

2.0 METHODOLOGY

To better understand the study participants and their environment, their U.S. and Mexican university contexts and study abroad programs will be examined, followed by a description of the study materials and procedures.

2.1 CONTEXT AND PARTICIPANTS

The participants featured in this series of case studies were four university Spanish heritage language learners and their Mexican roommates and professors during a 10-week study abroad program in Puebla, Mexico. Pseudonyms are used for all participants in this study to maintain confidentiality. The four Spanish heritage language learners are the focus of the case studies and will be described in depth.

The four case study participants were young women who ranged in ages from 20 to 22 years old. All were from the Southwestern United States and at the time of the study were attending three elite, private universities in three regions within the United States (see Table 1 for student background). The Chicana students' backgrounds, U.S. universities and study abroad programs will be described, followed by an account of their Mexican university context and host exchange program.

2.1.1 GRACIE FROM BROWN UNIVERSITY

The first case is about Gracie, a pre-medicine student who grew up in Lasara, a small town in south Texas where suspicions of illegal immigrants run rampant. She recounted how she always carries her social security card so that she could prove she is a U.S. citizen if the border patrol were to ask. In this environment, Gracie recounted, Mexican-Americans spend much time denying their Mexican heritage in order to prove they are from the United States; speaking

Table 1. Chicana Student Background

| | Birthplace/ Generation | Spanish in Family | Spanish in School | University /Major | Undergrad Student population/ % Latino or Chicano | Involvement with Chicano/Mexican community | College Spanish Experience (SHLL= Spanish heritage language learner) |
|---------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gracie | Raymond- ville, Texas/ 2 nd generation | Learned Spanish from housekeeper | Junior High & High School | <i>Brown/ Ethnic Studies (Pre-med)</i> | 7,300/ 7% Latino | Active in MEChA | Took non-SHLL lower level Spanish class, felt professor from Spain insulted her Spanish |
| Leila | Corpus Christi, Texas/ 2 nd generation | Learned Spanish from grandmother & nintera, Spanish dominant until 3 years, English dominant after that, spoke “Spanglish” to her family | 1-2 nd grade, Junior High and High School | <i>Notre Dame/ Manage- ment Informa- tion Systems</i> | 10,000/ 11% Latino | Some, but mostly involved in school and soccer; member of Mexico’s national women’s soccer team | Took two non-SHLL Spanish classes, said they were “elementary” and unchallenging |
| Mikaela | Fresno, California / 4 th generation | Learned Spanish from her family, spoken to in Spanish but responds in English | Elementary through High School | <i>Stanford/ Human Biology (Pre-med)</i> | 6,500/ 9% Chicano, 1% other Hispanic | Involved in UNIDAS, Chicanos for Medical Health, Ballet Folklórico, (at Stanford Chicano center) | Took one non-SHLL Spanish conversation class, did not think it improved her Spanish |
| Brooke | Greenville, Texas/ 2 nd generation | Learned Spanish at home, but spoke mostly English | High School | <i>Stanford/ Political Science & Spanish</i> | | Mentor/coordinator for Barrio Assistance; Ballet Folklórico (at Stanford Chicano Center) | Took two SHLL Spanish courses which gave her confidence in reading & writing; attended summer Spanish for bilinguals courses in Guadalajara |

English without a Spanish accent is key. Gracie's grandmother was reprimanded for speaking Spanish at school and did not teach her son, Gracie's father, to speak it. Consequently, her father learned English first, and after that, Spanish; he now has English-accented Spanish.

Gracie did not begin to learn Spanish until she shared a bedroom with a live-in housekeeper and friend of the family. Even though Gracie's mother, also from Texas, is a Spanish teacher and encouraged her daughter to learn Spanish, she did not take an active part in teaching Spanish to Gracie. However, life in Texas provided a bilingual Spanish-English environment where, Gracie included, people switched back and forth between the two languages. Gracie's first school experience with formal Spanish was in obligatory Spanish classes in junior high.

At the time of this study, Gracie was a Pre-medicine and Ethnic studies major at Brown University, located in Providence, Rhode Island. An Ivy-league school that was founded in 1764, Brown is one of the oldest and most prestigious universities in the United States. The university had a student population of around 7,300, 7% being Latino. Gracie was one of only three Latinos in her class in the prestigious eight-year Program in Liberal Medical Education (PLME) that integrates study in medicine and liberal arts. She was an active member of the campus MEChA (Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán), a support and advocacy group for Chicanos. She was also a student representative from Brown for the East Coast Chicano Student Forum. To Gracie, "Chicano" was a word that describes one who has strong ties to the Mexican culture, lives in the United States, and is trying to raise awareness about social issues related to their people.

