

Assessing Intercultural Competence as a Result of Internationalization at Home Efforts: A Case Study From the Nightingale Mentoring Program

Journal of Studies in International Education
2016, Vol. 20(5) 437–453
© 2016 European Association for
International Education
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1028315316662977
jsi.sagepub.com



Òscar Prieto-Flores¹, Jordi Feu¹, and
Xavier Casademont¹

Abstract

In the last decades, many higher education institutions have developed practices of internationalization of curricula aiming at developing intercultural competences among the non-mobile majority of students. Some of them have developed service-learning activities focusing on working with underserved communities from different cultures. This article shows some challenges on how intercultural competence of college students participating in a community-based mentoring program could be assessed. Outcomes are based on mixed-method research from a survey given to a treatment group that participated in a mentoring program ($n = 95$) and a control group ($n = 71$), and on 10 daily life stories from university students who were enrolled and participated in the mentoring program. Paradoxically, results show scarce differences between groups in Attitudes, Skills, Comprehension, and Desired Internal Outcomes in favor of the control group. But, on the other hand, some slightly significant differences in favor of the treatment group are observed with regard to Dominance Orientation and Symbolic Racism. These results bring new hypotheses and discussions helpful for scholars and administrators, especially coming from the learnings that students showed, particularly in qualitative data.

Keywords

intercultural competence, internationalization at home, service-learning, college students, multicultural education, assessing methods.

¹Institute for Educational Research, University of Girona, Girona, Spain

Corresponding Author:

Òscar Prieto-Flores, University of Girona, Plaça de Sant Domènec, 9, Office 119, Girona 17071, Spain.
Email: oscar.prieto@udg.edu

In 2000, the European Association for International Education highlighted the need for providing to the majority of students who do not participate in mobility programs the knowledge and competences to better understand people from different countries and cultures as well as respecting other human beings in a diverse and multicultural society (Crowther et al., 2000). This knowledge and competences can be learned through different *Internationalization at Home* experiences, among them, domestic service-learning activities that could enrich intercultural experiences of college students and engage them in intercultural dialogues. In this sense, some higher education institutions have developed, in the last decades, extracurricular activities that promote relationships with local cultural and ethnic community groups (Wächter, 2003).

Although we live in a globalized world and service-learning programs are more usually offered by higher education institutions, there is little evidence on how these programs with people from underserved or ethnic and cultural groups may affect college students' intercultural competences and knowledge. Some studies have highlighted that besides the skills they can learn from service-learning programs, including both academic and personal skills (Eyler & Giles, 1999), students also expect to develop civic responsibility through fostering trustworthiness to others, viewing social issues from a variety of perspectives, or establishing caring relationships (Caspersz & Olaru, 2016). While these types of programs tend to enhance personal transformation among participating students as well as the development of critical reflection, they may also have negative effects, and so a proper assessment of these activities should be conducted (Deeley, 2010). To further explore the positive side of service-learning programs, many scholars have argued in favor of the need not only to conduct quantitative assessment of the experiences but also to triangulate quantitative with qualitative data of participants that could bring information on how students perceive and experience learning (Fitch, 2005). With regard to programs targeting development of students' intercultural competences, assessment tools are needed to know how students understand their identities as well as that of the other groups, or how learning will make them more open and not perpetuate stereotypes (Deardoff, 2011). To this effect, it may be useful to have promising activities and programs that could provide us with the opportunity to experiment on assessment tools for these programs. The aim of this article is to test, through mixed-methods research, some of the main dimensions of intercultural competence and knowledge highlighted by Deardoff (2006) and by Bennett (2004) as well as other variables related to racism and dominance, as we consider that they are intrinsically related to the views students have of other groups. Our initial hypothesis was the following: Students participating in the Nightingale mentoring program develop more intercultural competences and knowledge than those who do not participate. Then, if we could identify variance between participant and non-participant students' competences and knowledge, we could attribute those changes to the development of the program and to the type of relationships mentors formed with mentees, their families, and context. Also, through daily life stories we could observe in depth how students internalize these learnings. At the same time, we also assume that if they improve their intercultural competences they will also develop more respectful attitudes toward minority groups.

