall into this range tend to see the world in dichotomous terms where the culture to which one belongs ("us") is superior to all other cultures ("them") in terms of industriousness, progress, desert, family values, and modeling ideal behavior and institutions. As positive interaction with other cultures occurs, individuals may experience the inverse of Defense, or Reversal. Often referred to as the "Peace Corps syndrome," the dichotomous worldview persists, but with the poles reversed so that one's own culture is viewed as inferior to other cultures. Resolution of the Defense/Reversal stage leads one into a mode of Minimization where similarities are emphasized (e.g. "People are the same; we have the same needs, interests, and goals in life") and values are universalized (e.g. "Human behavior worldwide should be governed by natural and universal ideas of right and wrong"). Those who minimize cultural variation frequently espouse viewpoints typically regarded as tolerant or egalitarian, but in doing so may trivialize, romanticize, or marginalize important cultural traits that are critical to understanding how and why other cultures are different than one's own (Hammer and Bennett 2001).

The last three stages of the DMIS are grouped together based on shared patterns of seeing one's own culture in relation to others, that is, in ethnorelative terms. The Acceptance stage is reached when people begin to recognize and identify manifestations of cultural difference in approaches to similar circumstances. In doing so, individuals at this stage of intercultural development begin to accept variation in the meanings of gestures, emotional expression, conversational patterns, decision-making processes, and in defining and solving problems as having intrinsic value to their respective cultures. One moves into the Adaptation stage only when one experiences cognitive and behavioral shifts when confronted with cultural difference. In terms of cognitive changes, individuals at this stage can apply readily interpretative, evaluative, and analytical criteria from other cultural groups to formulate multiple perspectives. The behavioral component of the adaptive stage is characterized by people acting differently when with people from different cultures, serving as cultural bridges between different cultural groups, or taking on gestures, patterns of eye contact, and other forms of interaction belonging to a different cultural group when interacting with people from that group. The final stage of DMIS is, perhaps, the most

² See www.intercultural.org/idi/idi.html for an extensive overview of the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) and the IDI including a sample profile, interpretative schema, and reports on the validity and reliability of the instrument.

difficult to achieve given that it essentially requires transcendence of cultural identity.³ Individuals who have incorporated a plurality of cultural perspectives in their worldview to the point where they feel rootless and lacking a culture with which they identify are said to have achieved Encapsulated Marginality (Hammer and Bennett 2001).

The IDI is well suited to assess the impact of comparative politics on students' levels of intercultural development and sensitivity given that students are confronted with evidence that potentially challenges them at nearly every stage of their intercultural development. Students are challenged to overcome their indifference and avoidance of difference via direct interaction and study of the political systems of other societies. As students are confronted with the plurality of approaches to similar political issues, it becomes increasingly difficult for them to maintain a dichotomous perspective, regardless of whether it is defensive or critical of their own culture. As students learn to employ both most and least similar case comparisons, the critical importance of recognizing subtle forms cultural difference may propel them from a perspective that minimizes difference to one that accepts it. While simulations may encourage temporary adaptation of students to the perspectives of other societies, intense focus on a country or region of the world, supplemented by area or cultural studies courses and language acquisition, might go considerably further in promoting cognitive and behavioral shifts in students' worldviews. Finally, a solid exposure to research methodologies, especially rational choice, that emphasize empirical approaches to understanding and comparing societies might contribute to student transcendence of the importance of cultural identity. Although the connections between these specific features of comparative politics and stages of intercultural sensitivity are largely speculative and untested, they highlight possible scenarios in which students might be normatively shaped by their study of the subfield generally.

Research Design

In order to replicate the original study, I chose the same two upper-level comparative politics courses with geopolitical foci on East-Central Europe. In each course, I administered the IDI to students at the beginning of the term to generate baseline measurements of students' levels of intercultural sensitivity before receiving the "treatment" of the comparative politics course. At the end of each course, students again took the IDI to generate the posttest data. These scores were then matched to the students' original IDI measures so that individual changes could be tracked and paired comparative analysis could be conducted.

The first course, East-Central European Politics, was a semester length, on-campus course organized along thematic lines with a strong emphasis on contemporary empirical research related to the politics of the region.⁴ The structure of the course focused intensely on evaluating the assigned materials in terms of the strength and quality of their theses, arguments, data, methods, conclusions, and scholarly contributions to the subfield and topic. Students were evaluated on their attendance, quality of participation, weekly reading memos, a midterm and final exam, and a research paper on a topic developed in consultation with the instructor.