At Brown, Gracie "recognized the necessity to understand and speak Spanish" and enrolled in a Spanish course. She did not take the lower level Spanish class (SP 60) or 100-level

Spanish literature course that were, according to Brown, suitable for native Spanish speakers. Instead, she enrolled in a class (SP 50) which, Gracie reported, was taught by a Spaniard who insulted Gracie's Spanish. Although not an important part of her academic program, Gracie used Spanish socially. She spoke Spanish with Latino peers because it connected them culturally.

Gracie decided to further her formal study of Spanish in Mexico through the Brown Office of International Programs. She wanted to learn more about Mexican geography and culture, and search for her family roots in Mexico. After completing one lower level Spanish course, Gracie qualified to apply for the program. The Brown Office of International Programs gives students the choice of staying in the dormitories or with a Mexican homestay family. Gracie chose to live in the Mexican university dormitories in order to socialize and live with Mexican students.

Although Gracie was motivated to spend a semester abroad in her heritage country, she did not receive support from her father or friends who did not seem to understand her desire to study in Mexico. She reports that "they were disappointed that I was traveling to a country that wasn't very popular, or safe. Especially since my Spanish, in their eyes, was extremely poor."

2.1.2 LEILA FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

The second student in this case study series is Leila, a Notre Dame student and native Texan who learned Spanish as her first language. Leila's maternal side of the family has been in Texas for many generations, while her paternal grandmother came to Texas from Cuba and her paternal grandfather from Mexico. Her closest connection to Mexico is through her paternal grandfather, qualifying her for dual Mexican-United States nationality and to play for the Mexican national women's soccer team, formed 3 years prior to this study.

Born in Corpus Christi, Texas, to a family of professionals, Leila started life hearing Spanish from her grandmother and “*niñera*” (nanny). She was dominant in Spanish until 3;0 when the *niñera* left the household and English became Leila’s dominant language. She continued to use Spanish with her family, mixing in her dominant English. Leila spoke English to the maternal side of her family and both Spanish and English to her paternal grandparents. “With my family it’s ‘Spanglish’ . . . a different language in itself. We switch back and forth, like five or six times in one sentence.”

Leila started her classroom study of Spanish at an early age, and after a break from third to seventh grade, continued through college. She studied first through third grade in an elementary school for gifted and talented students that offered 4 1/2 hours of Spanish per week. Junior high was her next Spanish classroom experience, which continued through high school until she took two Spanish classes in college.

At the time of this study, Leila was attending the prestigious Catholic mid-western University of Notre Dame. She was one of the few Latinos who made up 11% of a predominantly Anglo student population of 10,000. She commented that the Latino community is close-knit, although she does not spend much time with them because of her academic and soccer commitments. To be unique and retain her Mexican identity at Notre Dame, however, Leila adds a Spanish word to her English with her friends. “It makes me funny/unique. Among my friends I am the ‘dirty Mexican’ so I have to act like it . . . and I am okay with this.”

Leila originally majored in Spanish but felt dissatisfied with her college Spanish classes as there was little verbal interaction and the course material was “elementary.” Notre Dame offered only one Spanish course specifically for heritage language learners, in which Leila never enrolled. She changed her major to Management Information Systems.

Around this same time, Leila was recruited to play for the Mexican national women's soccer team. Still wanting to develop her Spanish skills, she hoped that being with the Mexican team would improve her Spanish. It did, although not without struggle since her Mexican teammates

at first used to laugh and make fun whenever [my American teammates and I] would . . . say something wrong or say something funny, and they were all talking real fast and we never knew what it was that we would say wrong. So we would just stop talking Spanish.

Two years later the opportunity arose to study with Notre Dame's then newly established study abroad program in Puebla, Mexico. Leila eagerly took the opportunity and was one of five students from Notre Dame to study Spanish and other content courses for the second trial semester of the Puebla program. The program was open to all students regardless of their Spanish proficiency. Students were given the option of living in the dormitories or with a family, and Leila chose to live in the dormitories. Leila was motivated by the chance to increase her Spanish fluency and practice with her Mexican national soccer team in Mexico City, two hours northwest of Puebla. At the beginning of the study Leila explained, "I love Spanish and I'm not going home until I pass for a native."