Assessing Intercultural Competence in Service-Learning Programs

The definition of intercultural competence has been discussed at length among scholars during the last decades. Although it has been broadly conceptualized, there are few studies that have generated theoretical models of intercultural competence based on inductive processes or from the experience of experts with long trajectories in assessing programs that aim to promote these competences (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009). The terms intercultural communicative competence and intercultural competence have been defined and worked on from different fields from foreign language teaching and assessment (Byram, 1997) to sociology (Bennett, 1986, 2004). Many of the concepts and definitions of these concepts proposed by these and other scholars have been useful to observe and describe how people develop intercultural competence. Then, intercultural competence is “the ability to think and act in interculturally appropriate ways” (Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003, p. 422). For Bennett (2004), programs should develop intercultural sensitivity among students to increase their intercultural competence. In this regard, he proposes the *Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity* (DMIS) consisting of a process in which learners move from ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism by being engaged in a new process of socialization that goes from denying (*Denial*) the existence of cultural difference to integrating the cultural difference in one’s identity (*Integration*) (Bennett, 1986, 2004). These authors also highlight that the foundations of intercultural competence are based on the attitudes of the learner or speaker in relation to other cultures, in how they approach other groups, and in relativizing their worldviews in relation to those of others.

If attitudes are so essential, the change in learners’ attitudes and how they internalize new values and norms in relation to prejudices or stereotypes could be gathered through tools that have been demonstrated to be useful. With regard to this aim, Fantini (2007) argues that what is challenging in assessment of intercultural competence is not assessing the acquisition of knowledge or skills but how attitudes and awareness may change, which tends to be less frequent. To this end, Fantini carried out an assessment of the development of intercultural communicative competences of British and Swiss volunteers who participated in an International Living program in Ecuador. He conducted pre-test and post-test surveys and interviews. With regard to the quantitative results, he observed significant changes in four different dimensions of intercultural competence—Knowledge, Attitudes, Skills, and Awareness—finding significant changes after the experience.

We found the way in which Fantini assessed Attitudes in his study to be useful, as well as how Bennett (1986, 2004), Byram (1997), and Deardoff (2009) managed to specify attitudes in learners such as openness, curiosity, and respect for other cultural groups. It would also be relevant to ascertain whether the tools for assessing intercultural competence can be implemented in other contexts, such as in Southwestern Europe, as well as to explore the possibilities and limitations of these tools. We can also ask how to improve the tools we have at our disposal for assessing progress in intercultural competences and knowledge of the students involved in service-learning

programs. On this last point, it is necessary to take into account what some authors have called self-selection bias because it is difficult to identify whether the improvement obtained by students can be transferred to other students who do not have the same profile as those who enrolled in the program (Steinberg, Bringle, & McGuire, 2013).

Nevertheless, we also thought it appropriate to take into account differentials in attitudes that students could have more explicitly related to identifying new forms of racism and how this could be connected to the acceptance of majority versus minority dominance as a way to assess intercultural competence. In this arena, two of the scales that have been largely validated among scholars in regard to identifying new forms of racism together with domination and inequality (Fiske & North, 2014) are Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, and Malle (1994) *Dominance Orientation* and Sears and Henry (2003) *Symbolic Racism 2000 scale*. These scales were developed in the United States and are aimed at improving the quantitative tools for identifying racial resentment and comparing the share of racism and dominance between populations. These scales have been criticized because they face challenges in measuring prejudices and distinguish these from an ideology opposed to the government racial policy (Feldman & Huddy, 2005). Although these measurements have to improve through the advancement of social sciences, the case of Southern Europe is different because Spain, France, and Italy do not have an explicit racial policy, as does the United States, so this confusion should not be considered for these countries. Thus, if students, during the service, develop less symbolic racism and less acceptance of majority–minority dominance, we assume they have developed greater intercultural sensitivity and competence.

Based on the need to develop and refine tools for assessment of intercultural competences and propose new steps to be taken (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2013), we decided to test some quantitative measures on intercultural competence and on attitudes and values students have towards other groups. In agreement with Deardoff (2009), we believe that proper assessment of intercultural competence must also be qualitative; thus, we carried out daily life stories to triangulate the data and obtain a more in-depth analysis of students' experience.

The Nightingale Program: An Internationalization at Home Strategy That Aims to Promote Intercultural Competence Among College Students

The Nightingale mentoring program (*Nartengalen* in Swedish) complements Malmö University *Internationalization at Home* strategy (Nilsson, 2003). The project started in 1997, in parallel with the birth of the concept of *IaH* in 1998, and is a concrete example of a university student-oriented action with a twofold aim: (a) for children and adolescents of migrant background, to make them feel safer at school and get them interested in university studies (b) and for the university mentors, to make them aware of other cultures, religions, and traditions, thus increasing their intercultural competence (Nilsson, 2003, p. 37). No study exists yet on exploring whether college students

develop these competences or reduce their prejudices toward other cultures through this specific action. This article also tries to shed some light on the issue through the evidence gathered.