The second course, Post-Communist Democracy in the Czech Republic, was a month-long, off-campus course headquartered in Prague, Czech Republic. The course was organized topically and highlighted empirical, philosophical, and cultural literature related to the transformation of communist Czechoslovakia into the post-communist democratic regime of the Czech Republic.⁵ In addition to

³ That groups such as global nomads, long-term expatriates, and non-dominant minority groups frequently fall into the stage of Encapsulated Marginality is a testament to the sort of conditions and lifestyles required to achieve this level of intercultural development.

⁴ The topics covered in the order in which they appeared in the syllabus were 1) the legacies of communism, 2) the dynamics of democratization, 3) constitutional foundations, 4) the state, 5) political society and institutional choice, 6) economic society, 7) elections and party systems, 8) civil society, 9) political elites, 10) identities and interests, 11) public opinion, 12) the European Union, 13) environmental politics, 14) women and politics, and 15) area studies versus political science.

⁵ In addition to receiving basic language training, students studied the following subjects throughout the interim: 1) communist and non-communist histories of Prague, Czechoslovakia, and the Czech Republic,

regular class meetings with the instructor, students received guest lectures from former “dissidents,” Czech academics, Czech politicians, journalists, and other government officials and toured a host of historical, political, and cultural venues including both chambers of the Czech parliament, the presidential offices, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, and Radio Prague. Excluding three group excursions to other parts of the Czech Republic, students were free on the weekends and evenings to explore Prague, the Czech Republic, or neighboring countries on their own. Students were evaluated based on their attendance and participation in all scheduled events, a journal in which they responded to readings and logged their personal experiences, a research project that drew upon personal interviews with Czechs, and completion of a series of cultural activities.⁶

In terms of demographic and experiential characteristics, there was little variation among the seven students enrolled in the on-campus course. All were high school graduates, aged 18-21, and were born and reared in the United States. Five of the students were female; only one did not self-report being “white” or “Caucasian” in terms of nationality and ethnic background. Three students reported having never experienced living in another culture, three reported doing so less than three months, and one student reported living abroad for between one and two years. Of the twenty students participating in the off-campus course, all were high school graduates from the United States, eleven were female, eighty-five percent were aged 18-21 (15% were over 21), and only 1 student did not self-report as “Caucasian.” In terms of their abroad experience prior to this course, fifteen percent reported having never lived in another culture, eighty percent had lived abroad for a year or less, and 5% claimed to have lived abroad 3-5 years.

Analysis

A preliminary examination of the data indicates that there are differences between students’ pre- and posttest scores in both courses (see Table 1). In the on-campus course, the number of students experiencing Defensive and Reversal attitudes drops by half between the pre- and posttest while the number of students with scores posting to the Acceptance dimension doubles. The number of students who continue to highlight cultural similarities and emphasize universal principles across cultures (Minimization) remains constant in both series of tests. For the off-campus course, the patterns of change appear more dramatic. The number of students whose levels of intercultural sensitivity fall on the two lowest dimensions of the intercultural development scale – Denial and Defense/Reversal – decreases by two-thirds and one-half, respectively, between the pretest and posttest. Rounding out the upper-end of the ethnocentric scale, nearly half of all students’ scores fall on the Minimization scale following completion of the off-campus course. On the ethnorelative end of the spectrum, the number of students who are able to recognize patterns of cultural difference between cultures (Acceptance) doubles in the posttest data and one student’s posttest score indicates that she has developed a tendency to shift her cultural perspective based on context (Adaptation).

(Insert Table 1 Approximately Here)

While the observed shifts in Table 1 appear to be oriented in a positive direction, these aggregated data do not afford the opportunity to observe readily the strength and direction of change in individual student’s scores. However, simple correlations of the pretest and posttest data return large positive values of 0.785 for the on-campus course and 0.846 for the off-campus course. The Cramér’s V

2) the emergence and impact of the Czechoslovak “dissident” movement, 3) the legacies of communism, 4) environmental issues in post-communist Europe, 5) the European Union, 6) the Roma minority, 7) women and politics, 8) economic liberalization, 9) the Holocaust, 10) “The Power of the Powerless,” 11) U.S.-Czech relations, 12) electoral politics and political parties, 13) *samizdat*, 14) political participation, 15) the plays of Václav Havel, and 16) political elites.