2.1.3 MIKAELA FROM STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Mikaela is one of the two Chicana students from Stanford participating in the present study. A fourth generation Mexican-American from Fresno, a medium-sized city in the agricultural Central Valley of California, Mikaela grew up hearing Spanish at home but responding in English to family members. Mikaela took Spanish classes from elementary through high school. The fact that she knew most of the Spanish taught in her elementary school for gifted and talented students gave Mikaela confidence in her Spanish language abilities, a

catalyst that motivated her to continue formal Spanish instruction through her junior year of high school.

At the time of the study, Mikaela attended Stanford University, a private and elite research university located in the San Francisco Bay Area in California (and whose campus the researcher visited prior to this study to meet and talk to faculty). Mikaela was majoring in Human Biology with aspirations to become a pediatrician. Chicano students make up 9% of the 6,500 undergraduate student population. Mikaela commented that

Stanford has what I think is a strong Latino community, and that's my Stanford community . . . I feel comfortable within my community . . . I don't always feel comfortable in my classes . . . on top of that, I'm pre-med . . . [and there are only] five in my classes that are Latino and pre-med. Which means in my classes . . . I'm [usually] the only [Latina].

Mikaela finds much of this “community” at the Stanford Chicano Center, which is the home of over 18 different service organizations and her “second home”. The mission statement for the Stanford Chicano center is to “catalyze Chicanos and Latinos at Stanford into a proactive community that creates an environment which celebrates and promotes the history, contributions, intellectual heritage, education, growth and empowerment of all Chicanos and Latinos here and beyond” (Stanford University, 2000c). Mikaela was involved with organizations such as Chicanos for Medical Health and UNIDAS, a Latina organization dedicated to peer support, community service and networking. She was also a dancer in the Ballet Folklórico de Stanford group.

Mikaela decided to continue her Spanish learning at Stanford. Although Stanford offers a series of six classes for Spanish heritage language learners (SHLL), she took a non-SHLL Spanish conversation course where she was the only SHLL student. Sensing little linguistic gain from this course combined with a three-year hiatus from Spanish study before that, Mikaela felt

she had lost ground in her academic Spanish proficiency. She was especially unsure of her writing abilities, but remained confident of her spoken Spanish.

Listening to her friend Brooke, a Chicana student case study described in section 2.1.4, encouraged Mikaela to study abroad through Stanford's Overseas Studies Program (OSP) at the Universidad de las Américas-Puebla (UDLAP) in Mexico. Mikaela qualified for the program which requires at least one year of college-level Spanish and two years if students are interested in taking economics or international relations courses. The OSP in Puebla also requires all students to "enroll in a writing course that allows them to continue to work on their language skills in coordination with their writing assignments from class" (Stanford University, 2000b). The course is essentially a writing workshop where students meet one-on-one with a writing counselor for a half an hour each week. Each student is assigned to live in the college dormitories, typically with Mexican students.

The OSP in Puebla was started in 1997 and at the time of the writing of this study, it had been reported that Stanford Chicano students had experienced cultural and linguistic clash while studying at the UDLAP. Due to these experiences, a Stanford professor cautioned Mikaela that UDLAP professors and students might be critical of her Spanish variety. Keeping these comments in mind, Mikaela continued to prepare for her study abroad to Mexico, which she envisioned as a unique opportunity to "improve my Spanish skills and get to know 'my' people and culture."

2.1.4 BROOKE FROM STANFORD UNIVERSITY

The next case is about Brooke, the Stanford student who proposed the idea of studying abroad in Mexico to Mikaela. Brooke is a second-generation Mexican American from Greenville, a northeastern Texas city. Her paternal grandmother immigrated to Texas from

Jalisco in 1916 during the Mexican Revolution. Her grandmother and father attended U.S. schools that forbade them to speak Spanish, Spanish was the language used at home. She described her home environment:

When I was younger . . . I'd always try to get my parents to only use Spanish in the house. They would always do it for *un ratitito* [a little while] and then switch back to mostly English at some point.

Brooke spoke English with her siblings as well. In her teen-age years, however, she used Spanish in cultural, religious, media, and work-related activities, although she also code-switched often, reportedly using Spanish and English in the same sentence. Spanish became a part of Brooke's academic world starting when she was a teenager. Her first formal Spanish language classes were in high school.

