

INSTITUTIONAL POLICY CHANGES AND THEIR EFFECTS ON THE QUALITY OF STUDY
ABROAD PROPOSALS AND STUDENTS' INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE:
A PROGRAM EVALUATION

L. Blair Alexander

Submitted to the faculty of the School of Education
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree
Doctor of Education
in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies,

Indiana University
December 2023

Accepted by the School of Education Faculty, Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Doctoral Committee

Thomas F. Nelson Laird, Ph.D.

Lucy A. LePeau, Ph.D.

Vasti Torres, Ph.D.

Date of Defense
(October 16, 2023)

© 2023
L. Blair Alexander
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

This is dedicated to my wife, helping me see the right path ahead in life and love.

Acknowledgements

I am deeply grateful to Professor Emerita Nancy Chism, who began me on a journey through organizational change. Associate Professor Andrea Walton Associate, for instilling a fire and passion for higher education through the ages. The depth of my gratitude cannot be easily quantified for Professors Phil Carspecken and David Rutkowski, your knowledge of methods and evaluations have led me on the most enjoyable professional journey into accreditation, program evaluations, and both quantitative and qualitative assessments. My mentor and friend, Donald Hossler Provost Professor Emeritus who changed the course of my life and studies, igniting my thoughts and interests into Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. Gerardo Gonzalez Professor and Dean Emeritus, for providing a great example of leadership and compassion to lift people to achieving the most for themselves. More directly to this dissertation I am grateful to Dean Joyce Alexander whose initial task for study abroad was the impetus for this program evaluation. With deep appreciation for CEHD Regents Professor and Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs supervisory style and support made it possible for me to incorporate my work into this dissertation. Most importantly, I owe much to Vasti Torres Interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education for getting me to change perspectives and see the work more precisely. Likewise, Luci LePeau Associate Professor and Director for the Center for Post Secondary Research, provided affirmation and support from my qualifying exam through the end of my graduate education. Nothing can really express my appreciation for the patience, understanding, and support I received from my dissertation chair Thomas Nelson-Laird Associate Dean for Graduate Studies, whose guidance through the iterations has focused my attention and vision on purpose, style, and content of this paper.

Abstract

L. Blair Alexander

INSTITUTIONAL POLICY CHANGES AND THEIR EFFECTS ON THE QUALITY OF STUDY ABROAD PROPOSALS AND STUDENTS' INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE: A PROGRAM EVALUATION

This dissertation provides a detailed program evaluation of a study abroad program within a college of education at a large, research I land grant university. The focus of the evaluation was to examine administrative policy changes and their effect on program quality. Using the guidelines in the Kellogg Foundations' Project-Level Evaluation Model (1998), I focused on describing the context, exploring the changes implemented, and documenting outcome changes.

I began with an examination of the context of the program, including the environment in which it operated, internal and external forces that were influencing the need for change, and resources and support available to facilitate change. This dissertation describes and evaluates the implementation of policy and procedural changes that were designed to affect program outcomes. Finally, the dissertation evaluates the outcomes of the administrative policy changes on 1) quality of faculty study abroad proposals and 2) students' intercultural competence as evidenced in study abroad experience reflections.

I present evidence that college administrators acted on a need to create more guidance to oversee the impact and effectiveness of the study abroad program. Policies were created with the intent of directing faculty to consider how their study abroad experiences might be

purposely designed as a high impact learning experience for both disciplinary learning and intercultural competence. Faculty proposal quality was measured using nine best practices identified in the literature. After implementation of policy changes, faculty proposal scores were significantly higher than before policy implementation.

Student’s intercultural competence was measured using the AAC&U VALUE Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Rubric. Students’ intercultural competence scores (as evidenced in their reflections) were compared between the 2014-2015 time frame (before changes were made) and the 2019-2021 time frame (after changes were made). In 2019-2021 reflection essays I found significantly higher scores for self-awareness, worldview, empathy, and openness. Communication and curiosity scores were not significantly different and may be due to short duration of the experiences (communication) and the fact that the experiences were embedded in credit bearing course with a thoroughly detailed analysis of cultural differences (curiosity).

Thomas F. Nelson Laird, Ph.D.

Lucy A. LePeau, Ph.D.

Vasti Torres, Ph.D.

Table of Contents

Abstract	vi
Table of Contents.....	viii
Chapter One.....	1
Intercultural competence	3
Best practices and pedagogy in study abroad experiences.....	5
Problem Statement.....	6
Study Purpose	7
Study significance	9
Chapter Two	11
Defining Intercultural Competence.....	11
Worldmindedness.....	11
Intercultural Communication Competence.....	12
Intercultural Sensitivity.....	13
Intercultural Maturity/Consciousness.....	13
Deardorff’s 2006 Consensus Study.....	14
Bennett (1986; 2017) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity/Competency.....	15
Summary.....	16
Intercultural Competence Outcomes from study abroad experiences	16
Cognitive: Cultural Self-Awareness.....	16
Cognitive: Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks.....	18
Behavioral: Empathy.....	19
Behavioral: Verbal and nonverbal communication.....	20
Affective: Curiosity.....	21
Affective: Openness.....	22
A Few Critiques of the Intercultural Competence Literature	23
Best Practices in Study Abroad Experience Design and Implementation.....	24
Pre-experience best practice #1:	27
Pre-experience best practice #2:	28
Pre- experience best practice #3:.....	29
During study abroad experiences.....	30
During study abroad experience best practice #4:.....	31
During study abroad experience best practice #5:.....	33

During study abroad experience best practice #6:.....	34
During study abroad experience best practice #7:.....	35
Post-experience best practice #8:.....	37
Post-experience best practice #9:.....	37
Overall administrative policy recommendation:.....	38
Conclusion	39
Overview of Present Study.....	40
Guiding Model for Project-Level Evaluation	40
Research Questions	41
Chapter Three	43
Introduction	43
Context Evaluation.....	43
Documents available for review.....	43
Trustworthiness of data.	44
Implementation Evaluation	45
Documents available for review.....	45
Trustworthiness of data.	45
Outcomes Evaluation.....	46
Changes in faculty proposals.....	47
Documents available for review.....	47
Measuring Quality of faculty proposals.	48
Descriptive Data.....	49
Student Intercultural Competency Outcomes	50
Documents available for review.....	50
Measuring Intercultural Competency.	51
Validity of the rubric.	53
Reliability.	54
Rating Process for the Current Study.....	54
Current Study Reliability.	55
Limitations	57
Chapter Four	60
Introduction	60
Context Evaluation.....	60

University Climate	60
College of Education and Human Development Climate	61
College of Education and Human Development leadership change	64
College of Education and Human Development faculty involvement	65
Implementation Evaluation	66
Faculty Proposals	72
Student Reflection Prompt	75
Faculty Resources	76
Outcomes Evaluation	77
Faculty Study Abroad Proposals.....	77
Intercultural Competence	78
Chapter Five	80
Discussion and Implications	80
Implications	88
Implications for CEHD.	88
Implications for practice beyond CEHD.....	91
Future Evaluation and Research	90
Summary.....	91
References	93
Current Vitae	

Chapter One

Studying abroad has been embedded in higher education in the United States since the colonial times (Twombly, Salisbury, Tumanut, & Klute, 2012) and many students consider study abroad to be life-changing (Metzger, 2006). Early on, study abroad was known as the student's junior year abroad predominantly for students majoring in humanities and was focused on learning languages and gaining cultural refinement in Western Europe (Heisel & Stableski, 2009; Hoffa, 2007). These junior-year abroad experiences have been shown to produce positive benefits for college students in the areas of global awareness (e.g., Clarke, Flaherty, Wright, & McMillen, 2009; Kitsantas, 2004; Younes & Asay, 2003) and academic performance post-experience (Malmgren & Galvin, 2008; Bell, Bhatt, Hodges, Rubin, & Shiflet, 2020). In recent years, short-term study abroad, defined as a higher education-related educational experience outside of your country of origin for less than 8 weeks, have become more common (e.g., Institute of International Education, nd).

Despite these benefits, higher education institutions face a challenge. Should institutions of higher education be offering study abroad opportunities and what do institutions know about the quality of the student experiences their faculty design? Are the proposed study abroad experiences having the intended effects? Do the designed activities place students in interactions and opportunities to grow in their ability to understand and work in different cultures? Or, as suggested by Zamach-Berson (2009), do college students choose their study abroad experiences based on places they would like to vacation and “get out of town”, giving

little thought to the cultural aspect of the study abroad experience and their own intercultural growth? Some of the fault for this viewpoint certainly comes from advertisements for study abroad that talk about it as an “adventure” and a means to “personal advancement and global citizenship” (Zemach-Bersin, 2009). The advertisements also focus on job skills to be learned. The argument almost seems implicitly to be, as Bolen (2001) states, that “Americans need international programs to compete better in the marketplace” (p. 187).

Colleges and universities do often have a goal to educate global citizens and a focus on expanding the number of U.S. students who study abroad (Twombly et al., 2012), so they too have a role in incentivizing participation in global experiences. In addition, research on study abroad has consistently found positive effects on student engagement in their academic endeavors following the experience (Dolby, 2004, 2007; Hadis, 2005; Vande Berg, 2007) suggesting that study abroad experiences may increase both intercultural competence and support “higher than average curiosity and interest in academic matters” (Hadis, 2005, p. 57). Students reported that these new interests were sparked by reflections and interactions during their study abroad trip. Increasingly, however, parents and government officials are interested in eliminating activities that delay time to graduation or increase costs of degree completion, including study abroad activities (Barclay-Hamir, 2011; Hoffa, 2007; Hoffa & DePaul, 2010; Metzger, 2006).

In sum, institutions need to understand the quality of their study abroad experiences and the effect those experiences have on students. Below, I introduce literature related to intercultural competence, exploring connections to how a well-designed study abroad experiences can facilitate growth in intercultural competence. Second, I examine the literature

related to best practices in study abroad design from an institutional perspective. Institutions might benefit from these best practices if their goal is to implement high quality study abroad experiences. Following, I review the problem statement, purpose of the present dissertation, and review the significance of the work. I then provide an overview for the literature to be reviewed.

Intercultural competence

Intercultural competence is one of today's most desired outcomes developed during study abroad. Intercultural competence is thought to be critical for international diplomacy, economic competition, and business. Friedman (2005) has noted that it is imperative in a "flat world" for individuals to be globally competent to compete economically. Farrugia and Sanger (2017) found that employers value the soft skills that get developed during study abroad and concluded that study abroad generally makes the student more employable (see also Carlson, Burn, Useem, & Yachimovicz, 1990; di Pietro, 2019; Nerlich, 2021).

It has been, and continues to be, difficult to define intercultural competence due to the large variance of working disciplines, models, and theories using terms associated with the concept (Deardorff, 2006). In 2006, Deardorff sought to bring the disparate terms related to intercultural competence together to find a consensus. The definition of intercultural competence with the highest agreement was Deardorff's (2004) "The ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations based on one's intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes" (p. 194).

Bennett (1986; 2017) adds to this consensus definition by viewing intercultural competence from a developmental perspective, with a real focus on how competence can

change following experiences and/or training. In Bennett's view, individuals grow in their understanding of other cultures through a series of stages leading from what Bennett coined as ethnocentric (or a denial of cultural differences) to ethnorelativism. Ethnorelativism is representative of Adler's (1977) "multicultural man". Despite the sexist and dated nature of Adler's terminology, the ethnorelative individual is seen as someone comfortable within a variety of cultures and with the assumptions, values, and underlying beliefs that go with them.

These are just two theoretical perspectives on intercultural competence. In chapter two I delve more deeply into more of these theoretical perspectives. What will be clear with this theoretical review is that, despite some variations of definitions, most agree that intercultural competence consists of understanding others within their cultures and has three main domains: cognitive (knowledge), affective, and behavior. The overall idea is captured in six components: 1) self-aware knowledge of one's own culture (cultural self-awareness); 2) knowledge of others and a cultural worldview (knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks) both help support an individual to act appropriately in a new environment; 3 & 4) self- and other- knowledge interacts with the affective components of curiosity (curiosity) and openness (openness) to prepare a person to be able to see, accept, value, and appreciate cultural differences; 5 & 6) knowledge and affect combine to lead to effective and appropriate behaviors within intercultural interactions seen in skills such as empathy (empathy) and verbal and nonverbal communication (communication). These six components of intercultural competence are captured in the Association of American Colleges and Universities' (AAC&U, 2009) Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE (Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education) Rubric, which was used in the present study.

Best practices and pedagogy in study abroad experiences

A group of researchers have been focusing on identifying the elements that make a short-term study abroad trip more impactful. These ideas include activities pre-experience, during the experience, and post-experience and will be reviewed thoroughly in the literature review. This literature review gathers best practices with the goal to ensure that an education abroad experience is purposefully designed to help the student notice, reflect on, and grow from their experiences in a different social, political, cultural, and economic environment (Hulstrand, 2015). Pre-experience, activities should be designed so that they enhance intercultural competence in addition to disciplinary knowledge (Citron, 2002). Students should complete activities before leaving to prepare them to notice and respond to differing cultural norms and values (e.g., Lockett, Moore & Wingenbach, 2014). Students should also practice reflective journaling to become better at nuanced observations of feelings and actions (e.g., Bell & Anscomb, 2013).

During the study abroad experience, instructors should purposefully design activities that embed students in real world cultural situations and challenge them to interact appropriately (e.g., Mitchell & Paras, 2018). Students should purposefully be involved in conversations that illustrate differences in world views, customs, and beliefs and instructors should be ready to take advantage of teachable moments while in country to expand students learning (Anderson, 2003). Short-term study abroad experiences should include some activities that mirror a full-immersion experience such as shopping or riding public transit (e.g. Caldwell & Purtzer, 2014). Finally, faculty-led debriefings or journaling are important. In fact, Wilkinson's (1998) study illustrated that, without effective debriefing, and with only their own cultural

experience on which to rely, students end up not gaining cultural understanding despite spending significant time in-country.

Post-experience, instructors should support students as they debrief not only about the discipline learning, but also about cultural interactions (e.g., Core, 2017). In addition, in general, institutions need administrative practices to ensure that individuals from underrepresented groups and those in need of financial aid have access to these high impact activities and feel welcome (Consortium for Analysis of Student Success through International Education, CASSIE, 2020). Research has suggested that study abroad, as a high impact practice, may have particularly beneficial effects for individuals of color or from historically underrepresented groups (Malmgren & Galvin, 2008).

Problem Statement

This dissertation is a program evaluation, centered on the outcome effects from administrative changes to policies and procedures related to study abroad experiences. It is important for institutions to carefully craft their policies and procedures based on best practices to ensure that study abroad opportunities have the greatest chance to impact student engagement and intercultural competence.

The program under evaluation was very committed to the integration of study abroad in undergraduate education. Unfortunately, it was clear something was amiss when, in Spring 2016, the Dean received a group of emails from students very thankful to the college for providing funding for the opportunity to snow ski at an internationally renowned ski resort. It

was clear that this institution did not have policies and procedures in place that would ensure the quality and impact of their study abroad experiences.

Consequently, a self-study ensued. All procedures and policies were reviewed with the idea that this institution needed a more focused approach to facilitating quality experiences abroad. The mission of the study abroad office became focused on student's growth within intercultural competence in addition to disciplinary growth. This clarified that all study abroad experiences would be more educational in focus, and less like a vacation. In addition, because the college invested substantial financial resources, it was even more imperative to understand the impact those resources were having on student growth. As a result of a purposeful cycle of continuous improvement, a set of new policies and procedural changes were implemented and were evaluated for their effectiveness in this dissertation.

For this particular institution, the outcomes of this study were important because little has been known about the efficacy of these administrative policies and procedural changes. The institution can use the specific outcomes of this study to make decisions about future financial commitments, make additional changes to policies and procedures, or to decide to discontinue or enhance the study abroad program.

Study Purpose

The present study examined a college within a research university that implemented a variety of administrative policy interventions over a 5-year period to increase the quality of their study abroad experiences, both in disciplinary connection and intercultural competence. This dissertation focused solely on the intercultural competence component. Following the

project-level evaluation guidelines in the Kellogg Foundations' Project-Level Evaluation Model (1998) I:

- I. Described the context of the program, including the environment in which it operated, internal and external forces that were influencing the need for change, and resources and support to facilitate changes that would affect program outcomes.

- *Research Question 1: What was the organizational and institutional context within which the study abroad policy changes were made?*

- II. Describe and evaluate the implementation of policy and procedural changes that were designed to affect program outcomes.

Research Question 2: What study abroad administrative policies designed to improve quality of student experience and students' intercultural competence changes were made within the College of Education and Human Development at Land-grant Southern University between 2015 and 2019?

- III. Evaluate the outcomes of the administrative policy changes. Specifically, I examined:
1) quality of faculty study abroad proposals and 2) students' intercultural competence as evidenced in study abroad experience reflections.

- *Research Question 3: How were best practices reflected within the quality of study abroad proposals within the College of Education and Human Development at Land-grant Southern University comparing faculty proposals before policy changes were implemented (2014-2015) to those after changes were implemented (2019-2021)?*

- *Research Question 4: How did ratings of students' intercultural competence, as reflected in post-experience essays (using the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric), comparing student reflections before policy changes were implemented (2014-2015) to those after changes were implemented (2019-2021)?*

Study significance

This dissertation will focus on a problem of administrative practice within the setting of the College of Education and Human Development at Land-grant Southern University. Land-grant Southern is a large public land grant university that self-identified high impact practices as an area for improvement and emphasis in 2012. The College of Education and Human Development (CEHD) approved their own focused areas of emphasis within their 2015 Strategic Plan and QEP which was aligned with the University's, delineating goals for initial implementation of high impact practices in the college through the year 2015. The broad ranging goals included:

- increasing intentional student interactions through college-wide learning community (\$280,000 yearly budget allocation),
- Increasing the number of service-learning activities (\$60,000 yearly budget allocation),
- Increasing the number of high impact learning capstone experiences (\$45,000 yearly budget allocation),
- Increasing the number and quality of domestic and international learning experiences initiatives (\$245,000 yearly budget allocation).