⁶ The “Czech List” of cultural items included the following: 1) attending an opera, 2) attending a puppet show, 3) attending a church concert, 4) attending a jazz concert, 5) spending an afternoon in a café, 6) attending a sporting event, 7) visiting a museum not on the group itinerary, 8) attending a church service or visiting a church not on the group itinerary, 9) visiting a Czech supermarket, and 10) riding a city-wide tram for its entire route.

for the data from each course is 1.000, which indicates the presence of the exceptionally strong statistical relationship between the pretest and posttest IDI scores required for further analysis.

To assess the impact of comparative politics courses on students' levels of intercultural sensitivity, I advance several hypotheses are tested using the new data collected from students using the IDI. The first of these addresses whether or not a course in comparative politics, in fact, can change the level of intercultural sensitivity of students who complete that course of study. Stated explicitly, I hypothesize that *students will experience statistically significant improvements in their levels of intercultural sensitivity after taking a comparative politics course, regardless of whether it is taken on-campus or abroad*. A simple difference of means test between students' pretest and posttest scores for each course is conducted in order to evaluate this hypothesis; the results are reported in Table 2. For the on-campus course, students' average IDI scores moved from 98.366 at the beginning of the semester to 104.981 at the end of the semester, an increase of 6.616 that is statistically significant at the .05 level. Before departing for their off-campus course, students posted an average IDI score of 89.983; after one month studying in the Czech Republic, the same students' average IDI score was 97.846. This increase of 7.863 points on the IDI scale is highly significant at the .001 level. These results support the hypothesis that comparative politics courses have a significant positive effect on students' levels of intercultural sensitivity.

(Insert Table 2 Approximately Here)

While a positive and significant relationship between comparative politics courses and levels of intercultural sensitivity has been identified, the nature of that relationship remains unclear. Regression analysis of the data from both student populations (Table 3) affords the opportunity to improve our understanding. For the on-campus course, the pretest IDI variable is positive (0.599) and significant at the .05 level, explaining over half of the variance ($R^2 = .54$) in the posttest IDI scores. Given that the amount of time a student has traveled or lived abroad might improve their levels of intercultural sensitivity, I introduce a control for students' prior abroad experience in Model 2. While the coefficient's sign is in the anticipated direction, the inclusion of this variable, however, renders the entire model statistically insignificant and substantially reduces the total amount variance explained in on-campus posttest scores.⁷

(Insert Table 3 Approximately Here)

For the off-campus course, the independent relationship between the pretest and posttest IDI scores after studying abroad is even stronger. With a positive coefficient of 0.896, the pretest IDI score is highly significant ($p < .001$) and explains seventy percent of the variation in the posttest IDI scores. The inclusion of the prior abroad experience variable in Model 2 does little to improve the results of the model. Similar to the second model for the on-campus course, the sign for the abroad experience variable is statistically insignificant, but in the correct direction and the explained variance in the posttest IDI scores is reduced ($R^2 = .69$), albeit only slightly. However, the coefficient for the pretest IDI variable remains strong (0.884) and statistically significant ($p < .001$). As the difference of means tests and the regression models for both courses evidence, courses in comparative politics with a geopolitical focus have a significant and positive relationship on students' levels of intercultural sensitivity while prior abroad experience does not appear to have a significant or transferable impact.

A question that remains outstanding in relation to these findings is which, if either, setting is more conducive to improving levels of intercultural sensitivity. International education and study abroad programs operate, in part, on the assumption that studying and living abroad will impart a degree of cross-cultural competency that cannot be generated in the classroom. Furthermore, the theoretical underpinnings of the developmental model of intercultural sensitivity assume that contact with the other is paramount in the promotion of ethnorelative perspectives (Bennett 1993; Greenholtz 2000; Mahoney and Schamber 2004; McAllister and Irvine 2000). Based on these expectations, we might expect that there

⁷ The introduction of a second independent variable into a regression model in which the number of cases is small reduces even further the extremely limited degrees of freedom available to produce an effective explanatory model.