In 2006, this *IaH* strategy was transferred to 20 other European universities that are carrying out their specific Nightingale programs in Sweden, Spain, Norway, Finland, Austria, Germany, Iceland, and Switzerland. The experience analyzed here comes from one program developed in northeast Spain that will be celebrating its 10th anniversary and gathers more than a 100 mentors in a university setting similar to Malmö.

The Nightingale program matches a college student with a student from primary or secondary school with immigrant background. They spend 3 hr a week during the academic year (from October to May) doing leisure activities together and develop a personal relationship that strengthens the child's personal and social confidence. This community-based mentoring program, where the mentor is a role model for children, also implies relationships with the child's cultural environment, their family, and friends. In this regard, the interaction between the mentor and the child may be viewed as a first step in the creation of "an increased understanding of, and tolerance for, each other's differing social and cultural backgrounds" (Sild-Lönroth, 2007, p. 16). While the project has shown to have impact on the mentees (Feu, 2015), we have little evidence from the mentors' side and even less on the intercultural knowledge and competence side (Grander, 2011; Leutwyler, Meierhans, & Aegerter, 2014).

It is also relevant to mention that students who participate in the Nightingale program benefit from a training course at the beginning of the program. The aim of this course is to enhance students' ability to effectively approach diversity, to develop flexible mindsets before the worldviews of others, and to promote intercultural dialogues based on respecting and valuing diversity.

Method and Data

To analyze the development of intercultural competence, we carried out both a quantitative analysis from surveying college students upon finishing the Nightingale mentoring program and a qualitative analysis of 10 daily life stories of college students, most of them participants who shared their experiences on how they approached intercultural contact, the prejudices, and stereotypes they had and how they changed over time. More specifically, we surveyed university students who mentored a minority child during the academic year and students who had applied for the program but were not ultimately selected because of the limited yearly capacity of the project. The fieldwork lasted 2 months and consisted of giving out a questionnaire to the 105 students who participated in the program and giving the same questionnaire to a group of 160 students who did not participate but had applied for it, to observe differences in their worldviews with regard to intercultural sensitivity, competence, symbolic racism, and dominance. After conducting the fieldwork and follow-up phone calls to obtain the highest possible return rate, we were able to gather 95 questionnaires from the mentors ($n = 95$) and 71 from the control group ($n = 71$).

Table 1. Characteristics of Sampled Population.

Variables	Mentors (n = 95)	Control (n = 71)
Sex		
Female	81%	87%
Male	19%	13%
Have participated in Erasmus		
Yes	3%	1.5%
No	97%	98.5%
Lived more than 3 months in a foreign country		
Yes	17%	22.5%
No	83%	77.5%
Lived in minority–majority neighborhood		
Yes	30%	40%
No	70%	60%
Prior experiences with diversity		
Yes	73%	77.5%
No	27%	22.5%
Having friends from other cultures		
Yes	61%	66%
No	39%	34%
Bachelor year		
1st	22%	51%
2nd	34%	35%
3rd	24%	7%
4th	20%	7%
Type of bachelor degree ^a	19	18

^aNumber of different bachelor degrees students are coming from.

As can be seen in Table 1, socio-demographic differences between one group and the other were not significant. Students in both groups were mostly women as tends to happen in this type of mentoring program (Fresko, Rubinstein, Eriksson, & Sild-Lönroth, 2013). They also came from a wide range of different bachelor degrees but those who participate in the program have a more distributed representation within the 4 years a bachelor degree lasts in Spain than those in the control group. This is due to how the selection of mentors is carried out by the program coordinators, trying to have a similar distribution of students for each year. With regard to the type of contact these students have with diversity, experiences are also similar, revealing the same levels of friendships with people from other cultures, prior experiences with diversity, or of having previously lived in a foreign country and in a minority–majority neighborhood.

The elaboration of the questionnaire was challenging. We only selected the dimensions on intercultural competence and knowledge described by Deardoff (2006) that showed the highest level of agreement among relevant scholars on intercultural education she interviewed in a Delphi panel. These were also the dimensions we could best

operationalize, taking into account the context and the types of interactions that occur in the program. These dimensions were the following:

- *Attitudes*: (a) General openness toward intercultural learning and people from other cultures, (b) curiosity and discovery, and (c) respect for other cultures.
- *Knowledge and Comprehension*: (d) Understanding others' worldviews, (e) cultural self-awareness, and (f) capacity of self-assessment.
- *Skills*: (g) Listen, observe, and evaluate.
- *Desired Internal Outcomes*: (h) Empathy, (i) ability to adapt to varying intercultural communication and learning styles, and (j) adaptability and adjustment to new cultural environments.¹