While the context of this dissertation is specific to Land-grant Southern University, many other institutions of higher education might benefit from the information in this dissertation. The policy changes made by this institution might be used by other administrators to make decisions about policies and procedures that best support study abroad quality and student's intercultural competence. Institutions of higher education sometimes take up new programs or opportunities that are designed to increase student learning without doing the hard work of assessing the outcomes and comparing findings in a cost/benefit analysis. This dissertation will be one for them to consider in their decision making.

Chapter Two

This chapter reviews the literature related to theories of intercultural competence, known outcomes of study abroad relevant to the six dimensions of the AAC&U's Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric, and summarizes a set of best practices for institutions related to study abroad.

Defining Intercultural Competence

(The) lack of specificity in defining intercultural competence is due presumably to the difficulty of identifying the specific components of this complex concept.

(Deardorff, 2006. P 241)

It has been, and continues to be, difficult to define intercultural competence due to the large variance of working disciplines, models, and theories using terms associated with the concept (Deardorff, 2006). I begin below by first defining what it means to be interculturally competent based on the primary theoretical models popular in the literature. This historical review illustrates how terminology shifted over time. I end this section with a full discussion of the definition used in this study.

Worldmindedness.

Up until post World War II, most methods of measurement related to outcomes of study abroad were focused on the dimension of nationalism-internationalism (Ferguson, 1942; Likert, 1932; Sampson & Smith, 1957). Sampson and Smith (1957) broadened the concept

worldmindedness to:

a value orientation, or frame of reference, apart from knowledge about, or interests in, international relations... individuals who favor a world-view of the problems of humanity, whose primary reference group is mankind, rather than Americans, English, Chinese, etc. (Sampson & Smith, 1957, p. 99).

Hett's (1993) Global Mindedness Scale (GMS) was developed to measure attitudes of students related to their sense of connection to, interest in, and responsibility for, the global community and the behaviors associated with this perspective (Hett, 1993, p. 4)

and was focused on cognitive, behavioral, and affective dimensions. Worldmindedness was the beginning of looking beyond culture as an "attitude" to acknowledge the importance of empathy and openness to other cultural perspectives outside of their own (a shared belief, and/or value).

Intercultural Communication Competence.

Intercultural communication competence is defined as an individuals' ability to achieve goals, collaborate effectively, and adapt to variations in cultures (Bochner & Kelly, 1974). In other words, from an effectiveness perspective, competent communicators need to be able to control and manipulate their environments in order to attain their personal goals during real time interactions and conversations. Chen and Starosta's (1996) synthesis of the literature described three kinds of appropriate behaviors: the ability to recognize how context constrains communication; ability to avoid inappropriate responses; and "the ability to fulfill appropriately

such communication functions as controlling, sharing feelings, informing, ritualizing, and imagining” (p. 358).

This “in the moment” requirement for effectiveness moves intercultural competence out of the cognitive and affective domains to the inclusion of behavior as a domain of competence. According to these theorists (see in particular Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992), intercultural awareness (cognitive) is the foundation of intercultural sensitivity (affective) which leads to intercultural adroitness (behavioral). These aspects together represent intercultural competence.

Intercultural Sensitivity.

Intercultural sensitivity places more emphasis on the affective domain as central to understanding intercultural sensitivity than the previous theoretical perspectives. Hart and Burks (1972) and Hart, Carlson, and Eadie (1980) proposed that sensitive persons should be able to deal with intercultural complexity by staying flexible and appreciating the ideas exchanged. These elements are represented in the cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions of intercultural interaction, but present a challenge to measurement as they are all based on beliefs, values, and interpretations of others’ behaviors. Chen and Starosta (1996) defined Intercultural sensitivity within intercultural communication competence as the ability to execute behaviors that reveal an understanding and appreciation for another’s cultural identity resulting in effective intercultural communication.

Intercultural Maturity/Consciousness.

Intercultural maturity/consciousness is similar to intercultural communication competence, in that it emphasizes the context within the interaction and views it within three

domains – cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal (affective). Landreman (2005) discusses intercultural consciousness as a developmental process. She notes that:

achieving consciousness implies an understanding of self and identity (intrapersonal), while interacting with others in a historical and socio-cultural-political context (interpersonal), leading to reflection (cognitive) that motivates action.” (p. 41 -42).

In other words, intercultural maturity/consciousness resides in understanding the context in which one is communicating, being sensitive to one’s own views and knowledge, and being able to listen, learn, reflect on the other individual’s context, thoughts, and behaviors.

Deardorff’s 2006 Consensus Study.

In 2006, Deardorff sought to bring the disparate terms related to intercultural competence together to find a consensus among top intercultural scholars and academic administrators. The idea was to create an agreed upon definition of intercultural competence including how to best assess the construct. Two methods were employed to find a consensus. The first was a questionnaire to be completed by institutional administrators. Second, consensus was sought among nationally and internationally known intercultural scholars on what it means to be interculturally competent and its intercultural components. Experts rated their agreement with others’ definitions and they either accepted or rejected proposed definitions and assessment ideas.

The definition of intercultural competence with the highest agreement was Deardorff’s (2004) “The ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations based on one’s intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes” (Deardorff, 2004, p. 194). Ninety percent of the intercultural scholars believed that intercultural competence could be assessed

using case studies or interviews. They also believed it best to use a mix of quantitative and qualitative measures. Many argued that “an inventory alone is not sufficient measurement of intercultural competence” (Deardorff, 2006, p. 257) and, instead suggested that pre- and post-test (most commonly self-report instruments) should be used as a means to measure cultural competence.

Bennett (1986; 2017) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity/Competency.

Bennett’s view of Intercultural sensitivity was different from many of the other theories reviewed. Bennett (1986; 2017) viewed intercultural sensitivity from a developmental perspective, with a real focus on intercultural communication training approaches. For Bennett, the explicit assumption was that intercultural competence changes over time and with experience.

Bennett proposed that many individuals start from the point of ethnocentric views of cultural difference in a stage of denial (of differences). In this view, those with ethnocentric views have a single worldview. People with this view will often attempt to protect themselves from perceived threats through a denial of difference, denigration of the other culture or asserting superiority of one’s own culture, or the minimization of what those differences represent (universal values or human traits).

Individuals grow in their understanding of intercultural competence through a series of stages leading up to what Bennett coined as the opposite of ethnocentric or viewing the world through an ethnorelativism lens. This final stage of ethnorelativism was representative of Adler’s (1977) “multicultural man”. Despite the sexist and dated nature of Adler’s terminology, the ethnorelative individual was seen as someone comfortable within a variety of cultures and

with the assumptions, values, and underlying beliefs that go with them. Experiences and interactions are critical to this growth over time.

Summary.

What is clear with this theoretical review is that, despite some variations of definitions, most agree that intercultural competence consists of understanding others within their cultures and has three main domains of cognitive, affective, and behavior and is composed of six components including cultural self-awareness, knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks, curiosity, openness, empathy, and communication. These components were captured in the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE (Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education) Rubric (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2009), which was used in the present study.

Intercultural Competence Outcomes from study abroad experiences

The Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE rubric (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2009) takes the outcomes typically seen for students from study abroad experiences and translates them into course-or campus-related student behaviors, knowledge, and affective outcomes. Below I review research on intercultural competence and the VALUE rubric's three primary domains: Cognitive, Behavioral, and Affect.

Cognitive: Cultural Self-Awareness.

To become culturally self-aware, one must first understand one's own contexts, behaviors, and communication patterns. Ang and Van Dyne (2008) term this metacognitive

intelligence and define it as an “individual’s level of conscious cultural awareness during cross-cultural interactions” (p. 5). Individuals who are more cross culturally aware reflect on their cultural assumptions during interactions. Through critical reflection, individuals question cultural assumptions (stereotypes) and this reflection and ongoing observation allows them the ability to adjust their cultural knowledge and behavior likely helping them with the behavior skills of empathy and verbal and nonverbal communication (Endsley, 1995; Sheldon, 1996; Triandis, 2006). Triandis (2006) found that individuals with elevated metacognitive intelligence understand how their own culture influences their behaviors and interpretations of intercultural situations.

Landreman (2005) believes that cultural self-awareness is a “developmental process that leads to an understanding of self and identity in historical and socio-cultural-political contexts” (p. 277). Knowledge of one’s own identity is a self-awareness that grows with exposure. As one becomes more self-aware, one’s communication and self-presentation become more socially appropriate, responsive to situational cues, and the speaker has an increased ability to control and modify their behavior based on the context. Some have termed this holistic development as self-authorship (e.g., Braskamp, Braskamp, & Merrill, 2009; Du, 2007).

Research supports these theoretical perspectives. For example, Hadis (2005) found that students who had studied abroad reported that they had learned a great deal about themselves as a student, individual, American, and global citizen. Souders (2006) found that individuals, upon their return from their long-term experience, saw themselves differently than their peers – clearly more international, maybe a step above those who had not studied abroad, most

importantly not a typical American. They were also very sensitive to stereotypes about Americans while studying abroad and understood the importance of fitting into their local culture (Clark et al., 2009; Souders, 2006). Many study abroad participants reported feeling more competent at making their own life decisions after returning (Hadis, 2005). Jessup-Anger (2008) found that students reported that they had learned more about themselves, their strengths and weaknesses by examining aspects of their identity that had been hidden to them. These reflections, whether negative or positive about American culture, clearly illustrate that students used their experience to help define themselves – and define themselves in relation to their culture.

Cognitive: Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks.

Students with advanced competence in the knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks demonstrate understanding of “the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices” (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2009). Chen and Starosta (1998/1999) refer to this as a cultural map or cultural theme that works as a guide to navigating life in a society, whether it be yours or one you are visiting. These maps represent social values, social customs, social norms, and social systems (Chen & Starosta, 1998/1999).

In addition to this cultural map, some have argued that direct cognitive knowledge of another culture aids in developing a full understanding of that culture. In the late 1970’s at the behest of the National Advisory Board of the Council on Learning’s Education and the World View (E&WV) project, the Educational Testing Service (ETS) set out to define, measure, and test college student’s global awareness/understanding (Barrows, Ager, Bennett, Braun, Clark, Harris,

& Klein, 1981). The Survey of Global Understanding was the first illustration that cognitive knowledge of a “cultures’ environment, food, health, international monetary and trade arrangements, population, energy, race issues, relations among states, and distributions of natural resources”, was needed for a full cognitive understanding of another culture (Barrows, et al., 1981, p. 5).

Research by the Study Abroad Evaluation Project (Carlson, Burn, Useem, & Yachimowicz, 1990) examined data from four higher education institutions and found that students who studied abroad, in contrast to those who stayed at their home institution, consistently scored higher on measures of international perspectives. Similar findings emerged from the Georgetown Consortium Project (Vande Berg, Connor-Linton, & Paige, 2009; see also Anderson, Lawton, Rexeisen, & Hubbard, 2006; Golay, 2006; Kishino & Takahashi, 2019; Pedersen, 2009) and most importantly, for the current study, these positive outcomes hold even for short-term experiences (Chieffo & Griffiths, 2009). As an example, Byker and Putman (2019) found that preservice teachers became more interculturally aware of other cultural frameworks and were subsequently more responsive when they taught in a different culture, modifying their behavior and responding to cues from their students and community, widening their perspectives of what it means to be a global citizen and educator.

Behavioral: Empathy.

Empathy allows a student to interpret a cultural exchange “from the perspective of [their] own and more than one worldview and demonstrates ability to act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another cultural group” (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2009). Pettigrew and Tropp (2006), in a metareview of over 700

studies found that significant interactions with other cultures allows one to grow in his/her understanding of others world views and to express that in real-time interactions, but only under certain conditions: 1) both groups need to have equal “social status”; 2) the social context needs to have both groups on an equal footing; 3) members of both groups need to work together toward a shared goal; 4) interactions needs to be long enough and intimate enough so that examples of previously held stereotypes can be contradicted; and 5) authority figures need to model and support the rethinking of prejudices (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Thus, the design of the experience and the activities thereof are important contributors to growth opportunities for students on study abroad.

Research has illustrated that well-designed study abroad experiences can affect how individuals interpret others’ perspectives. For example, students in one study demonstrated a shift by reporting being more empathetic with individuals from diverse cultures (Kinsantas & Meyers, 2001). Students also reported being more sensitive to cliches and triteness in American culture (Hadis, 2005) and more willing to question and be aware of assumptions and stories told about American culture. Many expressed that they started thinking critically about things they had taken for granted in American culture. Souders (2006) found similar outcomes with individuals, upon their return, able to identify both positive and negative stereotypes of Americanness. They were also very sensitive to stereotypes about Americans while studying abroad, and understood the importance of fitting into their local culture (Clark et al., 2009; Souders, 2006).

Behavioral: Verbal and nonverbal communication.

Individuals with high verbal and nonverbal communication recognize when cultures

differ on their expectations and behaviors related to communication. A person who rated high in this scale would demonstrate an “understanding of the degree to which people use physical contact while communicating in different cultures or use direct/indirect and explicit/implicit meanings.” They would also be able to “skillfully negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.” (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2009).

Hart and Burks (1972) and Hart, Carlson, and Eadie (1980) discuss intercultural sensitively in one's everyday verbal and nonverbal communication. They proposed that a sensitive person should be able to deal with intercultural complexity by staying flexible and appreciating the ideas exchanged. These elements amount to the kinds of awareness necessary for Bennett's (1986; 2017) developmental process to occur and should be able to be articulated by students after a study abroad experience.

Affective: Curiosity.

Curiosity, as advanced by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (2009), is the ability to “ask complex questions about other cultures and find answers that reflect multiple perspectives”. Research in the study abroad area is replete with examples of this finding. For example, according to Hadis (2005), students generally return from an experience abroad with a “higher than average curiosity and interest in academic matters” (p. 57). Dolby (2004) reported that the study abroad students returned with more interest in learning for the sake of learning (for pleasure of knowledge), and not necessarily for a grade.

Various research studies have also found that student's curiosity is not limited to their own culture, nor simply the culture they visited on the study abroad experience. For example, Hadis (2005) found that most students developed a new or deeper interest in world affairs after

returning from their experience. Kitsantas (2004) found that students had an intensified interest in global affairs and a new sense of global understanding (see also Kitsantas & Meyers, 2001). Additionally, students were more interested in foreign policy and international issues after their experience than before (Carlson, Burn, Useem, & Yachimovicz, 1990; Dolby, 2007). Students consistently report that these new interests and curiosities were sparked by reflections and interactions during their study abroad trip.

Affective: Openness.

Students whose artifacts or reflections score high on openness reveal comfort as they “initiate and develop interactions with culturally different others.” They also “suspend judgment in valuing his/her interactions with culturally different others” (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2009). Bennett’s (1986) work is probably the best example of the benefits to openness. As noted earlier, one begins from a personal, local perspective which he called ethnocentric (completely focused on one’s own culture). As someone becomes more sensitive to cultural differences, they develop along a continuum towards becoming ethnorelativistic. As one becomes more sensitive to the existence of differences, he/she grows past seeing culture differences as negative and leaves behind an adherence to the superiority of one’s own culture. As one moves more toward ethnorelativism, one must accept that there are differences between cultures, develop the ability to adapt to different worldviews as the differences are noticed and appreciated. Finally, an individual would demonstrate an integration of the differences between cultures through the perspective of not existing or identifying within any one culture; in other words, the individual can openly move effectively between cultures accepting and being comfortable within the culture

presented.

A Few Critiques of the Intercultural Competence Literature

Although much of the literature examining outcomes from study abroad captured positive outcomes, a few exceptions were worth noting. For example, Clarke, Flaherty, Wright, and McMillan (2009) have noted that increased intercultural awareness does not necessarily translate to an increased sense of “responsibility to the global community, nor a greater interest in the ‘good of the world’” (p. 176). Additionally, the analysis from the Study Abroad Evaluation Project (Carlson et al., 1990) did not make clear whether gains in intercultural awareness were made after controlling for potential pre-existing differences between the students who chose to study abroad and those who did not. This turns out to be a significant problem, as Salisbury, Umbach, Paulsen, and Pascarella (2009) were able to control for pre-existing differences in likelihood of going on a study abroad experience statistically and found that changes due to study abroad were actually smaller than changes seen due to participation in other campus-based diversity experiences.

There is also some debate on the exact nature of the “best” study abroad experience. For example, research by Iskhakova, Bradly, Whiting, and Lu (2021) found that cultural intelligence improved most when students were in study abroad experiences with similar cultures to their home culture, rather than distant cultures. This may be particularly important for short term study abroad trips, rather than longer-term study abroad experiences where more time to adjust to the cultural differences are available. On the other hand, Davis and Knight (2021) analyzed students’ journals and found that the cultural distance between the home culture and study abroad experience culture improved students’ study abroad

experiences during a semester long course. This was only true when there was a need to learn a new language and consistent attention to the cultural sociohistorical environment.