are differences in the scope and type of cultural learning processes based on whether the course takes place in a traditional classroom environment or in an abroad setting. To address the issue of scope, I hypothesize that *a comparative politics course taken while abroad will have a significantly greater impact on students' levels of intercultural sensitivity than a course taken on students' home campus*. The first test of means between the on- and off-campus scores yields a statistically insignificant result; that is, the on-campus pretest average of 98.366 is not statistically different than the off-campus pretest mean of 89.983 (see Table 4). Given that there is no theoretical or practical reason to expect students who have not yet taken the comparative politics courses in question to differ in their levels of intercultural sensitivity, this result should be neither surprising nor troubling. However, the difference of means test for the posttest scores also returns a statistically insignificant result. This suggests counterintuitively that completing a comparative politics course in an off-campus setting does not improve students' levels of cross-cultural development any more than taking the course in an on-campus setting.⁸

(Insert Table 4 Approximately Here)

One plausible explanation for why the predicted changes in IDI scores do not appear may be rooted in the temporal length of the courses. While the on-campus course in this study is a semester long course, the international off-campus course is only four weeks long. If a month-long abroad course produces statistically similar changes in students' levels of intercultural sensitivity, it may warrant that changes in IDI scores from a full-semester study abroad course would surpass those of a fifteen-week on-campus one. This explanation is supported by pre- and posttest IDI data collected from students participating in St. Olaf College's 2004-05 Term in the Middle East (TIME), a semester long study abroad program that incorporates a comparative politics course on Middle Eastern political institutions.⁹ Two-sample t-test between the pretest averages for the TIME (105.329) and the on-campus (98.366) course yields a statistically insignificant result while the comparison with the off-campus course (89.983) proved significantly larger at the .01 level. However, the posttest mean for the TIME (114.947) was significantly larger than either the on-campus course (104.981) or the off-campus course (97.846) at the .10 and .01 levels, respectively.

In order to address whether or not students in an on-campus course experience different types of change to their intercultural sensitivity than students in an off-campus course, an examination of the data from disaggregated IDI scores is necessary. For each case, pretest and posttest data exists for the five underlying dimensions of intercultural learning that the IDI uses to produce the aggregated score. We can, therefore, isolate and evaluate changes in levels of students' cultural denial and defense, reversal, minimization, acceptance and adaptability, and encapsulated marginality. Lacking theoretical reasons for predicting particular patterns of change based on the type of course, I simply hypothesize that *students' patterns of change among the disaggregated IDI scales will differ according the type of course in which they were enrolled*. For the on-campus course, the only statistically significant shift we observe is on the Reversal scale (see Table 5). The average increase of .399 points is statistically significant at the .05 level, indicating that the course had its largest impact in reducing students' perspective that other cultures are superior to their own. Although statistically insignificant, the change in average Minimization score is noteworthy as the only negative shift experienced by students in the on-campus course. Since a lower Minimization score identifies a tendency to view other cultures like one's own and to apply one's values to other cultures, students' lower posttest scores might be indicative of the strong empirical thrust of the readings, discussions, and assignments which encourages students to identify general patterns in data and to apply objective criteria to the evaluation of political phenomena. The other noteworthy result is that

⁸ Since the small sample size may increase the variance in the t-scores adversely, I performed a one-way post-hoc Scheffé test. This test compares differences between all individual data points for the pretest and posttest IDI variables in order to reveal significant patterns that are otherwise obscured by the difference of means test. The Scheffé analysis confirms the results reported in Table XX and the finding that there is no statistically significant difference between the impacts of an on- or off-campus comparative course on levels of intercultural sensitivity.

⁹ For a description of the program, see <http://www.stolaf.edu/international/programs/middleeast.html>.

students in the on-campus course experienced no change in their average scores on the Encapsulated Marginality scale, an unsurprising finding given that it is the highest and final stage of intercultural development and requires repeated interaction with different cultures.

(Insert Table 5 Approximately Here)

For the off-campus course, two dimensions of students' intercultural development undergo significant change. First, the average Denial/Defense score moves from a pretest level of 4.349 (out of 5.0) to a posttest level of 4.493, a difference of .144 that is statistically significant at the .10 level. This indicates that students' experiences in the off-campus course had a significant impact in increasing their interest in and interaction with cultural difference and in decreasing their tendency to view their own culture as superior to other cultures. That many students who participate in off-campus programs already tend to have an interest in other cultures, the ability this off-campus course to make further significant improvements on this dimension is particularly impressive. Second, students' average Minimization scores increased by .378, a shift that is significant at the .05 level, suggesting that studying comparative politics in an abroad setting reduces students' disposition to emphasize cultural similarity and universal claims. Certainly, there is variation in the patterns of change on the disaggregated IDI scales, supporting the hypothesis that on-campus and off-campus courses might alter students' levels of cultural competence in different ways. From these limited comparisons, it appears that off-campus courses impact students in more ways and on higher order scales than on-campus courses. While such a finding would be in keeping with the IDI model of development, we cannot begin to generalize to the population of all cases based on these results from these two courses.¹⁰