For the operationalization of each of these categories, we explored how some of them were recommended to be used by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU; 2015). This association developed a rubric following a discussion between faculty experts representing colleges and universities in the United States. Its aim is to provide examples on how some categories could be used in evaluating intercultural knowledge and competence. This rubric was mainly based on Bennett's (1993) and Deardoff's (2006) previous research analyses and intends to serve as an evaluation tool for student learning but not for grading (AACU, 2015). Taking into account how the AACU scaled the different categories as a role model, we designed our questionnaire using simple 4-point *Likert* scaled questions that students could easily identify with their worldviews in the Spanish context. So, we adapted these categories and answers to the daily life situations of our local and socio-political context. The questionnaire included one or two questions related to each of these above-mentioned categories. Once we obtained the data, we grouped the results into indexes, compared means, standard deviations, and significance of both groups.

We included these new questions because we deemed it appropriate to have such measures to explore whether changes in attitudes occur between participants and non-participants. In this sense, we also adapted to our socio-political context questions used mainly in the U.S. context that ask people about their prejudices and stereotypes, taking into account the current and changing patterns of racism. Thus, we adapted to the European context and included in the questionnaire the *Social Dominance Orientation* (Pratto et al., 1994) and the *Symbolic Racism 2000* scale (Henry & Sears, 2002; Sears & Henry, 2003). For instance, when referring to specific racial or minority groups, we decided to substitute Blacks for Roma, Arab-Muslims, and sub-Saharan population to adapt these scales to the groups that in the European context suffer the highest levels of discrimination (EU-FRA, 2009). We decided to include these questions in the survey because they could provide us with relevant data from college students' stereotypes, especially on how they view those who are in an underprivileged position and are from a different ethnic and racial background.

Four scholars from the field of intercultural education in Spain validated the questionnaire. We sent it to them and discussed together whether the answers to the questions of the draft could provide information relevant to the above-mentioned categories,

and whether the examples we provided could be interpreted as such in our context. The contributions of these experts consisted of discarding or complementing some of the questions initially planned. They also provided improvements in the composition of the queries and on how university students could understand them. Next, we administered a pilot questionnaire to two students who had participated as mentors and two students who had not. This pilot stage was useful for ascertaining whether they answered the questionnaires taking into account what we initially expected, based on the fact that questions had been adapted to our European context. Finally, we interviewed them after they answered the pilots and made some changes in answer categories that could be ambiguous for the students.

Qualitative techniques developed in the fieldwork consisted of 10 daily life stories of 10 undergraduate college students. Seven of them participated in the Nightingale program and three did not but demonstrated interest in participating in the past or wish to do so in the future. Student profiles were diverse, with students from different undergraduate programs, ages, and gender, to respect the variety of mentors. Researchers interviewed the students through open-ended questions making no explicit connections with how mentoring affected their experience so as not to influence their responses. Although the questions were very open, they were connected to the dimensions explored in the survey on intercultural sensitivity, past experiences with people from cultural minority groups, and what marked them the most in interacting with the other, their current point of view and critical reflection, and so on. Last, this fieldwork data were coded, analyzed, and triangulated with the results obtained from the surveys.

This study has some limitations that arise from its quasi-experimental nature such as the limited capacity of generalizing its effects. In this respect, we only used data from the Nightingale program in Spain, so we cannot extrapolate these outcomes to the college students participating in the Nightingale program in other universities including Malmö (Sweden), Linz (Austria), or Oslo (Norway). It would be relevant to conduct similar research in different countries to analyze the commonalities and particularities of the same program in relation to intercultural competences. We expect that in the future we could have more data on how the program affects other college students from other contexts as scholars or administrators decide to replicate this study and to compare results. At the same time, as the results from this inquiry mainly came from self-reporting through the tests given out, the outcomes also show the fragility of this system in gathering data. Although self-reporting is a tool that could show some practicality especially for administrators, studies have raised awareness on relying solely on this method for reporting assessment results (Deardoff, 2006). In this sense, the daily life stories we gathered were relevant for triangulating results and arriving at the conclusions we present in this article. Beyond these techniques, it is also recommended to employ other data gathering tools for triangulation purposes. These tools include onsite observations, student portfolios, and focus groups, among others. Thus, other future assessments could include these additional sources to obtain a more enriching experience from a greater multi-method approach.

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations for Variables on Intercultural Competences of Respondents.

Variables	Mentors (<i>n</i> = 95)	Control (<i>n</i> = 71)
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
Attitudes: Openness, curiosity, and respect ^a	13.02 (2.13)	13.46 (1.95)
Skills: To listen and observe ^b	3.51 (0.65)	3.52 (0.69)
Knowledge and Comprehension: Understanding worldviews and self-awareness ^c	5.98 (1.61)	6.11 (1.85)
Desired Internal Outcome: Tolerance, empathy, and adaptability ^d	12.33 (1.87)*	13.09 (1.30)*

^aScale for Attitudes goes from 4 to 16.