Best Practices in Study Abroad Experience Design and Implementation

Despite these slight disagreements, there is a growing body of evidence suggesting best practices for institutions interested in implementing a quality study abroad program. These best practices help move study abroad to rich educational experiences, rather than vacations. This framing as a vacation or break is a far cry from the stated goals of study abroad in the literature related to higher education (Bolen, 2001; Zemach-Bersin, 2009). In terms of quality, prepackaged consumer experiences are often not any different than tourist experiences (Bolen, 2001). There are unfortunate examples of participants who begin their study abroad with their peer group, stay in Americanized hotels, and see tourist attractions the entire time rather than have genuine cultural interactions (CEHD Associate Dean for Academic Affairs personal communication, August 12, 2019). Without guidance, many students do not choose the study abroad experience destination based on cultural growth goals; they do not study up on the country before they leave; and they state their main purpose as “to get out of town” or take a break (see also, He & Chen, 2010; Lucas, 2009).

According to the Standards of Good Practice for Education Abroad by the Forum on Education Abroad (2020; forumea.org), each unit designing and supporting education abroad should create a mission statement that ensures that culturally-relevant educational objectives are central to any study abroad design and implementation (p. 22). Although this seems self-evident for a university-involved activity, it separates an “education” abroad trip from a mere

vacation. An education abroad experience should be “purposefully designed to provide opportunities for students to reflect on the social, cultural, economic, and environmental impact of their activities” (Hulstrand, 2015, p. 36) and support them as they integrate and apply their academic, professional, and personal learning in a new international context (p. 37). These emphases prepare students to be successful not only in the academic content, but in the new culture as well.

Below, I explicitly address some best practice and suggested administrative modifications in study abroad trip design and support that would help confront some of these challenges. Universities or Colleges wanting to support study abroad most effectively might benefit from implementing some or all of these best practices. Preparation can occur in 3 phases: pre-experience, during study abroad experience, and post-experience. In addition, I have included an administrative policy recommendation focused on equity and access.

Pre-experience

- Activities should be designed so that they enhance both disciplinary knowledge and intercultural competence (Citron, 2002).
- Students should complete activities before leaving to prepare them to notice and respond to differing cultural norms and values (e.g., Lockett, Moore, & Wingenbach, 2014).
- Students should complete reflective journaling to become more practiced at observations of feelings and actions (e.g., Bell & Anscorn, 2013).

During the study abroad experience

- Instructors should purposefully design activities that embed students in real

world situations and challenge them to interact appropriately (e.g., Mitchell & Paras, 2018).

- Students should purposefully be involved in conversations that illustrate differences in world views, customs, and beliefs and instructors should be ready to take advantage of teachable moments while in country (Anderson, 2003).
- Short-term study abroad experiences should include some activities that mirror a full-immersion experience such as shopping or riding public transit (e.g. Caldwell & Purtzer, 2014).
- Faculty-led debriefings or journaling are important to prevent a student from NOT gaining cultural understanding despite spending significant time in-country (Wilkinson, 1998).

Post-experience

- Instructors should support students as they debrief about the experienced cultural interactions.
- Instructors should support students as they debrief, tying the experiences to the discipline (e.g., Core, 2017).

Administrative policy recommendations in support for equity and access

- Organizations need to ensure that those from underrepresented groups and those in need of financial aid have access to these impactful activities and feel welcome (CASSIE, 2020). Research has suggested that study abroad may have particularly beneficial for these individuals (e.g., Kronholz & Osborn, 2016).

Each of these best practices are reviewed more fully below. I focus most closely on the literature related to short-term study abroad experiences (1-8 weeks), as this was the focus of this dissertation.

Pre-experience best practice #1:

Design your unit's study abroad experiences with the dual goals of enhancing disciplinary knowledge and intercultural competence. Pre-experience activities are those activities in preparation for the study abroad experience prior to leaving the country. These activities are conducted under various forms from 100% online with assigned readings and asynchronous discussions, to experiences that are embedded in face-to-face courses with complex lesson plans and objectives to prepare for the study abroad trip. Most common are the semester course lessons embedded in a typical course, workshops that meet three or four times to prepare travelers, or meetings that are similar to the workshop but usually less formal. Content in these pre-experience meetings can vary from a simple checklist of what is needed for the trip to deep lessons with readings and discussions on the host community's history, government, economics, norms and values.

Study abroad experience formats that are embedded within disciplinary courses or within capstone activity courses associated with a discipline, do not automatically lead to intercultural competence (Fiedler & Kremer, 2017). The primary objective is often discipline specific and the study abroad might be couched simply as a service or experiential learning activity. In these types of arrangements, it is typical to see large gains of discipline depth of knowledge when the service or experiential learning activities couches that disciplinary knowledge in real-world experience (Bell & Anscombe, 2013; Bell, Moorhead, & Boetto, 2017;

Core, 2017; Engle & Engle, 2004; Gambino & Hashim, 2016). At times, so much emphasis is on the discipline content and experiential learning that global competence is left to develop on its own, or not seen as a focus at all for the trip. Within the literature there are many examples where study abroad outcomes do not include diversity or global competence (e.g., Fiedler & Kremer, 2017; Ritz, 2011). Given what we know about the potential for study abroad experiences to increase cultural competence, this discipline ONLY focus seems to diminish the potential impact of the trip. In fact, The Forum on Education Abroad (2020) explicitly suggests that leaders “communicate the importance of understanding the social, historical, political, economic, linguistic, cultural, and environmental context for each study abroad program and location” (p 28).

Pre-experience best practice #2:

Design pre-experience activities to explicitly prepare students to expect and observe culturally different norms and values. The format of the pre-experience activity (whether it is online or an independent workshop) is less important than the content embedded in the lessons. If the goal is to affect a student’s intercultural competence, it needs to be included as a transparent learning objective designed with thoughtful activities targeting growth.

Those experiences that have a centralized workshop describing what to bring, how to prepare, and behavior expectations are important but do not lend themselves to impactful intercultural experiences. Workshops, discussions, or meetings supplemented with culturally relevant readings that prepare the student to expect and observe culturally different norms and values are cultivating the student’s expectations. When the student begins to accept that there

are, and will be, differences, they begin to build intercultural awareness (Chen & Starosta, 1996) or global perspective (Engberg & Fox, 2011).

An instructor can also use pre-experience activities to help lead students to grow beyond beginning levels of intercultural awareness and into a more global perspective. Content should examine how other culture's view America(ns) and/or life from the host community's perspectives (Engberg & Fox, 2011; McMullen & Penn, 2011). The instructor might accomplish this goal by having government ambassadors speak about people's perceptions of America(ns). Field trips to religiously or culturally relevant places in-country before the trip would help students begin to identify different perspective of life, daily living, norms, and values of a people from another culture outside of their own. Some instructors might have students visit places or organizations of professional practice within the local community to interview and experience how the local practitioner defines and identifies with their practice. These types of activities can set the stage for a compare-and-contrast exercise post-experience which can be very powerful as one examines the same professional practice from another cultural perspective. Lockett, Moore, and Wingenbach (2014) reported that pre-experience activities for a trip to Guatemala included presentations about the culture and history. The purpose of the pre-experience activities was to communicate the value of study abroad for students' personal, academic, and career goals (The Forum of Education Abroad, 2020).

Pre- experience best practice #3:

Integrate reflective writings in all pre-experience activities so that students are practiced at observing their own and others' feelings and actions. To increase the impact of all these pre-experience activities, the instructor might consider integrating reflective writing. In reflective

writings, students are asked to examine an activity or event, to identify how it was perceived or integrated from another cultural perspective.

Making reflective writing workshops part of pre-experience activities enhances the quality and understanding from the student's perspective of the pre-experience activities and create a ready memory aid for later reflection (Bell & Anscorn, 2013; Bell, Moorhead, & Boetto, 2017; Le, Raven, & Chen, 2013). In reflective writing, instructors set the students' expectations to identify and observe how they themselves feel and identify with an event, but also to note how that event was observed or understood by people other than themselves. Reflection workshops are teaching students not only how to write about reflection, but also different forms of reflective writings. Reflections can be done at multiple points during the preparation process including anticipatory (or pre-experience), in-action (or during the study abroad experience, during an activity), on-action (directly after and focused on an activity), and critical (post-experience with full reflection on growth over time). Making intercultural awareness a focal point of the pre-experience brings the intercultural components to the forefront as something the student should be thinking about and does not rely on the simple presence of being in another country as a basis for a cultural growth experience for the student. As noted by the Forum on Education Abroad (2020), "providing students opportunities to reflect on the social, cultural, economic, and environmental impact of their activities" is critical (p. 37).

During study abroad experiences.

Activities and experiences while abroad must involve the students engaging with the host culture in order to be most impactful and to promote a shared cultural understanding (Deardorff, 2006). Thus, at some point within every experience, there needs to be the

opportunity for the student to engage with the culture for the specific purpose of developing intercultural competence. If the student only goes for a sightseeing tour and appreciates the landscape or architecture with a group of fellow students from their home university, there is no cultural embeddedness and thus little opportunity to promote gains in intercultural competence.

During study abroad experience best practice #4:

Purposefully have instructors design activities while in country to promote Deep Approaches to Learning. Bennett (1986) would posit that individuals that visit other cultures just to sightsee are not engaging and growing in cultural maturity, instead they might be considered to be in avoidance or denial of cultural differences. To avoid this “sightseeing” model of study abroad, faculty must develop experiences and opportunities that promote student engagement with the host culture.

Many study abroad experiences embed a service-learning projects or experiential learning activities. Service learning, experiential learning, and well-planned study abroad experiences are all represented as high impact practices as defined by George Kuh (2008). Kuh (2008) labeled these high impact practices because they engage students to produce greater perceptions of growth and deep learning. Rodriguez and Roberts (2011) report planning for students to spend time in schools working with local residents on service-learning projects related to school gardens. But these activities do not produce high impact learning outcomes on their own. Instructors need to purposefully design the activities to support student growth and deep learning.

Deep Approaches to Learning (DAL) are specific approaches to learning activities where the student vigorously engage in the content and is able to grasp key concepts and understand the relationships associated with those concepts well enough to integrate them into new or different circumstances (Nelson Laird, Shoup, Kuh, & Schwarz, 2008). DALs have been shown to directly affect student Learning outcomes such as knowledge retention, integration of knowledge across multiple situations, and transfer of information to new situations. In other words, DALs support higher-order, integrative, and reflective learning (Nelson Laird, Shoup, Kuh, & Schwarz, 2008).

When an activity is designed with Deep Approaches to Learning principles in mind, students work more diligently to understand the material rather than focus on surface information or memorization (Tagg, 2003). They are more likely to read non-required sources, discuss deeply, challenge peers and themselves to reflect often and apply what they are learning in new situations (e.g., Biggs, 2003; Ramsden, 2003; Tagg, 2003). Integration and synthesis are easier because the students have truly engaged deeply with the material and continually update their thinking (Forum of Education Abroad, 2020; Ramsden, 2003; Tagg, 2003). Biggs (2003) developed a model suggesting student factors and teaching contexts that lead to student choice of learning-focused activities that affect learning outcomes. More specifically Biggs model considers teaching and learning in terms of the 3-P's; presage (student characteristics, course, and learning context), process (students' perception of context and approaches to learning), and product (students' learning outcomes). Building on Biggs (2003) 3-P model, Meyers and Nulty (2009), posit that in order to facilitate deep approaches to learning, "teaching materials, tasks, and experiences should all be:

- Authentic, real world, and relevant
- Constructive, sequential, and interlinked
- Provide challenge, interest, and motivation to learn
- Align with each other and the desired learning outcomes
- Require student to use and engage with progressively higher order cognitive processes” (p. 567).

Mitchell and Paras (2018) have argued that the challenge and cognitive dissonance inherent in study abroad is important for enhancing a student’s intercultural competence. They propose that when students encounter experiences that run counter to their preconceived notions about a culture, they experience cognitive dissonance. That cognitive dissonance can be channeled into a growth opportunity by a skilled facilitator and through written reflections.

During study abroad experience best practice #5:

Purposefully have instructors design service-learning activities where differences between their world view and those of the in-country participants are laid bare. *This can occur often through conversation about and sensitivity to the needs, priorities, customs, and beliefs of the community they are serving.* Many effective activities during the experience, while in the host country or community, have focused on the service or experiential components of the experiences. Examples of experiential experiences have had students working with host country students and faculty learning and observing how their discipline of practice is performed within other cultures. Or, matched up with interns at a foreign company instructed to collaborate and come up with an answer for a significantly relevant current issue. Within these forms of experiential learning activities, the student must begin to acknowledge that there are different perspectives, priorities, organizational structures, and legal aspects. This acknowledgement of

different ways of seeing the world leads the student to acquiring a global perspective or intercultural sensitivity. Likewise, with service-learning activities abroad, the students must become familiar with the needs, priorities, customs, and beliefs of the community they are serving. These activities like experiential learning require the students to develop a global perspective which may lead the student to acquire intercultural sensitivity. In sum, the co-curricular learning opportunities in study abroad are at least as valuable as the curricular aspects of the program and should not be overlooked (Forum on Education Abroad, 2020).

During study abroad experience best practice #6:

Design short-term study abroad experiences with activities approximating full cultural immersion including using local transit, navigating, eating local foods, shopping, and participating in experiences as a local. Another form of impactful practice is the full immersion of a student into the home of a host family. With this practice, the student is forced to interact with the local host community, learning their customs and behaviors. Full immersion is used most commonly with language development study abroads, but other disciplines have used this practice with the idea that this immersion might lead students to grow in global awareness and intercultural sensitivity. If allowed to stay in a country for a significant period of time, research illustrates that students will become able to act and behave appropriately or display significant aspects of intercultural competence (DeLoach, Kurt, & Olitsky, 2019).

Although full immersion is shown to be effective for longer study abroad experiences, this is not typically feasible with short term trips. In short terms trips, research has shown that intercultural competence can be enhanced by spending time engaged in the general activities of the community (Burrow, 2019; Caldwell & Purtzer, 2014; Dietz & Baker, 2019; Gambino &

Hashim, 2016; Moorhead, Boetto, & Bell, 2014). Using a host culture's public transit system, navigating within the community, negotiating or bargaining at a local market, eating local foods, and watching local sports or participating in local festivals are probably the best proxies for cultural immersion in a short-term experience (Core, 2017). These types of experiences provide insight into the community's norms and if students look deep enough and engage with the people where they are comfortable, visiting students can learn more about the community member's beliefs (Caldwell & Purtzer, 2014; Gambino & Hashim, 2016). Understanding others' beliefs and values leads to the possibility of acquiring intercultural sensitivity or even intercultural competence (Bennett, 1986; Deardorf, 2006).

During study abroad experience best practice #7:

Include frequent faculty-led debriefings or self-reflective journal writing with prompts designed to help students see similarities and differences between cultures as well as make connections with feelings, emotions, empathy, and impact of experiences. As suggested earlier, reflective writing pre-experience is effective at helping students begin to identify cultural differences and similarities. Reflective writing should continue during the study abroad excursion. In particular, for these short-term study abroad experiences, research has shown that an end-of-day debriefing and reflective writing exercise is critical to enhancing cultural competence and integration (Bell & Anscombe, 2013; Bell, Moorhead, & Boetto, 2017; Caldwell & Purtzer, 2014; Cotton & Thompson, 2017; Gambino & Hashim, 2016; Nelson Laird, Seifert, Pascarella, Mayhew, & Blaich, 2011; Ritz, 2011). One of the best ways to focus the students on the impactful experiences of their day is through faculty led debriefings. During the debriefing, the faculty can spend time asking questions that stimulate the students to think about the

applications of their discipline, or how they felt during events. This is a form of group reflection that can promote deeper thoughts and connections as the student begins self-reflection activities (Bell & Anscombe, 2013; Bell, Moorhead, & Boetto, 2017; Cotton & Thompson, 2017; Ritz, 2011). A particularly important example of this technique is Wilkinson's (1998) study that illustrated that, without effective debriefing, and with only their own cultural experience on which to rely, students end up not gaining in cultural understanding despite spending significant time in country.

Reflection journal writings is another form often used to process the day's events, similarities and differences from home, as well as feelings, emotions, and empathy that presented themselves at different times of the day. Some faculty will assign prompted reflective writing based on specific questions that direct the student's attention and efforts towards the cultural competence and discipline-specific goals of the trip. It is often these reflective writings that provide qualitative data that demonstrate gains or progress towards intercultural competency (e.g., Bell, Moorehead, & Boetto, 2017; Caldwell & Purtzer, 2014; Cotton & Thompson, 2017; Le, Raven, & Chen, 2013; McMullen & Penn, 2011; Ritz, 2011). Whatley, Landon, Tarrant, and Rubin (2020) found that incorporating written reflection increased students' ability to respect and accept differences in the host culture. In sum, reflective writings help students identify transferrable skills and growth moments developed through the study abroad experience and push them to think about how they might communicate this value to future employers, or as a self-growth reflection (Forum for Study Abroad, 2020).

Post-experience best practice #8:

Faculty complete a debriefing with students' post-experience targeting the impact of the experience on individual intercultural competence growth. Once students have returned home, one type of activity found prevalently in the literature that illustrate significant impact on cultural competence is faculty-facilitated debriefing. Faculty-facilitated debriefings do not necessarily need to be faculty led. Sometimes faculty gather students to help facilitate a discussion focused on the importance or implications of the trip. The focus should be, just as it was in-country, on the intercultural competence growth from the experiences (e.g., Bell, Moorhead, & Boetto, 2017; Caldwell & Purtzer, 2014; Cotton & Thompson, 2017; Gambino & Hashim, 2016).

Post-experience best practice #9:

Faculty complete either a debrief or critical reflective writing assignment to demonstrate students' newfound disciplinary integrative learning and intercultural competence growth. The goal of this practice should be two-fold: 1) content or discipline focused; and 2) cultural competence focused (Bell & Anscombe, 2013; Cotton & Thompson, 2017; McMullen & Penn, 2011). This debrief is a great time for the students to begin integration of class concepts, discipline information and thinking through career implications of this experience. Many faculty members record these group interviews for research or program outcomes documentation with a particular eye on perceived gains from the experiences in the area of discipline knowledge, individual growth in cultural competence, and career/future implications (Cotton & Thompson, 2017; McMullen & Penn, 2011).