Once at Stanford University, while a Political Science and Spanish major, she became involved in the Stanford Chicano Center. Brooke was a mentor and coordinator for Barrio Assistance, a tutoring and mentoring program for minority children at a local school; and, like Mikaela, she danced in the Ballet Folklórico de Stanford dance group.

As a student at Stanford, Brooke "started taking classes [in Spanish] because for me I've always been annoyed that I can't speak fluently and it's important to me to retain Spanish in my family." She enrolled in two of the six SHLL classes Stanford offers. Stanford has what appears to be a strong heritage language program for home-background speakers. Intermediate and advanced Spanish courses are offered to "develop and accelerate the written and oral linguistic skills of students who come from homes/backgrounds where Spanish is spoken" (Stanford University, 2000a). Additionally, the course "Issues and Methods in the Teaching of Spanish as a Heritage Language" is offered through the Spanish and Portuguese department to

train teachers in instructing SHLL. There are also courses offered for home-background speakers of Chinese (Stanford University, 2000d).

Brooke reported that the SHLL courses at Stanford provided a comfortable environment that helped Brooke with her self-confidence and skill development in reading and writing Spanish. Six months before her study abroad time in Puebla, Brooke took a 5-week course for Spanish bilingual speakers at the Centro de Estudios Para Extranjeros (CEPE) at the University of Guadalajara, which, along with her Stanford classes, provided a “comfortable” environment in which to learn her Spanish heritage language. Then she decided to study Spanish even further through the OSP program in Puebla. She explained why:

Number one that being here is really the only way I’ll attain a level of fluency that I can be happy with, and number two, because this is where my family is originally from so I really wanted to spend time here and experience Mexican culture, as opposed to my Mexican-American/Chicano culture.

2.1.5 LA UNIVERSIDAD DE LAS AMÉRICAS-PUEBLA

This section describes the Mexican university and international program that received the four Chicana university study abroad students. The Universidad de las Américas-Puebla (UDLAP) is located in the state of Puebla in Central Mexico. Like Stanford, Notre Dame, and Brown, it is also a private, elite university.

UDLAP historian Edward Simmen (2000a, 2000b) gives a brief history of the UDLAP. Originally named Mexico City College (MCC) and run by U.S. educators, the college opened in 1940 in a Mexico City basement with five students, five professors, and five liberal arts courses. U.S. World War II veterans were allowed to study at MCC starting in 1946 because their GI Bill benefits were valid at the college. Students studying on the GI Bill made up more than half of the student population until 1953, at which time MCC had awarded 711 bachelor’s degrees and 232 master’s degrees. In 1959, the college received full membership in the Southern

Association of Colleges and Schools, and in 1968, MCC's name was changed to the Universidad de las Américas. Another campus was opened in Cholula, Puebla, where classes began in 1970 and when, for the first time since 1942, Mexican student enrollment outnumbered the U.S. student enrollment.

At the time of the study, the UDLAP had a population of about 7500 students. It was comprised of 37 undergraduate programs and 17 master's programs within its five schools. There were 250 full-time professors who were researchers and instructors, which was "more full-time professors per student than any other institution of higher learning in the Mexican Republic" (Simmen, 2000a, p. 6).

Exchange programs to the UDLAP started with nine Ohio State University students at MCC in 1946, and at the time of this study the Office of International Affairs was hosting 150 exchange students from various countries around the world. The UDLAP has the largest number and greatest variety of academic exchange programs of any Mexican university, currently overseeing active exchanges with over 60 institutions in the United States, Canada, Australia, Great Britain, France, Germany, other European countries, Japan and Latin America (Simmen, 2000a).

Among the large numbers of exchange students are students of Mexican heritage, mostly from the United States, who have participated in the UDLAP programs for the past 10 years. Many students come to find their Mexican roots, but also find a different Mexican culture than they know in the U.S., especially because of the elite, academic nature of the UDLAP campus (Joaquín López personal communication, October 18, 2000). Some Chicanos have experienced clash with the Mexican culture, and some find it to be a defining time for their ethnic identity. A

Chicana from Notre Dame summed up her experience while studying abroad at the UDLAP prior to this study:

I tend to think of myself as a Mexican because I was raised with Mexican ideals and have been surrounded by its culture; yet, I realize that I have an American influence because I grew up in the U.S. and this is what distinguishes me from a native Mexican. To the Mexicans I am a "*gringa*" because I am from the States or a "*pocha*" because I am of Mexican descent born in the United States and speak Spanglish, a mixture of Spanish and English. (Ibañez, 2000)