^bScale for Skills goes from 1 to 4.

^cScale for Comprehension goes from 2 to 8.

^dScale for Desired Internal Outcomes goes from 4 to 16.

Statistical significance *t* test: **p* < .05.

The Mixed-Method Assessment of Intercultural Competence in the Nightingale Program

Table 2 presents the results from the explored dimensions on the intercultural competence students' report. We can observe how no difference exists between mentors and those who did not participate in the mentoring program in regard to Intercultural Attitudes, Skills and Knowledge, and Comprehension. Both groups showed high levels of Openness, Curiosity, and Respect for other cultures (13.02 for mentors and 13.46 for the control group on a scale of 16), of Skills (3.51 and 3.52 on a scale of 4), and of Knowledge and Comprehension (5.98 and 6.11 on a scale of 8). These outcomes are high due to the predisposition towards intercultural relations that students who enroll and apply to the program already have. This reality was contrasted with the staff responsible for the project. They highlighted that students' motivation for enrolling or applying to be mentors was not due mostly to the academic recognition of the program but was based on the motivation these college students have for "doing something" to help others, while also recognizing that they will learn much more from other cultures and from the experience.

But in the case of Desired Internal Outcomes, on how students are able to see other's perspectives and respond to them in accordance with the way others would like to be treated, there is a slightly significant advantage of those who did not participate in the program. In this sense, students in the control group showed higher levels of Empathy, Flexibility, and Adaptability to diversity than mentors (12.33 and 13.09 on a scale of 16). Initially, we expected that the results would be different because mentors are not only more senior students than those in the control group, but they had also been in weekly contact with the child's family and engaged in intercultural dialogues on a weekly basis through the mentoring. One hypothesis that arises from this outcome is that what students from both groups have in mind when answering the same questions

Table 3. Means, Standard Deviations for Social Dominance Orientation–Dominance Scale.

Variables	Mentors (<i>n</i> = 95)	Control (<i>n</i> = 71)
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
Some groups of people are inferior to others ^a	1.11 (0.39)**	1.51 (1.27)**
It is necessary to use force against other groups	1.43 (0.95)	1.75 (1.37)
It is ok if some groups have more chances than others	1.38 (0.81)	1.45 (1.04)
Sometimes it is necessary to step on other groups to get ahead	1.27 (0.78)	1.38 (0.96)
If certain groups stayed in their place we would have fewer problems	1.81 (1.14)	2.14 (1.48)
It is good certain groups are at the top and other at the bottom	1.42 (0.85)	1.58 (0.97)
Inferior groups should stay in their place	1.27 (0.57)	1.34 (0.91)
SDO-D: Seven item scale ^b	9.69 (3.71)*	11.14 (5.24)*

Note. SDO-D = Social Dominance Orientation–Domination.

^aScale goes from 1 to 7.

^bIn this case, the range is between 7 and 49.

Statistical significance *t* test: **p* < .05; ***p* < .01.

(all of them related to their experiences or supposed experiences with diversity) could be different. While students from the control group could express more thoughts based on a desire or on soft experiences they have had in intercultural settings, others could answer based on a better knowledge of themselves with regard to their self-awareness and self-perception in relation to others.

This hypothesis could imply a higher level of self-demand among mentors for these items than those of the control group based on their prior experience in the mentoring program with children and families of cultural minorities. This was present in most of the daily life stories of past mentors. For example, Andrea,² a college student studying art history, highlights how participation in the mentoring program helped enhance her openness, curiosity, and skills, “With Nightingale I opened up more and showed more interest in others, I took advantage of the opportunity to ask about things I had never asked about and I became more predisposed to others.” Joana, a college student of tourism, comments on her experience in learning more about others’ culture, “I’ve always considered myself to be an open-minded person; I’ve never had problems accepting diversity, but I’m learning things that perhaps I didn’t know before, about their particular culture.”

To observe whether students who had higher outcomes in intercultural competence had less prejudices and stereotypes, we asked them to provide information about their world-views on other groups in relation to Social Dominance and Symbolic Racism. In Tables 3 and 4, results on Social Dominance Orientation are presented separately, first showing results related to SDO-D (students’ beliefs on Domination between cultural groups) and, secondly, to SDO-E (the same beliefs on Equality). In Table 3, results on SDO-D show the

Table 4. Means and Standard Deviations for Social Dominance Orientation–Equality Scale.