The other main post experience activity is to produce a critical reflective paper (typically for a final project). Looking back on their anticipatory pre-experience, in-action, and on-action reflections, students pull from those writings and think critically and holistically about the impact and meaning of the entire study abroad experience. This major paper should ask the student to make ties between the discipline and the experiences while out of country. The format of this reflective paper is not fixed; it could be written, an oral presentation, or a presentation to class. Again, the format is less important than the documentation of the students' integrative learning and cultural competence growth (Core, 2017).

Overall administrative policy recommendation:

Organizations should “recruit and advise students from all segments of the student population, including those from historically underrepresented populations” (Forum on Education Abroad, 2020), those in need of financial aid, and those from first generation backgrounds to participate in study abroad, examining additionally whether these opportunities are ways to increase graduation rates and retention. The Forum on Education Abroad (2020) notes that “each organization should emphasize equity, diversity, and inclusion in study abroad program design, implementation, goals, objectives, and outcomes” (p. 25). In support of this goal, the University of Georgia system recently released findings from its CASSIE project (2020). Over 30,000 students who went on study abroad were matched with individuals of similar backgrounds within the University of Georgia system. As noted earlier, overall findings of the impact of study abroad experiences (2- 8 weeks) were extremely positive for first generation students, students from traditionally underrepresented minority groups, and students who received need-based financial aid. In fact, students from historically

underrepresented minority backgrounds and first-generation students were about 11 % more likely to graduate in 4 years than URM students that did not study abroad; they finished their degrees around 4-5 weeks faster in general and had a significantly higher GPA upon graduation. The best experiences for these students tended to be 2-8 weeks, with experiences 1 semester or longer resulting in a drop in on-time graduation (9- 18% drop depending on length). This makes sense, as long study abroad opportunities likely interrupted progress toward degree.

Research has illustrated that participation in study abroad actually helps graduation and retention rates (Engel, 2017). For example, research in the Florida State system confirmed that study abroad participants were more likely to complete their degree (81% vs 57% for bachelor's degrees; Posey 2003). Beyond impact on graduation, students rated themselves higher in academic performance, satisfaction, and communication skills (Luo & Jamieson-Drake, 2015), personal growth (Dolby, 2007), and self-efficacy (Cubillos & Ilvento, 2013) after a study abroad experience. Kronholz and Osborn (2016) suggested from their data that positive effects were increased for students from historically underrepresented groups.

Conclusion

This literature review has examined two main issues that are relevant to my dissertation. First, how do administrators in institutions of higher education know if students are gaining anything from opportunities to study abroad? To answer this question, I defined intercultural competence, reviewed relevant theories of intercultural competence, and reviewed literature on outcomes associated with study abroad experiences. I followed next with a review of best practices and policy recommendations intended to guide university

administrators on some of the policies that would be most likely to have an effect on increasing student intercultural competence. These best practices allow me to examine administrative moves made by one large university and the effect those moves had on faculty study abroad proposals and students' reflections about their intercultural competence.

Overview of Present Study

This dissertation focused on a program evaluation within the setting of the College of Education and Human Development at Land-grant Southern University. Land-grant Southern is a large public land grant Research 1 university. The College of Education and Human Development is the 4th largest college (enrollment of 7,000 students) at Land-grant Southern (enrollment of approximately 70,000 students). From 2015 - 2019 several administrative policy changes were implemented and changes to faculty trip proposal requirements were implemented to bring the trips more in line with best practices likely to enhance intercultural competence.

Guiding Model for Project-Level Evaluation

To complete this evaluation, I followed the model described in Kellogg Foundation's Evaluation Handbook (1998). The handbook's blueprint for conducting project-level evaluation looks at three phases critical for a comprehensive understanding of how and why programs work: context evaluation, implementation evaluation, and outcome evaluation. For the present study, context is provided by looking at the state of the community in which the CEHD study abroad program operated. Documents reviewed included the Land-grant Southern University

Strategic Plan, The College of Education and Human Development Strategic Plan, Leadership Support provided through the creation of a faculty steering committee, Financial Support, Faculty interest in creating trip proposals, and staffing. This context evaluation provided the baseline and reviewed the context surrounding administrative changes (Research Question 1). Implementation evaluation is seen in the policy changes created by the administration to address their perceived need for change (Research Question 2). The Outcomes evaluation reviewed the effectiveness of changes as evidenced by more purposeful study abroad experience designs and inclusions of best practices in faculty study abroad proposals (Research Question 3). Outcome evaluation of student intercultural competence is provided by comparing student intercultural competence scores before policy changes were made (2014-2015) and after policy implementation (2019-2021; Research Question 4).

Research Questions.

Specifically, this dissertation answered the following research questions:

- Research Question 1: What was the organizational and institutional context within which the study abroad policy changes were made?
- Research Question 2: What study abroad administrative policies designed to improve quality of student experience and students' intercultural competence changes were made within the College of Education and Human Development at Land-grant Southern University between 2015 and 2019?
- Research Question 3: How were best practices reflected within the quality of study abroad proposals within the College of Education and Human Development at Land-

grant Southern University comparing faculty proposals before policy changes were implemented (2014-2015) to those after changes were implemented (2019-2021)?

- Research Question 4: How did ratings of students' intercultural competence, as reflected in post-experience essays (using the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric), comparing student reflections before policy changes were implemented (2014-2015) to those after changes were implemented (2019-2021)?

Chapter Three

Introduction

In this chapter, I discuss data collection techniques, relevant documents reviewed to identify significant policy changes to study abroad, and documents available to track students' intercultural competence. Following, I introduce the rubrics that were used to code faculty proposals for inclusion of best practices and student reflections for intercultural competence outcomes.

Context Evaluation

Research Question 1: What was the organizational and institutional context within which the study abroad policy changes were made?

Documents available for review.

I used a historical document review to provide context and a baseline understanding of existing administrative practices used by the College of Education and Human Development (CEHD) Study Abroad program at the beginning of the study's period (2012 – 2015). All reviewed documents were available with a public records request. The following types of documents were reviewed within the archives to identify the context and/or climate at the time before any implemented changes were proposed. For this context evaluation, I used:

- the *Land-grant Southern University's Quality Enhancement Plan*
- *College of Education and Human Development Strategic Plan and QEP*
- search of all electronic documents pertaining to study abroad and/or Global Education committee;

- meeting agendas,
- meeting minutes,
- draft proposals,
- approved proposals,
- forms and policy iterations from academic year 2012-2013 to Fall 2022.

Additional information regarding leadership context was obtained from interoffice memos and emails from the Dean of Education and Human Development and the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs within the College of Education and Human Development. Gaps were filled in from my personal experience and attendance at University and College level meetings while working for Land-grant Southern University. My final interpretations and reporting was then member checked by the sitting Associate Dean of Academic Affairs within the College of Education and Human Development December 12, 2022.

Trustworthiness of data.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) have worked to replace quantitative terminology to conform to qualitative paradigms. As such, reliability and validity are known as rigor within quantitative terminology and can be reliably reported qualitatively using a concept of trustworthiness (credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability). For this dissertation, the researcher is an expert practitioner and active member of the community. Therefore, verification confirming the trustworthiness is established using the member checking process with the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, my immediate supervisor and the person responsible for establishing and authorizing policy.

Implementation Evaluation

Research Question 2: What study abroad administrative policies designed to improve quality of student experience and students' intercultural competence changes were made within the College of Education and Human Development at Land-grant Southern University between 2015 and 2019?

Documents available for review.

The implementation evaluation also was a historical document review of policy and practice. All administrative policy changes were approved and documented in official committee minutes by an education abroad committee of appointed faculty with representatives from each department, chaired by the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and supported by staff from the college study abroad office. Policy and procedure changes were kept up to date in a faculty handbook that captured the approved policies as well as changes to the study abroad experience proposal guidelines. In addition to meeting minutes, I also reviewed draft proposals, approved faculty proposals for trips, forms and policy iterations, and communications between the Dean's Office and the study abroad program office from academic year 2012-2013 to Fall 2022. In addition to those documents, there were many iterations for the faculty handbook and reflection guidelines.

Trustworthiness of data.

Each historical document was reviewed by two individuals knowledgeable about study abroad, each producing a list of documented procedure or policy changes. After the few discrepancies were resolved, this list was member checked with the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs to ensure that 1) all intended policies and procedures were identified; and 2) to provide

clarity on perceived purpose of changes. Member checking (Creswell & Clark, 2017; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) is used to enhance the credibility and trustworthiness of this more descriptive portion of the present study. After member checking a timeline was created listing all policy decisions and procedural changes that were officially charged and is included in chapter 4.

Outcomes Evaluation

My outcomes evaluation was conducted by comparing data from the 2014-2015 academic year (before policy changes were made) to the data from the 2019-2021 time frame (after policy changes were made). Data were available for 11 study abroad experiences in the 2014-2015 time period (see Table 3.1).

Table 3.1

2014-2015 data set descriptions

2014 – 2015 Location Visited	Number of Students Enrolled	Number of Student Reflections	Length of Experience in Days	Embedded Discipline
China	15	12	9	Higher Ed/Human Resource Development
Dominica Republic	32	27	9	Health Education
Dominica Republic	10	9	7	Sport Management
Greece	29	4	10	Sport Management
Germany	49	48	8	Higher Ed/Health Education
Hungary	18	17	8	Higher Ed/Human Resource Development
Germany	8	7	11	Sport Management
Mexico	27	23	5	Bilingual
Switzerland	19	17	9	Dance Program
Scotland	24	20	9	Teacher Education/Reading
United Kingdom	23	19	7	Teacher Education/Reading

Six trips were available for review during the 2019-2021 time period (see Table 3.2).

There were 22 additional trips that were scheduled during academic years 2019-2021, but

beginning in the Spring of 2020 were unable to travel due to the COVID-19 pandemic disruption. All CEHD Study Abroad experiences were embedded in credit-bearing, regular semester courses.

Table 3.2

2019-2021 data set descriptions

2019 – 2021 Location Visited	Number of Students Enrolled	Number of Student Reflections	Length of Experience in Days	Embedded Discipline
Canada	18	17	7	Dance Program
France	22	21	10	Reading
Germany	7	7	34	Sport Management
Spain	22	21	5	Ed Psychology
South Africa	19	17	11	Ed Psychology/Teacher Education
Taiwan	15	15	6	Health Education

Changes in faculty proposals

Research Question 3: How were best practices reflected within the quality of study abroad proposals within the College of Education and Human Development at Land-grant Southern University comparing faculty proposals before policy changes were implemented (2014-2015) to those after changes were implemented (2019-2021)?

Documents available for review.

To examine the changes in faculty proposals brought about by policy and procedure changes, two raters reviewed all study abroad experience proposals. Raters noted best practices identified within each proposal using the best practices implementation rubric developed from my literature review and described below. Each rater examined 1) the required narrative on how intercultural objectives and high impact practices were incorporated within

the proposed experience; 2) Vendor proposals which illustrated how the experience travel, accommodations, and excursions were facilitated; 3) Course syllabi to examine course objectives, proposed learning outcomes, and class exercises.

Measuring Quality of faculty proposals.

For the present study, faculty proposals were rated on the presence of each of the best practices in any part of the proposal, syllabi, and/or vendor proposal by two independent raters familiar with study abroad. For each practice that was found to be present, the experience received 1 point. There were nine best practices and it is possible that no best practices are evidenced giving 10 possible scores 0 – 9 points. The best practices from my literature review for high quality faculty study abroad proposals included:

- Learning objectives include both disciplinary knowledge and intercultural competency (although student growth in disciplinary knowledge will not be a focus of this dissertation)
- Students are explicitly prepared to expect and observe culturally different norms and values.
- Students are prepared pre-experience on how to write reflection papers through observation of their own and others' feelings and actions.
- Purposefully designed study abroad activities that promote deep approaches to learning.
- Study abroad activities focused on sensitivity to the needs, priorities, customs, and beliefs of the community they are serving.
- Includes activities that approximate full cultural immersion (use of public transit, navigation, eating local foods, and participating in experiences as a local).

- Frequent faculty-led debriefings or self-reflective journal writing with prompts designed to help students see similarities and differences between cultures as well as make connections with feelings, emotions, empathy, and impact of experiences.
- Faculty complete a debriefing with students' post-experience targeting the impact of the study abroad experience on individual intercultural competence growth.
- Faculty complete either a debrief or critical reflective writing assignment to demonstrate students' newfound disciplinary integrative learning and intercultural competence growth.

Descriptive Data.

There was 97% agreement on the best practice rating of faculty study abroad proposals. Raters discussed the few discrepancies until both agreed. Table 3.3 presents the number of best practices evidenced in faculty proposals.

Table 3.3

Number of best practices in faculty proposals

Trips During 2014-2015	Number Of Best Practices	Trips During 2019-2021	Number Of Best Practices
China	0	Canada	0
Dominica Republic	7	France	0
Dominica Republic	1	Germany	8
Greece	6	Spain	7
Germany	4	South Africa	9
Hungary	3	Taiwan	8
Germany	1		
Mexico	5		
Switzerland	0		
Scotland	0		
United Kingdom	0		

Although it was expected that faculty proposals would include few best practices during the 2014-2015 time period (before policy changes were implemented), it was surprising to find two proposals during the 2019-2021 time period with zero best practices related to study abroad. Both of these trips were approved for travel by the Global Education Committee. A closer examination of these proposals revealed that both were heavily steeped in discipline-specific experience with very little planned intercultural interactions. Both involved program-specific international conferences that students attended. And, as is clear in the student reflections, the value of these conferences for the students was in the quality of disciplinary interaction, not the cultural interaction. Because these two experiences were approved to travel during the 2019-2021 time period, including them in this dissertation accurately captures the application of policy changes. But, their presence pointed to an additional next step the college needed to undertake and will be addressed further in Chapter 5.

Student Intercultural Competency Outcomes

Research Question 4: How did ratings of students' intercultural competence, as reflected in post-experience essays (using the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric), comparing student reflections before policy changes were implemented (2014-2015) to those after changes were implemented (2019-2021)?

Documents available for review.

Reflections were required from each participant that traveled under a college-sponsored study abroad experience. Student reflection artifacts were available for 203 students that traveled on study abroad trips in the years 2014 – 2015 and 98 students that traveled

during the 2019 – 2021 time frame. Tables 3.2 and 3.3 note the number of student reflections for each trip.

Measuring Intercultural Competency.

Student intercultural competence was assessed using the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE (Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education) Rubric (2009). This rubric was created and designed to assess intercultural knowledge and competency on an institutional level (McConnell, Horan, Zimmerman, & Rhodes, 2019). As noted in the literature review this assessment tool was chosen because the definition is in line with the current study's definition of intercultural competence. There is also significant agreement with Bennett's (1986/2017) definition of intercultural competence as "a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts" and the definition that arose from Deardorff's (2006) consensus study suggesting that intercultural competency is the "ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations based on one's intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes." The rubric also has clear criteria for levels of intercultural competency (from less developed to more developed) that are consistent with Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (1993).

The rubric measures intercultural competence along six components or dimensions:

- Self-awareness is the awareness of one's own and other cultural rules and biases.

- Worldview is the student's ability to understand the complexity of elements (history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, beliefs and practices) important to members of another culture.
- Empathy is where the student can interpret experiences from other perspectives and act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another cultural group.
- Communication is the understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication.
- Curiosity is when the student actively explores or seeks out deeper questions or understanding of another culture.
- Openness is the student's ability to initiate and value interactions with a people from another culture.

All Association of American Colleges and Universities VALUE rubrics have been designed in consultation with expert faculty representing American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities (APLU). The rubrics are designed to be valid and useful instruments focused on measuring learning outcomes. They are also useful for assessing change over time at the program level and can be used by institutions to draw conclusions about future support or program quality (McConnell et al., 2019).

To clarify terms and concepts, the Association of American Colleges and Universities Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric (2009) provides the following definitions:

- Culture: All knowledge and values shared by a group.

- Cultural rules and biases: Boundaries within which an individual operates in order to feel a sense of belonging to a society or group, based on the values shared by that society or group.
- Empathy: Empathy is the imaginary participation in another person's experience, including emotional and intellectual dimensions, by imagining his or her perspective (not by assuming the person's position).
- Intercultural experience: The experience of an interaction with an individual or groups of people whose culture is different from your own.
- Intercultural/cultural differences: The differences in rules, behaviors, communication and biases, based on cultural values that are different from one's own culture.
- Suspends judgment in valuing their interactions with culturally different others: Postpones assessment or evaluation (positive or negative) of interactions with people culturally different from oneself. Disconnecting from the process of automatic judgment and taking time to reflect on possibly multiple meanings.
- Worldview: Worldview is the cognitive and affective lens through which people construe their experiences and make sense of the world around them

Validity of the rubric.

McConnell, Horan, Zimmerman, and Rhodes (2019) published an extensive argument-based approach to the design of – and use of – the VALUE rubric. They claim that the VALUE rubric was designed explicitly as a data collection instrument for problems of practice. In addition, rubric scores can easily be interpreted by institutions of higher education and be used to make “defensible decisions about students and programs” (p. 38).

Reliability.