Lastly, four of the twenty students who participated in the off-campus course in the Czech Republic had completed in the previous semester the on-campus course on East-Central European politics. Given the above findings, we might expect students who take an on-campus course with a geopolitical focus prior to taking an off-campus course in the region to have higher IDI scores than their colleagues who did not study formally the region prior to living there. Stated hypothetically, *students who study a geopolitical region prior to participating in an off-campus comparative politics course in that region will experience larger positive changes in their levels of intercultural sensitivity than students who have not studied the region previously*. A difference of means test of the off-campus pre- and posttest scores of students who took both courses returns statistically insignificant results suggesting that prior study of a region before studying in that region does not have a significant impact on their ability to improve their cross-cultural competence scores. While the difference between the pretest means of students in both courses (101.31) and students only in the off-campus course (87.15) appears substantively large, a two-sample t-test reveals that the average values are not statistically different than one another (see Table 6). However, a comparison of posttest averages for the same groups indicates that the 15.43 difference is significant at the .10 level. Nonetheless, there is not enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference in levels of intercultural sensitivity between students who do and do not study the politics of a region of the world prior to studying politics in that region.

(Insert Table 6 Approximately Here)

Conclusion

Beyond the empirical and substantive knowledge comparativists impart to their students, frequently we hope to impart normative lessons that transform students perspectives about cross-cultural difference and facilitate a modicum of toleration for the variation in cultural approaches to politics. The evidence presented here suggests that courses in comparative politics can and do have such an impact on students attitudinal and behavioral approaches to difference by increasing levels of intercultural sensitivity. Moreover, the results of this study reinforce strongly the findings of the original study replicated here (Brooks 2005). In each study, comparative politics students experienced significant positive shifts in their overall levels of intercultural sensitivity regardless of whether or not it was taken in

¹⁰ This pattern receives additional support from the TIME data in which significant positive shifts occur on the Reversal ($p < .05$), Acceptance/Adaptation ($p < .05$), and Encapsulated Marginality ($p < .01$) scales.

an on- or off-campus environment. There is also no evidence from either study to support an argument that an off-campus course has a greater impact on levels of intercultural sensitivity among comparative students, although data from a semester-long program external to this research design suggests otherwise. Finally, despite the lack evidence to support the notion that students who study a region of the world prior to studying in that region experience greater within group shifts in their levels of intercultural sensitivity than students who do not, the results of both studies suggest that differences in pre- and posttest scores across groups are accentuated by prior exposure.

While the consistency of the results between these two studies is remarkable, the findings remain limited in their capacity to be generalized to all courses taught within the subfield of comparative politics. Statistically, the sample sizes of courses in this and the previous study are considerably small; substantively, the results may be affected by the fact that the same instructor taught all courses under consideration and all students were drawn from the same population. Rather than focusing on the limitations of these preliminary projects, comparativists should work further to improve our understanding of the relationship between their courses and the impact they have on fostering levels of intercultural sensitivity. Specifically, an expansion of this study that would include a wider range of comparative courses taught by different instructors at a variety of institutional types to students drawn from diverse populations could validate the results presented here and provide us with a new different perspective regarding how and why we teach our comparative politics courses. In the meantime, the results of these studies provide comparativists with enough evidence to warrant thinking seriously about how to enhance better the positive impact their courses may already have on students' levels of intercultural sensitivity.

Table 1. Distribution of IDI scores on dimensions of intercultural sensitivity scale, by course

	On-Campus		Off-Campus	
	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
<i>Ethnocentric scale:</i>				
Denial	0%	0%	15.0%	5.0%
Defense/Reversal	28.6%	14.3%	50.0%	25.0%
Minimization	57.1%	57.1%	25.0%	45.0%
<i>Ethnorelative scale:</i>				
Acceptance	14.3%	28.6%	10.0%	20.0%
Adaptation	0%	0%	0%	5.0%
Integration	0%	0%	0%	0%
N	7		20	

	On-campus		Off-campus	
	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
Mean	98.366	104.981	89.983	97.846
Standard error	4.570	3.489	3.466	3.673
Standard deviation	12.092	9.232	15.503	16.427
t-test	2.335*		3.943**	

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$.