Variables	Mentors (<i>n</i> = 95)	Control (<i>n</i> = 71)
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
It would be good if groups could be equal ^a	5.87 (1.78)	5.72 (1.65)
Group equality should be our ideal	6.16 (1.61)	5.93 (1.71)
All groups should be given an equal chance	6.42 (1.60)	6.30 (1.56)
We should do what we can to equalize conditions	6.19 (1.61)	6.14 (1.54)
Support for increased social equality	6.24 (1.66)	6.20 (1.61)
We would have fewer problems if we treated people equally	6.18 (1.60)	6.17 (1.52)
We should strive to make incomes as equal as possible	5.80 (1.81)	5.66 (1.71)
No group should dominate in society	5.91 (1.95)	6.06 (1.73)
SDO-E: Eight item scale^b	48.76 (12.13)	48.16 (12.08)

Note. SDO-D = Social Dominance Orientation–Equality.

^aScale goes from 1 to 7.

^bIn this case, the range is between 8 and 56.

Statistical significance *t* test: **p* < .05. ***p* < .01.

opposite side of what happened with intercultural competence. In this case, the mentors have slightly significant fewer prejudices than the control group. Both groups show low rates on domination but mentors not only show lower means but also a lower standard deviation, especially when grouping all asked items (while mentors were rated 9.69, those from the control group were 11.14 on a scale from 7 to 49). In regard to SDO-E, no differences exist between mentors and non-mentors. These different results between SDO-D and SDO-E also appear in other studies arguing that legitimization of current social structure and inequality suffered by minority groups as well as intergroup conflicts are more strongly related to SDO-D than SDO-E (Ho et al., 2011). One hypothesis could be that students who have been mentors have joined conversations and have lived daily life situations with minority groups that have favored changes especially in those students who had more dominant views. This is what we observed from daily life stories. In this sense, Mika, a social work college student, argues that through her participation she developed greater sensitivity in connecting inequality with the discrimination of some minority groups,

Nightingale strengthened an idea that in some way I already had: even though we are different, this difference shouldn't seem strange to us nor should it generate inequality in any way. Nightingale helps when you meet with the mentee, their family, friends, etc. It is clear that you look different but I constantly asked myself why does this difference so often unjustly generate inequality? In the daily practice of the meetings I learned to become aware to prevent this from happening.

A similar reflection comes from Maria, another mentor studying nursing,

Table 5. Means and Standard Deviations for Symbolic Racism Items.

Variables	Mentors (<i>n</i> = 95)	Control (<i>n</i> = 71)
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
[Work ethic and responsibility for outcomes]		
It is a matter of some people not trying hard enough ^a	0.38 (0.30)	0.44 (0.30)
Some minorities in Spain overcame prejudice, Roma and Muslim should do the same	0.49 (0.33)	0.53 (0.35)
[Excessive demands]		
How much racial tension do you think Roma & Muslim are responsible for?	0.18 (0.18)	0.21 (0.19)
[Denial of continuing discrimination]		
How much do you feel discrimination against Roma and Muslim limits their chances?	0.18 (0.23)	0.20 (0.23)
Discrimination has created conditions that make it difficult for Roma and Muslim to progress	0.54 (0.33)	0.56 (0.35)
[Underserved advantage]		
Roma and Muslim have gotten less than they deserve	0.32 (0.30)*	0.42 (0.31)*
Roma and Muslim have gotten more economically than they deserve	0.39 (0.32)	0.35 (0.33)

^aScales go from 0 to 1 because they were recoded. 1 reflects the highest degree of racism and 0 the lowest.

Statistical significance t test: **p* < .05.

Look, I considered myself to be someone who is tolerant of others, receptive to people from other cultures, etc., but being a mentor made me realize that I had to be even more so, that there were things I had to turn around because unconsciously I acted with an air of superiority, as if I was always right.

Finally, in Table 5, we can observe the results from the Symbolic Racism scale and we found no significant differences between both groups with one exception. This reflects the belief of students regarding undeserved advantages that some minority groups have in relation with mainstream society. In this regard, on a scale from 0 to 1, with 1 being the highest level of racism, those who have been mentors rated .32 whereas those who have not .42. If we compare other works that have used this similar scale the levels of racism of our sample do not differ much from those of other samples carried out with college students in the U.S. context (Henry & Sears, 2002). We could attribute then that some small changes can be observed on the mentors' side and that difference and how this occurred could be connected with how they relativize their worldviews as Joana, a psychology student, points out,

At a very early age, at school, I interacted with students from other cultures, but when through Nightingale I interacted every week with a boy younger than me I realized that I had to redo a lot of my thinking and especially my way of acting. In this regard, it has helped me a great deal in overcoming different obstacles. Nightingale has influenced me a lot; when you meet a boy from another culture it enriches you because it invites you to ask yourself things about his culture and your own, and then you relativize everything. You enrich yourself as a person, and you come away with a richer and more complex perspective.