Finley (2012) and McConnell and Rhodes (2017) both examined reliability of the VALUE rubric. Although each applied different reliability statistics, both found the VALUE rubric reliable in its scoring with percent agreement ranging from 84-94% and weighted Cohen's kappa's ranging from .26-.39. As noted by McConnell et al. (2019) and Pike (2018), these Kappa numbers are not as high as the reliability often achieved in standardized testing, so more work may yet need to be done to improve interrater reliability. One suggestion was to ensure that all student artifacts are reviewed by the same panel of raters - which happened in the current study. A second suggestion was that a common assignment or prompt be used. To preview information presented in Chapter 4, the reflection prompt did change in 2016 to focus students on more relevant dimensions of cultural competence in their reflections, but all prompts before the change were the same, as well as after the change. Both this common prompt and a non-varying set of raters provide ideal conditions for higher scoring reliability for the current study.

Rating Process for the Current Study.

The Association of American Colleges and Universities has long advocated for calibration training for raters as institutions prepare to use the VALUE rubric (McConnell et al., 2019). For the current study, three raters were calibrated on the use of the rubric with samples and discussion on an initial wide range of artifacts. AAC&U considers individuals to be “calibrated for scoring” if their scores are not more than one level away from an “expert” on the majority of the six dimensions (McConnell et al., 2019). I led the calibration and scoring of all documents, and I was trained/calibrated by the VALUE Institute and certified in the assessment of intercultural knowledge and competency in 2019. The present study used this definition of

calibration and continued to pull samples of artifacts for scoring until there was agreement with all three raters within one integer on the six dimensions of the rubric (two sets of 8 artifacts were required to achieve this consistency). Following calibration, raters independently rated the remaining reflections all within a 3-week period.

Current Study Reliability.

Each rater was randomly assigned 2/3 of the pool of student reflections. There were no visible indications of whether the reflection came from 2014-2015 or the 2019-2021 time period. Scores on the student reflection artifacts were analyzed for reliability using two rater’s scores. Any time the two initial raters did not agree within one integer, the artifact was rated by a third rater and the third rater’s scores replaced the outlier score bringing all ratings within the required single integer or 100% agreement. The average of the “agreeing scores” were used for all data analyses. Table 3.4 provides reliability metrics for each AAC&U VALUE outcome component.

Table 3.4

Reliability metrics by AAC&U VALUE rubric outcome component

Criterion Outcome	Percent agreement within 1 integer	Kappa
Self-Awareness	84.6%	.434
Worldview	91.2%	.342
Empathy	83.8%	.340
Communication	86.8%	.463
Curiosity	94.1%	.288
Openness	89.0%	.371

As Finley (2012) and McConnell and Rhodes (2017) noted in their reliability statistics, they achieved 84-94% agreement with a weighted Cohen’s kappa of .26-.39 which, according to McHugh (2012) is only a *fair* agreement. My goal for this dissertation was to at least reach the percent agreement and Cohen’s kappa comparable with the VALUE rubric report. The current study reliability met this goal as our kappas also fall into the *fair* and *moderate* agreement ranges. The percent agreement (those in which ratings fell within one integer) are very similar to those reported in the development of the rubric. I had hoped the numbers would be higher given the attempts at creating ideal rating conditions. But, our data was similar to nationally trained evaluators and thus, I consider it acceptable to use in the present study.

Table 3.5 presents mean and standard deviations for all 6 competency dimensions. There were 203 student reflections from the 2014-2015 period and 98 student reflections from the 2019-2021 time period. Please note, there was one trip in 2015 where reflections were uncodable and were not included in this analysis, although the faculty proposal was included in the previous analysis. Reflection guidelines were given to students so that they were aware of the criteria by which the required reflection paper would be assessed.

Table 3.5

Mean and Standard Deviation for each intercultural competency from student reflections

Competency	2014-2015		2019-2021	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Self-Awareness	1.46	1.11	1.80	1.23
Worldview	1.64	0.99	2.01	1.00
Empathy	1.09	1.00	1.41	1.14
Communication	0.95	0.91	1.04	0.93
Curiosity	1.05	0.88	1.23	0.95
Openness	1.26	0.93	1.63	1.21
Total Score	1.24	0.97	1.52	1.08

Limitations

Because of the nature of this program evaluation, there are inherent limitations to the data and conclusions that can be drawn. First, it is important to note that this is not a pre- post-assessment of one individual student's gains in intercultural competence, but instead forefronts an overall program's gain in faculty proposal and student reflection quality. This program evaluation examines average scores of faculty proposal quality and student intercultural competence as indicators of the effectiveness of policy interventions.

Second, it is important to note that there is no demographic data used for this study. The demographics of Land-grant Southern are the body of students from which participants self-selected into the study abroad experiences. Self-selection bias is a real limitation on all study abroad program evaluations (Nwosu, 2022).

Third, it is not clear whether changes in average reflection ratings reflect true intercultural skill growth in students. No observations were completed of students interacting with others of a different culture. And, one could question the effort and quality of the reflections received overall, as they were submitted to the CEHD study abroad office as a requirement for participation and were not graded. Given that these conditions did not change between 2014-2015 and 2019-2021, any growth in intercultural competence scores could not be explained by these challenges.

Fourth, as previously noted, there were significantly fewer trips in the 2019-2021 years than were approved. The worldwide covid-19 pandemic meant many trips could not complete during this time period. The number of cancellations does mean that the number of trips to

compare after policy changes is significantly lower than the number before policies were changed. Any program evaluation during this time period has been affected by the same phenomenon.

Fifth, percent agreement and Cohen's kappa each have their advantages and disadvantages. Percent agreement does inform us as to how often the two raters rated an item the same. However, the percent agreement does not account for the possibility of raters guessing on the scores or by chance agreement. Cohen's kappa is designed for two rater comparison while accounting for the possibility of a rater guessing on an item. McHugh (2012) suggests that extensive training means raters may not be completely independent of each other. Thus, two of the assumptions that kappa scores make about the independence of raters and the possibility of guessing may not hold true in this dissertation. In this study, raters were calibrated to score artifacts using a delineated scale and it can be assumed that none of the raters was guessing. McHugh (2012) goes on to say that these assumption violations result in low levels of Kappa agreement estimates. According to McHugh (2012, pg. 281):

thus it has become common for researchers to accept low kappa values in their interrater reliability studies... Perhaps the best advice for researchers is to calculate both percent agreement and kappa. If there is likely to be much guessing among the raters, it may make sense to use the kappa statistic, but if raters are well trained and little guessing is likely to exist, the researcher may safely rely on percent agreement to determine interrater reliability.

Sixth, there was no measure of faculty's own intercultural competence or their ability to carry out key cultural mentoring behaviors (e.g., Neuhaus, Reading, Nelson, Wegener, & Arthur, 2018). Interestingly, in this particular College, about half of the faculty were the same from the 2014-2015 to 2019-2021 proposals. As such, this may play a small role in the current evaluation. But, should be considered for future research.

Chapter Four

Introduction

As this was a program evaluation, I break down the results within three areas: Context evaluation, Implementation evaluation, and Outcome evaluation. Context provides an understanding of the organizational structure, culture, and resources prior to any attempts to change the program and student outcomes. Implementation provides a detailing of administrative processes that were implemented to create a change in quality of faculty proposals and student outcomes. Outcomes results provide evidence of the effectiveness of the policy implementation on quality of faculty proposals and the impact of the implementation on student intercultural competence. Each of these areas will be reviewed below.

Context Evaluation

Research Question 1: What was the organizational and institutional context within which the study abroad policy changes were made?

University Climate

Land-grant Southern University is accredited by a national accrediting body. The reaccreditation process requires not only extensive data about students and faculty, but also a commitment to continuous improvement. Each university chooses their own QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan) for continuous improvement. In 2012, the University chose to commit to increasing high-impact practices for students as the primary focus of their QEP.

The University laid out their QEP plan in an overarching document (Land-grant Southern University Quality Enhancement Plan). The quality enhancement plan was “to create a culture that makes intentional and thoughtful engagement in high-impact learning experiences the norm for our students”. To reach this goal, the university focused on increasing the number and availability of high-impact learning experiences while enhancing support for students to engage intentionally and thoughtfully in high-impact learning experiences. Faculty support for this work was to be provided by The Center for Teaching Excellence through faculty development workshops focused on creating high-impact learning experiences. The University committed \$3,340,000 towards high-impact learning experience development, implementation, and student support and requested colleges to submit plans on how their portion of the funding would be spent.

College of Education and Human Development Climate

The College of Education and Human Development identified several high impact practices on which to focus, one of which was student international learning experiences. College leadership detailed their College of Education & Human Development Quality Enhancement Plan in March of 2012. CEHD QEP allocated funds to enhance or develop high impact learning experiences with a focus on creating stronger undergraduate advising, learning communities, service learning, high impact learning capstone experiences, and domestic and international learning experience initiatives.

Although some isolated study abroad trips had been occurring in CEHD before this 2012 plan was submitted, there is very little information or records available prior to this initiative.

There were study abroad trips supported by the University's international study abroad office but there was little oversight of student learning outcomes. To illustrate, in 2013, the only information required by the University for an international study abroad experience included the department, instructor, course, dates, destination, summary of purpose, number of students, fee structure, signature from department head, signature from associate dean for finance in the college and signature from director of Study Abroad Program Office. Most review at the university level was focused on student safety and risk mitigation.

The College of Education and Human Development focused on the University's prioritization of high-impact learning experiences by proposing to increase student participation in study abroad to 20% of all CEHD students. Their stated purpose was:

The CEHD will promote and support short-term off-campus domestic and international learning experiences. These experiences will require curriculum modification, but will be tied to regular courses with off-campus experiences scheduled for Wintermester, spring break, Maymester, and during summer sessions. While some will be international experiences, others may take place in large urban settings in the U.S. The experiences will be designed to help students discern the impact of society, economics, politics, etc. on common cultural practices. Faculty will be paid a small stipend for planning and implementing these courses. Other funds will be devoted to travel assistance funds to assist students who may not have the ability to pay for off-campus experiences (CEHD Quality Enhancement Plan).

As a sign of administrative support, \$245,000 of annual support was given to this effort to fund administrative support and student discounts on trips.

Faculty were encouraged to apply for program support by filling out a simple form asking three questions relating to how the experience would: 1) result in a high impact learning experience; 2) assist students to discern the impact of society, economics, politics, etc. on common cultural practices; and 3) whether there were any additional service-learning opportunities associated with the travel. Finally, the submission was completed with the inclusion of a syllabus that was to clearly articulate how the experience was imbedded within the course. These applications were evaluated by the (then current) CEHD Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and financial support to reduce the student's cost of participation was awarded. Each student participant was supported with a \$1000 discount or \$2000 if the trip was longer than 14 days.

With an action plan that was focused on increasing student participation rates, most if not all of the applications were approved, sometimes after multiple rounds of discussions and alterations with the proposing faculty member. As an initial plan to examine quality, each student was required to complete and submit a reflection focused on the travel experience portion of the course. The students were given the following instructions: Student reflections should relate the experience to the course content, demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence, and demonstrate the ability to work collaboratively.

There is one final note contextualizing study abroad work at the Land-grant Southern University. The university level office of assessment, charged with tracking the overall progress of the QEP, was hesitant to impose a definition of “high-impactful learning experience”. In

2015, I attended the first University-level meeting focused on how the institution could be an example of high-impact learning across higher education. When the topic of progress measurement arose, the response was that all faculty would be allowed to define high-impact practices in a way that works best within their discipline. Without a clear, agreed upon definition of high-impact practices, *any* argument by the faculty on how an experience would be impactful to the student was allowed and accepted. This lack of a consensus definition contributed to the need for the refinements CEHD undertook from 2015-2019 to enhance the impact of study abroad experiences for students. In effect, this lack of definition set the stage for the policy revisions which were the focus of this dissertation.

College of Education and Human Development leadership change

In Fall 2015, the College of Education and Human Development hired a new Dean. To her surprise, she received many “thank you” letters from students for the college’s support of a recent ski trip. It was not clear from the notes whether this experience was linked to any educational or cultural learning goals, but some early questioning made it clear that this trip had been provided financial support from the college. With this knowledge, the dean requested more oversight of what was currently happening in the study abroad program and directed that changes be implemented so that all experiences were more closely linked to a discipline and the intercultural competence goals. In other words, the dean wanted to be clear that the college would not spend financial resources on a trip that looked more like a student vacation. This task was assigned to the newly appointed Associate Dean for Academic Affairs who subsequently created the office of Global Education and staffed it with a coordinator for global

education. This change in charge was noted in the minutes of the Global Education faculty advisory meeting early Fall 2017.

College of Education and Human Development faculty involvement

Faculty were nominated by department heads and appointed to a newly formed CEHD Global Education committee in Spring 2017. The committee began meeting in Fall 2017 and was chaired by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and had faculty representation from all four departments. The primary purpose for the committee was to be a liaison between the University's Education Abroad Office, the College's Global Education office, CEHD's Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and the respective departments. It was hoped that the committee would facilitate a communication pathway from faculty to dean's office and serve as a resource for education abroad policy decisions. According to meeting minutes, the committee was charged with increasing participation in study abroad while ensuring quality control (meaning no non-educational, non-cultural experiences; and, ensuring that students had experiences that allowed them to grow in the understanding of another culture).

In sum, this committee's charge served as the statement of need for my current evaluation. The needs of this college centered on creating policy changes that steered faculty to create meaningful international learning experiences (as evidenced by higher quality proposals). In addition, the College needed to create policies and procedures to ensure that students were experiencing high quality trips. At the time the committee was charged, the definition of high-quality trip can be assumed from the Action 2015 plan faculty proposal requirements that state the course must specifically assist students to "discern the impact of

society, economics, politics, etc. on common cultural practices” (CEHD Quality Enhancement Plan) As will be seen below, the committee soon focused their understanding of these terms, and adopted a definition consistent with the AAC&U VALUE Rubric (2009), and focused explicitly on intercultural competence. This change in definition was a large part of the implementation evaluation below.

Implementation Evaluation

Research Question 2: What study abroad administrative policies designed to improve quality of student experience and students’ intercultural competence changes were made within the College of Education and Human Development at Land-grant Southern University between 2015 and 2019?

Changes to policies and procedures began during the academic year 2017 – 2018. In the Fall of 2017, in response to the Dean’s concerns, the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs set out to create policies that would impact the way faculty developed and facilitated their study abroad experiences, beginning with the staffing of a new Global Education Office and creation of the Global Education Committee. At the first meeting in November 2017, the Associate Dean began by stating that she

Heard some students commenting that they had a lot of free time on their trip.

So, we will work on making sure the trip is academic-oriented, and what happens is actually what has been stated in the application.

Below, I summarize the sequential changes to all policies and procedures identified through a thorough review of all documents detailed earlier with a specific emphasis on the meeting minutes of the Global Education committee and various iterations of the newly developed CEHD Faculty Handbook for Global Education. Those items of particular significance to the present study are bolded and described in more detail later.

1. Fall 2017

a. Associate Dean of Academic Affairs stated *"Heard some students commenting that they had a lot of free time on their trip. So, we will work on making sure the trip is academic-oriented, and what happens is actually what has been stated in the application."*

b. **Created new CEHD Forms:**

i. Proposal application increased faculty narrative requirements to four parts including:

1. How the experience will result in a high-impact learning experience?
2. How the location enhances student learning?
3. What are the anticipated or documented academic or career benefits to students?
4. Are there additional high impact learning experiences associated with this trip?

ii. Aligned proposal review rubric with new proposal guidelines.

c. **Created a reflection prompt based on the literature that would elicit student responses to describe how the study abroad experience affected their intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes (Based on Brown and Irby, 2001).**

d. Modified Policies

- i. Clarified that all faculty leaders must use a vendor or get Dean's Office approval.
- ii. Dean's Office handled all travel funds (reimbursements / working funds)
- iii. CEHD allowed student participation from all University Systems campuses and other disciplines across campus.
- iv. All student participants in CEHD global education experiences were required to enroll in the affiliated course(s).
- v. Funding Priorities for scholarships was given to CEHD students or equally to all individuals who signed up for a course, if funding was available.
- vi. All participating students were required to submit a post-experience reflection based on the new reflection prompt.

2. Spring 2018

a. Modified Policies

- i. Clarified that all CEHD study abroad experiences must have two faculty/staff leaders and no less than 10 student participants (8 for graduate experiences).

- ii. Financial support was modified so that CEHD covered the cost for one CEHD faculty/leader and the 2nd faculty/leader was to be covered by student fees or by the department.
 - iii. Experiences with more than 30+ participants were required to have a 3rd faculty/leader for which CEHD allocated \$1,500.
 - iv. No graduate or undergraduate could serve as a faculty leader being paid by student fees.
 - v. Faculty were required to work through the CEHD Global Studies Coordinator on all issues pertaining to enrollment, budgeting, billing, travel, third party vendors recruitment and selection, and other trip aspects that may arise.
 - vi. Required that all global education activities take place in the same semester as the affiliated course(s)
 - vii. Created withdrawal and refund protocols.
 - viii. Student eligibility to participate was modified to include students co-enrolled with the community college and set a minimum GPA of 2.5 to participate.
- b. Proposal applications and rubrics were reviewed and updated to be more explicit regarding faculty instructions for the proposal narrative to ensure the faculty responses were more in line with study abroad best practices and created more purposeful pedagogical designs to target intercultural competence as an outcome.**

- c. Created a Global Education Office (not just a part-time staff member) within the Dean's Office reporting directly to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.
- 3. Summer 2018
 - a. Modified Policies
 - i. Withdrawal procedures were clarified.
 - ii. Decisions were made to allow staff/non-teaching faculty to accompany a CEHD global education experience as a second or third "faculty" participant.
- 4. Fall 2018
 - a. Modified Policies on faculty pay while abroad.
- 5. Spring 2019
 - a. Representation on the Global Education committee was expanded to include staff members from the finance group as well as the global education coordinator.
 - b. Modified Policies
 - i. Faculty reimbursement issues were clarified; use of Dart cards were explored which would limit the amount of funds a trip leader could withdraw.
 - ii. It was clarified that all residual funds (after a program was over) would be returned to the students that had paid fees in advance.
 - iii. If a faculty leader chooses not to use a vendor, he/she should provide cost of comparison of how much money he/she would save versus using

a vendor, and a rationale as to why he/she preferred to coordinate a trip without a vendor.