In order to organize educational and cultural programs for the international students, the UDLAP Department of International Affairs has nine full-time staff members and several volunteer "*amigos internacionales*" ("international friends"). *Amigos internacionales* are UDLAP students who act as tour guides and friends for the new international students; the researcher was a part of this welcoming group. The International Affairs department hosted 150 international students at during semester of this study, four of whom were the Chicana students in this study. The orientation program was conducted in Spanish. It was a week packed-full of tours of Puebla, Cholula, and the UDLAP campus; trips to shopping centers and a picnic in Atlixco, a near-by town; a welcome speech given by the UDLAP President and the Dean of International Affairs; other information meetings regarding UDLAP facilities, academic and recreational programs; academic placement and course advisement; a luncheon where the *amigos internacionales* gave student-to-student advise; a bonfire and dinner complete with a mariachi band; and a final dinner in an up-scale Mexican restaurant. During the welcome meeting the Dean of International Affairs challenged students to step outside of their observer role, integrate themselves into the Mexican community in and outside of the university, and become a Mexican for a semester, seeing things from a Mexican perspective.

Along with the welcome week just described, Notre Dame and Stanford conducted programs to orient their students to study abroad at the UDLAP. The Notre Dame orientation, in which Leila participated, included special meetings and luncheons with the Notre Dame-Puebla study abroad program director. Throughout the semester, Notre Dame students continued to receive special attention from their director, a visiting professor from Notre Dame, who met with every student at least once a week and with the whole group once every 2 weeks. The Notre Dame program also organized three cultural trips to various sites in central Mexico.

Like the Notre Dame students, the four Stanford study abroad students (Mikaela and Brooke included) also received special attention. Two staff members from the Department of International Affairs were in charge of special programs, in which Stanford is included. The two staff members were dedicated to working specifically with Stanford students. For example, during orientation week Stanford students were picked up at the Puebla airport by one of the staff members, where the other international students were picked up in a bus by the *amigos internacionales* in Mexico City. Stanford students were given a meeting and luncheon with their perspective professors and the Dean of the International Affairs. At this meeting, the Dean of International Affairs informed them that they were “*estudiantes muy, muy, muy especiales*” (very, very, very special students). The students and staff proceeded to discuss all that would be made available to the Stanford students throughout their 10 weeks of study.

First, they were offered classes in a special 10-week syllabus designed to accommodate the Stanford winter quarter, while the rest of the UDLAP classes had a 16-week syllabus. Along with the Stanford students, these shortened courses were also made available to international students from Yale, Brown, Notre Dame, and some Mexican national UDLAP students. The special classes were given by some of the UDLAP’s top professors, including an economics

class conducted by the university president. The Stanford students were also given a one-on-one writing workshop to improve their academic Spanish writing (as described in section 2.1.3), access to professors to help with their independent study projects, and a volunteer opportunity to work at a near-by orphanage. Like Notre Dame, Stanford students were given two cultural trips paid for by Stanford. Brown students, Gracie included, did not receive such a special program either from their own university or from the Department of International Affairs.

2.2 MATERIALS

The materials used in the case studies included two participant consent forms, three background questionnaires, a journal prompt, a class observation protocol, and three protocols for interviews. All participants had the option of completing the forms and interviews in either Spanish or English.

Informed consent provides participants with information about the means and expected end product of the research in which he/she is involved before the research takes place. The social science fields, just like the medical fields, are responsible for “full disclosure, to the best of their ability, ...[about] issues affecting participants regarding methods, use, or publication of research” (Fluehr-Lobban, 1994, p. 6). Therefore, two consent forms, one for the Chicana students (see Appendix A) and the other for their professors and peers (see Appendix B), were created to familiarize participants with the nature of this study by explaining the purpose of the proposal and requesting use of participants' testimonies in the study. The consent forms were modeled after forms used in a study of language use and schooling in a Mexican-American barrio in the U.S. (Smith, 2000). The Chicana student consent form entailed specified requirements of participation not asked of the professors and peers. For example, the Chicana students were asked to write a journal but their professors and peers were not.