Discussion and Conclusions

In this study, we provide evidence from the assessment of a case study of a domestic *IaH* service-learning program. We tested some instruments aiming to provide us with mixed-method data on how much and how students who participated in a mentoring program developed intercultural competence. Deardoff (2011) highlighted that these types of programs could generate intercultural exchanges where students can learn about identities different from their own. But to know more about the effects these programs have, she points out that further tools need to be developed to know whether learning can perpetuate stereotypes or develop more flexible mindsets among participants. In this sense, she highlighted the need for critical reflection on how these attitudes could be assessed.

The quantitative part of the inquiry tested an adaptation of the dimensions the AACU (2015) proposes for assessing intercultural competence. Our results show that no differences exist between the control group and the mentors in the quantitative analysis using these categories. On the contrary, the only significant relationship occurs when students from the control group who had not participated rated higher in the views they have on their adaptability, flexibility, and empathy to other cultural groups (what has been dimensioned as Desired Internal Outcomes) than mentors. Nevertheless, when including in the assessment of intercultural sensitivity the Dominance Orientation and Symbolic Racism scales, outcomes from these scales showed some other differences between mentors and the control group. They are slight but we think they are enough to show that these scales could be considered in the quantitative assessment of similar domestic service-learning programs. Whether or how can they be included in the intercultural competence model is a discussion that needs to be undertaken by experts and as a consensus of the community. These results do not suggest that AACU assessment rubrics could not be useful. They would probably be useful for the American context and as a basis for a qualitative assessment. Another issue to take into account is that outcomes may not be so different between treatment and control groups partly because of the self-selection bias. Students who apply for this type of program tend to be interested in the service-learning proposed and demonstrate greater sensitivity than those who do not apply (Steinberg et al., 2013).

On the other hand, if we take into account the information gathered in the pilot interviews we conducted with the staff that developed the program and the daily life

stories with college students, we could find transformative learning in openness, curiosity, knowledge, critical reflection, and intercultural sensitivity among mentors. They tend to develop increased intercultural sensitivity toward a greater ethnorelativist worldview, as Bennett (1986, 2004) highlighted in his DMIS model. In this sense, one hypothesis arising from this evidence we have found is that mentors tend to be more demanding on themselves and adjust their experiences to reality as opposed to those in the control group when answering surveys and especially quantitative measuring scales. Thus, we conclude that learnings in intercultural competence and knowledge can be assessed especially using qualitative methods. But we think that quantitative tools could also be considered, in mixed-method assessments, if these learnings expressed in the daily stories could be gathered through measurements.

In this sense, additional research would be needed to further test and improve quantitative tools such as these and obtain a more balanced assessment using mixed methods. Pre- and post-test experimental studies of the same program or another would be useful to complement this and other analyses, especially if they come together with daily life stories, interviews, or other qualitative techniques. Quantitative tools, far from being perfect tools, can nevertheless provide route maps on how the participation of students in extracurricular programs can positively affect students' attitudes, learning, and competence, if they are well focused and rigorously driven. A triangulation of data derived from a mixed-method assessment could help scholars and administrators to better assess how much and how students improve their abilities to relate with others in a context of enriched diversity. Last, this work also has implications for international education practitioners. It can contribute to reflection on how to assess intercultural competence in International at Home programs such as Nightingale and other similar programs, what type of data and methods might be used, and other questions. It also raises concerns about the interpretation of outcomes that some practitioners may use, especially if they decide to use only pre- and post-test measurements to assess the programs being developed in their institutions. The results might be disappointing if they are interpreted from a narrow and simple analysis, as shown in this article. For example, with only the results from the quantitative analysis, one might argue that the program might not have an effect on students' intercultural competences and therefore there is no need to offer it. However, the results from daily life stories show another reality. The assessment of Intercultural Competence is quite complex and further research is needed to design new tools, rethink existing ones, and find proper methods to carry out triangulations.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Notes

1. Categories related to the dimension *Desired External Outcomes* (behaving and communicating effectively and appropriately) were not included in the questionnaire because it was difficult to contrast these outcomes appropriately between those who did not participate in the program and those who did participate.
2. Participants names are fictitious to preserve their anonymity.