6. Summer 2019

a. Modified Policies

- i. The decision was made that no university funds could be used to cover guests or non-university affiliated people traveling with the study abroad experience.
- ii. It was clarified that individual members on the committee would serve 2-year terms.

b. Changes to questions 1 and 3 on the review rubric were made for clarification.

c. Enrollment growth was examined (CEHD was growing significantly in enrollment during this time), and ways to enhance or expand existing study abroad programs were explored vs creating new programs

d. The Vision and Mission Statements for the office were expanded and clarified

- i. Vision: The Office of Global Education carries out the College's mission by providing students an opportunity for leadership and innovative learning. We strive to ensure that global education programs are safe and cost-effective while increasing student participation and student diversity.
- ii. Mission: The Office of Global Education offers all students credit-bearing global education programs that develop intercultural competency skills.

7. Fall 2019

a. Appointment of a new Global Education Office Coordinator

- b. Policy and Procedural Revisions of the Faculty Handbook were made updating all previously enacted policies and making it available for faculty on the internal web.
- c. **A new Faculty Proposal Guide was designed to assist faculty in creating their faculty proposal, incorporating answers to frequently asked questions.**

This list of actions was member checked by the CEHD Associate Dean for Academic Affairs responsible for the creation of the policies and procedures to ensure that major changes were correctly captured. As the staff member responsible for executing many of these changes, I also verified the authenticity of this list from a review of my notes and the policy changes that were integrated in the faculty handbook. Below, I review the primary policy changes and provide clarification as to the intended purpose and expectation of the administrative policy decisions discussed.

Faculty Proposals

The College of Education and Human Development's focus was to create a means by which faculty members could proactively produce higher quality, high impact, learning experiences that would affect students' disciplinary knowledge and intercultural competence. This would require that faculty begin planning for these experiences during the developmental stages of trip design. The Global Education Committee, steered by the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, created a new faculty proposal application form with questions explicitly asking faculty to provide a narrative in response to four prompts:

1. How will the experience result in a high-impact learning experience for your students?
2. How will the location enhance student learning?
3. What are the anticipated or documented academic or career benefits to the university students?
4. Are there additional High Impact Learning Experiences associated with this trip?

After reviewing the first batch of applications using this proposal form, it was decided that there was too much ambiguity in the narrative prompt questions. Without any clear definition, faculty narratives remained vague. In other words, the prompts required more clarity. It was decided that brief examples were needed to illustrate what the committee was expecting. In Spring 2018, the committee agreed that a revision using more descriptive examples of the narrative prompts. The second iteration of the faculty proposal narrative prompts guided faculty as to what types of evidence or descriptions were needed to satisfy the committee in exchange for financial considerations:

1. To what degree is the trip associated with high-impact learning experiences for the students? *High-impact learning experiences provide students with opportunity to:*
 - 1) *apply, integrate, and synthesize knowledge from curricular and co-curricular experiences,*
 - 2) *have diverse interactions with those different from self,*
 - 3) *invest time and effort in purposeful tasks that result in learning,*
 - 4) *express awareness of individual impacts of experience to self, others, and the larger world, and*
 - 5) *interact with faculty, peers, and staff/advisors about substantive matters over extended periods of time.*
2. How does the trip's location create and enhance a unique learning experience? *Consider specialized trip activities that take advantage of the trip site's locale, language, history, and culture in ways that could not be replicated on campus.*

3. How does the proposed program enhance students' career benefit and lifelong learning? *Lifelong learning refers to "purposeful learning activity, undertaken on an ongoing basis with the aim of improving knowledge, skills, and competence" (Lifelong Learning Value Rubric).*

4. How does the proposed program support and facilitate the development of intercultural knowledge, diversity, equity, and access? *Consider what detail the program provides students opportunity to enhance self-awareness through examining one's own cultural rules, norms, and biases. How do programs intentionally expose students' different cultural worldviews, modes of communication, and other interactions?*

The edited proposal guidelines emphasized purposefully embedding students in real world situations and ensuring that students had opportunities for conversations that illustrated differences in world views, customs, and beliefs between cultures. These changes specifically addressed three of the nine best practices proposed in this dissertation: 1) making intercultural competency a learning objective; 2) purposefully designing trip activities that promote deep approaches to learning; and 3) purposefully including activities that approximate full cultural immersion.

To receive CEHD support funding (funding to cover lead faculty travel costs and discounts for student participants), faculty proposal narratives were evaluated by Global Education committee members using the Global Education Program Support Award Rubric. The rubric allowed faculty to rate proposals on each question on a scale of 1= poor to 5 = excellent. There were no anchoring definitions of what "poor" or "excellent" meant. Regardless, it was hoped that the time faculty spent considering these required questions/factors and the influence of the questions on how faculty might modify the study abroad experience was probably far more important than the scoring itself. In chapter 5, I argue that definitions of the anchors could improve this rating process.

Student Reflection Prompt

Another area of administrative policy change with high impact was the re-design of the student post-experience reflection prompt. The Associate Dean of Academic Affairs is from a bilingual cultural research discipline and an expert on school leader reflection. Based on her expertise, she redesigned the reflection prompt so that it would lead students to describe the cultural significance of their experience and its impact on them (Brown & Irby, 2001). Students were instructed using the following prompt: *Intercultural knowledge and competence represents a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts. Please think about your global education experience and reflect on how the experience affected your intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Use the steps below in the reflection cycle (Brown & Irby, 2001) to respond to the prompt.*

- 1. Select artifacts that demonstrate success and growth in intercultural knowledge and competence.*
- 2. Describe the circumstances, situation, or events related to the experience and address the Four W's: Who was involved?*

What happened?

When did it take place?

Where did it take place?

- 3. Analyze: Discuss your reason(s) for selecting the artifact and how this artifact relates to your goals, expectations, skills, or professional beliefs and intercultural competence.*

4. *Appraise: Interpret the events; evaluate the impact and appropriateness of your action(s) in this international experience and how it may have changed you, and relate them to your professional values and beliefs in intercultural competence.*
5. *Transform: How do you plan to use what you have learned to improve your professional goals and take “next steps” based on this experience?*

With this prompt, students could see that their response should focus on their intercultural experiences while abroad and the prompts lead them to think about how those experiences impacted their knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Just like the faculty proposal narrative prompt, explicit instructions and examples were provided leading the students through their reflective steps and writing.

Faculty Resources

In addition to the redesign of these forms, new faculty resources were made available through the creation of a faculty study abroad handbook and a faculty proposal guide. As a resource, the faculty handbook was created to facilitate the faculty’s understanding of what the CEHD’s expectations were before, during, and after traveling. The handbook focused more on risk management issues and was not meant to steer faculty towards best practices. On the other hand, the faculty proposal guide was explicitly designed to provide context and understanding of what and how to create high quality study abroad proposals with the (already introduced) instructions on how to create a narrative, and additional support on how to choose a vendor, and travel information. This proposal guide also illustrated how the proposals would be evaluated, by whom, and included the rubric.

Outcomes Evaluation

To examine the outcomes of the changes made by this program, I examined the quality of faculty study abroad proposals and ratings of student intercultural competence, comparing data from 2014-2015 to data from 2019-2021.

Faculty Study Abroad Proposals

Research Question 3: How were best practices reflected within the quality of study abroad proposals within the College of Education and Human Development at Land-grant Southern University comparing faculty proposals before policy changes were implemented (2014-2015) to those after changes were implemented (2019-2021)?

I compared study abroad proposals from 2014-2015 with those for trips taken during 2019-2021 time period. As noted earlier, these 17 faculty proposals were rated for the inclusion of best practices. Table 4.1 provides descriptive statistics for the number of best practices evident in faculty proposals. A one-tailed equal variance t-test comparing 2014-2015 to 2019-2021 found a significant increase in the number of best practices used across the two time-frames, $t(15) = 1.89, p < .05$. A one-tailed test was deemed appropriate as administrative moves designed to increase proposal quality should not allow a decrease in quality. Variance equivalence was checked and was considered equivalent.

Table 4.1

Number of Best Practices Evidenced Within Faculty Study Abroad Proposals

Trips During 2014-2015	Number Of Best Practices	Trips During 2019-2021	Number Of Best Practices
Mean	2.45	Mean	5.33
SD	2.66	SD	4.18

*potential range for number of best practices 0-9, $p < 0.05$, One-Tailed

These results make clear that administrative changes focused on increasing the explicitness of a focus on intercultural competence, discipline knowledge, and high-impact learning experiences had a significant impact on the quality of faculty proposals.

Intercultural Competence

Research Question 4: How did ratings of students' intercultural competence, as reflected in post-experience essays (using the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric), comparing student reflections before policy changes were implemented (2014-2015) to those after changes were implemented (2019-2021)?

As noted in the methods section, student intercultural competence was assessed using the AAC&U VALUE Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Rubric. Students' intercultural competence scores (as evidenced in their reflections) were compared between the 2014-2015 time frame (before changes were made) and the 2019-2021 time frame (after changes were made). Table 4.2 provides overall intercultural competence scores as well as scores on the six individual attributes identified by the AAC&U VALUE rubric along with the corresponding t-test probability and Cohen's d. Separate t-tests were run for each attribute, as they can stand alone conceptually, according the AAC&U.

Table 4.2*Intercultural competence 2014-15 vs. 2019-21 by criterion*

Competency	2014-2015		2019-2021		2-tailed t-test probability	Cohen's d
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Self-Awareness	1.46	1.11	1.80	1.23	0.018	.29
Worldview	1.64	0.99	2.01	1.00	0.003	.37
Empathy	1.09	1.00	1.41	1.14	0.013	.30
Communication	0.95	0.91	1.04	0.93	0.439	.10
Curiosity	1.05	0.88	1.23	0.95	0.105	.20
Openness	1.26	0.93	1.63	1.21	0.004	.34
Total Score	1.24	0.97	1.52	1.08	0.003	.27

Note: 2014-2015 student reflections n = 203; 2019-2021 n = 98

As can be seen, overall intercultural competence scores increased between the 2014-2015 implementation and the 2019-2021 implementation. Increases were also seen in the attributes of self-awareness, worldview, empathy, and openness. Interestingly, there were no significant differences between the two time-frames on the communication and curiosity attributes. Implications of this pattern will be discussed further in Chapter 5.

Chapter Five

Discussion

The purpose of this dissertation was to evaluate the effectiveness of policy changes to the study abroad process on quality of faculty proposals and student intercultural competence learning outcomes at one institution. Below, I review the findings relevant for each research question followed by an accounting of study implications for the program under review, the university, and other interested parties.

Research Question 1: What was the organizational and institutional context within which the study abroad policy changes were made?

The climate within the University System had prioritized high-impact practices and provided financial resources towards that goal. At the time this study began, however, the University was still struggling to adopt a common definition of high-impact practices. This led to the institution, colleges, administration, and faculty self-identifying what is a study abroad experience and/or a high-impact learning experience for the students. This likely contributed to events that set off this evaluation project. In an ideal world, a clear definition of high impact practices up front could be helpful and ensure that monies dedicated to activities like study abroad are going toward the most impactful experiences for students.

The College of Education and Human development was in alignment with the University and prioritized study abroad with the allocation of financial resources and personnel to help facilitate faculty through the process. The impetus for accountability stemmed from the appointment of a new leadership team and evidence questioning the merit and financial

stewardship of resources. The charge was made to evaluate the process and procedures to ensure that student experiences are impactful and interculturally relevant.

Research Question 2: What study abroad administrative policies were made to improve quality of student experience and students' intercultural competence within the College of Education and Human Development at Land-grant Southern University between 2015 and 2019?

Administrators in the CEHD first targeted policy moves that would affect study abroad experiences by implementing changes to the faculty proposal process. Faculty were required to explicitly explain in detail how their proposals would meet high impact learning requirements, student academic and career benefits, and the student's development of intercultural competence. Expectations were that the policies would influence faculty to be more purposeful in their program design, and in turn, there would be positive impact on student intercultural competence. These policy changes aligned with pre-experience best practice #1 from my literature review by focusing on the dual learning objectives of enhancing both disciplinary knowledge and intercultural competence (Bell & Anscombe, 2013; Bell, Moorhead, & Boetto, 2017; Citron, 2002; Core, 2017; Engle & Engle, 2004; Fiedler & Kremer, 2017; Gambino & Hashim, 2016; Mitchell & Paras, 2018; Ritz, 2011; Forum on Education Abroad, 2020). Results indicated a significant increase in the number of best practices incorporated within the design of study abroad experiences which led to a greater impact on student intercultural competence learning scores. It is my belief that creating an intervention at the point of faculty proposal development had the greatest potential for making these dramatic impacts. The guidelines for

faculty proposal development also created a definition which was common, and faculty could work toward.

The second big policy change involved requiring students to write a reflection paper from a designed prompt after their participation in each study abroad experience. This policy change aligns to the best practice #9 from my literature review. A prompt was chosen from the literature and research experience of the faculty (Brown & Irby, 2001) that led the student through a series of questions to begin a process of integration and reflection on the experience.

Additional changes to the handbook supported and facilitated faculty understanding and completion of the faculty study abroad proposals process. The faculty handbook was written with detailed descriptions of study abroad policy and procedures. The faculty proposal guide was designed to walk the faculty through step-by-step instructions and expectations. These last changes simply codified (with faculty committee approval) the changes implemented.

Research Question 3: How were best practices reflected within the quality of study abroad proposals within the College of Education and Human Development at Land-grant Southern University comparing faculty proposals before policy changes were implemented (2014-2015) to those after changes were implemented (2019-2021)?

In reviewing the proposals, syllabi, and itineraries, both I and a second rater, identified evidence of best practices designed to enhance student's intercultural competence. A list of nine best practices was derived from my literature review and the number of best practices that were present for each study abroad experience was noted. For academic year 2014-15,

there were 11 study abroad experiences with a mean number of 2.45 best practices identified per trip. This is not to say that there were no good study abroad experiences in 2014-2015, but the experiences were quite bifurcated. Four of the experiences were scored as demonstrating 0.0 best practices while other long-standing experiences had embedded experiences where students participated in activities designed to share and identify differences in how the discipline was defined and practiced within other cultures. These three experiences scored over a 5.0 on the best practice coding and skewed results from the pre-intervention phase slightly more positive than they really were. I suspect that if specific student reflections could be tied to specific cultural trips, results would show an increase in intercultural competency based on the number of best practices identified within faculty proposals. This is an area for future study for the college and the field in general.

Policy implementations described above occurred from 2015-2019. After the policy implementations, during academic years 2019-2021, there were six study abroad experiences with a mean of 4.18 best practices identified. This difference is statistically significant. There were two outliers in the 2019-2021 proposals which scored 0.00 on the study abroad best practices rubric. Upon closer examination, these two experiences were undergraduate trips to an international conference (two different years). These are certainly worthwhile undergraduate experiences, but they were not designed as intercultural growth experiences.

Without these two outliers, the mean study abroad best practice score for 2019-2021 would have been 8.00. In other words, the implementation of these policies had a significant effect on the quality of faculty proposals submitted.

This brings to question how the two outlier proposals were approved by the committee given the new proposal guidelines. Within the proposal narrative, it was clear that the experiences were designed to be high impact learning experiences. Students were to meet other professionals and peers within the discipline from diverse professional perspectives. It was expected that the student's ability to integrate their knowledge of the field with those from various disciplines would increase, offering the student a greater understanding and view of the discipline as a whole. According to Kuh's (2008) and Brownell and Swaner (2010) this is the definition of a high-impact practice. Additionally, the proposal provided evidence as to how the experience would enhance students' career benefits and lifelong learning.

The only area where the faculty proposals scored low was the ability to state how the experience would support and facilitate the development of intercultural knowledge, diversity, equity, and access. Within the proposal it was stated that students would be in a foreign country for x number of days interacting with a diverse group of participants but there was no direct narrative about activities designed to enhance intercultural competence knowledge.

Faculty on the review committee looked at all four questions on the proposal form (To what degree is the trip associated with high-impact learning experiences for the students? How does the trip's location create and enhance a unique learning experience? How does the proposed program enhance students' career benefit and lifelong learning? How does the proposed program support and facilitate the development of intercultural knowledge, diversity, equity, and access?), rated the quality of how the proposal addressed each question, then approved those with a score above an **overall** criterion. To maintain a dual emphasis on disciplinary knowledge and intercultural competence, it is clear there needs to be a minimum

criterion for intercultural competence that must be met for the other parts of the narrative to be scored. Just to be clear, those two experiences were very strong developmental opportunities that should be supported from a departmental funding model, but probably not from a college study abroad funding source.

The overall effectiveness of these policy implementation led to a significant increase from 2.66 practices identifiable in the proposals in 2014-2015 to an adjusted (after removing the two outliers - conferences) 8.0 best practices identified within the 2019-2021 proposals. It is also important to note that not all of the 2014-2015 experiences were lacking best practices. There has been a Sport Management experience that has been collaborating with a German college with a direct objective of understanding intercultural differences and working intimately with student from the local culture on presentations and activities that highlight these differences. There were, however, no policies in place to ensure that this type of rich experience was the norm rather than the exception. The findings from this research clearly indicated that helping faculty define and understand best practices in the faculty proposal stage is key to ensuring great student cultural experiences.