Pellegrino (1998) suggests using questionnaires in collecting qualitative data for study abroad situations, and self-report language attitude data has been used since the late 1950's, reporting feelings and attitudes toward the target language (Gardner and Lambert, 1972). The Chicano background questionnaire included four sections in which students were asked to report on themselves (see Appendix C). The first section asked for biographical data. The second section asked participants to identify family origins to determine where in Mexico the family is from, as Spanish varies by region (Ramos-Pelicia, 2000). Also in the second section were tables where participants filled in their bilingual background information. The first table elicited the percentage of Spanish and English used at school, with friends, and at home during the elementary through college years. The second table elicited information on Spanish language use in a variety of domains from 12 years of age to the present. These tables were created to understand the formal and informal use of Spanish and the functions of language during the school years (Baker, 1992; Grosjean, 1997).

The third section contained an English skills (speaking, listening, reading, writing) self-rating scale, a Spanish skills self-rating scale, and two bilingualism language proficiency self-rating scales. All scales were based on Hall (1997) and were used to understand how the Chicana participants view their own language proficiency. The scales were also used on a form given to the Chicana students at the end of this study to assess any change in their self-rating of Spanish skills. The third section also asked if, when, and how often the Chicana student code-switched between English and Spanish, and for student opinions of possible social, academic and professional implications of code-switching. Adapted from Hernández Pérez (1997), the questions elicited information and perspectives on code-switching.

Linguistic awareness is a suggested area of study for Spanish heritage language learners (Valdés & Geoffrion-Vinci, 1998). Therefore, the fourth section asked for definitions of “standard” Spanish and “non-standard” Spanish to glean the linguistic awareness of each participant. The last question asked for additional comments the Chicana student would like to include about their Spanish.

The peer questionnaire included three sections (see Appendix E). The first section elicited biographical data, background on previous contact with Chicanos to understand any awareness of language learning and/or Chicano students, and a description of the time spent with their Chicana suitemate. The second section contained four language rating scales (the same scales from the Chicana student questionnaire) to elicit peer ratings of the Chicanas' Spanish. The third section asked about their suitemates' code-switching frequency, their opinions about the social and professional implications of code-switching, and their ideas about “standard” languages (this section is the exact same as that of the Chicana student questionnaire). The professor questionnaire is similar to the peer questionnaire, only slightly modified to slant questions toward the academic setting (see Appendix D).

Diaries provide a chance for writers to generate and reflect on ideas, feelings and thoughts (Brecht & Robinson, 1995; Nunan, 1992; Richards & Nunan, 1990; Pavelenko & Lantolf, 2000). Therefore, journal entries were used in the study to allow the Chicana participants to reflect on their language experiences and feelings, and to make comments on attitudes toward their Spanish variety. The journal prompt, the third instrument, was used to guide the Chicana students in their writing (see Appendix F). The prompt listed the guidelines for each journal entry, writing topics, and due dates for each journal entry. During the study, the

Chicana participants were asked to type five one-page journal reflections using the following writing topics:

1. How are you feeling about your Spanish?
2. Explain any change in your Spanish, citing some examples.
3. Reflect on others' attitudes toward your Spanish and write them down. Please illustrate this with examples of circumstances and/or interaction.

The journal prompt listed journal due dates in fifteen-day increments so the students would have two weeks worth of experiences about which to write, and so their reflections could be analyzed over time.

Triangulation enhances internal validity in that it uses multiple data sources to confirm findings (Merriam, 1998). Two instruments were used to triangulate data from journal entries and questionnaires. One was the class observation protocol, the fourth instrument used in this study (see Appendix G). Following a pilot study, the class observation protocol was developed to obtain information from class proceedings. The protocol included questions about class demographics, class proceedings, Chicana student's participation, and Chicana-teacher interactions and/or Chicana-student interactions. Once complete, it was a resource from which to generate an understanding and more questions about the academic environment, later posed in the interview. A fifth instrument, the interview protocol, was used as a guide to ask questions that allowed participants to confirm or deny patterns noted in previous data. Additional questions were added to the interview protocol according to the researcher's questions for each participant. Three protocols were created: a Chicana student interview protocol (see Appendix H), a professor interview protocol (see Appendix I), and a peer interview protocol (see Appendix J). A second interview was held with the four students to focus discussion on a few themes

gleaned from previous interviews. Therefore, a focus group interview protocol was created as a prompt for follow-up discussion (see Appendix K).

The materials described above in section 2.2 and the procedures mentioned below in section 2.3 were piloted with three Chicano participants, one German-Mexican, and two Anglo-Americans who studied abroad at the UDLAP in the semester previous to this study. Any changes in material or procedures were due to an evaluation of the pilot study by the researcher.