References

- Association of American Colleges & Universities. (2015). *Intercultural knowledge and competence VALUE rubric*. Retrieved from <http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/intercultural-knowledge>
- Bennett, M. J. (1986). A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10*, 179-196.
- Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience*. Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.
- Bennett, M. J. (2004). Becoming interculturally competent. In J. Wurzel (Ed.), *Toward multiculturalism: A reader in multicultural education* (pp. 62-77). Newton, MA: Intercultural Resource Corporation.
- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Caspersz, D., & Olaru, D. (2016). The value of service-learning: The student perspective. *Studies in Higher Education*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/03075079.2015.1070818
- Crowther, P., Joris, M., Otten, M., Nilsson, B., Teekens, H., & Wächter, B. (2000). *Internationalization at home a position paper*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: European Association for International Education. Retrieved from <http://cdigital.uv.mx/bitstream/123456789/31163/5/iah.pdf>
- Deardoff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 10*, 241-266.
- Deardoff, D. K. (2009). Implementing intercultural competence assessment. In D. K. Deardoff (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 477-491). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Deardoff, D. K. (2011). Assessing intercultural competence. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 149*, 65-79.
- Deeley, S. J. (2010). Service-learning: Thinking outside the box. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 11*, 43-53.
- EU-FRA. (2009). *EU-MIDIS. European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey (Main Results Report)*. European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. Retrieved from <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2012/eu-midis-main-results-report>
- Eyler, J., & Giles, D. E. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fantini, A. E. (2007). *Exploring and assessing intercultural competence*. Center for Social Development, Washington University in Saint Louis. Retrieved from <http://csd.wustl.edu/Publications/Documents/RP07-01.pdf>

- Feldman, & Huddy, L. (2005). Racial resentment and White opposition to race-conscious programs: Principles or prejudice? *American Journal of Political Science*, *49*, 168-183.
- Feu, J. (2015). How an intervention project contributes to social inclusion of adolescents and young people of foreign origin. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *52*, 144-149.
- Fiske, S. T., & North, M. S. (2014). Social psychological measures of stereotyping and prejudice. In G. Boyle & D. Saklofske (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological constructs* (pp. 684-718). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.
- Fitch, P. (2005). A mixed methods approach to studying outcomes of intercultural service-learning with college students. In S. Root, J. Callahan, & H. B. Shelley (Eds.), *Improving service-learning practice: Research on models to enhance impacts* (pp. 187-211). Greenwich, UK: Information Age.
- Fresko, B., Rubinstein, L., Eriksson, T., & Sild-Lönroth, C. (2013). Developing narratives as a pedagogical approach to fostering professional interpersonal competences. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *39*, 232-239.
- Grander, M. (2011). Learning through Mentoring. Mentors as bearers of a model of learning for an integrated society. *Pedagogia i Treball Social. Revista de Ciències Socials Aplicades*, *1*(1), 51-75.
- Hammer, M. R., Bennett, M. J., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *27*, 421-443.
- Hebert, A., & Hauf, P. (2015). Student learning through service learning: Effects on academic development, civic responsibility, interpersonal skills and practical skills. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, *16*, 37-49.
- Henry, P. J., & Sears, D. O. (2002). The Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale. *Political Psychology*, *23*, 253-283.
- Ho, A. K., Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., Levin, S., Thomsen, L., Kteily, N., & Sheehy-Skeffington, J. (2011). Social dominance orientation: Revisiting the structure and function of a variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *38*, 583-606.
- Leutwyler, B., Meierhans, C., & Aegerter, M. (2014). "Nightingale" in teacher education: A focus on the mentors. Learning processes and impact analysis. *La Famiglia*, *48*(258), 281-305.
- Nilsson, B. (2003). Internationalization at home from a Swedish perspective: The case of Malmö. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *7*, 27-40.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*, 741-763.
- Sears, D. O., & Henry, P. J. (2003). The origins of symbolic racism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *85*, 259-275.
- Sild-Lönroth, C. (2007). *The Nightingale scheme—A song for the heart*. Malmö, Sweden: Malmö University.
- Spitzberg, B. H., & Changnon, G. (2009). Conceptualizing intercultural competence. In D. K. Deardoff (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 2-53). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Steinberg, K., Bringle, R. C., & McGuire, L. E. (2013). Attributes of high-quality research on service learning. In P. H. Clayton, R. G. Bringle, & J. A. Hatcher (Eds.), *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment* (pp. 359-388). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2013). *Intercultural competences: Conceptual and operational framework*. Paris, France: Author.

Wächter, B. (2003). An introduction: Internationalization at home in context. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7, 5-11.

Author Biographies

Òscar Prieto-Flores is an associate professor of Sociology in the Institute for Educational Research at the University of Girona.

Jordi Feu is an associate professor of Sociology in the Institute for Educational Research at the University of Girona.

Xavier Casademont is an assistant professor of Social Policy at the University of Girona.