Research Question 4: How did ratings of students' intercultural competence change, as reflected in post-experience essays (using the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric), comparing student reflections before policy changes were implemented (2014-2015) to those after changes were implemented (2019-2021)?

Students were asked to write critical reflection essays post participation regarding their international experiences and how those experiences affected their understanding of other

cultures and intercultural competency. These essays were then evaluated using the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric to assess the average scores in six areas of intercultural competence (self-awareness, worldview, empathy, communication, curiosity, and openness) for student participants in 2014-2015 compared to those student participants in 2019-2021. After reviewing 301 written reflection essays, it was clear that there were significant increases in the average student scores in the areas of self-awareness, worldview, empathy, and openness when comparing average reflections scores from the 2014-2015 year to 2019-2021. For communication and curiosity, the average scores increased but not at a significant level. It may be that many of the study abroad experiences were taken in countries with a good understanding of the English language and thus communication was relatively easy, especially if students stayed in more tourist – oriented areas. There also may not have been enough emphasis on opportunities for reflection on the topic of communication differences. Given the short time frame of the visits (almost all were less than two weeks) it is not entirely clear that students were able to spend enough time conversing one-on-one with others to have an impact on their understanding of nuanced cultural differences encapsulated in communication. A review of the proposals and itineraries verified that much of the time was scheduled where students participated in learning and less time was scheduled for organic interactions with others from another culture. Regardless of the exact reason, it was in the area of intercultural communication that students saw the smallest average gain.

The second area where the average scores did not increase between 2014-2015 and 2019-2021 was curiosity to learn more about another culture. It may be that students traveling on any study abroad have a slightly higher sense of curiosity than those who choose not to

travel. Within the literature, much is written regarding openness and curiosity as necessary precursors to becoming more interculturally aware. Deardorff's (2004) pyramid model of intercultural competence places curiosity as a requisite attitude for the learning that follows. Another plausible explanation for this finding could be found in the reflection prompt itself, as there is nothing cuing the students to consider their curiosity before, during, or after the experience. Finally, because all study abroad experiences since 2014 were tied to credit bearing courses, all students completed assignments tied to learning more about their experience destination. As such, individual differences in curiosity-driven learning may have been minimized.

One limitation of the current study is the rubric that I chose to define intercultural competence. Given the variety of definitions introduced earlier in this document, it is easy to get lost in all of the complexities and variants of intercultural competence. Deardorff's (2006) work had previously suggested that a single self-report instrument (such as the Intercultural Development Inventory) was not sufficient to ascertain a student's intercultural competency. As an alternative, I used the AAC&U VALUE Intercultural Knowledge and Competency rubric. The VALUE rubric has inherent limitations. For example, the rubric assesses growth along a four-point spread from ethnocentric to ethnorelativism. Given that all the College's study abroad trips were short-term and typically less than two weeks, it is highly unlikely that a student would move from ethnocentric to a fully mature level of development. In addition, students participating in an intercultural experience for the first time would likely only be expected to show some openness to experiencing cultural difference, perhaps bringing them to a midpoint in the developmental model. By definition, this restricts students to scoring a 1 or 2

on the developmental scale. In order for students to rate at a level three or four, they would have likely needed multiple previous experiences in a variety of countries. Some of the students seemed to have traveled extensively and could reach level four, but they were the rare exceptions. It would be more useful to develop an evaluation model that could focus more on the intricacies of the developmental growth across the four stages with definable behavioral delineations between each stage if researchers want to be able to document growth in intercultural competence especially in short-term study abroad experiences.

Implications

Implications for CEHD.

The primary outcome for CEHD administration is the knowledge that the policies they created were successful at increasing the quality of faculty study abroad proposal and subsequent student intercultural competence. As with all program evaluations, however, there continues to be room for improvement. Continued focus needs to be given to faculty proposal quality. As noted earlier, I found two conference trips that were awarded CEHD financial support without any cultural objectives or activities designed to promote prolonged interactions with another culture. These two trips scored very high on the disciplinary component of the evaluation rubric. But neither included any best practices for enhancing intercultural competence in the study abroad experience. A suggestion for CEHD would be to adopt a minimum standard for the inclusion of an intercultural component in the faculty proposals. Each proposal needs to include a minimum intent to make intercultural competence a learning objective. This could easily be accomplished by stating within the policies that a

minimum score must be met on question 4, (“How does the proposed program support and facilitate the development of intercultural knowledge, diversity, equity, and access? *Consider what detail the program provides students opportunity to enhance self-awareness through examining one’s own cultural rules, norms, and biases. How do programs intentionally expose students’ different cultural worldviews, modes of communication, and other interactions?*”) to be considered for College funding support. This change is important because the Standards of Good Practice for Education Abroad put forward by the Forum on Education Abroad (2020; forumea.org) notes that culturally-relevant educational objectives are central to any study abroad design and implementation. My Best Practices #1, 4, and 5 speak to the need for activities and interactions to be designed more purposefully to place the student in situations and interactions that promote intercultural competence as a learning objective (Citron, 2002; Mitchell & Paras, 2018; Anderson, 2003). The narrative prompt currently leads CEHD faculty to consider this aspect and foremost proposals appears to be successful thus no changes are recommended to the narrative prompt.

Beyond the fact that increases were found in students’ intercultural competence overall, there still seems to be a disconnect between their current experiences and the student’s understanding of differences in verbal and nonverbal communication styles, beliefs and norms. This was illustrated by nonsignificant differences on the communication aspect of the VALUE rubric. Possible pre-experience sessions may be able to focus students on differences in communication styles, but in the end the students need to reflect on these differences and how they played out in specific interactions with people from a different

culture. CEHD might consider implementing a training opportunity supporting faculty to understand and facilitate this post-experience reflections.

Curiosity also was not found to be significantly different comparing 2014-2015 to 2019-2021. The most plausible reason for this may be that thorough pre-experience course work may satiate curiosity before the trip begins. As a next step, I would recommend that the college structure more obvious prompts into the reflection stage post-experience, specifically asking students to tie current and future interests in other cultures to their study abroad experience. If this helps, curiosity satiation pre-trip may not be the problem.

One additional area of exploration for the college might be to examine faculty intercultural competence. Are all faculty equally prepared to support student's growth in this area? How prepared are faculty to design culturally relevant experiences, provide culturally competent leadership while abroad, and lead culturally-sensitive post experience debriefings? Niehaus, Reading, Nelson, Wegener, and Arthur (2018) investigated faculty behaviors that facilitate best practices through what is referred to as Cultural Mentoring during study abroad experiences. In their work, faculty who help students set appropriate expectations, explain aspects of the host culture both before and during the trip, help students explore themselves in relation to the host culture, and facilitate connections between and among different experiences in the study-abroad (and after) experience. These are skills that could be taught to faculty and would likely increase the impact of the study abroad experience for students (though direct connections to student intercultural growth still need to be explored according to Niehaus et al., 2018).

Implications for practice beyond CEHD.

The primary focus of this study is how policies can effect changes in quality of faculty proposals and student's intercultural competence outcomes. My findings suggest that other programs could use similar policies as direct mechanisms to effect student intercultural competence outcomes. I have provided a list of policies that were created to provide a baseline for others to consider within their study abroad administrative practices. A more valuable resource is the list of best practices I developed. This list provides the basis for a valid assessment instrument that can be used to measure faculty proposal quality and could be adopted by any university. A third important tool is the student prompt designed by Brown and Irby (2001) that successfully leads a student through the process of self-reflection, tying intercultural interactions to disciplinary knowledge. This prompt might prove particularly helpful for universities.

Future Evaluation and Research

The VALUE rubric notes student's intercultural competence at "benchmark" levels, "milestone" levels, and "capstone" levels with each progressive level demonstrating a more advanced level of understanding. Bennett (1986) would say that these progressions are demonstrative of the students level of ethnorelativism. Even after CEHD administrative changes were made, the majority of students scored at the benchmark or first of two milestone levels. As part of a commitment to continuous improvement, program faculty should meet yearly to discuss how they can begin to move students' understanding beyond a benchmark level. What kinds of experiences would assist in the support of students' understanding of cultural worldview at the more advanced level of understanding? In a short-term study abroad, this will

require careful planning and structure. In addition, while students' reflections did show improvement across time, both curiosity and communication struggled to meet benchmark outcome. Future policies should be designed to improve intercultural competence in these two areas in particular.

The Forum on Education Abroad (2020) notes that each organization should emphasize "equity, diversity, and inclusion in study abroad program design, implementation, goals, objectives, and outcomes" (p. 25). In fact research by University of Georgia's CASSIE project (2020) suggests students from underrepresented groups may benefit the most from these experiences. A next research step may be to determine effective ways to engage these students to consider participating in a study abroad experience. Because of cost, there is considerable inertia that must be overcome to ensure participation. CEHD should prioritize this as a next goal.

The need to collect more details and demographics of both the students and faculty would be useful in future studies. Niehaus, Reading, Nelson, Wegener, and Arthur (2018) examined faculty and cultural mentoring and found that assistant professors and faculty of color were more likely than associate professors and white faculty to consistently engage in their four cultural mentoring behaviors. Relatedly, Paige and Goode (2009) expressed how a faculty member's own intercultural competence likely influences the faculty's ability to facilitate cultural mentoring processes.

As a final note, making study abroad experiences available to students from all socioeconomic backgrounds is a critical step for universities to truly help high-impact practices

likely study abroad live up to their expectations. The College began a process to explore ways to increase equity and access to study abroad experiences. There were many university rules that served to make this goal more difficult. For example, in many countries, students can eat at street vendors for a very reasonable price, but receipts are not given, and cash is required. Universities must find a way to provide cash for low-income students in these situations. Otherwise, students simply will not consider studying abroad as a viable option for them. These could be life-changing experiences for students; and yet they remain restricted by income. The inclusion of demographic data going forward is critical for being able to track the impact of these experiences on low-income, minorities, and underrepresented students.

Summary

Institutions of higher education need to make a continuous improvement cycle part of their everyday practice. This study serves as an example of how careful analysis of policy and procedural changes reveal impact on student study abroad experiences. The findings of the current study suggest that the policy changes CEHD made between 2016 and 2019 were effective and may serve as a model for other institutions to adopt.

It is evident that CEHD administrators acted on a need to create more guidance to oversee the impact and effectiveness of their study abroad programs. Policies were created with the intent of directing faculty to consider how their study abroad experience might be considered a high impact learning experience for both disciplinary learning and intercultural competence. Creating a culture where all faculty-led study abroad experiences were purposefully designed was the primary goal. And, as can be seen above, generally held true. A review of the faculty proposals found significant improvements in the number of study abroad

best practices evidenced. Faculty were more purposeful in their pedagogy to include student outcomes in intercultural competence as well. Positive impact on students' intercultural competence learning outcome highlights a successful administrative intervention.

References

- Adler, P. (1977). Beyond cultural identity: reflections on cultural and multicultural man in R.W. Brislin (Ed.), *Culture learning: Concepts, application and research* (pp. 24-41). University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, HI.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) (2009). *Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric*. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/intercultural-knowledgeandcompetence>
- Anderson, A. (2003). Women and cultural learning in Costa Rica: Reading the contexts. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 9 (Fall), 21–52.
- Anderson, P. H., Lawton, L., Rexeisen, R. J., & Hubbard, A. C. (2006). Short-term study abroad and intercultural sensitivity: A pilot study. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30, 457–469.
- Ang, S., & Van Dyne, L. (2008). Conceptualization of cultural intelligence: Definition, distinctiveness, and nomo-logical network. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook of Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement, and Applications* (pp. 3–15). Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Barclay-Hamir, H. (2011). *Go abroad and graduate on-time: Study abroad participation, degree completion, and time-to-degree*. University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1065&context=cehsedaddiss>

- Barrows, T. S., Ager, S. M., Bennett, M. F., Braun, H. I., Clark, J. L., Harris, L. G., & Klein, S. F. (1981). College Students' knowledge and beliefs: A survey of global understanding. *Change Magazine Press*. New Rochelle, NY.
- Bell, K., & Anscombe, A. W. (2013). International Field Experience in Social Work: Outcomes of a Short-Term Study Abroad Programme to India. *Social Work Education, 32*(8), 1032-1047.
- Bell, A., Bhatt, R., Hodges, L., Rubin, D. & Shiflet, C. (2020). *CASSIE Study Abroad and World Language Analyses and Infographics*. University System of Georgia.
- Bell, K., Moorhead, B., & Boetto, H. (2017). Social Work Students' Reflections on Gender, Social Justice and Human Rights During a Short-Term Study Abroad Programme to India. *International Social Work 60*(1), 32-44.
- 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, *Education for Intercultural Experience, 2*, 21-71.
- Bennett, M. J. (2017). Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity. In Kim, Y (Ed). *International encyclopedia of intercultural communication*. Wiley.
DOI:10.1002/9781118783665.ieicc01.
- Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Brislin, R. (1992). The measurement of intercultural sensitivity using the concepts of individualism and collectivism. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 16*, 413-436. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767\(92\)90031-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(92)90031-0)

- Biggs, J. B. (2003). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (2nd ed.). Buckingham, England: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Bochner, A. P., & Kelly, C. W. (1974). Interpersonal competence: Rationale, philosophy, and implementation of a conceptual framework. *Communication Education, 23*, 279-301, DOI:10.1080/0363452740937810
- Braskamp, L. A., Braskamp, D. C., & Engberg, M. E. (2014). *Global Perspective Inventory (GPI): Its Purpose, Construction, Potential Uses, and Psychometric Characteristics*. Global Perspective Institute Inc. Chicago, IL, downloaded from <http://gpi.central.ed>
- Braskamp, L. A., Braskamp, D. C., & Merrill, K. C. (2009). Assessing progress in global learning and development of students with education abroad experiences. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 18*, 101–118.
- Brown, G., & Irby, B. J. (2001). The principal portfolio for professional growth. In *The principal portfolio*, (pp. 23-32) Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications
- Bolen, M. C. (2001). Consumerism and U.S. study abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 5*, 182–200. doi: 10.1177/1028315301530
- Bu, L. (1999). Educational exchange and cultural diplomacy in the Cold War. *Journal of American Studies, 33*, 393–415.
- Burrow, J. D. (2019). *A meta-analysis of the relationship between study abroad and intercultural competence*. (Doctoral dissertation). University of Toronto, Canada. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

- Byker, E. J., & Putman, S. M. (2019). Catalyzing cultural and global competencies: Engaging preservice teachers in study abroad to expand the agency of citizenship. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 23*, 84-105.
- Caldwell P., & Purtzer, M. A. (2014). Long-Term Learning in a Short-Term Study Abroad Program: Are We Really Truly Helping the Community? *Public Health Nursing 32*(5), 577-583.
- Carlson, J., Burn, B., Useem, J., & Yachimovicz, D. (1990). *Study abroad: The experience of American undergraduates*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (1996). Intercultural Communication Competence: A Synthesis. *Annals of the International Communication Association, 19*, 353-383.
- Chen, G. & Starosta, W. J. (1998/1999). A review of the concept of intercultural awareness. *Human Communication, 2*, 27-54
- Chieffo, L., & Griffiths, L. (2009). Here to stay: Increasing acceptance of short-term study abroad programs. (pp. 365–380). In R. Lewin (Ed.) *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship*. NY: Routledge.
- Citron, J. L. (2002). U.S. students abroad: Host culture integration or third culture formation? In W. Grünzweig & N. Rinehart (Eds.), *Rockin' in Red Square: Critical approaches to international education in the time of cyberculture* (pp. 41–56). Munster, Germany: Lit Verlag.
- Clarke, I., Flaherty, T. B., Wright, N. D., & McMillen, R. M. (2009). Student intercultural proficiency from study abroad programs. *Journal of Marketing Education, 31*(2), 173–181.

Consortium for Analysis of Student Success through International Education (CASSIE; 2020).

Research Brief: University System of Georgia CASSIE project shows positive impact of international education on student success. University System of Georgia. Retrieved from: https://www.usg.edu/cassie/results/study_abroad

Core, R. S. (2017). Assessing Global Learning in Short-term Study Abroad: Population, Environment, and Society in Shanghai. *Teaching Sociology*, 45(4) 399-408.

Cotton, C., & Thompson, C. (2017). High Impact Practices in Social Work Education: A Short-Term Study-Abroad Service-Learning Trip to Guatemala. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 53, 622-636.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). Designing and conducting mixed methods research. John W. Creswell, Department of Family Medicine, University of Michigan, Vicki L. Plano Clark, School of Education, University of Cincinnati. Third Edition. SAGE.

Cubillos, J. H., & Ilvento, T. (2013). The impact of study abroad on students' self-efficacy perceptions. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(4), 494-511.

Davis, K. A., & Knight, D. B. (2021). Comparing students' study abroad experiences and outcomes across global contexts. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 83, 114-127.

Deardorff, D. K. (2004). *The identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of international education at institutions of higher education in the United States.* Unpublished dissertation. North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC.

- Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and Assessment of Intercultural Competence as a Student Outcome of Internationalization, *Journal of Studies in International Educations*, 10, 241-266.
- DeLoach, S. B., Kurt, M. R., & Olitsky, N. H. (2019). Duration Matters: Separating the Impact of Depth and Duration in Study Abroad Programs, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 1-19.
- Dietz, S. S., & Baker, S. B. (2019). Study abroad as a cultural competence development tool: Case study Honduras. *International Journal of Advanced Counseling*, 41, 1024-124.
- Di Pietro, G. (2019). University study abroad and graduates' employability. *IZA World of Labor*, 109 (2), 1-2.
- Dolby, N. (2004). Encountering an American self: Study abroad and national identity. *Comparative Education Review*, 48(2), 150–173.
- Dolby, N. (2007). Reflections on nation: American undergraduates and education abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(2), 141-156.
- Du, F. (2007). *Self-authorship as a learning outcome of study abroad: Towards a new approach for examining learning and learning conditions* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Minnesota, Minneapolis. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Endsley, M. R. (1995). Toward a theory of situation awareness in dynamic systems. *Human Factors*, 37, 32–64.
- Engberg, M. E., & Fox, K. (2011). Exploring the relationship between undergraduate service-learning experiences and global perspective-taking. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 48(1), 85-105.