Table 3. Regression of posttest IDI scores, by course

	On-campus		Off-campus	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Pretest	.599** (.212)	.379 (.440)	.896*** (.133)	.884*** (.136)
Prior abroad experience		2.122 (3.632)		1.128 (1.482)
Constant	46.032* (20.942)	63.736 (37.723)	17.222 (12.167)	15.484 (12.521)
Adj. R-squared	.54	.47	.70	.69
N	7	7	20	20

Note. Cell entries are unstandardized OLS coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. * $p < .10$, ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .001$.

	Pretest		Posttest	
	On-campus	Off-campus	On-campus	Off-campus
Mean	98.366	89.983	104.981	97.846
Standard error	4.570	3.466	3.489	3.673
Standard deviation	12.092	15.503	9.232	16.427
t-test	1.294		1.082	

Table 5. Difference of means tests of disaggregated IDI scores, by course

Scale	Statistic	On-campus		Off-campus	
		Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
Denial/Defense	Mean	4.417	4.593	4.349	4.493
	Standard error	0.120	0.123	0.109	0.090
	Standard deviation	0.317	0.326	0.486	0.401
	t-test	1.039		1.964*	
Reversal	Mean	4.014	4.413	3.494	3.667
	Standard error	0.249	0.203	0.176	0.179
	Standard deviation	0.659	0.538	0.788	0.798
	t-test	3.008**		1.598	
Minimization	Mean	2.459	2.303	2.362	2.740
	Standard error	0.347	0.251	0.156	0.178
	Standard deviation	0.919	0.664	0.699	0.794
	t-test	-0.728		2.591**	
Acceptance/Adaptation	Mean	3.396	3.540	3.408	3.543
	Standard error	0.324	0.372	0.134	0.096
	Standard deviation	0.858	0.985	0.599	0.431
	t-test	0.702		1.020	
Encapsulated Marginality	Mean	4.100	4.100	3.770	3.640
	Standard error	0.379	0.334	0.175	0.191
	Standard deviation	0.927	0.817	0.785	0.855
	t-test	0.000		-0.788	

Note. * $p < .10$; ** $p < .05$.

Table 6. Two-sample t-tests of off-campus IDI scores, by student enrollment

	Pretest		Posttest	
	Students in both courses	Students in off-campus course only	Students in both courses	Students in off-campus course only
Mean	101.31	87.151	110.193	94.759
Standard error	7.492	3.681	10.599	3.546
Standard deviation	14.984	14.722	21.198	14.182
t-test	1.715		1.773*	

Note. * $p < .10$.

Works Cited

- Bennett, Milton J. 1986. A Developmental Approach to Training for Intercultural Sensitivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 10:179-195.
- Bennett, Milton J. 1993. Towards Ethnorelativism: A Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity. In *Education for the Intercultural Experience*, edited by R. M. Paige. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Brooks, D. Christopher. 2005. Learning Tolerance: The Impact of Comparative Politics Courses on Levels of Cultural Sensitivity. *Journal of Political Science Education* 1 (2):221-232.
- Greenholtz, Joe. 2000. Assessing Cross-Cultural Competence in Transnational Education: The Intercultural Development Inventory. *Higher Education in Europe* 25 (3):411-416.
- Hammer, Mitchell R. 1998. A Measure of Intercultural Sensitivity: The Intercultural Development Inventory. In *The Intercultural Sourcebook*, edited by S. Fowler and M. G. Mumford. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Hammer, Mitchell R., and Milton J. Bennett. 2001. *The Intercultural Development Inventory Manual*. Portland, OR: The Intercultural Communication Institute.
- Mahoney, Sandra L., and Jon F. Schamber. 2004. Exploring the Application of a Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity to a General Education Curriculum on Diversity. *Journal of General Education* 53 (3-4):311-334.
- McAllister, Gretchen, and Jacqueline Jordan Irvine. 2000. Cross Cultural Competency and Multicultural Teacher Education. *Review of Educational Research* 70 (1):3-24.