2.3 PROCEDURES

The instruments were applied over 2 1/2 months of the four Chicana students' study abroad program at the Universidad de las Américas-Puebla, Mexico (see Table 2). Prior to the data collection period I acted as an UDLAP *amiga internacional* (see section 2.1.4 for further description) by welcoming students, giving tours, and participating in various activities alongside the new international students, particularly with Stanford's special welcome activities. As a result, I came to know Brooke, Mikaela, Leila, and Gracie. At the end of the orientation festivities, I informed them of my study and invited them to participate.

Nine days after their arrival in Mexico, the Chicana students were given the journal prompt (see Appendix F), asked to fill out the two consent forms (see Appendix A) and one background questionnaire (see Appendix C). Gracie was given this same information twelve days after her arrival as she was unable attend the previous meeting.

During the ninth and tenth weeks of the study I held separate interview appointments with the Chicana students, their suitemates and their professors. Prior to the interviews, I asked each Chicana student which professor and suitemate they would prefer me to interview so that the Chicana students would feel as comfortable as possible with whom I interviewed. The researcher then contacted the professors and asked permission to observe a class and afterward

Table 2. Chicana Case Study Procedures and Materials

| Time | Procedures | Materials |
|---|---|--|
| 1 st week | Orientation week: Chicana students and researcher met and began to know each other | |
| 9 days after arrival | Leila, Mikaela, and Brooke were informed of the nature of the study, consented to participate and filled out the Chicana questionnaire | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Journal prompt (Appendix F) - Chicana consent form (Appendix A) - Chicana questionnaire (Appendix C) |
| 12 days after arrival | Gracie carried out the same procedures as above | - Same as above |
| 1 st – 10 th weeks | Chicana students used journal prompts to write journal entries every two weeks | - Journal prompt (Appendix F) |
| 9 th – 11 th weeks | Researcher asked Chicana students which professors and peers they preferred her to interview; contacted professors, asked permission to observe their classes; conducted observations, adjusted interview protocols | - Class observation protocol (Appendix G) |
| 10 th - 11 th weeks | Researcher contacted suitemates for interviews; conducted individual interviews with Chicana students, their professors and peers; conducted focus group interview | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Spanish skill self-rating scale (Appendix C) - Chicana interview protocol (Appendix H) - Professor/Peer consent form (Appendix B) - Professor questionnaire (Appendix D) - Professor interview protocol (Appendix I) - Peer questionnaire (Appendix E) - Peer interview protocol (Appendix J) - Focus group interview protocol (Appendix K) |
| 12 th week | Gracie reviewed and commented on group interview | |

meet with him or her for an interview. All accepted and the interviews took place after the class observations so I could adjust each interview protocol to include questions that arose from the class observations.

The interviews were conducted in the 10th through 12th weeks of the study. All interviews were semi-structured in nature (Nunan, 1992; Merriam, 1998) and audio-recorded. The interview length and location varied. The professors and peers filled out consent forms (see Appendix B) and the questionnaires (see Appendix D and E) before their interview. The researcher quickly reviewed the questionnaire and used it as a discussion tool for the interview, along with the interview protocols for the professor (see Appendix I) or the peer (see Appendix J). The peer and professor interviews lasted from 10 minutes to 1/2 hour.

The Chicana student interviewees were asked to fill out another Spanish skill self-rating form (see Appendix C), which was used as a discussion tool to talk about changes in ratings and perceived improvements in their Spanish skills. The Chicana interview protocol (see Appendix H) further guided the interview. The Chicanas' individual interviews lasted from 40 minutes to 1 hour and 15 minutes. After the Chicana students' first interviews, their interview data were cross-checked by asking questions from the focus group interview protocol (see Appendix K). The focus group interview lasted 1/2 hour. Gracie could not attend the focus group interview, but read and made comments on the researcher's questions and notes on participants' responses during the group interview. Her comments were also audio-recorded. Selected segments of all interviews were transcribed.

All interviews were conducted on the UDLAP campus in offices, library cubicles, meeting rooms, and dormitory rooms. Interview locations were selected according to optimal,

private, and/or neutral environments, as well as at the convenience of both the participant and myself.

Now that participants and context have been introduced and data collection instruments and procedures have been discussed, Chapter 3 will relate the results from the study methodology.