- Engel, L. C. (2017). *Underrepresented students in US study abroad: Investigating Impacts*. IIE Center for Academic Mobility Research and Impact. Retrieved from: <https://www.iie.org/Research-and-Insights/Publications/Underrepresented-Students-and-Study-Abroad>
- Engle, L., & Engle, J. (2004). Assessing language acquisition and intercultural sensitivity development in relation to study abroad program design. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 219-236.
- Farrugia, C., & Sanger, J. (2017). *Gaining an employment edge: The impact of study abroad on 21st century skills and career prospects in the United States*. IIE Center for Academic Mobility Research and Impact. retrieved from ciee.org.
- Fiedler, G., & Kremer, U. (2017). Self-Efficacy in Prosthetics and Orthotics student who did and did not participate in short-term study abroad programs – preliminary results, *Education in HealthCare*, 121, 36-41.
- Finley, A. P. (2012). How reliable are the VALUE rubrics? *AAC&U Peer Review*, Fall/Winter, 31-33.
- Forum on Education Abroad (2020). *Standards of Good Practice, 6th edition*. Retrieved from [Standards of Good Practice – 6th Edition | The Forum on Education Abroad \(forumea.org\)](http://standards.fomea.org)
- Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Farrar, Strauss, & Giroux.
- Ferguson, L. (1942). The Isolation and Measurement of Nationalism. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 16 (2), 215-228. DOI: 10.1080/00224545.1942.9714117

- Gambino, G., & Hashim, S. M. (2016), In Their Own Words: Assessing Global Citizenship in a Short-Term Study-Abroad Program in Bangladesh. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 12(1) 15-29.
- Golay, P. (2006). *The effects of study abroad on the development of global-mindedness among students enrolled in international programs at Florida State University* (Doctoral dissertation). Florida State University, Tallahassee. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Hadis, B. F. (2005). Why are they better students when they come back? Determinants of academic focusing gains in the study abroad experience. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 11, 57–70.
- Hammer, M. R., Bennett, M. J., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring Intercultural Sensitivity: The Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27, 421-443.
- Hart, R. P., & Burks, D. M. (1972). Rhetorical sensitivity and social interaction. *Speech Monographs*, 39 (2), 75-91, DOI: 10.1080/03637757209375742
- Hart, R. P., Carlson, R. E., & Eadie, W. F. (1980). Attitudes toward communication and the assessment of rhetorical sensitivity, *Communication Monographs*, 47 (1), 1-22, DOI: 10.1080/03637758009376016
- He, N., & Chen, R. J. C. (2010). College students' perceptions and attitudes toward the selection of study abroad programs. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism*, 11, 347–359. doi: 10.1080/15256480.2010.518525

- Heisel, M., & Stableski, R. (2009). Expanding study abroad: Where there's a will, there's a way. In P. B. R. Gutierrez (Ed.), *Expanding study abroad capacity at U.S. colleges and universities*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- Hett, E. J. (1993). *The development of an instrument to measure global-mindedness (doctoral dissertation)*. University of San Diego. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Hoffa, W. W. (2007). *A history of U.S. study abroad: Beginnings to 1965*. Carlisle, PA: Forum on Education Abroad.
- Hoffa, W. W., & DePaul, S. C. (2010). *A history of U.S. study abroad: 1965–present*. Carlisle, PA: Forum on Education Abroad.
- Hornby, G., Jennings, G., & Nulty, D. (2009). Facilitating Deep Learning in an Information System Course through Application of Curriculum Design Principles, *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 9: 124-141.
- Hulstrand, J. (2015). Best practices for short-term faculty-led programs abroad. *International Educator*, May-June, 58-63.
- Institute of International Education (IIE). (n.d.e). *Open Doors, Special Reports: Community College Data Resource*. retrieved from www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data/Special-Reports/Community-College-Data-Resource.
- Iskhakova, M., Bradly, A., Whiting, B., & Lu, V. N. (2021). Cultural intelligence development during short-term study abroad programmes: The role of cultural distance and prior international experience. *Studies in Higher Education*, online first. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2021.1957811>.

- Jessup-Anger, J. E. (2008). Gender observations and study abroad: How students reconcile cross-cultural differences related to gender. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49(4), 360–373.
- Kellogg Foundation. (1998). Evaluation handbook. Battle Creek, MI: Author. Retrieved from [Evaluation Handbook \(issuelab.org\)](http://issuelab.org)
- Kishino, H., & Takahashi, T. (2019). Global Citizenship Development: Effects of Study Abroad and Other Factors. *Journal of International Students*, 9, 535-559. doi: 10.32674/jis.v9i2.390
- Kitsantas, A. (2004). Studying abroad: The role of college students' goals on the development of cross-cultural skills and global understanding. *College Student Journal*, 38(3), 441–452.
- Kitsantas, A., & Meyers, J. (2001, March). *Studying Abroad. Does it Enhance College Student Cross-Cultural Awareness?* Paper presented at combined Annual Meeting of the San Diego State University and the U.S. Department of Education Centers for International Business Education and Research (CIBER 2001), San Diego, CA.
- Kuh, G. D. (2008). High-Impact Educational Practices: What They Are, Who Has Access to Them, and Why They Matter, *Association of American Colleges and Universities*, vii, 1-35.
- Kronholz, J. F., & Osborn, D. S. (2016). The Impact of Study Abroad Experiences on Vocational Identity among College Students. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 27, 70–84.
- Landreman, L. M. (2005). Toward social justice: A case study of multicultural practice in higher education. University of Michigan. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.

- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 22 (140), 1-55.
- Lockett, L., Moore, L., & Wingenbach, G. (2014). A global worldview among extension professionals: A case study of best practices for study abroad programs. *Journal of Extension*, 52 (4), 1-7.
- Lucas, J. M. (2009). *Where are all the males? A mixed methods inquiry into male study abroad participation* (Doctoral dissertation). Michigan State University, East Lansing. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Luo, J., & Jamieson-Drake, D. (2015). Predictors of study abroad intent, participation, and college outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, 56, 29–56.
- Malmgren, J., & Galvin, J. (2008). Effects of study abroad participation on student graduation rates: A study of three incoming freshman cohorts at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities. *NADADA Journal*, 28(1), 29–42.
- McConnell, K. D., Horan, E. M., Zimmerman, B., & Rhodes, T. L. (2019). *We have a rubric for that: The VALUE approach to assessment*. Association of American Colleges and Universities, Washington, DC.
- McConnell, K. D., & Rhodes, T. L. (2017). *On solid ground*. Washington DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- McHugh M. L. (2012). Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochemia medica*, 22(3), 276–282.
- Metzger, C. A. (2006). Study abroad programming: A 21st century retention strategy? *College Student Affairs Journal*, 25(2), 164-175.

- Meyers, N. M., & Nulty, D. D. (2009). How to use (five) curriculum design principles to align authentic learning environments, assessment, students' approaches to thinking and learning outcomes. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 34*, 565-577.
- Mitchell, L., & Paras, A. (2018). When difference creates dissonance: Understanding the engine of intercultural learning in study abroad. *Intercultural Education, 29*, 321-339.
- Nelson Laird, T. F., Seifert, T. A., Pascarella, E. T., Mayhew, M. J., & Blaich, C. F. (2011). *Deeply Effecting First-Year Students' Thinking: The Effects of Deep Approaches to Learning on Three Outcomes*, Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Charlotte, NC.
- Nelson Laird, T. F., Shoup, R., Kuh, G. D., & Schwarz, M. J., (2008). The Effects of Discipline on Deep Approaches to Student Learning and College Outcomes, *Research in Higher Education, 49*, 469-494.
- Nerlich, S. (2021). Outcomes-focused evaluation of study abroad experiences, *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 43*, 166-181, DOI:10.1080/1360080X.2020.1771511
- Niehaus, E., Reading, J., Nelson, M., Wegener, A., & Arthur, A., (2018). Faculty engagement in cultural mentoring as instructors of short-term study abroad courses. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 30*, 77-91.
- Nwosu, C. (2022). Does study abroad affect student academic achievement? *British Educational Research Journal, 48*, 821-840.
- Paige, R. M., & Goode, M. (2009). *Intercultural competence in international education administration: Cultural mentoring*. In D. K. Deardorff (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence*, 121-140. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Pedersen, P. J. (2009). Teaching towards an ethnorelative worldview through psychology study abroad. *Intercultural Education, 20*, 73–86.
- Perez, R. J., Shim, W., King, P. M., & Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2015). Refining King and Baxter Magolda's model of intercultural maturity. *Journal of College Student Development, 56*, 759-775.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 751–783.
- Pike, G. (2018). *The dependability of student-, institution-, and state-level scores for critical thinking, written communication, and quantitative literacy: Final report to AAC&U*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Posey, J. T. (2003). *Study abroad: Educational and employment outcomes of participants versus nonparticipants* (Doctoral dissertation), The Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to teach in higher education*. London: Routledge.
- Rhodes, T. L. (2012). Emerging evidence on using rubrics. *AAC&U Peer Review, Fall/Winter*, 4-6.
- Ritz, A. A. (2011) The Educational Value of Short-Term Study Abroad Programs as Course components. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism, 11*, 164-178.
- Rodriguez, M. T., & Roberts, T. G. (2011). Identifying best practices for a successful study abroad program. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education, 18*(1), 19-32.

- Salisbury, M. H., Umbach, P. D., Paulsen, M. B., & Pascarella, E. T. (2009). Going global: Understanding the choice process of the intent to study abroad. *Research in Higher Education, 50*(2), 119–143. doi: 10.1007/s11162-008-9111-x
- Sampson, D., & Smith, H.P. (1957). A scale to measure world-minded attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology, 45* (2), 99–106.
- Sheldon, K. M. (1996). The social awareness inventory: Development and applications. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 620–634.
- Souders, B. W. (2006). Now that I am home, who am I? Renegotiating American identity among returned study abroad participants. *LLC Review, 6*(1), 22–41.
- Tagg, J. (2003). *The learning paradigm college*. Boston, MA: Anker.
- Triandis, H. C. (2006). Cultural intelligence in organizations. *Group and Organization Management, 31*, 20–26.
- Twombly, S. B., Salisbury, M. H., Tumanut, S. D., & Klute, P. (2012). Special issue: Study abroad in a new global century—Renewing the promise, refining the purpose. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 38*(4), 1-152.
- Vande Berg, M. (2007). Intervening in the learning of U.S. students abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3/4), 392–399.
- Vande Berg, M., Connor-Linton, J., & Paige, M. R. (2009). The Georgetown Consortium Project: Interventions for student learning abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 18*, 1–75.
- Wilkinson, S. (1998). Study abroad from the participants' perspective: A challenge to common beliefs. *Foreign Language Annals, 31*, 23–49.

- Xu, M., de Silva, C. R., Neufeldt, E., & Dane, J. H. (2013). The impact of study abroad on academic success: An analysis of first-time students entering Old Dominion University, Virginia, 2000-2004. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 23, 90-103.
- Younes, M. N., & Asay, S. M. (2003). The world as a classroom: The impact of international study experiences on college students. *College Teaching*, 51(4), 141–147.
- Zemach-Bersin, T. (2009). Selling the world: Study abroad marketing and the privatization of global citizenship. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship* (pp. 303–320). New York: Routledge.

L. BLAIR ALEXANDER
4235 ROCKY RHODES DR.
COLLEGE STATION, TX 77845
BLAIRALEX12@ICLOUD.COM, LALEXAN@IU.EDU
(812) 327-4679

Education

Doctor of Education Educational Leadership & Policy Studies (December 2023)

Dissertation: *“Institutional policy changes and their effects on the quality of study abroad proposals and students’ intercultural competence: A Program Evaluation”*
Emphasis in Higher Education Administration
Minor Public Affairs Management
Indiana University

Master of Science Kinesiology (June 1998)
Indiana University
Athletic Training Specialization

Bachelor of Science Kinesiology (May 1997)
Indiana University
Major: Athletic Training

Academic Positions

2020-2022 **Assessment & High Impact Practices Manager** College of Education and Human Development Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas

Responsible for Program Review Assessment and reporting continuous improvement efforts to University and external accreditors including Southern Association of Colleges and School Commission on Colleges (SACS COC) and Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB). Oversight of Global Education Office including mission, budgets, and alignment with best practices. Facilitating growth, access to, and quality of high impact practices.

- Consulted with faculty to move program assessment from compliance to internal continuous improvement model.
- Created a model to increase quality and frequency of high impact practices, particularly for low income, first generation students.

2015-2020 **Manager**, Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation
Provost Office, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas

Responsible for managing and providing leadership for activities and initiatives pertaining to the university-wide Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) for SACSCOC accreditation, high impact practices for students, and faculty assessment of student

learning. Worked closely with associate deans, deans, the QEP Advisory Committee and other high-level administrators to coordinate and implement these efforts.

- Managed the logistics for coding sessions and artifact sampling and submission, including the development of final reports.
- Membership on office research team, where analysis and sense-making of wide array of data occurred including translation into meaningful and useful reports for the campus community.
- Represented the office in an advisory capacity to the Core Curriculum Committee of the Faculty Senate.

2015

Doctoral Internship, Office of Admissions Transfer Recruitment
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana

Reviewed current Indiana state legislation affecting admissions and transfer students. Reviewed school transfer policies and evaluated current data and trends of transfer students. Provided recommendations for increasing transfer student enrollment, retention, and diversity. Afforded opportunity to interview all offices under Enrollment Management umbrella at IU to better understand how they all are integrated and work towards achieving college enrollment objectives.

2005-2014

Associate Professor & State Program Chair Kinesiology (2010-2014)
Ivy Tech Community College, Bloomington, Indiana

Developed new classes within Kinesiology for adoption across the college's 14 campuses statewide (Sports Marketing and Management, Structural Kinesiology, Current Concepts in Physical Fitness, Prescriptive evaluation of Personal Fitness); created and submitted for approval the curriculum for Associates of Science degree in Kinesiology as well as Personal Fitness Trainer Certificate to match Indiana legislative mandates and transferability to all State Higher Educational Institutions; led articulation discussions with Indiana University School of Public Health's Kinesiology program (creation of 2 + 2 degree path); conducted yearly program assessments (number of declared degree seeking students, completion rates, retention, and transfer) including assessment of strengths and weaknesses and ways to improve across all 14 campuses; Teaching load was 5/5 including Human Anatomy & Physiology and Kinesiology disciplines; supervised adjunct hires and oversight of standardized anatomy and physiology class (18 sections).

Department Chair of Kinesiology (2007-2014)

Created yearly budgets and purchasing for the Bloomington campus kinesiology needs (new equipment, repair, supplemental instructional materials); Planned all needs for Kinesiology lab room for new building expansion; completed yearly program assessments (number of declared degree seeking students, completion rates, retention, and transfer) including program strengths and weaknesses and ways to improve; created and chaired the Bloomington Kinesiology Advisory Board with representatives from Bloomington Hospital, Indiana University, a local business personal fitness gym owner, faculty and student representation with mission to assess the quality and preparation of Ivy Tech graduates and enhance program quality.

Committees and other duties as assigned

- Indiana University School of Public Health advisory board member – general advice on future school directions. I was particularly focused on the possibility of a 2 + 2 agreement with the community colleges in Kinesiology.
- Student Advising in the Allied Health Care / Kinesiology disciplines from new student registration to application and degree audits for graduation.
- Faculty Professional Development Committee Chair - charged with creating a culture and process for ongoing faculty professional development on the Bloomington Campus.
- State Faculty Professional Development Committee member
- Presentation at Statewide Program Chairs Retreat on new transfer legislation in Indiana and requirements of ongoing compliance.

Professional Presentations and Non-Referred Reports

Alexander, L.B. (2022). *Assessment Inventory 2022-2023 School of Education and Human Development* [Unpublished internal report]. School of Education and Human Development, Texas A&M University College Station.

Alexander, L.B. (2021). *Proposed changes in mission and funding of TAMU's College of Education and Human Development global education experiences* [Unpublished internal report]. College of Education and Human Development, Texas A&M University College Station.

Alexander, L.B. (2021). *Global education's student support disbursement matrix to facilitate equity and access to TAMU's CEHD approved study abroad experience.* [Unpublished internal report]. College of Education and Human Development, Texas A&M University College Station.

Alexander, L.B. (2020). *Current program review within TAMU's College of Education and Human Development* [Unpublished internal report]. College of Education and Human Development, Texas A&M University College Station.

Alexander, L.B. (2020). *Funding request for TAMU's CEHD purchase and onboarding of the Watermark's Planning & Self-Studies computer platform* [Unpublished internal report]. College of Education and Human Development, Texas A&M University College Station.

Alexander, L.B. (2018). *Core curriculum assessment data report* [Unpublished internal report]. Office of the Provost, Texas A&M University College Station.

Alexander, L.B. (2016). *Report on current quantity and participation levels for high impact practices at Texas A&M University* [Unpublished internal report]. Office of the Provost, Texas A&M University College Station.

Related Experience

2018

Certified VALUE Institute Scorer, AAC&U VALUE Institute.

Trained and calibrated to score and assess student artifacts using the AAC&U VALUE rubrics. Operating on a team of paid scorers that will score random artifacts from various institutions.